

**Preaching, Print, and Politics: The
Sermons of the Royalist and Episcopalian
Clergy, 1642–1660**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

William White

St. Anne's College

September 2019

Preaching, Print, and Politics: The Sermons of the Royalist and Episcopalian Clergy, 1642-1660

William White

St. Anne's College

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2019

Short Abstract:

This thesis explores the sermons of royalist and episcopalian clergymen during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum. While contemporaries and historians have long ascribed a central role to parliamentary preachers in fomenting rebellion, attempts to harness the power of the pulpit for conservative, loyalist purposes have gone largely unstudied. Despite this historiographical neglect, this thesis argues that those churchmen committed to both the king and the pre-war Church of England came to regard sermons as a vital means of responding to and negotiating the radical politico-religious changes with which they were confronted over the course of these two tumultuous decades.

Both the pulpit and the printed sermon provided a platform from which different audiences – king, parliament, people – could be appealed to and influenced as changing circumstances dictated. These opportunities became ever more valuable for clergymen who found themselves steadily marginalised, by the king's supporters as well his opponents. Moreover, in their efforts to manipulate popular allegiance and direct the decision making of political elites at critical moments of the crisis, they exploited the traditional authority of preachers to interpret scripture and providence, and to adjudicate in matters of conscience. Although the royalist and episcopalian clergy have sometimes been presented as comparatively passive or moderate in these years, their preaching is here depicted as belligerent, divisive, and polarising, intimately involved with the processes by which violent conflict was driven forward and the attempts of successive regimes to 'heal and settle' undermined.

Close attention is also paid throughout the thesis to practices of publication, and to the ways that rhetorical strategies and homiletic conventions evolved in response to the new print, political, and religious culture that emerged from the early 1640s. This thesis therefore enhances our understanding of royalism and episcopalianism; of the early modern sermon and its evolution; and of the interrelation between the religious and the political spheres in seventeenth-century England.

Preaching, Print, and Politics: The Sermons of the Royalist and Episcopalian Clergy, 1642-1660

William White

St. Anne's College

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2019

Long Abstract:

This thesis is a study of the ways in which the revolutionary events and partisan politico-religious allegiances of mid-seventeenth century England impacted on one of the most important aspects of Protestant worship: preaching. Specifically, it examines how those clergymen committed both to the king and to an episcopalian Church of England used sermon-giving as a means of responding to the series of unwelcome constitutional and ecclesiastical changes with which they were confronted between 1642 and 1660. That preaching played a particularly significant role in these decades was frequently alleged by contemporaries and has since been reasserted in many modern accounts of the period. However, the overwhelming focus has hitherto been on the clerical supporters of parliament, whose notorious fast-day sermons during the 1640s specifically are held up as evidence of the dynamic relationship between religious and political radicalism that helped drive forward first rebellion and then regicide. That there were sermons, indeed *fast-day* sermons, delivered by churchmen and before audiences who stood in complete opposition to the parliamentary cause has gone largely unnoticed.

This thesis is therefore on one level an attempt to redress a longstanding historiographical imbalance, and to achieve a more holistic, dialectical understanding of Civil War preaching. The decision to focus exclusively on these loyalist preachers, however, is also a result of the

unique position they occupied during the 1640s and 1650s: they constituted a persecuted and defeated group, forced to contend with censorship, imprisonment, and ejection in their attempts to preach and print sermons. Moreover, many had been deeply hostile to the perceived populism of puritan preachers in the decades immediately preceding the Civil War, while some had resented too the sermon-centred piety that had come to predominate in English Protestantism by the end of the sixteenth century. The ways in which they negotiated these constraints and recalibrated their prejudices regarding the pulpit at a time of unprecedented upheaval are, in this respect, of especial interest. It is therefore also hoped, more generally, that this thesis can contribute to our understanding of royalist and episcopalian identities; of the early modern pulpit and press; and of the complex interrelation between the religious and political spheres in seventeenth-century England.

It is shown that, throughout the 1640s and 1650s but particularly at climactic moments, clergymen regarded the preaching and printing of sermons as an important means by which they might intervene in and alter the course of events. Both the pulpit and the printed sermon provided a platform from which different audiences – king, parliament, people – could be appealed to and influenced as changing circumstances dictated. These opportunities became ever more valuable for clergymen who found themselves steadily marginalised, by the king's supporters as well his opponents. It is argued that, in their efforts to manipulate popular allegiance and direct the decision making of political elites at critical moments of the unfolding crisis, they exploited the traditional authority of preachers to interpret scripture and providence, and to adjudicate in matters of conscience. Moreover, although episcopalian clergymen are sometimes depicted as 'moderate' or 'irenic' in comparison with their puritan counterparts, their preaching is here depicted as consistently belligerent, divisive, and polarising, serving first to drive forward violent conflict and then to undermine the attempts of successive regimes to 'heal and settle'.

This thesis also pays close attention to the processes of publishing sermons throughout: specifically, it shows how and why preachers chose to enter print in these years, while highlighting the extent to which print could transform the meaning of a sermon. It also explores the literary and rhetorical dimensions of preaching, charting the effects of a revolutionary print and political culture on established homiletic structures, styles, and conventions. While a certain amount of contemporary discussion had always been expected of a preacher, the increasing role played by the pulpit in public debate during the 1640s meant that the sermons of clergymen on both sides assumed a more topical, polemical, and intertextual character. During the following decade, however, those royalist and episcopalian clergymen who were still in a position to preach sermons publicly or who went into print, often fell back on the rhetorical strategies and safeguards that Elizabethan and Jacobean preachers had traditionally employed for engaging with controversial subject matter. There was thus continuity as well as change in the generic conventions adopted by these preachers.

