

Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



The Universality of Discipline: Restoration of the English Episcopacy 1660–1688

Marcus Harmes

Volume 33, Number 1, Winter 2010

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1106623ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v33i1.14633>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Harmes, M. (2010). The Universality of Discipline: Restoration of the English Episcopacy 1660–1688. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 33(1), 55–79. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v33i1.14633>

Article abstract

Cet article offre une analyse d'un aspect relativement négligé de la pensée épiscopaliennne anglaise du dix-septième siècle. Il s'agit de la dégradation et des violences éprouvées par des membres épiscopaliens durant les guerres civiles, qui ont ensuite servi d'arguments en faveur de la puissance épiscopaliennne. Pendant la Restauration, certains éléments de l'Église épiscopaliennne ont instauré une politique que les chercheurs ont qualifiée de « High Tory », et qu'ils ont considérée comme visant la persécution systématique des dissidents. Toutefois, ces politiques étaient accompagnées de tracts issus d'auteurs épiscopaliens montrant comment les évêques eux-mêmes avaient souffert. Une lecture systématique de ces tracts, et des sermons des évêques, et à leur sujet, en particulier les sermons de consécration, nous donnent accès aux conceptions que l'épiscopat avait de lui-même pendant la Restauration. Ces sources révèlent tout un corps ecclésiastique organisant une pratique de persécution, alors qu'il souligne les persécutions dont lui-même a fait l'objet.

The Universality of Discipline: Restoration of the English Episcopacy 1660–1688¹

MARCUS HARMES

The University of Queensland

Cet article offre une analyse d'un aspect relativement négligé de la pensée épiscopaliennne anglaise du dix-septième siècle. Il s'agit de la dégradation et des violences éprouvées par des membres épiscopaliens durant les guerres civiles, qui ont ensuite servi d'arguments en faveur de la puissance épiscopaliennne. Pendant la Restauration, certains éléments de l'Église épiscopaliennne ont instauré une politique que les chercheurs ont qualifiée de « High Tory », et qu'ils ont considérée comme visant la persécution systématique des dissidents. Toutefois, ces politiques étaient accompagnées de tracts issus d'auteurs épiscopaliens montrant comment les évêques eux-mêmes avaient souffert. Une lecture systématique de ces tracts, et des sermons des évêques, et à leur sujet, en particulier les sermons de consécration, nous donnent accès aux conceptions que l'épiscopat avait de lui-même pendant la Restauration. Ces sources révèlent tout un corps ecclésiastique organisant une pratique de persécution, alors qu'il souligne les persécutions dont lui-même a fait l'objet.

Introduction

During the Civil Wars, King Charles I and the bishops of the Church of England suffered various forms of persecution ranging from deprivation to execution.² The downfall of bishops in 1646, and the suffering that followed, added to a noteworthy strand of seventeenth-century thought in which churchmen claimed the identity of martyrs, claims grounded in the experiences of a wide spectrum of English religious experiences. For instance, the Caroline dissenter William Prynne recalled every bloody detail of the punishment inflicted on the Puritan Dr John Bastwick (1593–1654), and Bastwick's willingness "to spill every drop" of his blood when he was pilloried on Archbishop William Laud's order outside Parliament in Westminster.³ From the other side of the polemical exchange, narratives transmitted the sufferings of specific bishops in pungent and pithy anecdotes. Thus Bishop Manwaring roamed from alehouse to alehouse, while Bishop Morton of Winchester escaped from his cathedral city disguised as a labourer on a dung cart.⁴ During the Commonwealth,

bishops in England suffered from varying degrees of mistreatment; notably, Laud and Wren were excluded from the general pardon offered to their colleagues contained in the Uxbridge Propositions. Other clergy were not treated so severely.⁵ But the deprived bishops in England experienced the disciplinary measures of the religious authorities of the Commonwealth, experiences which later gave coherent meaning to attempts to legitimate the authority of the restored bishops after 1660. Between 1660 and 1662 parliamentary legislation revived the deans and chapters of cathedrals, recreated bishoprics, and restored the advowsons and estates which formed the Church of England's revenues. As bishoprics revived, so did the disciplinary powers of the Church. No Restoration bishop had the authority to imprison dissenters; those powers were reserved for magistrates and justices of the peace. Nonetheless, the first years of the restoration restored the office of bishop, as well as the revenues of that office, and implemented legislation which made dissent from episcopal authority illegal.⁶

These restored powers came after more than a decade of legal and financial deprivation for bishops and many decades of contestation of episcopal authority. Both in 1646, at the time of the episcopate's abolition, and again after 1660, Protestant divines condemned episcopacy as being inherently popish. Central to this perception were the disciplinary functions of bishops. It seemed to Protestant dissenters that English bishops were at their most popish when exercising their authority. Against this background of contested authority, episcopal writers stressed that bishops were themselves the targets of disciplinary strictures. A tightly associated body of literature interpreted the persecution of both episcopal and dissenting clergy during the Commonwealth and into the Restoration, and in doing so historicized the authority of the English episcopate by directing attention to its own suppression and suffering.⁷ For example, the writings of John Gauden (d.1663) and Thomas Long (1621–1707) addressed the reputation of English bishops for being persecutors.⁸ This evidence provides a necessary context for the accounts of episcopal authority which located that authority in the subversion of the bishops.

Establishing the common narrative of episcopal suffering in the writings of Edward Young (c.1641/2–1708), Thomas Wilson (dates unknown), Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715), Thomas Tenison (1636–1715) and William Sancroft (1617–1693), my paper argues that accounts of episcopal suffering allowed episcopal clergy to illustrate the discipline exercised by other Protestant communities. These writers can be read as revealing a common emphasis on the treatment of bishops during the Commonwealth.⁹ Although the persecution and proscription of the episcopate during the Commonwealth was all too real for the bishops, it allowed English divines to

theorize about the imposition of ecclesiastical authority and to demonstrate that all reformed authorities insisted upon some degree of conformity. Further, this paper finds a complex reading of episcopal authority in the work of Edward Stillingfleet (1635–1699), court preacher and then bishop of Worcester and contemporary to Young, Wilson, Burnet, Sancroft and Tenison. Stillingfleet identified the grounds of English episcopal authority in the usurpation of these powers by Protestant opponents of episcopacy. His work pointed to the disciplinary imperatives exercised by other Protestants in England during the Commonwealth and queried why these powers should be denied to the bishops or be castigated as popish.

The arguments and works examined here raise questions of the effective relationship between suffering and the authority of the restored English episcopacy. Episcopal churchmen of the Restoration advanced two polemical points especially pertinent here: first, that the suffering of bishops under the Commonwealth amounted to a form of martyrdom; and second, that dissenters themselves overused and misapplied the title of martyrdom when pointing to their punishment by bishops who had regained their authority after 1660. For example, the episcopal chaplain and future non-juror Nathaniel Bisbie (1635–1695) argued that dissenters were in error in claiming to be martyrs and that their doctrinal errors meant they could not be martyrs. His argument reflected the much earlier claims of Cardinal Reginald Pole (d.1558), Mary Tudor's archbishop, that the Marian Martyrs had been in error and were therefore no martyrs.¹⁰ Churchmen of the Restoration were as such applying old arguments concerning the validation of authority through suffering. The suffering of bishops during the Commonwealth years provided the Restoration episcopate with the means of reconciling the downfall of episcopal authority with its resurrection and the application of its authority.¹¹

