

OXFORD

‘SETTLING
the PEACE *of the*
CHURCH’

1662 REVISITED



Edited by
N. H. KEEBLE

‘SETTLING THE PEACE OF THE CHURCH’

‘Settling the Peace of the Church’

1662 Revisited

EDITED BY N. H. KEEBLE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2014

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2014

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014941175

ISBN 978-0-19-968853-1

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Preface

This new study of the 1662 Act of Uniformity and its consequences results from the work of the Dr Williams's Centre for Dissenting Studies, established in September 2004 by Isabel Rivers and David L. Wykes as a collaboration between the School of English and Drama, Queen Mary University of London, and Dr Williams's Library, Gordon Square, London. The objectives of the Centre are to promote the use of the Library's unique holdings of Puritan, Protestant nonconformist, and dissenting books and manuscripts; to encourage research into and dissemination of these resources; and to increase knowledge and understanding of the importance of Puritanism and Protestant dissent to English society and literature from the sixteenth century to the present.

The Centre has developed an extensive programme of conferences, seminars, workshops, and publications to support these aims. The annual one-day conferences have led to several volumes of essays. To date five have been published by Oxford University Press: *Joseph Priestley, Scientist, Philosopher, and Theologian* (2008), and *Dissenting Praise: Religious Dissent and the Hymn in England and Wales* (2011), both edited by Isabel Rivers and David L. Wykes; *Women, Dissent, and Anti-Slavery in Britain and America, 1790–1865*, edited by Elizabeth J. Clapp and Julie Roy Jeffrey (2011); *Dissent and the Bible in Britain, c.1650–1950*, edited by Scott Mandelbrote and Michael Ledger-Lomas (2013); and now *Settling the Peace of the Church: 1662 Revisited*. In addition, *Heart Religion: Evangelical Piety in England and Ireland, 1690–1850*, edited by John Coffey, is forthcoming from Oxford University Press, as is a monograph by Tessa Whitehouse, *The Textual Culture of English Protestant Dissent, 1720–1800*. A further volume of essays has been published by Cambridge University Press: *Religious Dissent and the Aikin-Barbault Circle, 1740–1860*, edited by Felicity James and Ian Inkster (2011).

The Centre has published the following editions and studies online on its website:¹ *The Letters of Joseph Priestley to Theophilus*

¹ <www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/>

Lindsey 1769–1794, edited by Simon Mills (2007); *A Bibliography of the Writings of William Hazlitt 1737–1820* (2009) and *New College, Hackney (1786–96): A Selection of Printed and Archival Sources* (2011), both by Stephen Burley; *Dissenting Education and the Legacy of John Jennings c.1720–c.1729*, by Tessa Whitehouse (2011); *The Letters of Henry Crabb Robinson, Wordsworth Library, Grasmere* (2013), edited by Timothy Whelan; and *A Biographical Dictionary of Tutors at the Dissenters' Private Academies, 1660–1729*, by Mark Burden (2013).

The Centre has also published three online databases: *The Surman Index Online* (2009);² *Dissenting Academies Online: Database and Encyclopedia*,³ and *Dissenting Academies Online: Virtual Library System* (2011).⁴ The last two are an outcome of the Dissenting Academies Project, funded by the Leverhulme Trust and the Arts and Humanities Research Council. The other main outcome of the project is the multi-authored *History of the Dissenting Academies in the British Isles, 1660–1860*, edited by Isabel Rivers, with David L. Wykes as associate editor, to be published by Cambridge University Press.

The Centre is also supporting the publication of new multi-volume editions of *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, edited by N. H. Keeble, John Coffey, Tim Cooper, and Thomas Charlton; of Henry Crabb Robinson's *Diary* and *Reminiscences*, edited by Timothy Whelan and James Vigus; and of *The Correspondence of Richard Baxter*, of which Johanna Harris and Alison Searle are general editors. All three are to be published by Oxford University Press.

Isabel Rivers
David L. Wykes
The Dr Williams's Centre for Dissenting Studies
London

² <<http://surman.english.qmul.ac.uk/>>

³ <<http://dissacad.english.qmul.ac.uk/>>

⁴ <<http://vls.english.qmul.ac.uk/>>

Acknowledgements

This collection of essays originated in papers delivered in 2012 at the eighth annual one-day conference of the Dr Williams's Centre for Dissenting Studies held at Dr Williams's Library, London, to mark the 350th anniversary of the Act of Uniformity. I am grateful to the Centre's Advisory Committee for the invitation to edit the collection and, most especially, to the contributors for their work upon the essays and for their patience with my editorial interferences. I should like also to pay tribute to the staff of Oxford University Press who saw the copy through the production process with such exemplary professionalism.