The first three chapters of the thesis are concerned with royalist and episcopalian preaching from the eve to the conclusion of the First Civil War. Chapter one explores the ways in which clerical supporters of the king and established Church reconceptualised their ideas about sermon-giving in response to the mass print, adversarial politics, and vociferous public debate that they confronted after 1640. It argues that the many royalist and episcopalian sermons delivered in the early 1640s were both an integral part of, and profoundly shaped by, these dramatic developments. Chapter two, meanwhile, shows how preaching was used in military contexts during the First Civil War, as a means of mobilising support and resources for the king's cause. It suggests that royalist preachers deployed a polarising, divisive language of holy war that conflated questions of political allegiance with questions of providence and salvation in order to galvanise support. The third chapter builds on these findings, focusing on the sermons preached before the Oxford Parliament in early 1644. It argues that

clergymen used the pulpit in St. Mary the Virgin disrupt the peace process and to press for greater commitment to the war effort. Co-opting the early Stuart Jeremiad, they called for a programme of moral reform that would assuage the wrath of a vengeful deity and thereby ensure victory over their enemies, rather than condescension to the Westminster Parliament's ecclesiastical demands – which they feared a peace treaty would involve.

The following two chapters then examine royalist and episcopalian preaching in the aftermath of the Civil Wars, as these clergymen responded not only to the defeat of the king's cause but to the growing realisation that their priorities and those of their monarch had begun to diverge. Chapter four documents how the clergy at the courts of Charles I and Charles II offered these kings counsel from the pulpit in these years. As both contemplated sacrificing episcopacy as the necessary price of saving, or regaining, their throne, royal chaplains tried desperately to counter this pragmatic policy when given the opportunity to preach *coram rege*. The differing rhetorical strategies they deployed when counselling Charles I and his son are compared. The fifth chapter, meanwhile, is a study of loyalist preaching during the 1650s. Taking as its starting point the fact that many more royalist and episcopalian clergymen retained livings after the Regicide than was once supposed, it seeks to determine how and whether these ministers continued to use their pulpits to advance the causes of Church and king – both now at their lowest ebb. It is argued that many saw preaching as a central means by which the new political and ecclesiastical status quo could be resisted: they not only offered guarded, subtle criticism of the authorities, they also communicated a 'theology of loyalty' to lay audiences that could persuade them to remain steadfast in their allegiance to the old order.

The thesis ends by considering in more detail the reception and circulation of these sermons: how audiences, whether sympathetic or hostile, responded to this kind of partisan, political preaching and the ways in which the politico-religious identities of laypersons might have

shaped, and been shaped by, the experience of sermon hearing during the Civil Wars and Interregnum.

Contents

Acknowledgments.....	2
Abbreviations and Conventions	3
Introduction.....	7
Chapter One: Pulpit, Press, and Public Politics on the Eve of the English Civil Wars	30
Chapter Two: Royalist Mobilisations and the Pulpit, 1642-1646.....	76
Chapter Three: Prophetic Preaching and the Oxford Parliament of 1644.....	107
Chapter Four: Sermons and the Politics of Counsel, 1646–51	139
Chapter Five: Preaching, Royalism, and Episcopalian ‘Conformity’ in Interregnum England.....	190
Chapter Six: Transmission and Reception	251
Conclusion	286
Bibliography	297

Acknowledgments

Above all, I must thank my supervisor, Grant Tapsell. I have now had the great fortune to be Grant's student twice over – first as an undergraduate and then as a D.Phil. candidate – and his influence on my scholarly development has accordingly been profound. It is impossible to imagine a more dedicated or supportive mentor for a doctoral project: unfailingly generous with his time, he was always willing to read overlong chapters, presentations, and articles at short notice and to dispense encouragement when it was much needed. Just as importantly, his good humour, wisdom, and kindness made all our meetings a real pleasure. This thesis would not have been possible without him and I owe him an enormous debt.

I am likewise very grateful to Richard Serjeantson, who supervised my M.Phil. in Cambridge and has remained a source of advice and support ever since. It was thanks to Richard that I first became interested in the relationship between preaching and politics in the seventeenth century, and during his inspirational supervisions that I resolved to continue on to doctoral study.

Hannah Dawson, Anthony Milton, Jason Peacey, and David Smith all offered invaluable suggestions when I was initially devising this project and directed me towards several important manuscript collections. I subsequently benefitted greatly from the advice provided in my transfer and confirmation of status interviews by Leif Dixon, Sarah Mortimer, Jon Parkin, and Lucy Wooding, as well as conversations with Richard Cust, Ken Fincham, Vivienne Larminie, George Southcombe, and Matt Ward in more informal settings. Special thanks are also due to Judith Maltby and Antony Milton for examining the thesis, and for their insightful commentary during the viva.

Parts of chapters two, four, and five were initially tried out in papers delivered at the Oxford Early Modern Britain seminar, the IHR, the German Historical Institute in London, and Queen's University, Belfast. I thank the participants for their many helpful questions and comments, and the organisers for hosting me.

Finally, I am very happy to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

Abbreviations and Conventions

Place of publication London unless otherwise stated.