Developments during the Civil Wars had revealed the vulnerability of episcopal authority, as opponents of episcopacy who were also supporters of Charles I had seen the possibility of a state with a king but no bishops. The idea that the King was a captive of evil advisers, including Archbishop Laud, circulated during the 1630s, serving to separate Charles rhetorically from his archbishop and bishops.¹² It is also the case that Charles had been prepared to abandon the bishops of the Church of England.¹³ Bishops therefore returned in 1660 distanced from an older association with royal power.¹⁴ The confrontation between crown and Church was later reinforced by the troubled relationship between Charles II and Archbishop Gilbert Sheldon (in office 1663–1676), and was most emphatically declared by the events of 1688, when English bishops revolted against their sovereign.¹⁵ The exchange between Church of England clergy and King James II preserved in the State Papers captures the King's

expectation of the loyalty of the Church of England and his bewilderment at their disloyalty. In exchanges which emerged from the flashpoint of the Magdalen College election controversy, in which college fellows refused the King's order to elect his own nominee as president, the King rhetorically exclaimed, "Is this your Church of England's loyalty?"¹⁶ While speaking in the light of a specific crisis, James's words reflect more broadly the distinctions in royal and episcopal priorities, distinctions apparent also in the different trajectories which royal and episcopal martyrdoms followed in Restoration thought. Stuart monarchs could envisage ruling without bishops, but some bishops could imagine episcopacy underpinned by forces other than monarchical or Erastian authority. Devoid of royal or courtly support, bishops stressed the reformed origins of their authority and found in their actual vulnerability the rhetorical substance for their reformed power.

Even if Charles I had not been the champion that his bishops may have wanted, his death and suffering occupied a prominent aspect of Restoration religious culture. Charles I had proclaimed his martyrdom under the circumstances of the Commonwealth, claims amplified after his death in 1649 and into the later-seventeenth century by bishops, divines, and royalist gentlemen.¹⁷ But the execution of the King and the privations of the English bishops during the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth cast enduring but different shadows into the Restoration age. The accession of Charles II in 1660 highlighted the triumphalist connotations of Charles I's execution. Andrew Lacy's recent survey of contemporary reactions to Charles's death stresses the notion of the "Glorious Failure," meaning that his failures as king revealed a celestial victory.¹⁸

Charles's apotheosis and the resurrection of his reputation and dynasty, if not his actual corporeal resurrection, find no parallels in the Restoration accounts of episcopal sufferings. The emphasis given to his martyrdom reveals the distinctive path pursued by writers and polemicists on episcopal martyrdoms. Narratives of episcopal suffering, retelling the execution of William Laud, the long imprisonment of Matthew Wren, or the milder problems of bishops who were rusticated or molested, contained polemical intentions for justifying the restoration of episcopal discipline after 1660.

Destruction and Recreation

While many historians point out the disturbances and destruction of the Civil Wars, some modern scholars including John Morrill have conversely argued for the relative ecclesiastical stability of the 1640s and 1650s. Morrill's investigations

of parish registers and churchwardens' accounts reveal the continuing use of *The Book of Common Prayer* in many churches even after the abolition of bishops, the execution of Archbishop Laud in 1645, and the publication of the *Directory for Public Worship*—the service which replaced the prayer book. Morrill reconstructs from this same evidence the continued celebration of communion at Easter and Christmas and the continuity in Church personnel, as many vicars and rectors remained in office from the 1640s into the 1650s.¹⁹ Morrill argues for the survival and the significance of “Popular Anglicanism.”²⁰ But the parochial continuities uncovered by Morrill contrast with the upheaval at the highest ecclesiastical levels. While many clergy continued to function in their parishes and used the prayer book, these clergy were no longer licensed or supervised by bishops based in their palaces. Instead, political and religious forces of the 1640s violently threw down bishops, and continuities in episcopal government and cathedral worship were violently broken, even if they remained at a lower level.²¹

The Long Parliament abolished bishops in 1646 and replaced them with Protestant authorities who were preoccupied with church discipline, even in the absence of bishops. The Presbyterian minister Robert Baillie (1599–1662) urged the English parliament to enforce strong parochial discipline. His fellow Presbyterian Thomas Edwards (d.1647) pointed to the importance of national church authority and the control of clergy.²² Church discipline remained, although no general system of Presbyterian discipline existed; instead, some measure of religious freedom existed with only the piecemeal authority of the Assembly of Divines.²³ The treatment of bishops during the Commonwealth and the later interpretation of this treatment emerged from lengthy and longstanding debates in both England and Europe about the status of bishops. Critics of the Church of England before the Civil Wars evinced rhetorical confusion between Romanist and reformed bishops, and for this reason viewed bishops as an unreformed relic of Roman Catholicism. From the 1570s the English episcopate had faced a full-blown Presbyterian attack which gained intensity and momentum during the seventeenth century. This dispute turned on the question of whether the episcopate could be an agent of reformed authority. By 1572 the Admonition Controversy of the Elizabethan period had established the broad contours of polemical debate that would continue in contestations between individual clergy such as John Whitgift and Thomas Cartwright on the issue of scripturally-endorsed church government.²⁴ Lectures delivered in 1570 on ecclesiastical hierarchies by the divinity professor Thomas Cartwright (1535–1603) indicate the substance of arguments made against bishops, arguing against unreformed episcopal rule and in favour of congregational episcopacy.²⁵

Episcopacy prevailed during these disputes until its abolition by the Long Parliament. This point is necessary to understanding the episcopate's approach to its degradation. Following their restoration in 1660, members of the episcopate pointed out that dissenters viewed episcopal authority as popish in origins and appearance yet had been content to exercise that same authority under different circumstances. The priorities of Baillie and Edwards are also important for understanding the circumstances that bishops endured. Aside from Laud's execution and Wren's protracted imprisonment in the Tower of London, episcopal suffering more often took the form of rustication, as Manwaring and Morton show. Furthermore, Baillie and Edwards did not achieve their goal, as uniform religious discipline did not prevail under the Commonwealth in spite of efforts by the Westminster Assembly of Divines.²⁶ The usurped authority which Restoration bishops pointed to as inhering in the Commonwealth was never an ordered reality, for the religious circumstances of the Commonwealth included elements of prayer book observance and significant dissent among episcopal opponents. Yet restored bishops found in the Republican religious authorities the substance of their suffering and the mirror image of their authority. Contemporary literature reveals the conception that episcopal authority and episcopal degradation could be connected: Protestant dissenters had claimed and exercised authority against bishops, and episcopal writers argued that authority derided as popish had been exercised by Commonwealth churchmen who proclaimed their own impeccably reformed credentials.

Disciplining Bishops

For members of the episcopate, the circumstances of their deprivation in the Commonwealth therefore pointed to the powers they could reclaim in 1660. Modern scholars highlight the significance of events of the 1640s and 1650s to understanding the recreation of episcopal rule in the first years of Restoration. Recent studies of the episcopate in Restoration England have stressed both the disciplinary capacities of the restored bishops and their fixation on their suffering during the Commonwealth. These points converged in the minds of the restored English bishops. John Spurr points to the importance of the experiences of episcopal clergy during the Civil War to interpreting Restoration church discipline. He speculates that the experiences of some clergy during the Civil War may have encouraged greater feelings of tolerance towards Protestant dissenters on the part of the bishops upon their return to power at the Restoration.²⁷

Spurr further speculates that the experiences of episcopal clergy under the Commonwealth encouraged their efforts to unite the dissenting clergy of the Restoration Church with the established Church. He particularly draws attention to Edward Stillingfleet's enumeration of which of the Thirty Nine Articles dissenters needed to conform to and which not, as being an illustration of ecclesiastical latitude.²⁸ Other scholars have reflected Spurr's approach to the recreation of the Church of England. Barry Collett argues that John Cosin, the Bishop of Durham, reflected Stillingfleet's latitude and intended to revise the *Book of Common Prayer* to make it "communal and inclusive."²⁹

Ambitions for ecclesiastical union were tightly bound up with the application and extent of episcopal power. Suggestions for reducing or limiting episcopacy were intended to achieve union among English Protestants. In 1641 John Williams, the Bishop of Lincoln, had investigated the possibility of instituting an elected episcopacy.³⁰ In the same decade, the means of reducing episcopacy were most thoroughly explored by Archbishop Ussher of Armagh.³¹ Arguments about reducing the episcopate were more muted after 1660, but during the Restoration the episcopate remained a source of controversial debate as different options for church government were explored.³² Judge Jeffrey referred disparagingly to ongoing attempts to reform the episcopate, alluding to "primitive Episcopacy" as advocating "a bishop in every parish"³³, meaning that the diocesan oversight of bishops would be substantially and dramatically reduced.

