Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The Seventeenth Century

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsev20

The English Presbyterian Conundrum of 1660-1

Kenneth Fincham & Stephen Taylor

To cite this article: Kenneth Fincham & Stephen Taylor (2023) The English Presbyterian Conundrum of 1660-1, The Seventeenth Century, 38:6, 969-987, DOI: 10.1080/0268117X.2023.2276601

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2023.2276601

Published online: 14 Dec 2023.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
2023, VOL. 38, NO. 6, 969–987
https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2023.2276601

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The English Presbyterian Conundrum of 1660-1

Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor

ABSTRACT

This article aims to explain the failure of the English presbyterian programme to reform the church at the Restoration. Specifically, it analyses the period between March 1660, when the Long Parliament reaffirmed the Solemn League and Covenant, and May 1661, when the Cavalier Parliament ordered that document to be burned by the common hangman. This striking transformation is what we refer to as the 'presbyterian conundrum'. Focusing primarily on the 'presbyterians' and their opponents, the 'episcopalians', who were court politicians, MPs and London clergy, we argue that the weakness of the presbyterian cause was apparent even before the return of the king in May 1660. While the episcopalians possessed strong and determined leadership with a clear vision for the reconstruction of the church, the presbyterians lacked the same unity, both at home and with their co-religionists in Scotland. Even in the spring of 1660, many presbyterians had demonstrated, in their negotiations with Charles and his advisers, that they were prepared to accept both modified episcopacy and a revised Prayer Book as the basis for the religious settlement. The presbyterian position was further weakened by Charles's own clear preference for strong episcopal government, the Book of Common Prayer and a rich ceremonialism in worship. The unconditional restoration of the king cut the ground from beneath the presbyterians, and through the summer and autumn of 1660 they were left trying to negotiate on the basis of an agenda set by the episcopalians and the court. Their failed attempt to assert themselves by securing statutory status for the Worcester House declaration in November 1660 greatly offended the king, paving the way for the imposition of a narrow episcopalian settlement by the Cavalier Parliament.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 20 October 2023
Accepted 20 October 2023

KEYWORDS
Religion; Presbyterians; Episcopalians; Church of England; Parliament; Charles II

On 3 March 1660 the presbyterian cause was riding high as the restored Long Parliament ordered that the Solemn League and Covenant be printed, displayed and 'forthwith read' in every parish church in England and Wales. Just over a year later, on 22 May 1661, the newly elected Cavalier Parliament had the Solemn League and Covenant burnt by the 'common' hangman and copies removed from churches.[1] This extraordinary reversal in

[1]Earlier versions of this paper were given at the 'The Church in England c.1640-c.1670' conference at the University of Kent and to the Baxter Association. We are grateful to Ann Hughes, Paul Seaward and Elliot Vernon for their guidance, to Andrew Foster and George Southcombe for commenting on this essay, and to Sam Tunnicliffe for allowing us to read his Cambridge Ph.D thesis. Neil Keeble has been particularly generous in providing detailed responses to two drafts of what follows.

Journals of the House of Commons, vii. 862, viii. 256.

fortunes for English presbyterians forms part of the established narrative of the return of the episcopalian Church of England in 1660-3, and it has been attributed to a whole range of factors, many of them listed by George Abernathy in 1965: 'their disunity, their numerical weakness, their indecision, their lack of a positive and consistent policy, and their unwillingness to support Charles II and Clarendon at the risk of gains for Catholics'.[2] The respective weighting which should be given to these various explanations remains unclear, and in any case we should note that Abernathy's list is not exhaustive. Despite some excellent recent work on London presbyterians in 1660-2 and the 'Abortive Reformation' of 1659-61,[3] the precise reasons for the dramatic collapse of the presbyterian platform remains something of a conundrum, which this essay sets out to crack. Our approach is essentially chronological, examining the presbyterian cause in England from February 1660, on the eve of the Restoration, through the summer of 1660 and the issuing of the Worcester House Declaration that October, until the opening of the Cavalier Parliament in May 1661. The emphasis, however, is analytical, assessing the coherence of presbyterianism, as well as the key role played by others, principally Charles II and a resurgent episcopalian interest. What emerges is presbyterian weaknesses and vulnerabilities, well before the meeting of the Cavalier Parliament, which rang the death-knell of any lingering hopes that the presbyterians could secure any more than minor reforms to the constitution and worship of the pre-civil war church.

This essay primarily focuses on 'presbyterians' and 'episcopalians' who were court politicians, MPs or London clergy. Not only was the political elite based in London, but there is also little evidence of the presbyterians, at least, mobilising a national constituency in support of demands for religious reform. Strikingly, they were not able to replicate the success of the presbyterian campaign in the provinces to bring about a 'free parliament' in 1659-60.[4] Both 'presbyterian' and 'episcopalian' refer to coalitions of interests and require some clarification. Contemporaries used 'presbyterian' from the king's return in May 1660 through to the Act of Uniformity in August 1662 to identity all those committed to some further reform of the national church, either through the introduction of 'moderated' episcopacy, revision of the prayer book or easing of requirements to perform ceremonies such as kneeling to receive communion. Their broad objective, in short, was to press for a more comprehensive church as the religious settlement took shape. There was also a minority still hoping for the creation of full-fledged classical Presbyterianism, in line with the Commons' reforms of March 1660. Most, however, came to abandon the Solemn League and Covenant or, at least, were willing to redefine it in ways that were far removed from classical presbyterian government.[5] Indeed, as Richard Baxter rightly

[2]Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, chs 3-5; Whiteman, 'Restoration', pp. 49-88; Green, *Re-establishment*, chs. 1-4, 6-7, 9-10; Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, p. 93. We will examine the historiography in depth in our forthcoming book on the religious settlement of 1660-3.

[3]Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, chs. 11-12; Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp. 443-78. See also Cooper's brief but incisive account of the 'tactical errors' of the presbyterians in 1660 in his 'Baxter and Savoy', pp. 335-6, 338-9; and Keeble, 'Introduction', pp. 1-15.

[4]For the first, an exception might be the letter-writing campaign in March 1661, led by London presbyterians, to encourage those in the provinces to follow their example and elect godly MPs to the Cavalier Parliament. See Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 209-10; Withington, *Politics of Commonwealth*, pp. 260-1. For the second, see Worden, '1660', pp. 23-52; id., 'Campaign', pp. 159-74; id., 'Demand', pp. 176-200; Southcombe, 'Presbyterians in the Restoration', pp. 74-6.

[5]See, for example, Glasgow University Library [hereafter GUL] MS Gen 210, p. 171; also pp. 140, 141.

observed, the term was applied to very many who did not want a presbyterian system of church government, and included 'reconcilers' from the 1650s, of no party, such as Baxter himself.[6] In this period of considerable fluidity, any firm distinction between 'moderate' presbyterians who engaged with reform and 'rigid' presbyterians who stood aloof seems unhelpful. Thus, to take one example, the popular London minister Zachary Crofton argued for the retention of the national covenant, but also contemplated the adoption of a primitive episcopacy based on Archbishop Ussher's famous proposals and attended prayer book services while a prisoner in the Tower in 1661.[7] Even among the presbyterian clergy there was no agreed programme of reform, while the commitment of many of the presbyterian leaders in the Lords and Commons was further weakened, in religious matters as much as constitutional, by the strength of their royalist sentiments and their desire for settlement.