N. H. Keeble
Candlemass, 2014

Contents

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xv
Introduction: Attempting Uniformity N. H. KEEBLE	1
1. The Debate over Authority: <i>Adiaphora</i> , the Civil Magistrate, and the Settlement of Religion JACQUELINE ROSE	29
2. Circumstantial Temporary Concessions: Clarendon, Comprehension, and Uniformity PAUL SEAWARD	57
3. The Silencing of God's Dear Ministers: John Bunyan and His Church in 1662 MICHAEL DAVIES	85
4. The Bishops of Ireland and the Beasts at Ephesus: Reconstruction, Conformity, and the Presbyterian Knot, 1660–2 ROBERT ARMSTRONG	114
5. Presbyterian Politics and the Restoration of Scottish Episcopacy, 1660–2 ALASDAIR RAFFE	144
6. Going Dutch: Beyond Black Bartholomew's Day CORY COTTER	168
7. Crisis and Opportunity: The Restoration Church Settlement and New England OWEN STANWOOD	190
8. The Nonconformist Narrative of the Bartholomeans N. H. KEEBLE	209

9. John Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy* and Church of
England Responses to the Ejections of 1660–2 233
MARK BURDEN

Index 263

List of Abbreviations

Full details of works referred to by author and short title will be found in an earlier note in that sequence.

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Abernathy | George R. Abernathy, 'The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration', <i>Transactions of the American Philosophical Society</i> , ns 55 (1965), 5–101. |
| Appleby | David L. Appleby, <i>Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity</i> (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007). |
| Baker | Sir Richard Baker, <i>A Chronicle of the Kings of England... Whereunto is Added the Reign of King Charles the First, and the First Thirteen Years of his Sacred Majesty King Charles the Second... in which are... the most remarkable occurrences relating to his Majesties most happy and wonderful Restauration</i> , [cont. by Edward Phillips], 5th edn (1670). |
| BDBR | R. L. Greaves and R. Zaller (eds), <i>Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century</i> , 3 vols (Brighton: Harvester, 1982–4). |
| BL | British Library. |
| Bosher | Robert S. Bosher, <i>The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians 1649–1662</i> (Dacre: Westminster, 1951). |
| Browning | Andrew Browning (ed.), <i>English Historical Documents, 1660–1714</i> (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1966). |
| Burnet | <i>Burnet's History of My Own Time, Part I: The Reign of Charles the Second</i> , ed. Osmund Airy, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897–1900). |
| Calamy 1702 | Edmund Calamy, <i>An Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times. With an Account of many Others of those... who were Ejected after the Restauration... And a continuation of their History, till the Year 1691</i> (1702). |

- Calamy 1713 Edmund Calamy, *An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times. With an Account of the Ministers... Ejected or Silenced after the Restoration... And a Continuation of their History, to... 1711*, 2 vols (1713).
- Calamy 1727 Edmund Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers... Ejected and Silenced after the Restoration*, 2 vols (1727).
- CCRB N. H. Keeble and Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); references are to letter numbers.
- CJ *The Journals of the House of Commons*.
- Clarendon, HR Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols (1888; reprinted Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Clarendon, LEC Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, *The Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon... in which is included A Continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion, from the Restoration in 1660 to his Banishment in 1667*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1857).
- Clarendon, SP [R. Scrope and T. Monkhouse (eds)], *State Papers Collected by Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1767–86).
- CR A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (1934; reprinted Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).
- DWL Dr Williams's Library, London.
- EHR *English Historical Review*.
- Evelyn *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. de Beer, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
- Firth & Rait C. H. Firth and S. R. Rait (eds), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642–1660*, 3 vols (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911).
- Goldie Mark Goldie et al. (eds), *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice*, 7 vols (Woodbridge: Boydell Press with the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2007–9), vol. I, Mark Goldie, *Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs*.

Green	Ian M. Green, <i>The Re-establishment of the Church of England</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).
Henning	Basil Duke Henning (ed.), <i>History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1660–1690</i> , 3 vols (London: Secker and Warburg for the History of Parliament Trust, 1983).
HJ	<i>Historical Journal</i> .
HR	<i>Historical Research: The Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</i> .
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission.
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i> .
Lacey	D.R. Lacey, <i>Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661–1689</i> (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969).
LJ	<i>The Journals of the House of Lords</i> .
LJI	<i>The Journals of the House of Lords of the Kingdom of Ireland</i> , vol. 1.
NLS	National Library of Scotland.
NRS	National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh
Nuttall & Chadwick	G. F. Nuttall and O. Chadwick (eds), <i>From Uniformity to Unity 1662–1962</i> (London: SPCK, 1962).
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online</i> (2004 with thrice yearly updates).
Old Parl. Hist.	<i>The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England, from the earliest times to the Restoration... by several hands</i> , 24 vols (London: T. Osborne and W. Sandby, 1751–61), 2nd edn of vols 14–24 (London: J. and R. Tonson, A. Millar, and W. Sandby, 1761–3).
PBHRS	<i>Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society</i> .
Pepys	<i>The Diary of Samuel Pepys</i> , ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols (London: Bell and Hyman, 1970–3).
PRONI	Public Record Office of Northern Ireland.
Rel. Bax.	<i>Reliquiae Baxterianae</i> , ed. Matthew Sylvester (1696); references are to part, page and, where appropriate, numbered section (so, <i>Rel. Bax.</i> , i. 20, §30).