These strategies for reduction were not confined to conforming divines and bishops. Dissenting divines also urged the reduction of episcopacy to a near-parochial level of jurisdiction.³⁴ Spurr argues that churchmen of the Restoration pursued Latitudinarian policies, as divines urged that "little things" could be "conceded" in order to accommodate dissenters.³⁵ Among these little things was the extent of episcopal power. Proposals were made to adjust the power of bishops, or rather to reduce the episcopacy to something resembling the Calvinist presbytery—i.e. dismantle the exclusive sacramental and disciplinary powers of bishops, such as ordination, consecration and licensing, and construct an inclusive ministry in which bishops shared these duties with other ministers.³⁶ In seeking a satisfactory understanding of Restoration church discipline, Spurr asserts the moderation, even gentleness, inherent in this idea and that episcopal churchmen adopted a position intended to encourage the return of dissenters to the Church of England.³⁷ It is possible to invert Spurr's analysis. If anything, it can be argued that the experiences of the English clergy under non-episcopal ecclesiastical government reinforced the impression that other reformed communities enjoined discipline and enforced their authority.

Episcopal Authority During the Restoration

By 1660 the ranks of the bishops had been severely depleted. Manuscript sources left by Thomas Birch, biographer of Archbishop Tillotson, indicate the parlous state of the episcopate by 1660 and the importance of consecrations to rebuilding it. For example, Birch recorded that “Tillotson took orders (as he hath told me) from the Old Scottish Bp of Galloway, who at that time had recourse made to him on that account.”³⁸ Birch recounted an episcopate on the verge of extinction, for only one member of the Scottish episcopate had survived and the English bishops comprised elderly and unwell bishops such as William Juxon, the former Lord Treasurer and Bishop of London.³⁹ Surviving and new members of the episcopate asserted the necessity of their recreated order. The notion of a divinely appointed and instituted episcopate re-emerged after 1660. In the year of the Restoration, the court preacher William Sancroft delineated the apostolic origins of the English episcopate’s authority, declaring on the divine origin of bishops that: “Twas *the Holy Ghost*, that *made you Bishops*.”⁴⁰

Sancroft’s sermon repeated well-established ideas, but contemporary writers incorporated the more recent history of the Civil Wars and Commonwealth into statements of episcopal authority. In stressing the suffering of their order, English bishops were therefore narrating and interpreting the temporary destruction of episcopal authority and developing the self-conception of martyrs for the Church. Peter King attributes Oliver Cromwell’s reluctance to execute Matthew Wren, the imprisoned bishop of Ely, to Cromwell’s desire not to create any episcopal martyrs.⁴¹ Cromwell’s attitude reveals the rhetorical substance given to episcopal suffering during the Commonwealth and into the Restoration period. Yet the identity of martyrs and claims to have suffered martyrdom became a contested area of Restoration religious thought. Nathaniel Bisbie (1635–1695) argued in 1682 that dissenting Protestants overused the term martyr.⁴² Earlier writers including Thomas Browne (1605–82) and John Donne (c.1572–1631) had discussed the meaning of martyrdom in a reformed context and explicated a meaning of martyrdom pertinent to that context, particularly meaning that martyrs could exist without the supernatural signs accompanying narratives of Roman Catholic martyrs.⁴³ Echoing their ideas, Bisbie acknowledged that since the Reformation others had claimed the title of martyr and had asserted their own sufferings, as “We live in an age that talks much of Suffering.”⁴⁴ Bisbie’s text rejected such claims, as for Bisbie English martyrs were created exclusively by the “*Marian Flames*.”⁴⁵ Yet Bisbie’s text reveals more than a rejection of claims by Restoration dissenters to

be martyrs. Bisbie established the centrality of ideas of persecution in the thought of the episcopal bench. Instead, his analysis of varying conceptions of martyrs was incorporated into a discussion of episcopal authority. Claims by dissenters to be martyrs functioned, in Bisbie's opinion, as an "endeavour to run down the Church of *England*; making the truly Orthodox and Loyal Members thereof the only Oppofers of *Chrift*, and themselves the only Confessors; Us the Martyrers, and them the Martyrs."⁴⁶

Bisbie reflected ideas and language which had long currency in religious disputes. Peter Heylyn, chaplain to Archbishop Laud, complained that dissenters "cry out" allegations of persecution, claims which Heylyn found to lack substance.⁴⁷ In 1649, the lawyer and controversialist William Prynne noted that traditionally in the Apostolic age bishops had been among the martyrs of the Church. But since that time, "instead of being Martyrs," the bishops "fell a persecuting and making Martyrs." During the Restoration the legal and religious vulnerability of dissenters was again raised in the anonymous tract, *The Regular Clergy's Sole Right to Administer Christian Baptism*. The various sides of this issue were expressed by a dialogue between "a Churchman and a Diffenter," known respectively as "Orthodoxus" and "Philo-Schifmaticus."⁴⁸ "Philo-Schifmaticus" articulated the substance of their discussion, observing that: "If we have no Sacraments, then it follows, we have no true Minister, then our Church is no Church; and then, I think, there is an End of the Toleration."⁴⁹ According to this work, dissent was understood by its legal vulnerability. Bisbie's own works reflected in general this strand of thought but also rejected it.⁵⁰

Bisbie's point can be located in a wider body of evidence from the Restoration. The "Person of Quality," an anonymous writer whose works were written from the perspective of a loyal and orthodox member of the Church of England, addressed a body of dissenting brethren, who claimed the title and status of "Confessors and Martyrs."⁵¹ The tract was grounded in a specific political context, namely the Exclusion Crisis of the last years of Charles II's reign.⁵² The "Person's" conclusion was that the idea and label of persecution was being mis-used, for "no man is persecuted."⁵³ The "Person of Quality" argued that claims by dissenters to have been persecuted were misplaced in late-seventeenth-century England. While he disputed labels and titles, like Bisbie he asserted the powers of the English bishops to enforce discipline. Citing an opinion, apparently from a foreign Protestant divine, the "Person of Quality" discovered that "if he [the foreign Protestant] were in *England*, he would be of the *Episcopal Party*, and heartily submit himself to the *Discipline* and *Government* of the *Church of England*."⁵⁴ The "Person of Quality" therefore asserted the power of the Church's leadership to impose discipline.

For martyrs to be created, ecclesiastical authority had to be exercised. Since the sixteenth century, churchmen as diverse as Archbishop Matthew Parker and John Field, an Elizabethan puritan leader, had stressed the necessity for church discipline.⁵⁵ The Calvinist divine Robert Sanderson (1587–1663, bishop of Lincoln 1660–63) rose to the episcopal bench, having produced a body of work which stressed the importance of ecclesiastical order.⁵⁶ These ideas also characterized ecclesiastical discipline in the seventeenth century. The puritan Richard Baxter (1615–1691) attempted to institute parochial discipline after the collapse of episcopal control in the 1640s.⁵⁷ In this respect, it was possibly not a long or difficult intellectual leap from a Calvinist presbyter to a bishop, given the widely-placed emphasis on church discipline.