Nor were these the only fault lines within presbyterianism. The erastianism of many of the laity, especially the lawyers, opened up other divisions. William Prynne, one of the great puritan martyrs of the 1630s, conceded that bishops could be acceptable, provided they derive their power from the king, and not own themselves to be *iure divino*.[8] Generally, the 'presbyterian' interest was not taken to include the independents, though Philip, Lord Wharton was one leading figure who tried to bring the two together.[9] The independents comprised only a small number of peers and MPs, and their ministers were less prominent in public debate. While there were some points of common interest for presbyterians and independents, such as the Bill for Confirming and Restoring of Ministers of September 1660, there were significant divergences on others, such as the state church and the desirability of indulgence, and independents were also very conscious of their reliance on the king to implement his commitment to a 'liberty to tender consciences' made at Breda.[10]

Their opponents were the episcopalians. Contemporaries used a variety of names to refer to this group, among them 'episcopalians', and saw and described the debates of this period in terms of a struggle between two sides.[11] The term 'episcopalian' embraces those who pressed for the revival of the pre-war church, above all episcopacy and the Prayer Book, which had emerged as the central pillars of episcopalianism in the 1640s and 1650s. Some of them wished to see it shorn of Laudian excesses; many were smarting from their privations in the 1640s-50s and were antagonistic towards presbyterians and their precursors. A small number of episcopalians contributed positively to the public debate on reform of church government and the liturgy,[12] though with little discernible influence on the outcome of events. More significantly, and in contrast to the presbyterians,

[6]Whiteman, 'Restoration', pp. 49-51; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, pp. 2-4; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, i. 42-3, 444-5, ii. 89, 90, 181, 192; Thomas, 'Rise of the Reconcilers', pp. 46-72.

[7]Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp. 448 and n. 55, 459, 466. The best treatment of Crofton is now Tunnicliffe, 'Development of the Doctrine of the Church and Religious Toleration', ch. 2.

[8]Henning ed., *House of Commons*, iii. 296.

[9]Paley ed., *House of Lords*, iv. 877-94, provides the latest account of Wharton's parliamentary career and warns against exaggerating his influence as a parliamentary manager. When discussing the '"presbyterian" opposition' in the years *after* the Act of Uniformity, R. W. Davis suggests that it has a rather broader meaning, incorporating all those 'presumed to be favourable to Protestant Dissenters'. 'The "Presbyterian" Opposition', esp. p. 6.

[10]See their petitions to the king in 1660: Bodleian Library [hereafter Bodl.,], Carte MS 81, fos 140-2, and Clarendon MS 73, fo. 314.

[11]Variations included 'episcopal men', 'episcopal party', 'episcopalian party' and 'prelatical party'. Pepys referred to 'episcopalian and presbyterian divines' meeting at Worcester House on 22 Oct. 1660. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, i. 271.

[12]Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp. 453-5, 460-2, 463-4, 468-9, 471-2, 475.

a small group of leading episcopalians had a clear programme for reform; they were well connected both before the king's return and after to his leading minister, Edward Hyde; and their vision for the restored church aligned closely with the views of Charles himself.[13]

The sources for this study are fairly sparse, and most are well-known to historians. Perhaps the least exploited is the rich correspondence of the Edinburgh presbytery, led by Robert Douglas. Much of it relates to James Sharp, a Scottish presbyterian representing the Resolutioner party, who was based in London from February to August 1660.[14] Sharp's abrupt switch from presbyterian to archbishop in 1661 led some contemporaries, and later historians, to question his reliability as an impartial witness in 1660. These doubts look misplaced, and we endorse Julia Buckroyd's claims for the broad veracity of his commentaries.[15] There is certainly little reason to doubt Sharp's reports about the attitudes and actions of the London ministers and politicians. His long-standing familiarity with presbyterianism in London, as a result of his imprisonment there in 1651-2, and subsequent visits on behalf of the Resolutioners in 1656-7 and 1659, made him a well-connected and informed observer during some critical months in 1660.[16] The Edinburgh presbytery's correspondence with Irish presbyterians also adds a valuable British perspective. Sharp himself serves as a minor counterpoint to Baxter, whose detailed and retrospective narrative of events for 1660-1 is regularly taken as the authentic voice of presbyterianism, in the absence of much information in this period on leading presbyterian divines such as Thomas Manton and Edmund Calamy or on court grandees such as Edward Montagu, 2nd Earl of Manchester, Denzil Holles and Arthur Annesley.[17] Nor are episcopalians better recorded, and the activities of royal intimates such as the Marquess of Ormonde, Gilbert Sheldon and George Morley remain shadowy, while Edward Hyde's account of ecclesiastical developments for 1660-1 in his *Life* is often muddled, incomplete and questionable. Nevertheless, by revisiting and recontextualising reasonably familiar sources, it is possible to advance a more convincing explanation of this long-standing conundrum.

In February 1660, it seemed that the presbyterian moment had finally arrived, after nearly two decades of reversals, frustrations and compromise. Addressing the re-assembled Long Parliament on 21 February, General Monck, *de facto* head of state, endorsed 'moderate Presbyterian government, with a sufficient liberty for tender consciences' as the most acceptable settlement of the church. In March MPs passed a body of legislation to establish a presbyterian church: the adoption of the Westminster Confession as the confession of faith, the re-affirmation of the Solemn League and Covenant, the observance of the Directory for Public Worship in churches, the creation of Presbyterian classes across the country, and remodelling the 'Triers' to be a predominantly presbyterian commission. Yet episcopalians

[13]We intend to address elsewhere Charles II's major contribution to the religious settlement of 1660-3, which hitherto has been usually overlooked or misunderstood.

[14]Historians have traditionally relied on extracts, not always full and accurate, in Wodrow, pp. vi-lxiii. A few have drawn on the manuscript versions, chiefly Hutton, *Charles the Second*, Cooper, 'Baxter and Savoy', pp. 334-6 and Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp. 441-76. Many of the original letters are in the National Library of Scotland [hereafter NLS], Wodrow Folio XXVI, whence copied into National Records of Scotland, CH1/1/11, with a nearly complete transcription by Wodrow in Glasgow University Library, MS Gen 210, pp. 1-187. See also Buckroyd, *Life of James Sharp*, p. 133 fn. 4.

[15]Ibid., pp. 50-7, 63, 133 fn. 4. See also Raffe, *Culture of Controversy*, pp. 31-2.

[16]For one example, see Sharp's claim on 10 March that his access to General Monck meant that he had become an intermediary between Monck, some MPs and Monck's 'friends' in the city, as well as between city ministers and 'their friends in parliament'. GUL, MS Gen 210, p. 20.

[17]Keeble and his team provide a useful evaluation of the *Reliquiae* as a whole: Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, i. 72-94.

were not overly dismayed by this, since there was already talk of the return of the king and in any case a new Parliament would convene on 25 April, whose religious complexion might well be less presbyterian.[18] On 4 March Sharp noted that some presbyterian MPs were reluctant to enact classical presbyterian government, since they feared it would be unpopular and might prejudice their chances of re-election. Although this particular measure did go ahead, the package of legislation was incomplete: proposals to settle the church through a national synod were discussed but not enacted, and two chapters of the Westminster Confession dealing with censures, synods and councils were rejected. In short, this was a paper-thin presbyterian triumph; as Sharp observed, the 'good partie are doing what they can to keep the Covenant interest on foot, but I fear there will be much adoe to have it so' for 'matters here are in a verie discomposed and ticklish condition'. So, was this legislation an attempt, in a rapidly changing political situation, to establish presbyterian government and worship as the basis for settling the national church? Or was it primarily a move to construct a bulwark against independents and sectaries? Or was it a tactical ploy, to shore up presbyterianism in the expectation of having to negotiate with episcopalians? Or was it a rather futile exercise in gesture politics, raising the presbyterian standard when the opportunity finally arose, heedless of uncertainty and likely change?[19] It seems possible that all four positions were held by different people, but the precise balance of opinion is hard to establish.