- Seaward Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Spurr John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646–1689* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991).
- TCHS *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society.*
- TNA The National Archives, Kew.
- TRHS *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.*
- Turner G. Lyon Turner (ed.), *Original Records of Early Nonconformity under Persecution and Indulgence*, 3 vols (London: Unwin, 1911–14).
- URCHSJ *United Reformed Church History Society Journal.*
- Walker John Walker, *An Attempt towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England... who were Sequester'd, Harrass'd, &c., in the Late Times of the Grand Rebellion... Occasion'd by the Ninth Chapter... of Dr. Calamy's Abridgment of the Life of Mr. Baxter* (1714).
- Watts M. R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).
- WR A. G. Matthews, *Walker Revised* (1948; reprinted Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

Notes on Contributors

Robert Armstrong is a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, where he is Associate Professor of History. He is the author of *Protestant War: The British of Ireland and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Manchester University Press, 2005) and has co-edited several volumes including, most recently, *Insular Christianity: Alternative Models of the Church in Britain and Ireland c.1570–c.1700* (Manchester University Press, 2012, with Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin). He is part of a team currently working on an edition of seventeenth-century Irish Presbyterian histories.

Mark Burden is a Research Assistant, and formerly the MHRA Research Associate (University of Oxford), for Oxford University Press's *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*, gen. ed. David Norbrook, 4 vols (2011–). His University of London PhD thesis, awarded April 2012, is titled 'Academical Learning in the Dissenters' Private Academies'. With David L. Wykes and Simon Mills he is co-authoring four chapters for *A History of the Dissenting Academies in the British Isles, 1660–1860* (forthcoming from Cambridge University Press). His *Biographical Dictionary of Tutors at the Dissenters' Private Academies, 1660–1720* was published by the Dr Williams's Centre for Dissenting Studies in 2013.¹

Cory Cotter is a Teaching Intern at the University of Michigan. He received his training as a religious and intellectual historian at Edinburgh (MTh), Cambridge (MPhil), and Virginia (PhD), where, in 2010, he defended his doctoral dissertation on 'Anglo-Dutch Dissent: British Dissenters in the Netherlands, 1662–1688'. He is currently working on two projects: turning his thesis into a monograph, tentatively titled *The Intellectual Geography of the Restoration Diaspora: A Trans-Atlantic Perspective, 1660–1720*, and preparing for publication an essay on 'English and Scottish Dissenters in the Dutch Republic, 1575–1689', for John Coffey (ed.) *Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions—Volume 1: Beginnings to the Toleration Act* (forthcoming from Oxford University Press).

¹ <<http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/pubs/dictionary.html>>

Michael Davies is Senior Lecturer in English at the University of Liverpool. He has research interests in the Renaissance and Restoration periods, focusing especially on the literary and religious cultures of seventeenth-century England. He has published essays on a range of writers, from William Shakespeare to William Cowper, and is the author of *Graceful Reading: Theology and Narrative in the Works of John Bunyan* (Oxford University Press, 2002). He is currently editing *The Bunyan Church Book 1656–1710* and *The Oxford Handbook of John Bunyan*, both for Oxford University Press.

N. H. Keeble is Professor Emeritus of English Studies at the University of Stirling, Scotland. His academic and research interests lie in English cultural history of the period 1500–1725, with a particular focus on literary and religious history. His publications include studies of *Richard Baxter: Puritan Man of Letters* (1982), *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in later seventeenth-century England* (1987), *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (2002), a two-volume *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter* (1991; with Geoffrey F. Nuttall), and editions of texts by Richard Baxter, John Bunyan, Daniel Defoe, Lucy Hutchinson, Andrew Marvell, and John Milton. He currently leads an AHRC-funded project preparing a scholarly edition of Richard Baxter's *Reliquiae Baxterianae* for publication by Oxford University Press.

Alasdair Raffe is Chancellor's Fellow in History at the University of Edinburgh. He is the author of *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660–1714* (Boydell, 2012) as well as published and forthcoming articles and chapters, mostly concerning Scottish religious and political culture. His article 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660–1715', *English Historical Review*, 125 (2010), won the Royal Historical Society's David Berry Prize for the best essay in Scottish History.