<i>AO</i>	Anthony Wood, <i>Athenae Oxonienses</i> , ed. Philip Bliss (4 vols., 1813–20)
BL	British Library, London
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
<i>CC</i>	Thomas Carte, <i>A Collection of original letters and papers, concerning the affairs of England, from the year 1641 to 1660</i> (2 vols., 1739)
<i>CCSP</i>	<i>Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library</i> , ed. Octavius Ogle, William Henry Bliss, William Dunn Macray and F. J. Routledge (5 vols., Oxford, 1869–1970)
<i>CHR</i>	Edward Hyde, <i>The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England</i> , ed. William Dunn Macray (6 vols., Oxford, 1888)
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Journal of the House of Commons</i> (10 vols., London, 1802)
<i>CSPD</i> , Charles II	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II, 1660–1685</i> , ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1860)

CSPD, Commonwealth	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, during the Commonwealth, 1649–1660</i> , ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1875–86)
CUL	Cambridge University Library
DC	Francis Peck, <i>Desiderata Curiosa</i> (1779)
DHT	<i>The Diary and Papers of Henry Townshend, 1640–1663</i> , ed. Stephen Porter <i>et al</i> (Bristol, 2014)
DJE	<i>The Diary of John Evelyn</i> , ed. Esmond S. de Beer (6 vols., Oxford, 1955)
EHR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
HJ	<i>Historical Journal</i>
HLQ	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
JBS	<i>Journal of British Studies</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
LJ	<i>Journal of the House of Lords</i> (39 vols., London, 1767–1830)
LJE	<i>The Letterbooks of John Evelyn</i> , ed. Douglas Chambers and David Galbraith (2 vols., 2014)

<i>LK</i>	<i>Letters of the Kings of England</i> , ed. J. O. Halliwell-Phillips (2 vols., 1848)
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives
<i>ODNB</i>	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography www.oxforddnb.com
<i>OED</i>	Oxford English Dictionary Online www.oed.com
<i>MEA</i>	Bulstrode Whitelocke, <i>Memorials of the English affairs</i> (4 vols., Oxford, 1853)
<i>P&P</i>	<i>Past and Present</i>
<i>PH</i>	<i>Parliamentary History</i>
<i>SF</i>	<i>The Sermons of the Reverend Anthony Farindon</i> , ed. Thomas Jackson (4 vols., 1849)
<i>SPC</i>	<i>State papers collected by Edward, earl of Clarendon</i> , ed. Richard Scrope and Thomas Monkhouse (3 vols., Oxford, 1767–86)
<i>TRHS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>
<i>WJC</i>	<i>The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin</i> , eds. John Henry and James Parker (5 vols., Oxford, 1855)

WR

A. G. Matthews, *Walker Revised: being a Revision of John Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion, 1642–60* (Oxford, 1948)

Introduction

This thesis examines the sermons of royalist and episcopalian clergymen during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum. While contemporaries and historians have long ascribed a central role to parliamentary preachers in fomenting rebellion, attempts to harness the power of the pulpit for conservative, loyalist purposes have gone largely unnoticed. Despite this historiographical neglect, it is argued that those churchmen committed to both the king and the pre-war Church of England came to regard their sermons as a vital means of responding to and negotiating the radical politico-religious changes with which they were forced to contend over the course of these two tumultuous decades.

These clergymen sought to exploit their traditional authority as preachers in scriptural, providential, and theological matters in order to manipulate popular allegiance and direct the decision making of political elites. Although episcopalian clergymen are sometimes depicted as ‘moderate’, irenic, or even ‘secular’ in comparison with their puritan counterparts, their preaching is here depicted as belligerent and polarising, aimed first at driving forward violent conflict and then undermining the attempts of successive regimes to ‘heal and settle’. This thesis also pays close attention to processes of publication, and to the literary and rhetorical dimensions of preaching, charting the effects of a revolutionary print and political culture on established homiletic structures, styles, and conventions.

This introduction will first establish the historiographical context of the thesis, before supplying more precise definitions for the key terms deployed in subsequent chapters. It will then provide an overview of the central arguments advanced over the course of the thesis and the ways in which these build on or challenge existing scholarly literature on Civil War royalism, episcopalianism, and early modern preaching. Finally, the structure adopted and the sources utilised are elucidated in more detail.

Historiography

This thesis sits at the intersection of two important recent trends in the historiography of seventeenth-century England: first, the development of sophisticated analytical approaches to the theory and practice of preaching, and, secondly, the much greater attention paid to the fortunes of the defeated royalist party and the Church of England between 1642 and 1660. Work by both literary scholars and historians over the last two decades has dramatically transformed the field of early modern sermons studies. Twentieth-century scholars tended to focus exclusively on the literary merits of early modern preaching, fetishizing the likes of John Donne and Lancelot Andrewes for their rhetorical sophistication and poetic sense.¹ The great majority of early modern preachers, lacking the literary talents of Donne and Andrewes, were deemed unworthy of serious study.² But if the works of W. F. Mitchell, J. W. Blench, or Horton Davies thus demonstrated an insensitivity to historical and political context, historians have for their part often failed to appreciate the subtleties and particularities of the sermon as a distinctive genre. ‘The historiographical role played by the sermon’, it has been observed, ‘has nearly always been supporting rather than leading’ and ‘until very recently, sermons themselves have never been the focus of historical study’.³ Mary Morrissey has accused historians of ‘source mining’ sermons: extracting quotations out of context to corroborate arguments about religious, political, or intellectual thought, and thereby treating them ‘as bare axioms rather than elements within a highly wrought rhetorical “set-piece”’.⁴ Notions of

¹ W. F. Mitchell, *Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: A Study of its Literary Aspects* (1932); J. W. Blench, *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English sermons 1450–c.1600* (Oxford, 1964); Horton Davies, *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588–1645* (San Marino, CA, 1986).

² Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 1–2; Millar Maclure, *The Paul’s Cross Sermons, 1534–1642* (Toronto, 1958), p. 148.

³ Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, ‘Introduction’, in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1500–1750* (Manchester, 2000), p. 9.

⁴ Mary Morrissey, ‘Interdisciplinarity and the Study of Early Modern Sermons’, *HJ*, 42 (1999), pp. 1111–1123, at p. 1117.

style, structure, and gesture have too often been entirely disregarded by those drawing on sermon literature.

However, work by Morrissey, Peter McCullough, Lori Anne Ferrell, and Arnold Hunt – to name just a few – has now greatly enhanced our understanding of the early modern sermon as an *event* rather than simply a text: an oral, even theatrical, performance in which the audience as well as the preacher participated.⁵ Taking a genuinely interdisciplinary approach, these scholars have stressed the need for sensitivity to the immediate context, audience, and location in which a sermon was originally delivered when reconstructing its meaning, and to be alive to discrepancies between sermons as they were preached from the pulpit and as they subsequently appeared in printed form. In doing so, we become more attuned to the sophisticated rhetorical strategies and techniques that enabled preachers, not least those at the royal court, to engage with contemporary political or religious debates. Indeed, as Hunt and Kevin Killeen have both shown, ostensibly anodyne theological or scriptural discussion was often employed to communicate critical and controversial messages in the pulpit while simultaneously maintaining the deniability that might protect the preacher from official censure.⁶

Thanks to this literature, it is now possible to appreciate just how central the sermon was not only to religious but to political culture in early modern England too, serving as a critical

⁵ Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998); Lori Anne Ferrell, *Government by Polemic: James I, the King's Preachers, and the Rhetorics of Conformity, 1603–1625* (Stanford, CA, 1998); David Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007); Hunt, *Art of Hearing*; Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558–1642* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 130–59; Hugh Adlington *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), *passim*; John Spurr, *The Laity and Preaching in Post-Reformation England* (Friends of Dr Williams's Library 66th lecture, 2013); Ann Hughes, 'Preachers and Hearers in Revolutionary London: Contextualising Parliamentary Fast Sermons', *TRHS*, 6th series, 24 (2014), pp. 57–78.

⁶ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, pp. 292–342; Emma Rhatigan, 'Preaching to Princes: John Burgess and George Hakewill in the Royal Pulpit', *JEH*, 62 (2011), pp. 273–96; Kevin Killeen, 'Veiled Speech: Preaching, Politics and Scriptural Typology', in Adlington *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, pp. 387–403.

component of an emerging ‘public sphere’.⁷ It has, of course, long been noted that the pulpit was a means of inculcating obedience to civil authorities amongst the populace and communicating royal policy – especially in the decades following the Reformation and the establishment of royal supremacy over the Church.⁸ This was a function that seventeenth-century Englishmen themselves frequently acknowledged. ‘Those who holds the helm of the pulpit’, observed the ecclesiastical historian Thomas Fuller, ‘always steer the people’s hearts as they please’.⁹ According to the cleric and controversialist Peter Heylyn, meanwhile, when Elizabeth I ‘had any business to bring about amongst the people, she used to tune the Pulpits, as her saying was; that is to say, to have some preachers in and about London, and other great auditories in the kingdom, ready at her command to cry up her design’.¹⁰ Much later, in 1646, Charles I would confide to Henrietta Maria that, if ‘the pulpits teach not obedience ... the king will have but small comfort of the militia’.¹¹

There were good reasons for this eagerness to control the pulpit. Until 1689, attendance at a Church of England service was compulsory by law, and thus for most of the seventeenth century the entire adult population was – officially at least – expected to hear a sermon on a regular basis.¹² Especially outside London, where literacy rates were lower and orality still crucial to the spread of news and information, preaching helped keep regional populations abreast of national political developments. Educated and literate clergymen could act ‘as

⁷ On the applicability of this concept to early modern England, see Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England’, *JBS*, 45 (2006), pp. 270–92.

⁸ See Godfrey Davies, ‘English Political Sermons, 1603–1640’, *HLQ*, 3 (1939), pp. 1–22; Susan Wabuda, *Preaching during the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 89–99.

⁹ Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, ed. J. S. Brewer (6 vols., Oxford, 1845), III, 102.

¹⁰ Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1671), p. 153. See also Arnold Hunt, ‘Tuning the Pulpits: The Religious Context of the Essex Revolt’, in Ferrell and McCullough (eds.), *English Sermon Revised*, pp. 86–114.

¹¹ *Charles I in 1646: Letters of King Charles the First to Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. J. Bruce (Camden Society, 63, 1858), p. 79 (Charles I to Henrietta Maria, Newcastle, 30 Nov. 1646).

