

“BETTER TO BE ALONE THAN IN ILL COMPANY”

JEREMY COLLIER THE YOUNGER: LIFE AND WORKS, 1650-1726

by

Tania Boster

B.A. Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, 2001

M.A. University of Pittsburgh, 2004

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2008

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

Tania Boster

It was defended on

November 25, 2008

and approved by

Seymour Drescher, University Professor, Department of History

Peter K. Machamer, Professor, Department of History and Philosophy of Science

Marcus Rediker, Professor and Chair, Department of History

Dissertation Advisor: Jonathan Scott, Carroll Amundson Professor of British History,

Department of History

Copyright © by Tania Boster

2008

“BETTER TO BE ALONE THAN IN ILL COMPANY”

JEREMY COLLIER THE YOUNGER: LIFE AND WORKS, 1650-1726

Tania Boster, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2008

This dissertation is an intellectual biography of Jeremy Collier the younger, a controversial clergyman who was committed to an ecumenical form of religion. As a consequence of his opposition to the Glorious Revolution of 1688/9 he was imprisoned twice, for sedition and high treason, and was outlawed from 1696 until the end of his life. He wrote in a remarkable variety of genres, including political pamphlets, theological treatises, sermons, history, and critical and moral essays. A consistent theme in Collier’s writings is his concern with the office of a minister, and his commitment to the practical duties of pastoral care, regardless of changes in Church and State policy. Collier’s belief that ministers are responsible to God and to individuals, not governments, is a constant theme across all of his writings. His thought resonates with religious and philosophical ideas of the mid-seventeenth century, a period during which Collier’s father, himself a divine, schoolmaster and linguist, invested his energies in social improvement through humanist education. This is the first study to treat Jeremy Collier’s life and thought comprehensively. In the process of recovering biographical data and contextualizing Collier’s publications and manuscripts, the dissertation covers a century of history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0	PATERNAL INFLUENCE: JEREMY COLLIER THE ELDER, C. 1630-1660.....	6
3.0	EARLY LIFE: JEREMY COLLIER THE YOUNGER, 1660-1688	26
4.0	THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION AND “PRETENDED AUTHORITY”, 1689-1696	55
5.0	THE “STAGE CONTROVERSY”: MORAL REFORM, OR REFORMATION OF MANNERS? 1698-1708	82
6.0	RELIGION, 1708-1726.....	109
7.0	CONCLUSION	127
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	130

PREFACE

I am indebted to many people for their support during the process of researching and writing this dissertation. The members of my committee, Professors Seymour Drescher, Peter Machamer and Marcus Rediker have generated enthusiasm, offered guidance, and inspired me to cast my net wide and to consider a variety of questions and sources. I thank Sy Drescher for challenging me to be innovative in my conceptualization of historical themes and problems, while insisting that I maintain focus on the immediate task of investigating Jeremy Collier's intellectual biography; Peter Machamer for overseeing my formal introduction to the mechanical philosophy that worried Collier so, and for his guidance in coming to grips with foundational texts; and Marcus Rediker encouraged me to pursue the network analyses of Collier the elder and Collier the younger, has been a mentor, and has provided an ongoing and influential intellectual community through seminars, workshops, lectures and informal gatherings of activists and fellow students of history. I am particularly grateful to my advisor, Professor Jonathan Scott, for his generous and critical feedback, and for fostering my development and encouraging my independence as a young scholar. Despite having had the privilege to work with such a remarkable committee of historians, this remains a work in progress with many flaws for which I take full responsibility.

I have been fortunate to receive the Department of History's support in my successful application for the Carolyn Chambers Memorial Fellowship and the Lillian B. Lawler

Predocctoral Fellowship. These awards, and a grant from the University Center for International Studies, made it possible for me to conduct research in the United Kingdom, and to write the dissertation. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to individual faculty members of the History Department. I thank Janelle Greenberg, under whose supervision I discovered Jeremy Collier the younger, Rob Ruck, Bernie Hagerty and Evelyn Rawski for their guidance, friendship, and professional example. I also appreciate the kindness and dedication to graduate students that has been shown by the History Department staff, particularly Molly Estes and Grace Tomcho.

A number of scholars and friends in the U.K. made my time there intellectually fruitful and full of cherished memories. Professors Reid Barbour, J.C. Davis, Mark Goldie, Felicity Henderson, Alexis Sanderson and Edward Vallance offered valuable advice and insight into my project, while Lucy Capes and Sharon Seager made London feel like a second home.

Thanks is due to all of the librarians and archivists who aided me in my research at the British Library, London; Bodleian Library, Oxford; Cambridgeshire County Record Office, Cambridge; Cambridge University Archives, and Cambridge University Library, Cambridge; Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone; Chetham's Library, Manchester; Gray's Inn, London; Lambeth Palace, London; Suffolk County Record Office, Bury Saint Edmunds; The National Archives: Public Records Office, Kew; and West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds.

I have learned a great deal more about my own work through conversations and spirited debates with fellow graduate students about their research. In particular, I am thankful to have had the feedback and friendship of Niklas Frykman, Bayete Henderson, Patrick Hughes, Craig Marin, Richard Purcell, Alyssa Ribeiro, Ellie Walsh and Kenyon Zimmer.

A core group of people have supported and inspired me in ways that will not be perceptible to most readers, but they have been integral to my work. Lisa Bartolli, Matthew

Duffy, Ronnie Kaye, Ellen, Robin and Alan Phillips, Paul Street and Anita Zubére brought my attention back on many occasions to what is truly important in life. This is a modest offering indeed in comparison to what they have given me, and words cannot express the depths of my gratitude to each of them. Finally, I dedicate this dissertation with love to my mother and father, who continue to teach me lessons of loyalty and compassion.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is the preliminary attempt to study Jeremy Collier's life as a whole. He published in a remarkable variety of genres, including political pamphlets, theological treatises, sermons, works of history, and critical and moral essays. Yet historians have only focused on three aspects of his literary output, in isolation from one another, and without accompanying biographical research: his Glorious Revolution pamphlets, the "Stage Controversy," and his involvement with the nonjurors' church.

The main points of Collier's life to date have derived from a biographical entry in the *Biographia Britannica*, published in the mid-eighteenth century, in which it is claimed that the background information about his early life was written by Collier himself. The provenance of this source has not been determined, but its use as a foundational reference for my dissertation is justified by archival findings. I suggest that the entry was written by the nonjuror Samuel Jebb, and that the portion attributed to Collier can be accepted as autobiographical in its circumstantial detail.¹ In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Collier received attention from Anglican ecclesiastical historians as a prominent nonjuror.² Two new editions of his *Ecclesiastical*

¹ The evidence for this claim is found in Samuel Jebb to Thomas Brett, 21 May 1726, Bodleian MS Eng Th c. 29, f. 139-140; *Biographia Britannica: or, The lives of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. I (London: 1747).

² Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings* (London: 1845); John Henry Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London: Smith, Elder, & co., 1902); Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-jurors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924); John William Charles Wand, *The High Church Schism: Four Lectures on the Nonjurors* (London: Faith Press, 1951).

History of Great Britain were published within about a decade of one another, both of which included introductions to Collier's life.³ Again, biographical details were limited to information from the *Biographia Britannica*. To the extent that these studies were inclusive of Collier's many publications, considerations of context were limited to the public aspect of his controversies as they appeared in print. The publication of Rose Anthony's thesis in 1937, reissued in 1966, marked a new direction in Collier studies, one which was mainly followed by literary scholars, and focused solely on the Stage Controversy.⁴ This strand of analysis is summarized by the governing assumptions in David Self's *The Single Source of All Filth*, in which Collier is assumed to "have been blissfully free of self-doubt and to have lived his life in a white fury of indignation at those who failed to adopt his ecclesiastical and moral stances. He was, frankly, a bigot or, to put it in current, politically correct terms, a religious conservative and traditionalist."⁵ More recent scholarship has taken a more nuanced view, incorporating Collier's resistance to the Glorious Revolution.⁶ Yet even though Collier is generally accepted as an able political controvertialist, he has continued to be, at the same time, castigated as a reactionary moralist.

This dissertation reconstructs Collier's intellectual biography primarily from his publications, his personal correspondence, and official documents in an attempt to bring into focus a more accurate view of his life and thought. The archival record is unevenly geared toward the last decade of his life, and the surviving correspondence is mostly concerned with

³ Jeremy Collier, Francis Foster Barham, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, 9 vols. (London: 1841); Jeremy Collier, Thomas Lathbury, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, (London: 1852).

⁴ Rose Anthony, *The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy, 1698-1726* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1937).

⁵ David Self, *The Single Source of All Filth: The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy* (Malvern: J. Garnet Miller, 2000), ix.

⁶ The finest examples of a recent study that focuses on Collier is Andrew Starkie's, "Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* (68:1) 2005. See below, chapter 5.

theology. This may be explained by the seizure of his papers when he was arrested in 1692, and allusions to the destruction of papers after his death by his widow and fellow nonjurors. But the relatively scarce evidence for the first half of his life nevertheless suggests some themes that are sustained in the second half. Chapter 1 focuses on Collier's father, who seems to have fared well during the civil wars. He was intruded as a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge in 1644, when General Manchester purged the university as part of an effort to institute Presbyterian supremacy. In 1646 Collier the elder began working with the Hartlib circle, translating Latin tracts to be published and submitted to parliament as acts of counsel. He was even included in Hartlib's plans to establish a "Council for Schooles" alongside the republicans John Milton and Marchamont Nedham. However, he fell out of favor with religious and educational authorities under the Protectorate, and was ejected from a school Mastership in 1653.

Chapter 2 establishes connections between father and son, starting with the younger Collier's education at Ipswich School under Collier the elder's tutelage. In 1663 Collier's father and teacher was once again ejected from a teaching post, perhaps as a result of the Clarendon Code. This body of legislation obliged clergymen and schoolmasters to adhere to a revised prayer book and liturgy. Collier the elder briefly held another teaching post, but according to Ely diocesan records, from 1666 until his death he was also a licensed preacher. Collier senior's appointments subsequent to his ejection are studied in terms of the interests of his patrons.

This chapter goes on to reconstruct for the first time the pre-1688 biography of Collier the younger based upon manuscript and printed sources which reveal the identities of his lay and ecclesiastical patrons, his whereabouts and employment from 1669 until the eve of the Glorious Revolution. Collier's education at Caius College, Cambridge (1669-1676), ordination as a deacon (1676) and then priest (1677/8) in the diocese of Ely are considered in relation to the

histories and concerns of his institutional superiors and benefactors. His brief service as chaplain (1678-79) to the countess dowager of Dorset at Knole House is addressed through extracts from the Sackville Papers, a description of the household's protocols based upon secondary sources, and the estate's broader political and cultural significance under the direction of notorious court favorite Charles Sackville, sixth earl of Dorset and first earl of Middlesex. The countess died within the year and Collier transferred immediately to a minor rectorship at Ampton near Bury St. Edmunds, again under private patronage. Collier moved to London in 1685 and reportedly lectured (preached) at Gray's Inn.

Chapter 3 focuses on Collier's first substantial period of publication in reaction to the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the establishment of the Williamite regime, and the Nine Years War. As in every decade since the civil wars, 1689 saw the repopulation of the universities and the institutions of church and state, this time, in Collier's view, as a result of conquest. Because he refused to take the oath of allegiance, Collier was deprived of his living as a clergyman of the Church of England. Hereafter, he would be a minister, and eventually the head of a schismatic church. Collier was arrested twice, for publishing seditious pamphlets in 1689 and for high treason in 1692, and was associated with two plots to assassinate King William. His printed remonstrations and the circumstances of his arrests are discussed in the context of wartime ideology and legislation. In his political pamphlets Collier argued that 1688/9 was a conquest, and explains the connection between pride in the individual and the religious and political tyranny of conquerors.

Between the end of the Nine Years War (1697) and the beginning of the War of the Spanish Succession (1701), Collier started to write about culture. Chapter 4 describes the infamous decade-long print debate Collier began in 1698, in which he criticized such eminent

dramatists as John Dryden and William Congreve for corrupting morals through their plays. These publications are surveyed in the context of competing visions of moral reform which were active at the turn of the century. Mainly, though, it is the intention of this study to provide a close textual analysis of Collier's essays to discover what he was actually saying, and to hopefully dispel the misconceptions that have continued to taint his biography. In the midst of this debate, Collier published volumes I (1701) and II (1705) of his *Great Historical Dictionary*, a translation of and supplement to the French Jesuit Louis Moréri's 1676 *Grande Dictionnaire Historique*. This thesis discusses Collier's edition in relation to prior translations to which he claimed that his own provided a corrective.

Chapter 5 begins with Collier's two-volume *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*. The major themes addressed in this thesis include Collier's emphasis on anti-Erastianism, and his return to the issue of conquest. From the final decade of Collier's life has survived the largest volume of personal correspondence, with the nonjuror Thomas Brett. These letters are almost exclusively concerned with the "usages controversy" that divided the nonjurors, and the disruptive effects of issues related to liturgy and ritual. They provide the subtext to Collier's publications during these years. Despite the fact that Brett allied with him during the course of this dispute which irreparably divided the nonjurors, Collier's insistence on certain points of theology is distinctive, leaving him isolated.

2.0 PATERNAL INFLUENCE: JEREMY COLLIER THE ELDER, C. 1630-1660

The details of Jeremy Collier's childhood are vague. He was born Jeremiah Collier on September 23, 1650, in Stow cum Qui (now Quy), Cambridgeshire, the second son of Jeremiah and Elizabeth Collier (née Smith). His mother's family had settled in Qui, but both the Collier and Smith families traced their roots to Yorkshire, where Jeremy the younger maintained property until the end of his life.⁷ In his autobiographical statement, Collier the younger identified himself, first of all, as "son of Jeremy Collier...a Divine and considerable Linguist."⁸ Following Collier's lead, this chapter focuses on the intellectual world and associates of his father and namesake.

In fact, Collier was a third-generation clergyman. His paternal grandfather had been an esteemed minister at Bradford in Yorkshire, a region legendary for its dissenting population.⁹ In a sermon preached during the early 1630s, he called upon his congregation to take charge of their own consciences, to examine the state of their own souls, to know for themselves "whether yw be in yr ffaith." It is "safer for a ppl to Examme yeselves" than "curiously to inquire...into ye ministry. Look to faith &...yr heart; be not curious about ye minister, but judg basely of

⁷ See below Chapter 5.

⁸ *Biog Britannica: or, The lives of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. I (London: 1747), 1406. Due to limitations on time and space of a Ph.D. dissertation, I am unable to provide detailed genealogical data on either the Smith or Collier families. These will be pursued in the holdings of the Cambridgeshire County Record Office, Cambridge and West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds.

⁹ *Biog. Brit.*, 1406. Collier's grandfather ("Colyer of Bradford") is mentioned in a list of "evangelical" and "energetic" preachers in James G. Miall, *Congregationalism in Yorkshire: A Chapter of Modern Church History*, (London: John Snow and Co., 1868), 26.

thyself...”¹⁰ The mechanism for this inquiry is the “petty jury within every man,” the individual’s God-given conscience, “whereby a man is able to reflect upon his particular actions...A man must sit in commission upon himself.”¹¹ This process of self-examination is accessible to everyone; it does not require that one be “Book-learned” because the teaching of God can be read “in thy heart, without ye teaching of man.”¹² Even wicked men can have “a swimming knowlidg,” yet their faith does not derive from a humble soul. Theirs is “not a renewed heart...it is...a deceitfull heart, a Darck heart wherin is no light.” This “dreaming drunken heart, besotted with pleasures, lusts, self-love...they are ye old Epicures, sabboth-breakers...”¹³ Rather, the new-born Christian “longs after ye pure simple & unmixd word,” and is thereby nourished with the “milk of faith,” the effect of which “will be love...ye soul will be affectionatly inclined towards this God who hath been so good & mercyfull as to forgive his sin.” The soul is free to submit to the will of God in this state of “Liberty and freedom for God and goodness.”¹⁴

The transcript of this sermon by Collier’s grandfather was recorded in a collection of sermons by dissenting preachers.¹⁵ What particular strain of dissent is not evident, yet the sermon does register theological controversies that were prevalent in the early 1630s. He was, for instance, careful to emphasize that the concept of faith is sometimes mistaken for “ye Doctrine of faith...and sometimes for ye Grace of faith,” but that in fact faith is the life’s blood of a Christian, who “lives by faith as a fish in ye watr is in his elamt.”¹⁶ During the 1630s,

¹⁰ Mr Collier, Bradford, Hall Mss Vol. III, BL Add. Mss 45, 671, f. 110.

¹¹ BL Add. Mss 45, 671, f. 110.

¹² BL Add. Mss 45, 671, f. 112.

¹³ BL Add. Mss 45, 671, f. 112.

¹⁴ BL Add. Mss 45, 671, ff. 113; 115.

¹⁵ The British Library catalogue notes that the Hall Mss comprises notes of sermons “mostly preached by dissenting ministers at Kipping and elsewhere in the West Riding, in the hands of John Hall.”

¹⁶ BL Add. Mss 45, 671, f. 110.

ministers confronted Caroline religious reform under the direction of Archbishop William Laud, “distinguished by an attack on the calvinist, and indeed protestant, piety of preaching; an alternative emphasis upon the liturgy, ceremony and the sacramental officiation of the priesthood.”¹⁷ While the grandfather’s sermon was generally in line with the doctrine of free-will favored by Laudians, contrary to predestinarian Calvinist theology, he also made an antiformal appeal to the individual conscience that would have challenged the uniform devotional practice prescribed in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Similarly, the emphasis on the individual’s relationship to God, suspending reliance upon a priestly intermediary, contradicted Laudian policy, which aimed to consolidate religious practice by way of standardized procedures of worship as administered by ordained members of the clergy.¹⁸ At any rate, the label “dissenting” does not help to pinpoint with precision a denominational affiliation for Collier’s grandfather any more than “non-juror” describes the particular character of Collier the younger’s theology.

While his grandfather preached in the north country, Collier’s father attended Trinity College, Cambridge, where between 1636 and 1639/40 he earned his B.A. as a sizar, or poor scholar, a status Collier the younger would share later in pursuit of his own education at Cambridge. If it was likely that Laudian policy had an impact upon his grandfather as a

¹⁷ Jonathan Scott, *England’s Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 129; Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

¹⁸ On Laudian policies aimed at preachers in the 1630s, see John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714* (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2006), 76-77. Collier the younger later offered his own account of this situation in his *Ecclesiastical History*. Citing Laud’s Diary, Collier shared Laud’s view that the Calvinist “feoffees” who financed preachers independent of the Church of England were “the main Instruments for the Puritan Faction to undo the Church.” Jeremy Collier the younger, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, Part II, Book IX (London: 1714), p. 754. See also Peter King, “Bishop Wren and the Suppression of the Norwich Lecturers,” *The Historical Journal*, 11, no. 2 (1968), 241. Collier’s father would enjoy Bishop Matthew Wren’s patronage after the Restoration, to be discussed in chapter 2, although it is difficult to discern why he would have earned Wren’s sympathy after his intrusion into St. John’s College, Cambridge. See below.

preacher, his father most certainly witnessed its implementation first-hand. Collier the elder's arrival at Trinity coincided with the visitation of a disapproving Archbishop Laud, who in September 1636 described an atmosphere of negligence in matters of ritual and ceremony.¹⁹

On completion of his B.A. in 1640, Collier senior spent two years at Boston Grammar School in Lincolnshire, where he was elected Usher March 19, 1641, the position just beneath that of Master. He returned to Cambridge, earning his M.A. at Trinity College in 1643.²⁰ Shortly thereafter he replaced a Fellow of St. John's College under "An Ordinance for Regulating the University of Cambridge, and for removing of Scandalous Ministers in the seven Associated Counties." Lord Manchester had appointed committees throughout the Eastern Association, charged with rooting out loyalist university masters and fellows, students, ministers and schoolmasters. Offending parties were to be ejected, their estates seized, and their positions filled with suitable replacements as determined by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster.²¹ Under these circumstances, on September 16, 1644, by recommendation of the Assembly of Divines and by Manchester's order, Jeremy Collier "was intruded as a fellow of St. John's in the place of an expelled royalist sympathizer. The furniture of St. John's chapel had been removed, its organ, pictures, and the cross on the tower being taken down, and the walls whitened."²²

¹⁹George Bagley, *Floreat Bostona: the history of Boston Grammar School from 1567* (Boston, Lincolnshire: Old Bostonian Association, 1985); Elizabeth Leedham-Green, *A Concise History of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 78-81. Collier the younger would later draw from Laud's *Register* of June 21, 1636 to provide an account of the actions taken to reform the situation at Cambridge. Collier the Younger, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part II, Book IX, 766-767. See also William Laud, *The Autobiography of Dr William Laud - Collected From His Remains* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1839).

²⁰J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900 Cambridge*, Vol. I, Part 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922-54), 352.

²¹W.A.I. Vincent, *The State and School Education in England and Wales, 1640-1660* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1950), 60-61.

²²Bagley, *Floreat Bostona*; Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 352.

Collier the younger would later provide an account of this incident sympathetic to the Fellows who lost their livings, and critical of those who had been selected to replace them, though his father was not specifically named. He described the universal refusal of the Oath of Discovery, the “Test obliging [Fellows] to inform against their Friends, Tutors, and Masters, and betray the Interest of their Societies.”²³ The noncompliant Fellows likewise refused the Covenant and were turned out three days later.²⁴ Collier went on to detail a state of iconoclastic fervor which overtook, among others, the college of which his father was to become a member:

...To this List may be subjoined some other Misfortunes suffer'd by the University: The Soldiers were quartered in their Colleges, their Chapels plunder'd and defac'd, the Common-Prayer Books torn in St. Mary's before the coming out of the Suppressing-Ordinance. Their Bridges were broken, their Materials for Building seiz'd, their Groves fell'd; and which was almost an irreparable Damage, a choice Collection of Antiquity in Coins and Medals, weighing twenty two Pounds, was plunder'd from St. John's College. And for a farther Mortification, their Estates formerly exempted, were tax'd, and the Assessment proportion'd by the Townsmen.²⁵

Presumably, Collier the elder would have been required to subscribe to the Solemn League and Covenant. But this was not necessarily the case. Some fellows, including Simon Patrick, William Sancroft, Henry More, Benjamin Whichcote and John Worthington managed to avoid the oath.²⁶ “In fact,” as J.D. Twigg explains, “the purge, though severe, was not as total as the royalist tracts suggested.”²⁷ As an intruded Fellow, it is possible that Collier's father was required to publicly declare his intentions to promote learning and piety in accordance with the statutes of the College and the Covenant, and also to ‘endeavour to procure the good welfare and

²³ Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part II, Book IX, 853-854.

²⁴ Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part II, Book IX, 853-854.

²⁵ Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part II, Book IX, 853-854.

²⁶ J.D. Twigg, “The Parliamentary Visitation of the University of Cambridge, 1644-1645,” *The English Historical Review*, 98, no. 338 (1983), 521.

²⁷ Twigg, “Parliamentary Visitation,” 522.

perfect reformation both of the College and the University, so far as to me appertaineth.’²⁸ This would have presented less of a challenge to the consciences of those who may not have subscribed to or supported the Covenant.²⁹ However, by January 1645, admission was denied to any new Fellows who had not taken the Oath.³⁰ Further measures were taken between 1646 and 1648 to achieve concensus and to extract any royalists who had “slipped through the net” in 1644.³¹

Questions about Collier the elder’s commitment to the “puritan” cause arise from his association after Restoration with Bishop Matthew Wren, who before the civil wars had been among those dispatched by Laud to enforce conformity, and would have been at odds with the circumstances of Collier’s appointment as Fellow at St. John’s.³² However, in 1646 the future republican John Hall introduced Collier into Samuel Hartlib’s circle.³³ The next eight years of Collier’s life follow a pattern similar to the turns in fortune experienced by Hartlib in his efforts to enact monumental social, economic and intellectual reform. Briefly put, J.C. Davis distinguishes “three waves of ideal-society expectation” in the Hartlib circle’s era, a classification reinforced by the analysis of Charles Webster.³⁴ The first wave, 1640-1641, was marked by the excitement and optimism surrounding the Moravian minister John Amos

²⁸ Quoted in Twigg, “Parliamentary Visitation,” 525-526.

²⁹ See Edward Vallance, ““An Holy and Sacramentall Paction’: Federal Theology and the Solemn League and Covenant in England,” *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 145 (2001), 50-75; and Vallance, “Oaths, Casuistry and Equivocation: Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy,” *The Historical Journal* 44, no. 1 (2001), 59-77.

³⁰ Twigg, “Parliamentary Visitation,” 527.

³¹ Twigg, “Parliamentary Visitation,” 528.

³² Collier the elder’s post-Restoration relation to Wren is treated below in chapter 2.

³³ This suggests an explanation which both transcends specific confessional identity, and which accomodates common interests between Fellows such as Collier, who managed to survive and even infiltrate the universities during the purge, and those who executed the purge. That is, namely, the ubiquity of anti-formalism. See J.C. Davis, “Living with the Living God: radical religion and the English Revolution,” in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds, *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

³⁴ J.C. Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1516-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 315-316; Charles Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), Introduction.

Comenius's 1641 arrival in England.³⁵ During the second wave, between 1647 and 1653, Hartlib sought state support for his Office of Address, a universal network of scholars designed to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas. This mission encompassed a variety of projects ranging across scientific, agricultural and medical experimentation, to plantation and urban improvement schemes, systems for employing the poor, and the complete restructuring of educational philosophy and pedagogy. These projects were disseminated, in part, through the translation of ideal society tracts, which were submitted to Parliament and circulated among potential patrons to advise ways in which the commonwealth would be best directed and structured to complete godly reform. These were not isolated pursuits; the Hartlib circle's publications convey the interconnectedness Hartlib identified between natural philosophy, learning, spirituality and republicanism as ideas along the continuum of a pan-protestant and humanist effort. Collier the elder contributed in several ways to this broadly conceptualized undertaking.

In the two year period between the civil wars John Dury addressed the House of Commons. His message was a continuation of attempts that were begun by himself and Samuel Hartlib in the 1630s and early 1640s to reform the commonwealth. In the summary of Hugh Trevor-Roper:

Parliament must settle and purge the universities so that the clergy learn 'the true language of Canaan' instead of 'the gibberage of scholastical divinity'; it must reform the law and the law courts throughout the land; and it must embrace all native and foreign Protestants in a comprehensive Church....At the same time Hartlib also was eager to show that a new day had dawned. He enlisted a team of translators. At Cambridge the poet John Hall was set to translate the utopias of Hartlib's master, [Johann Valentin] Andreae.

³⁵ See below.

Another agent was instructed to translate the utopia of [Tomasso] Campanella ‘the City of the Sun’ – that Campanella whom Comenius venerated next to Bacon.³⁶

This second “agent” was Collier the elder. Hall, whose *The Grounds and Reasons for Monarchy* (1651) Jonathan Scott classifies as one of the “key republican texts” along with John Milton’s *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* (1651), and Marchamont Nedham’s *The Case of the Commonwealth of England Stated* (1650), demonstrates the futility of focusing solely upon political allegiances during the decades of the civil wars and Interregnum.³⁷ In his tract on educational reform, *The Advancement of Learning* (1649), Hall emphasized the republican content of his friend Milton’s *Of Education* (1644), calling upon the Rump Parliament to recognize that “the new republic will come to nothing unless the propagation of learning is reformed.”³⁸ In what was most likely a reference to Hartlib and Dury, Hall in his *Humble Motion to Parliament* (1649) implored, ‘For what more seasonable opportunity can we have, then that we see the highest spirits, pregnant with great matters, and in despite of these Tumults and Troubles which environ them of every side, labouring with somewhat, the greatnesse of which they themselves cannot tell, and with a wonderfull deale of courage, attempting the discovery of a new world of knowledge.’³⁹

John Hall had been studying at St. John’s since February of 1646. G.H. Turnbull tells us that as early as November of that year, “the letters show that he [Hartlib] was relying on Hall to

³⁶ H.R. Trevor-Roper, “Three Foreigners: The Philosophers of the Puritan Revolution,” in *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 277.

³⁷ Jonathan Scott, “The English Republican Imagination,” in John Morrill, ed, *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins & Brown, 1992), 37. Collier shares a page in the Hartlib papers with Milton and Nedham in the context of educational reform: Ephemerides, Undated [47/13/3A-4B] *HP*. See below, note 44.

³⁸ Nigel Smith, *Literature & Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 187; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 212-213.

³⁹ Quoted in Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 29. See also Foster Watson, “The State and Education during the Commonwealth,” in *The English Historical Review* 15 (1900), 60.

get him into touch with members of the University who might serve his purpose of ‘gleaning together’, as Hall puts it in one letter, ‘great and honest spirits’ for his various projects.”⁴⁰ It was on December 17, 1646 that Hall explained to Hartlib:

“Sir I pray yow take not my declining Translations that I any way wold draw my Neck from the yoak but that I may serv to better advantage, I haue got one Gent. His name is Collier a Fellow of our howse fitt for it especially in Latin, <Hee> wold quickly engage wold yow be pleasd to Direct one short letter of Acquaintance to him by my hands & after Refer him to my Intelligence.”⁴¹

Collier possessed the expertise in Latin that Hall and Hartlib sought. Equally important, Collier would have approved at least passively of Hartlib’s philosophy of social change, even if he was not necessarily in sympathy with Campanella’s prescription.⁴² The translations were to be presented to parliament as acts of counsel. While the correspondence between Hall and Hartlib makes a convincing case that Collier took up the task of translating Campanella’s *Civitas Solis*,⁴³ and that it was nearly finished by March of 1647,⁴⁴ Turnbull notes that Collier’s translation is never mentioned again, “Nor is there, so far as I know, any record of the publication of this or any other English translation of the *Civitas Solis* during this period.”⁴⁵ The only allusion he finds to the text is in a letter from Robert Boyle to Hartlib dated April 8, 1647, in which he says “that the work deserves ‘to be taught in our language.’”⁴⁶

⁴⁰ G.H. Turnbull, “John Hall’s Letters to Samuel Hartlib,” *The Review of English Studies*, New Series 4 (1953), 221.

⁴¹ John Hall to Samuel Hartlib 17 December 1646? [60/14 3B-4A] *The Hartlib Papers* 2nd Edition (Sheffield, HROnline, 2002). (hereafter *HP*) By August, 1647, Collier was on sufficiently familiar terms with Dury and Hartlib that his cousin, who was evidently quite a handful, spent time under both Dury and Hartlib’s care. John Dury to Mr Collier 10 August 1647 [4/1/5A-B] *HP*. Hall was also affiliated with a royalist circle engaged in translation projects in 1646, based in London, and centering around Thomas Stanley. Susan A. Clarke, “Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post-Regicide Funerary Propaganda,” *Parergon* 22, no. 2 (2005), 113-130. It is possible that, through Hall, Collier the elder was a member of the Stanley circle as well.

⁴² On the latter, see Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society*, 69-73.

⁴³ “Here yow haue an answer & account from Mr Collier, I haue been about with him to translate Campanella’s *Civitas Solis*...” Hall to Hartlib, 15 February 1647 [60/14/22A] *HP*.

⁴⁴ “*Civitas Solis* is Iust at an vpshot vpon the Conclusion of it, Mr Collier is for Comenius...” Hall to Hartlib Undated (Late March 1647?) [60/14/39A-39B] *HP*.

⁴⁵ Turnbull, “John Hall’s Letters to Samuel Hartlib,” 221-223.

⁴⁶ Turnbull, “John Hall’s Letters to Samuel Hartlib,” 221-223.

Collier's next translation, *Pansophia Diatyposis* (1643) or *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge*, was completed in 1651. This implies that Hartlib subsequently entrusted him with the work of Comenius, one of the circle's foundational theorists.⁴⁷ Comenius was one of Hartlib's chief sources of inspiration and imparted ideas crucial to the Hartlib circle's undertakings. In 1621 Hapsburg armies invaded his homeland forcing him to flee first to Bohemia, then to Poland. He launched an open campaign to reform education, particularly methods for teaching Latin: children should be taught about the things of this world rather than disembodied ideas, and should be imbued with a sense of the divine harmony of humankind and nature.⁴⁸ Useful and morally substantial learning for all boys and girls was a means of healing religious disunity, the cause of Europe's violent discord. Comenius applied himself to providing a system of developmentally appropriate educational methods. Hartlib had published translations of Comenius's works and arranged for him to come to England to establish an academy based on his philosophy of teaching and *pansophia*, or universally shared knowledge. After investing substantial effort and enthusiasm, Comenius abandoned England for Sweden in June of 1642 due to the looming outbreak of the first civil war.⁴⁹

Collier provided the English translation *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge*, one of many statements of Comenius's view of *pansophia*, which Dagmar Čapková explains as unique in its emphasis upon the connection between intellectual and spiritual processes and the integration of the disciplines with an eye toward universal moral edification, rather than a mere

⁴⁷ John Amos Comenius, *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge, In a plaine and true Draught: or a Diatyposis*, trans. Jeremy Collier (London: Printed for T.H. and Jo. Collins, 1651).

⁴⁸ Latin, which he lauded for its role as an international language, had been taught primarily by rote methods and prioritized over native languages. Instead, Comenius asserted, Latin was secondary to learning one's vernacular tongue and should be taught in association with real world objects and experience.

⁴⁹ H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Three Foreigners," in *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 253-275; Paul Monroe, ed., *A Cyclopaedia of Education*, Vol. II (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), 135-137; John E. Sadler, *J.A. Comenius and the Concept of Universal Education* (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1966), 124.

accumulation of data or indoctrination. “Pansophia should integrate intellectual as well as moral and religious activities, pulling together human reason, speech, will, emotions, conscience and endeavour.”⁵⁰ In the “Epistle Dedicatory,” Collier praised Hartlib as the vessel by which Comenius’s ideas were transmitted to England. Collier reprimanded parliament for its loss of momentum at a critical stage of reform: “...it will be a thing much to be deplored, that such pious and profitable designes, should not bee encouraged by some eminent and correspondent favours from the managers of publick concernments in our owne Nation at this time of reformation especially...”⁵¹ He expressed his regret at the circumstances under which Comenius’s plans to realize true reform in England unravelled because “certain Honourable and active Patrons of Learning in this present Parliament” who had invited Comenius “hither...disappoynted of the preferment they did sincerely intend him, in regard of the great distractions which happened in the State at that juncture of time when hee came over.”⁵² But Collier hoped that unlike Comenius, Hartlib would “let no crosse accidents disanimate you in your earnest prosecution of a generall good, but...still continue and persist in this laudable way of deserving well of the Christian and learned Commonwealth,” implying that under the Republic (established 1649) another opportunity to affect substantive change had arrived, and that it should be seized.⁵³ Collier expressed his own dedication to the effort, stating that “since I have not lately heard of what Mr. Comenius hath done in his Philologicall or Pansophicall

⁵⁰ Dagmar Čapková, “Comenius and his ideals: escape from the labyrinth,” in Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Ralor, eds, *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 79. The summation of Comenius’ entire system would not be available until 1657 with the publication of his collected works. Comenius’ bibliography may be gleaned from C.H. Dobinson, ed., *Comenius and Contemporary Education: Commemoration of the Tercentenary of the Death of Comenius – An International Symposium* (Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1970), 91-95.