Yet in the eyes of some contemporary observers the episcopate seemed most unreformed when applying its authority, and the gulf between episcopal and reformed authority could seem extensive.⁵⁸ Sources emanating from the Roman Catholic and dissenting communities cohered in outlining the repressive policies of Restoration bishops. An anonymous Roman Catholic author, writing in 1688, argued that since 1660 English bishops had exercised an authority which was not only severe but illegitimate. Writing at the height of the crisis when the Fellows of Magdalen College Oxford had bridled at the imposition of a Roman Catholic president by James II, he referred to one of the Anglican critics of the King's actions, John Sharp, the rector of St Martin-in-the-Fields, and argued that "if His MAJESTY would have proceeded against Dr. *Sharp* according to the Method these Church of *England* Judges have directed against *Puritans*, the Doctors offence muft have been made a Matter Criminal worthy of open Shame."⁵⁹

This tract contained an argument relating to the ambiguity inherent in the imposition of reformed episcopal authority and questioned not only the severity of English bishops, but the possibility of reformed bishops being able to impose their discipline at all. Thus disputes over episcopal authority resided in issues of suffering and persecution. As the anonymous Roman Catholic observed " ... it's not eafy for the Church of *England* to speak against the *Authority* of His MAJESTIES Commifioners, or the Legality of their Proceedings, without Condemning Themfelves, for what they have done against the *Puritaines*."⁶⁰ Asserting the rhetorical similarities between Roman and English conduct, the anonymous author argued that: "The Cafe in fhort will be brought to this; Either the Church of *England* has moft unjuftly Deprived the old *Puritaines*; or, the KING has very Righteoufly Sufpended the Bifhop of *London*, and Expell'd the Fellows of *Magdalen* College."⁶¹ The anonymous author was not accusing the Roman Church or the Roman Catholic King of acting severely.

Rather this text highlighted the ambiguity of the reformed English Church exerting ecclesiastical discipline.⁶²

Bisbie's sermon *The Bishop Visiting* addressed a similar point, arguing that dissenters saw bishops as the creators of martyrs.⁶³ Bisbie's texts, even in his age and context, are notably enthusiastic for their calls for the prosecution of dissenters and for their emphasis on physical punishment. Bisbie spoke of a bishop's authority to resort to "his rod and his keys" when chastising, subduing and punishing dissenters from the Church of England.⁶⁴ The nature of this authority was explicitly prelatial, for the accoutrements of power, especially the keys, were Apostolic and Petrine. After the Restoration, the Act of Uniformity did not give bishops powers to discipline congregations and ministers without episcopal licence, but with the Act of Uniformity Parliament did create the legal infrastructure to enforce episcopal authority, rebuilding an earlier system where consistory courts had handed over offenders to secular courts.⁶⁵ The interaction between episcopal courts and secular authority re-emerged, and in this period the actual punishment of dissent was magisterial and carried out by Justices of the Peace under statute, on behalf of bishops.⁶⁶ Bisbie's emphasis was not universal, and his contemporary William Cave (1637–1713) argued that "God never intended His Laws should have been oppression and a torment."⁶⁷ Interpreters of episcopal authority, including Bisbie, would not have acknowledged the creation of torment by bishops, but did stress their capacity to govern and to punish.

The Persecution of Bishops

Religious writers during the Restoration therefore identified the severity of restored ecclesiastical authority. Churchmen loyal to episcopal rule were alert to these arguments. The episcopal writer Thomas Long identified those who held dissenters to be martyrs, observing that dissenters viewed the Church of England as a "House of Bondage."⁶⁸ Long's text sought to invert this perception and he outlined the suffering of bishops rather than persecutions enacted by bishops. His text embedded evidence intended to create an association between episcopal power and episcopal suffering. For Long, this suffering could be precisely identified. Referring to the same events as the anonymous Roman Catholic writer above, Long argued that from the Commonwealth into the later Restoration, the episcopal hierarchy had been subject to attack and deprivation. In Long's immediate context, the clearest evidence of the suffering of bishops was the suspension of the bishop of London (Henry Compton) by James II for refusing to discipline Dr James Sharp. For Long,

this act was merely a prelude to further attacks upon the established Church and its leaders. His perception on this issue was mirrored by an address from the House of Lords to William III, James II's successor, which recalled a clear sense of anxiety at dangers to the Church of England under James II, as William III had "been pleased to rescue [the Church] from that dangerous Conspiracy that was laid for Her Destruction."⁶⁹ Long also noted that "In this one Noble Bishop [Compton] the whole Hierarchy of *England* were struck at, and his Sentence [was] but a Prologue to the Tragedy intended."⁷⁰ The political circumstances of 1688, namely the suspension of Compton from his episcopal duties and the trial in Westminster Hall of the Archbishop of Canterbury and six of his bishops, allowed Long to postulate the ultimate ruin of the Church of England's bishops.

Authority and Suffering

Long's fear that ruin confronted the episcopate emerged from his study of the longer history of the episcopate, which stressed that bishops and the episcopal order in general had withstood attacks. By 1688, the attacks came from a Roman Catholic king and his courtiers and chaplains. This had not always been the case, and defences of Restoration episcopal authority came from attacks on the episcopate by Protestant religious authorities. The stress upon the vulnerability of the episcopate to other Protestant authorities appeared in religious discourse throughout the Restoration. In 1660 William Sancroft preached at an episcopal consecration in Westminster Abbey and declared "blesed be this Day ... in which we see the Phoenix arising from her *Funeral Pile* and taking wing again; our *Holy Mother*, the Church, standing up from the Duft and Ruins, in which she fate for so long."⁷¹ That same year Bishop Sheldon of London savoured the triumph of his position, but the triumphalist tone of Sheldon and Sancroft at the Church's restoration also contained a more plaintive bleat that recounted episcopal hardships.⁷² This theme is illustrated by John Gauden, appointed to the see of Exeter in 1660. Gauden was the most likely author of the *Eikon Basilike*, the text which narrated the spiritual sufferings of King Charles I.⁷³ Before the Restoration, Gauden recounted how many dissenters were "rejoicing to see the *Church of England* brought to so broken and infirm, so *poor* and *deffpicable*, so mean and miserable a condition, as she now appears."⁷⁴ During the Commonwealth the English liturgy was revised in a manner that stressed this perception of the persecution of the Church. As W. Jardine Grisbrook points out, the liturgist Jeremy Taylor composed a series of offices "to be said in the days of the Persecution of a Church." Taylor's service included appropriate hymns, which while intended to be

“[c]onsolatory,” also stressed the martyrdom of the Church.⁷⁵ Gauden and Taylor wrote in the 1650s. During the Restoration, the description of what for Gauden and Taylor were the circumstances through which they had lived became historical narratives of persecution and the substance of defences of reformed episcopacy.

The themes of consolation in suffering that Taylor and Gauden highlighted did not lose currency after the Restoration. The dean of Windsor, Gregory Hascard, asserted the credentials of the Church of England as a persecuted Church. According to Hascard’s analysis of Christian history, the Church of England had been “handed down to us through many Sufferings and Persecutions.”⁷⁶ The suffering of the Church remained salient throughout the Restoration. An anonymous prayer composed in 1687, the time of crisis concerning the reign of James II, asked of God “thy Grace and favour toward us in this distrefs’d Church.” While the Church of England was proclaimed as being in a state of distress, this condition allowed the author of this prayer to assert the reformed character of the Church. The author of the prayer requested that God “continue thy Protection also over all other Reformed Churches, which hitherto were in safety.”⁷⁷ The Church of England, as a persecuted body, could be located in a broader reformed context. The association between suffering and reform points to a strand of Restoration episcopal thought which fixated on the suffering of the Church, but specifically focussed on the downfall of bishops, a downfall which occurred in a wider context of the collapse of royal and ecclesiastical authority in the 1640s.