¹² Whether children were expected to attend services before had been confirmed is unclear. See Susan Brigden, ‘Youth and the English Reformation’, in Paul Slack (ed.), *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 77–107, at pp. 92–3.

interpreters of print and were agents from which webs of oral communication radiated'.¹³ This was recognised in the frequent charges against 'scandalous' and 'malignant' clergymen during the 1640s, that they had failed to read parliamentary declarations. But sermons were widely read, as well as heard and discussed: from the late sixteenth century, a booming market for printed sermons allowed preachers to reach an audience far beyond their immediate congregation.¹⁴ This combined oral and literary audience, argues Tony Claydon, meant that the pulpit 'played a vital role in creating and sustaining the public sphere' in Stuart England.¹⁵ Furthermore, preachers traditionally claimed a unique authority as 'Christ's ambassadors' – 'a special tier inside the greater body of Christendom' – and their task required not only explicating the words of scripture but applying its doctrines directly to the lives of their hearers.¹⁶ This inevitably meant that preachers felt justified in pontificating on the political or religious questions of the day, even if, as Morrissey has shown, audiences sometimes reacted unfavourably to a sermon that strayed too far into the 'secular' realm.¹⁷

Early modern preaching has increasingly been approached, then, as 'literary art inextricably engaged in the public sphere' – a genre with the potential to shape both political decision-making and popular opinion.¹⁸ Yet despite this historiographical shift, studies of Civil War preaching remain relatively few and far between. The ground-breaking recent monographs of McCullough, Morrissey, and Hunt take their stories up to 1642 at the latest, and only a single unpublished DPhil thesis by James Rigney has made any attempt to examine the development

¹³ Lloyd Bowen, 'Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639–40 and 1642', *HJ*, 56 (2013), pp. 297–319, at p. 314. This point is also made in Jacqueline Eales, 'The Clergy and Allegiance at the Outbreak of the English Civil Wars: The Case of John Marston of Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 132 (2012), pp. 83–110.

¹⁴ Barbara Shapiro, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558–1688* (Stanford, CA, 2012), p. 166. See also: Mary Morrissey, 'Sermons, Primers, and Prayerbooks', in Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 491–509.

¹⁵ Tony Claydon, 'The Sermon, the "Public Sphere" and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England', in Ferrell and McCullough (eds.), *English Sermon Revised*, pp. 208–34, at p. 211.

¹⁶ Wabuda, *Preaching*, p. 66.

¹⁷ Mary Morrissey, 'Presenting James VI and I to the Public: Preaching on Political Anniversaries at Paul's Cross', in Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2016), pp. 107–22, at p. 114

¹⁸ Ferrell and McCullough, 'Introduction', p. 2.

of the sermon as a literary and religious genre over the revolutionary decades.¹⁹ This is surprising, not least because contemporaries on both sides consistently pointed to the pulpit, as well as the press (on which much more has been written), when it came to explaining how the nation had descended into civil war.²⁰ Preaching, contemporaries realised, had the potential to mobilise support for king or parliament, to engage the public, and thereby shape patterns of popular allegiance. Reflecting on the causes of the Civil War in his *Behemoth*, Thomas Hobbes singled out presbyterian preachers for particular criticism: ‘had it not been much better,’ he asked in characteristically uncompromising fashion, ‘that those seditious Ministers, which were not perhaps a thousand, had been all killed before they had preached?’²¹ Parliamentarians and royalists alike charged their opponents with perverting the office of preaching and using the pulpit in new and illegitimate ways, radically altering established homiletic forms, structures, and styles. A revolutionary political situation, the collapse of ecclesiastical government, unprecedented developments in news and print culture – all served to accelerate the evolution of early modern preaching, changing, in some cases forever, who was able to preach, what they preached, where, and how.

Where Civil War preaching has been discussed, it is the fast-day sermons delivered before the Long Parliament that have elicited by far the most scholarly attention. It is telling that the single chapter devoted to the English Revolution in the recent *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* is concerned with ‘Preaching and Parliament’.²² The incendiary, blood-thirsty discourses of Stephen Marshall and his fellow puritan ministers, inciting MPs to holy war and religious reformation, featured heavily in the twentieth-century works of Michael

¹⁹ James Rigney, ‘The English Sermon, 1640–1660: Consuming the Fire’ (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1994).

²⁰ See below, chapter one; Mark Hartman, ‘Contemporary Explanations of the English Revolution’ (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1978), pp. 10, 20–21, 30–1; Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641–1649* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 188–93.

²¹ Thomas Hobbes, *Behemoth, or, the Long Parliament*, ed. Paul Seaward (Oxford, 2010), p. 231.

²² Tom Webster, ‘Preaching and Parliament, 1640–59’, in Adlington *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, pp. 404–422.

Walzer, Christopher Hill, and Stephen Baskerville.²³ In these studies, sermons were ‘source-mined’, to borrow Morrissey’s phrase: invoked for what they could tell us about the character of ‘revolutionary puritanism’, rather than being studied as a phenomenon in their own right. By contrast, in the 1960s both Hugh Trevor-Roper and John F. Wilson produced accounts that placed the fast sermons more precisely in the context of the parliamentary debates and factionalism of the 1640s.²⁴ However, that there were sermons – indeed fast-day sermons – being delivered by those close to and loyal to the king has only been far more recently, and indeed fleetingly, acknowledged, with several scholars calling for a comprehensive study of these important texts.²⁵

Nor are the sermons of royalist and episcopalian clergymen only worth scrutinising because they have hitherto been overlooked in comparison to parliamentarian or radical preaching. An investigation into this kind of preaching has the potential for intriguing insights because of the unique nature of conservative experience in these decades: the clergymen studied in this thesis were forced to grapple with the realities of defeat and persecution, to negotiate life under a regime and within a Church to which they were to a greater or lesser extent opposed. They found themselves disempowered and their faith proscribed. Although the intellectual impact of the puritan ‘experience of defeat’ in 1662 has long been studied, historians are only

²³ Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (1966); Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (1993); Stephen Baskerville, *Not Peace but a Sword: The Political Theology of the English Revolution* (1993). See also: J. C. Spalding, ‘Sermons before Parliament (1640–1649) as a Public Puritan Diary’, *Church History*, 36 (1967) pp. 24–35.