We may wonder just how robust English presbyterianism was on the eve of the Restoration. Nationally, it seems to have been pastorally active, a major player in the association movement, and according to Cromwell in 1657 'the most serious significant solid party of the three nations'.[20] However, in London, the heartland of English presbyterianism, the movement had been experiencing difficulties throughout the 1650s in recruiting lay elders for the classes and delegates for the provincial assembly. In November 1658 the latter tried to address 'the decay of government', but with little success, so that in November 1659 only six of the twelve classes attended the assembly. In the same month the 4th London classis evidently closed its doors, and other classes 'probably collapsed around the same period'. The London provincial assembly itself transacted little or no business after the spring of 1659, although it continued to meet until August 1660.[21] It seems that a distinguished clerical leadership (Manton, Calamy, Ashe and so on) in London was not backed by an activist rank-and-file. By no means the least of the challenges facing presbyterians may have been a sense of spiritual as much as political lassitude, searching for an explanation for the endless '*Confusions* and *Changes*', and finding only '*clear evidence* that God hath in displeasure darkened our eyes, and hid counsel from us'.[22] In this respect, episcopalians may have been in better shape on the eve

[18]Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp. 441-3; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, pp. 271-3; Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 101-3.

[19]GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 16-17; De Krey, *London*, ch. 1; Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, p. 41; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, p. 273; Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, p. 443.

[20]Vernon, 'Ministry of the Gospel', pp. 115-36; Halcomb, 'Association Movement', pp. 177-8, 181-2; *Register of the Consultations*, ii.127.

[21]*Register-Booke of the Fourth Classis*, p. xvii; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, pp. 184-6; Lambeth Palace Library [hereafter LPL], ARC L 40.2/E17, fos 247r-55v. The delegates of the 4th London classis did attend the provincial assembly in Dec. 1659 but not, it seems, thereafter. Ibid., fo. 252v.

[22][Reynolds], *Seasonable Exhortation*, p. 12. Edmund Calamy's admission in Feb. 1660 that he was 'weary of the late changes, and willing to close with the royal party, or at least not averse to them', may also have had a spiritual dimension. Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, p. 275.

of the Restoration. There is considerable evidence for the vibrancy of episcopalianism among both clergy and laity, including the rising numbers of candidates for ordination, which had steadily increased since 1657 to match the numbers coming forward in the early 1640s, and the strong demand for devotional works to sustain episcopalian piety in the absence of the Book of Common Prayer.[23]

The brittle character of the presbyterian interest and its pyrrhic victory of March 1660 was exposed in the weeks which followed. The prospect of imminent regime change, with the return of the king, was welcomed by some presbyterians but opposed by others; some leading presbyterian peers, anxious to have a place in the new order, were prepared to contemplate a form of episcopacy and a set liturgy, encouraged by episcopalian agents such as John Barwick and George Morley. By mid-April Morley could report that he had been with the Earl of Manchester 'one of the cheif pillars of the presbiterians, and I find he will serve the King by disposing the presbiterians to admit of episcopacy in such a notion as I have before expressed', namely retaining the name of bishop but sharing his authority with senior clergy. Perhaps influenced by Manchester, Edmund Calamy and Edward Reynolds were among the prominent city clergy willing to discuss some such form of moderated episcopacy, as well as a modified liturgy, as Morley offered them preferment to sweeten the deal. Both were influential divines: Reynolds, for example, had been chosen to preach before General Monck, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen on 28 February, before the Convention Parliament on 25 April and to the House of Lords five days later. Others, however, held out for a restoration conditional on the Treaty of Newport, which had included presbyterian government and the temporary suspension of episcopacy.[24] But all such restrictions were swept away by the Convention Parliament, which opened on 25 April. It voted to restore Charles II without conditions, aided by the king's conciliatory undertakings in the declaration of Breda, notably a liberty to tender consciences. While the meaning of this phrase was opaque, it was seized on by those anxious for some accommodation in the religious settlement. On 7 May the general assembly of Sion House, nerve-centre of London Presbyterianism, 'most thankfully accepted' the declaration, and drew up an address to the king.[25] In short, the presbyterians' position in May 1660 was insecure: they were a minority, albeit a substantial one, in both the newly-elected House of Commons and in the House of Lords,[26] and the unconditional restoration of the king meant that presbyterian hopes very largely rested on his favour. On 29 May, Sharp reported that the leading London presbyterians who had visited Charles II at The Hague earlier that month 'have often since' admitted to him that 'they have no reserve or hope but in his Majesty's good disposition and clemency'.[27]

[23]Fincham and Taylor, 'Vital Statistics', 324-6; Fincham and Taylor, 'Episcopalian Identity', pp. 466-8.

[24]Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, pp. 274-7; Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 105-29; GUL, MS Gen 210, p. 62; Bodl., Clarendon MSS 71, fo. 233v, 72, fos 199, 284r; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 73; Wing, *Short-Title Catalogue of Books . . . 1641-1700*, R1239, R1265, R1302. For Manchester, see also Clarendon MS 92, fo. 21[I].

[25]London Metropolitical Archives, CLC/198/SICA/008/MS33445/001, p. 204.

[26]Significant caveats must be applied to any attempt to categorise members of both houses of parliament according to political and religious affiliations. But it seems likely that approximately two-fifths of both houses can be described as presbyterians, though their position in the Lords was significantly stronger before the admission on 31 May of the peers created at Oxford. Brown, 'Religious Factors', pp. 51-63; Lacey, *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics*, pp. 11-12 and n. 34; Swatland, *House of Lords*, pp. 146-50. See also Jones, 'Political Groups', pp. 159-77, and Davis, 'The "Presbyterian" Opposition', pp. 4-5.

[27]GUL, MS Gen 210, p. 118; see also p. 114. Pepys concurred: *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, i. 152. For an alternative view, that by 1 June 'the presbyterian cause had a good, if not brilliant prospect for success', see Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, p. 67.

The absence of an effective presbyterian alliance across Britain and Ireland further weakened the position of English presbyterians. For all the lip service paid to the Solemn League and Covenant uniting the kingdoms of England, Ireland and Scotland, the vicissitudes of the later 1640s and 1650s had weakened ties, with Scotland under military control and presbyterians there divided as Protestors and Resolutioners vied for supremacy.[28] Presbyterians in England had come to terms, reluctantly and uncomfortably, with the dominance of independency, which they attempted to throw off at national level in both 1659 and 1660.[29] Ann Hughes has demonstrated ties of friendship and mutual esteem between presbyterians in England and Scotland,[30] but this did not constitute an effective or influential pan-British interest. For all that Sharp arrived in London in February 1660 carrying a letter from Douglas and his colleagues in the Edinburgh presbytery conveying fraternal greetings to 'our Reverend and dear Brethren' Ashe, Calamy and Manton, with the request that they assist Sharp in his pursuit of Resolutioner objectives, and for all that Douglas warmly welcomed Parliament's endorsement of the Covenant in March 1660, gaps between them became apparent once the restoration of Charles II became imminent. The Edinburgh presbytery wanted the return of their covenanted king across the three nations. On 31 March Douglas urged Sharp as well as the presbyterian peers Lauderdale and Crawford who were in London to press in 'all earnestness that the League and Covenant be settled as the only basis of the security and happines of these nations'. The Scots found allies in Ireland, led by their former patron Lord Broghill and John Gorges, governor in Ulster, who recognized the need for co-ordinated action to defend the Covenant.[31] They also found some support in England, from where Robert Ellison, MP in the Convention Parliament, belatedly wrote to Douglas on 5 May on behalf of 'eminent friends to presbyterian government' asking him to intervene with Monck.[32]

Most London presbyterians, however, were much more hesitant. In early April Sharp and Lauderdale convened a meeting of ten presbyterian ministers from the city to agree on bringing in the king on covenant terms, although this was rather undermined by the likelihood of forthcoming talks between some of these clergy and episcopalians.[33] The contrasting reactions to the promise of 'liberty to tender consciences' in the declaration of Breda highlighted the different priorities either side of the border: while Sion House welcomed it, Douglas opposed its introduction into Scotland. Toleration, according to the Edinburgh presbytery, had already permitted a deluge of errors to 'overflow the face of the three nations, and verie neer overthrowen the exercise and power of the reformed religion'. Both Douglas and his compatriot Robert Baillie saw the idea of 'reduced' episcopacy, favoured by most English presbyterians,[34] as a chimera; bishops would never be satisfied with limited powers, but would seek to recover their accustomed tyranny. So when Sharp visited Charles II in The Hague in early May, Douglas told