Sufferings of the clergy: bishops and their narratives

Stuart churchmen, parliamentarians and courtiers, and not least King Charles II, interpreted the execution of King Charles I in 1649 and the destruction of the ecclesial structures of the Church of England as forms of martyrdom.⁷⁸ Charles I’s execution was not the only one of the period which lasted long in public consciousness. Samuel Pepys recalled, for instance, that the execution of Sir Henry Vane in 1662 was the talking point of London for a week. But Charles’s death received long-standing analysis, and the martyr king was a familiar aspect of episcopal thought in the Restoration.⁷⁹ The sermons of the higher clergy and in the anonymous text *Eikon Basilike*, purportedly authored by the late king himself, interpreted the execution in religious terms.⁸⁰ Even before his death, Charles I himself stressed that his impending execution would make him a martyr by asserting the common experiences of himself and the Messiah. Addressing Christ directly, he pointed out that “We have been mutually punished.”⁸¹ Similarly a

letter from Charles to Christian IV of Denmark foretold the “extirpating [of] the Royall Blood.”⁸²

Accounts of Charles I’s death raise important questions as to the narration and interpretation of the sufferings of the English bishops. Texts that interpreted the execution of the King underline the contrast to clerical understandings of episcopal martyrdoms, a contrast in emphasis and meaning which makes clear the arguments bishops used to justify their authority. Bishop John Gauden stressed the congruence between the martyrdom of the episcopate and the martyrdom of the King as “our late Sovereign” had “fuffered as a Martyr in her *defence*” (meaning the Church of England).⁸³ According to Bishop Gilbert Sheldon of London in 1660, the Church kept good company in being persecuted along with the monarchy, for “we shall find that the best of Men and most godly, have ever had many afflictions, many enemies, and many the more for being so.”⁸⁴ Sheldon was here arguing from virtue by association, finding a connection in that king and bishops had both fallen.

Bisbie echoed Sheldon’s account of the royal and ecclesiastical suffering, showing how king and bishops suffered together. His discourse developed themes by Gauden and Sheldon, but moved from the martyrdom of the Church to the specific idea of the martyrdom of the episcopate. He advanced an analysis of the role of bishops which incorporated the martyrdom of Charles I. In the first place, he worked up the very clearly physical decapitation of Charles I into an allegory of the collapse of English episcopal authority. Referring to what was for him an unnatural and perverse sight, Bisbie argued that “to see a Church without a Bishop is as monstrous in Christianity, as in Nature to see a Body without an Head.” Bisbie had a particular decapitated corpse in mind, for the absence of episcopal oversight was as monstrous as “that sad and never to be forgotten Spectacle of our late Martyred Sovereign.” In case anyone missed his point, Bisbie elaborated that he was referring to “a Royal Trunk, with an Head chopt of [f], lying bleeding by.”⁸⁵ Bisbie did more than defend the dual rule of episcopate and monarchy; the bishops so unnaturally removed from office were central to the reformed identity of the English Church. Charles I himself had indicated that the identity of reformed religion inhered in episcopacy, and that the characteristics and the meaning of Protestantism derived from episcopal rule. He stated that “no Protestant (or rather Christian) Church can be acknowledged for such without a Bishop.”⁸⁶ Bisbie’s work took this idea further, finding in the trope of a headless king the condition of the Church in England without any bishops.

Bisbie’s parallel between physical and ecclesiastical decapitation made a point more pertinent to episcopal martyrdom than to episcopal authority, but during the Restoration and up to the crisis of 1688 threads of arguments concerning episcopal

authority became closely entwined in accounts of episcopal suffering. For example, the episcopal chaplain Edward Young, preaching at a consecration at Lambeth Palace in 1685, referred to the decades when the episcopate was oppressed and when “the office itself was accounted martyrdom.”⁸⁷ Young’s themes are also to be found in the writings of William Sancroft, the dean of St Paul’s. Like Young, Sancroft’s sermons at the consecration of bishops drew attention to the persecution of the episcopate.⁸⁸ By the 1670s Sancroft argued that the ambition of the Church’s opponents had been “that the Name of the Reformed Church of *England* may be no more in Remembrance.”⁸⁹

Bisbie, Young, Sancroft and other authors gave a general impression of the sufferings of the English episcopate. This general idea gained far greater precision in the works of a further restoration divine, Edward Stillingfleet. In 1680 Stillingfleet, the dean of St Paul’s, preached at the Guildhall Chapel. Shortly after doing so, and following an official exhortation from the Royal Court, his sermon was printed under the title *The Mischief of Separation*. Stillingfleet’s sermon had two purposes: to highlight the causes of non-conformity; and to justify the authority of the Church’s bishops. Yet his analysis was grounded in persecution, not of dissenters but of bishops, for Stillingfleet located the grounds of episcopal authority in the episcopate’s persecution during the Civil Wars. Stillingfleet addressed two accusations made against the episcopate which functioned as justifications for dissent among radical Protestants. Its imperfection, as pointed to by dissenters, was a reason for non-conformity, for “men fit up their own fancies [to] abuse the Rule.”⁹⁰ Similarly, Stillingfleet believed that dissenters explained their dissent by referring to the supposed tyranny of the Church, as “we find *Uniformity* and *Order* condemned as *Tyrannical*.”⁹¹

Stillingfleet’s tract acknowledged the episcopate’s reputation as a persecutor, yet it also asserted the sufferings of the bishops. In this work, the degradation of the Church’s authority and power became at the same time the source of its authority. As Stillingfleet had observed, demands for ecclesial order were condemned by dissenters as tyranny. His work inverted such allegations, as he urged that claims of tyranny persisted only until “man come into *Power* themselves, and then the very same things and arguments are used and thought very good and substantial, which before were weak and fophtical.”⁹² Stillingfleet reflected on the reversal of power during those years when the power of the episcopate was denuded; returning the focus to his own time, Stillingfleet drew attention to the legal underpinnings of episcopal authority through parliaments and justices, referring to: “Thofe who fpeak now moft againft the *Magiftrates Power* in matters of *Religion* had *ten fubftantial Reafons* for it, when they thought the *Magiftrate* on

their own *fide*.”⁹³ For Stillingfleet, the powers exercised by dissenters were the same about which dissenters complained.

Stillingfleet’s contemporary, Gilbert Burnet, concurred and accused “Presbyterians and Independents” of taking the Church of England’s authority and then “having carried the Principle or Rigour in the point of Conscience much higher and have acted more implacably upon it than ever the Church of England has done, even in its angriest fits.”⁹⁴ Burnet did not quite suggest that the dissenters impersonated bishops; for even while acknowledging the occasional severity of the Church of England, its opponents were noticeably different in their degree of severity. Nonetheless, he stressed that the authority held by religious leaders under the Commonwealth had been appropriated from bishops and then used against them. His contemporary, the orthodox clergyman Thomas Wilson, inverted the notion of the Church of England persecuting other clergy and other Protestants. It was Wilson’s provocative contention that dissenters comprised “the true Popery” as they were more likely to be agents of persecution.⁹⁵ Like Burnet and Wilson, Stillingfleet hardly approved of the exercise of Protestant authority by the episcopate’s opponents, meaning those who governed the English Church during the Commonwealth. However, his sermon indicated that dissenters from the English bishops exercised the same ecclesiastical discipline as had the bishops.