²⁴ Hugh Trevor-Roper, ‘The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament’ in *idem* (ed.), *Essays in British History: Presented to Sir Keith Feiling* (1964), pp. 85–138; John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (Princeton, 1969).

²⁵ Two valuable studies that do consider both royalist and parliamentarian preaching during the Civil Wars are: Barbara Donagan, ‘Casuistry and Allegiance in the English Civil War’, in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.), *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 89–111, and Jacqueline Eales, ‘Provincial Preaching and Allegiance in the First English Civil War, 1640–6’, in Thomas Cogswell *et al* (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 185–210. For scholars commenting on the need for this study, see Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven, CT, 2010), p. 325; Margaret Griffin, *Regulating Morality and Religion in the King’s Armies, 1639–1646* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 158–9.

beginning to appreciate the extent to which the struggles of the preceding two decades had generated, for royalists and episcopalians, fresh perspectives and innovative approaches to familiar questions like toleration, providence, or the royal supremacy.²⁶ Some of these divines, moreover, were close to Charles I or Charles II and regularly preached at court, and their sermons accordingly can help to illuminate the theory and practice of ecclesiastical counsel at pivotal moments in the 1640s and 1650s. At the same time, some episcopalians had, prior to the Civil Wars, resented the predominance of sermons in religious worship and most had been wary of attempts to engage with political questions through the pulpit or the press, reserving particular disdain for puritans who sought to dictate policy to the king from the pulpit. This all makes their use of pulpit and press during the 1640s and 1650s, their evolving attitude to the sermon and its merits, worthy of much closer consideration than it has traditionally been accorded.

The lack of attention to royalist and episcopalian preaching is symptomatic of a wider tendency to focus disproportionately on parliamentarianism and puritanism, radicals and republicans, which, until recently, characterised historical accounts of revolutionary England: royalists have often been treated as, in Ronald Hutton's words, 'the poor relations' of Civil War historiography.²⁷ However, the mass of publications on royalism that have emerged during the last decade or so, produced by both historians and literary scholars, means that it is no longer possible to lament the comparative neglect of the king's party.²⁸ These have

²⁶ See, for example, Christopher Hill, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (1984); Judith Maltby, 'From *Temple* to *Synagogue*: "Old" Conformity in the 1640s–1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds.), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 88–120; Anthony Milton, 'Coping with Alternatives: Religious Liberty in Royalist Thought 1642–47', in Robert Armstrong and Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin (eds.), *Insular Christianity: Alternative Models of the Church in Britain and Ireland, c. 1570–c.1700* (Manchester, 2013), pp. 149–69.

²⁷ Ronald Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642–1646* (2nd edn., 1999), p. x.

²⁸ See, amongst much else, Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628–1660* (Cambridge, 2001); Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (Basingstoke, 2003); Jerome de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004); Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007); Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007); Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*

depicted the complex and variegated nature of royalist politics, experience, and identity. In the process, they have highlighted the inadequacy of older paradigms that either portrayed the king's supporters as a homogenous, monolithic grouping or else constructed overly-simplistic taxonomies that divided them into, for instance, either 'constitutional royalists' or 'absolutists'.²⁹

Nonetheless, there is still plenty of research that remains to be carried out, both on the religious dimensions of royalism and on the roles played by the loyalist clergy during the Civil Wars and Interregnum specifically. Because of the coverage given to the fast-day sermons of parliament, it is easy to get the impression that only those ministers opposed to Charles I were willing to intervene in politics and to stoke the fires of conflict.³⁰ Indeed, historians, observes Margaret Griffin, have often 'written as if they believed that parliamentarians had a premium on religion and piety during the English Civil Wars'. Judith Maltby has likewise questioned the problematic 'assumption that non-conformists took their faith more "seriously" than men and women who conformed to the lawful worship of the Church of England'.³¹

(Manchester, 2010). For an overview of this literature, see Grant Tapsell, 'Royalism Revisited', *HJ*, 54 (2011), pp. 881–906.

²⁹ Contrast David Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement* (Cambridge, 1994), with Paul Seaward, 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism', *HJ*, 40 (1997), pp. 227–39; David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–1649', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–1649* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 36–60; and Barbara Donagan, 'Varieties of Royalism', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalism and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, pp. 66–88.

³⁰ For recent examples of this trend, see Edward Vallance, 'Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications for the English Civil War', *HLQ*, 65 (2002), pp. 395–419; John Coffey, 'England's Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance', in Charles Prior and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *England's Wars of Religion Revisited* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 253–80; Jordan S. Downs, 'The Curse of Meroz and the English Civil War', *HJ*, 57 (2014), pp. 343–68; and John Walter, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 81–91, 219, 229–30.