[28]MacKenzie, *Solemn League and Covenant*, presents a very different reading of the British covenanting interest.
[29]Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, pp. 242-74; De Krey, *London*, ch. 1; Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp. 440-3.
[30]Hughes, 'Remembrance of Sweet Fellowship', pp. 170-189.
[31]GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 5-6, 19, 39-49, 54, 98-100; Little, *Lord Broghill*, pp. 95-109; Clarke, *Prelude to Restoration in Ireland*, pp. 263-4. See also *A Letter from Several Ministers in and about Edinburgh*, which may be a spoof.
[32]NLS, Wodrow Folio XXVI, pp. 112-13. For Douglas' reply, see GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 110-12.
[33]Ibid., pp. 65-6.
[34]For evidence of this, see Bodl., Clarendon MS 71, fo. 233; Charles II, *His Majestie's Declaration*, p. 3; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 79-80, 83; GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 123, 186.

him that 'your great errand there will be for this Kirk' since there was no realistic possibility of a three kingdoms' solution built around the covenant.[35] Most tellingly, on 12 May the Edinburgh presbytery wrote to Ashe, Calamy and Manton urging them to work to prevent 'those evils' of episcopacy and a set liturgy, and grew impatient when they received no answer. The London trio eventually responded three months later, on 10 August, with the painful admission that 'the perplexed posture of our affairs' had obliged them to work to incorporate presbyterianism into a moderated episcopacy, and hoped that none would regard it as 'apostacy from the Covenant', a sign of just how much had changed in England within the first three months of the Restoration.[36] By early summer 1660 the church settlements envisaged by presbyterian leaders in Edinburgh and London were radically different. Thus, the stance of English presbyterians undermined the possibility of an effective pan-presbyterian alliance in Britain and Ireland, which, in turn, weakened the bargaining position of English presbyterians and allowed the king to handle religious affairs in his three kingdoms, in his own time and in turn.

Charles II, assisted by Lord Chancellor Hyde, played a decisive role in shaping the fortunes of English presbyterians in 1660. From a mixture of gratitude for their support for his restoration,[37] and prudence in view of their strength among the merchants and clergy of London, the king determined on exploring ways to comprehend or include English presbyterians within a refurbished national church. Negotiations, however, were to be on his terms, not theirs. The king had been pleased to find that the presbyterian delegation visiting him at The Hague were 'neither enemies' to episcopacy nor the prayer book, and he ensured that the negotiations which he supervised between presbyterians and episcopalians from June to October 1660 were framed by the search for agreement on minor modifications to government, worship and ceremonies rather than their wholesale revision which many presbyterians desired.[38] As a token of goodwill and an intimation of further preferment, Charles quickly appointed thirteen presbyterian clergy to royal chaplaincies, led by Calamy, Reynolds and Baxter.[39] Several months of discussions on religious reform followed, culminating in a twin initiative. First, bishoprics and deaneries were offered to several of these chaplains from early September; and secondly a royal declaration of religion (usually known as the Worcester House declaration) was published in late October, following a conference of councillors, presbyterians and episcopalians at Worcester House, the London residence of Lord Chancellor Hyde, presided over by the king. This interim settlement promised substantial concessions to presbyterians. Proposed reform to government included creating suffragan bishops and devolving powers over jurisdiction to rural deans and parish clergy; an equal number of presbyterians and episcopalians would meet to thrash out revisions to the prayer book, which

[35]Ibid., pp. 22, 44, 88, 93-8, 106, 136; *Letters and Journals of Baillie*, iii. 406.
[36]GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 106-8, 114-16, 185-7.
[37]Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, pp. 30-60; De Krey, *London*, ch. 1; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, pp. 267-79.
[38]Charles II, *His Majestie's Declaration*, pp. 5, 8: GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 158, 163.
[39]Since contemporaries and historians have given different numbers, it is worth giving the full list here. Baxter gives ten names – himself, Simeon Ashe, William Bates, Thomas Case, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Jacombe, Thomas Manton, Edward Reynolds, William Spurstow, and John Wallis – to which we can add John Shaw, Anthony Tuckney and Benjamin Woodbridge. Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 74; Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, p. 435; British Library [hereafter BL], Add. MS 36781, fos 10v-11v. Calamy and Reynolds were appointed chaplains at Canterbury, immediately after Charles II's arrival in England, although not sworn in until 13 June: Staffordshire Record Office [hereafter SRO], D868/5/57 (Thomas Langley to Sir Richard Leveson, 26 May 1660); *Mercurius Politicus* no. 22 (24-31 May 1660), p. 342; GUL, MS Gen 210, p. 138.

eventually took place at the Savoy Palace from April to July 1661; meanwhile, those with scruples were permitted to forgo certain oaths, the use of the prayer book and the disputed ceremonies.

The declaration has been described as the 'highwater-mark of comprehension', but its limitations are often overlooked.[40] In it Charles II proclaimed his own 'high affection and esteem' for the Church of England established by law, with the prayer book liturgy 'the best we have seen', and episcopal authority as 'the best support of Religion'. The declaration also briefly rehearsed the classic conformist defence of ceremonies: national churches, with the consent of the sovereign power, could introduce edifying ceremonies, which need not be specified in the scriptures, and such indifferent ceremonies, once enforced, ceased to be indifferent and should be obeyed. The implication was that once the religious settlement had been finalised, there would be no scope for Christian liberty or the exercise of individual consciences. On the heated matter of receiving communion kneeling, the king spelled out his own belief: kneeling was 'the most humble, most devout, and most agreeable posture for that holy duty'. On government, all Charles would concede was an attenuated form of 'reduced' or 'primitive' episcopacy: bishops would rule with the 'advice and assistance' but with not the consent of their clergy, which represented a rejection of the central plank of 'reduced episcopacy' for which the presbyterians had been pushing, following Archbishop Ussher's model of 1641. There was to be no 'negative voice' of ministers over their bishop. Moreover, the presbyterians failed to have re-ordination suppressed.[41] Since June 1660 bishops had been insisting upon re-ordination before instituting presbyterian clergy to livings, a device which angered and marginalized presbyterian ministers at precisely the time they were seeking accommodation within the church. When in November the London ministers thanked the king for the declaration, they requested again that re-ordination be dropped, but without success.[42] In short, the declaration promised much, but the king did not disguise his preference for the *status quo ante*, and nothing irreversible had been secured by the presbyterians.

The summer of 1660 also saw episcopalians at court collude with numerous supporters in London and the wider nation to push for the return of bishops, prayer book and cathedrals, which further imperilled presbyterian hopes for a refashioned Church of England. A Scottish episcopalian, visiting London in April 1660, had witnessed the affection in which the handful of surviving bishops were held. Having lived obscurely in the 1650s, they appeared 'now openly in the streetes, crouded with affectionat salutations, and accosted for benedictions; such a veneration ther people have for that holy order, now so long eclipsed', while the gentry and nobility 'reverently' attended them or else knelt in the streets to receive their blessing. In early May the House of Lords used the proscribed book of common prayer at the thanksgiving service for the Restoration in

[40]Charles II, *His Majestie's Declaration*, pp. 10-18; Till, 'Worcester House Declaration', p. 230 and passim; Whiteman, 'Restoration', pp. 67-8.

[41]Charles II, *His Majestie's Declaration*, pp. 4, 8-9, 11-12, 14-16; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 86-7. The declaration included a reference to 13 Eliz. ch. 12, which has sometimes been seen as a covert acceptance of clergy without episcopal orders. In fact, it was not connected with ordination at all, but rather introduced in response to the presbyterian request to avoid subscribing to those of the 39 Articles of 1563 relating to church government and ceremonies. *His Majestie's Declaration*, p. 18; *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, iii. 494, 507; *pace* Wood, *Church Unity without Uniformity*, pp. 159-61; Till, 'Worcester House Declaration', p. 217; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, p. 284.

[42]Fincham and Taylor, 'Ordination, Re-Ordination and Conformity', pp. 197-232; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, iii. 516-17.