⁵¹ Comenius, *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge*, Epistle Dedicatory.

⁵² Comenius, *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge*, Epistle Dedicatory. Regarding Comenius’ biography and his sojourn to England, see Trevor-Roper, “Three Foreigners.”

⁵³ Comenius, *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge*, Epistle Dedicatory.

undertakings, bee pleased to let me participate therein, and you shall find none readier to serve you, then, Sir, Your entirely loving, and duly regarding Friend, J.C.”⁵⁴ In this introductory statement to Comenius’s text, Collier demonstrates that he valued his own work as a Latinist in this far-reaching reform effort. He also offered his services to see to it that this work continued, with or without Comenius.⁵⁵

By 1651, Collier appears to have transferred his efforts to other aspects of educational reform. Appointed Master of Aldenham School in 1649, he had at some point married Elizabeth Smith. In addition to teaching, Collier began work in early 1651 on a dictionary: “Mr. Collier. Master of the free-schoole at Aldenham in the brewers company gift 14 or 16. miles from London, is about a Lexicon Etymologicum et Harmonia Linguae Anglicae which is to bee very big.”⁵⁶

Hartlib’s Office of Address, a pansophical effort to facilitate the sharing of knowledge through “an international correspondency among scholars,” has been regarded primarily at the level of grand schemes and ideas, such as William Petty’s “Literary Workhouse.”⁵⁷ But Jeremy Collier the elder shows that collaboration among reform minded individuals, and the corroboration of philosophies for collective change, relied upon people in the localities. Among the ranks of engineers, agronomists and philosophers, educators such as Collier made a vital contribution.

In April of 1651 Collier reported to Hartlib that he had engaged in dialogue with another schoolmaster, a Mr. Kempe, who wanted to discuss Hartlibian school reform. According to

⁵⁴ Comenius, *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge*, Epistle Dedicatory.

⁵⁵ Collier might also be (boldly) asserting here that he himself is capable of performing Comenius’s role by proxy.

⁵⁶ Ephemerides Jan. c.-April 1651 [28/2/10A] *HP*. Collier may have considered this work part of the “systematic encyclopaedism” initiated by Hartlib in the 1630s and 1640s. See Stephen Clucas, “In search of ‘The True Logick,’” in *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation*, 52-53.

⁵⁷ Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-1660* (New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1976), 67-77, 423-424.

Hartlib, Kempe “began to impart” to Collier tracts by John Dury and William Petty that advocated and described the institutional and moral reform of schools, universities and libraries. These included, in Petty’s case, a consideration of appropriate educational techniques based upon an understanding of children’s intellectual development.⁵⁸ Collier reported to Hartlib that Kempe was sincerely interested in the advancement of learning, but because he had such a large school, with thirty or forty boarders in his care, he did not have time to devote to the effort.⁵⁹ The discussion of these tracts by two schoolmasters exhibits Comenian developmental theory adapted to English circumstances.⁶⁰ It also indicates the degree of commitment and effort that putting such ambitious theory into practice would have demanded of teachers and educational administrators. Collier’s report of this exchange was important enough for Hartlib to record it in the *Ephemerides* – Hartlib’s chronicle of correspondence, ideas and developments deemed significant to his reform efforts – despite the fact that Kempe was unable to actively enlist in the mission. Parliament could legislate in line with Hartlib’s and Dury’s recommendations, but the true transformation depended upon educators adopting and adapting these ideas and implementing them in the schools.

Another indication of Collier’s involvement in educational reform is his inclusion in Hartlib’s plans for a “Council for Schooles...to prepare for the Advancement of Universal Learning.” Collier is listed as secretary to the Commissioners named to pursue an Act that would establish the council, a position which he was to hold alongside leading defenders of the

⁵⁸ John Dury, *The Reformed Librarie Keeper: With a Supplement to the Reformed School, As subordinate to Colleges in Universities* (London: Printed by William Du-Gard, 1650); William Petty, *The Advice of W.P. to Mr. Samuel Hartlib for The Advancement of some particular Parts of Learning* (London: 1648).

⁵⁹ *Ephemerides* C. April 1651 [28/2/14B] *HP*.

⁶⁰ On this subject see Howard Hotson, “Philosophical pedagogy in reformed central Europe between Ramus and Comenius: a survey of the continental background of the ‘Three Foreigners,’” in Greengrass, Leslie, Rayor, eds, *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation*, 29-50.

Republic, including John Milton and Marchamont Nedham.⁶¹ Hartlib and Dury had reactivated their campaign for school reform in 1646, and even then they called for the establishment of a formal oversight committee: “[The Magistrate’s] Duty towards the Young ones; it is to Order the Meanes of their Education aright, to which effect he should see Schools opened, provided with Teachers, endued with Maintenance, regulated with Constitutions, and hee should have Inspectors and Overseers to looke to the observance of good Orders in this businesse.”⁶²

These ideas and the associated projects with which Collier became involved drew upon a longer humanist tradition, stretching back to at least the early to mid-sixteenth century, as well as developments flowing from the protestant reformation. The Hartlib circle could be considered a legacy of this intellectual heritage, but within distinctive circumstances.⁶³ The Rump Parliament took some interest, voting June 8, 1649 to grant money annually to educational reform.⁶⁴ The vote occurred in the weeks following the defeat of the Levellers, a period in which parliament was divided between ‘revolutionaries’ and ‘conformists.’ As Blair Worden explains, “Radical motions always fared best when attendances were thin, and there was a small house on the 9th [of

⁶¹ Ephemerides, Undated [47/13/3A-4B] *HP*. See also Charles Webster, *Samuel Hartlib*, 43, 58. Webster is not explicit regarding the Council’s place in the chronology, but gives the impression that these plans were being made between 1647-51.

⁶² Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 37. It was Queen Mary Tudor who first established the licensing of schoolmasters, a system for controlling texts and other aspects of intellectual content which was maintained by Elizabeth and the early Stuarts. Helen M. Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, Inc., 1998), 26-27.

⁶³ A strong case for a sixteenth-century humanist foundation for commonwealth-era educational reform efforts is made by Joan Simon, who traces such movements back to the Henrician era. During Edward VI’s reign, reforming parties believed that the expansion of educational opportunities “was essential to a real reformation of church and state.” These early advocates, in turn, drew upon continental humanist thought. Joan Simon, “The Reformation and English Education” in *Past and Present* 11 (1957), 48-65. Charles Webster connects the Hartlib circle’s efforts at educational reform to the longer puritan traditions of millenarian eschatology and “the revival of learning.” Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 1-27, 100-242. For a general overview of humanist and protestant educational reform in early-modern England, see Jewell, *Education*, 26, 33-36.

⁶⁴ Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 77.

June, 1649, one day after the above-mentioned vote],”⁶⁵ and there is no evidence that Hartlib’s “Council for Schooles” was ever realized.

Under these circumstances, Collier the elder’s efforts subsequently turned to more esoteric projects. In July of 1654 Collier paid a visit to Hartlib, accompanied by the eccentric poet Edward Benlowes:

The 11. of July Mr. Benlow’s coming to my house with Mr. Collier j prevented him by going to his lodging in Russel-street at the signe of the Crowne where hee promised to give mee yearly the sume of 20. lb. to begin Michalmas next. Hee brought mee also acquainted with his Niece that is brought up in all manner of knowledge and languages. but explained that shee and her mother could not bee draw’n from Popery.⁶⁶

Benlowes, who was a well known patron of poets, had deemed Hartlib worthy of his support.⁶⁷ Benlowes’s epic poem *Theophila* is the story of the soul’s progress toward and communion with God. Collier translated the seventh canto of *Theophila* into Latin and included a dedicatory poem to Benlowes, meditating on the work’s greater theme of spiritual transcendence. This may have been a daring move. Harold Jenkins suggests that both Collier and John Hall revered Benlowes’s work, which was known to them through St. John’s College where Benlowes, who matriculated in 1620, continued to be held in esteem as a benefactor.⁶⁸ Although he was raised Catholic, Benlowes denounced the faith openly in a Latin poem entitled *Papa Perstrictus* (1645). The sincerity of this public anti-Catholicism has not been questioned

⁶⁵ Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1974), 200.

⁶⁶ *Ephemerides* July 1654 [29/4/20B] HP; Benlowes’s niece, Philippa, and her mother Mary (his sister), were indeed Catholics to whom he gave financial support. Benlowes even provided Philippa’s dowry when she married Walter Blount. Philippa was Benlowes’s sole heir; he never married or had children of his own. See Harold Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes (1602-1676): Biography of a Minor Poet* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 236-237.

⁶⁷ The month in which Collier and Benlowes appear together in the *Ephemerides* coincides with Benlowes’s period of homelessness due to a house fire, which forced him to spend time living in London. Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 234-235.

⁶⁸ Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 212-213.

by Benlowes's biographer, who does however find that Benlowes suffered financially for his Catholic heritage through recusancy fines.⁶⁹

If his Catholicism did not make Benlowes suspect, his royalism may have. Benlowes was given command of a troop of royalist cavalry in 1646.⁷⁰ According to David Norbrook, he financed the publication of Payne Fisher's royalist poem *Marston-Moor* (April 1650).⁷¹ Furthermore, Benlowes counted among his friends John Gauden, author of the post-regicidal lament *Eikon Basilike* (1649), who would also go on to introduce a Latin poem in *Theophila*.⁷² *Theophila* itself contains passages that may have been deemed subversive, including a critique of the civil wars which were underway at the time of the poem's composition.⁷³ According to Jenkins, *Theophila* went largely unnoticed when it became available in 1652, perhaps because it was sold by "an aristocrat among publishers, who dealt in learning and culture, put out all the finest poetry of the age, and declined to accommodate baser tastes."⁷⁴

Within a year of *Theophila*'s publication, Collier was dismissed from his mastership at Aldenham School "for 'divers negligence and misdemeanours.'"⁷⁵ It is conceivable that his

⁶⁹ Anthony à Wood believed that Benlowes "had picked up the taint of Romanism while on the Continent." Quoted in Harold Jenkins, "Toward a Biography of Edward Benlowes," *The Review of English Studies* 12 (1936), 276; Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 136, 155; see also Carl Niemeyer, "New Light on Edward Benlowes," *The Review of English Studies* 12 (1936), 31-41, to which Jenkins was responding in his 1936 article. Niemeyer associates Benlowes's "descent from affluence to poverty" with his "reckless generosity and his lavish patronage of the arts," as well as parliamentary "extortions" after the civil wars; Jenkins gives more weight to the latter.

⁷⁰ Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 173.

⁷¹ David Norbrook, describing Benlowes as "no republican," includes in a footnote that Fisher's *Marston-Moor* contains a quotation from *Eikon Basilike*. Fisher, a royalist during the civil wars and critic of the regicide, "became the main ceremonial laureate first of the republic and then of the Protectorate." David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 229-230; 192-213.

⁷² Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 146-148.

⁷³ Jenkins estimates that Benlowes wrote much of *Theophila* during the early years of the civil war, completing most of it by 1648. Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 186, 309-313

⁷⁴ I am suggesting the possibility that the book may have been too controversial for wide circulation. Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes*, 219.

⁷⁵ The College nominated three replacements on 6 Sept. 1653. CUA, Lease Book 1649-69, pp. 227-8. Many thanks to Malcolm Underwood for providing this information. W.A.L. Vincent dates Collier's dismissal as occurring in 1653. He offers the following explanation: "The falling demand for a classical education was already apparent in

affiliation with Benlowes merely suggested subversive behavior of another sort, given that the state was acutely interested in the morality and activities of its schoolmasters. In 1652, the Rump's committee had proposed a system of Triers, who would select suitable candidates for the ministry and schoolmasters (who were drawn from the clergy's ranks), and Ejectors, who were to eliminate offending incumbents. The establishment of the Protectorate in December of 1653 saw heightened concern by Congregationalists with "heretical" teachers, defined as those who had popish leanings and Socinians, or anti-Trinitarians, Quakers, and other radicals.⁷⁶

Collier's trouble may not have ended with this ejection. Under Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate, between May and August, 1654, a further series of "Ordinances for ejecting scandalous and ignorant ministers and schoolmasters" and amendments to such decrees begin to appear in the *State Papers*. This marked the deployment of the system of Triers and Ejectors, with the Congregationalist innovation of a more restricted tolerance.⁷⁷ In July, 1655, the Protector proclaimed that since Parliament's meeting of November 2, 1640, "divers ministers, lecturers, and schoolmasters have been sequestered for delinquency, scandal, or insufficiency, by Parliament, the Committee for Plundered Ministers, County Committees, and Commissioners appointed by the Ordinance for ejecting scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient Ministers and

some areas in the seventeenth century. Thus the school at Aldenham does not appear to have flourished as a grammar school and in 1653 the parishioners obtained the dismissal of the master, Jeremie Collier, because he had shut the school when the number of boys learning grammar was reduced to two." Vincent, *The Grammar Schools: Their Continuing Tradition, 1660-1714* (London: Cox and Wyman, 1969), 104. If Collier was dismissed and replaced within the year, perhaps scant attendance at the school does not explain his ejection. As there were three different governments in 1653, it will also be important to determine more precisely when exactly Collier was dismissed.

⁷⁶ John Coffey, "A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution," in David Lowenstein and John Marshall, eds, *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 120-121.

⁷⁷ Mary A.E. Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1654* (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1965), 190, 212, 308, 361. Many Anglicans and Royalists continued teaching, despite the order, though they frequently had to change schools to evade authorities. "The ordinance of the 28th August, 1654...was confirmed and continued for three years by an Act of the 26th June, 1657." Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 70, 102. Coffey, "A Ticklish Business," 121-122.

Schoolmasters.”⁷⁸ Despite these measures, many of the expelled had continued in their positions, “and others have brought suits for their recovery, to the great discouragement of the godly ministry.” Cromwell and his Council declared “themselves obliged to take care that the ejected be not restored.” All those who had been ejected since 1640 were to abandon their positions within one month and abstain from initiating any lawsuits. “All who refuse conformity are to be debarred their right to 1/5 of their parsonage, &c., and to be reputed disturbers of the peace, disaffected, &c., and so proceeded against.”⁷⁹ These orders were reinforced in September, 1655:

...From 1 Nov. 1655, none of the party are to keep in their houses chaplains, schoolmasters, ejected ministers, or fellows of colleges, nor have their children taught by such, on pain of double their proportion of the above tax.

...None who have been, or shall be, ejected from any benefice, college, or school, preach or administer the sacraments, marry persons, or use the Book of Common Prayer, on pain of 3 months imprisonment; on a second offence, 6 months; and on a third, banishment; unless their hearts are changed and they obtain the approval of the Commissioners for Public Preachers.⁸⁰

The Hartlib papers contain no further mention of Collier the elder after his association with Benlowes. Davis and Webster identify the Hartlib movement’s denouement in the late 1650s, as the Protectorate disintegrated and Hartlib and those associated with his designs, “turned their minds to prophetic schemes and to notions of both intellectual fraternities and ideal communities. There was, however, a tiredness, scepticism and disillusion about their discussion.”⁸¹ Whatever the circumstances of his dismissal, it can be assumed that as an ejected schoolmaster, Collier the elder would have been hard-pressed to find employment after 1654.

Collier the younger’s grandfather, in his sermon, offered one view of the individual’s relationship with God: “Now [Christ] is in us when we are really united unto Him by faith...and

⁷⁸ “July 3, 1655,” in Green, *Calendar of State Papers*, 224-225.

⁷⁹ “July 3, 1655,” in Green, *Calendar of State Papers*, 224-225.

⁸⁰ “September 21, 1655,” in Green, *Calendar of State Papers*, 347.

⁸¹ Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society*, 315-316.

in regard of this union He is said to dwell in us, being spiritually joined to Him which is done by faith on our part, and ye spirit on His part.”⁸² His father demonstrated other means of pursuing communion with the Divine through educational reform in his work with the Hartlib circle, and in a more metaphysical sense through his participation in Benlowes’ *Theophila*.

Collier the elder’s intellectual biography provides us with the case study of an individual who worked with a variety of reform-minded people during the civil wars and Republic. Yet he was ejected from a position as Master of Aldenham School for unspecified reasons, just as Hartlib’s pursuit of state-supported reform went into decline. As we will see, he resumed teaching as Master of Ipswich School in Suffolk after the Restoration in 1663. Among Collier’s students at Ipswich was his thirteen-year-old son Jeremy. Within a few months of the Colliers’ arrival at the school, Collier the elder was once again ejected from a mastership, perhaps this time as a result of the Clarendon Code. Thereafter, according to Ely diocesan records, from 1666 until his death Collier the elder was a licensed preacher under the patronage of Matthew Wren. Despite his capricious employment history during the 1650s and 60s, in the end Collier the elder managed to secure a considerable benefice. These ostensible contradictions, and their practical impact on Collier the younger, are addressed below in chapter 2.

Of course, Collier the Elder’s initial involvement with the Hartlib circle preceded his son’s birth in 1650, and is only documented as having spilled over into his early childhood. Yet young Collier was his father’s pupil; he probably learned Latin from his father by way of a distinctive philosophy of teaching. What influence did these circumstances have on his later thought? And what memories did he hold of an interregnum childhood, a father with

⁸² Mr Collier, Bradford, Hall Mss Vol. III, BL Add. Mss 45, 671, f. 117.

unconventional friends who was associated with a group of people active in a period the
Restoration establishment would attempt to leave behind?

3.0 EARLY LIFE: JEREMY COLLIER THE YOUNGER, 1660-1688

Although very little biographical information survives for this period, it is possible to reconstruct, to some extent, the final decade of Collier the elder's life. We can also begin to trace Collier the younger's pre-1688 biography, and identify some fundamental elements of his intellectual composition. The pedagogical influence of his father, his education at Caius College, Cambridge, his experience as a chaplain in a private household, then rector in a tiny parish, and life in London in the years of James II's brief reign – these seminal Restoration-era experiences inform his post-1688 choices to an extent which has never before been considered.

When Collier the elder resurfaced following restoration, it was as Master of Ipswich School in Suffolk. In the final years of the Protectorate and immediately post-Restoration, the school underwent a “period of difficulties and frequent changes, some of which, it is reasonable to suspect may have been due to political causes.”⁸³ Collier the elder was preceded as master by Cave Beck, an individual who, in a project reminiscent of the Hartlib circle, had tried to develop a universal language.⁸⁴ Beck left Ipswich School in 1657, but reassumed the mastership just prior to Collier's assumption of the post in 1663.

⁸³ I.E. Gray and W.E. Potter, *Ipswich School: 1400-1950* (Ipswich: W.E. Harrison & Sons, Ltd., 1950), 39, 60-62.

⁸⁴ His book, *The Universal Character, by which all Nations in the World may understand one another's Conceptions, Reading out of one Common Writing their own Mother Tongues*, was dedicated to Nathaniel and Francis Bacon. Gerhard F. Strasser, “Closed and open languages,” in *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 159-160. Strasser gives only passing mention to Beck, and does not directly connect him to the Hartlib circle. See also Jonathan Cohen, “On the Project of a Universal Character,” *Mind*, New Series 63 (1954), 53.

Among Collier's students was his thirteen-year-old son Jeremy. Within a few months of the Colliers' arrival at the school, his father came into conflict with a committee that was 'desired to hear the differences between the Master and the Usher.' Collier evidently made a convincing case for himself, as a new Usher was appointed the following day. But trouble resurfaced in January 1665 when another committee was appointed, 'to take some paines in the examining of the schollers in the Free Schoole, and to see howe they profit in learninge. And that they would be pleased to agree among themselves to vissite the Schoole once a week to see the schollers lattine. And to do what they shall thincke fitt for the improvement of the said Schole.'⁸⁵ The committee ruled against Collier in this instance, as he was subsequently ejected from his Mastership on May 24,⁸⁶ and 'dischardged of attending any longer upon the Schole.'⁸⁷ Clearly, Collier's Latin was not defective. With what did this committee take issue?

Because most of the available biographical information about Collier the elder relates to his work with Samuel Hartlib, the fate of the circle after Restoration suggests one explanation for the difficulties he faced. Charles Webster tells us that "Hartlib's most generally accepted influence was in the non-conformist academies...Dissenting private tutors and academies practised some of the educational ideas advocated by the Hartlib group, their curriculum...being strikingly similar to Dury's 'Reformed School.'"⁸⁸ Hartlib himself lived out his last days in

⁸⁵ Gray and Potter, *Ipswich School*, 62.

⁸⁶ Bagglely records the year 1664 for Collier's dismissal, which I attribute to the English new year beginning (until 1752) on March 25, and to his taking as his reference point the committee's visitation in January, but this requires further investigation. George Bagglely, *Floreat Bostona: The History of the Boston Grammar School from 1567* (Boston: Lincolnshire: Old Bostonian Association, 1985); See also Gray and Potter, *Ipswich School*, 62. The younger Collier's entry in the index of the *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College* assigns the year 1665 to his term at Ipswich. John Venn, *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349-1879, Containing a list of all known members of the college from the foundation to the present time with biographical notes*, Vol. III (Cambridge, 1901), 428.

⁸⁷ Gray and Potter, *Ipswich School*, 62.

⁸⁸ Charles Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 71.

“poverty, illness and isolation from public life,” a testament to the status of his ideals after 1660, which Charles Webster describes in grim detail:

[T]he new authorities...showed no inclination to favour schemes for social reconstruction. The Christian commonwealth was further away than at any time during Hartlib’s life in England....Even in 1662, his death went virtually unnoticed. Indeed, after 1660 he was treated with studied indifference by most of his former acquaintances. His name and associations evoked too many memories of the puritan revolution. His carefully preserved correspondence contained embarrassing information, at a time when few intellectuals wished to draw attention to their careers under the protectorate...[His papers] were regarded as expressions of a transient and unfortunate experiment.⁸⁹

Hartlib’s situation went well beyond a mere falling off of his reputation. His ideas were considered dangerous enough that government agents began monitoring and intercepting his correspondence.⁹⁰ Nor does it appear that Comenius continued to enjoy the public admiration of schoolmasters, at least not in the immediate aftermath of the restoration when even those who maintained the efficacy of his pedagogical methods may have needed to do so in a subdued fashion. The schoolmaster Charles Hoole had in 1659 praised Comenius for developing “a shorter course of teaching, which many of late endeavour to follow.”⁹¹ In the same year, Hoole prominently displayed Comenius’s name and portrait alongside his own in his translation of Comenius’s *Orbis Pictus* into English, which he promoted as “Joh. Amos Commenius’s Visible World...A Work newly written by the Author in Latine, and High-Dutch (being one of his last Essays, and the most suitable to Children’s capacities of any that he hath hitherto made) & translated into English, By Charles Hoole.”⁹² Conversely, in 1660 Hoole’s praise was reserved

⁸⁹ Webster, *Samuel Hartlib*, 63-64.

⁹⁰ Webster, *Samuel Hartlib*, 69.

⁹¹ Charles Hoole, *Scholastick Discipline: or The Way of ordering a Grammar-Schoole, Directing the not experienced, how he may profit every particular Scholar, and avoyd Confusion amongst a multitude* (London: Printed by J.T. for Andrew Crook, 1659), 305.

⁹² John Amos Comenius, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*, trans. Charles Hoole (London: Printed for J. Kirton, 1659), title page.

for the older teaching methods, which he had used in the Rotherham School where he taught in the 1640s:

A New Discovery of the old Art of Teaching Schoole, In four Small Treatises. Shewing how Children in their playing years may Grammatically attain to a firm groundedness in and exercise of the Latine, Greek and Hebrew Tongues. Written about Twenty three yeares ago...and after 14 years trial by diligent practise in London...now at last published for the general profit, especially of young Schoole-Masters.⁹³

In this tract, Hoole provided a list of “Authours useful for the first Form,” which includes the *Orbis Pictus*, but bears no mention of Comenius’s name.⁹⁴

As elucidated by Jonathan Scott, “Restoration was a conscious experiment in historical reconstruction.”⁹⁵ The elder Collier may have suffered for his Interregnum associations and pedagogical practices after the Restoration. His difficulties after 1660 correlate with the experiences of others who did not fare well by post-Restoration attempts to erase civil war and interregnum radicalism. The post-1660 backlash included among its targets reform-minded approaches to the sciences and strategies for educational progress. The scientific expression of this enmity has been given due attention; treatment of the educational context has, in the main,

⁹³ Charles Hoole, *A New Discovery of the old Art of Teaching Schoole, In four small Treatises* (London: Printed by J.T. for Andrew Crook, 1660), title page, Epistle Dedicatory.

⁹⁴ Joseph Levine situates Hoole as an “ancient” (as opposed to a “modern”), arguing that “His indifference to the radical views that had resounded for a while in press and pulpit is an indication of a certain lack of appeal to many even in those heady days and may help to suggest why the reformers disappeared so abruptly at the Restoration.” Of *A New Discovery*, Levine argues that “Hoole’s book helped to rejuvenate the classical humanist pedagogy that had been briefly challenged during the Interregnum and to establish the common ground of *ancienneté* that pervaded the culture of the Restoration...” Hoole thus reverted to the pedagogy of pre-civil war educators. “He accepted their premises without question or equivocation in deliberate disregard of the radicals, although he did manage to find a few practical ideas among the reformers Dury and Comenius.” Dury and Comenius are named in passing in *A New Discovery*, but in two tracts published in 1659: *The Usher’s Duty, or a Plat-forme of Teaching Lilies Grammar and Scholastick Discipline: or, The Way of ordering a Grammar-Schoole*, which comprise two sections of *A New Discovery* integrated into the 1660 compilation reprinted by The Scolar Press Limited in 1969. Joseph Levine, *Between the Ancients and the Moderns: Baroque Culture in Restoration England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 36-38. Hoole, *The Usher’s Duty and Scholastick Discipline* (London: Printed by J.T. for Andrew Crook, 1659), 6, 57, 229.

⁹⁵ Jonathan Scott, *England’s troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 355.

been limited to the universities, disregarding the consequences for grammar schools and primary-level instruction.⁹⁶ But this neglects the outcome of one of the fundamental aspirations of Comenian and Hartlibian efforts at moral and material transformation. The influence that Comenian educational theory has had on later school reform movements and its still-relevant merits has not gone unnoticed.⁹⁷ But it is clear that these ideas were not held in great esteem in Restoration England – quite the contrary. As a conservative regime set about the task of consolidating submission to church and state, the mainline to subjects’ consciousness would be regulated, in part, via behavioral, doctrinal and didactic mandates to schoolmasters and ministers, practices not dissimilar to those implemented in civil war and interregnum England. Though the profiles of its targets had changed with the times, labels such as “popish” or “fanatical” were applied with the same force and dire consequences as various parties came to power in the 1650s and early 1660s, in efforts to keep nascent citizens or young subjects on what was deemed the proper moral and intellectual course.

If Jeremy Collier the Elder continued to teach Comenian and Hartlibian pedagogy, which was subject to misgivings after 1660, he may have suffered for his persistence. After the Restoration, grammar schools came to be “regarded with suspicion in influential quarters as potential breeding grounds of the enemies of the State.”⁹⁸ The ‘Clarendon Code,’ which included the Corporation Act (1661), Act of Uniformity (1662) Conventicle Act (1664) and Five Mile Act (1665), prevented non-conformists from holding positions in local government or

⁹⁶ For diverging views on the institutionalization of the sciences after the Restoration as a check on radical interregnum natural philosophy, see Michael Hunter, *Science and Society in Restoration England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); James Jacob, *Robert Boyle and the English Revolution: a study in social and intellectual change* (New York: B. Franklin, 1977); Malcolm Oster, “Millenarianism and the new science: the case of Robert Boyle,” in *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation*, 137-148.

⁹⁷ See for example John E. Sadler, *J.A. Comenius and the Concept of Universal Education* (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1966), 34; Matthew J. Duffy, “‘Children do not like anarchy’: Comenius, Orbis Pictus, and the Philosophical Origins of Books for Children” (M.Ed. thesis, Kutztown University, 2004).

⁹⁸ Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 109.

universities. Among these, the Act of Uniformity obliged all public and private schoolmasters, including private family tutors, to “subscribe a declaration expressing abhorrence of armed resistance to the King or those in authority and readiness to conform to the Book of Common Prayer, and renouncing the Solemn League and Covenant as unlawful,” by August 24, 1662, or be deprived of their places. Schoolmasters or private tutors who taught without or prior to obtaining a license, “from his respective archbishop, bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, according to the laws and statutes of this realm,” would be subject to three-months’ imprisonment, “without bail or mainprize; and for every second and other such offence shall suffer three months’ imprisonment without bail or mainprize, and also forfeit to his majesty the sum of £5.”⁹⁹ Consequently, many schoolmasters who had been granted their positions under Cromwell were forced to seek private endowment or establish their own private schools, known as “dissenting academies,” similar to the strategy adopted by Anglicans, royalists and other persons judged by the state to be hazardous to young minds and souls in the 1650s.¹⁰⁰

In 1665, the year in which Collier was dismissed from Ipswich School, Parliament passed the Five Mile Act which forbade nonconformist preachers from coming within five miles of their former parishes or incorporated towns unless they took an oath denouncing rebellion against the king. It also imposed a forty pound fine on dissenters who taught in public or private schools.¹⁰¹

C. John Sommerville argues that “This law showed a growing awareness of the threat of alternative instruction, but it was widely evaded and the presence of scores of Dissenting

⁹⁹ G. Gould, ed., *Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity of 1662*, (London: 1862), 392-393, quoted in Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 112.

¹⁰⁰ Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 113. See also Irene Parker, *Dissenting Academies in England: Their Rise and Progress and their Place among the Educational Systems of the Country* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969).

¹⁰¹ Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 116.

‘academies’ did not immediately become a national issue.”¹⁰² But in the same year, Archbishop Sheldon requested that his bishops investigate all free schools, providing him with information about their Masters and Ushers, such as “whether the said schoolmasters, ushers, schoolmistresses, and instructors, or teachers of youth publicly or privately, do themselves frequent the public prayers of the church, and cause their scholars to do the same; and whether they appear well affected to the government of his majesty and the doctrine and discipline of the church of England.”¹⁰³

If Collier was excluded during the interregnum for exhibiting royalist or Catholic sympathies, would this not deem him credible after Restoration? Not necessarily, if indeed the series of Acts that comprised the Clarendon Code explain Collier’s dismissal. Schoolmasters turned out under the Clarendon Code were caught between the competing religious concerns of the Charles II and the Cavalier Parliament, for whom “The intolerant Act of Uniformity and its accompaniments were an attempt to steer both church and state between the twin poperies of counter-reformation and radical reformation.”¹⁰⁴ Not even Lord Chancellor Clarendon himself endorsed the laws which bore his name. Charles II, however, preferred to accommodate Catholics because of their “comparative political loyalty.”¹⁰⁵

Despite this setback in his career as an educator, Collier’s fortune seems to have turned in his favor once again as a result of developments in the Church of England. The Restoration of monarchy in 1660 entailed yet another disturbance of personnel in the universities and in the institutions of church and state. From 1660-61 parliament was dominated by cavaliers and a

¹⁰² C. John Sommerville, “The Distinction between Indoctrination and Education in England, 1549-1719,” in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44 (1983), 397.

¹⁰³ Quoted in Vincent, *The State and School Education*, 116.

¹⁰⁴ Scott, *England’s Troubles*, 169.

¹⁰⁵ Scott, *England’s Troubles*, 169.

revitalized Church of England, “principally notable for its re-establishment of an exclusive, coercive, and uncompromising Episcopalian order,” in reaction to the troubles of the preceding twenty years.¹⁰⁶ Restoration ecclesiastical appointments raised the problem of whether or not incumbents installed under the former regime should be replaced with ousted loyalists at the risk of provoking a presbyterian backlash, or even renewed civil war.¹⁰⁷ As we saw in chapter 1, Collier the elder had been intruded as a Fellow of St. John’s in 1644, when the university was purged as part of an effort to institute Presbyterian supremacy. However, there is no indication that Collier himself was sympathetic to the puritan cause.

Under these circumstances, the terms of Collier the elder’s 1664 dismissal from Ipswich are hard to explain. According to the *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*, the Colliers were quick to transfer to Blockley, Worcestershire, after departing Ipswich, with the younger Jeremy resuming study under his father from 1665-1669. The likelihood that Collier the Elder taught at Blockley in some capacity is reinforced by the entry for attorney Richard Baker, who reportedly studied there under Collier for four years.¹⁰⁸ Either the archival record is contradictory in this instance, or perhaps Collier held a plurality of offices. Ely diocesan records reveal that from 1666 until his death in 1669, Collier was a vicar and licensed preacher. In 1666 he was awarded a vicarage and granted a license to preach by Matthew Wren, bishop of Ely (1638-1667).¹⁰⁹ His status and license were renewed upon Wren’s death in 1667 by his successor, Benjamin Laney.¹¹⁰ The fact that Collier conformed under the patronage of these

¹⁰⁶ Gary De Krey, *Restoration and Revolution in Britain: A Political History of the Era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 32-35.

¹⁰⁷ I.M. Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

¹⁰⁸ Venn, *Biographical History*, Vol. I, 418, 441.

¹⁰⁹ CUL EDR A/5/2 Subscription Book 21/4/1666; “Returns to First Fruits Office,” TNA: PRO, E331/Ely/10. See above chapter 1 regarding Wren in the 1630s.

¹¹⁰ CUL EDR B/2/67 Exhibition Book 1668.

bishops who had served under Laud in the 1630s suggests his support of an episcopal campaign against the Erastian policies of Charles II and Clarendon. At a minimum, his patrons believed that his views were in line with their own visions of religious settlement.