³¹ Griffin, *Regulating Morality*, p. 1; Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 8. See also, *idem*, "'By this Book: Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 115–37, esp. p. 116.

Certainly, evidence to support John Morrill's famous thesis that the conflict was a 'war of religion' has been drawn most often from the parliamentary side.³² Peter Newman, for instance, has claimed that 'if the Civil War is to be seen as a war of religion, only one side in it possessed anything approaching crusading zeal', and that for royalists 'the religious factor [was] subservient to the cause of the defence of the Crown'.³³ Both Newman and Gerald Aylmer see allegiance to the Stuarts as 'essentially emotive', owing 'more to the concepts of honour and loyalty than to the force and validity of [argument]'.³⁴ Thus, while historians have expended much energy in delineating the various ways that religious and theological discourse – anti-papery, providentialism, scriptural exegesis, covenant theology – helped to escalate political opposition to Charles I, the ways in which religious ideas shaped and informed support for the king has rarely been considered. Preaching, situated as it is at the interface of religion and politics, allows us to explore further the confessional dimensions of royalism.

Where they have been discussed, royalist clergymen tend to be presented as the very antithesis of those bellicose, zealous, 'fiery' parliamentary preachers, whose puritanism, it is supposed, was much more conducive to radical rhetoric and revolutionary intent. The royalist clergy can appear as 'disapproving onlookers, waiting politely for the Restoration', powerless to counteract the untempered religious zeal pouring forth from pulpit and press.³⁵ We are familiar with a narrative in which episcopalians, alarmed by the excesses of puritan preaching during the 1640s and 1650s, developed in response a 'Latitudinarian' preaching

³² John Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *TRHS*, 5th series, 34 (1984), pp. 155–178.

³³ Peter Newman, *The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642–1646* (Manchester, 1993), pp. 2–3.

³⁴ Peter Newman, 'The King's Servants: Conscience, Principle and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism', in John Morrill *et al* (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 225–41, at p. 225; Gerald Aylmer, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England, II: Royalist Attitudes', *TRHS*, 5th series, 37 (1987), pp. 1–30, at p. 30.

³⁵ Anthony Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War*, pp. 61–81, at pp. 79–80.

style that embraced rationality, simplicity, and restraint.³⁶ For Barbara Donagan, however, even during the Civil Wars it is possible to ‘identify a more traditional, moderate, obedient, irenic tone in royalist sermons, one that looks forward to Restoration moderation as much as back to H. R. Trevor-Roper’s golden age of the Erastian 1630s’.³⁷ The attacks of Henry Ferne, John Bramhall, and Henry Hammond on the use of religion to resist the lawful magistrate are likewise well-known. Indeed, it has recently been argued that Hammond and other royalist writers came to advance a Socinian conception of Christianity, which could counteract the invocation of Old Testament scripture for violent ends by insisting on the moral hegemony of the new, pacifistic law brought by Christ and contained within the gospel.³⁸

This thesis therefore builds on studies by Anthony Milton, Judith Maltby, Fiona McCall, and Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor on the Church of England and its clergy during the Civil Wars and Interregnum.³⁹ The findings of these scholars have helped to show the inadequacy of a number of existing assumptions regarding the episcopalian and royalist clergy and highlighted the fruitfulness of further enquiry. In his intellectual biography of Peter Heylyn and a series of subsequent articles, for instance, Milton rejects the notion of a

³⁶ See, for example, George Williamson, ‘The Restoration Revolt against Enthusiasm’, *Studies in Philology*, 30 (1933), pp. 571–603; R.F. Jones, ‘The Attack on Pulpit Eloquence in the Restoration: An Episode in the Development of the Neo-Classical Standard for Prose’, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 30 (1931), pp. 188–217; Irene Simon, *Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South, Tillotson* (Paris, 1967). By far the most authoritative account, however, is provided by Mary Morrissey, ‘Scripture, Style and Persuasion in Seventeenth-Century Theories of English Preaching’, *JEH*, 53 (2002), pp. 686–706.

³⁷ Barbara Donagan, ‘Did Ministers Matter? War and Religion in England, 1642–1646’, *JBS*, 33 (1994), pp. 119–56, at p. 136.

³⁸ Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 88–118.

³⁹ Judith Maltby, ‘Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of “Anglicanism”, 1642–60’, in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158–80; Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007); *idem*, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism’; *idem*, ‘Sacrilige and Compromise: Court Divines and the King’s Conscience, 1642–1649’, in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 135–53; Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity, 1646–60’, in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 18–43; Fiona McCall, *Baal’s Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013); Christopher Haigh, ‘Where was the Church of England, 1646–1660?’, *HJ*, 62 (2019), pp. 127–47.

transformation in this period, whereby the ceremonial and clericalist excesses of Laudianism were rejected by king and clergy alike, and a moderate, pliant, and fundamentally erastian ‘Anglicanism’ began to emerge from the early 1640s.⁴⁰ Rather than confining themselves to a ‘meek pastoral role’, he argues, these clergymen played a more active and significant role in the unfolding political narrative of the 1640s than has hitherto been acknowledged: ‘they preached, wrote, published and argued over’ the political and religious changes taking place, ‘constructing vigorous new defences of the existing Church, and deploying a biblical rhetoric and outspoken providentialism that could match or even exceed that of parliamentary ministers’.⁴¹