Westminster Abbey, which was reported in the newspapers.[43] Once the king had returned in late May, the gathering force of episcopalian sentiment across the country was expressed through county petitions, the eviction of puritan intruders, the renewal of leases with bishops, deans and chapters, and the prosecution of nonconformists, as has been well demonstrated by scholars.[44] What has been missed is the rapid revival of much of the old church under the direction of the crown, which fanned the flames of resurgent episcopalianism in the localities. Within three weeks of his return, the king was worshipping in the chapel royal according to the prayer book, notwithstanding objections from English and Scottish presbyterians, who feared it would encourage others to follow his example; back, too, came choral music and a railed altar in his chapel. Charles acquiesced in the insistent demands for place and preferment in the church, quickly filling livings, deaneries, cathedral canonries and archdeaconries. Assisted by the Marquess of Ormonde and Bishop Bramhall, in mid-June the king appointed bishops to Irish sees, and in the autumn did likewise for England and Wales. His chief clerical advisers were not his presbyterian chaplains but Gilbert Sheldon and George Morley, both staunch episcopalians. Oxford and Cambridge saw the ousting of presbyterians and the return of royalists and episcopalians to headships and fellowships.[45] Ordinals and books of common prayer rolled off the presses and the latter were advertised in the newspapers, which also publicised episcopalian loyalism in the provinces and books such as that listing the laws of the Church of England 'now in force', including the Act of Uniformity of 1559.[46] By the time the king issued the Worcester House declaration on 25 October, much of the old Church of England was taking shape again, with the encouragement of the crown. A potent symbol of this occurred just three days later on 28 October: the first consecration of English bishops since 1644, in the royal peculiar of Westminster Abbey.

In the face of these mounting pressures from crown and episcopalian opponents, how effectively did English presbyterians push their case for a refashioned national church in the summer of 1660? Their Scottish brethren were unimpressed: north of the border, Baillie wished they were more prudent and industrious, and Douglas censured their 'neglect', while Sharp, in London, accused them of doing nothing but 'complaine in secret' as the episcopalians stealthily acquired offices and consolidated their influence at court and in the city.[47] We can test these censures by looking at presbyterian activists and actions in four related spheres: at court, in parliament, among the London clergy and in the city. The Presbyterian lobby at court looked ostensibly strong: Manchester, Monck, Annseley, Ashley Cooper, Holles and Morrice were all privy councillors, Baxter's patron Lauderdale was secretary of state for Scotland, and additionally Monck was Master of the

[43] *Chronicles of the Frasers*, pp. 426-7; *The Parliamentary Intelligencer* 20 (7-14 May 1660), p. 318.
[44] Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 156-7, 164-5, 199-205; Beddard, 'Restoration Church', pp. 155-9, 161-5; Pruett, *Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts*, pp. 16-20.
[45] GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 106, 142-4; Charles II, *His Majestie's Declaration*, pp. 5-6; *Continuation of the Life of Clarendon*, ii. 15-16; Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 129-30, 155, 157; McGuire, 'Appointment of Bishops 1660-61', pp. 112, 116, 118-19; Beddard, 'Restoration Oxford', pp. 815-17, 822-30; BL, Add MS 70114 [unfol: Anthony Fidor to Edward Harley, 11 Aug. 1660]; Twigg, *University of Cambridge and the English Revolution*, pp. 235-50. For Bramhall's presence in London in mid-June 1660, see The National Archives [hereafter TNA], SP 29/4/41.
[46] *Parliamentary Intelligencer* 31 (23-30 July 1660), p. 493, 38 (10-17 Sept 1660), pp. 607-8: *Mercurius Publicus* 36 (6-13 Sept 1660), p. 588, referring to *Acts of Parliament now in Force, establishing the Religion of the Church of England* (1660), pp. 1-9; Griffiths, *Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 106-7.
[47] Baillie's criticism was aimed at Scottish as well as English presbyterians: *Letters and Journals of Baillie*, pp. 408, 414-15, 444, 484; GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 131, 143-5, 147, 149, 159, 171, 173, 178, 182, 184.

Horse and Manchester Lord Chamberlain. In the event, Monck went with the episcopalian tide: in December 1660 his brother Nicholas was elected bishop of Hereford, and that same month his confidant and chaplain, Thomas Gumble, was episcopally ordained, having very probably been once ordained as a presbyter.[48] Other peers proved to be intermediaries rather than advocates. Manchester encouraged Baxter to become a royal chaplain in June 1660, facilitated the meetings between the king and presbyterian clergy, and hosted the first conference in his lodgings. Manchester, Holles and Annesley helped to moderate Baxter's intemperate response to the draft declaration of religion in September 1660; according to Baxter, having meekly adopted the official call for 'moderate episcopacy and liturgy', the three encouraged presbyterian ministers 'to yield further than we did'. The rumour in August 1660 that Holles had proposed at the council table that presbyterianism should replace episcopal government, to the disgust of the king, seems unlikely to be true.[49] Monck, Manchester, Holles and Annesley attended the Worcester House conference on 22 October, and the latter two were appointed to oversee the final wording of the declaration arising from the meeting. Baxter claimed he had rebuked Annesley for speaking there 'more for prelacy than we had expected', with the result that Annesley was stung into incorporating concessions over ministerial powers in the parish into the published declaration, which delighted Baxter.[50] As a group, then, the court grandees toed the royal line and did not lobby for any radical change.

In contrast, there were attempts to defend the covenant and classical Presbyterianism among some MPs in the House of Commons, a minority in the city's Common Council and in the clerical stronghold of Sion House, and the reasons for their failure are instructive. In early June, within days of the king's return, the city ministers at Sion House drew up a petition to submit to king and parliament in favour of the presbyterian programme of March 1660, but it got no further than the common council and was condemned in the House of Commons and, on one account, by the king. A counter-petition 'by the most considerable in the city' requested that no mention should be made of the covenant in future petitions, nor that such matters be debated unless the common council be full.[51] Zachary Crofton, an open advocate of the covenant, attributed the original petition's defeat to 'state stratagems and court complements, and over prudent cowardice of some'; indeed, the rumour that the petition originated with Scottish presbyterians was probably court-based and calculated to smear the petition as radical and unrepresentative of English presbyterian opinion. But opposition was also the result of the royalism of many presbyterians, who wished to stabilise not to jeopardise the new regime, and the real prospect of religious reform, promised in the declaration of Breda and getting underway in early June. It is significant that one such prominent stakeholder in the new order, the freshly-minted royal chaplain Edward Reynolds, refused to endorse the petition. This opposition clearly cowed some presbyterian clergy: another ministerial petition was mooted at the end of June, that religion might be settled with 'moderation', but which omitted any mention of the covenant and presbyterian government to avoid

[48]LPL, V/1/l, fo. 2r; 'Thomas Gumble' (CCEd Person ID 63621).
[49]*Continuation of the Life of Clarendon*, i. 47-8; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 73-5, 84, 89; GUL, MS Gen 210, p. 171; *Diary and Papers of Henry Townshend*, p. 290; Crawford, *Denzil Holles*, pp. 195-6.
[50]Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 85-6, 89, 91.
[51]Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 151; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, p. 281; SRO, D868/4/469 (S. Charlton to Sir Richard Leveson, 9 June 1660).

giving 'offence', according to Sharp.[52] Yet another move in September 1660 in the common council to request that the covenant be revived was suppressed by fellow-councillors.[53]