Jacqueline Rose is Lecturer in History at the University of St Andrews, Associate Director of the Institute of Intellectual History, and Director for 2013–14 of the Reformation Studies Institute. Her research and teaching span early modern British religious, political, and intellectual history. Her first monograph, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), won the Royal Historical

Society's Whitfield Prize. She is currently co-editing John Locke's early religious and political writings, and is working on a book entitled *Kingship and Counsel in Early Modern England* as part of a broader project that she leads on medieval and early modern political counsel.²

Paul Seaward is director of the History of Parliament. His publications include *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–67* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), an edition of Thomas Hobbes's *Behemoth* for the Clarendon edition of Hobbes's works (Oxford University Press, 2010), and selections from Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* for the Oxford World's Classics series (2010). He is general editor, with Martin Dzelzainis, of a complete edition of the works of Clarendon to be published by Oxford University Press.

Owen Stanwood is Associate Professor of History at Boston College, where he has taught since 2009. He is the author of *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), as well as of articles that have appeared in *The Journal of British Studies*, *French Colonial History*, *The Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, *The American Historical Review*, and several edited volumes. He has won two prizes for previous articles, including the Walter D. Love Prize for the best article in British history by a North American scholar in 2008. He has received fellowships from the Library of Congress, the British Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the John Carter Brown Library, the Newberry Library, and the Massachusetts Historical Society.

² <<http://politicsofcounsel.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/>>

Introduction: Attempting Uniformity

N. H. Keeble

MONARCHY AND EPISCOPACY

On 2 January 1660 General George Monck, formerly the Protectorate's and now the Commonwealth's commander-in-chief in Scotland, crossed the Tweed into England and set in train the course of events that would lead to the calling of a free parliament, the Convention's vote on 1 May to restore monarchy and to recall the King, and Charles II's triumphant entry into London on 29 May, his thirtieth birthday.¹ It also, however, set in train another kind of restoration, as Monck himself foresaw. Whatever his true motives and intentions—on 18 January Pepys noted in his diary that 'All the world is now at a loss to think what Monke will do'²—publicly he remained committed to parliamentary government and a republican constitution. When, after reaching London on 9 February, on 21 February he readmitted to the Rump parliament those (chiefly Presbyterian) members who had been excluded by Pride's Purge in December 1648, it was 'on condition they would promise to Declare for a Common-wealth Government'. In his speech on that occasion, Monck asserted that 'I have nothing before my eyes but Gods Glory, and the settlement

¹ For accounts of the events leading to, and the process of, Restoration, see: Godfrey Davies, *The Restoration of Charles II, 1658–1660* (1955; reprinted London: Oxford University Press, 1969); Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658–1667* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); and, more briefly, N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 5–31, which is drawn on in what follows.

² Pepys, i: 22.

of these Nations, upon Common-wealth *Foundations*’, and in his explanatory letter to the army in justification of the restoration of the Long Parliament he again stated that ‘nothing was intended for *alteration of Government... as a free State and Common-wealth*’. In the words of Pepys’s succinct summary, he ‘recommended to them a commonwealth, and against Ch. Stuart’. To this, there was a corollary: in that same speech Monck observed that ‘as to Government in the church... It is most manifest, that if it be Monarchicall in the State, the Church must follow, and Prelacy must be brought in, which these nations I know cannot bear’.³

In this, Monck expressed a commonly held view. The aphorism of James VI of Scotland and I of England, ‘No bishop, no king’,⁴ encapsulated the close alliance between ecclesiastical and monarchical interest that characterized the government of his son Charles I and his first minister William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1660 few doubted that the restoration of monarchy would see a renewal of this alliance between church and state through the re-establishment of a national episcopal church. On this assumption, in February that year one of the arguments advanced against the return of the King by John Milton’s passionately republican pamphlet *The Readie & Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* was that the toleration of religious diversity enjoyed under the Commonwealth and Protectorate would not endure under monarchy: ‘we shall... begin to finde the old incroachments coming on by little and little upon our consciences, which must necessarily proceed from king and bishop united inseparably in one interest’. Monarchy and episcopacy are ‘individual’, that is, indivisible, he asserted in the second edition of the tract, warning that a return to kingship would consequently outlaw Puritan opinion and insist on conformity to the doctrine and liturgy of a re-established national episcopal church.⁵

At the time, this might have seemed an unduly gloomy prediction. Monck’s own religious views were Presbyterian, and it was Presbyterianism that the now fully restored Long Parliament set

³ Baker, 710; *The Speech and Declaration of His Excellency the Lord Generall Monck* (1659/[60]), 3, 4–5; *Old Parl. Hist.*, xxii: 140–3; Pepys, i: 62.

⁴ Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, ed. J. S. Brewer, 6 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1845), v: 297.