Based on the timing of these developments, Collier's discharge from Ipswich may have been due to an objection to the revised Prayer Book, which resulted from an attempt to find a *via media* between episcopal and Presbyterian clergy.¹¹¹ In 1661, Convocation met and revised the Prayer Book in a manner which favored puritan practise, and rejected Wren's argument in favor of the *status quo ante bellum*.¹¹² The issue of the altered Prayer Book would figure large among Collier the younger's concerns after 1688; he would even institute a campaign within the nonjurors' church to restore the version produced during the reign of Edward IV.¹¹³

Collier the elder's association with Wren and Laney in the late 1660s must also be seen in the context of nonconformists' pleas for liberty of conscience, a campaign which began in earnest in 1667-68. At Restoration, accusations of sectarianism were launched by Anglicans at Presbyterians, who were critical of the restored Episcopal Church of England and in so doing came to be equated polemically with Baptists and Quakers.¹¹⁴ Rumors that Charles II was seriously considering liberty of conscience, in conjunction with Clarendon's espousal of the King's authority in matters civil and ecclesiastical, led the bishops to assert more forcefully the *jure divino* authority of the episcopacy.¹¹⁵ In the 1630s Wren had promoted Laud's policies, and had been impeached in July of 1641 for articulating arguments in support of divine right

¹¹¹ John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 43-44.

¹¹² Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 40-41.

¹¹³ We will explore this correlation in chapter 5.

¹¹⁴ De Krey, *Restoration*, 32-35.

¹¹⁵ Jeffrey R. Collins, "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy," *Church History* 68 no. 3 (1999), 549-550; 562-563.

episcopacy.¹¹⁶ These sentiments were revived in the 1660s, this time in opposition to the role of monarchy in matters ecclesiastical, as much as to puritan dissenters.¹¹⁷

Laney advised Charles II to recognize the divine right of bishops in a sermon preached at Whitehall in 1661, in which he explained that God “hath erected an office of trust and confidence in his Church, under the quality of a Sheperd and Bishop, to direct and guide us, who otherwise would err and stray like sheep, and so be lost forever.”¹¹⁸ While he acknowledged royal supremacy in the church, he qualified this as a concession by defining the crown’s jurisdiction as the duty to maintain ordained bishops in the execution of “their sacred office.” The episcopal church claimed authority in all other matters.¹¹⁹ Because the king has never been ordained, ‘I cannot therefore think, that the King is an ecclesiastical person.’¹²⁰ Laney delivered this message to Charles once again, in stricter terms, in 1665, when “he took as his theme the unlawful usurpation of authority, whether it be the authority ‘to govern with the King,’ or the authority ‘to pray and preach...with the Priest.’”¹²¹

The ecclesiastical benefice granted to Collier by Wren and confirmed by Laney entailed full possession of its rights, freehold of the church, churchyard, vicarage and glebe.¹²² Additionally, he was able to pass this estate on to his heirs. His will, dated November 9, 1668, shows that he bequeathed the advowson and right of patronage associated with the parsonage to his wife Elizabeth. Should Elizabeth remarry or die, the parsonage was to pass to the eldest son Theophilus and his heirs. Had the property passed to Theophilus, he would have been obliged to

¹¹⁶ Matthew Wren, *Bishop Wren’s Petition to Parliament, in Defense of Episcopacie. In Behalf of Himself and the Rest of the Bishops* (London: 1642).

¹¹⁷ Collins, “Restoration Bishops,” 559-560.

¹¹⁸ Benjamin Laney, “The Shepherd or the Pastoral Charge and Obedience Due It,” quoted in Collins, “Restoration Bishops,” 559.

¹¹⁹ Collins, “Restoration Bishops,” 564.

¹²⁰ Laney, quoted in Collins, “Restoration Bishops,” 563.

¹²¹ Laney, quoted in Collins, “Restoration Bishops,” 563.

¹²² “Will of Jeremiah Collier of Pampisford, proved in the Consistory Court of Ely,” CCRO, VC31:78 1669 CW.

pay his sister Elizabeth £50 on her twenty-first birthday. If he failed to do this, Theophilus would forfeit the advowson of the rectory and parsonage to his sister and her heirs. Only on the death of both Theophilus and Elizabeth prior to their twenty-first birthdays would the estate pass to the younger sons: Jeremiah, his father's namesake, and the (presumably youngest) brother John.¹²³ Jeremy and John were granted 5 shillings each in the primary scenario, "having already made other provisions for them."¹²⁴ His wife was instructed to apply the profits of the estate to the maintenance and education of the two youngest children until they turned twenty-one.¹²⁵

There is no evidence to suggest that Jeremy ever inherited this estate.¹²⁶ As a younger son in a legal culture which upheld primogeniture, his options for making his own way in the world were limited.¹²⁷ Among these was the possibility of training as a priest. That Collier would choose this path, which had also been chosen by his father, in these narrow circumstances should be kept in mind after 1689 (chapter 3), when he would prioritize commitment to his own understanding of justice and morality over ordination in the established Church, hence his status thereafter as "nonjuror." Jeremy the younger matriculated at Gonville and Caius College Cambridge in 1670, the year after his father's death, financing his education at least in part as a sizar, or "poor scholar."¹²⁸ Attending students from wealthier families was a common way by

¹²³ It is noteworthy that Collier's sister was ranked preferentially according to age, blind to gender, in a will from this period. On occasion daughters were granted portions of exceptionally large estates. Eve McLaughlin, *Wills Before 1858* (Haddenahm: Varneys Press, 2002), 10. This may also have been Elizabeth's dowry.

¹²⁴ CCRO, VC31:78 1669 CW.

¹²⁵ CCRO, VC31:78 1669 CW.

¹²⁶ Further research needs to be done on this subject to flesh out the biographies of his siblings. Presumably, if his elder brother had inherited the parsonage it would be documented.

¹²⁷ On the issue of younger sons and primogeniture in early modern England, and contemporary literature on the subject, see for instance Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623-1677* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 67.

¹²⁸ John Venn, *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349-1879, Containing a list of all known members of the college from the foundation to the present time with biographical notes*, Vol. III (Cambridge, 1901), 428.

which students seeking to enter the priesthood supported themselves through college.¹²⁹ The “provisions” alluded to in his father’s will perhaps involved an arrangement with Sir John Ellys, Collier the younger’s patron at Cambridge, who was at the time a well respected tutor and Master of Caius. Ellys’s closest intellectual associates included Isaac Newton, whose “new scientific methods” he supported, and the antiquarian Robert Brady.¹³⁰ Collier would later combat mechanical, Newtonian philosophy; the foundation of this opposition was perhaps based in theological and philosophical principles imparted by his father, and developed in his young adulthood at Cambridge in opposition to the latitudinarian “Cambridge Platonists.”¹³¹ In his allegiance controversy pamphlets of 1689, Collier would provide his own twist on Bradian arguments to show that parliament convened as a result of royal summons, rather than in just exercise of its jurisdiction.¹³² Collier never cited Brady directly, perhaps related to the fact that Brady took the oath of allegiance in 1689.¹³³

Collier received his B.A. in 1672-3. As a clerical candidate, upon receipt of his M.A. in 1676, he had to seek ordination.¹³⁴ Either a college official, such as Ellys, or a parish minister would have had to attest to Collier’s “soundness in doctrine, learning, and personal morality,” before he came under examination by the bishop.¹³⁵ The Canons of 1604 and later royal injunctions recommended a hiatus of at least one year before elevation from the status of deacon to the priesthood. Collier was ordained deacon by Peter Gunning, Bishop of Ely – in the same

¹²⁹ John H. Pruett, *The Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: The Leicestershire Experience* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 40.

¹³⁰ Victor Morgan, *A History of the University of Cambridge, Vol. II: 1546-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 520.

¹³¹ John Gascoigne, “Politics, Patronage and Newtonianism: The Cambridge Example,” *The Historical Journal* 27 no. 1 (1984), 1-24.

¹³² See below chapter 3.

¹³³ Morgan, *University of Cambridge*, 487-489; 492-494.

¹³⁴ Venn, *Biographical History*, Vol. I, 418.

¹³⁵ Pruett, *The Parish Clergy*, 48-49.

diocese as his father – on September 24, 1676, and priest by Henry Compton, Bishop of London, on February 24, 1677. Such a quick rise in rank may be accounted for by the Restoration rush to ordain conforming clergymen.¹³⁶ Additionally, the common ties of father and son to Ely may have been a factor. Whatever the reason, he had gained the approval of two highly influential bishops.¹³⁷ Even so, Collier was in no way guaranteed employment. At this stage, the placement of clergymen was in most cases out of episcopal control. Advowsons were property rights, often held by laymen and subject to the preferences that accompanied simony and nepotism.¹³⁸ New ordinands typically held a variety of positions in private capacities as vicars, chaplains and rectors, or in universities and cathedrals. Securing a permanent post was long-term pursuit.¹³⁹

In keeping with this pattern, Collier was employed immediately after ordination as a chaplain in the household of courtier and notorious rake Charles Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, 6th earl of Dorset, 1st earl of Middlesex, at Knole House in Kent.¹⁴⁰ The Sackvilles had long been conditional supporters of the Stuarts. In January 1644 Edward Sackville, 4th earl of Dorset, was made lord chamberlain to Charles I. Yet he had been critical of Archbishop Laud's insistence on religious conformity, promoting instead the idea of a relatively tolerant national church. Richard Sackville, 5th earl of Dorset, was an active participant in the Restoration House of Lords and was

¹³⁶ Pruett notes that this tendency had subsided by the end of the century, when the average time between diaconate and priestly ordination extended to five or six years. Pruett, *The Parish Clergy*, 50-52. See also Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 168-169.

¹³⁷ "Next to the archbishop of Canterbury the bishop with the most influence in Cambridge affairs was the incumbent of the see of Ely which, between the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution, had been governed by a succession of Cambridge high churchmen – Matthew Wren, Benjamin Laney, Peter Gunning and Francis Turner." Gascoigne, "Politics," 13.

¹³⁸ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 172-173.

¹³⁹ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 171.

¹⁴⁰ On Dorset as "trustee" of Nell Gwyn, see John H. Wilson, *Nell Gwyn: Royal Mistress* (New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1952).

on the commission that tried the regicides.¹⁴¹ Charles had become 6th earl of Dorset on his father's death in 1677. Under his charge Knole became a sanctuary for Restoration poets, such as Dryden and D'Urfey, who enjoyed Dorset's patronage and who would later (1698-1708) be the targets of Collier's attack on the immorality of the English Stage.¹⁴² Knole was in many ways an extension of Charles II's court, a site at which political and sexual intrigue, both glorified and satirized in courtier poets' verse, found an audience among libertine aristocrats such as Rochester and Sedley.¹⁴³

Fears of 'popery' from within the episcopacy also found expression in this courtier culture. Anglican perceptions of rampant irreligion and profanity resulted as much from the 1672 Indulgence, by which Charles II attempted to suspend the penal laws and extend tolerance to nonconformists, as from "the cult of 'wit,' of intellectual scepticism and fashionable scoffing at religion, which seemed so prevalent in the later 1660s and the 1670s."¹⁴⁴ Collier's service at Knole also coincides with the series of crises that kicked off with the "popish plot." Although the crisis itself occurred in 1678, it was the manifestation of tensions which had been mounting over the course of the 1670s. "As it was deployed by Shaftesbury in 1675, 'popery' meant any aspiration to diminish the civil magistrate's ecclesiastical power and to emancipate the church as an autonomous institution. Thus 'popery' might emanate from Rome or from Anglican bishops who sought to seduce gullible princes into absolutism. Politics and religion merged almost

¹⁴¹ David L. Smith, 'Sackville, Edward, fourth earl of Dorset (1590-1652)', *ODNB, Online Edition*, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24444>, accessed 28 March 2006].

¹⁴² See below chapter 4.

¹⁴³ John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000), 197-198. For a fuller view of Restoration poetic culture, see Paul Hammond, *The Making of Restoration Poetry* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006). De Krey provides a context for the royalist gentry who sought to restore the level of influence over the localities that they had enjoyed prior to the 1640s and 50s. De Krey, *Restoration*, 32-33.

¹⁴⁴ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 68-69.

seamlessly.”¹⁴⁵ Indeed Dorset’s politics would have been equally offensive to Collier, and inseparable from his “atheism.” As a direct supporter of his maternal relative Buckingham, he was among the cavaliers who supported Shaftesbury and opposed Danby, Church and King between September 1678 and 1681.¹⁴⁶

Although Dorset was his source of patronage, Collier’s practical obligation was to Dorset’s first wife, Mary née Bagot (1645-1679), whom he served as a personal chaplain. Bagot had previously been married to Charles Berkeley, Earl of Falmouth, who was, like Dorset, a favorite of Charles II, and also of the Duke of York. As Countess of Falmouth, Mary was selected to be a Lady of the Bedchamber to the queen. Widowed in 1665 as a result of Berkeley’s death in the Second Anglo-Dutch War, she married Dorset late in 1678, and died in childbirth the following September.¹⁴⁷ Collier arrived at Knole House at an unspecified time in 1678, in the same year as Mary. His abrupt departure in 1679 also coincides with the Countess Dowager’s death; whether or not her passing provided the occasion is unknown. There is no mention of Collier in the Sackville papers held at the Centre for Kentish Studies.¹⁴⁸

Despite a lack of specific information about his brief term of service, and beyond what can be inferred about the pressure experienced by Collier as an ordained clergyman in this environment, his status as a chaplain in a private household carried an additional and related set of problems. Throughout the seventeenth century, the legal status of domestic chaplains had been tenuous, alternating with the rise to power of puritan or cavalier factions during each wave

¹⁴⁵ Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, 227.

¹⁴⁶ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 74-75; Scott, *England’s Troubles*, 434-439.

¹⁴⁷ She died intestate. The child later petitioned Dorset for her mother’s £8,000 dowery, which was under his administration. Charles J. Phillips, *History of the Sackville Family* Vol. I (London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1930), 488-491.

¹⁴⁸ A list of “The Earle of Dorset’s Chaplains since his Majestyes Restauration” ends four years prior to Collier’s arrival at Knole, and so would have pertained to the 5th earl of Dorset. It is at least noteworthy that Collier’s employer did not maintain a comparable list. CKS, Sackville papers, U269 Q1 f. 89.

of troubles. James I had shielded chaplains from attacks by puritans, largely ignoring strict statutes against the employment of private chaplains which had been instituted under Henry VIII. Alternately under Charles I, Laud began a campaign in 1629, coinciding with his attempt to control preaching, to enforce the Henrician statutes.¹⁴⁹ Under Cromwell and the Protectorate, nobility and gentry who employed ejected clergy as chaplains in their homes were in violation of legislation passed in 1655.¹⁵⁰ The failure of the 1661 Savoy Conference to achieve the comprehension of Anglicanism and Presbyterianism resulted in clandestine chaplaincies populated by excluded Presbyterians. In turn, the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence had temporarily reopened the possibility of legally sanctioned, non-conforming chaplaincies.¹⁵¹

The social dimension of this insecure status found expression in the tendency for chaplains to be treated as servants, which they were in terms of the social codes that defined status. Consequently, they were dependant upon the good will of their patrons, and required to adhere to the culture of the household that was under the jurisdiction of their benefactors. However, Collier took a different view, one which saw chaplaincy as an office, rather than a rank. In 1688 Collier would publish the first edition of *The Office of a Chaplain*, which is in all likelihood addressed to Dorset. It opens with disdain for “the generality of Mankind,” on the grounds that they are susceptible to persuasion. As Juvenal observed of lawyers “where he that appear’d in the best Equipage was supposed to have the greatest share of Law and sense in him: so that had the Vulgar had any Power in determining Right, a good Cause might oftentimes have been lost for want of fine cloathes to plead it in.” Thus “the Success of Truth depends very much

¹⁴⁹ William Gibson, *A Social History of the Domestic Chaplain, 1530-1840* (London: Leicester University Press, 1996), 28; J.T. Cliffe, *The World of the Country House in Seventeenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 132.

¹⁵⁰ Gibson, *Domestic Chaplain*, 34. See also Spurr, *Restoration Church*, ch. 1.

¹⁵¹ Gibson, *Domestic Chaplain*, 36.

upon the Reputation of its Advocate. For the generality of Mankind, in regard they are not judicious and impartial enough to penetrate the bottom of things, are more influenced by show and appearance, than by substance and reality.”¹⁵² The “rules of wisdom and conduct” are not welcome lessons, despite any inherent value the arguments may possess. Yet ill-intentioned men, determined to enjoy the pleasures of vice, misrepresent ministers of religion to restrain them from posing any challenge to their indulgent designs. The result is that in this sceptical and licentious age the function of the clergy is regularly misunderstood, especially those who officiate in private houses. But a priest or chaplain in a private family household is not a servant, and even offers of “future advantage” suggested by the patron or master do not amount to terms under which he may demand submission. Neither does a clergyman’s dependence upon the patron for his livelihood place him in a state of subjection, any more than being a guest at one’s table. “We are *bound* to contribute towards the support of our Parents, if they stand in need of it,” yet this does not make us their superiors, as enjoined by the Fifth Commandment.¹⁵³ The Old Testament further affirms that a portion of one’s income was to be allotted to priests, “And that this practice did not depend upon any Ceremonial Constitution, but was founded in the unalterable reason of things.”¹⁵⁴

At the same time, a clergyman officiating in a private household should not interfere with the master of the house in issues relating to the government of his family, or with secular affairs in general; only affairs related to “another world.” The Office of a Clergyman in a Family is to pray for, bless, and give Absolution, and to provide counsel to the master as necessary. These functions are all acts that carry authority and are not commensurate with the roles of a servant,

¹⁵² Jeremy Collier, *The Office of a Chaplain Enquir’d into, and Vindicated from Servility And Contempt* (Cambridge: Printed by John Hayes, Printer to the University: 1688), 1-2.

¹⁵³ Collier, *Office of a Chaplain*, 9.

¹⁵⁴ Collier, *Office of a Chaplain*, 10-11.

and the commission derives not from the master of the family or from any other human power, but directly from God. Collier appropriates *jure divino* arguments from the elevated office of the bishop, and applies it to the rank of a common minister. The minister of a private family is distinct from a parish priest only in terms of scale: “the one having but only one single Family to take care of, and the other a great many: but the Office is the same, and therefore the one hath no more reason to be accounted a servant than the other.”¹⁵⁵ Those who consider clergy servants bring ruin to the very Office of priesthood. Most susceptible to this error are the “wealthy and Honourable, the nature of their circumstances being such as make them much more apt to flatter themselves, and to be flatter’d by others...”¹⁵⁶ Such “self-love” gratifies their need for admiration in the course of which their flatterers, establishing themselves in a position of subservience, “frequently resign their ease, their Liberty and conscience too, to purchase fewer conveniences than they are already possess’d of...[this] makes their will a kind of Law to their Inferiors and Dependants.”¹⁵⁷ Echoing Laney’s Whitehall sermon, Collier cautions that the priest should not overstep his bounds and overexert his liberty in providing service as this would constitute a “Usurpation upon Dominion.” In recognition of the fragile status of chaplains throughout the 17th C., Collier explains that itinerant ministers were no less qualified to perform in God’s service than those who were directly affiliated with the visible church. Upon ordination, the individual office holder, not the office, is the conduit of God’s instruction.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Collier, *Office of a Chaplain*, 14. Collier was not at all unique in this conception of “office,” the subject of which is treated in accute detail by Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in early modern England: the presupposition of oaths and offices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

¹⁵⁶ Collier, *Office of a Chaplain*, 14

¹⁵⁷ Collier, *Office of a Chaplain*, 16.

¹⁵⁸ William Gibson provides a textual interpretation of “Office of a Chaplain,” but does not set it within a historical context. Gibson, *Domestic Chaplain*, 52-55. Conal Condren discusses this tract in *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England*, 89.

By asserting his position on the office of a chaplain in a manifesto of sorts, Collier probably intended this as a criticism of Dorset – his, by then, former employer, although Collier circumvented the question of membership in an aristocratic household. The argument also falls in line with the episcopal anti-Erastian movement discussed above. He was furthermore working within the tradition of chaplain apologetics exemplified by George Herbert in the 1630s.¹⁵⁹ At the same time, Collier makes a very personal statement about his conception of his office, his commitment to which would subsequently be demonstrated throughout changing and personally challenging circumstances.¹⁶⁰

Upon leaving Dorset's service, Collier was quick to find employment with another private patron. He was granted a rectorship by James Calthorpe and instituted by Anthony Sparrow, bishop of Norwich, at Ampton, a tiny parish five miles north of Bury St. Edmunds.¹⁶¹ Here he remained the longest of any position he is known to have held, aside from his later affiliation with the nonjurors' church. Again, the archival record specific to Collier is relatively silent with respect to his service at Ampton.¹⁶² A list of parish incumbents confirms that he arrived in 1679, and that he was succeeded by Thomas Rogerson, who resigned after the Glorious Revolution because he was a nonjuror.¹⁶³ But it is clear that the Calthorpe family's interests were of an entirely different character than those of Dorset. James Calthorpe's father,

¹⁵⁹ The work appeared in multiple editions. George Herbert, *A priest to the temple, or, The country parson his character, and rule of holy life* (London: 1652).

¹⁶⁰ What would distinguish Collier's anti-Erastianism from that of his contemporaries in the ranks of the Church of England in the 1670s, and later from his fellow nonjurors, are the particulars of his theology, of which we are afforded glimpses in pre-Revolution tracts, addressed initially below, and which will need to be further developed in an expanded study.

¹⁶¹ The parish had only 38 hearths and was "ill-endowed, but...it was good enough for Jeremy Collier." W.A. Wickham, "The Famous Rector of Ampton," newspaper cutting, Dec. 12, 1920, SCRO, Bury St. Edmunds, HD 526/3/3.

¹⁶² The Ampton parish records at Suffolk County Records Office contain a fair measure of notes taken by late 19th and early 20th century antiquarians, some of which mention Collier favorably. These notes, however, reveal little in the way of biographical information beyond that contained in the *Biographia Britannia* and the *ODNB*.

¹⁶³ SCRO BSE FL 519/13/1 (1).

Sir Henry Calthorpe (1586-1637) was a lawyer who had been solicitor-general to Queen Henrietta Maria. He had provided counsel to Sir John Corbet at the behest of the judges in the ‘Five Knights’ Case, arguing (ineffectively) that Corbet was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus. He had also represented Benjamin Valentine, the Commons representative who had restrained the speaker when parliament was dissolved in 1629. Henry Calthorpe died a wealthy man, leaving property at Ampton and London to his eldest son James who founded a Boys’ Hospital in the parish in 1692.¹⁶⁴ The school was established to accomodate six poor boys, providing them with instruction by a Master who was qualified to impart the principles of Christianity in accordance with the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England, as well as lessons in reading, writing and arithmetic.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, he was to exercise patience and be committed to instructing students of even “the meanest capacity,”

and endure to repeat his instructions as often as occasion shall require...according as the age and understanding will admit. One that with sagacity and judgment can discern ye particular disposition and temper of those he is to teach...that so by striking in with Nature, and Conducting it in ye way it will most easily go, he may steer and govern them in ye most sweet and agreeable manner...One, that with diligence and application will constantly attend to this laborious and painful office, shewing Himself in all things a Pattern of those good works which by His office He is obliged to recommend and instil into the Children...¹⁶⁶

The children were expected to be taught the Lord’s Prayer, the Apostle’s Creed, and the Catechism, and the master was to instruct the boys “to behave themselves with all Reverence in ye House of God; to bow decently...to kneel down...and to spend ye rest of [Sunday]...reading some part of ye Holy Scripture.”¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ Christopher W. Brooks, “Calthorpe, Sir Henry (1586-1637)” *ODNB, Online Edition* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4405>, accessed 16 June 2006].

¹⁶⁵ SCRO BSE FL 519/12/6; 19/13/1/d cutting 27 Sept 1922

¹⁶⁶ SCRO BSE FL 519/12/6; 19/13/1/d cutting 27 Sept 1922

¹⁶⁷ SCRO BSE FL 519/12/6; 19/13/1/d cutting 27 Sept 1922

A few points seem relevant to Collier, even though the school was established post-Revolution, and did not actually commence with admissions and instruction until 1713. According to the credo, orthodox Anglican forms of worship were observed. Furthermore, in comparison to other educational options available at the time, the qualities expected in a schoolmaster are benevolent and though dogmatic, distinctly less so in comparison to Latitudinarian catechetical curricula.¹⁶⁸ This is also reminiscent of the developmental theory exemplified in the pedagogy of Comenius.¹⁶⁹

Like his father, James Calthorpe was also a lawyer at Middle Temple and may have been in contact with Collier in the course of Collier's next endeavor as a "lecturer" or preacher at Gray's Inn.¹⁷⁰ While Collier's arrival at Ampton is documented, his date of departure is not.¹⁷¹ Neither is there any official record of his presence at Gray's Inn. The office of a chaplain at Gray's Inn dates to the early 14th century, and was phased out at the end of the 17th century. The preachership originated at the end of the 16th century. The two offices were distinct: "The Preachers were as a rule eminent churchmen for whom the Preachership at Gray's Inn was a brief stage in the course of a career of success and distinction. The Chaplains were less ambitious clergymen who were content to live and die at Gray's Inn."¹⁷² The chaplaincy disappeared from Gray's Inn entirely by the end of the 17th century, "and the second Minister of

¹⁶⁸ For comparison, see for instance Thomas Bray, *The whole course of catechetical institution...A pastoral discourse to young persons* (London: 1704).

¹⁶⁹ James Calthorpe's sister Dorothy, who also resided at Ampton, left a bequests on her death in 1693 to found an almshouse in Ampton to accomodate six poor widows. Also noteworthy, twenty-three Suffolk clergymen would sacrifice their cures and refuse the oath of allegiance in 1689. SCRO BSE FL 519/13/4 f. 2

¹⁷⁰ "Jeremy Collier," *Biog Brit*, 1407.

¹⁷¹ According to the Gray's Inn Communion Books, Calthorpe took communion at Gray's Inn Chapel in 1685. He had been admitted to Middle Temple February 1, 1678/9. There is no evidence to suggest that Collier was in any way affiliated with Middle Temple, but did he perhaps accompany his Ampton patron to London, and attend him as a personal chaplain at the Inns of Court? Lesley Whitelaw believes that this is possible, and suggests that he may have attended Temple Church and heard William Sherlock, whom he would later criticize, preach. Thanks to Lesley Whitelaw, Archivist at Middle Temple, for providing me with this information. H.A.C. Sturgess, *Register of Admissions to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple* Vol. I (London: Butterworth & Co., 1949), 178.

¹⁷² Sir Dunbar Plunket Barton, "The Office of 'Chaplain' and 'Preacher' at Gray's Inn," *Graya* 16, 154-157. 1935.

the Chapel, who assisted the Preacher as a sort of Curate in the services, was usually described as ‘Reader in Chapel’ or ‘Chapel Reader’.”¹⁷³ It is also possible that Collier was appointed to a lesser, short-lived post, and perhaps served as a private chaplain to one of the readers.¹⁷⁴

Between 1680 and 1700, Gray’s Inn suffered financial difficulties resulting from a decline in members’ attendance. Fire damage and repairs to the dillapidated chapel contributed to the inn’s indebtedness in the 1680s and 1690s.¹⁷⁵ These financial troubles may be attributable to a decline in admissions, reflecting a more general crisis within the legal profession during the Restoration period. All of the inns relied on the revenue drawn from fellows’ fees. Middle Temple, where Calthorpe was a reader, had also fallen into debt by 1680, a situation exacerbated by fire.¹⁷⁶ Perhaps this explains his taking communion at the chapel at Gray’s. Finally, as official members stopped attending, the inns began leasing rooms to ‘unofficial’ residents, resulting in their population with “a motley collection of inhabitants who had no connection with the legal profession.”¹⁷⁷ It is therefore possible that Collier was merely a resident while preaching independently.

Collier’s first published sermon, “The Difference Between the Present and Future State of our Bodies,” appeared in 1686, early in the reign of James II. The title page offers no claims about the dating or circumstances of its delivery or when it was committed to writing. But because the sermon takes a position on the theological debate about the immortality of the soul

¹⁷³ Barton, 155.

¹⁷⁴ Collier does not appear in the Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn (1521-1889), nor is he listed in the Orders in Pension. Joseph Foster, ed., *The Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn 1521-1889* (London: 1889); Reginald J. Fletcher, ed., *The pension book of Gray’s Inn: records of the honourable society, 1569-1800* (London: Stevens and Sons, 1901-1910). I am grateful to Theresa Thom, Librarian of Gray’s Inn, for her assistance in helping me to research this aspect of Collier’s biography.

¹⁷⁵ David Lemmings, *Gentlemen and Barristers: The Inns of Court and The English Bar, 1680-1730* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 45-47.

¹⁷⁶ Lemmings, *Gentlemen and Barristers*, 43-44, 48.

¹⁷⁷ Lemmings, *Gentlemen and Barristers*, 50-52.

and free will, at the time of publication it would have been in direct breach of a royal order of March 1686, *Directions Concerning Preaching*. This decree forbade Church of England theological discourse on “abstruse and speculative notions,” confining the range of acceptable topics to those offering the most basic guidance in moral conduct.¹⁷⁸

“The Difference Between” describes the soul’s rapport with the organic structure of the body that it temporarily inhabits. It is a meditation on I Corinthians 15:29: “And as we have born the Image of the earthy [*sic*], so we shall also bear the Image of the heavenly.” The flesh and blood are corruptible, but not in the sense of humankind’s inevitable disposition for sin. Rather, the faculty of reason and the gift of free will render virtue or vice options contingent on the individual’s choice. The temporal body, its vulnerability to the natural processes of age, disease and physical harm, can also be useful to the conscience by bringing attention to sinful acts. The interaction between conscience and the passions also constitutes a necessary challenge to free will. In childhood we rely entirely on our senses. If one grows into a state of adulthood without sound instruction in the development of reason, lacking guidance in the discovery of moral truth, interaction with the world will continue to be governed by the passions, “our senses Umpires of the value of things.”¹⁷⁹ This position on the relationship between reason and the physiology of the passions was not at all unique in early modern thought.¹⁸⁰ But it is distinctive with regard to Collier in its context.

¹⁷⁸ Michael Mullett, *James II and English Politics, 1678-1688* (London: Routledge, 1994), 54.

¹⁷⁹ Jeremy Collier, “The Difference Between the Present and Future State of our Bodies, Considered in a Sermon” (London; 1686), 5.

¹⁸⁰ See Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), ch. 6.

This text stands out in three respects. First, not only is this Collier's earliest published sermon; he would not publish another work in this genre until three years before his death.¹⁸¹ It is also significant that the text is attributed to Collier on the title page, along with the name of Sam. Smith, for whom it was printed. Finally, this is Collier's only publication to carry an imprimatur, that of the Reverend Henry Maurice, a Church of England clergyman, who from 1680 until 1691 served as Archbishop William Sancroft's domestic chaplain. The formal capacity in which Maurice approved Collier's sermon is unclear.¹⁸² Yet Maurice's involvement in the debates of the early 1680s and his allegiance to Sancroft suggest some possible motives for his approval of the sermon, at least as it appeared in print.

During the early 1680s Maurice famously defended episcopacy against the nonconformists Richard Baxter and David Clarkson, arguing from primitive apostolic practice.¹⁸³ In a sermon preached at Whitehall in 1682, on the anniversary of the regicide, he countered nonconformist accusations of clerical corruption in the Church by prescribing moral vigilance to his fellow Churchmen: 'let us confute their *Reproaches* with a Reformation of our *Manners* and detect their *Hypocrisie*, not by washing off the Paint with *Satyr*, but by confronting their Pretence and Form with *solid* and *sincere Piety*.'¹⁸⁴ Like his patron Sancroft, Maurice vociferously opposed toleration.¹⁸⁵ In 1685, he accused the duke of Buckingham of supporting

¹⁸¹ See below chapter 5.

¹⁸² He may have been licenser of the press. There is no indication that he held this office in Edward Vallance's *ODNB* entry, but Maurice licensed Thomas Barlow's *Protestant and Papist* on July 9, 1687, according to Edward B. Davis, "The Anonymous Works of Robert Boyle and *the Reasons Why a Protestant Should not Turn Papist* (1687)," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 55, no. 4 (1994), 620, n. 52.

¹⁸³ Edward Vallance, "Henry Maurice (1647?-1691)," *ODNB*, 461-462.

¹⁸⁴ Henry Maurice, *A sermon preached...on January the 30th, 1681* (London: 1682), 33, quoted in John Spurr, "'Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church," *The Historical Journal* 31, no. 1 (1988), 78.

¹⁸⁵ Regarding Sancroft's programme to counter whig influence during the Tory Reaction, see Robert Beddard, "The Commission for Ecclesiastical Promotions, 1681-84: An Instrument of Tory Reaction," *The Historical Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1967).

toleration to an extent that would abide pagan idolatry and justify criminal acts on the basis that matters of conscience are relative.¹⁸⁶

Tensions between James and the Church were already mounting in March of 1686 over the issue of tolerance. Reverend Maurice approved the sermon attributed to Collier on April 23, in defiance of the Crown-mandated *Directions* noted above, while the Court encouraged publication of the Catholic sermons which were being preached at Whitehall. At the same time, supporters of toleration circulated pamphlets of their own. Maurice, along with other Church of England clergymen such as Edmund Bohun, deemed pro-toleration propaganda antinomian and subversive, arguing “that this liberty of every man to ‘run after’ his own reason could only produce as many religions as there were men.”¹⁸⁷ Directions concerning preaching had been issued by Stuart monarchs throughout the seventeenth century, and had become semi-routine injunctions. What distinguishes the Directions issued by James II in 1686 is that previously the Church, especially under Laud, had been in concert with crown policy. James, however, had alienated High Churchmen, Sancroft in particular.¹⁸⁸

The premises of “The Difference Between” outlined above are consistent with Collier’s thought, as will be established in subsequent chapters. Collier counsels that

...we should be careful to maintain the Sovereignty of the mind; that whenever Reason and Religion requires it, we may have power to controul our senses, and be pleased with

¹⁸⁶ [Henry Maurice], *The Antithelmitte*... (London: 1685), 5-8, 22, cited in J.R. Jacob, “Boyle’s Atomism and the Restoration Assault on Pagan Naturalism,” *Social Studies of Science*, 8, No. 2 (1978), 232.

¹⁸⁷ John Spurr, “‘Rational Religion’ in Restoration England,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49, no. 4 (1988), 568. Spurr specifically cites [Henry Maurice] *The Antithelmitte* (London, 1685).