Their contemporary Thomas Tenison (who became archbishop of Canterbury in 1694) also reminded readers of his appeal to Protestant union that “In the late times of Publick difquiet, they [dissenters] had great Power.”⁹⁶ Indeed, Tenison argued that “the Disciplinaryans are of all Parties, the most numerous.”⁹⁷ While these divines did not actually argue for dissenters having functioned as bishops (for example by taking over episcopal revenues or sacramental functions) their rhetorical emphasis was to show the disciplinary capacity of the episcopate’s opponents. These ideas reflected the re-alignment of ecclesiastical authority during and after the Civil Wars. Observers other than Edward Stillingfleet argued that the religious authorities of the Commonwealth seemed to take on the authority of episcopacy. Post-episcopal church government, argued John Milton’s thirteenth sonnet, was merely “old *Priest* writ large.”⁹⁸ Independents such as Milton condemned the forces that had toppled episcopacy for replicating the old church under a new order. According to Milton, the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1643), which met to debate church polity after the downfall of bishops, had “seize[d] the widowed whore,” meaning that Independents and Presbyterians seemed to be emulating the bishops they had just disposed of.⁹⁹ Milton produced this assessment shortly after the Westminster Assembly had met. Looking back from the Restoration, Stillingfleet defended the

exercise of reformed episcopal power on similar terms, for he argued that the ecclesiastical discipline which condemned bishops as popish and deprived them was itself an appropriation of the bishops' own authority.

Stillingfleet's immediate context was the gathering anxiety about the possibility of a popish succession, as by 1680 the Duke of York had converted to Catholicism and Charles II had produced no legitimate off-spring by his consort, Catherine of Braganza. The Restoration can be taken to have ended with the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the trial and imprisonment of the Seven Bishops, and the attendant sequestration of Bishop Henry Compton who had emerged in the 1680s as a partisan of William of Orange and the organizing spirit of Protestant opposition to court Catholicism.¹⁰⁰ Anxieties about the political developments of the late Restoration were exhibited publicly in the Popish Plot and constitutionally in the Exclusion Crisis. Both of these formed the backdrop to ecclesiastical controversies in the 1680s.¹⁰¹ The Popish Plot would make martyrs of the Jesuits accused by Titus Oates and tried by Lord Chief Justice Scroggs. However, the Exclusion Crisis and the eventual conflict between bishops and the Catholic King James II would mean that the Restoration age ended with the creation of further episcopal martyrs. As the leaders of ecclesiastical rebellion against James II's Declaration of Indulgence, seven bishops underwent trial and imprisonment, events swiftly troped in popular polemic as martyrdom.¹⁰² Different polemical arguments were drawn in the cases of martyrdom under the Commonwealth and in the lead up to the 1688 Revolution. The substance of both Stillingfleet and Wilson's work was to stress the legitimacy of reformed episcopal power by showing the usurpation of this authority by the religious forces of the Commonwealth. Stillingfleet in particular aimed to neutralize ideas of the inherent popishness of English bishops, pointing out that the dissenters of the Restoration age, when they had been the religious authorities of the Commonwealth, had exercised the same powers they complained were popish. The forces persecuting the seven bishops were explicitly Roman Catholic, and no similar arguments regarding the reformed basis of their power could be drawn, as polemicists such as Stillingfleet could not defend English episcopacy by comparing its authority to Roman bishops. The two different sets of episcopal martyrdom stress the arguments that clergy and bishops made concerning the persecution of bishops by Protestant authorities under the Commonwealth.

Conclusion

Episcopal and dissenting clergy concurred in the authoritative emphasis they gave to English bishops. Modern historians have endorsed this emphasis, proclaiming

that Restoration bishops presided over a Church that was an agent of persecution. English bishops themselves may not have disputed their capacity to punish dissent, but their own degradation from power and status was a source of reflection and argument. These arguments developed in a context where episcopal authority was contested from different sources. From dissenting perspectives, English bishops seemed irredeemably popish in character and their exercise of authority served to reinforce this impression. Schemes to reduce episcopacy or to amalgamate it with congregational Presbyterianism emerge from this context of disputation. But arguments in defence of episcopal rule also occurred in a context where, after 1660, relations between crown and episcopate were strained and in which episcopal clergy sought out arguments showing that episcopal authority rested on reformed foundations. A comparison with accounts of Charles I's execution shows that bishops tended to dwell on their suffering, not the resurrection of their order. But such reflections could also reveal the basis of episcopal authority, and the idea of episcopal office itself as a form of martyrdom arose. Writers including Gilbert Burnet, Thomas Wilson, Thomas Tenison and Edward Stillingfleet, all public preachers, explored the different claims to martyrdom that English bishops could make. By 1688 the argument was being made that the rule of James II had created the potential for bishops to again become martyrs. Arguments of this nature served to justify the 1688 rebellion and to orient the episcopate as a defender of English Protestantism. But Wilson, Tenison, Burnet, and Stillingfleet also looked to earlier experiences of martyrdom under the Commonwealth to locate and define the grounds of episcopal authority in the Restoration. Stillingfleet in particular indicated that dissenters had been content to exercise ecclesiastical discipline against bishops, while they themselves complained about the powers of bishops. The degradation of bishops underlined the bishops' authority, for the forces of punishment and degradation ranged against them allowed a bishop such as Stillingfleet to delineate the grounds of English ecclesiastical authority, even when it was appropriated by the other side. In this context, it mattered to the episcopate and its supporters to show that the religious authorities of the Commonwealth, who had proclaimed their own reformed identity at the same time as they attacked bishops, had used the very authority they condemned.

Notes

1. Earlier versions of this paper were read before the Sydney Medieval and Renaissance Group and the 10th Annual Conference of the Centre for Medieval and Early Modern

- European Studies at the University of Auckland. I thank the reviewers of this journal for feedback, and Sybil M. Jack and Judith Richards for comments on earlier versions of this paper.
2. *Eikon Basilike* (London: for R. Royston, 1648), p.166.
 3. William Prynne, *A New Discovery of the Prelates Tyranny in their late persecutions of Mr William Pryn, an eminent Lawyer; Dr John Bastwick, a learned physitian; and Mr Henry Burton, a reverent Divine* (London: for M.S. [Michael Spark], 1641), pp. 62–63.
 4. Not all bishops endured such striking sufferings. Bishop Brian Duppa lived in his wife's house in Richmond and was the recipient of many food gifts from his friend Sir Justinian Isham; Sir Gyles Isham, ed. *Correspondence of Bishop Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham* (Northampton Record Society, xvii, 1950–51).
 5. S.R. Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899), p. 278.
 6. Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 52–55. See also Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians 1649–1662* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1951), pp. 82–87.
 7. In modern readings of this topic see particularly W.K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England 1558–1660* (vols. III and IV) (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1932–40); John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain 1603–1714* (London: Pearson, 2006), p. 206; and Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660–1715* (London: Longman, 1993), pp. 153–56.
 8. Thomas Long, *The Cafe of Persecution Charg'd on the Church of England Consider'd and Discharg'd, In order to her Justification and a Desired Vnion of Protestant Dissenters* (London: Freemans Collins for Richard Baldwin, 1689).
 9. Especially Edward Young, *A Sermon Preached at Lambeth January the 25th. At the Consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God, Thomas, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London: William Grantham, 1685); William Sancroft, *A Sermon Preach'd to the House of Peers, Novemb. 13th 1678. Being the Feast Day Appointed by the King to implore the Mercies of Almighty God in the Protection of his Majesties Sacred Person, and His Kingdom* (In the Savoy: Printed by Tho. Newcomb for Robert Beaumont, 1678); Gilbert Burnet, *An Apology for the Church of England with Relation to the Spirit of Persecution for which she is accused* (Amsterdam, 1688). Burnet explored the history of persecution in a range of other works, including his preface to *A Relation of the death of the Primitive persecutors. Made English by Gilbert Burnet* (London: A Balwin, 1713), and his *Life of the Most Reverend Father in God John Tillotson, arch-bishop of Canterbury* (London: E. Curll, 1717).
 10. Eamon Duffy, "Cardinal Pole Preaching: St Andrew's Day 1557," *The Church of Mary Tudor*, ed. Eamon Duffy and David Loades (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 194–97.
 11. Accounts of episcopal suffering had a wide currency beyond England and the Church of England. For a study of the importance of martyrdom to defining episcopal office in France under the *Ancien Régime*, see Alison Forrester, "A Catholic Model