⁵ Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns (eds), *The Complete Works of John Milton*, 11 vols in progress, vol. vi: *Vernacular Regicide and Republican Writings*,

about reinstituting, together with a more liberal political sphere and franchise than had been tolerated by its predecessor, the Rump. It struck from the record all decisions surrounding Pride's Purge (including the refusal to treat with Charles I) and annulled the Rump's vote to restrict eligibility to stand in the forthcoming elections. On 5 March it reinstated the Solemn League and Covenant and agreed that the Westminster confession should be the confession of faith for the Church of England, both, though not without support from some Independents, firmly Presbyterian. On 13 March it voted to annul the Engagement, the 1650 oath of loyalty to the Commonwealth 'as it is now established, without a King or House of Lords' imposed upon all adult men, and it reaffirmed that Presbyterianism is the form of church government to be used in England and Ireland. The next day it agreed to broaden considerably the eligibility criteria for parliamentary candidates from the committedly republican franchise contemplated by its predecessor, the Rump. On 17 March writs for elections to a new parliament to meet on 25 April were issued.⁶

As the Long Parliament thus declared its monarchical and Presbyterian commitment, leading Presbyterian lords and MPs adopted the Civil War negotiating position they had taken with Charles I, namely, that the army and navy should be under parliamentary control and monarchy and church established on the clearly defined constitutional and Presbyterian principles enunciated in the Newcastle Propositions of 1646 and in the Treaty of Newport of 1648.⁷ Their support for the return of the King depended upon Charles II's acquiescence to such terms: 'there must be strict conditions to which he must be bound, which it should not be in his power to break', in the words of Charles II's Lord Chancellor, Edward Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon.⁸ The case changed, however, once the new parliament (or Convention, as it

ed. N. H. Keeble and Nicholas McDowell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 484, 509.

⁶ *CJ*, vii: 846 (annulment of the December 1648 votes and of restrictions on parliamentary candidature), 857 (15 March dissolution), 862 (reinstatement of the Covenant), 872 (annulment of the Engagement), 873–5 (Presbyterian church government and broadening of candidature eligibility), 880 (dissolution); *Mercurius Politicus*, 612 (15–22 March 1660), 1180–1 (writs).

⁷ Abernathy, 34, 48–9.

⁸ Clarendon, *HR*, vi: 191.

was not summoned by the monarch) met on 25 April: 'Very many' of those returned were, said Clarendon, 'of singular affection to the King, and very few who did not heartily abhor the murder of his father and detest the government that succeeded', with the result that the Convention was dominated by outright royalists and by Presbyterians, that is, conditional royalists (for although Milton spoke at this time of the 'new royaliz'd presbyterians' they had, as he well knew, always been monarchists).⁹ The former, however, outweighed the latter. Although, in Lucy Hutchinson's scornful phrase, the Presbyterians were now 'the white boyes' and did succeed in securing the election of a sympathetic Speaker, Harbottle Grimston, they lacked coherence and leadership as a group and found themselves unable to command an outright majority in either the Lords or Commons. Furthermore, by April the popular tide was running so strongly in favour of the return of Charles that for any Presbyterian member to make a stand for a conditional restoration was to jeopardize his position once the King had been restored.¹⁰ 'The Cavaliers', it was reported to Pepys, 'have now the upper hand clear of the Presbyterians'. The possibility of making terms with Charles, of offering a conditional restoration, simply never arose. His return was to be, as Andrew Marvell later remarked, neither 'soiled with the blood of Victory, nor lessened by any capitulations of Treaty'.¹¹

The one person who might have been expected to support the old Presbyterian negotiating position studiously declined to do so. With his usual taciturnity Monck, in the main, simply 'now sate still'. He made no opening address to the Parliament which he had called into being and offered that assembly no advice or guidance. However, and again as usual, he had a hand to play. On 1 May he revealed the

⁹ Clarendon, *HR*, vi: 193; Milton, *Vernacular Writings*, 509; Godfrey Davies, 'The General Election of 1660', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 15 (1951-2), 211-35; Louise F. Brown, 'Religious Factors in the Convention Parliament', *EHR*, 22 (1907), 52-5; J. R. Jones, 'Political Groups and Tactics in the Convention of 1660', *HJ*, 6 (1962-3), 160; Davies, *Restoration*, 319-34; Hutton, *Restoration*, 111-13; Henning, i: 27, 31-2; *Old Parl. Hist.*, xxii: 210-25.

¹⁰ *CJ*, viii: 1; Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. James Sutherland (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 227; Abernathy, 54-5; Jones, 'Political Groupings', 62-71; Hutton *Restoration*, 117-18; Henning, i: 27, 32.