Hyde recalled that some MPs in the Convention Parliament were 'very importunate' to retain the covenant and presbyterian government and to avoid the re-introduction of the prayer book since it would 'very much offend the people'. Certainly, in debates that July, Sir George Gerrard, Colonel Shapcote and Colonel Birch held fast to the covenant as they enquired how it could be compatible with primitive episcopacy and the prayer book. But these were minority opinions, and, in any case, presbyterians in the Commons could only prevail over episcopalians with the support of the independents, who had little interest in backing the covenant. As a result, discussions of discipline and worship were put on hold for three months pending the king's negotiations with presbyterian divines.[54] Meanwhile, the lively debate in print over the covenant, provoked by John Gauden's tract in June 1660 arguing that it was compatible with episcopal government, had no clear impact on policy.[55] The signal achievement of presbyterian MPs, probably assisted by independents, was the Act for Confirming and Restoring of Ministers of September 1660, allowing most ministers to remain in their livings, including those who did not possess episcopal orders. Bosher was surely correct in identifying this as a presbyterian measure, albeit with some episcopalian amendments.[56] Thus, from the earliest days of the Restoration the king's agenda of modest religious reform in government and worship prevailed, and advocacy of the covenant and presbyterian government were deemed by most to be unacceptable. In all probability, the king's hostility to both had been conveyed by Morley and Barwick to London presbyterians in their meetings in April and May, and by Charles II or his advisors to the presbyterian delegation at The Hague; crucially, as we have seen, it was endorsed by the presbyterian grandees at court.[57]

Crofton may have been right that the presbyterian clergy negotiating with the king privately supported the covenant and opposed episcopacy, but publicly, they had no choice but to dance to the royal tune.[58] As they told Sharp in July, 'present necessity' and 'the duty they owe to the peace of the church' limited their options; their aim was for a form of presbyterian government under the guise of reduced episcopacy as well as substantial modifications to the liturgy, which, they told him, showed that they had not abandoned the covenant. Sharp and 'some of the presbyterian way' feared they gave away too much too soon, which would be exploited by their episcopalian opponents: in Sharp's graphic phrase, 'they have thereby given a knife to cutt their owne throats'.[59] But given the weakness of their position, dependent as they were on trusting the king, it is difficult to see what else they could have done. Charles had required them in June to lay out how

[52]Crofton, *Berith Anti-Baal*, sig. B2r-B2ir; GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 130, 138, 146; Wodrow, *History*, pp. xxxiii-iv (letter of c. 10 June, omitted from GUL, MS Gen 210); HMC, *12th Report Appendix, Part VII*, p. 137.
[53]HMC, *5th Report Appendix*, p. 156: see also Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 173 fn. 1.
[54]*Continuation of the Life of Clarendon*, i. 16; Bodl., MS Dep f 9, fos 82r, 83r; Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 167-70; Jones, 'Political Groups', pp. 171-3.
[55]Milton, *Second Reformation*, p. 491; see also Vallance, *National Covenant*, pp. 180-6.
[56]Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 171-9; Jones, 'Political Groups', p. 173.
[57]See above, pp. 978-979.
[58]Crofton, *Berith Anti-Baal*, sig. B2r-v.
[59]GUL, MS Gen 210, pp. 149, 171, 186; see also Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 81. Baxter stated that he, Calamy and Reynolds all saw the model of episcopacy in the royal declaration of Oct. 1660 as compatible with the covenant: ibid., ii. 96.

much they were prepared to concede and (as both Sharp and Baxter attest) had 'promised' that the episcopalians would do the same, and then he would find common ground between them. In the event, the episcopalians escaped with merely offering their hostile critique of the presbyterian proposals, though, as we have seen, the king did make substantial concessions in the royal declaration of October 1660.[60] A leading participant at the Worcester House conference, and in the earlier meetings, was Richard Baxter, an outsider to London presbyterianism, and an avowed 'reconciler' and 'Christian'. His presence may be explained by his national prominence, the influence of his patron Lauderdale, and his position as royal chaplain. Might it also point to the divisions and uncertainties within the city clergy, which allowed the irrepressible Baxter to become so quickly a dominant voice?[61]

The Worcester House declaration on religion was broadly welcomed, with addresses of thanks to the king in early November from both houses of parliament and from the bulk of the city presbyterian clergy. The latter was signed by 36 ministers, 27 of whom would leave their livings after the imposition of the Act of Uniformity in 1662: thus far, most presbyterians backed the king's offer of modest reform.[62] Events in parliament quickly dissipated this cautious optimism. Clergy such as Baxter and MPs such as Anthony Irby were determined to seize the moment and incorporate the declaration into statute, as a bulwark against resurgent episcopalianism in court and country. On 6 November a committee was appointed to draw up a bill, which was read for the first time on 28 November. After an acrimonious debate, the motion to proceed to a second reading was defeated by 183 to 157 votes.[63] Episcopalians who opposed the motion were probably joined by a small group of independents, who had little to gain from the bill and were probably still smarting from their plea for toleration at the Worcester House conference being ignored by presbyterians.[64] The rejection of the bill has been seen, quite correctly, as the decisive defeat for the English presbyterian cause in 1660.[65] Its broader significance, however, has not been fully appreciated. First, it is clear that the king opposed the bill and the court drummed up support in the Commons. His secretary of state, William Morrice, notwithstanding his presbyterian sympathies, criticised the bill; so too did Sir Heneage Finch, the Solicitor-General, who stated that the king was not in favour of it; the two tellers for the vote against a second reading were Roger Palmer and Solomon Swale, both of whom had court connections and Catholic links. There was every reason why Charles would regard the bill as a public affront: to his integrity, since it expressed mistrust that he would fulfil his promises in the declaration; to his prerogative

[60]GUL, MS Gen 210, p. 149: Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 78-81; iii. 402, 416-26; see above, pp. 976-977.
[61]Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae,* ii. 58, 65, 74; Osborne, *Reformed and Celibate Pastor*, pp. 289-90 and fn. 166.
[62]*Journals of the House of Commons*, viii. 178; *Journals of the House of Lords*, xi. 183; *To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, the humble and grateful acknowledgement of many ministers*. For the full list of signatories, see the original: Bodl., Clarendon MS 73, fo. 3. Baxter noted that two presbyterians (Arthur Jackson and Zachary Crofton) 'and some others' refused to sign the address, since they regarded the declaration as breaking the Solemn League and Covenant. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 99.
[63]Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, iii. 510; *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England*, iv. cols. 141-2, 152-4; *Journals of the House of Commons*, viii. 175-6, 185, 194.
[64]Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 88; SRO, D868/8/15a (Thomas Gower to John Langley, 29 November 1660). The latter newsletter is the only direct evidence we have of independents voting with episcopalians, although it looks reliable. Jones is sceptical and, instead, attributes the episcopalian victory to effective court management: Jones, 'Political Groups', pp. 159-77.
[65]Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 198; Whiteman, 'Restoration', p. 71; Keeble, 'Introduction', p. 14; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, p. 286.

powers as supreme governor which he was using to offer comprehension and indulgence; and to his search for 'perfect and entire unity and uniformity throughout the nation'. As he stated in November 1661, the bill had no other design than to lay the foundation for 'a perpetual schism in the church'.[66] When, in the declaration of Breda, Charles had invited Parliament 'upon mature deliberation' to submit a bill to him to protect liberty of conscience, he had not contemplated such an attempt to restrict his prerogative and wrestle control of the religious settlement from his hands.