¹⁸⁸ The 1662 Licensing Act had installed a system similar to that of the 1630s, the terms of which included compulsory licensing for all authorized works prior to publication. The intention was to support the Act of Uniformity, which gave licensers extensive powers of search and seizure, in quelling the spread of non-conformist ideas. The Act had lapsed in 1679. I am grateful to Edward Vallance for discussing these issues with me in relation to his work on Maurice and for suggesting sources. See Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996), particularly pages 135-171. For comparison, see Anthony Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England,” *The Historical Journal* 41, no. 3 (1998), 645-647.

the victory: But on the contrary, to make the Soul a Slave to the Body; to employ the powers of Reason (the Image of the Glorious God) in providing for the gratification of the Animal Life; is a most degenerate and dangerous abuse of so great a privilege.¹⁸⁹

Collier returned to these themes in a sermon preached the following year (1687): “The Comparison Between Giving and Receiving.” He again argued that the soul is immortal: “The Pleasure of a Charitable Action keeps us Company all along in this World, and in the next too. ‘Tis turn’d as it were into the Substance of the Soull, and is as immortal as the *Will* from whence it proceeded.”¹⁹⁰ In his suggestion that the love of parents for their children is due to the fact that “they look upon them as Beings derived from themselves; because they grew up into Strength and Reason under their Care and Protection,” he reiterated the parental obligation to foster the development of their dependants’ reason.¹⁹¹ Collier acknowledged the necessity of some form of temporal authority: “Indeed, in this World, where Weakness, and Vice, and Passion, are so frequent and troublesom, Government and Subordination are of absolute Necessity. But in Heaven, all Men will be rais’d to such a Pitch of Vertue and Understanding, that they may be safely trusted with the Disposal of themselves.”¹⁹² The secular magistrate is necessary to maintain order, but not as a means of forcing the application of “right reason.”

Nevertheless, while there is continuity in substance, the circumstances of this second sermon differ from those of the first. Collier preached “The Comparison between Giving and Receiving” at Whitehall on April 19, 1687, following James II’s first Declaration of Indulgence (April 4). His audience would likely have included James II, and the subject of the sermon seems to have been the king’s gift of indulgence to Catholics and nonconformists. Collier

¹⁸⁹ Collier, “The Difference Between,” 28-29.

¹⁹⁰ Jeremy Collier, “The Comparison between Giving and Receiving, with the Reasons for Preference, stated: In a Sermon Preach’d at Whitehall, April 19, 1687” (London: 1723), 17.

¹⁹¹ Collier, “Comparison,” 19

¹⁹² Collier, “Comparison,” 23.

advised that those who are in a position to give should do so, but explained that if the act extended from self-interested intentions, or to advance a particular “faction,” then the benefits of the gift to the receiver would be diminished and the act of giving negated. Like the monarch, the “Giver resembles a fruitful Country, which has all the Conveniences of Life within itself, and subsists upon the Product of its own Growth...Farther, Giving includes Choice; for what a Man parts with to another, he may keep for himself...And if he takes his Measures too narrow, he is accountable to none but God Almighty.”¹⁹³ The sermon counsels the giver not to abuse his position of advantage over the receiver so as not to promote subservience, “for there’s nothing more certain than that the owning of Impotence and Dependence, which is imply’d in the Relation to a Benefactor, makes some People abate in their Affection towards him.”¹⁹⁴ The extension of charity should be free of “any Signs of Pride” or ill-feeling toward the beneficiary. It was the belief of Anglican clergymen that James had issued the first declaration primarily to enable Catholics to serve in the military, government and universities. Protestant dissenters were also included in the hope that together nonconformists and Catholics would form a base of support from which James could diminish the Church of England’s influence on Parliament.

One year later, James issued the second Declaration of Indulgence (April 27, 1688). It has been proposed above that “The Office of a Chaplain” referred to Collier’s experience as a domestic chaplain at Knole House. The first edition of this essay was published in 1688, but the precise dating has never before been considered. Internal evidence suggests that it was published prior to the November 5 invasion, as Collier would see it, by William of Orange. First of all, there is no reference to the Glorious Revolution, the subject which dominates Collier’s writings until 1693. He does, however, make reference to pre-invasion political tensions. Collier is

¹⁹³ Collier, “Comparison,” 6.

¹⁹⁴ “Collier,” Comparison, 19.

adamant that the patrons of chaplains – be they bishops or clergymen serving in private households – are not their masters. He concedes,

with all due submission and respect to this Legislative Council, that if the question was concerning any Civil Right, then 'tis confessed 'tis in the Power of the Parliament either to limit, or take it away, because the whole Power and Authority of the Kingdom is there, either personally, or by Representation; and therefore they may deprive any Person of his Honour or Estate (the Right of the Succession to the Crown excepted) as far as they please: not that 'tis impossible for them to act unjustly, but only that what they Determine hath the force of a Law, because every man is suppos'd to have given his consent to it.¹⁹⁵

Parliament only has jurisdiction in matters civil, and Collier emphasizes these distinct limits, the context of which is the refusal by seven senior bishops to obey a royal command which they believed to be in conflict with the Act of Uniformity. The Act remained in place, but James had claimed the royal dispensing power to extend his mercy of withholding punishment under the Act. Collier goes on to use the office of MP as a metaphor for the office of a chaplain to to assert that neither should be treated as a servant. But Collier's reference to the suspension of parliament is crucial to the present purpose of dating this tract:

The House of Commons likewise have Pensions from their Electors, during the Session of Parliament; I confess 'tis not usually paid now, but if they did receive it as formerly they have done, I hope no one would say a Knight of a Shire was servant to a man of Fourty shillings *per annum*, because he contributed something towards his maintenance.¹⁹⁶

James had dissolved parliament on July 2, 1687, and began in earnest his effort to ensure that the next session would be packed with pre-engaged supporters of tolerance. Collier expresses his support for the king against parliamentarians who considered the dispensing power arbitrary.¹⁹⁷ Collier does not blindly defend the authority of bishops. He takes a hardline view

¹⁹⁵ Collier, "The Office of a Chaplain," 24-25.

¹⁹⁶ Collier, "The Office of a Chaplain," 26.

¹⁹⁷ See Corinne C. Weston and Janelle R. Greenberg, *Subjects and Sovereigns: The Grand Controversy over Legal Sovereignty in Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

of the inviolability of sacred office which derives from God; Parliamentarians are trespassing against this obligation. Among the Lords was Collier's former employer, Dorset, who is addressed in this tract not only as a head-of-household who was out of line with respect to treatment of his domestic chaplain, but also as a pompous lay peer who misunderstood the boundaries of his own authority.¹⁹⁸

Collier's Whitehall sermon also implies that he supported James' first Declaration, if indeed it was a reflection of benevolent royal motives. The second Declaration stipulated that Church of England clergy read it aloud from their pulpits. Those who refused would be reprimanded by the Ecclesiastical Commission, under the direction of Lord Chancellor Jeffreys.¹⁹⁹

In these early publications, Collier presents a free will oriented version of Church of England doctrine which would have appealed to Sancroft, who from 1686 had strong reasons to seek allies. However, Collier appears to have been recruited by James to preach at Whitehall in support of the Declaration of Indulgence, thereby breaking any alliance he may have had with Sancroft.

¹⁹⁸ Gary De Krey, "Reformation and 'Arbitrary Government': London Dissenters and James II's Polity of Toleration, 1687-1688," in Jason McElligott, ed., *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 18-25.

¹⁹⁹ Jeffreys had also overseen the merciless punishment of Monmouth's supporters in 1685, known as the 'Bloody Assizes.' The Commission enjoyed jurisdiction in all religious controversies, and powers of suspension or deprivation over any ecclesiastical office holder, including within the universities.

4.0 THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION AND “PRETENDED AUTHORITY”, 1689-1696

The previous chapter established that in his first seven years of service as a clergyman Collier was supported by private patrons; that he moved to London in 1685, coinciding with the accession of James II; and that he preached, first at Gray’s Inn (c. 1685) and then at Whitehall (April 19, 1687) shortly after the first Declaration of Indulgence (April 4, 1687). In his first published sermon (1686) he made a case for the immortality of the soul, the free-will content of which may have appealed to High Church Anglican sensibilities. But Collier’s Whitehall sermon implied that he supported James II’s extension of toleration to dissenters. *The Office of a Chaplain*, it was also argued, may be read not only as a negative appraisal of Collier’s experience at Knole House, but also as an anti-erastian criticism of parliamentarians overstepping their bounds and imposing on the sacred office of clergymen.

This chapter focuses on Collier’s first substantial period of publication, which was in reaction to the Glorious Revolution, the establishment of the Williamite regime, and the Nine Years War. While his range of options changed after November 1688, Collier’s devotion to the duties of his office, as he perceived them, remained constant. Although Collier’s precise confessional identity prior to the Revolution is unknown, it is striking to observe the pattern of private patronage as a chaplain in Kent during the “Exclusion crisis,” his seclusion as a rector in Suffolk before 1685, and his more public presence in London as religious tolerance became initially a possibility, then a royal directive under James. This could imply that Collier was a

royalist or even perhaps pro-Catholic. However, Collier's interest in James's accession, and the fact that he did not share the worries many of his fellow Anglicans had about the king, may have been based on other grounds.²⁰⁰

Those who became "nonjurors" included clergymen, schoolmasters, those who held positions in the universities, and office-holders who refused the oath of allegiance and were consequently expelled from their posts by Act of the Convention Parliament.²⁰¹ Reasons for repudiation included scrupulous commitment to oaths taken to the Stuarts in particular, and a crisis of conscience over the binding power of previous oaths as a general principle.²⁰² Riddled with contradictions similar to those of his father, Collier's stance is not easy to place.²⁰³

According to his biographer Collier published "the first pamphlet that appeared in defence of the cause which he espoused," in which he contended that James's flight after the invasion of William III was warranted, therefore he did not abdicate.²⁰⁴ This was in response to Gilbert Burnet's *An Enquiry into the present state of affairs*.²⁰⁵ In *The Desertion Discuss'd*

²⁰⁰ The issue is further complicated by the fact that Collier does not offer the same support for the Toleration Act under William and Mary as he did for the Declaration of Indulgence by James II. A feature of 1 W&M ch. 18 which distinguishes it from the broad tolerance extended by James is the exclusion of non-Trinitarians and Catholics.

Suggestions about what this might tell us about Collier follow below, chapter 4.

²⁰¹ The Act specified that the oath was to be taken by members of Parliament and peers by March 1, all others before August 1, 1689 to avoid suspension, and by February 1, 1690 to prevent deprivation. The question of why the term came to be associated solely with a particular group of clergymen remains unanswered.

²⁰² On early modern conceptions of the relationship between oaths and conscience, see John Spurr, "'The Strongest Bond of Conscience': Oaths and the Limits of Tolerance in Early Modern England," in Harald E. Braun and Edward Vallance, eds, *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004). For perspective on the relationship between "the office of rule" and the Oath of Allegiance, see Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in early modern England: the presupposition of oaths and offices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 196-197.

²⁰³ A starting point for comparing the experiences of Collier the elder to those of Collier the younger which has been suggested to me by J.C. Davis is the common context of oaths. See Edward Vallance, "The Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden's View of the English Constitution (1709)," in *Contexts of Conscience*, 67-81. Vallance examines the parallels between the allegiance controversy after the Glorious Revolution and the Engagement controversy under the English republic (1649).

²⁰⁴ [Samuel Jebb], *Biog Brit*, 1407. [Jeremy Collier], *The Desertion Discuss'd In a Letter to a Country Gentleman* (London: 1688).

²⁰⁵ [Jebb], *Biog Brit*, 1407. Burnet had been in the Netherlands since 1686 operating as an adviser to William of Orange. He became the leading light of a Protestant propaganda campaign against James' religious policies, and

Collier refuted Burnet's defense of the Convention's lower House, the legality of which rested on the assumption that James had abdicated and that he was in "breach of what they call the original contract."²⁰⁶ Collier was equally wary of the assertion that there existed such a contract between subjects and sovereigns in *Vindiciae juris regii*, another response to Burnet. Because "the Kings of *England* hold their Crown by Right of Conquest and Succession, and consequently are no Trustees of the People," it was wrong to declare that James had forfeited the crown by breaking a mythical compact with his subjects.²⁰⁷ He explained "That the Liberties of the Subjects are not founded upon the Reservations of an Original Contract. For a Conquered People must not pretend to make their own Terms. And therefore, their Privileges are not of their own Creating, but Acts of Royal Favour, and Condescensions of Sovereignty."²⁰⁸

In the bibliography to his comprehensive study of allegiance controversy pamphlets, Mark Goldie notes that Collier's *Vindiciae* is "A unique tract: defends James by virtue of the Norman Conquest...English liberties the condescensions of a conqueror; patriarchy defended against contract and right of deposition."²⁰⁹ However, the position that Stuart royal power had been a product of the Conquest is far from unique, and builds upon a longer tradition of royalist/loyalist political thought that included, most famously, that of Sir Robert Filmer. Collier made use of this ideological inheritance (arguments defending royalism on patriarchal grounds) in political language which would have been extremely familiar to the public in 1689.

helped to draft the October *Declaration* which preceded William's invasion. Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 29-30.

²⁰⁶ [Collier], *The Desertion Dicuss'd*.

²⁰⁷ [Jeremy Collier], *Vindiciae juris regii, or Remarques upon a paper, entitled, An enquiry into the measures of submission to the supream authority* (London: 1689), 8.

²⁰⁸ *Vindiciae.*, 14. For comparison with the thought of an early Stuart divine, see Glenn Burgess on Calybutte Downing in "The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered," *The English Historical Review* 107 (1992), 854-855.

²⁰⁹ Mark Goldie, "The Allegiance Controversy: An Annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets," in *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83 (1980), 534. M.P. Thompson also singles out Collier's *Vindiciae* as representative of a type of conquest argument which took its cue from James II in assailing the Revolution. "The Idea of Conquest in Controversies over the 1688 Revolution," in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38 (1977), 33.

Collier's reputation and, more generally, the expectations that accompany readings of patriarchal argumentation have come to define interpretations of his thought.²¹⁰ But is Collier in fact *defending* James on the basis of conquest or patriarchy? How does our understanding of his position on the Revolution change if his discussion of conquest theory and patriarchy are read as descriptive of the situation (historical and contemporary) rather than as a prescriptive royalist/loyalist apologetic? Bearing in mind what has been established about his biography before Jacobitism became an option, Collier's opposition to the Dutch invasion (as he and other nonjurors saw it) is remarkable for the extent to which issues from the previous decade remained current. By establishing points of continuity and change between his allegiance controversy pamphlets and his views before November 5, 1688, we will attempt to understand the features of Collier's noncompliance with particular attention to his view of conquest, and the subsequently established political order. It will be argued that he was using these conventional arguments in unconventional ways.

Before the invasion, Collier had drawn an analogy between the relationship of chaplains to their patrons, and that of the House of Commons to "the people."²¹¹ Collier accepted as fact the existence of a tacit agreement between the Commons and those whom they represent.²¹² As well in 1689, Collier explained that monarchs depend upon the assent of subjects via

²¹⁰ However, Collier never grounds his allegiance to James II or the Stuarts in arguments supporting unlimited monarchical sovereignty. To the contrary, it was Collier's polemical opponent Edmund Bohun who had in 1684 published the *Defence of Sir R. Filmer against Algernon Sidney* followed by a translation of Filmer's *Patriarcha* in 1685. According to Paul Monod, "Filmer, in fact, was seldom cited by Jacobite writers, and never for his opinions on monarchical power; to represent divine right theory as Filmerian, an error many historians have fallen into, is like characterizing British socialism as Marxist-Leninist." Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English people, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 18. Johann Sommerville suggests that the portrayal of Filmer's patriarchalism as representative of English royalism has a republican origin, beginning in 1656 with John Hall's reading of Filmer's *The Anarchy of a Limited Monarchy*. Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, Johann P. Sommerville, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), xiv.

²¹¹ See above, chapter 2.

²¹² Collier, *Office of a Chaplain* (1688), 7-8. Emphasis added.

parliament's power of the purse, even in exercising an acknowledged royal right: "The Right of making War and Peace, is an Indisputable Branch of the King's Prerogative; yet unless his Subjects assist him, this Authority can seldom be exerted to any Successful effect, because his Majesty cannot Levy Money (which is the Sinews of War) without the consent of Parliament."²¹³ However, contract theory did not justify the invasion by William III in 1688. James had not been in violation of any existing contract; it defied logic that a king would offer to forfeit authority founded in conquest in the event that his subjects objected to his rule. In other words, assent as part of the practical functioning of government and consent as its foundational basis are distinct and unconnected. Collier exposed the contradiction as follows:

Indeed to talk of a Character for Resistance in a Country which has been Conquered so often, and all along Monarchically Governed, seems to be a Romantick Supposition. For can we imagine that when our Kings had fought themselves into Victory and Power, and forc'd a Nation to swear Homage and Submission to them, that they should be so easie as to Article away their Dominions, make their Government Precarious, and give their Subjects leave to Dispose of them, as often as they should be pleased to say they had broken their Agreement...²¹⁴

In short, 1688/9 had replaced the heir of one conquest with the fact of another. Since 1066, "Kings and Emperors Reigned." It was they who enjoyed "Independency."

Collier's refutation of Burnet's "Original Notion of Society" as a voluntary act of submission rested on the grounds that this accounted for neither parental authority, nor primogeniture. Burnet, Collier explained, "laies it down for *certain*, *That the Law of Nature has put no difference, or subordination among Men, except it be that of Children to Parents, or of*

²¹³ [Collier], *Vindiciae*, 24.

²¹⁴ [Collier], *Vindiciae*, 43. Collier adds, "But the Silence of our Laws and History as to any such *Compact*, is a sufficient disproof of it; For if there had been any such Enfranchising Instrument, how prejudicial soever it might have been in its Consequence, yet the natural desire of Liberty would have occasioned the preserving it with all imaginable Vigilance: And as it would not have miscarried through Negligence, so if Violence had wrested such a pretended Palladium from us, the Calamity would have got into the Almanack before this time, and been as certainly Recorded as the Destruction of Troy."

Wives to their Husbands; so that with relation to the Law of Nature, all Men are born Free.”²¹⁵

But Collier could not reconcile the idea that we are born free, yet simultaneously subordinate to our parents. He opposed Burnet’s application of natural law theory by emphasizing the reality of patriarchalism. As children, with undeveloped faculties of reason, we are reliant upon our parents and governed by our passions. As adults we are bound to care for aged or infirm parents under Mosaic Law. “If he means, that we are naturally subject to none but our Parents and Husbands; this, I believe, will not hold neither. For it seems pretty plain from Scripture, That the Younger Children are all born under the jurisdiction of their Elder Brother.”²¹⁶ It seems fitting to recall Collier’s own experience as a younger son who was low on the list to inherit his father’s estate. “Now if the Younger Children ought always to be governed either by their Father, their Elder Brother, or those who claim under him; then certainly the State of Nature is not such a State of Liberty, as the Enquirer supposes. But this Patriarchal Notion, being not much material to the present Dispute, I shall insist no farther upon it.”²¹⁷ His personal investment in using Filmer’s political argument suggests that he was well aware that he brought this contradiction to light as an issue that was suffered at his own expense.

Furthermore, because the meaning of words is malleable and due to the fact that sensory perception is unreliable as a means of determining truth, Collier cautioned that written laws are frequently manipulated by ill-intentioned men against the purposes of the original legislators. “But the Law of Nature is not tyed up to the Alphabet, nor bound to determine by the

²¹⁵ [Collier], *Vindiciae*, 1-2.

²¹⁶ [Collier], *Vindiciae*, 1-2.

²¹⁷ [Collier], *Vindiciae*, 1-2.

Imperfections of former Ages.”²¹⁸ The law of nature is the law of God – opposed to violence and usurpation.²¹⁹

If he was not in breach of contract, how did Collier answer the charge that James intended to subvert Protestantism and impose popery on his subjects?²²⁰ According to Collier, had this been his intention and had he acted on such self-interested motives, James would have been rightly held accountable. Furthermore, Collier continues, while a Counter-Reformation theorist such as Cardinal Bellarmine would validate such arbitrary royal power, this was from within an entirely different political culture, namely Absolutism, which Collier equates with the rule of Hebrew kings and Roman emperors. For a king to deny liberty of conscience would be to step outside the bounds of his office and abuse his portion of the legislative authority.

It’s true *Bellarmino*...pretends to prove by Scripture, the Fathers, and Reason, That Kings ought not to permit a Liberty of belief, but then he supposes their Authority to be Absolute; as appears from his Instances of the Jewish Kings, and Roman Emperors. Therefore his Doctrine does not oblige Princes, who have only a Part (though a Principal one) in the Legislative Power, especially when a different Communion is Established by the Laws of the Realm, which cannot be Repealed but by consent of Parliament. A King when he exceeds his Prerogative, is in some measure out of the Sphere of Royalty: For though his Subjects are not to resist him, when he Persecutes against Law, yet his Actions, having no Warrant from the Constitution, are altogether Private and Unjustifiable.²²¹

In the tradition of Filmer, Collier did not support rebellion against overbearing monarchs.²²² But neither did he accept that apologists for absolutism omitted the necessity of a prince acting above the law, when the civil law had been rendered obsolete. “I say it’s neither openly asserted, nor can it be collected from any of these Authorities, That a limited Prince is

²¹⁸ [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 7.

²¹⁹ [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 7. Collier was not alone in his concern about the abuses of language. See Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 279-303.

²²⁰ [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 35.

²²¹ [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 37.

²²² [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 18-31. .

obliged to break through the Establishment of his Country, and Act Arbitrarily for the sake of Religion; or (which is all one) that a private Man ought to propagate the Orthodox Faith *Vi & Armis*, though he violates the Laws of Civil Justice, as well as Humanity by so doing.”²²³

Even if James II was Catholic, this did not preclude peaceful coexistence with protestants in a religiously tolerant society. Citing his polemical adversary Gilbert Burnet’s own *Animadversions on the reflections upon Dr. B’s Travels*, Collier found positive examples in the Huguenot experience within Catholic France, at least until the Revocation of 1685, and in the commonwealth of Switzerland:

If the Point was dubious, the Practice of the Roman Church ought to determine the Controversie...To begin with *France*; It is certain that from the time of *Henry* the Fourth till within these few Years, the Hugonots [*sic*] have had little or no disturbance about their Religion, notwithstanding the Absoluteness of that Monarchy, and the vast Majority of Roman Catholicks amongst them, and yet this Indulgence of their Kings has never been condemn’d as a prevarication of their Duty. To proceed; In the *Canton* of *Switzerland* the Protestants at this Day enjoy their Perswasion with Ease and Security enough (Dr *Burnet’s* Travels.)²²⁴

This is inflammatory rhetoric, as one of the reasons given for the “invitation” extended to William of Orange in the Bloodless Revolution was the threat of a French and, more to the point, Catholic invasion enabled by James II. Yet in the *Desertion Discuss’d*, Collier had gone so far as to support the authority of Tyrconnell’s administration in Ireland, under which the civil government and army had been purged of Protestants and replaced by Catholics in the wake of Monmouth’s rebellion.²²⁵ According to Collier, regardless of the invasion’s outcome, Scotland and Ireland were exempt from any settlement established in England. In the case of Scotland,

²²³ [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 37-38.

²²⁴ [Collier], *Desertion Discuss’d*, 38. The reference is to Gilbert Burnet, *Animadversions on the Reflections upon Dr. B’s travels* ([Amsterdam]: 1688).

²²⁵ Collier also argues that Scotland and Ireland are independent kingdoms in *Animadversions*, 2. The subject of Irish Catholic anticipation that through James’s succession would be realized “a total transformation of Irish political and religious life,” as well as accounts of public declarations “that the day was their own and that the Protestant religion must go down,” see Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite cause, 1685-1766: A fatal attachment* (Portland: Four Courts Press, Ltd., 2002), 58.

“there his Majesty’s Commissioners acted in the usual Manner, till they were distorted,”²²⁶ and with regard to Ireland, he argued that it is a sovereign kingdom, which “continues still under the Regular Administration of the Lord Lieutenant.”²²⁷ Collier made it clear that he paid no mind to the popular Anglo-Protestant fear of an Irish Catholic menace. He even called into question claims that Ireland was under English jurisdiction: “Neither is it sufficient to say, That *Ireland* is an Appendage to the Crown of *England*, and therefore it must follow its Revolution. For allowing a Demise was really consequent upon a Failure of Seals and Representatives; yet there would be no colour to apply it to a case where there was no such Omission. For no Forfeiture ought to be stretched beyond the Reason upon which it is grounded.”²²⁸

Collier concluded that if England was conquered in 1688, as in 1066, then a state of subjection had persisted for the entire period 1066-1688. “[W]hen a People are Conquered their Lives and Fortunes lye at the Mercy of the Conqueror. This Title makes his Sovereignty absolute, and his Will a Law.”²²⁹ As we will see, Collier’s solution to this dilemma was a form of passive resistance, refusing to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Williamite regime and its established Church, at great personal expense. In short, Collier did indeed justify James’ title to the throne by right of hereditary succession in the wake of conquest.²³⁰ But he was not explicit as to why this was not equally true of William’s claim in 1689.²³¹

²²⁶ Presbyterian militants began purging episcopalian ministers on Christmas Day, 1688. Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 210-218

²²⁷ [Collier], *The Desertion Discuss’d*, 2.

²²⁸ [Collier], *The Desertion Discuss’d*, 2. See also Breandán Ó Buachalla, “From Jacobite to Jacobin,” in *1798: A Bicentenary Perspective*, Thomas Bartlett, David Dickson, Dáire Keogh, and Kevin Whelan, eds. (Dublin: Four Courts, 2003), 75-96; Ó Ciardha, *Ireland*, 52-181.

²²⁹ [Jeremy Collier] *Animadversions upon the modern explanation of II Hen. 7. cap. I, or, A King de facto* (London: 1689), 1.

²³⁰ [Collier], *Vindiciae*, 5.

²³¹ This contradiction needs to be explored in greater depth.

Glenn Burgess distinguishes between the divine right of kings as a theory of sovereignty, and royal absolutism. One of the only identifiable innovations in early modern divine right theory was “its connection with indefeasible hereditary right,” and a lessened belief in sacral kingship.²³² In the early seventeenth century the notion of divine right provided Church of England divines with a means of combating Presbyterian and Catholic resistance theory. Bishops could claim against puritans that ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been communicated to them by the king. “But the point of this ecclesiological argument was not to magnify royal authority or to assert a royal power to govern without law. It was simply to keep royal authority superior to all other human authority.”²³³ To prevent sovereignty from tipping over into tyranny, divines such as Peter Heylyn distinguished between the king’s abstract and concrete powers, “[i]n order both to free the king from all human authority and to preserve the rule of law.”²³⁴ According to Heylyn, the king had a commitment to his subjects to exercise his authority according to law.²³⁵ In Collier’s case specifically, the preservation of James’ suspending power served the cause of tolerance in the face of opposition from both parliamentarians and bishops.

Mark Goldie explains that Collier’s *Vindiciae* was unique among nonjuror tracts in its argument that James’s unremitting legitimacy rested on the Norman Conquest.²³⁶ Furthermore, “Collier never returned to such an argument, and it is extraordinary that he should have attempted to use it at this juncture.”²³⁷ On January 25, 1691 a Parliamentary resolution banned the use of conquest theory in Revolution pamphlets. Goldie surmises that Edmund Bohun, who

²³² Burgess, “Divine Right,” 841.

²³³ Burgess, “Divine Right,” 845-846; 858-859. See also Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), chapter 4.

²³⁴ Burgess, “Divine Right,” 847.

²³⁵ Burgess, “Divine Right,” 854.

²³⁶ Collier does seem to have been anomalous among nonjurors, a likelihood that merits an expanded comparative study.

²³⁷ Mark Goldie, “Edmund Bohun and Jus Gentium in the Revolution Debate, 1689-1693,” *The Historical Journal* 20 (1977), 574.

had pamphleteered in favor of Charles II's suppression of Whig dissent in the early 1680s, had attempted to use conquest theory as a positive justification for allegiance to William III as king *de facto* to soothe Tory consciences, leading Collier "to use the old conquest argument which would put the opposite case."²³⁸ Bohun argued after Grotius that William had *jus gentium*, just cause under international law, to oust James. In spite of his good intentions in approving Charles Blount's *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors* on these grounds, Bohun, as a result, lost his post as Licenser of the press.²³⁹ Collier also utilized Grotius for his own purposes. Having proved that James' flight was warranted and that he did not, therefore, abdicate, an examination of the word itself further established Collier's case: "For we are to observe, that to Abdicate an Office, always supposes the Consent of him who Quits it. That this is the signification of the Word *Abdico*, appears from *Tully, Salust, and Livie*." To these classical authorities Collier added the argument of the "Learned *Grotius*" who in *De jure Belli ac Pacis* Book I, Chapter 4, Section 9 "makes Abdicating the Government, and plainly Giving it up, to be Terms of the same importance."²⁴⁰

Collier was arrested in 1689 on account of these seditious publications, committed to Newgate, and released without trial.²⁴¹ Yet he did in fact return to the issue of conquest shortly thereafter, albeit in a different genre. *A Moral Essay Concerning the Nature and Unreasonableness of Pride*, an unsigned tract licensed on August 17, 1689, is the second of his moral essays (*Office of a Chaplain* being the first) and the last to be published independent of

²³⁸ Goldie, "Edmund Bohun," 574.

²³⁹ Goldie, "Edmund Bohun," 574.

²⁴⁰ [Collier], *The Desertion Discuss'd*, 4.

²⁴¹ He supposedly published a translation of the Lutheran historian Johannes Sleidan's *Commentaries*, books 9, 10, 11 and 12 specifically, after his release. [Jebb], *Biog Brit* 1407. I have not found a copy of Collier's translation, but it is interesting to note that Bohun also published a translation of Sleidan in the same year. Edmund Bohun, *The general history of the Reformation of the Church from the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome... Written in Latin by John Sleidan, and faithfully Englished* (London: 1689).

other essays.²⁴² It is a dialogue between Philotimus and Philalethes. Pride is not an accusation to be made indiscriminately, explains Philalethes, who is the dominant speaker and whose object is to examine this vice closely so that it may be recognized and kept in check. The conversation begins with discussion about an unpleasant personal acquaintance from whom Philalethes has just parted company. Attributing his displeasure to this individual's excessive pride, Philalethes explains the difficulty: "Pride is originally founded in Self-love, which is the most intimate and inseparable Passion of humane Nature."²⁴³

The scope of the conversation widens to encompass more general examples of this vice. The issue of clerical office is revisited as Philotimus suggests that prideful curates who "forget they hold by a servile Tenure" provide a "very ill example to the Parish, and make all other servants challenge the same liberty, and grow pert upon their Masters: And when this Sawciness became universal, as it's likely it might do in a short time, what less Mischief could be expected from it, than an old *Scythian* Rebellion?"²⁴⁴ Philalethes replies provokingly that he did not realize that "the being of Government" relied upon such a distinction, "and that if the modern way of Distance and Subordination was not kept up, we must presently return to *Hobs*'s state of Nature."²⁴⁵ In what is most likely Collier's own comment on the nonjurors' plight, Philalethes ponders the notion that, "If a Curate be such a dangerous thing, that a little civil Usage to him is ready to make the World fall about our Ears, I wonder why so many of them are suffered."²⁴⁶

In an argument reminiscent of Collier's "Office of a Chaplain," Philalethes explains that the English meaning of the word "Curate," contrary to Philotimus's misconception, is not an

²⁴² Future editions of Collier's moral essays, including "Of Pride," would be signed and published as collections.

²⁴³ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay concerning the nature and unreasonableness of pride in which the most plausible pretences of this vice are examined* (London: 1689), 4.

²⁴⁴ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 31-32.

²⁴⁵ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 31-32.

²⁴⁶ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 32.

“Ecclesiastical Hireling.” Rather, “the proper import of the Word signifies one who has the Cure of Souls; therefore in *France* all Parochial Priests are called Curates, as they are likewise in our Rubrick and Common Prayer.”²⁴⁷ His French example, provocatively deployed again in wartime, underscores the universality of his argument.²⁴⁸ Philotimus asks why Philalethes is “so much concerned to prove Curates no Servants,” to which Philalethes replies that his immediate concern is “to rescue them from that contempt, which they will certainly fall into, as long as they pass under this notion.”²⁴⁹ More broadly, he is concerned with the consequences of “miscalling things.” Citing Plato, Philalathes explains “that an alteration of the Notes in Musick is apt to produce an Innovation in the Laws and Customs of a Country: so by changing the names of Offices for others of less Repute, we change the Uses and Designs of them, and make them less satisfactory to those engaged, and less serviceable to the Publick than they would have been, if the Character of their Institution had been kept up.”²⁵⁰ Therefore, the integrity of the office must not be compromised.

Part two of the dialogue builds upon what has been established about the effects of pride in the individual, which by extension accounts for imperial conquest. But conquest is not merely an external imposition. Philalethes describes the state of moral decay which renders a society vulnerable to invasion, citing sentimental adherence to tradition and hereditary privilege as chief among the contributing factors. While he allows that some members of the nobility rise to meet the standards of their inherited or regally bestowed honor through public service, there is a tendency to rely upon the benefits of hereditary title without personally improving “that Stock

²⁴⁷ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 33.

²⁴⁸ Collier repeatedly uses French examples positively from 1689 forward.

²⁴⁹ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 35-36.

²⁵⁰ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 35-36.

which was granted to their Ancestors.”²⁵¹ Philotimus suggests that soldiers are especially entitled to honor, “[f]or can there be a more extraordinary instance of Greatness, than for a Man to be undismayed amidst so many horrible Instruments and Images of Death?”²⁵²

In response, Philalethes agrees that gentlemen of the sword are entitled to their esteem. Yet he finds that professions of Learning deserve greater merit. First of all, war itself relies upon educated decisions in the management of armies and the formulation of tactics, and the insight into human nature that enables a general to assess the enemy’s strengths and weaknesses. Secondly, a soldier’s courage contributes little to his Country after he has died in battle; “But Learning, by inventing and improving Arts and Sciences, scatters its Favours in a much larger compass; becomes a universal Benefactor, and obliges mankind in its most comprehensive Latitude of Place and Time....The Conquests of Arts are not like those of Arms, gained by slaughter, and attended with ruin and desolation.”²⁵³

Similar to “Office of a Chaplain,” while Collier was, on the one hand, simply doing his job as a minister by providing guidance in matters moral, on the other hand the contemporary circumstances of publication indicate that “Of Pride” was directed against supporters of the “invasion.” In his opening address to the reader Collier declared that in an attempt to avoid censure, he wished to make perfectly clear “*that here are no particulare Characters attempted, nor is there the least intention to provoke or expose any Person Living. Besides when a Piece like this is drawn from so many different Faces; the mixing of Features and Complexions, will keep the Originals from being discover’d.*”²⁵⁴ Accordingly, this dialogue goes some distance in elucidating Collier’s political thought, suggesting that his appeal to the Norman Conquest of

²⁵¹ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 61.

²⁵² [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 72.

²⁵³ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 75-76.

²⁵⁴ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, preface.