¹¹ Pepys, i: 116 (26 April 60); Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpos'd*, in Annabel Patterson et al. (eds), *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2 vols (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), i: 90.

existence of letters and a *Declaration* dated by Charles from Breda on 4/14 April which were delivered to the speakers of Lords and Commons to be read: 'And from this time Charles Steward was no more heard of, and so universal a joy was never seen within those walls'. On what Pepys called the 'happiest May-day that hath been many a year in England', the Commons approved a motion concurring with the Lords that 'according to the antient and fundamental Laws of this Kingdom, the Government is, and ought to be, by King, Lords, and Commons' and that ways should be sought 'to obtain the King's Return to his People'.¹²

THE WORCESTER HOUSE DECLARATION

In the *Declaration of Breda* Charles's judicious first minister, Hyde, compiled one of the most delicately phrased of political documents. It contrived to reassure a range of political and religious opinion by its notable lack of vindictiveness and its moderate and conciliatory tone. It spoke of a restoration not of a king's authority over his subjects but of the nation to stability and legality, to 'our just rights and theirs in a free Parliament'. It presented a benevolent king, a healer, one who, in the political sphere, promised a 'free and general pardon' for past deeds, and in the religious, declared 'a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom'.¹³ This was reassuring and encouraging to Puritan opinion, but quite what it might mean in ecclesiastical practice would be a matter of debate and negotiation for the next eighteen months. That the Convention no more prescribed a church settlement than it did a political one was no cause of dismay to Baptists, Quakers, and many Independents, who suspected any Presbyterian

¹² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 229; Clarendon, *HR*, vi: 215; *CJ*, viii: 4–8; *LJ*, xi: 6–9; John Price, *The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restauration* (1686), 155–8; Maurice F. Bond (ed.), *The Diaries and Papers of Sir Edward Dering* (London: H.M.S.O., 1976), 35–7; Pepys, i: 122 (2 May 60); Davies, *Restoration*, 339–42; Hutton, *Restoration*, 118. The texts are in *CJ* and *LJ loc. cit.*, Baker, 723–9, Clarendon, *HR*, vi: 202–10, and in *Old Parl. Hist.*, xxii: 237–48.

¹³ Browning, 57–8.

inclination towards a treaty with the King as likely to impose upon them a uniformity as intolerant as might be imposed by episcopal authority. While the Presbyterians¹⁴ hoped for a church settlement sufficiently broad to include (or *comprehend* in contemporary terminology) them within the national church, these congregational and radical groupings looked for toleration (or *indulgence*) to worship independently. The questions to be confronted were: how broad would be the terms of communion in the re-established church and how far would dissent from them be tolerated?

For six months or so the signs were promising for supporters of comprehension at least. In religious affairs as in political the theme of 1660, taken up from the *Declaration of Breda*, was reconciliation. There was every indication that the national church would be established on sufficiently broad terms to allow it to accommodate a range of Protestant opinion: 'Some plain and moderate Episcopal Men though of Reconciliation and Union with the... Presbyterians; yea, and a Reward to the Presbyterians for bringing in the King'¹⁵ Preliminary discussions between these moderate episcopalians and Presbyterian divines appear to have begun as early as March 1660. On 25 April, on the eve of the Restoration, John Gauden, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, met the Presbyterians Richard Baxter and Thomas Manton at the house of Nicholas Bernard, formerly chaplain to Archbishop James Ussher, of whom he had published an appreciative *Life* in 1656. Their discussions were sympathetic to a form of moderate, or 'primitive', episcopacy, such as that proposed by Ussher as a basis for church union in the 1640s.¹⁶ This greatly reduced the size of episcopal sees and limited the authority of bishops by associating it with presbyters and restricting it to a single church, with a merely presidential role over other churches. In the spring of 1660 there seemed every likelihood that this conception of *episcopus*

¹⁴ The term is inappropriate for those Puritans who argued not for a strict Presbyterian church system but for a moderated episcopacy (see further pp. 8, 19, and nn. 16, 56). The 'odious Name' was rejected by Baxter since 'the Presbyterian Cause was never spoken for', but nevertheless 'the Vulgar called them by the name of *Presbyterians*' (*Rel. Bax.*, ii. 146, §23; ii. 278, §113; ii. 373, §242), cited on pp. 215, 218.

¹⁵ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 229, §87.

¹⁶ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 217, §76 and ii. 218, §80 (and cf. i. 62, §93(2)); Abernathy, 44–6; Bosher, 120–1; Green, 13–16. Baxter prints the *Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church, proposed in the year 1641* in *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 238–40. It had been published in 1656.

praeses, rather than ‘*Episcopus Princeps*; indued with *sole* Power both of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*’, would prevail. Baxter, who, with the Smectymnuan Edmund Calamy and Gauden, was chosen to preach at the opening of the Convention, ‘told them it was easy for moderate Men to come to a fair Agreement, and that the late Reverend Primate of *Ireland* and my self had agreed in half an Hour’. These words prompted ‘many moderate Episcopal Divines’ to seek him out to ask ‘what those Terms of our Agreement were’, ‘and we agreed as easily among our selves in private, as if almost all our Differences were at an end’.¹⁷