- of Martyrdom in the Post-Reformation Era: The Bishop in Seventeenth-Century France," *The Seventeenth Century* 20.2 (2005), pp. 254–80.
12. Judith Richards, "'His Nowe Majestie' and the English Monarchy: The Kingship of Charles I before 1640," *Past & Present* 113 (1986), pp. 70–96 (76).
 13. Ian Gentles, "The Sales of Bishops' Lands in the English Revolution, 1646–1660," *English Historical Review* 95 (April 1980), p. 591.
 14. Nevertheless, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were particularly retained by Charles II when he proposed to reduce the size of his Privy Council; National Archives (PRO) SP 9/247. Jeffrey R. Collins points to the mutual hostility between Charles II's court and the Restoration episcopate in "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy," *Church History* 68 (Sept 1999), pp. 549–80.
 15. The earlier obedience of bishops to James II is revealed by their presence at his coronation and Archbishop Sancroft's implementation of James's instructions; Lambeth Palace Library: Sancroft's Register fols. 336–37.
 16. S/P.31/2, p.39.
 17. John Milton challenged this idea by pointing out that Charles I had died because he was a tyrant, not because he was a Protestant; Andrew Lacy, "'Charles the First and Christ the Second': The Creation of a Political Martyr," in *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400–1700*, eds. Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), p. 220.
 18. Lacy, p. 204. These sentiments were expressed as early as the actual moment of his execution, Bishop Juxon commenting to Charles that "This stage is turbulent and troublesome; it is a short one." *King Charls, His Speech Made upon the Scaffold at White-Hall Gate Immediately before his execution* (London: Peter Cole, 1649), no pagination.
 19. John Morrill, "The Church in England, 1642–9," in *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642–1649*, ed. J. Morrill (New York: St Martin's Press, 1982), chapter four.
 20. See also B. Reay, "Radicalism and Religion in the English Revolution: an Introduction," in *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, ed. J.M. McGregor and B. Reay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 9.
 21. Stanford Lehmberg, *English Cathedrals: A History* (London: Hambledon and London, 2005), pp.185–98.
 22. J.F. McGregor, "The Baptists: Fount of All Heresy," in *Radical Religion*, p. 24.
 23. George Yule, *Puritans in Politics: The Religious Legislation of the Long Parliament 1640–1647* (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1981), chapter six.
 24. Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 20.
 25. Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485–1714: A Narrative History* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), p. 120.
 26. On Cromwell's attempts at religious uniformity and public peace see Christopher Hill, *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970), p. 77.

27. John Spurr, "'Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church," *The Historical Journal* 31 (March 1988), pp. 61–82. The place of conscience and latitude in the Restoration is also discussed in Gary S. De Krey, "Rethinking the Restoration: Cases for Conscience, 1667–72," *The Historical Journal* 38 (March 1995), pp. 53–83 and J. Marshall, "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude Men 1660–1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson and 'Hobbism,'" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985), pp. 407–27.
28. Spurr, "Latitudinarianism," p. 74.
29. Barry Collett, "Civil War, Communal Guilt and Reconciliation in England: The *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662," *Parergon* 21.2 (2004), p. 120.
30. Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 251.
31. James Ussher, *The Bishop of Armagh's Direction, Concerning the Lyturgy, and Episcopall Government* (London: for A.D. and C.D., 1642), p. 5, and *The Reduction of Episcopacie Unto the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Antient Church: Propofed as an Expedient for the compromising of the now Differences, and the preventing of those Troubles that may arife about the matter of Church-Government* (London: T.N. for G.B. and T.C., 1660), p. 4.
32. Marcus Harmes, "Protestant Bishops in Restoration England," *Parergon* 26.1 (2009), pp. 175–96.
33. Jeffrey's observation was recorded in Richard Baxter's *Autobiography*, eds. J.M. Lloyd Thomas and N.H. Keeble (London: Dent, 1974), pp. 260–61.
34. Richard Baxter cited in Peter Bayne, ed. *Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity of 1662* (London: Kent, 1862), p. 16. The orthodox clergy of the Church had their own proposals, embodied in the Worcester House Declaration, to appoint suffragen bishops; W.M. Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660–1700* (London: University of Georgia Press, 1993), pp. 35, 38.
35. Spurr "Latitudinarianism," p. 73.
36. James Ussher in *Directions Propovnded and Hvmbly Presented to the High Court of Parliament, Concerning the Booke of Common Prayer And Episcopall Government. Written by a Reverend and Learned Divine now Resident in this City* (London: for Iohn Thomas, 1641); see also William M. Abbott, "James Ussher and 'Ussherian' Episcopacy, 1640–1656: The Primate and his Reduction Manuscript," *Albion* 22 (Summer 1990), pp. 237–59.
37. Spurr, "Latitudinarianism," p. 75.
38. BL Add. MS 4236 fl. 92.
39. Godfrey Davies and Paul H. Hardacre, "The Restoration of the Scottish Episcopacy," *Journal of British Studies* 1 (May 1962), p. 39.
40. William Sancroft, *A Sermon Preached in St Peter's Westminster, on the first Sunday in Advent, at the Consecration of the Right Reverend in God, John Lord Bishhop of Durham, William Lord Bishhop of S. David's, Benjamin L. Bishhop of Peterborough, Hugh Lord*

- Bishop of Landaff, Richard Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Brian Lord Bishop of Chester, and John Lord Bishop of Exeter* (London: T. Roycroft for Robert Beaumont, 1660), p.11.
41. Peter King, "The Episcopate during the Civil Wars, 1642–1649," *English Historical Review* 83 (July 1968), p. 530.
 42. Nathaniel Bisbie, *Prosecution no Persecution: Or, the difference Between Suffering for Difobedience and Faction, and Suffering for Righteousness, and Christ's Sake* (London: Walter Kettilby, 1682), p. 2.
 43. Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici* [1635] (London: J.M. Dent, 1906), p.32; John Donne, *Pseudo-Martyr* (ed. Anthony Raspa), (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), Vol 2, p. 39. On their context see Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999).
 44. Bisbie, *Prosecution no Persecution*, p. 18.
 45. Bisbie, *Prosecution no Persecution*, p. 15.
 46. Bisbie, *Prosecution no Persecution*, p. 18.
 47. Peter Heylyn, *A Briefe and Moderate Answer to the seditious and scandalous challenge of Henry Burton, late of Friday-streete* (London: Ric. Hodgkinfonne, 1637), p. 115.
 48. Anon., *The Regular Clergy's Sole Right to Administer Christian Baptism, Asserted in a Familiar Dialogue Betwixt a Churchman and a Dissenter, by the Author of the Hampsted Conferences* (London: for Richard Wilkins, 1712).
 49. Anon., *Christian Baptism*, p. 8.
 50. William Prynne, *The substance of a Speech made in the House of Commons by Wil. Prynne of Lincolns Inn Esquire, on 4th Dec 1648* (London: Michael Spark, 1649), p. 52.
 51. Anon., *A Letter from a Person of Quality to an Eminent Dissenter, To rectifie his Mistakes concerning the Succession, the Nature of Persecution and a Comprehension* (London: T.B. for Randolph Taylor, 1685), p. 12.
 52. John Millar, *The Restoration and the England of Charles II* (London: Longman, 1997), p. 71. The Bills for Exclusion were pursued through different parliamentary sessions by Whiggish opponents of Popery and supporters of a Protestant succession. Charles II himself had seen that Exclusion was intended to "establish a firm security for the Protestant religion." *Lords' Journals*, xiii, p.345, cited in George Clark, *Oxford History of England: The Later Stuarts 1660–1714* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 96.
 53. Anon., *A Letter*, p. 11.
 54. Anon., *A Letter*, p. 14.
 55. On John Field see Patrick Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," in *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), p. 335. On Parker's attempts at discipline see Caroline Litzenberger, "Richard Cheyney, Bishop of Gloucester: An Infidel in Religion?," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25.3 (1994), pp. 567–84.
 56. Peter Lake, "Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson," *Journal of British Studies* 27.2 (1988), p.90.