1066 in the Allegiance Controversy did not comprise positive grounds for arguing James II's legitimacy. As conquerors, William III *and* William I had acted on a self-interested impulse – pride. James II, though the descendant of conquest, was at least susceptible to counsel under the terms of his office, which was a process in which Collier himself probably participated through his sermon at Whitehall. A “Great Man” succumbs neither to pride nor to servility, “and scorns either to trample upon a Worm, or sneak to an Emperor.”²⁵⁵

Having argued the invasion's illegality, from 1690 Collier directed his efforts toward proving the established Church of England guilty of schism, the ranks of the episcopacy occupied by flatterers seeking advantage at the cost of the deprived nonjurors. The Restoration debate over comprehension continued into the 1690s, and took a turn in favor of the “latitude men” (latitudinarians) who now gained ascendancy by acquiring the vacant sees. Their ideological beliefs complemented the Williamite agenda; victory against Catholic France depended upon securing domestic peace, and this required compromise between the Church of England and dissenting Protestants, as well as the persecution of Catholics and certain dissenting sects, such as the Socinians.²⁵⁶ Many Restoration High Church Anglicans of nonjuring status remained opposed to comprehension of protestant nonconformists after 1688, which they viewed as the importation of schism into the Church of England. If, as was suggested in chapter 2, Collier did indeed support James's Declaration of Indulgence, he would not have based his refusal to conform on these grounds.

Collier struck hard at members of the clergy who had taken the oaths and who directed public worship for the usurping monarchy, accusing them of blurring the very distinction between right and wrong: “[T]o mention an Usurper in Sovereign Language, is a dangerous

²⁵⁵ [Jeremy Collier], *A moral essay*, 87.

²⁵⁶ Rose, *England*, 162.

Impropriety; for as far as the abuse of Words can influence, it confounds the Notion of Monarchy, makes One signifie Two, and sets Right and wrong upon the same Level.”²⁵⁷ In a direct address to William Sherlock, Collier accused him of equating right with the use force in a successful invasion, and with lacking constancy.²⁵⁸ In line with his critique of conquest as an act of pride, Collier degraded justification of the invasion by Providencial will: “For if Power be a certain Sign of God’s Authority, then we ought to submit to every one who challengeth the Name of King, though for never so small a Precinct; if he has but force to back his Pretensions.”²⁵⁹ Consistent with his emphasis on the integrity of offices, he cautioned that in succumbing to this presumption, “by consequence every Parish may set up for an Independent Government; and we may be obliged to swear Allegiance to a Constable.”²⁶⁰ Once again, Collier had attacked submission to and recognition of an illegitimate authority.

Furthermore, political divisions should not run contrary to the dominion of God’s law: “For the Limits of Kingdoms are founded upon nothing but Legal Right, and Human Constitutions, and therefore they ought not to oppose *God’s Authority*, which is always visible in *Power*. Seas and Rivers, and Mountains, the usual Barriers of Empire and Jurisdiction, ought not to hinder Divine Right from taking place; nor shut Providence out of the World.”²⁶¹ “Divine Right” as Collier applies the term is the law of God, not a doctrine of absolute monarchy.

²⁵⁷[Jeremy Collier] *A caution against inconsistency, or, the connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers* (London: 1690), 2. See also Condren, *Argument and Authority*, 323-324.

²⁵⁸ Sherlock had virulently opposed James II’s Catholicism in the early 1680s; he served as one of James’s chaplains as of 1686. In 1689 he refused to take the oath of allegiance and advocated the nonjurors’ cause. But in February of 1690, the day after nonjurors were officially removed from their offices, he prayed publicly for William and Mary, and took the oaths in August of that year. William E. Burns, ‘Sherlock, William (1639/40-1707)’, *ODNB, Online Edition* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25381>, accessed 21 Sept 2005].

²⁵⁹ [Collier], *Dr. Sherlock’s Case of Allegiance Considered* (London: 1691), 8.

²⁶⁰ [Collier], *Sherlock’s Case*, 8.

²⁶¹ [Collier], *Sherlock’s Case*, 8. Collier’s understanding of Providence, as distinct from that of Sherlock and Burnet (a usurping power has God’s sanction), is treated in the following chapter.

Collier referred to classical usurpers (Pompey, Alexander, Darius) as negative models. Against Sherlock's ruling that "*Power will govern,*" and that "*God so orders it by his Providence as never to entrust Sovereign Power in any hands without giving them his Sovereign Authority,*" Collier sided with the judgment of a meeting of Convocation of the clergy which met in the reign of James I.²⁶² Finding a positive example in the Macedonian conquest of Judea, Collier and "The Gentlemen of the Convocation are quite of another Opinion: And affirm that the Jews were *free*, and under no Tyes of Subjection; to any of *Alexanders* Captains; notwithstanding any claims they could make from *Providence and Possession.*"²⁶³ From this it followed that "God's Authority is always conveyed in a Legal Chanel; where there is not express Revelation to the contrary."²⁶⁴ Collier defined *Providence* as the will of God in action which did not show favor, for instance, through military victory. This designation varies significantly from the use to which term was put by Williamite propagandists, or as it was understood by Cromwell in Collier the elder's day.²⁶⁵

In *A Brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church Power*, Collier denied the right of Parliament to deprive the nonjurors of their offices. He pointed out that the bishops' votes were cast in their capacity as members of the Upper House, in their "meerly Civil Capacity; they voted not as Bishops but as Lords of Parliament."²⁶⁶ Collier's rested his case on "the Original of Ecclesiastical Authority." The authority to perform the "Offices of Religion," Collier explained, derived neither from the people nor from kings; "It springs from a greater Original, and derives

²⁶² [Collier], *Sherlock's Case*, 10-11. William had prorogued Convocation in 1689, and it would not sit again until 1701. On the Convocation Controversy, see Rose, *England*, 190-193.

²⁶³ [Collier], *Sherlock's Case*, 13.

²⁶⁴ [Collier], *Sherlock's Case*, 13.

²⁶⁵ On the latter, see J.C. Davis, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Arnold Publishers, 2003), chapter 6.

²⁶⁶ [Jeremy Collier], *A brief essay concerning the independency of church-power* (London, 1692), 1.

no lower than Heaven it self.”²⁶⁷ He cited the practice of the Apostles of the primitive church against the authority of the Romans via the Sanhedrim. Anticipating that his critics would attack his argument on the basis that the Roman princes were heathens, and that when emperors became Christian the situation changed, Collier contended that “Magistracy in general does not imply a Right to Spiritual Authority; so neither does the denomination of Christian give it any such Advantage.”²⁶⁸ The relationship of the priest to God precludes intervention by the secular magistrate.

Indeed the notion of a Priest supposes a peculiar, and incommunicable Relation to God Almighty: And in this sense, Natural, as well as Revealed Religion has understood it; the Roman Emperors, tho’ they were vain enough, yet never pretended to have Priests BELONG to them till they were dead and Deified. And if any are so extravagant as to exceed the Pride of a Heathen Emperor, tho’ in Charity we ought to pray for them; yet I am afraid ‘tis to little purpose to pray with them.²⁶⁹

Collier was arrested again in 1692, this time on suspicion of his involvement in a supposed plot that, had it been successful, would have enabled a French invasion and a Stuart restoration. Judging by the people with whom he was arrested, it is likely that he was associated, by agents of the state if not in fact, with the conspirators of the Ailesbury plot.²⁷⁰ Collier was apprehended at Romney Marsh, an area notorious for the south coast smugglers who ran Jacobite agents across the Channel.²⁷¹ However, insufficient evidence resulted in his release on bail. Collier’s case was not at all unusual. Paul Hopkins attributes the preponderance of plot rumors in the 1690s in part to the legacy of the Popish and Rye House Plots. This manifested in the reappearance of perjurers, who were often in the employment of patrons set on destroying

²⁶⁷ [Collier], *A brief essay*, 2.

²⁶⁸ [Collier], *A brief essay*, 6.

²⁶⁹ [Collier], *A brief essay*, 13. Collier would later act on his belief in this “peculiar, and incommunicable Relation to God.” See below with regard to the Absolution controversy.

²⁷⁰ Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 55.

²⁷¹ Niklas Frykman, "For reasons of state? The war against smugglers in mid-eighteenth-century southern England" (University of Sussex: MA diss., 2003); Monod, *Jacobitism*, 112-113.

opponents of the Williamite regime. The government “was well-informed about the activities of committed Jacobites. To keep them in check and deter others, it must ensure that the choice between mercy and severity lay in William’s hands; and for this successful prosecutions were essential.”²⁷² In practice, Hopkins explains, procedural error, hurried evidence collection, and unfounded accusations resulted in numerous failed convictions.²⁷³

What seems likely is that Collier was well enough known, despite the fact that he published anonymously, that he may have been rounded up during a widespread sweep by the authorities arresting suspected Jacobites throughout southern England.²⁷⁴ His biographer implies that Collier had remained under surveillance after his 1689 arrest, and that this incident should have come as no surprise: “There is no doubt but this conduct of his occasioned an eye to be kept over his proceedings, nor could it be supposed that any government would forbear the first opportunity that occurred of giving some check, to so active, so industrious, and so dangerous a man. It was not long before such an occasion offered itself.”²⁷⁵

Collier was committed to the Gate House and charged with High Treason on August 16, 1692. Nottingham recommended to Chief Justice Holt of Collier and the others “that they should be delivered from their present confinemt upon Baile...that the said persons should be Bailed to appear at such a time and in such Court as you shall Judge most proper.”²⁷⁶ Friends persuaded

²⁷² Paul Hopkins, “Sham Plots and Real Plots in the 1690s,” in Eveline Cruickshanks, ed., *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1982), 92.

²⁷³ Hopkins, “Sham Plots,” 93.

²⁷⁴ Szechi, *Jacobites*, 55. Manuscript evidence of surveillance and orders for arrest, though not specific to Collier, may be found in CKS, *Sackville Papers*, 1692, U269 C116-119.

²⁷⁵ [Jebb], *Biog Brit*, 1408.

²⁷⁶ Nottingham 16 August 1692, TNA:PRO SP 44/341, f. 400; TNA:PRO SP 44/98, f. 523. The other alleged conspirators named alongside Collier in the *State Papers* were fined £5,000 each; bail was set at £2,000 for the lords, and Nottingham and Her Majesty instructed Holt to “take very good Baile of the others,” though Collier’s price is unspecified. Nottingham had introduced the Comprehension Bill into the House of Lords, and recommended statutory Indulgence for nonconformists, in 1689. Rose, *England*, 162.

him to accept these terms and secure his release, which he did. But to Collier this presented an ethical conflict, and in December of 1692, he chose to be recommitted.

During his second confinement, this time at King's Bench, he wrote "The CASE of Giving BAIL To a pretended AUTHORITY Examined," which he addressed directly to "ye pretended Lord Chief Justice Holt," explaining that he now refused bail on the grounds that to achieve his release in this fashion would be to acknowledge the authority of an illegitimate government.²⁷⁷ In this personal testimony Collier stated that previously he had only followed the advice of his friends because he could not at the time provide them with reasonable arguments to the contrary, and "I did not think it prudent to continue a Prisoner to an opinion I was not able to defend."²⁷⁸ After he was released and had the opportunity for reflection and study, Collier determined that he had erred in accepting bail, that "these Arguments which gave me my Liberty were partly Mistakes in Law, and partly defective in other points of Reasoning. And thus being fully convinc'd I was in ye Wrong; my next Business was to recover ye old ground as soon as might be."²⁷⁹ To set things right, Collier "chose rather to be recommitted, and loose ye benefit of ye Habeas Corpus Act," as it had been rendered null and void anyway under the current regime.²⁸⁰

The Habeas Corpus Act was intended to secure the Liberty of the Subject from the oppressions of the Crown. And in all Pleas depending upon this Act, the King is in Law supposed to be a party. From whence it follows, that we cannot receive any Releife from this Act, unless we putt the Usurper in the Kings place, and apply to him as the Head of

²⁷⁷ Jeremy Collier, "The CASE of Giving BAIL To a pretended AUTHORITY Examined," transcribed by William Emmett, January 1732, Bodleian Library MS Eng Hist. d. 220. Claims that only five copies of this tract were printed may be found in the *Biographia*, p.1408 note C, and in the original manuscript. The Bodleian houses the original MS, but printed copies do not survive. MS Rawl c. 701.

²⁷⁸ Collier, "CASE of Giving BAIL" Bodl Lib MS Rawl c. 701.

²⁷⁹ Collier, "CASE of Giving BAIL" Bodl Lib MS Rawl c. 701.

²⁸⁰ Collier, "CASE of Giving BAIL" Bodl Lib MS Rawl c. 701.

the Government. And if this be not Owing him in some measure, I doubt words and Circumstances have lost their usuall signification.²⁸¹

He made no claims about his own guilt or innocence and did not in any way respond to the accusation of High Treason. The piece is focused solely on refuting the legitimacy of the legal apparatus under an illegitimate state. His obligation was to the law of God, not to a pretended sovereign. Accordingly, Collier justified his actions on the basis that his refusal to bow to this government was in fact civil iconoclasm:

Now What an Idol is in Religion, an Usurper is in respect of Law and Government. The one sets up against God Almighty, and ye other against ye King his Representative and therefore let private Mens Opinions be what they will; the giving any Respect to an Usurper, which Law and Custom has appropriated to ye King; such as ye Regal Stile, &c is, by ye Constitution no less than civil Idolatry.²⁸²

He had made a similar argument against “civil idolatry” in 1690, when he denounced participation in public ceremonies and prayers for William and Mary. “This practice (especially when it is attended with Circumstances of Solemnity) appears to be much the same Crime in State, as Idolatry is in Religion; for as those who give Attributes of God Almighty to a Creature, do as much as in them disown his supreme Excellency.”²⁸³

Another context for the plot in which Collier was allegedly involved is the anxiety of the state three years into the Nine Years War. Regardless of the practicality or impracticality of such a scheme, the the government treated seriously the threat of a French invasion facilitated by Jacobites to restore James to the throne. At the end of March 1692, James had issued a proclamation declaring his intention to enact religious tolerance upon his restoration. This was

²⁸¹ Collier, “CASE of Giving BAIL,” Bodl Lib MS Rawl c. 701 f. 57. Throughout this period Collier repeatedly expresses this concern about the contested meaning of words in relation to moral truth and falsehood. Condren, *Argument and Authority*, 323-324.

²⁸² Collier, “CASE of Giving BAIL,” Bodl Lib MS Rawl c. 701, f. 4.

²⁸³ Collier, *A caution against inconsistency*, 2.

answered with mass arrests of reputed Jacobites as Catholics were expelled from London and the militia summoned.²⁸⁴ Williamites portrayed this broadly as a war in defense of Protestantism against French Catholic tyranny. Conversely, Jacobites believed that the war betrayed the true impetus for William's invasion. The "Revolution," in their interpretation, had been a ruse for the Dutch and their allies to finance their own war with the French at the expense of English blood and treasure.²⁸⁵

Victory over the French at Barfleur and La Hogue in May of 1692 was met with public celebration in London, the ringing of church bells and blaze of bonfires.²⁸⁶ Queen Mary delayed public thanksgiving prayers in anticipation of more good news from the Low Countries, but her hopes were dashed.²⁸⁷ A series of English losses shortly followed, most notably the French capture of Namur in June, breeding both public and parliamentary cynicism about the war. Campaigns continued to go poorly into 1693, with defeat at Landen in Flanders in July, and the capture of the Smyrna merchant convoy two months later. These defeats dealt a considerable blow to England's economy, an impact felt by people of all socio-economic classes.²⁸⁸

In August of 1693, Collier issued his *Remarks upon the London Gazette: relating to the streights-fleet and the Battle of Landen in Flanders*, a condemnation of the Williamite regime's manipulation of public information about the war through its official periodical. The *Remarks* was published anonymously at a moment when the Act requiring pre-publication licensing of printed tracts had been renewed.²⁸⁹ *The Gazeteer*, Collier declares, in "two Relations, both

²⁸⁴ Philip Aubrey, *The Defeat of James Stuart's Armada, 1692* (Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), 88.

²⁸⁵ Rose, *England*, 119.

²⁸⁶ Aubrey, *Armada*, 125-126.

²⁸⁷ Aubrey, *Armada*, 125-126..

²⁸⁸ Rose, *England*, 124-127; Aubrey, *Armada*, 147-164.

²⁸⁹ The Licensing Act would ultimately be abolished in 1695.

Published by Order of the Court,” is self-contradictory in presentation of fact.²⁹⁰ Through detailed comparisons with accounts provided by French and Dutch newsbooks and the official information contained in two “Whitehall Papers,” Collier revealed that the *Gazette*’s report, in attempting to paint a brighter picture for popular consumption, had misrepresented by downplaying English losses in these incidents. It was characteristic of this regime to lie, as he had already established, but Collier also censured the war itself, wishing “heartily [that] we might have Peace and *Justice*, without the Expence of an ounce of Blood.”²⁹¹

All of Collier’s publications had been unsigned since the Revolution, which did not seem to deter the authorities from repeatedly apprehending him. However, this anonymity would dissolve with the release of his first collection of moral essays in 1694. The first essay was a new edition of “The Office of a Chaplain.” In the preface, Collier cited Milton’s *Eikonoklastes* as a source of scepticism about the relevance of this office. “‘Tis true Milton treats the Argument as he does the King, with great Contempt: But to be ill used by such a Hand, and in such Company, is rather an Honour than otherwise.”²⁹² Regardless of the degree of devotion Collier may have exhibited to a “royalist” cause, this did not preclude his public claim of respect for the republican Milton. He found common cause with Milton on moral grounds. In “Of General Kindness,” for example, Collier, like Milton before him, personified pride in the example of Lucifer.²⁹³

In 1694 Convocation remained under suspension, and the Church of England continued under the authority of intruded bishops. The following year Collier, again publishing

²⁹⁰ [Jeremy Collier], *Remarks upon the London Gazette: relating to the streights-fleet and the Battle of Landen in Flanders* (London: 1693), 3.

²⁹¹ [Collier], *Remarks*, 7. On the divisive and socially corrosive effects of political lying in contemporary critiques, see Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 300.

²⁹² Jeremy Collier, *Miscellanies in five essays...the four last by way of dialogue* (London: 1694), 1.

²⁹³ Collier, *Miscellanies*, 61.

anonymously, accused the “Royalists; Particularly those of the Church of England,” of “stoical pride” for their indifference to recent events, and lack of concern for the fortune of others. Such self interest, he explained, was neither Christian nor Human.²⁹⁴ Collier complained of mounting state interference in matters spiritual and a Church in the throes of schism. At this rate, he asked ironically, why not extend the scheme of comprehension to include non-Christians? “Once more, either we may join in a sinful Communion; because of the Mixture of Good in it; or we may not. If the first; then what hinders us from uniting with Socinians, Jews and Mahometans, upon occasion: For here the true God is worshipped, and many Points of Morality are taught.”²⁹⁵ On the question of his own separation from the established Church, Collier wished circumstances were otherwise, but declined “To break a moral Law for a positive Ordinance”²⁹⁶ Despite adherence to his principles, Collier emphasized that he was “loath to leave” his Church. Yet he questioned whether the institution in its present form was in fact the true church.

...But can you expect to find the Church, where its particular Doctrines are disowned; where its Authority is opposed, and betrayed to the Secular Power? Does the Being of a Church consist in Brick and Stone? What would you do if *Jupiter* was worshipped there? I hope the Chiming of the Bells would not draw you to the Service of the Idol. If it is urged, that we may be so planted as to want the Advantage of an Orthodox Pastor; What is to be done in such Circumstances? Must we pray alone, without the Assistance of Priest or Congregation?²⁹⁷

In answer to this question Collier appealed to proverb: “*Better to be alone than in ill Company.*”²⁹⁸ The institutional and the structural forms were inconsequential if the true substance of the Church had been compromised.

²⁹⁴ [Jeremy Collier], *A perswasive to consideration, tender'd to the Royalists* (London: 1695), 1.

²⁹⁵ [Collier], *A perswasive*, 15.

²⁹⁶ [Collier], *A perswasive*, 16.

²⁹⁷ [Collier], *A perswasive*, 16.

²⁹⁸ [Collier], *A perswasive*, 16.

In 1696 Collier gave a public demonstration of his separation from the established Church, and his personal maintenance of its rites and exercise of his office, by delivering absolution at Tyburn to two convicted, would-be assassins of King William.²⁹⁹ By performing this rite, Collier implied that he possessed authority under an authentic church. Two other nonjuring ministers, Shadrach Cook and William Snatt, accompanied Collier on the scaffold and in the imposition of hands.³⁰⁰ The condemned men had been participants in the first plot to elicit widespread public condemnation of Jacobites because of their collusion with the French in exchange for arms. Governmental response to the plot marked a “defining moment of William’s kingship”; in his address to the Westminster Parliament on February 24, 1696, the King announced that there had been a plot to assassinate him, which would, in turn, have facilitated a combined Jacobite and French invasion.³⁰¹ Three hundred suspected Jacobites were arrested. William’s supporters exploited the social anxiety of wartime to solidify the Whig Junto’s authority.³⁰²

At midnight, three days after the execution, Collier claimed that “six or eight Persons rushed into my Lodgings, broke open a Trunck, and seiz’d some *Papers* of Value, tho’ perfectly Inoffensive, and Foreign to their Purpose.”³⁰³ Consequently, a bill was brought against him, and also against Cook and Snatt, for High Misdemeanors. Not even awaiting the possibility to

²⁹⁹ The Earl of Middleton, with whom Collier was arrested in 1692, was also an organizer of the 1696 plot. For a narrative of the plot, see Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

³⁰⁰ In his published testimony Collier claims to speak only for himself, not for his clerical accomplices, Cook and Snatt. Jeremy Collier, *A defence of the absolution given to Sr. William Perkins...with a further vindication therof, April 21, 1696* (London: 1696), 6. Cook published his own defense, *Christian supports under the terrors of death: a sermon preached to Sir John Friend in Newgate* (London: 1696).

³⁰¹ Julian Hoppitt, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 153-154.

³⁰² Hoppitt describes the manner in which “The assassination plot undoubtedly boosted the position of William and the Whigs and was a step towards one-party rule.” Hoppitt, *Land*, 153-154. See also Anon., *Simeon and Levi: or Jacobite Villany and French Treachery* (London, 1696), 13.

³⁰³ Jeremy Collier, *A defence of the absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, at the place of execution, April the 3d. 1696* (London: 1696), 1.

refuse bail on this occasion, Collier fled before he could be arrested.³⁰⁴ In *A Declaration of the Sense of the Archbishops and Bishops*, published in condemnation of Collier's "Irregular and Scandalous Proceedings," it was alleged that Collier had "no Authority nor no Pretence for the absolving these Persons."³⁰⁵ He and his fellow nonjuror accomplices "all pretended to be Members of the Church of *England*: We do declare, That we disown and detest all such Principles and Practices; looking upon them as highly Schismatical and Seditious; dangerous both to the Church and State."³⁰⁶

In a series of six pamphlets, published in rapid succession and from his place of hiding, Collier responded that by absolving these men he was merely carrying out the duties of his office in the absence of bishops; failure to do so would have been in violation of his function.³⁰⁷ He claimed that his actions had been misunderstood, and defended the imposition of hands – a rite which had only become specific to bishops under the reformed rubric – citing the ancient ceremony of the primitive church, and on the basis of reason.³⁰⁸ Collier accused the bishops and archbishops of acting outside their jurisdiction, in their secular capacity.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁴ While Collier absconded, but Snatt and Cook were imprisoned at Newgate and convicted of high crimes and misdemeanors. In the later "Usages Controversy" (1718), Snatt opposed Collier's introduction of the four usages into the liturgy. See below chapter 5. Richard Sharp, 'Snatt, William (1644/5-1721)' *ODNB, Online Edition*, [accessed 4 Oct 2005].

³⁰⁵ John Williams, *A declaration of the sense of the archbishops and bishops* (London: 1696), 7.

³⁰⁶ Williams, *A declaration*, 12.

³⁰⁷ The first is dated April 9, six days after the execution. All of the pamphlets in this series are signed except for the last two: Jeremy Collier, *A defence of the absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, at the place of execution, April 3d* (London: 1696); *A reply to The absolution of a penitent, according to the directions of the Church of England, May 20* (London: 1696); *An answer to the Animadversions on two pamphlets lately published by Mr. Collier, July 1* (London: 1696); [Jeremy Collier], *The great question in the case of the absolution...which will be insisted on at the trial of the absolvers* (London: 1696); [Jeremy Collier] *The case of the two absolvers that were tried at the Kings-Bench-Bar...on...the 2d of July 1696* (London: 1696). The last pamphlet of the series was occasioned by the trial and conviction of Cook and Snatt. This could be seen to represent Collier's own testimony *in absentia*.

³⁰⁸ By 'reformed rubric' Collier refers to the first Book of Common Prayer published under Edward VI. More on Collier's view of this edition follows below, chapter 5.

³⁰⁹ The bishops' *Declaration* had been published to convey the opinions of the Archbishops and Bishops "upon occasion of our Attendance in *Parliament*." Williams, *A declaration*, 1.

In contrast to his arrests in 1689 and 1692, in which he was one example among many of individuals being swept up for their involvement in suspected plots, in 1696 he became a central figure in a high profile public execution.³¹⁰ Collier made it publicly known that he refused and opposed the public ritual of prayers for William and Mary on the basis that to do so would be civil idolatry. Yet he also implied that he could see past the crime of William's attempted assassination by giving absolution to the alleged perpetrators. His focus was trained uncompromisingly on carrying out his office, in spite of any personal consequences.

³¹⁰ On the legislative innovations that resulted from the Assassination Plot, see Clarence C. Crawford, "The Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the Revolution of 1689," *English Historical Review* 30 (1915), 626.

5.0 THE “STAGE CONTROVERSY”: MORAL REFORM, OR REFORMATION OF MANNERS? 1698-1708

In the two years following the absolution controversy, Collier reportedly kept a low profile and dedicated his time to the translation of a historical dictionary.³¹¹ His whereabouts during this period are unknown, though he may have sought refuge among his nonjuring brethren. George Hickes, for instance, had also refused the oath of allegiance in 1689, vocally protested his removal from office, and had become the foremost nonjuror after the Revolution. Under circumstances similar to Collier’s, Hickes continued to devote himself to research while hiding in 1696 at the home of White Kennet, another of Collier’s cohort. All the while dodging the authorities, Hickes persisted in his work on a comprehensive antiquarian study of Anglo-Saxon England defending his view of the Church. He relied upon a circle of trustworthy friends to conceal his whereabouts and identity, many of whom contributed to his project. Perhaps Collier, who would be ordained as a nonjuring bishop by Hickes in 1713, was among them.³¹² As a nonjuror, Collier was no longer an ordained member of the established Church of England. As an outlaw, he enjoyed no protection under civil law. He had chosen to revoke his status, given

³¹¹ Thomas Lathbury, “Life of Jeremy Collier,” in Jeremy Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (London: William Straker, 1852), *xviii*.

³¹² Thomas Hearne recorded that during this time, Hickes lived under an assumed identity, using the name Smith. Collier would later sign surreptitious correspondence “J. Smith” (See chapter 5). Another coincidence shared between Hickes and Collier: both were supposedly granted a *nolle prosequi*, in Hickes’s case, by Lord Somers in 1699, after which he was able to return to work in London. Joseph Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 355-356.

the circumstances, but maintained that his office was intact on the premise that his authority derived from God, and that his obligation was to individuals, not governments.

When Collier resurfaced in 1698, he began to write about culture. This chapter examines the decade of his life in which his attention shifted to contemporary cultural wars. In three main genres he dealt with these debates in different ways: theater criticism, translation, and public lectures. However, his central concern was consistent in his focus on linked worries about atheism, immorality and anticlericalism, and the impact of these on the moral condition of the nation. This dissertation makes no claims about the uniqueness of these issues to Jeremy Collier. He used classical authorities to support his complaints in apparently conventional ways. However, this chapter does make some suggestions as to what his work in this period adds up to based on what has been established about Collier's earlier life and thought.

The first cultural concern, and most significant in terms of the attention it has received from historians and literary scholars, is the stage controversy. Collier initiated this particular incarnation of an old debate in 1698, and it is the English theater since the reign of Charles II with which he took specific issue. The history and historiography of the dispute has been treated at length elsewhere.³¹³ Of interest to the development of Collier's intellectual biography is the clarification of what he actually said in an effort to counter longstanding misinterpretation. Collier acquired notoriety as the exemplar cantankerous critic which has lasted to the present day, and his name has become synonymous with the controversy. This obscures the reading of

³¹³ For the most recent critical account, see Robert Hume, "Jeremy Collier and the Future of the London Theater in 1698," *Studies in Philology* 96, no. 4 (1999), 480-511. Useful studies and fresh approaches to the debate itself are provided by Hume and also by Raymond Tumbleson, "Polemic and silence: Jeremy Collier, Elkanah Settle, and the ideological appropriation of morality," in Tumbleson, ed., *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), ch. 5.

Collier's contribution to the debate, and perhaps by extension, interpretations of the Stage Controversy as a whole and all its participants.

The three essays which mark Collier's entry into the stage controversy were published between 1698 and 1700. In the first of these, *A Short View of the immorality and profaneness of the English stage*, Collier articulated his concerns about the disgraceful moral condition of English theater. The two subsequent essays were Collier's refutations of critical responses by William Congreve and James Drake in defense of his original assertions.³¹⁴ Collier protested the abuse of language – swearing and cursing. This complaint has added meaning in light of his refusal to swear the oath of allegiance and his accusations about the blurred distinction between truth and falsehood following the Glorious Revolution.³¹⁵ However, the greatest crime, as Collier saw it, was the misrepresentation of clergymen as lewd drunkards, while rakes and libertines were depicted as enviable characters. Collier called John Dryden out in particular on this offense. Shakespeare, Collier explained, generally treated the clergy well in his plays, albeit with a few exceptions. But even in these instances, “the Disgrace falls rather on the person than [sic] the Office,” whereas Dryden's intention was “to sink the Notion, and Murther the Character, and make the Function despicable.”³¹⁶ Such depictions of the clergy, he felt, encouraged rampant immorality.

We are familiar with these positions from Collier's discussion of the office of a chaplain, which was republished as part of a collection of his moral essays, also in 1698. Collier in fact referred to *The Office of a Chaplain* in the *Short View* to emphasize his point that the clergy, “are

³¹⁴ Jeremy Collier, *A Defense of the Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage*, &c. (London: 1699); Jeremy Collier, *Second Defence of the Short View* (London: 1700).

³¹⁵ See above chapter 3. See also Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 279-305. On the subject of refusing to swear oaths as an antierastian principle see Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 54.

³¹⁶ Collier, *A Short View of the Immorality, and Profaneness of the English stage* (London, 1698), 125.

no *Servants*, neither do they *Belong* to any *Body*, but God Almighty.”³¹⁷ Remarkably, Collier did not limit his defense of the clergy to his own nonjuror’s view of the Church of England, his own era, or even his own faith. He would not abide playwrights’ attacks on any form of religion as they “pursue the Priesthood through all the Subdivisions of Opinion. Neither *Jews* nor *Heathens*, *Turks* nor *Christians*, *Rome* nor *Geneva*, *Church* nor *Conventicle*, can escape them.”³¹⁸

Collier cited as his sources of authority the Church Fathers, and classical philosophers, historians and orators, and gave instances in which governments throughout place and time have censored the stage. Homer and Virgil were fair in their treatment of priests; they “were govern’d by the Reason of Things, and the common usage of the Word. They knew the *Priesthood* a very reputable Employment, and always esteem’d as such.”³¹⁹ For the same reasons that “Plato banish’d the Poets his Commonwealth: And one of the Fathers calls Poetry, *Vinum Daemonum*, intoxicating Draught made up by the Devils Dispensatory,” Collier too denounced “licentious discourse” because it “stains the imagination, to awaken fully and weaken the Defences of Virtue.”³²⁰

Collier was especially concerned with widespread scepticism, in classical and contemporary thought, which he equated with atheism like his grandfather before him.³²¹ Among the moderns Collier singled out Dryden, who admired the Renaissance sceptic Montaigne and found comfort in the materialist view of Lucretius that the universe is comprised

³¹⁷ Collier, *Short View*, 139. In a collection of moral essays published the same year, he explains that the same is true of other offices, such as the office of a friend. Jeremy Collier, “Of Friendship,” in *Essays upon several moral subjects* (London, 1698), 60.

³¹⁸ Collier, *Short View*, 110-111.

³¹⁹ Collier, *Short View*, 119.

³²⁰ Collier, *Short View*, 69.

³²¹ See chapter 1.

of impersonal forces.³²² He was disturbed by Dryden's view which, as Collier understood it, was that "our Souls are nothing but Organiz'd Matter...our *Souls* are nothing but our Bodies."³²³ To Collier, this implied that body and soul both terminate at death, and this disturbed his notion of moral law.³²⁴ Under such a system, "no Man can say his Soul is his own"; a universe governed by chance, fate and necessity does not permit individual choice, virtue or constancy.³²⁵ Yet Collier was equally forceful in condemning Aristophanes, who he considered a "downright Atheist" for his abuse of Socrates.³²⁶ "A *Sceptick*," whether ancient or modern, "has no notion of Conscience, no Relish for Virtue, nor is under any Moral restraints from Hope or Fear. Such a one has nothing to do but to consult his Ease, and gratifie his Vanity, and fill his Pocket."³²⁷

In his condemnation of scepticism, Collier found his adversaries guilty of what his contemporaries referred to as Hobbesianism, an accusation often used by the clergy to characterize atheism.³²⁸ Anxiety about rampant atheism, scepticism and anticlericalism was ubiquitous. Rhetorically, Collier's argument is indistinguishable from that of contemporary societies for the reformation of manners who called for the legal suppression of vice, or from the concerns of High Churchmen who sought to reclaim moral authority from these voluntary societies, from the State, and from the whig Low Churchmen who had risen to dominant positions as of 1689. In 1708, 626 people were prosecuted in London for swearing and cursing, and 1,187 for Sabbath breaking. The laws against these and other moral offences were enforced

³²² David Hopkins, *John Dryden* (Devon: Northcote House Publishers, Ltd., 2004), 85-92; Louis Bredvold, *The Intellectual Millieu of John Dryden: Studies in Some Aspects of Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934).

³²³ Collier, *Short View*, 69.

³²⁴ Recall Collier's own position on the present and future state of the soul treated above, chapter 2.

³²⁵ Collier, *Short View*, 69.

³²⁶ Collier, *Short View*, 36-38.

³²⁷ Collier, *Short View*, 43.