This tendency towards reconciliation received official encouragement. George Morley, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, had been dispatched to England by Hyde in March 1660 and engaged in discussions with William Bates and other Presbyterian divines, including Baxter, had heard he was ‘a Moderate Orthodox Man’. In April, Charles himself expressly encouraged Morley to have ‘frequent conferences’ with the Presbyterians, ‘that if it be possible, you may reduce them to such a temper, as is consistent with the good of the Church’.¹⁸ Following the King’s return, ‘for the Gratifying and Engaging some Chief Presbyterians, that had brought in the King’, a number, including those involved in continuing meetings to discuss the governance of the restored Church of England, were appointed chaplains to Charles.¹⁹ Charles took this inclination towards agreement ‘very well, and was resolved to further it’. At a personal audience in the summer with Baxter, Reynolds, Calamy, Simeon Ashe, John Wallis, Thomas Manton, and William Spurstowe at the lodgings of Edward Montagu, 2nd Earl of Manchester (now Lord Chamberlain), attended also by Hyde and Henry Jermyn, Earl of St. Albans, Charles heard from the Presbyterian ministers (and in particular from Baxter) a protestation of their loyalty and of their detestation of Cromwell’s usurpation, a plea that he should not be misled by misrepresentations

¹⁷ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 269, §106 (2) and ii. 217, 218, §§76, 80. Baxter refers to meetings with Ussher in 1654/55 (*Rel. Bax.*, ii. 206, §61). His sermon was printed as *A Sermon of Repentance* (1660), Gauden’s as *ΜΕΤΑΛΛΕΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ. God’s Great Demonstration and Demands of Justice, Mercy and Humanity* (1660).

¹⁸ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 218, §81; Bosher, 105–14, citing (113–14) Peter Barwick, *The Life of John Barwick* (1724), 525; Abernathy, 46–7, 54–5.

¹⁹ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 229, §88. They were: Simeon Ashe, William Bates, Richard Baxter, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Case, Thomas Manton, Edward Reynolds, William Spurstowe—‘But never any of them was called to Preach at Court, saving Mr. Calamy, Dr. Reynolds, my Self, and Dr. Spurstow, each of us once’ (*Rel. Bax.*, *loc. cit.*).

of them as factious and fanatical, and a reassurance of their desire for a comprehensive church settlement. He

gave us not only a free Audience, but as gracious an Answer as we could expect: professing his gladness to hear our Inclinations to Agreement, and his Resolution to do his part to bring us together; and it must not be by bringing one Party over to the other, but by abating somewhat on both sides, and meeting in the Midway; and that if it were not accomplished, it should be long of our selves, and not of him: Nay, that he was resolved to see it brought to pass, and that he would draw us together himself.²⁰

As a result of this meeting, proposals for a settlement were invited from the Presbyterian side. Drawn up during the early summer, these focused on church government, 'for that was the main Difference: if that were agreed there would be little danger of differing in the rest', with some recommendations touching liturgy and worship. Doctrinal differences were never raised as a threat to church unity. The Presbyterians proposed, in church government: the model of reduced episcopacy drawn up by Ussher, 'without a Word of alteration...that the World might see...that we pleaded not at all with them for *Presbytery*, unless a *Moderate Episcopacy* be *Presbytery*'; in liturgy: that the Prayer Book should be subject to revision by a group of 'Learned, Godly and Moderate Divines of both Perswasions', before being reimposed; and, in ceremonies: that disputed incidentals, such as the use of the cross in baptism and kneeling to receive the sacrament, should not be imposed but left to the individual conscience.²¹

These were moderate and practical propositions but they conflicted with two convictions of growing influence among episcopalians: first, that diocesan episcopacy (or prelacy) was essential not merely to the well-being but to the being of the church no less than monarchical rule by a single person was essential to right order in the state; second, that submission to that authority, leading to uniformity in religious observance, was the mark of a Christian state.²²

²⁰ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 229, 230–1, §§87, 90–1.

²¹ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 232–58, §§92–101, which prints the papers (quotations from 231, §92, 232, §96, 235, §96, 2(2)); cf. ii. 278, §113. For the names of those involved in the discussions, see ii. 229, §§87–8, and ii. 232, §§95–6.