The failure of the bill also helped kill off the strategy of preferment to prominent presbyterian clergy. Baxter had declined the see of Hereford on 1 November in order to be free to work for 'the churches peace'; Manton rejected the deanery of Rochester as a direct result of the defeat of the bill, which may have also influenced Calamy, who had been in favour of the bill and turned down the see of Lichfield and Coventry by very early December. The only successful recruit was Reynolds, who had accepted the see of Norwich in September.[67] As a result, the clerical proponents of moderate reform had less presence, influence and voice at court in the winter of 1660-1, and in Convocation and the House of Lords thereafter. Their silence is captured nicely in the prestigious list of Lent preachers in 1661: it included only one of the thirteen presbyterian royal chaplains, Edmund Calamy, and episcopalians dominated the roster.[68]

Given the king's displeasure at the attempted legislative coup, it is unsurprising that little was done to implement the Worcester House declaration in the winter of 1660-1. The proposed meeting to discuss revisions to the liturgy was temporarily shelved, and what became the Savoy conference was only summoned, in April 1661, as a conciliatory move following the unwelcome election of four anti-episcopal MPs for the city of London to the forthcoming parliament.[69] All the promises to reform diocesan administration proved to be stillborn, even though many of them could have been implemented, quite swiftly, through the royal supremacy. No documented evidence survives as to why these concessions were dropped.[70] Was it the outcome of a silent struggle between presbyterian and episcopalian courtiers over whether or not to move ahead with change, which the presbyterians lost? Or was it merely because the king had little appetite to favour the presbyterians, following the offence they had given by pressing for the declaration to become statute? Certainly, there is no sign that bishops were reminded to observe the indulgence over oath-taking and ceremonies in the dioceses, so that many often disregarded its provisions; only two of them, Reynolds of Norwich and Gauden of Exeter, tried to incorporate the notion of 'reduced' episcopacy into their government. At London, Sheldon brushed aside the declaration by pressing conformity to the prayer book on Bates, Jacombe and Manton, all three presbyterian royal chaplains, an

[66] *Journals of the House of Commons*, viii. 194; *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, iv. cols. 152-4; Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 198; Henning ed., *House of Commons*, iii. 199-201, 514-17; Bodl., Clarendon MS 130, ii. pp. 9-11.

[67] Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, pp. 77-9; Green, *Re-establishment*, pp. 71, 83-6; Vernon, *London Presbyterians*, p. 283; Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 95-8, 184 and fn. 774, iii. 510-11; Calamy, *Abridgement*, p. 209; HMC, 5th *Report Appendix*, p. 158.

[68] *Lent-Preachers at Court* (1661). In the event, Calamy was replaced by his fellow-presbyterian chaplain, Benjamin Woodbridge. Bosher drew attention to three Lenten sermons that year which attacked presbyterians and were then published on the king's command; in fact, each was preached in Lent 1662 not 1661. Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 208, n. 4.

[69] Ibid., pp. 208-11.

[70] See Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ii. 101-3.

unequivocal mark of the episcopalian ascendancy.[71] In short, presbyterianism at court was a broken reed well before the meeting of the Cavalier Parliament on 8 May 1661.

Let us return to the question posed at the beginning of this essay: how do we explain the collapse of the presbyterian platform at the Restoration? In part, the answer lies in the strength of its opponents. The presbyterian cause was confronted by a strong and determined episcopalian leadership, with a clear programme for the settlement of the church. It had support from Charles's leading adviser, Edward Hyde, and also, crucially, from Charles himself. The tensions between king and episcopalian clergy, a recurrent feature of the rest of his reign, were largely absent through 1660 and 1661, as Charles made clear his preference for strong episcopal government and worship according to the Book of Common Prayer, practised a rich ceremonialism in his chapel, and quickly filled vacant deaneries, canonries, archdeaconries and bishoprics. More importantly, on the presbyterian side, even before the return of the king at the end of May 1660, there was little evidence of zealous leadership, and still less of a coherent group articulating and pushing for the kind of programme of reform embodied in the parliamentary order of 3 March. The presbyterian grandees at court were preoccupied by the need to demonstrate their commitment to royalism, their desire to achieve a political settlement and their concern to secure their own place in it; religion had become a secondary concern, as a succession of key figures indicated their willingness to support a settlement based on a reduced episcopacy. Many of the London ministers had done the same by the time they met Charles at The Hague, revealing starkly both the disunity within English presbyterianism and the gulf with their co-religionists in Scotland. Even before the return of the king, two key achievements of the revolutionary years, the abolition of episcopacy and the prayer book, had been abandoned, and the setting of the agenda for the religious settlement had been handed over to Charles and the episcopalians.

We should resist the temptation to attribute presbyterian failures in 1660-1 to its internal conflicts and divisions. English presbyterianism, unlike Scottish, was not divided into factions competing for dominance. Rather, the impression is of a movement searching for identity and for a language with which to describe itself.[72] After a decade and a half of disappointments and false hopes, presbyterianism was torn between a language of loyalty to the king, a language of settlement, in politics as much as in religion, and a language of continuing reformation.[73] The absence of a clear identity and a clear programme for reformation was brought into sharp focus by the indications, from across the presbyterian spectrum, that they were open to negotiations, first in 1659 but more crucially from March 1660, in discussions with Monck and the positioning of the general himself, in meetings with episcopalians like Barwick and Morley, and in conversations with Charles. These negotiations surrendered the initiative to the king and his episcopalian allies, and then the presbyterian position was completely undercut when the Convention voted for an unconditional restoration. The political and constitutional consequences of this decision are an established element of the narrative of the restoration; the implications for the religious settlement have received less emphasis but were

[71]Fincham and Taylor, 'Ordination, Re-Ordination and Conformity', pp. 219-20; Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, pp. 207-8; *The Kingdomes Intelligencer* 9 (25 Feb. – 4 March 1661), p. 134; TNA, SP 29/32/97, 109.

[72]As Neil Keeble has suggested to us, this lack of self-identity might be usefully pursued for the earlier period of the 1640s-50s.

[73]See the perceptive remarks of George Southcombe in his *Culture of Dissent*, pp. 36-7.

equally profound. The presbyterians were left with little leverage to influence the negotiations to which they were now committed: some support in Parliament and the city of London, a perception among royalists that they were stronger they were and a hefty dose of royal gratitude. In the event, they could do little to resist the episcopalian tide in the summer of 1660, as the surviving bishops were feted and prayer book worship resumed across the country. They had to accept an agenda at the conference at Worcester House which assumed the return of both episcopacy and the prayer book. Then, their (perhaps belated) attempt to assert themselves by pushing for statutory enactment of the Worcester House declaration merely alienated the king, arguably their closest ally, and helped to ensure that the limited concessions about the form of episcopal government were still-born. The Savoy conference, when it came, only offered minor corrections to the prayer book.[74] The failure of English Presbyterianism to achieve a religious settlement that included any significant element of further reformation was determined well before the meeting of the Cavalier Parliament.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

Bodleian Library Oxford, Clarendon MSS 71, 73, 92, 130; Dep f 9.
British Library London, Add. MSS 36781, 70114.
Glasgow University Library, MS Gen 210.
Lambeth Palace Library, ARC L 40.2/E17; V/1/I.
London Metropolitical Archives, CLC/198/SICA/008/MS33445/001.
National Library of Scotland, Wodrow Folio XXVI.
National Records of Scotland, CH1/1/11.
Staffordshire RO, D868/4/469, D868/5/57, D868/8/15a.
The National Archives London, SP 29.

Printed primary sources

Acts of Parliament now in Force, establishing the Religion of the Church of England. London, 1660.
A Letter from Several Ministers in and about Edinburgh, to the Ministers of London, concerning the Re-establishing of the Covenant. Edinburgh, 1659, *recte* 1660.
Baillie, R. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*. Edited by D. Laing. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1841–2.
Baxter, R. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*. Edited by N. Keeble, J. Coffey, T. Cooper and T. Charlton. 5 vols. Oxford: OUP, 2020.
Calamy, E. *An Abridgement of Mr Baxter's history of his life and times*. London, 1702.
Charles II. *His Majestie's Declaration to all His Loving Subjects of his Kingdom of England and His Dominion of Wales concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs*. London, 1660.
Chronicles of the Frasers. Edited by W. Mackay. Scottish History Society 1st series 47. Edinburgh, 1905.

[74]Ratcliff, 'Savoy Conference', pp. 110-28; Buchanan ed., *Savoy Conference Revisited*, pp. 4-8, 77-8; Cummings ed., *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. xliii-vi.

Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England from . . . 1066, to . . . 1803. Vol 4. London: R. Bagshaw, 1808.
Historical Manuscript Commission. *5th Report Appendix*. London, 1876.
Historical Manuscript Commission. *12th Report Appendix, Part VII: Le Fleming*. London, 1890.
Hyde, E. *The Continuation of the Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1759.
Pepys, S. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Edited by R. C. Latham and W. Matthews. 11 vols. London: Bell and Hyman, 1970–83.
Journals of the House of Commons, vols vii-viii. London: HMSO, 1802.
Journals of the House of Lords, vol. xi. London: HMSO, 1767.
Crofton, Z. *Berith Anti-Baal*. London, 1661.
Lent-Preachers at Court. London, 1661.
Mercurius Politicus, 22 (24–31 May). London, 1660.
Mercurius Publicus, 37 (6–13 Sept). London, 1660.
Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and some other brethren of the ministry. Edited by W. Stephen. 2 vols. Scottish History Society 3rd series 1, 16. 1921–1930.
[Reynolds, E]. *A Seasonable Exhortation of Sundry Ministers in London to the People of their Respective Congregations*. London, 1660.
Townshend, H. *The Diary and Papers of Henry Townshend, 1640-1663*. Edited by S. Porter, S. K. Roberts and I. Roy. Worcestershire Historical Society, ns, 25. 2014.
The Kingdomes Intelligencer, 9 (25 Feb.-4 March). London, 1661.
The Parliamentary Intelligencer, 20 (7–14 May), 31 (23–30 July). London, 1660.
To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, the humble and grateful acknowledgement of many Ministers of the Gospel in, and about the City of London, to His Royal Majesty for his gracious Concessions in His Majesties late Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs. London, 1660.
Surman, C. E. ed., *The Register-Booke of the Fourth Classis in the Province of London 1646-59*. Edited by C. E. Surman. Harleian Society, 82-3. 1953.
Wodrow, R. *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of* Scotland. 2 vols. Edinburgh 1721-2.

Printed secondary sources

Abernathy, G. R. *The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration, 1648–1663*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, ns 55, ii. Philadelphia, 1965.
Beddard, R. A. 'Restoration Oxford and the Remaking of the Protestant Establishment' in *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford*. Edited by N. Tyacke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
Beddard, R. A. 'The Restoration Church' in *The Restored Monarchy 1660-1688*. Edited by J. R. Jones. London: Macmillan, 1979.
Bosher, R. *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*. London: Dacre Press, 1951.
Brown, L. F. 'The Religious Factors in the Convention Parliament', *English Historical Review*, 22, 1907.
Buchanan, C. ed. *The Savoy Conference Revisited*. Cambridge: Grove Books, 2002.
Buckroyd, J. *The Life of James Sharp Archbishop of St Andrews: a Political Biography*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987.
Clarke, A. *Prelude to Restoration in Ireland: the end of the Commonwealth, 1659-1660*. Cambridge: CUP, 1999.
Cooper, T. 'Richard Baxter and the Savoy Conference (1661)'. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68, 2017.
Crawford, P. *Denzil Holles 1598-1680: a Study of his Political Career*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1979.
Cummings, B. ed. *The Book of Common Prayer. The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*. Oxford: OUP, 2011.

Davis, R. W. 'The "Presbyterian" Opposition and the Emergence of Party in the House of Lords in the reign of Charles II' in *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784*. Edited by C. Jones. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984.
De Krey, G. *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
Fincham, K. and Taylor, S. 'Episcopalian Identity, 1640-1662' in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume 1. Reformation and Identity, c.1520-1662*. Edited by A. Milton. Oxford: OUP, 2017.
Fincham, K. and Taylor, S. 'The Restoration of the Church of England: Ordination, Re-Ordination and Conformity' in *The Nature of the English Revolution Revisited*. Edited by S. Taylor and G. Tapsell. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
Fincham, K. and Taylor, S. 'Vital Statistics: Episcopal Ordination and Ordinands in England, 1646-60', *English Historical Review*, 126, 2011.
Green, I. M. *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*. Oxford: OUP, 1978.
D. N. Griffiths. *The Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer 1549-1999*. London: British Library, 2002.
Halcomb, J. 'The Association Movement and the Politics of Church Settlement during the Interregnum' in *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66*. Edited by E. Vernon and H. Powell. Manchester: MUP, 2020.
Henning, B. D. ed. *The History of Parliament. The House of Commons 1660–1690*. 3 vols. London: Secker and Warburg, 1983.
Hutton, R. *Charles the Second*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
Hughes, A. '"The Remembrance of Sweet Fellowship": Relationships between English and Scottish Presbyterians in the 1640s and 1650s' in *Insular Christianity*. Edited by R. Armstrong and Tadhg ó hannracháin. Manchester: MUP, 2013.
Jones, J. R. 'Political Groups and Tactics in the Convention of 1660'. *Historical Journal*, 6, 1960.
Keeble, N. 'Introduction: Attempting Uniformity' in *'Settling the Peace of the Church': 1662 Revisited*. Edited by N. Keeble. Oxford: OUP, 2014.
Lacey, D. R. *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661-1689*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969.
Little, P. *Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004.
MacKenzie, K. M. *The Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms and the Cromwellian Union, 1643-1663*. London: Routledge, 2017.
Matthews, A. G. *Calamy Revised*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
McGuire, J. 'Policy and Patronage: the Appointment of Bishops 1660-61' in *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland since the Reformation*. Edited by A. Ford, J. McGuire and K. Milne. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1995.
Milton, A. *England's Second Reformation*. Cambridge: CUP, 2021.
Osborne, S. D. *The Reformed and Celibate Pastor: Richard Baxter's Argument for Clerical Celibacy*. Gottingen: Vandehoeck and Ruprecht, 2022.
Paley, R. ed. *The History of Parliament: The House of Lords 1660–1715*. 5 vols. Cambridge: CUP, 2016.
Pruett, J. H. *The Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: the Leicestershire experience*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978.
Ratcliff, E. C. 'The Savoy Conference and the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer' in *From Uniformity to Unity 1662-1962*. Edited by G. F. Nuttall and O. Chadwick. London: SPCK, 1962.
Raffe, A. *The Culture of Controversy*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012.
Southcombe, G. 'Presbyterians in the Restoration' in *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions. Volume I: the Post-Reformation era, c.1559-c.1689*. Edited by J. Coffey. Oxford: OUP, 2020.
Southcombe, G. *The Culture of Dissent in Restoration England: 'The Wonders of the Lord'*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2019.
Swatland, A. *The House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

Thomas, R. 'The Rise of the Reconcilers' in *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism*. Edited by C. G. Bolam, J. Goring, H. L. Short, and R. Thomas. London: Allen and Unwin, 1968.
Till, B. 'The Worcester House Declaration and the Restoration of the Church of England'. *Historical Research*, 70, 1998.
Twigg, J. *The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution 1625-1688*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1990.
Vernon, E. 'A Ministry of the Gospel: the Presbyterians during the English Revolution' in *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Edited by C. Durston and J. Maltby. Manchester: MUP, 2006.
Vallance, E. *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005.
Vernon, E. *London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638-64*. Manchester: MUP, 2021.
Whiteman, A. 'The Restoration of the Church of England' in *From Uniformity to Unity 1662-1962*. Edited by G. F. Nuttall and O. Chadwick. London: SPCK, 1962.
Wing, W. *Short-Title Catalogue of Books . . . 1641–1700*. 3 vols. 2nd ed. New York, 1972–88.
Withington, P. *The politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in early modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
Wood, A. H. *Church Unity without Uniformity*. London: Epworth Press, 1963.
Worden, B. '1660: Restoration and Revolution' in *From Republic to Restoration. Legacies and Departures*. Edited J. Clare. Manchester: MUP, 2018.
Worden, B. 'The Campaign for a free Parliament, 1659-60'. *Parliamentary History*, 36, 2017.
Worden, B. 'The Demand for a Free Parliament, 1659-60' in *Revolutionary England, c.1630-c.1660. Essays for Clive Holmes*. Edited G. Southcombe and G. Tapsell. London: Routledge, 2017.

Unpublished thesis

Tunnicliffe, S. J. 'The Development of the Doctrine of the Church and Religious Toleration among English Presbyterians, 1643-1705'. Cambridge University Ph.D thesis, 2023.

Database

https://theclergydatabase.org.uk/