³²⁸ According to this fairly standard interpretation of Hobbes, his notions of a world in which people were governed by appetite did not accord with free will, moral necessity and choice. On the subject of Hobbes's influence on restoration poets, see Louis Teeter, "The Dramatic Use of Hobbes's Political Ideas," *ELH* 3, no. 2 (1936), 140-169.

by members of these societies who “searched the streets with blank warrants and employed (occasionally unreliable) informers in order to prosecute thousands of men and women before the civil authorities...The Reformation of Manners societies were distinguished, therefore, by their resort to secular authority to enforce a rigid moral code.”³²⁹

Ostensibly, in his *Stage Controversy* essays Collier shared the concerns expressed by moral reformers of varying types, such as swearing and profaning the name of God. Yet whereas the societies, echoing puritan efforts a half century before, endeavored to arrest swearers, sabbath-breakers and actors,³³⁰ Collier was especially concerned about the consequences of a society in which scepticism and atheism had become the norm, on his own terms. When he described the model priest, it is important to bear in mind that Collier did so as a clergyman who was no longer associated with the established church. In another forum, Collier explained that his intention was to demonstrate “the Danger, and the Injustice, of an Intemperate and Licentious Practice,” and “to raise the Idea of Religion, and give a just value to Things and Persons, of the greatest Dignity and Concern.”³³¹

Given Collier’s audacious disapproval of the Williamite regime, historians have long assumed that his grievance with the theater was an expression of elitism or a thinly veiled Jacobite political protest. But often in the same breath Collier’s actions are characterized as “puritanical,” without recognizing this contradiction. In a recent study, Raymond Tumbleson conforms to the traditional view of Collier as having a “political agenda” and embarking on a “crusade” to shut down the playhouses.³³² He argues that Collier was unconcerned with the

³²⁹ Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 238.

³³⁰ Joseph W. Krutch, “Governmental Attempts to Regulate the Stage after the Jeremy Collier Controversy,” *PMLA* 38 (1923), 154

³³¹ Jeremy Collier, *Essays upon several moral subjects*, Part III (London: 1705), iii.

³³² Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, 131.

concept of virtue as an ideal. Rather, Tumbleton alleges, Collier “identifies morality with elite behavior, and his object is less to promote virtue than to reinforce class divisions...Immorality of the stage seemed less pernicious to Collier than the fact that this immorality appeared in the persons of the great and therefore lessened respect for them and subverted the structure of society.”³³³ Such typical interpretations of Collier as an elitist derive in part from the association of Collier with Jacobite ideology, and the assumption that this perspective entailed an interest in maintaining a class-based hierarchy and society of orders. But it is contrary to Collier’s negative opinions about hereditary privilege discussed in chapter three.³³⁴

It is conceivable that through his critique of the stage Collier was participating in the general climate of wartime grievances over government finance. Tory rhetoric had been particularly critical of the debauched courtier, attributing heavy taxation and corruption to greedy “knaves and villains” in the king’s service. This resonates with Collier’s personal history, having been at a center of cultural production at Knole House in the midst of the restoration crisis, and having at that time very likely encountered some of the poets he would later confront in these essays. Moreover, William III had elevated whigs who had lost access to official posts during the “Exclusion crisis,” such as Dorset, to prominent government positions.³³⁵ They in turn shaped cultural production to the extent that they dispensed patronage. The benefaction extended to artists, playwrights and poets was not confined to cash stipends, and often included lucrative offices.³³⁶

³³³ Tumbleton, *Catholicism*, 136-137.

³³⁴ It is puzzling that Tumbleton comes to this conclusion about Collier, because he also provides a complicated analysis of the Williamite regime which suggests connections to civil war era puritanism. This could ultimately prove useful to establishing the personal and ideological contexts of Collier’s criticism.

³³⁵ Tumbleton, *Catholicism*, 92.

³³⁶ See John C. Hodges, “William Congreve in the Government Service,” *Modern Philology* 27, no. 2 (1929), 183-192.

As a form of institutionalized censorship, the circumstances of the 1690s differed formally from the 1660s and 70s when, at least in theory, patronage and suppression emanated more directly from the crown. Compared to his Stuart predecessors, William showed little interest in the theater, or perhaps it offended his Calvinist sensibilities to even give it his attention.³³⁷ In this light the 1695 expiration of the licensing act, coinciding with a conscious attempt by courtiers to distance themselves from association with a crown “circle,”³³⁸ it could be argued that even if formal mechanisms of government censorship were on the wane, a more diffuse system had taken its place. This included not only the distribution of patronage to playwrights who promoted Whig interests, but also the encouragement of published criticism such as Collier’s, and a market for published plays in which the demands of the consumer provided another forum for debate over what was and was not acceptable or desirable theater.³³⁹

However, we must account for the apparently common cause these concerns created between Collier and his adversaries, who used the same language of moral outrage. His former employer against whom, it was argued in chapter two, Collier had directed *The Office of a Chaplain*, now in his capacity as Lord Chamberlain Dorset, had on January 24, 1696 ordered both principal theaters to submit plays to Master of the Revels Charles Killigrew for screening.³⁴⁰ Dorset’s successor, Lord Chamberlain Sunderland, repeated the order on June 4, 1697, complaining that ‘many of the new Plays Acted by both Companys...are scandalously

³³⁷ John Loftis, *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 21-23.

³³⁸ Claydon, *William III*, 92.

³³⁹ Loftis takes a different view, arguing that “The effective restraint on politically minded dramatists came, not from the critics or the public, but from the patentees or from the machinery of stage regulation supervised by the Lord Chamberlain.” However he admits that governmental supervision was “ambiguous and variable.” Loftis, *Politics of Drama*, 27. Both Dorset’s and Sunderland’s orders were ineffective. Hume, “Jeremy Collier,” 43. I maintain that exclusive focus on the relative success or failure of Collier’s “campaign” based upon studies of the social outcome of moralizing theater legislation has contributed to the misreading of Collier’s stage essays.

³⁴⁰ Royal patents for two theatrical companies had been issued by Charles II shortly after his restoration to the throne in 1660, bringing to an end the puritan ban on stage plays. These were the King’s Company and the Duke’s Company.

lew'd [sic] and Prophane, and Contain Reflections against his Majesty's Government.'³⁴¹ On February 24, 1698, William responded to a Commons petition by issuing a proclamation against vice.

The later stage essays attributed to Collier deviate from the originals in a manner that seems to address these widespread concerns about rampant immorality. "Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the playhouse," published in 1703, is a more compact recitation of his original arguments.³⁴² It differs from the earlier stage essays in its brevity, and is in the format of a letter rather than an extensive academic essay. The rhetorical style has also changed; this pamphlet is directed toward a more popular audience and the arguments less technical. All of the distinguishing features of Collier's polemics are present, but in a widely accessible form. We see the same concern with immorality and religious offenses committed by the modern English poets, whose work surpasses the modern European stage as well as "the Ages of Ignorance, and the Precedents of Heathenism" in licentious content.³⁴³

As before, the author is concerned about the corrupting effects of the stage on the passions and the conscience, and these outcomes are emphasized in place of detailed evidence from authorities ancient and modern. The author of the "Disuasive" does provide a digest of church and state authorities, classical and contemporary, to support his position. However, in this instance, his classical example is the Roman Republic, in which Julius Caesar put a stop to the construction of a theater arguing that it would encourage vice and the depletion of the "Old Roman Virtue."³⁴⁴ Mr. Collier does not refer to Plato or any of the Greek philosophers and poets

³⁴¹ PRO LC 5/152, p. 19, quoted in Hume.

³⁴² Jeremy Collier, "Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Play-House" (London: 1703). The "Dissuasive" was reprinted the following year in Dublin.

³⁴³ Collier, "Dissuasive," 7-8.

³⁴⁴ Collier, "Dissuasive," 11.

Jeremy Collier had relied upon so heavily in the first series. Another innovation is the specific reference to current legislative action taken against actors, which he views as ineffective. The blame is now shared between playwrights and players. The actors are unstoppable, according to Mr. Collier, because they have resolved “to exterminate Religion, and subdue the Conscience of the Kingdom...they have without Doubt pitched upon the most likely Expedient to make Vice absolute, and Atheism universal.”³⁴⁵ The author suggests that if the public is not willing to forgoe the attendance of plays altogether, young people in particular must at least “fortifie themselves at Home, and take the Guard of Religion along with them.”³⁴⁶ But he wants his readers to know that frequenting the playhouse is “inconsistent with the Duties and Character of a Christian....To delight in ill Company, is to become part of it, and all People are *Principals* in Profaneness, as well as in Murther.”³⁴⁷ He likens such willfull engagement to contributing taxes to “the Government *Below*.”³⁴⁸

Mr. Collier concludes with reference to the late “sad Instance of God’s Judgments in the terrible Tempest: Terrible beyond any thing in that Kind in Memory, or Record.”³⁴⁹ He sees Providence at work in the destruction of a playhouse in which a performance of *Macbeth* was in progress by a storm described by a contemporary as the ‘Greatest, the Longest in Duration, the wider in Extent, of all the Tempests and Storms that History gives any Account.’³⁵⁰ This analysis also diverges from Collier’s previous complaints in that the offending play is Shakespearean, and not one of the Restoration plays he targeted in the early stage controversy

³⁴⁵ Collier, “Dissuasive,” 9.

³⁴⁶ Collier, “Dissuasive,” 10-11.

³⁴⁷ Collier, “Dissuasive,” 14.

³⁴⁸ Collier, “Dissuasive,” 14.

³⁴⁹ Collier, “Dissuasive,” 14; Dudley Bahlman, *The Moral Revolution of 1688* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 12.

³⁵⁰ [Daniel Defoe], *The Storm: or, a Collection of the Most Remarkable Casualties and Disasters which Happen’d in the Late Dreadful Tempest*, 1704, p. 11, quoted in Hoppit, *Land of Liberty*, 82. See also Bahlman, *Moral Revolution*, 12-13.

essays. In a remarkable act of self-contradition, Mr. Collier has adopted the meaning of “providence” which he declaimed in its use by Williamite propagandists. Nevertheless, he reads the destruction of the playhouse as evidence of God’s disfavor.

“The Dissuasive” echoes critiques of the stage from an earlier period, and this observation could help to shed light on Jeremy Collier’s intentions with his earlier essays. The basic tenets of the arguments are the same as his earlier, more meticulous commentaries. But the connection Mr. Collier makes to an event – the storm – recalls puritan polemic of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Peter Lake argues that in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods the playhouse and the church were competing “schools of virtue,” because “a central strand in the defence of the theatre – that audiences were edified by the spectacle of abuse and immorality unmasked and punished, of nobility and virtue, if not always rewarded, then certainly lauded – represented a crucial act of trespass onto the ideological turf of the godly clergy.”³⁵¹ Ministers, pamphleteers and playwrights all made use of “murder pamphlets” for their own purposes, in which criminal perpetrators were providentially brought to justice, as they competed to attract congregations and audiences. In Mr. Collier’s usage, the criminal element and object of Providential discipline is a society who willfully permits this sort of theater, and whose general spirit of scepticism has evoked this act of divine retribution:

Does it not look as if they had a Mind to out-brace the Judgement: And make us believe the Storm was nothing but an Eruption of Epicurus’s Atoms, a Spring-Tide of Matter and Motion, and a blind Salley of Chance? This throwing Providence out of the Scheme, is an admirable Opiate for the Conscience! And when Recollection is laid asleep, the Stage will recover the Course, and go on with their Business effectually.³⁵²

³⁵¹ Peter Lake with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists & Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 438-439.

³⁵² Collier, “Dissuasive,” 15.

Despite the dissonant qualities of Mr. Collier's pamphlet in comparison to Collier's first three stage controversy essays, the above passage is fairly characteristic of his thought. It is possible that Collier was not the author, or at least not the sole author. Indeed, Collier's alleged authorship of a similar missive published in 1706 has been questioned.³⁵³ "A Letter to a Lady Concerning the New Play House" is also in the format of a letter written in an accessible style. In place of academic references to the Church Fathers, for instance, this pamphlet contains references to Scripture. Also missing is the antisepticism that figures so prominently in his other publications from this period, both the early stage essays and the texts treated below which were published at the same time as this later series of stage pamphlets.

Collier's final stage controversy essay, *A further vindication of the short view*, published in 1708, casts further doubt on his authorship of both of the preceding pamphlets. In response to Edward Filmer's *Defense of plays* (1701), Collier explained that this was the first rejoinder he had received in seven years, and that he had "concluded the *Stage-Controversie* was over."³⁵⁴ Thus if he did indeed write the two stage pamphlets in question, he did not consider them part of the controversy proper. Whether or not he was the author, it is nonetheless significant that these documents *advertise* Collier as the author, and convey an interpretation of his thought in popular form, implying that he had become a sort of "name brand."³⁵⁵

It was suggested above that Collier's grievances concerning the theater may have provoked a sense of common cause with others concerned about rampant vice. Gilbert Burnet had called for an urgently needed and all-embracing reformation of manners in his 1692

³⁵³ See Robert Hume, "Jeremy Collier and the London Theater," 495-496, note 46; Rose Anthony, *The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy* (New York: B. Blom, 1966), 225-227. Both question Collier's authorship on different bases than will be suggested here.

³⁵⁴ Jeremy Collier, *A further vindication of the short view of the profaneness and immorality of the English stage* (London: 1708), 3.

³⁵⁵ I am grateful to J.C. Davis for suggesting this interpretation.

Discourse of the Pastoral Care, which was republished in 1714 with an even more demanding preface. Was it not evident, Burnet asked, “that the present State of Things, and the *Signs of the Times*, call aloud upon the whole Nation to repent?”³⁵⁶ Burnet summoned the clergy to renew their commitment to the defense of Protestantism by “lifting up our *Voices like Trumpets, to shew our People their Transgressions*,” in order to stave off the wrath of God.³⁵⁷ In his concerns about scepticism, atheism and anticlericalism, Collier would also seem to agree with High Churchmen such as Francis Atterbury, who in his *Letter to a Convocation Man*, published in 1696, asserted that widespread scepticism, Socinianism, Deism and contempt for the episcopacy demanded a concerted response from the Church. Atterbury justified the need for a meeting of convocation to check these abuses, and also revived the anti-Erastian doctrine of the Two Societies that the nonjurors had invoked in their own defense since the Revolution.³⁵⁸

Atterbury’s response amounted to a High Church moral reform campaign, in opposition to the latitudinarian bishops who had dominated the established Church since 1689.³⁵⁹ Of particular concern to High Churchmen was the ongoing controversy over the Trinity. They perceived this problem as having worsened under the watches of Tillotson and Tenison, both of whom were accused of antitrinitarian teaching in violation of the 1698 Blasphemy Act.³⁶⁰

When convocation sat in 1701, the first business taken up by the lower house was the formation of a committee on heretical and scandalous books, putting into action Atterbury’s

³⁵⁶ Gilbert Burnet, *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London: 1714), xiii-xiv.

³⁵⁷ Burnet, *Discourse*, xiv.

³⁵⁸ The doctrine of the Two Societies has a much longer history prior to 1688, one with which Collier engages in his *Ecclesiastical History*, see below chapter 5. On the relationship between the ecclesiological arguments of the nonjurors and Atterbury’s party, see Mark Goldie, “The Origins of the Convocation Controversy,” in *Ideology and Conspiracy*, 17-18.

³⁵⁹ Martin Greig, “Hersey Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701,” *The Historical Journal* 37, no. 3 (1994), 571.

³⁶⁰ John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1701* (Harlow: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2006), 207-208.

vision of a “high church heresy hunt.”³⁶¹ Not surprisingly, the committee condemned John Toland’s deist *Christianity not mysterious* (1696). Martin Greig has analyzed the committee’s proceedings to understand “why, with other equally heretical deist and socinian works available to them, did the lower house committee choose to censure Burnet’s *Exposition [of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England* (1699)] instead?”³⁶² He concludes that the affinity between the ideas of the latitudinarian Burnet and the deist Toland “was not that they shared exactly the same views, but that their epistemological approach was similar. In Atterbury’s eyes, both subordinated biblical revelation to reason and a ‘natural’ religion.”³⁶³ Put differently, Burnet’s rejection of traditional patristic exegesis and the vagaries of his language in attempts to explain the nature of the Trinity opened him up to accusations of the high crime of Socinianism, or unitarianism, an accusation which High Churchmen were eager to pin on their latitudinarian opponents. The convocation of 1701 provided them “with a very public forum within which to launch a full-scale assault on latitudinarianism.”³⁶⁴

Collier’s denunciation of atheism and scepticism as expressed in the stage essays, and his previous attacks on latitudinarian theology and ecclesiology, would have been complementary to this programme of High Church moral reform. But what about his views on the Trinity? This is a challenging historical problem for several reasons. First of all, belief systems deemed heretical are defined by the bias and fear of their critics; efforts to historicize the attitudes and values of actual practitioners become interpretations of silences in the records. More specific to Collier, his own philosophy of religion is never quite clear. As we will see in the next chapter, his surviving correspondence shows that he appreciated the forms and rituals of the Church of

³⁶¹ Greig, “Heresey Hunt,” *passim*.

³⁶² Greig, “Heresey Hunt,” 571.

³⁶³ Greig, “Heresey Hunt,” 583-584.

³⁶⁴ Greig, “Heresey Hunt,” 591.

England into which he was ordained. He demonstrated that even after he chose not to take the oath of allegiance and separated himself from the established church as of 1689, he believed that he maintained authority from God to continue to exercise the duties of his office. In chapter two it was suggested that Collier supported the religious toleration that James II had attempted to put into place, a policy that was much more comprehensive than that of William III, most notably in the inclusion of Catholics and Socinians. Nonetheless, the specifics of Collier's religious beliefs, including his position on tolerance or liberty of conscience, can only be brought into question at this stage.

This brings us to the second contemporary cultural debate in which Collier participated, which concerns philosophies of translation in two types of texts: a multi-volume historical dictionary, and Collier's own rendition of a classic. In 1701 Collier published his *Great Historical Dictionary*, which has been praised as a specimen of sound, objective historical research. In the context of Atterbury's heresy hunt, however, this text would have warranted a less benign reading. What follows are suggestions about how this source may be probed in greater depth to shed light on an aspect of Collier's thought which is difficult to pinpoint at this stage.

Collier discussed the *Dictionary's* lineage in his preface, the first two-thirds of which was translated from the original text of the *Grand Dictionnaire Historique* by the Jesuit Louis Moréri, published in 1674.³⁶⁵ Collier explained that his version was taken primarily from the eighth French edition, "Corrected and Enlarged" by Jean Leclerc, printed in Holland (1698). Alternately, Collier distanced himself from the first English edition, compiled by Edmund

³⁶⁵ Moréri's dictionary was published in twenty editions, including Collier's, culminating in d'Alembert's and Diderot's famous *Encyclopédie*. Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 134.

Bohun, claiming that he has “*endeavour’d to correct the Inequality of the Stile, and bring it up to a tolerable and uniform Propriety*”³⁶⁶

A number of factors complicate the analysis of this aspect of Collier’s intellectual biography. This thesis suggests that Collier used the dictionary for reasons similar to those informing Bayle’s and Leclerc’s modifications to Moréri’s original – to confirm their philosophical prejudices. Briefly put, Collier was trying to disguise the fact that he at least sympathized with a persecuted group. For the reason stated above it is difficult to support the theory that Collier’s translation is covertly Socinian or Unitarian, categories that are used here for the sake of convenience, but which have not previously been applied to Collier in any of the secondary literature. More concretely, the task of properly researching and analyzing Collier’s edition of the dictionary is monumental and would constitute a dissertation in itself, as it would involve, at a minimum, a detailed cross-comparison of all of the editions relevant to Collier.³⁶⁷

A few observations can be made about Collier’s dictionary based on preliminary comparative work with the available sources. Sample entries from the first edition of Moréri, and the seventh and eighth of Bayle and Leclerc, as well as the first English edition by Bohun suggest that there are grounds for the thesis that the dictionary betrays Collier’s philosophical, metaphysical and theological sympathies. In many cases, Collier’s translation is identical to all or some of the previous versions. Presumably this fact is just as significant as the entries Collier modifies. With respect to his uncritical translation of Moréri’s preface and many of his entries,

³⁶⁶ Jeremy Collier, *The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary* (London: 1701), preface, iv.

³⁶⁷ The endeavor is further complicated by the fact that the only complete set of Bayle’s 1699 edition is housed at the Bibliothèque Nationale. I am grateful to Phil Wilkins for his assistance in confirming the whereabouts of the Bayle edition. All other editions immediately relevant to Collier are intact at the British Library, and were consulted in a preliminary fashion for this dissertation. In chronological order, these include: Louis Moréri, *Le grand dictionnaire historique* (Lyon: 1674), Jean LeClerc, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique* (Amsterdam: 1694), [Edmund Bohun], *The Great Historical Dictionary* (London: 1694), Pierre Bayle, *Le grand dictionnaire historique* (Paris: 1699) The copy of the Bayle edition I consulted lacked volumes I and IV of IV].

Collier once again demonstrated his willingness to use Catholic sources. In other instances, Collier included additional information beyond Bohun, Bayle, Leclerc or Moréri. The most conspicuous entries, though they are rare, are those that are unique to Collier's version.³⁶⁸

Collier's edition follows the format of Leclerc and of Bayle. In its original form, as the creation of the Jesuit Moréri, the dictionary is, in part, a heresiography. Indeed, this was the source of its appeal to both Bayle the sceptic, and Leclerc, disciple of John Locke. Both adapted the original text as "an effective weapon in the further battle against superstition and ignorance, being strongly pervaded by the views on toleration, and the condemnation of bigotry and fanaticism."³⁶⁹ Bayle's modifications transformed Moréri's heretics into heroes. In Jonathan Israel's interpretation, Bayle's edition "went out of its way to point out the pervasive presence of atheistic, deistic, and materialistic philosophies throughout the whole history of human thought, seemingly almost with the deliberate intention of coaxing readers to focus their minds on radical arguments."³⁷⁰ But Collier was more accepting of the eighth edition in which, "*Sieur Le Clerc Lets us know, That he has corrected all the Faults, which the famous Monsieur Bayle had remark'd in this Dictionary; unless in some places where he believes Monsieur Morery in the right.*"³⁷¹ Although he does not reveal why he preferred Leclerc's edition over Bayle's, or why he praised either, let alone both, presumably Collier would have found fault with Bayle's scepticism.³⁷²

Collier may have been more accepting of Leclerc's edition than of Bayle's for theological reasons. Bayle took a view of human nature in which subjects are governed "not by the moral

³⁶⁸ For instance, Collier's is the only edition that contains an entry for "Comenius," whose work his father translated.

³⁶⁹ Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, 134.

³⁷⁰ Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, 134.

³⁷¹ Collier, *Dictionary*, preface, iv.

³⁷² This was one of the main issues guiding the limited comparative work undertaken for this study.

principles they claim to endorse, but by their base passions – by pride, greed, ambition, sexual desire. In short, Bayle accepted the French Augustinian contention that after Adam’s Fall human reason had lost its power to enforce its dictates.”³⁷³ The nuance in Leclerc’s edition which Collier may have favored is that in contrast to the Calvinistic Huguenot sympathies of Bayle, “Locke...and Leclerc were sympathetic towards...Pelagian, anti-trinitarian, and tolerationist opinions.”³⁷⁴ Bayle and Leclerc modified their editions of the dictionary to reflect their competing visions of moral reform, according to S.J. Savonius. In the same way that they appropriated the catalogue of heresies generated by a Jesuit hand for their own purposes, Collier may similarly have appreciated the universality throughout history and across geographical locations and cultures of the Socinian heresy.³⁷⁵

In 1705 Collier published a supplement to his Dictionary in response to “some unexpected Censures” met with by the first two volumes. He claimed to have been criticized (we do not know by whom) for failing to include “considerable Persons” and for only selectively drawing from the “*Undertaker’s Model*” – omissions he excused because of the vast quantity of information. In this volume, Collier explained that he had given more attention than he had previously to the subject of philology, because the discipline “gives so much Light into the Customs, Laws, and Religion of Nations both Ancient and Modern, that the length of it...will fall under no imputation.”³⁷⁶

³⁷³ S.J. Savonius, “The rival enlightenments of Pierre Bayle and John Locke,” unpublished paper presented to the Early Modern Seminar, The School of Historical Studies (University of Leicester, 24 May 2005). Savonius cites Bayle’s *Dictionnaire* entry “Eve” as an example of this philosophy. Savonius, 16.

³⁷⁴ Savonius, “The rival enlightenments,” 16.

³⁷⁵ To explore this further, I will need to distinguish Collier’s view of Unitarianism from that of his contemporaries, such as Locke.

³⁷⁶ Jeremy Collier, *A Supplement to the Great Historical...Dictionary* (London: 1705), Preface. This perspective is exemplified in the entry for “ACCENT,” in which Collier summarizes the correspondence, as he perceives it, between philology, his reverence for Greek and Hebrew learning, and the effects of music on the passions.

The *Supplement* is divided into two parts. The first part contains Collier's contribution. The second is a "*Continuation done by another Hand*," which begins in 1688, where Collier decisively ends his own chronology, and which, according to him, "shall stand wholly by it self, and be printed in a distinct *Alphabet*."³⁷⁷ Collier claims that he is "altogether unaquainted with the *Author*, and his Performance." Indeed, Collier would not have treated the subjects of the *Continuation* with the degree of reverence they are afforded by their anonymous compiler. These entries read like whig eulogies. The entry on Locke, which has been attributed to James Tyrell,³⁷⁸ lists and praises his major works. Collier himself accused Locke of self-contradiction and Hobbesianism in his recommendatory preface to *Human souls naturally immortal*, published in 1707.³⁷⁹

Furthermore, the anonymous author's view of history since 1688 is completely opposed to Collier's.³⁸⁰ As he explains, the *Continuation* "*Commences from the Year 1688, so Memorable for the Revolution in Britain, and the great War which Ensued thereupon...It consists only of the Lives and Actions of several Great Men, in their various Professions and Faculties.*" These entries derive from solicitations to the "*Friends and Relations*" of these eminent persons. Referring to the English edition of the Dictionary which preceded Collier's, the author of the *Continuation* claims that geographical, genealogical and other entries besides biographical are

³⁷⁷ Collier, *Supplement*, Preface.

³⁷⁸ Hearne J.W. Gough, "James Tyrell, Whig Historian and Friend of John Locke," *The Historical Journal* 19, no. 3 (1976), 608.

³⁷⁹ Collier is referring to Locke's Answer to Bishop Stillingfleet. *Human souls naturally immortal. Translated from a Latin manuscript by S.E. With a recommendatory preface by Jeremy Collier, M.A.* (London: 1707).

³⁸⁰ Collier himself had declared in the preface to volume one of the dictionary: "And here it will not be improper to mention, That I have gone no farther in Time than the Year 1688; so that whatever the Reader meets with of a fresher Date, is either the Remainder of the old English Edition, or else continu'd by some other Hand."

not treated here because these have been “*handled in the former Volumes, to say nothing of their being continued in the First Edition to the Year 1693.*”³⁸¹

Why would Collier’s Supplement be paired with a collection of entries so strikingly opposed to his own views? Perhaps this was a condition of the Supplement’s publication, which was financed by subscription, unlike Collier’s previous volumes. The catalogue of subscribers at the beginning of the Dictionary lists mainly ministers, tradesmen (such as brewers and engravers), booksellers, schoolmasters, and gentlemen.

Also in 1701, the same year that Collier published the first volume of his *Dictionary*, he published his version of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, *His conversation with himself*.³⁸² The text is as much an interpretation as it is a translation. Collier was forthright about the fact that he had in some instances “*ventur’d to throw in a Word or two, to make the Text more Intelligible. But when this Liberty was taken, I have been always careful to speak the Emperour’s Mind, and keep close to the Meaning of the Original.*”³⁸³ As a philosophy of translation, this tells us that Collier was less concerned about accuracy and precision, than about laying emphasis on what he believed to be the essence of the text.

Furthermore, Collier’s analysis of the “Original” deviated from the version he claimed to have used as a reference, the 1697 edition of the Presbyterian Thomas Gataker’s translation. Reid Barbour has studied Gataker’s original edition of 1652, placing it in the context of his desire for stability in the wake of civil war and sectarian conflict.

³⁸¹ “A Continuation of Mr. Collier’s Supplement to the Great Historical Dictionary, &c.,” Preface.

³⁸² His was not the only treatment of the emperor to be published that year. William Wotton had been commissioned by Gilbert Burnet in 1698 to prepare a comparative history of two pairs of Roman emperors, Aurelius and Commodus, and Elagabalus and Alexander. Burnet was at the time tutor to the Duke of Gloucester, the king’s son and impending heir to the throne, and he intended to use the history to impart moral lessons. Upon the duke’s premature death, Wotton decided to transform the biographical study into a complete narrative which included the twenty-six years between the two sets of emperors. Joseph Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 343-351.

³⁸³ Jeremy Collier, trans., *The Emperor Marcus Antoninus: His Conversation With Himself* (London: 1701), Preface.

Gataker comes to Marcus Aurelius with Job on his mind. In the tradition of the Caroline emperor, Marcus is still associated with a charitable holism, but for the Presbyterian in 1652, this ideal is a dream born with the piety of Job from the ashes of affliction....In his commentary, Gataker wants a Job-like Marcus and a stoicized Job that will provide England with a model of charity, piety, and harmony in submission to God and the order of things...³⁸⁴

Citing Job 23: 12-13, Gataker's Aurelius projected an ideal of submission of the individual will to the will of God, reconciling "human nature and the cosmos, individual will and universal destiny."³⁸⁵

Collier began with different assumptions about Aurelius. He approved of the emperor's "Natural Religion," his thoughts were "*Noble, and Uncommon,*" and his logic, by which he pursued first principles, was "*very true and exact.*" We saw in chapter three that Collier disapproved of "Providence" as it was applied by Williamite propagandists such as Burnet, who claimed God's sanction (providence) for the 1688 invasion and subsequent military victories. As presented in Collier's translation of Aurelius, providence is one aspect of a trinity of metaphysical principles that constitute humanity's rational nature, which endeavors to serve the best interests of all. The component parts are reason ("the Deity within"), providence ("the Soul of the Universe"), and the government of nature, to which the whole of humankind is accountable. This is in contrast to our animal nature (the interest of the body and the senses), which, if indulged, leaves us subservient to chance ("That is *Chance* or *Providence*, for the World must be govern'd by one of them.")³⁸⁶ Through Marcus Aurelius, Collier reiterated his view of the moral shortcomings of scepticism: to eliminate nature's government as the "First

³⁸⁴ Reid Barbour, *English Epicures and Stoics: Ancient Legacies in Early Stuart Culture* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 236-239.

³⁸⁵ Barbour, *English Epicures and Stoics*, 239.

³⁸⁶ Collier, *Antoninus*, 179-180.

Cause,” and assume “that Things follow the Make and Tendency of their Constitution,” removes free will and and personal accountability from the human equation.³⁸⁷

By way of marginal commentary throughout the text Collier conveyed his approval of the emperor’s philosophy and metaphysics, as he interpreted them. He did, however, have reservations about Aurelius’s stoicism. Collier appreciated that the Stoics offered advantages over other “sects.” At the same time, he identified some of their mistakes, such as their belief in multiple gods. Collier’s gloss established a running dialogue with the emperor, and the meditation of Aurelius became a comparative presentation of the tenets of the Hellenistic schools: the peripatetics, the epicureans and the stoics. These were shown by Collier to share in common Socratic and Platonic principles, with epicureanism and stoicism emerging as developments built upon these foundations, but in a corrupted form.

Gatiker had Christianized the emperor’s stoicism, and emphasized the individual’s humble submission to a common fate. By contrast, Collier made no attempt to reconcile Aurelius’s stoicism with Christianity, and identified the common bond of humanity not in a universal destiny, but in the faculty of reason. As Collier’s Aurelius explains it:

If the Faculty of Understanding lies in Common amongst us all, then Reason, the Effect of it, must be common too...From whence we may conclude, that Mankind are under one Common Regulation: And if under one Common Law, they must be Fellow Citizens, and belong to the same Body Politick. From whence ‘twill follow, that the whole World is upon the Matter but one Common-Wealth.³⁸⁸

In his introductory preface to a 1702 translation of *Tullys Five Books De Finibus* by S.P., Gentleman, Collier clarifies in brief the philosophical inquiry that he believed to be relevant for discussion. According to Collier, the *Five Books* address “the *Grand Question*. The Enquiry is concerning the Seat of the *Sovereign Good*, the Complement of Human Happiness, and the

³⁸⁷ Collier, *Antoninus*, 182-183.

³⁸⁸ Collier, *Antoninus*, 44.

farthest Object of Desire.” Collier summarized the main text, which is a series of ethical debates in which Cicero dissects the “Cause” of the Epicureans, the Stoics, and the Peripatetics. According to Collier, the Epicureans do not fare well as Cicero “exposes the Fallacy of [Torquatus’s] Reasoning, and the Scandal of his *Hypothesis*; and in short, makes a perfect Conquest of *Epicurus* and all his *Clan*.” Cato provides a persuasive argument in support of the Stoics, which is subsequently dismantled by Cicero, who “proves the *Stoical* Provision for Happiness too narrow, shews the Vanity and Canting of that *Sect*, and that tho’ their Terms were different, their Principles were much the same with those of the *Peripateticks*.” Piso defends the peripatetic moral philosophy in an argument which, according to Collier, “must have a great deal of Learning, and Curiosity in it,” and is sufficiently persuasive, particularly as it is managed by “so great a Master as *Tully*.”³⁸⁹

Collier extended his approval to S.P.’s translation, which Collier claims to have compared with the original Latin, “and am of Opinion the *Criticks* will find the *Authors Sense* well represented...And in some Places I shall venture to say, *Tully* is improv’d by Transplanting, and thrives better in our Soil, than in his own.”³⁹⁰ As it has been argued above, Collier was less concerned with verbatim translation than with conveying an interpretation of the central meaning of the original text.

Collier’s campaign against atheism took a third form in this decade. In 1702 he delivered a public address on two documented occasions as a participant in a program on Divine Music prepared for members of parliament at Stationers Hall. He contributed to this presentation, delivering the same lecture on January 31, 1701/2, and again the same year in May. The topic

³⁸⁹ Jeremy Collier, “Recommendatory Preface,” in *Tullys Five Books De Finibus...Revis’d and Compar’d with the Original*, S.P., Gent., trans. (London: 1702).

³⁹⁰ Collier, “Recommendatory Preface.”

was Psalm 104, a passage which was put to frequent use in the eighteenth century by preachers from a range of theological orientations, including both Church of England ministers and ‘natural’ theologians.³⁹¹ Collier’s elaboration of the text was a contemplation of God’s hand in creation, as revealed in the intricacy and beauty of nature.