²² Spurr, 10–11, 138–43 (132–63 survey views of episcopacy in the Restoration church with a wealth of evidence). Baxter attributed this 'New Prelatical way' largely to the influence of Henry Hammond (*Rel. Bax.*, i. 97, §140; ii. 149, §29; *Five Disputations of Church Government* (1659), 5–9), a view substantially borne

The episcopalians did agree to the revision of the liturgy ‘by such discreet Persons as his Majesty shall think fit’, but it was with some justification that Baxter nevertheless characterized their reply to the Presbyterian proposals as a ‘Paper of bitter Oppositions’, for it contrived to associate the case for moderate episcopacy with the sedition of the Interregnum, with democratic anarchy and with discontent at the restoration of monarchy. It expressed surprise that anyone should claim that ‘Administration of government by one single Person’ was to be avoided in the church for fear of partiality and corrupt practices when such an idea, ‘if applied to the Civil State, is a most dangerous Insinuation’. Lest the point be missed, the reply went on:

we verily believe what Experience and the Constitutions of Kingdom, Armies and even private Families sufficiently confirmeth (in all which the Government is administered by the Authority of one single Person...) that the Government of many is not only most subject to...Evils and Inconveniencies, but more likely also to breed and foment perpetual Factions both in Church and State, than the Government by one is or can be.²³

In short, ‘No bishop, no King’. Any suggestion that individuals might vary ceremonial practice was similarly rejected as a licence to question and challenge the competence of properly constituted authority. That some ceremonies were queried is occasioned less by the practices themselves than by ‘the unsubduedness of some Mens Spirits’ which are ‘more apt to contend, than willing to submit their private Opinions to the Publick Judgment of the Church’. It is not the business of conscience to pretend to arbitrate between an individual and ecclesiastical law but in matters indifferent—that is, matters not prescribed by divine law²⁴—to submit to ‘lawful Authority’ in church as in state.²⁵

Nevertheless, the executive continued to be more liberally disposed. The government had delayed filling the bench of bishops during the summer and now that it moved to do so it included men of known moderation. By 1660 seventeen of the twenty-six English and

out by John W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643–1660, with Special Reference to Henry Hammond* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969).

²³ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 243, §101 (§8).

²⁴ See Chapter 1 for further discussion of the concept of *adiaphora*.

²⁵ Baxter *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 241, §101, ii. 245, §101 (§20), ii. 246, §101 (§§24, 26).

Welsh sees had fallen vacant.²⁶ Earlier in the summer offers of preferment to a number of Presbyterians seemed to confirm the goodwill of the restored regime: the bishoprics of Hereford, Coventry and Lichfield, and Norwich were offered to Baxter, Edmund Calamy, and Edward Reynolds respectively, and the deaneries of Rochester, Coventry and Lichfield, and York to Thomas Manton, William Bates, and Edward Bowles.²⁷ Only Reynolds accepted, but the episcopalians consecrated in October and December 1660 and in January 1661 included such men as Gauden, John Hacket, Humfrey Henchman, Robert Sanderson, and Nicholas Monck. These were not men identified with 'the prelatical party', the 'high episcopal men', the 'Laudians', as they were variously styled. Gauden was the author of the moderate *Slight Healings of Publique Hurts* (1660) and Sanderson excelled in precisely that practical and casuistical divinity which the Puritans especially valued.²⁸

Meanwhile, on 4 September the Commons passed the Act for Confirming Ministers which recognized the legitimacy of non-episcopal orders and imposed no liturgical or ceremonial test upon beneficed ministers. There were some ejections as a result of this act, but by far the majority of Interregnum clergy were confirmed in the livings they had held in the Cromwellian church.²⁹ In his speech at the adjournment of the Convention on 13 September Hyde spoke for reconciliation and compromise and promised a royal declaration on religion.³⁰ A first draft of this declaration had been received by the Presbyterians on 4 September and a meeting to discuss and revise it, at which the King was present, was held on 22 October at Hyde's residence, Worcester House.³¹ Baxter left this meeting

²⁶ Spurr, 35. The nine surviving bishops were: Brian Duppa of Salisbury (1641, translated to Winchester in 1660); Accepted Frewen of Coventry and Lichfield (1643, elevated to York in 1660); William Juxon of London (1633, elevated to Canterbury in 1660); Henry King of Chichester (1642); William Piers successively of Peterborough (1630) and Bath and Wells (1632); William Roberts of Bangor (1637); Robert Skinner successively of Bristol (1636) and Oxford (1641); John Warner of Rochester (1637); Matthew Wren successively of Norwich (1635) and Ely (1638).

²⁷ *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 281–4, §§118–27; Boshier, 93–4; Green, 83–7.

²⁸ Boshier, 79–84; Green, 28–30, 82–90, 89–98, 255, and appendix vi; Spurr, 35.

²⁹ *CJ*, viii: 149; Boshier, 177.

³⁰ *CJ*, viii: 95; *LJ*, xi: 175–6; Boshier, 169.

³¹ For the Worcester House negotiations, those present, and attendant papers (including the draft *Declaration*), see *Rel. Bax.*, ii. 259–79, §§105–14; Boshier, 184–8; Abernathy, 65–77; and, in most detail, Barry Till, 'The Worcester House Declaration', *HR*, 70 (1997), 203–30.