57. J. William Black, "From Martin Bucer to Richard Baxter: 'Discipline' and Reformation in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," *Church History* 70.4 (2001), pp. 644–73.
58. This theme is explored in Edward O. Smith, "The Elizabethan Doctrine of the Prince as Reflected in the Sermons of the Episcopacy, 1559, 1603," *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 28.1 (1964), p. 3.
59. Anon., *A Vindication of the Proceedings of His Majesties Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Against the Bishop of London, and the fellows of Magdalen-College* (pr. Tho. Milbourn, Published by Richard Faneway, 1688), p. 27.
60. Anon., *A Vindication*, p. 3.
61. Anon., *A Vindication*, p. 3.
62. The commentary offered by this Roman Catholic author reflects the interest taken by the Church of Rome in dissenting congregations and their treatment by the Church of England. Gilbert Burnet identified this aspect of thought, writing that the Catholic monarch James II endeavoured to solicit dissenters as a prelude to de-stabilizing the Church of England. He argued that the King wished to "try what he could expect from the dissenters"; cited in H.C. Foxcroft, ed. *A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), p. 255.
63. Nathaniel Bisbie, *The Bishop Visiting: or a Sermon on 1 Cor. xi. Xxxiv*, (London: Walter Kettelby, 1686), p. 12.
64. Nathaniel Bisbie, *The Bishop Visiting*, p. 12.
65. Bishops retained many traditional legal functions, for instance serving on the Privy Council. In fact the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were particularly retained by Charles II when he proposed to reduce the size of his Privy Council; National Archives (PRO) SP 9/247.
66. J.F. McGregor, "Paul Best and the Limits of Toleration in Civil War England," *Parergon* 21 (2) (2004), p.95.
67. William Cave, *A Sermon Preached before the King at Whitehall, January xxiii, 1675/6* (London: William Godbid for Richard Chiswell, 1676), p. 9.
68. Long, p. 74.
69. National Archives (PRO) MS SP9/251: *The Address of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, to the King's Most Excellent Majesty for maintaining the Church of England, as by Law Established; with His Majesty's Most Gracious Answer thereunto* (1689).
70. Long, p. 68.
71. Sancroft, *A Sermon*, p. 33.
72. Sheldon, *David's Deliverance and Thanksgiving: a sermon preached before the King at Whitehall* (London: Timothy Garthwaite, 1660), pp. 3–17.
73. A discussion of the authorial controversy of this text is offered by Gilbert Burnet, who concluded the question of authorship was insolvable; Burnet, *History of his own Time*, pp. 94–95. Questions of authorship have since been taken up by Kevin Sharpe

- in “‘So Hard a Text?’ Images of Charles I, 1612–1700,” *The Historical Journal* 43.2 (2000), p. 402.
74. Gauden advanced other imagery to describe the condition of the Church; for example, its enemies had worked “to turn our waters into blood”; Gauden, *Analysis: the Loofing of St. Peters Bands; Setting forth the true Sense and Solution of the Covenant in Point of Conscience so far as it relates to the Government of the Church by Episcopacy* (London: J. Belft for Andrew Crook, 1660), p. 7.
 75. Jardine W. Grisbrook, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: SPCK, 1958), p. 22.
 76. [Gregory Hascard], *A Discourse About the Charge of Novelty Upon the Reformed Church of England, Made by the Papists Asking of us the Question, Where was our Religion before Luther?* (London: T. Baffet, 1685), p. 5.
 77. BL Add MS 40160.
 78. Dosia Reichardt, “Marvell’s ‘Interior Paramour’: Clora meets the Cavaliers in ‘The Gallery,’” *Parergon* 23.2 (2006), pp. 100–101.
 79. John Coffey, “The Martyrdom of Sir Henry Vane the Younger: from Apocalyptic Witness to Heroic Whig,” in *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England*, p. 222.
 80. Watson’s sermon of 1649 was joined by others of the same year including John Gauden’s *Stratoste Liteutikon* and John Warner’s *The Devilish Conspiracy*.
 81. Anon., *Eikon Basilike*, p. 146.
 82. Charles was also alleged, according to the publisher of his coded letters, to have petitioned the King of Denmark for military aid; *The King’s cabinet opened: or, Certain packets of secret letters & papers written with the Kings own Hand* (London: Robert Bostock, 1645), pp. 44, 56.
 83. John Gauden, *Loofing*, p. 5.
 84. Sheldon, p. 18.
 85. Bisbie, *Prosecution no Persecution*, p. 6. Appropriately, this sermon was to be sold by Kettilby at the Bishops Head in St Paul’s Churchyard.
 86. Cited in Martin Dzelzainis, “‘Undoubted realities’: Clarendon on Sacrilege,” *The Historical Journal* 33.3 (1990), p. 515.
 87. Young, p. 18.
 88. Sancroft, *A Sermon*, p. 33.
 89. Sancroft, *A Sermon*, p. 9.
 90. Edward Stillingfleet, *The Mischief of Separation. A Sermon Preached at the Guild-Hall Chappel, May 11. MDCLXXX. Being the Firft Sunday in Easter-Term, Before the Lord Mayor, &c.* (London: Henry Mortlock, 1680), p. 45.
 91. Stillingfleet, p. 46.
 92. Stillingfleet, p. 46.
 93. Stillingfleet, p. 46.
 94. Gilbert Burnet, *An Apology for the Church of England with Relation to the Spirit of Persecution for which she is accused* (Amsterdam, 1688), p. 86.

95. Thomas Wilson, *A Sermon on the Martyrdom of King Charles I. Preached January 30 1681. With a Relation of Some Rebellious Practices and Principles of Fanaticks* (London: Walter Davis, 1682), p. 17.
96. [Thomas Tenison], *An Argument for Union Taken from the True Interest of the Dissenters in England* (London: for Thomas Baffet, 1683), p. 6.
97. [Tenison], p. 6.
98. John Milton, Sonnet XIII [1646?] in *Poetical Works*, ed. Douglas Bush (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 176.
99. Milton, Sonnet XIII.
100. S.P. 8/2, pt.2, fols.24–5, 146–7.
101. On the background for the political circumstances of the 1680s see J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuarts* (London: Fontana, 1966), chapter five.
102. Wilfrid Prest, *Albion Ascendant: English History 1660–1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 53–54. Documents relating to the trial of the seven bishops were collected in Agnes Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops Committed to the Tower in 1688* (London: Bell and Daldry, 1866).