Collier began by presenting the “Honorable Assembly” with a “comprehensive Idea of the Deity,” a narrative of Creation, “the making of a World...the Disposition of the parts of it, and the Subordination they stand in for the Conveniencies of Life.”³⁹² Beginning with the cosmos, Collier explained that the Sun which “is as it were the Soul of the Inferiour World,” gives “Life, and Vigour, and Beauty to the Creation, and Nature would expire without it.”³⁹³ The earth is likewise remarkably suited to sustaining life. Collier asked his audience how anyone could imagine “that all these Proportions and Correspondencies, came, and continue by Chance?”³⁹⁴ Shifting his focus to the microcosm, he argued that even Galen denounced his atheism in recognition of a Deity after studying the intricacies and “astonishing Marke of Wisdom in *Humane Bodies*.”³⁹⁵

The speech, or sermon, concluded with his signature statement about the fallacies of scepticism and atheism. “Nothing can be more Irrational,” he declared, “than to ascribe such stupendous Works of Providence, to the Recounters of *Atomes*....And what can be more Absurd, than...To Attribute Thought and Counsel to Things insensible, Constancy to Chance, and Order to Confusion?”³⁹⁶ Confronted with this remarkable body of natural evidence, “Must we not of Necessity confess, That Nature has a *Commander in Chief*? That her Motions are under the

³⁹¹ Alexander Shapiro, “‘Drama of an Infinitely Superior Nature’: Handel’s Early English Oratorios and the Religious Sublime,” *Music and Letters*, 74:2 (1993), 239.

³⁹² Jeremy Collier, *The Oration...Undertaken by Cavendish Weedon, Esq.* (London: 1702), 16-19.

³⁹³ Collier, *The Oration*, 16-19.

³⁹⁴ Collier, *The Oration*, 16-19.

³⁹⁵ Collier, *The Oration*, 16-19.

³⁹⁶ Collier, *The Oration*, 16-19.

Force of Order and Government...and the Measures taken for the Common Advantage.”³⁹⁷ This brought him to the purpose of the oration – to advocate a form of music which complimented God’s art in nature: “And since the Nature of God shines out so gloriously in his *Works*. What can be more reasonable and Becoming, than to Praise him in the most exalted Strains, and joyn the *Musick* of the Place, with that of the Creation?”³⁹⁸

His opinions about music are illuminated by one of his moral essays, in which he explained the effects of “Anti-music” on the passions, which, while engaging and entertaining, also manipulates listeners “out of our Reason and Sobriety.”³⁹⁹ Collier praised those who master the application of music to encourage meditation on the Divine, explaining that this was a science at which the ancients, who “had a deeper In-sight into the Philosophy of Nature, and understood the *Laws* of the *Union* of the Soul and Body more throughly [sic],” were expert, but which the moderns had neglected, or had chosen to cultivate to negative ends.⁴⁰⁰ In its contemporary application, Collier saw the purpose of church music as a device by which to “endear the Offices of Religion...There must be no...Military *Tattoos*, no Light and Galliardizing *Notes*; nothing that may make the Fancy trifling, or raise an improper Thought.” This would, he emphasized, “be to Prophane the *Service*, and bring the *Play-house* into the Church.”⁴⁰¹

Collier’s opinions about the proper form of devotional music are similar to his criticisms of the theater, and there is overlap between the contextual issues. Furthermore, this was a conflict that involved the same parties. Innovations in musical composition and presentational style had accompanied the Glorious Revolution. Whereas under the Stuarts elaborate orchestral

³⁹⁷ Collier, *The Oration*, 16-19.

³⁹⁸ Collier, *The Oration*, 20.

³⁹⁹ Jeremy Collier, “Of Musick,” *Essays* (1698), 24-25.

⁴⁰⁰ Collier, “Of Musick,” 22-23.

⁴⁰¹ Collier, “Of Musick,” 24.

and choral religious music was composed and performed in the Chapel Royal, William III would not allow orchestral anthems in his chapel, insisting instead upon a sparse hymnal form. He did however encourage the performance of an innovatory form of ceremonial music which, while reminiscent of the traditional devotional music he had banished from his court, was repurposed for a decidedly secular application as it was composed specifically for thanksgiving ceremonies, such as the celebration of the Peace of Ryswick (1697). This “new style of sacred composition” continued under Queen Anne, and became a customary feature at celebrations of military victories throughout the eighteenth century as a celebration of Providential favor.⁴⁰²

Collier’s apprehension about the effects of “anti-Musick” on the passions was a standard concern in the early eighteenth century, when music was believed to designate social norms and evoke emotional responses. “Contemporaries readily asserted that musical styles and techniques used in the theatre retained the immoral associations and affects of such a venue when transferred to a new context. By the same token, the church music style could retain its spiritual hold on the passions when introduced outside the domain of the church service.”⁴⁰³ The man responsible for organizing the Oration at Whitehall was Cavendish Weedon, a barrister and member of Lincoln’s Inn who had been active in promoting a number of civic projects for religious edification.⁴⁰⁴ The events in which Collier participated were part of Weedon’s series of “sacred concerts.” These were generally conceived as an effort to combat irreligion, and specifically as charities for the ‘benefit of decay’d gentry and the maintenance of a school for the

⁴⁰² Shapiro, “Drama,” 222-223.

⁴⁰³ Shapiro, “Drama,” 226-227.

⁴⁰⁴ Regarding Weedon’s other projects, see Paul Jeffrey, “The church that never was: Wren’s St. Mary, and other projects for Lincoln’s Inn Fields,” *Architectural History* 31 (1988), 136.

education of children in religion, musick and accounts.’⁴⁰⁵ For the price of five shillings, attendees would have enjoyed a performance of devotional music, speeches such as Collier’s, and an orchestral anthem by poet laureate John Blow. The concerts were held twice a month until May, at which time they became weekly events. An advertisement in the *Post Boy* declared that the presentations would ‘endeavour to reduce musick...back to its noblest and cheifest end the praise of our great Creator.’⁴⁰⁶

As an aspect of the cultural wars in which Collier was a participant, these festival concerts had become a novel setting for sacred music in the post-Revolution period. In this environment, composers and performers were not bound by strictures of court or church patronage, instead drawing stipends from charitable societies and private benefactors.⁴⁰⁷ They also became a forum for contested forms of church music. Collier, as well as High Church Anglicans, advocated the sacred music with instrumental accompaniment (e.g. Purcell, Blow) that William and Mary had curbed in the Chapel Royal, yet had appropriated for military and national aggrandizement.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁵ Michael Tilmouth, “Some Early London Concerts and Music Clubs, 1670-1720,” *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 84th Sess. (1957-1958), 21; Shapiro, “Drama,” 216.

⁴⁰⁶ *The Post Boy*, 25-27 December 1701, quoted by Shapiro, “Drama,” 220.

⁴⁰⁷ Shapiro, “Drama,” 221-222.

⁴⁰⁸ Shapiro, “Drama,” 227.

6.0 RELIGION, 1708-1726

The Stage Controversy and his public lecture on the proper form of music created forums in which Collier could exploit mainstream fears about irreligion, immorality and atheism. He anticipated, perhaps even intended that his message would be misunderstood as “puritanical,” because he knew that he could count on the presence of a particular moral climate to receive his ideas. The consequence of his actions in 1689 had been a private and secluded life, “which excluded him from places of importance.”⁴⁰⁹ The manner in which Collier addressed the common cause of moral reform, most conspicuously in the Stage Controversy, may have been an act of redemption devised to permit his reentry into the public eye.

Two eighteenth century commentators cited Collier as having had a marked effect on the reform of the English stage. Samuel Johnson said that in the wake of the Stage Controversy, ‘at last Comedy grew more modest, and Collier lived to see the reward of his labour in the reformation of the theatre.’⁴¹⁰ Robert Dodsley remarked that ‘the public opinion saw so much against the defenders of the theatre, and in favour of their enemy, that king William considered Mr. Collier’s book as a work which entitled the author of it to some lenity in a prosecution then

⁴⁰⁹ Thomas Lathbury, “The Life of Collier,” in *A History of the Nonjurors Their Controversies and Writings* (London: W. Pickering, 1845), xvii

⁴¹⁰ Samuel Johnson’s *Lives of the Poets*, quoted by Lathbury, “The Life of Collier,” in *A History of the Nonjurors*, xvii.

carrying on in consequence of errors in his political conduct.⁴¹¹ Furthermore, according to Collier's biographer, the Established Church became keenly interested in bringing Collier into the fold after the accession of Queen Anne (1702) to the throne. "All efforts of this kind, though supported not only with general promises of preferment, but with more particular assurances, were ineffectual, and Mr Collier remained among the Nonjuring Clergy, as seeing no reason to alter his sentiments from any change that had happened, and being incapable of dissembling an alteration for the sake of temporal views."⁴¹²

In 1708, the same year in which Collier published the last of his stage controversy essays, he issued volume one of his *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*. Despite his earlier troubles, he was able to secure a modest list of subscribers in advance of publication.⁴¹³ This initial volume, in fact, enjoyed favorable reception, perhaps because the history only extended to the reign of Henry VII. Yet even if it went generally unremarked upon, Collier took a characteristic view in Volume I of historical instances of conflict over ecclesiastical jurisdiction which would have had contemporary relevance. In presenting the Investiture Controversy, for instance, he praised the moderation of French Kings in contrast to the Holy Roman Emperor, who had acted "As if the King was the Fountain of Spiritual Jurisdiction, & the Bishops, like officers of *State*, had all their Authority from the *Crown*."⁴¹⁴ Repeatedly Collier emphasized that the English Church since the Saxons had been independent of the state in matters purely spiritual. The

⁴¹¹ Robert Dodsley, *A Select Collection of Old English Plays*, quoted by Lathbury, "The Life of Collier," in *A History of the Nonjurors*, xviii.

⁴¹² [Samuel Jebb], *Biog Brit: or, The lives of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. I (London: 1747), 1411.

⁴¹³ [Jebb], *Biog. Brit.*, 1411.

⁴¹⁴ Jeremy Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, Vol. I (London: 1708), 300-303.

Church's autonomy, he argued, had been compromised after the Norman Conquest, which initiated a decline in ecclesiastical self-government.⁴¹⁵

The *Ecclesiastical History* needs to be situated in the context of Collier's earlier political arguments about conquest in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, discussed above in chapter 3. Recall the argument put forth in that chapter that Collier associated the act of conquest with submission to the sin of pride. In light of this interpretation, it may be possible to reconcile the hanging question of why Collier seemed to argue that the Norman conquest legitimated James II, while the invasion by William of Orange produced an illegal regime. At this moment I merely make a suggestion to that end, which involves looking to Collier's historical account of 1066, about which he proclaimed:

For that which was wrong at first, will never mend by bare Continuance. Just and Unjust don't depend upon the Motion of the *Sun*, or the Revolution of the *Seasons*...ill Practice swells by Repetition, and grows more bulky upon the Progress. The Length of Usurpation is an Aggravation of the First Injustice; and the Guilt of it, like other Sins, rises by the frequency of the Commission.⁴¹⁶

In both volumes I and II Collier visits this theme, using the same language to describe Oliver Cromwell that he applies to William the Conqueror. Both, according to Collier, had engaged in a "Usurpation."⁴¹⁷

Subscriptions to the first volume had included only two bishops. The second volume boasted thirteen bishops, both High and Low churchmen, indicating that the first had been "esteemed for its scholarly value beyond the confines of the nonjuring communion."⁴¹⁸ By

⁴¹⁵ Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History*, I, 238.

⁴¹⁶ Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History*, I, 343. R.J. Smith argues that Collier, in the *Ecclesiastical History*, contradicts the position he had taken on conquest twenty years earlier, but I disagree on the basis of reading Collier's view of conquest as a moral philosophy. R.J. Smith, *The Gothic Bequest: Medieval Institutions in British Thought, 1688-1863* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 28-29.

⁴¹⁷ Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History*, I, 343, and II, 870.

⁴¹⁸ Andrew Starkie, "Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* (68:1) 2005, 338.

contrast with the first, volume two of the *Ecclesiastical History*, which covered the English Reformation through the reign of Charles II, provided an occasion for Collier to confront his old enemy Gilbert Burnet. In September of 1710, Collier had reportedly borrowed a copy of Burnet's *History of the Reformation*: "Mr. Collier makes great use of it now in the IId vol. of his Church History of Britain, wch is to come as low as King Charles IId & is done by him with much Care and Judgmt."⁴¹⁹ In his detailed comparison of Collier's and Burnet's histories, Andrew Starkie establishes that they exhibit "the ways in which competing convictions of history, theology, and politics interrelated and engaged – and failed to engage – with one another in the context of the tension and uncertainty in the English church and state."⁴²⁰ The Peace of Utrecht (1713), which concluded the War of the Spanish Succession, had raised concern among Whigs such as Burnet because the settlement favored Catholic France at a moment when the Hanoverian succession was under threat by a Tory ministry. Whigs believed that this administration intended to exploit weaknesses in the Treaty to restore the Stuart Pretender.⁴²¹ "It was his sense of duty, not to historical research but to the public good, that brought Burnet back to the history of the Reformation. He first engaged in this subject because of the 'danger of a popish successor then in view.'⁴²² The Jacobite rebellion of 1715 would do nothing to soothe these fears. Among the points of historical interpretation on which Collier and Burnet differed was the familiar theme of Providence, such that "the providential element in Burnet's thought

⁴¹⁹ Thomas Hearne, 4 September 1710, *Hearne's Collections* Vol. III, 1710-1712 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884), 45-46.

⁴²⁰ Starkie, "Contested Histories of the English Church," 335.

⁴²¹ Starkie, "Contested Histories of the English Church," 336.

⁴²² Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, vol. 3: xxviii, quoted in Starkie, "Contested Histories of the English Church," 336.

provided a counterweight to the locus of divine interaction with the world that Collier located in the church.”⁴²³

Collier’s second volume, which was widely recognized as an attack on Burnet, met with severe reactions. Critics focused on charges of crypto-Catholicism and questioned Collier’s historical methodology targeting, for instance, his emphasis on the authority of the primitive church in the Reformed era, and his opposition to religious persecution on any grounds. Collier responded to the accusations by claiming to have adhered to reformed theology, on the basis of Christian antiquity.⁴²⁴

Thomas Hearne, the Oxford antiquary and outspoken nonjuror, had performed bibliographic research for Collier in the Bodleian Library.⁴²⁵ Hearne was invited to dinner by Dr. Charlett, Master of University College, and was also joined by a Mr. Collins of Magdalen College. The Master proceeded

to condemn that excellently good, & indeed, great Man, Mr. Jeremy Collier. I could not forbear speaking well of Mr. Collier, & to commend his writings...Then the Master fell upon Mr. Collier again, and said His Church History was mean, purely, I suppose, because done by a Non-Juror. He said Mr. Collier took all occasions to speak against the Reformation, and K. Hen. VIII, K. Edw. VI, and Q. Eliz. I replied yt Mr. Collier had spoke very well himself as to this Charge in his new Tract.

Hearne persisted in his defense of Collier against the Master’s claims that Collier wrote “without Records...and does not understand them.” At the end of the ordeal, Hearne recorded that he felt he had been set up, and saw “this Invitation to Dinner as a premeditated Design to insult &

⁴²³ Starkie, “Contested Histories of the English Church,” 348.

⁴²⁴ Starkie, “Contested Histories of the English Church,” 341, 344. Collier answered the charges in *An Answer to some Exceptions in Bishop Burnet’s Third Part of the History of the Reformation* (London: 1715); *Some Considerations on Doctor Kennet’s Second and Third Letters* (London: 1717).

⁴²⁵ Theodor Harmsen, “Hearne, Thomas (bap. 1678, d. 1735)”, *ODNB*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12827, accessed 18 June 2006].

affront me, upon no other account yt I know of, but because I will not give up my Conscience and act contrary to my understanding.”⁴²⁶

When Collier drew a parallel in the *Ecclesiastical History* between Queen Elizabeth and Mary Tudor, saying that “the one made Martyrs in the Church, the other Beggars...The one executed the Men, and the other Estates,” he had to have known that this would be an inflammatory and highly suspect comparison. Collier meant to draw attention to the impoverished state of the clergy after Elizabeth reformed the First Fruits and Tenths, which had placed “many Vicarages in a deplorable Condition,” and had imposed “a perpetuity of poverty on the Church.” Was this not, Collier inquired provocatively, “much more prejudicial than Fire and Faggot?”⁴²⁷ In response to Burnet’s criticism that Collier had afforded “too much to the Advantage” of Mary, Collier’s response was twofold. First, he explained in a manner that did not seem overly concerned with defending himself against the charge, that he had framed the comparison “by way of Question, and refer’d to the *Reader’s* Decision. And where nothing is affirm’d, one might have hoped, nothing would have been charg’d.”⁴²⁸

Secondly, even if the queries were “turn’d into Affirmations,” Collier asked, “are not the Facts undoubted, and the Inferences beyond contradiction?”⁴²⁹ He maintained that poverty undermined the clergy, bred “Ignorance and Contempt,” and weakened their character. If a society’s moral authorities were thus affected, Collier insisted, “...must not the *Laity* be losers in their Biggest Interest, and suffer deeply upon this score?”⁴³⁰ In 1713, one year prior to the release of the second volume of the *Ecclesiastical History*, Collier had been consecrated bishop

⁴²⁶ Thomas Hearne, 24 April 1717, *Hearne’s Collections*, Vol. VI, 1717-1719, 46.

⁴²⁷ Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History*, II, 670. Regarding earlier instances of Collier’s uncritical use of French Catholic sources during the Nine Years War, see above chapter 3.

⁴²⁸ Collier, “An Answer to Some Exceptions,” 5.

⁴²⁹ Collier, “An Answer to Some Exceptions,” 5.

⁴³⁰ Collier, “An Answer to Some Exceptions,” 5.

by the nonjuror George Hickee, with the assistance of two Scottish episcopalian bishops, James Gadarrar and Archibald Campbell. In light of this elevated status, the consistent, self-sacrificial public stance on the office of a clergyman he had taken throughout his career, and the uncompromising position he would take within his own nonjuring communion, as we will see below, his final argument against Burnet on this issue, posed as a question, is suggestive of a personal declaration: “What Bishop of primitive Conscience and Courage would not willingly go to the *Stake* to rescue Religion from such a state of Impotence?”⁴³¹

Given his inflammatory rhetoric, it is understandable that these accusations of Catholic sympathies were directed at Collier by his enemies. It is perhaps of greater significance that he raised the same suspicion among his fellow nonjurors. Upon Hickee’s death, in 1716 Collier was elevated to the rank of primus of the Nonjuring Church. He had also reportedly married Cecelia Deacon (*d.* 1733), who had been a housekeeper to Hickee and was the mother of Thomas Deacon (1697-1753), a prominent nonjuror and close associate of Collier. When Collier came to the fore of the nonjuring communion, he confronted two main issues: division among the bretheren over the question of Usages, and attempts to forge a union with the Eastern Orthodox Church.⁴³² At issue for Collier in the Usages controversy was his preference for the prayer book of 1549 over the version that had been instituted in 1662. Although he never makes mention of this, it is noteworthy that the 1662 version Collier rejected may have been a point of contention for his father in the circumstances surrounding his dismissal from Ipswich School in 1664.⁴³³ To remedy deficiencies in the current service, Collier recommended the introduction of four

⁴³¹ Collier, “An Answer to Some Exceptions,” 5.

⁴³² Comprehensive narratives of both have been provided elsewhere. John J. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1902); Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*; Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993).

⁴³³ See above, chapter 2.

primitive usages, or rites: the mixing of water with the communion wine, prayers for the dead, prayer over the Eucharist for descent of the Holy Ghost, and also over the bread and wine in tribute to Christ's sacrifice. Objections from the majority of his fellow nonjurors included accusations of popery. Praying for the souls of the deceased, for instance, implied a belief in purgatory. Writing in his diary in January of 1720/1, Hearne reported that he had overheard the nonjuror Samuel Parker the night before "say that some Years agoe Mr. Jer. Collier said to this Effect, *That we must come as near the Papists as we can, that they may not hurt us.*"⁴³⁴

Yet Collier went forward with his vision of reform, unilaterally imposing the usages on December 20, 1717. He published a document explaining his justification for this action on the basis of custom and tradition which originated with the Jewish Paschal service, and was carried forward in the Last Supper.

For, if our Saviour had been Corporally present, either by changing the Elements into his Body and Blood of Christ, being spoken at some Distance after the Words pronounced by our Saviour at the Institution; it is plain, the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* did not believe the pronouncing the Words, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*, either *Trans* or *Consubstantiated* the Bread and Wine: For, if our Saviour had been Corporally present, either by changing the Elements into his Body and Blood, or united to them by *Consubstantiation*; if this Effect had follow'd upon pronouncing these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. to what Purpose would the Descent of the Holy-Ghost have been afterwards Invok'd to make the Elements the Body and Blood of Christ?"⁴³⁵

Collier based his judgement about Transubstantiation on his understanding of the primitive church, whose authority "may claim Preference to that of the *Moderns*," and, strikingly, on *pre-Christian* sources, as "Natural Religion will teach us," including the Jewish Passover service, but

⁴³⁴ Thomas Hearne, 19 January 1720/1, *Hearne's Collections*, Vol. VII, 1719-22, 208.

⁴³⁵ Jeremy Collier, *Reasons for restoring some prayers and directions, as they stand in the communion-service of the first English reform'd liturgy* (London: 1717), 23.

also the rites of Gentiles, and ‘Grecians.’⁴³⁶ According to Collier, and opposed to the “non-usagers,” the “principall design of our Bd Saviours Eucharistick Institution” was “to refresh ye memory of his sacrifice upon ye Cross, to propitiate God ye father by this commemorative Sacrifice, & procure ye Blessings of pardon & peace.”⁴³⁷

In his correspondence with the Scottish nonjuring bishop John Falconer, Collier explained that the issue of the Usages had been taken up among the brethren by way of debated petitions. These meetings included both clergymen and laity, and were held in a house at St. Albans Street beginning in 1716. At first, there had been broad agreement that “a Liberty of Practise might be left to either side,” against which only one presbyter dissented. But soon after, “these Terms of Neutrality were broken by some of our old Friends, our Congregations disturbed, & Reflections thrown out, as if we were advancing towards Popery.”⁴³⁸ Collier described heightened animosity which developed the following summer of 1717, at which time he had acted in the interest of peace by granting individual discretion in the precise wording of the usages, with “a Reservation of Liberty for using our own Office.”⁴³⁹ This offer was rejected by nonusagers. In answer to Falconer’s question, “who were the first aggressors,” Collier replied that “the Controversy does not turn upon the Point, who were the Agressors, but which side is best supported to Reason & Authority: For, if the Matters contested can be proved necessary by primitive Vouchers & Scripture interpreted by the earliest & most enlighten’d Ages, this is

⁴³⁶ Collier, *Reasons for restoring.*, 31. He had adopted this stance the previous year in his translation of *A panegyrick upon the Maccabees*, by St. Gregory Nazianzen (London: 1716). Collier stated in the preface his standard philosophy of translation, which, though not exact, “has strong Colouring in the Original.” Furthermore, Collier appended two of his own dialogues to the end of the translation. Collier repeated his argument about the authority of ancient sources, echoing his basis for critiquing the English stage, in *A Vindication of the Reasons and defence* (London: 1718); *A defence of the Reasons for restoring some prayers and directions of King Edward the Sixth’s first Liturgy* (London: 1718); *A farther defence, &c.* (London: 1720).

⁴³⁷ Collier, *Reasons for restoring.*, 31.

⁴³⁸ Collier to John Falconer (19 April 1718), Correspondence of John Falconer, LP, MS 1536, f. 123.

⁴³⁹ Collier to John Falconer (19 April 1718), LP, MS 1536, f. 124.

sufficient to cast the Ballance, & determine the Dispute.”⁴⁴⁰ While he continued to insist on the authority of the primitive church, Collier did not once discuss the nature of the Eucharist in the surviving correspondence with Falconer.⁴⁴¹

By comparison, Collier’s letters to Thomas Brett, his closest ally in the Usages dispute, reflect the same concern with primitive authority, but place great emphasis on the metaphysical issue of Transubstantiation. All of the letters to Brett in this period are signed with the pseudonym “J. Smith.” On several occasions Collier instructed Brett to omit his name in his replies, implying concern that their communications were being intercepted. In these letters Collier attempted to clarify his position on fine points of theology alongside expressions of profound concern about the division among his brethren. For someone who had been so bold in provoking negative opinion after the Glorious Revolution, and who had shown such resolve in challenging the Williamite regime and the established church to the point of arrest and the rebuke of the episcopacy, Collier’s concern over these divisions is a marked, albeit understandable departure. He preferred pragmatic measures to encourage reconciliation at the expense of dogmatic adherence to fine points of ceremony and ritual, even though he privately endeavored to make his own views clear to Brett. By December of 1720, he conceded that even if there existed no Biblical or apostolic precedent for a ritual insisted upon by the opposing faction of nonjurors, “there’s no harme in ye ceremony, & therefore since wee have it, lett us keep it.”⁴⁴²

⁴⁴⁰ Collier to John Falconer (19 April 1718), Lambeth Palace, MS 1536, f. 124.

⁴⁴¹ He repeats this appeal to the Primitive Church in a letter to Falconer dated 20 May 1720, Lambeth Palace MS 1536, f. 145.

⁴⁴² Collier to Brett, 4 March 1720/1. Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 27, f. 165-166. These conciliatory sentiments are also reflected in a letter to Brett dated 13 December 1720, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 27, f. 147-148.

There was, however, one theological point upon which he insisted: the argument that Christ sacrificed himself voluntarily, and that the rite of the Eucharist is an act commemorating this choice. Christ did indeed absolve humanity of sin. Beyond this, he is not present in the bread and wine.⁴⁴³ It is this point about the fallacy of Transubstantiation by authority of the Primitive Church, and its predecessors in the Hebrew Passover ceremony, that Collier emphasizes with utmost persistence in his correspondence with Thomas Brett.⁴⁴⁴

If, as Robert Cornwall claims, Thomas Brett “asserted that Christ suffered and died according to his will in the eucharist, culminating in his death ‘in deed’ on the cross,”⁴⁴⁵ then this was a view Brett came around to only under pressure from Collier. Collier even admitted to exercising editorial license in one of Brett’s publications to this end.⁴⁴⁶ “By comparison, High Churchmen and Non-Jurors believed that the Lord’s supper communicated the benefits of the cross to the people of God. The elements were not simply types or representative images, they were the instruments of Christ’s work in the lives of his people...They did not receive common bread and wine in the Lord’s supper, but inwardly they received the body and blood of Christ.”⁴⁴⁷ The four usages upon which Collier insisted, “administerd according to scripturall & prime primitive Direction,” ensured that “no Comunicant could suffer under...unexeptionable

⁴⁴³ Collier to Brett, 1 July 1721. Bodl Lib, MS Eng Th c. 27, f. 259-260.

⁴⁴⁴ He not only maintained this position but expounded upon it at some length in these letters, e.g. Collier to Brett, 1 July 1721, Bodl Lib, MS Eng Th c. 27, f. 259-260; Collier to Brett, 1 November 1722, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 63-64, and 6 November 1722, f. 69-70.

⁴⁴⁵ Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 138.

⁴⁴⁶ Collier corrected Brett, to the extent that he actually deleted lines of text written by Brett before it went to press, for laying too much emphasis upon the ritual Eucharistic sacrifice at the expense of the sacrifice made at the moment of crucifixion. The Eucharist, Collier explains, “was instituted as a memoriall of ye crucifixion, & yt ye force of ye Eucharistick Sacrifice depends on yt of ye Cross.” Collier to Brett, 25 October 1722, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 53-57.

⁴⁴⁷ Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 138-139.

circumstances.”⁴⁴⁸ The omission of the four usages by “our old Brethren” removed this safeguard.

Beyond the formalities of ritual, the deeper significance to Collier of denying the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and his voluntary sacrifice on the cross, must be inferred at this stage. Collier admits as much, counselling Brett that “both yrselfe & I have publickly declar'd & I hope prov'd too, ye 4 things necessary, at least as to practise.”⁴⁴⁹ Reliance upon the authority of the primitive church gave credence, Collier believed, to his position.⁴⁵⁰ As with the worries he expressed about immorality and atheism in the Stage Controversy, so too the appeal to primitive christianity was not unique to Collier. But the particulars of his argument and evidence, for instance, that Gentile and Jewish custom are precursors to Christian doctrine, calls for a comprehensive study of Collier’s theology. John Marshall explains, in reference to Locke’s treatment of the same issue, that he “spoke only of Christ’s redeeming man and of his offering himself up, phrases capable of subscription – in very different senses – by Socinians, Arminians, and even Calvinists.”⁴⁵¹

The problem carries over into the second major issue Collier confronted during his tenure as head of the nonjurors: the attempt at union with the Eastern Orthodox Church. It was hoped that such a union would relieve the nonjurors from externally perceived obligations to the Church of England as well as to Rome. One condition, which most nonjurors agreed to, was the acceptance of Jerusalem as the patriarchal see. Efforts to reach an agreement occupied the greater part of the final decade of Collier’s life (1716-25). Its failure is attributed to the issue

⁴⁴⁸ Collier to Brett, 1 July 1721, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 27, f. 259-260.

⁴⁴⁹ Collier to Brett, 3 January 1722/3, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 83-84.

⁴⁵⁰ Collier to Brett, 6 November 1722, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 70.

⁴⁵¹ John Marshall, “Locke, Socinianism, “Socinianism”, and Unitarianism,” in M.A. Stewart, ed., *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 163.

with which Collier was obsessed in his correspondence with Brett: reluctance to accept the doctrine of transubstantiation.⁴⁵² Historians who have treated this attempt at ecumenical outreach have focused primarily on the ecclesiological points of union; I am suggesting that the theological reasons for the union's breakdown, in light of Collier's correspondence with Brett, demand specific attention.

After the *Ecclesiastical History*, Collier's biographer reports that due to ill health, Collier published little else. This omits the entirety of the usages controversy, which perhaps betrays the allegiances and identity of the author.⁴⁵³ Furthermore, Collier lived his final days in poverty.⁴⁵⁴ Collier had implied that he was in financial trouble as early as December of 1720, when he thanked Brett for "laying out for subscriptions" in anticipation of the dues which would be paid for the Appendix to his Dictionary.⁴⁵⁵ In the last months of his life, he thanked Brett once again for retrieving "ye money you were so kind to pick up for me in trades...for it will not come unseasonably."⁴⁵⁶

In April of 1724, Collier began complaining that he was too sick to keep up his working pace. He was able to continue a limited amount of reading, but "as for writing I am entirely disabled."⁴⁵⁷ By February of 1724/5, he reported feeling a bit better, but was unable to go downstairs in his own home.⁴⁵⁸ Despite these hardships, Collier found the energy to be an active participant in preparing his sermons for publication.⁴⁵⁹ These would be the last of his printed work over which he exercised some measure of control.

⁴⁵² Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 451-466.

⁴⁵³ [Jebb], *Biog. Brit.*, 1412. The biographer's identity is suggested in the introduction to the dissertation.

⁴⁵⁴ Thomas Hearne, 4 May 1725, *Hearne's Collections*, Vol. VIII, 1722-25, 364.

⁴⁵⁵ Collier to Brett, 13 December 1720, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 27, f. 147-148.

⁴⁵⁶ Collier to Brett, 2 November 1725, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 119.

⁴⁵⁷ Collier to Brett, 18 April 1724, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 275.

⁴⁵⁸ Collier to Brett., 4 February 1724/5, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 28, f. 355.

⁴⁵⁹ Collier to Brett, 29 April 1725, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 29, f. 1; 25 May 1725, f. 21-22; 3 August 1725, f. 61-62.

The Comparison Between Giving and Receiving, the sermon he had preached at Whitehall in April of 1687, in support of the Declaration of Indulgence, was not actually published until 1723, three years before his death. It was reprinted in 1725 along with a collection of moral essays.⁴⁶⁰ The last of Collier's published works, issued in 1726, the year of his death, may have been released posthumously, although it is unclear from the available sources. The title page of *God not the Origin of Evil* attributes the text to Mr. Collier, and explains that the sermon is an addendum to a collection of his discourses.⁴⁶¹ Collier returned to earlier themes, such as the state of tyranny – moral, social and by extension political – associated with pride.⁴⁶² The sermons exhibit a more comprehensive sense of audience, which is attributable to the genre. Whereas in the *Office of a Chaplain*, Collier had focused primarily on the abuse of clergymen in a private household, and had by extension implied arguments about ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he addresses the issue of servitude in *God not the Origin of Evil* as a practical status, and a state of soul. Specifically, Collier acknowledged that as a matter of socio-economic rank, "Servants are forc'd to live with vitious Masters; sometimes they are fixed there by the Impudence of others, being not at their own Disposal, and in this Case, they can't in Justice go off, till the Contract is satisfy'd; and if they could, it sometimes happens so, that they can't provide for themselves elsewhere."⁴⁶³ God does not punish these individuals who "have not the Liberty of a Removal."⁴⁶⁴ In this instance, culpability lies with "those exceptionable Masters."

⁴⁶⁰ Jeremy Collier, *Several Discourses upon Practical Subjects* (London: 1725).

⁴⁶¹ Presumably, this refers to the *Several Discourses*.

⁴⁶² Jeremy Collier, *God not the Origin of Evil* (London: 1726), 19.

⁴⁶³ Collier, *God not the Origin of Evil*, 24.

⁴⁶⁴ Collier, *God not the Origin of Evil*, 24.

With regard to the care of one's own soul, Collier echoed his criticism of scepticism and atheism, and insistence on free will. He declared it "a scandalous Meanness...to let the rational and immortal Soul, which was made for Government and Empire, to be trampled on, and as it were led in Triumph by unconscious and stupid *Matter?*"⁴⁶⁵ He prioritized adherence to principles as directed by reason, not selfishness or pride, above all, even if such convictions led to the loss of all earthly possessions: "For...a poor Man, that subsists fairly by his Labour, is thought a Person of more Value and Reputation," than those who live opulently by false or fraudulent means. In his closing appeal, Collier again made reference to primitive christianity, in this case not in an academic argument, but in a widely accesible humanist example:

But, is Poverty so uncreditable a State do you say? I'm afraid those that think so, would have been asham'd of our Saviour and his Apostles, if they had convers'd with them: But if a poor Man may be just and temperate, religious and resolute in a good Cause, then he needs not grow despicable for want of Fortune: the Practice of those Vertues will gain him the Esteem of all equal Judges, yes of God Almighty himself.⁴⁶⁶

By his own reckoning, at least, in spite of the hardships Collier faced because of his adherence to what he believed throughout his life to be right, he would have died in good conscience. He passed away on April 26, 1726, at the age of seventy-six, after struggling with illness for several years. He was buried three days later in the churchyard of St. Pancras which was, in this period, a paupers' cemetery. His biographer notes that he "preserved the free use of his senses to the very last."⁴⁶⁷ This is a significant observation in light of the controversy that pursued him even in death. His appeal to the authority of the primitive church in defense of his position on the necessity of the four Usages was unremarkable to the extent that many divines invoked this precedent to support a myriad of arguments. Collier deployed primitive christianity

⁴⁶⁵ Collier, *God not the Origin of Evil*, 14-15.

⁴⁶⁶ Collier, *God not the Origin of Evil*, 30-31.

⁴⁶⁷ [Jebb], *Biog Brit*, 1411-1412.

in a number of contexts too, including his *Ecclesiastical History*. However, with respect to the usages controversy, which provided the last of several positions upon which he insisted throughout his life, it is important to keep in mind that the congregation he oversaw was the same group of people who would be the custodians of his papers after death. Between his public statements on issues ranging from religious tolerance to the Glorious Revolution to the Stage Controversy, and his attacks on such prominent public figures as Gilbert Burnet, institutions such as the Established Church, and the State, Collier had himself contributed to his own image as an adamant, even obnoxious nonconformist. He had made plenty of enemies in the course of speaking truth to power. But his posthumous reputation may have been equally tainted by fellow nonjurors.

In June of 1728, Thomas Brett confronted a rumor that had been circulating about Collier head-on. Among the Scottish nonjurors, there had been claims that “Mr Collier did upon his Death bed profess Repentance for the Part he had acted in introducing & restoring primitive worship, desiring his Friends then present to notify & publish this his Recantation to the Whole World & desired one & all of them to return to the Peace & Unity of the Church, & to drop all those things wch had occasioned such a woful schism.”⁴⁶⁸ This, according to Brett, was heresay, and he obtained the signed testimony of six other nonjurors who had visited Collier at his deathbed in his final days. To the contrary, these men maintained that not one person, “ever heard Mr Collier say any thing, ever on his Death-bed or at any other time, intimating any Repentance for his having restored primitive Worship.”⁴⁶⁹ Rumors of “this pretended Recantation,” could only have been, Brett surmised, “a groundless Calumny raised to asperse the

⁴⁶⁸ Declaration fm Engld. vindicating Bp. Collier from a false of Aspersion,” 25 June 1728, LP MS 1536, f. 157.

⁴⁶⁹ Declaration fm Engld. vindicating Bp. Collier, LP MS 1536, f. 157.

Memory of yt great Man.”⁴⁷⁰ Collier’s allies and closest friends among the brethren came to his defense in this controversy, and had no reservations about signing a statement to that effect.⁴⁷¹

But the correspondence between Collier’s widow and Thomas Brett indicates that there was another issue which was too sensitive to be named even after his death. Perhaps this has to do with the issue of transubstantiation; it cannot be determined definitively. Those closest to Collier had begun, within months of his passing, assisting his wife in collecting some of Collier’s papers. In her letters to Thomas Brett, Cecelia Collier spoke in vague terms as to the intended purpose of the compilation.⁴⁷² Additionally, in a letter dated November 21, 1726, Cecelia expressed concern about the sparse information that she did betray in their correspondence, insisting that what she did discuss with Brett be kept in strictest confidence. Most likely referring to the above-mentioned rumor, she explained that “had it bin possible to have known Mr Colliers opinion I am certain he would never have confessed to [it]: Especially when I call to mind my dear Spouses Directions which are not proper to be written but they will for ever Remain with me as a true signe of the Love & Respect I have to his memory.”⁴⁷³ This presented no dilemma for her, as she had “as Little Regard to what the world shall think or say as he himself had.”⁴⁷⁴ In closing, she assured Brett that when they next met and she had the opportunity to speak to him in person, that he would likewise have no trouble assisting her in burning his papers.⁴⁷⁵

A few years later, his widow would oversee the transcription of several of Collier’s tracts. One of these was a rare find, the *Case of Giving Bail*, which Collier had written during his

⁴⁷⁰ Declaration fm Enfld. vindicating Bp. Collier, LP MS 1536, f. 157.

⁴⁷¹ Preparations for the statement were being made as early as January of that year. Wagstaffe to Brett, 16 January 1727/8, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 30, f. 135.

⁴⁷² Cecelia Collier to Thomas Brett, undated, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th c. 30, f. 137.

⁴⁷³ Cecelia Collier to Thomas Brett, 21 November 1728, Bodl Lib MS Eng Th. c. 30, f. 285.

⁴⁷⁴ Bodl Lib MS Eng Th. c. 30, f. 285.

⁴⁷⁵ Bodl Lib MS Eng Th. c. 30, f. 285.

second imprisonment. The transcriber, William Emmett, explained in his notes that only five copies had ever been printed, and that he doubted that any of these survived with the exception of the printed copy provided by Collier's widow.⁴⁷⁶ He also copied two additional printed tracts, *A Brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church Power* (1692) and *Remarks on the London Gazette* (1693).⁴⁷⁷ Finally, Cecelia Collier made available to Emmett an original manuscript in which Collier did not hold back in expressing his rage over the events set in motion in 1688. Among the most notable passages, Collier complains, in verse, that the "Court Minions" had, "In favour of the good Old Cause, They banter and debauch the Laws...They batten, flourish and grow Great. Sucking the Vitalls of the State...For all thats rais'd by Usurpation, Is but meer robbing of the Nation."⁴⁷⁸ Thus far, none of these sentiments are particularly surprising; they are characteristic of Collier's complaints about usurpation in the wake of what he believed to be a Dutch invasion, enabled by courtiers such as his former employer Dorset. His private meditations take on a darker tone, however, as he reflects upon the bloody consequences of compromised reason by the Revolution's henchmen:

Voting the Nation into Treason,
Should represent them with tyed Reason.
And teach such Legislative Fellows,
To serve for Country at the Gallows.
Compar'd to Those had Blood that Stole
The Crown; been sent to Newgate Gaol,
And for the Fact been doom'd to dye,
He had swung for Petty Larceny.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁶ Jeremy Collier *The Case of Giving Bail to a Pretended Authority*, 1694, transcribed by William Emmett, 1732, Bodl Lib MS Eng Hist d. 220, f. 51.

⁴⁷⁷ Collier, *The Case of Giving Bail*, Bodl Lib MS Eng Hist d. 220, ff. 98-112; 114-129.

⁴⁷⁸ Collier, *The Case of Giving Bail*, Bodl Lib MS Eng Hist d. 220, ff. 131-132.

⁴⁷⁹ Jeremy Collier, untitled, transcribed from the original by William Emmett., Bodl Lib MS Eng Hist d. 220, ff. 131-132.

7.0 CONCLUSION

This thesis tells us a bit more about Jeremy Collier the younger's own life and thought, and may help to advance a more general repositioning of the nonjurors and Jacobite political culture after the Glorious Revolution. Collier the younger's previously unexamined childhood and early career established contexts connecting him to his father. These connections are both personal, in terms of intellectual influence, and practical as they present opportunities to study two generations of clergymen and their experiences of regime change. I also shed new light on the second half of Collier's life and his work after the Glorious Revolution. The year 1688 has been the starting point for anyone who has studied Collier, in part because of the dearth of information about him prior to this point. In this dissertation 1688/9 is seen instead as the last of a succession of seventeenth-century institutional and intellectual upheavals affecting church, state and society. Both Collier the younger and Collier the elder confronted these processes at different points in time.

Over the course of his life, Collier exhibited a series of High Church positions on church government and doctrine that attracted accusations of crypto-Catholicism from friends and enemies alike. However, I am not persuaded that he actually crossed a line into Catholicism, even though his arguments and actions could be construed as catholic, or ecumenical. There are striking similarities, which need to be looked at in detail, between his own thought and the Laudianism of the Caroline Church. This is especially relevant given the line of family

ordination that connected father to son. Furthermore, if indeed Collier the younger preached at Whitehall in the second half of James II's reign, going on to publicly defend James after he fled in 1688, this would make Collier a unique member of the Church of England. It is possible, for instance, that he was a Catholic sympathizer. Even if his willingness to support Catholics was initially, from 1688/9, a political decision, it had increasingly become an issue of theology toward the end of his life. What is consistent, however, is that Collier was very vocal about his own High Church views, as well as the office of a clergyman and its exalted stature.

I suggest three main areas in which to build upon this preliminary research into Collier the younger. First, as it was stated in the introduction, until now no new biographical information on Collier has been assembled or mentioned. There is more work to be done in the National Archives, where I have located chancery records which may be related to a case involving Collier's brother. Additionally, I have recently uncovered a source relating to Collier's sister which suggests that she married into the circle of Restoration courtiers that became the target of Collier's attack on the English stage. Both the Collier and Smith (maternal) family lines need deeper exploration at two sites where I conducted preliminary research for this thesis: the West Yorkshire Archive Service in Leeds, and the County Record Office, Cambridge, respectively.

Second, the context of Collier's printed work needs a fresh look in light of the inclusive overview provided here. Individual genres and texts require more detailed attention, and need to be situated in the context of tracts written by Collier's opponents and other influential contemporaries, such as John Locke, and the circumstances of their publication. The genres in which Collier wrote are as important as any other aspect of his biography, because he chose these modes with care based upon what he wished to communicate at a given moment. Prior to

the Revolution, his mode of choice was the sermon. In the upheaval following the Glorious Revolution he published relatively short, casuistic pamphlets in which he argued the illegality of conquest. When the Revolution Settlement no longer seemed reversible, Collier confronted institutionalized moral reform through his “Stage Controversy” essays. In his final years he turned his attention inward, focusing on disagreement within his own church. Despite changing circumstances and relatively coherent periods of writing within a particular genre, the moral essay and the sermon continued to resurface over the course of his life. An expanded study would also treat Collier’s textual legacy. A collection of his sermons was published immediately after his death. By 1838, Collier’s moral essays had been dismantled and reassembled as a collection of pithy maxims which bear little resemblance to their original form or meaning.⁴⁸⁰ Posthumous editions of his texts demonstrate that the alteration of textual format is as significant to the corruption of Collier’s biography as any other historical factor. Such longstanding misconceptions about an individual biography are intriguing, but they also indicate broader delusions about the history that surrounded that biography. I look forward, ultimately, to working outward from lives of Collier the elder and Collier the younger to view a century of historical context in a new light.

⁴⁸⁰ *Pearls of Great Price...Selected from the works of The Rev. Jeremy Collier, M.A. by the editor of “Sir William Jones’s Discourses”* (London: 1838).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

<i>Biog Brit</i>	<i>Biographia Britannica</i>
BL	British Library
Bodl Lib	Bodleian Library
CCRO	Cambridgeshire County Record Office
CUA	Cambridge University Archives
CUL	Cambridge University Library
CKS	Centre for Kentish Studies
<i>HP</i>	<i>Hartlib Papers</i>
LP	Lambeth Palace
<i>ODNB</i>	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
SCRO	Suffolk County Record Office
TNA: PRO	The National Archives: Public Records Office, Kew

Manuscripts and Archives

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Collier, Jeremy. The Case of Giving Bail to a pretended authority. 1694. MS Rawl c. 701

‘Collier’s Tracts’: Works of Jeremy Collier transcribed mainly from printed sources, by William Emmett, 1731-2. MS Eng Hist d. 219 - 220

Papers of Thomas Brett, nonjuror (1667-1744)

MS Eng Th. C 26

MS Eng Th c. 27

MS Eng Th c. 28

MS Eng Th c. 29

MS Eng Th c. 30

MS Eng Th c. 38

MS Eng Th c. 39

MS Eng Th c. 40

MS Eng Th c. 52

MS Rawl c. 701

MS Rawl Poet 91

British Library, London

Hall MS Vol. III , Add 45671 ff. 110-117

Add MS 4275 ff. 112, 114

Add MS 5853 ff. 106-108

Add MS 5865 f. 54

Sloane MS 3065 f. 73

Cambridge University Archives, Cambridge

Lease Book 1649-59, f. 227-228

Cambridge University Library, Cambridge

Ely Diocesan Records A/5/2, A/5/3, B/2/67

Cambridgeshire County Record Office, Cambridge

Will of Jeremiah Collier of Pampisford VC31:78 1669 CW

Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone

Sackville Papers U269 C116-119, Q1, f. 89

The Hartlib Papers 2nd Edition (Sheffield, HROnline, 2002):

Dury, John to Mr Collier 10 August 1647, 4/1/5A-B.

Ephemerides, Jan. c.-April 1651, 28/2/10A.

Ephemerides, c. April 1651, 28/2/14B.

Ephemerides, July 1654, 29/4/20B.

Ephemerides, Undated, 47/13/3A-4B.

Hall, John to Samuel Hartlib 17 December 1646? 60/14 3B-4A.

Hall, John to Hartlib, 15 February 1647, 60/14/22A.

Hall, John to Hartlib, Undated (Late March 1647?) 60/14/39A-39B.

Hall, John to Hartlib, Letter, 20 April 1647, 60/14/32A-33A.

Lambeth Palace, London

Correspondence of John Falconer MS 1536 ff. 123, 145, 157

National Archives, Kew Gardens

Returns to First Fruits Office PRO E331/Ely/10

State Papers, Domestic, 44/98 f. 523

State Papers, Domestic, 44/341 f. 400

Suffolk Record Office, Bury Saint Edmunds

Ampton Parish Records

FL 519/13/1

FL 519/13/4

FL 519/13/50

FL 519/13/88

Papers of the Reverend Edmund Farrer

HD 526/3/3

West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds

WYL500/63 28-29 Stasfield Muniments, Stansfield family of Esholt, West Riding of Yorkshire

Select Printed Works attributed to Jeremy Collier the younger, in order of publication

(* indicates unsigned)

The Difference between the Present and Future State of our Bodies, considered in a sermon. London: 1686.

The Comparison between Giving and Receiving...stated in a Sermon preached at Whitehall, 19 April 1687. London: 1723.

The Office of a Chaplain. Cambridge: 1688.

**The desertion discuss'd. In a letter to a country gentleman.* London: 1688.

**Vindiciae Juris Regii*. London: 1689

**Animadversions upon the Modern Explanation of...a King de facto*. London: 1689

**A Caution against Inconsistency, or the Connection between Praying and Swearing, in relation to the Civil Powers*. London: 1690.

**Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance considered. With some remarks upon his Vindication*. London: 1691.

**A brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church Power*. London: 1692.

A Defence of the Absolution given to Sr William Perkins, at the Place of Executin, April the 3rd. With a farther vindication thereof, occasioned by a paper entituled a Declaration of the sense of the Archbishops and Bishops. 1696.

A Reply to the Absolution of a Penitent according to the Directions of the Church of England, &c. [Signed J.C.] 1696.

Essays upon several Moral Subjects. In two parts...The second edition [of "Miscellanies: in five essays": and "Miscellanies upon Moral Subjects: the second part": originally published in 1694 and 1695 respectively] corrected and much enlarged. London: 1697.

A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage. London: 1698

A Defense of the Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage, &c. Being a reply to Mr. Congreve's Amendments, &c. and to the Vindication of the author of the Relapse. London: 1699.

A Second Defence of the Short View of the Prophaneness and Immorality of the English Stage, &c. Being a reply to a book [by James Drake], entituled The Ancient and Modern Stages surveyed, &c. London: 1700.

Aurelius Antoninus called the Philosopher, Emperer of Rome. The Emperer Marcus Antoninus his Conversations with himself...trans. Collier. London: 1701.

The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary. London: 1701

The Oration, Anthems & Poems, spoken and sung at the Performance of Divine Musick...undertaken by C. Weedon. London: 1702.

Cicero, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum. Tully's Five Boooks De Finibus...done into English by S.P. Gent. Revis'd...with a recommendatory preface by J. Collier. London: 1702.

Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Play-House; in a letter to a person of quality, occasion'd by the late calamity of the tempest. London: 1703.

A Supplement to the Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary... Collected from the best historians... more especially out of Lewis Morery his eighth edition... Together with a continuation from the year 1688, to this time, by another hand. London: 1705.

A Letter to a Lady concerning the New Play House. London: 1706.

Human Souls naturally Immortal. Translated from a Latin manuscript, by S.E. With a recommendatory preface, by J. Collier. London: 1707.

An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England: from the first planting of Christianity, to the end of the reign of King Charles the Second. With a brief account of the affairs of religion in Ireland [With "A Collection of Records."] 2 vol., 1708, 1714.

A Farther Vindication of the Short View of the Profaneness of the English Stage. In which the objections of a late book [by Edward Filmer] entituled: A Defence of Plays are consider'd. London: 1708.

An Essay upon Gaming, in a dialogue between Callimachus and Dolomedes. London: 1713.

An Answer to some Exceptions in Bishop Burnet's Third Part of the History of the Reformation, &c. against Mr. Collier's Ecclesiastical History. London: 1715.

Of Discontent: in a dialogue between Philotimus and Philalethes. [See Gregory, Saint of Nazianus, Patriarch of Constantinople] A Pangyrick upon the Maccabees. London: 1716.

Some Considerations on Doctor Kennet's Second and Third Letters [to William Nicholson, Bishop of Carlisle]. Wherin his misrepresentations of Mr. Collier's Ecclesiast. History are lay'd open, and his calumnies disprov'd. London: 1717.

Reasons for Restoring some Prayers and Directions as they stand in the Communion Service of the First English Reform'd Liturgy, compiled by the Bishops in...the reign of King Edward VI. London: 1717.

A Communion Office taken partly from Primitive Liturgies, and partly from the first English Reformed Common Prayer-Book, etc. London: 1718.

A Defense of the Reasons for Restoring some Prayers and Directions of King Edward the Sixth's first Liturgy: being a reply to a book, entituled, No Reason for Restoring them. London: 1718.

A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, &c. Part I. Being a reply to the first part of No Sufficient Reason for Restoring some Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI's first Liturgy [by Nathaniel Spinckes] (Part II being a reply to the second part of No Sufficient Reason, etc.) By the author of the Reasons and Defence [i.e. J. Collier] 2 pt. London: 1718.

A Farther Decence &c. Being an Answer to a Reply [by Nathaniel Spinckes] to the Vindication of the Reasons and Defence for Restoring some Prayers and Directions in King Edward VI's First Liturgy. By the author of the Reasons, &c. [i.e. J. Collier.] London: 1720.

An Appendix to the three English volumes in folio of Morery's Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary...Collected from authors of character and chiefly from the French Supplement. London: 1721.

Several Discourses upon Practical Subjects. London: 1725.

God not the Origin of Evil. Being an additional sermon to a collection of Mr. Collier's Discourses, &c. London: 1726.

Other Printed Primary Sources

Bayle, Pierre. *Le Grande Dictionire Historique.* Paris: 1699.

Benlowes, Edward. *Theophila, or Loves Sacrifice. A Divine Poem.* London: 1652.

Biographia Britannica: or, The lives of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland...collected from the best authorities...and digested in the manner of Mr. Bayle's Historical and critical dictionary...Vol. I. London: Printed for W. Innys, 1747.

[Bohun, Edmund]. *The General History of the Reformation of the Church from the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome...by John Sleidan.* London: 1689.

_____. *The Great Historical Dictionary.* London: 1694.

Campanella, Tommaso. *The City of the Sun: A Poetical Dialogue.* Translated by Daniel J. Donno. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Collier, Jeremy. *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.* Thomas Lathbury, Ed. London: William Straker, 1852.

Cook, Shadrach. *Christian supports under the terrors of death: a sermon preached to Sir John Friend in Newgate.* London: 1696.

Comenius, John Amos. *Orbis Sensualium Pictus.* Translated by Charles Hoole.

London: Printed for J. Kirton, 1659.

_____. *A Patterne of Universall Knowledge, In a plaine and true Draught: or a Diatyposis.* Trans. Jeremy Collier the elder. London, 1651.

Dury, John. *The Reformed Librarie Keeper: With a Supplement to the Reformed School, As subordinate to Colleges in Universities.* London: Printed by William Du-Gard, 1650.
Green, Mary A.E., Ed. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1654, 1655.* Vaduz, Kraus Reprint, Ltd., 1965.

Fletcher, Reginald, Ed. *The pension book of Gray's Inn: records of the honourable society, 1569-1800.* London: Stevens and Sons, 1901-1910.

Foster, Joseph, Ed. *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn 1521-1889.* London: 1889.

Hearne, Thomas. *Hearne's Collections*, Vol. III, 1710-1712; Vol. VI, 1717-1719; Vol. VIII, 1722-25. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.

Herbert, George. *A priest to the temple, or, The country parson his character, and rule of holy life.* London, 1652.

Hoole, Charles. *A New Discovery of the old Art of Teaching Schoole, In four small Treatises* (London: Printed by J.T. for Andrew Crook, 1660), title page, Epistle Dedicatory.

_____. *Scholastick Discipline: or The Way of ordering a Grammar-Schoole, Directing the not experienced, how he may profit every particular Scholar, and avoyd Confusion amongst a multitude.* London: Printed by J.T. for Andrew Crook, 1659.

Laud, William. *The Autobiography of Dr William Laud – Collected from His Remains.* Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1839.

LeClerc, Jean. *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique.* Amsterdam, 1694.

Moréri, Louis. *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique.* Lyon: 1674.

Petty, William. *The Advice of W.P. to Mr. Samuel Hartlib for The Advancement of some particular Parts of Learning.* London: Printed Anno Dom. 1648.

Sturgess, H.A.C. *Register of Admissions to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple*, Vol. I. London: Butterworth & Co., 1949.

Williams, John. *A declaration of the sense of the archbishops and bishops.* London: 1696.

Wren, Matthew. *Bishop Wren's Petition to Parliament, in Defense of Episcopacie. In Behalf of Himself and the Rest of the Bishops*. London, 1642.

Books and Articles

Anthony, Sister Rose. *The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy*. New York: B. Blom, 1966.

Aubrey, Philip. *The Defeat of James Stuart's Armada, 1692*. Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979.

Baggley, George. *Floreat Bostona: the history of Boston Grammar School from 1567*. Boston, Lincolnshire: Old Bostonian Association, 1985.

Bahlman, Dudley. *The Moral Revolution of 1688*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Barbour, Reid. *English Epicures and Stoics: Ancient Legacies in Early Stuart Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

Beddard, Robert. "The Commission for Ecclesiastical Promotions, 1681-84: An Instrument of Tory Reaction." *The Historical Journal* 10:1 (1967), 11-40.

Braun, Harald and Edward Vallance, Eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

Bredvold, Louis. *The Intellectual Millieu of John Dryden: Studies in Some Aspects of Seventeenth-Century Thought*. Ann Arbor: university of Michigan Press, 1934.

Burns, William E. "Sherlock, William (1639/40-1707) *ODNB*

Ciardha, Éamonn Ó. *Ireland and the Jacobite cause, 1685-1766: A fatal attachment*. Portland: Four Courts Press, Ltd., 2002.

Clarke, Susan A. "Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post-Regicide Funerary Propaganda." *Paregon* 22:2 (2005), 113-130.

Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Cliffe, J.T. *The World of the Country House in Seventeenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Clucas, Stephen. "In Search of 'The True Logick.'" Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, Timothy

- Raylor, Eds. *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 51-74.
- Coffey, John. "A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan Revolution." David Lowenstein and John Marshall, Eds. *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 108-136.
- Cohen, Jonathan. "On the Project of a Universal Character." *Mind* New Series 63 (1954), 49-63.
- Collins, Jeffrey R. "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy." *Church History* 68:3 (1999), 549-580.
- Condren, Conal. *Argument and Authority in early modern England: the presupposition of oaths and offices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Cornwall, Robert D. *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
- Crawford, Clarence C. "The Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the Revolution of 1689." *English Historical Review* 30 (1915), 613-630.
- Cruikshanks, Eveline, Ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1982.
- Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Davis, Edward B. "The Anonymous Works of Robert Boyle and *the Reasons Why a Protestant Should not Turn Papist* (1687)." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 55:4 (1994), 611-629.
- Davis, J.C. *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing, 1526-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- _____. *Oliver Cromwell*. London: Arnold Publishers, 2003.
- _____. "Living with the Living God: Radical Religion and the English Revolution." Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, Eds. *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- De Krey, Gary. "Reformation and 'Arbitrary Government': London Dissenters and James II's

- Polity of Toleration, 1687-1688.” Jason McElligott, Ed. *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006, 13-31.
- _____. *Restoration and Revolution in Britain: A Political History of the Era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.
- Dobinson, C.H., ed. *Comenius and Contemporary Education: Commemoration of the Tercentenary of the Death of Comenius – An International Symposium*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1970.
- Durston, Christopher and Judith Maltby, Eds. *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Földes, Éva, & István Mészáros, eds. *Comenius and Hungary: Essays*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973.
- Garret, Jane. *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Gascoigne, John. “Politics, Patronage and Newtonianism: The Cambridge Example.” *The Historical Journal* 27:1 (1984), 1-24.
- Gibson, William. *A Social History of the Domestic Chaplain, 1530-1840*. London: Leicester University Press, 1996.
- Goldie, Mark. “The Allegiance Controversy: An Annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets.” *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83 (1980).
- _____. “Edmund Bohun and Jus Gentium in the Revolution Debate, 1689-1693.” *The Historical Journal* 20 (1977), 569-586.
- _____. “The Origins of the Convocation Controversy.” Eveline Cruickshanks, Ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1982.
- Gough, J.W. “James Tyrell, Whig Historian and Friend of John Locke.” *The Historical Journal* 19:3 (1976), 581-610.
- Gray, I.E., & W.E. Potter. *Ipswich School: 1400-1950*. Ipswich: W.E. Harrison & Sons, Ltd., 1950.
- Greig, Martin. “Hersey Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701.” *The Historical Journal* 37:3 (1994), 569-592.
- Green, I.M. *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*. Oxford:

- Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Greengrass, Mark, and Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor, Eds. *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Hammond, Paul. *The Making of Restoration Poetry*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006.
- Harmsen, Theodor. 'Hearne, Thomas (bap. 1678, d. 1735)' *ODNB*.
- Hodges, John C. "William Congreve in the Government Service." *Modern Philology* 27:2 (1929), 183.
- Hopkins, David. *John Dryden*. Devon: Northcote House Publishers, Ltd., 2004.
- Hopkins, Paul. "Sham Plots and Real Plots in the 1690s." Eveline Cruickshanks, Ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1982.
- Hoppit, Julian. *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hotson, Howard. "Philosophical Pedagogy in Reformed Central Europe between Ramus and Comenius: A Survey of the Continental Background of the 'Three Foreigners.'" Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, Timothy Raylor, Eds. *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 29-50.
- Hume, Robert. "Jeremy Collier and the Future of the London Theater in 1698." *Studies in Philology* 96:4 (1999), 480-511.
- Hunter, Michael. *Science and Society in Restoration England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Israel, Jonathan. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Jacob, J.R. "Boyle's Atomism and the Restoration Assault on Pagan Naturalism." *Social Studies of Science* 6:2 (1978), 211-233.
- _____. *Robert Boyle and the English Revolution: A Study in Social and Intellectual Change*. New York: B. Franklin, 1977.
- Jeffrey, Paul. "The church that never was: Wren's St. Mary, and other projects for Lincoln's Inn Fields." *Architectural History* 31 (1998), 136-147.

- Jenkins, Harold. *Edward Benlowes (1602-1676): Biography of a Minor Poet*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- _____. "Toward a Biography of Edward Benlowes." *The Review of English Studies* 12 (1936), 273-284.
- Jewell, Helen M. *Education in Early Modern England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1998.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- King, Peter, "Bishop Wren and the Suppression of the Norwich Lecturers," *The Historical Journal* 11:2 (1968), 237-254.
- Knights, Mark. *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Krutch, Joseph W. "Governmental Attempts to Regulate the Stage after the Jeremy Collier Controversy." *PMLA* 38 (1923), 153-174.
- Lake, Peter and Michael Questier. *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists & Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Lathbury, Thomas. *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings*. London: W. Pickering, 1845.
- Leedham-Green, Elizabeth. *A Concise History of the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Lemmings, David. *Gentlemen and Barristers: The Inns of Court and the English Bar, 1680-1730*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Levine, Joseph. *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- _____. *Between the Ancients and the Moderns: Baroque Culture in Restoration England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Loftis, John. *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.
- Lowenstein, David and John Marshall, Eds. *Hersey, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- John Marshall. "Locke, Socinianism, "Socinianism", and Unitarianism." M.A. Stewart, Ed. *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000, 111-182.

- McElligott, Jason, Ed. *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- McLaughlin, Eve. *Wills Before 1858*. Haddenahm: Varneys Press, 2002.
- Miall, James G. *Congregationalism in Yorkshire: A Chapter of Modern Church History*. London: John Snow and Co., 1868.
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- _____. "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England." *The Historical Journal* 41:3 (1998), 625-651.
- Monod, Paul. *Jacobitism and the English People: 1688-1788*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Monroe, Paul, Ed. *A Cyclopaedia of Education, Vol. II*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.
- Morgan, Victor. *A History of the University of Cambridge, Vol. II: 1546-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Morrill, John, Ed. *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s*. London: Collins & Brown, Ltd., 1992.
- Mullett, Michael. *James II and English Politics, 1678-1688*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Niemeyer, Carl. "New Light on Edward Benlowes," *The Review of English Studies* 12 (1936), 31-41.
- Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Ó Buachalla, Breandán. "From Jacobite to Jacobin." Thomas Bartlett, David Dickson, Dáire Keogh, Kevin Whelan, Eds. *1798: A Bicentenary Perspective*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003.
- Ó Ciardha, Éamonn. *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment*. Portland: Four Courts Press, Ltd., 2002.
- Oster, Malcolm. "Millenarianism and the New Science: The Case of Robert Boyle." Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, Timothy Raylor, Eds. *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 137-148.

- Overton, John J. *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings*. London: Smith, Elder and Col, 1902.
- Parker, Irene. *Dissenting Academies in England: Their Rise and Progress and their Place among the Educational Systems of the Country*. New York: Octagon Books, 1969.
- Phillips, Charles J. *History of the Sackville Family* Vol. I. London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1930.
- Plunket, Sir Dunbar. "The Office of 'Chaplain' and 'Preacher' at Gray's Inn." *Graya* 16 (1935), 54-157.
- Pruett, John H. *The Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: The Leicestershire Experience*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978.
- Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- Sadler, John E. *J.A. Comenius and the Concept of Universal Education*. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1966.
- Scott, Jonathan. *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623-1677*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- _____. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- _____. "The English Republican Imagination." Morrill, John, Ed. *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s*. London: Collins & Brown, Ltd., 1992.
- Shapiro, Alexander. "'Drama of an Infinitely Superior Nature': Handel's Early English Oratorios and the Religious Sublime." *Music and Letters* 74:2 (1993), 215-245.
- Sharp, Richard. 'Snatt, William (1644/5-1721)' *ODNB*.
- Simon, Joan. "The Reformation and English Education." In *Past and Present* 11 (1957), 48-65.
- Smith, David L. 'Sackville, Edward, fourth earl of Dorset (1590-1652)', *ODNB*, 2004.
- Smith, R.J. *The Gothic Bequest: Medieval Institutions in British Thought, 1688-1863*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Smith, Nigel. *Literature & Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

- Sommerville, C. John. "The Distinction between Indoctrination and Education in England, 1549-1719." In *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44 (1983), 387-406.
- Sommerville, Johan P. *Sir Robert Filmer, Patriarcha and Other Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Spurr, John. "'The Strongest Bond of Conscience': Oaths and the Limits of Tolerance in Early Modern England." Harald E. Braun and Edward Vallance, Eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.
- _____. *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000.
- _____. "'Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church." *The Historical Journal* 31:1 (1998), 61-82.
- _____. *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714*. Harlow: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2006.
- _____. "'Rational Religion' in Restoration England." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48:4 (1988), 563-585.
- _____. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Stewart, M.A., Ed. *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Starkie, Andrew. "Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 68:1 (2005), 335-351.
- Strasser, Gerhard F. "Closed and Open Languages." Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, Timothy Raylor, Eds. *Samuel Hartlib & Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 151-161.
- Szechi, Daniel. *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Teeter, Louis. "The Dramatic Use of Hobbes's Political Ideas." *English Literary History* 3, No. 2 (1936), 140-169.
- Thompson, M.P. "The Idea of Conquest in Controversies over the 1688 Revolution." *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 38 (1977), 33-46.
- Tilmouth, Michael. "Some Early London Concerts and Music Clubs, 1670-1720." *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 84th Session, (1957-1958), 13-26.

- Trevor-Roper, H.R. *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change*. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Tumbleson, Raymond. *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Turnbull, G.H. "John Hall's Letters to Samuel Hartlib," *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 4 (1953).
- _____. *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers*. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1947.
- Twigg, J.D. "The Parliamentary Visitation of the University of Cambridge, 1644-1645." *The English Historical Review* 98:338 (1983), 513-528.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Vallance, Edward. "'An Holy and Sacramentall Paction': Federal Theology and the Solemn League and Covenant in England," *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 145 (2001), 50-75.
- _____. "Oaths, Casuistry and Equivocation: Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy," *The Historical Journal* 44, no. 1 (2001), 59-77.
- _____. "The Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden's View of the English Constitution (1709)." Harald E. Braun and Edward Vallance, Eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.
- Venn, J.A. *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900*, Vol. I, Part 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922-54.
- Venn, John. *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349-1879, Containing a list of all known members of the college from the foundation to the present time with biographical notes*, Vols. I-III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901.
- Vincent, W.A.L. *The Grammar Schools: Their Continuing Tradition, 1660-1714*. London: Cox and Wyman, 1969.
- _____. *The State and School Education in England and Wales, 1640-1660*. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1950.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

- Wand, J.W.C. *The High Church Schism: Four Lectures on the Nonjurors*. London: Faith Press, 1951.
- Watson, Foster. "The State and Education during the Commonwealth." *The English Historical Review* 15 (1900).
- Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
- Webster, Charles. *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine, and Reform, 1626-1660*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1976.
- _____, ed. *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Worden, Blair. *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Unpublished Secondary Sources

- Duffy, Matthew J. "'Children do not like anarchy': Comenius, Orbis Pictus, and the Philosophical Origins of Books for Children." Kutztown University: Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, 2004.
- Frykman, Niklas. "For reasons of state? The war against smugglers in mid-eighteenth-century southern England." University of Sussex: Unpublished M.A. diss., 2003.
- Savonius, S.J. "The rival enlightenments of Pierre Bayle and John Locke." Unpublished paper presented to the Early Modern Seminar, The School of Historical Studies, University of Leicester, 24 May 2005.