Meanwhile, Fincham and Taylor have challenged another hegemonic narrative, particularly predominant in accounts of the Church of England in the 1650s. They point out that, in contrast to the tendency to depict the Church as an oppressed underground movement in these years, kept alive by a small group of nonconformist exiles, the majority of clergymen were *not* ejected from their livings.⁴² Nor can we simply dismiss those who stayed within as ‘timeservers, prepared to sacrifice whatever principles they may have had to preserve their income’.⁴³ Instead, they show that many within the Interregnum Church practised both conformity and nonconformity simultaneously – making some concessions to the new powers even while they engaged periodically in illegal acts, like prayer book use and episcopal ordination.⁴⁴ Maltby, Milton, and Fincham and Taylor have all stressed too the tensions

⁴⁰ See especially Milton, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism’. Examples of this older view include J. W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643–1660* (Manchester, 1969) and, more recently, David Loewenstein and John Morrill, ‘Literature and Religion’ in David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* (2003), pp. 664–713.

⁴¹ Milton, ‘Sacrilige and Compromise’, p. 135.

⁴² See, for example, Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662* (1951); Anne Whiteman, ‘The Restoration Church of England’, in Geoffrey Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (eds.), *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662–1962* (1962), pp. 19–88; Packer, *Transformation*.

⁴³ Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity’, p. 19.

⁴⁴ See also Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, ‘Vital Statistics: Episcopal Ordination and Ordinands in England, 1646–1660’, *EHR*, 126 (2011), pp. 319–44; Maltby, ‘From *Temple* to *Synagogue*’.

inherent in the relationship between Stuart royalism and the Church of England, a theme that likewise runs through Jacqueline Rose's recent book on the politics of the royal supremacy in Restoration England.⁴⁵ These insights serve as a point of departure for this thesis. If, for example, royalist and episcopalian clergymen were actively ministering and preaching, struggling to make their voices heard amid the clamorous public debate, throughout the 1640s and 1650s, it surely makes sense to examine more closely what, exactly, they were saying (and *doing*) when they mounted the pulpit or put a sermon through the press.

Definitions and Labels

Some definitions of 'royalism' and 'episcopalianism' should here be attempted, though in the former case at least this is a notoriously tricky exercise. Jason McElligott and David Smith have argued that 'the only acceptable definition of a royalist' is

somebody who, by thought or deed, identified himself or herself as a royalist and was accepted as such by other individuals who defined themselves as royalists. These royalists could (and did) hold a wide variety of political or theological opinions but they were united by a concern to see the Stuarts return to power on their own terms or, failing that, the best possible terms available.⁴⁶

Clearly, any definition must combine some subjective and objective criteria and it is important that those we label 'royalist' would have identified themselves as such. We might wonder, however, whether it is necessary to stipulate that other royalists would have agreed with this identification – after all, factional or ideological divisions may have meant that

⁴⁵ Jacqueline Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011). See also: Anthony Milton, "'Vailing his Crown": Royalist Criticism of Charles I's Kingship in the 1650s', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 88–105.

⁴⁶ Jason McElligott and David Smith, 'Introduction: Rethinking Royalists and Royalism', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, pp. 1–15, at pp. 12–13.

those within the king's party themselves found it hard to agree on who, exactly, counted as a royalist. Nonetheless, the definition of McElligott and Smith is otherwise helpful because it includes in the royalist penumbra those who, despite strong support for the king, never actually took up arms on his behalf, while at the same time excluding those (like the Levellers) whose short-term interests may have coincided with the Stuart cause or who may have had some fleeting sympathy for Charles I's plight. Furthermore, any definition must be sufficiently broad to take into account the fact that royalism was evidently a spectrum of opinion: not only were there more or less ardent royalists, even those most committed to the king's cause had different views about, say, the nature of the royal prerogative or the legal status of the Church of England, not to mention the best strategy for restoring the king to his throne.⁴⁷ This heterogeneity does not, however, render the term entirely devoid of meaning: these men and women were bound together by not only a mutual commitment to a Stuart triumph above all but also a shared antipathy towards first parliament and then the republic. 'Loyalist' is hereafter employed simply as a synonym for 'royalist', as it was at the time.⁴⁸

Episcopalianism, meanwhile, is used to refer to those whose primary religious commitment was to bishops, Prayer Book, and the royal supremacy as they had existed prior to the Civil Wars. As Fincham and Taylor have pointed out, these 'had been central characteristics of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* for over eighty years' but it was only after they came under attack in the early 1640s that 'we see the emergence of individuals and groups who began to define their religious identity in terms of their adherence to these features of the old order'.⁴⁹ Central to the identity of these episcopalians was a shared hatred of puritanism, which they equated with

⁴⁷ Seaward, 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional'; Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics'.

⁴⁸ McElligott and Smith, 'Introduction', p. 14.

⁴⁹ Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, 'Episcopalian Identity, 1640–1662', in Anthony Milton (ed.) *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume 1: Reformation and Identity c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 457–82, at p. 457. See also: Maltby, 'Suffering and Surviving', *passim*.

social disorder, political subversion, and religious schism.⁵⁰ It is nevertheless important to note that, like royalism, episcopalianism was a spectrum: not all had shared the enthusiasm of Laudians for the ecclesiastical reforms of the 1630s and some had actively opposed them. Many laymen and clergy were therefore happy to concede during 1641-2 that some measure of religious reform was necessary, while nonetheless fiercely opposing the more radical campaigns for ‘root and branch’ reform of the Church that parliament had begun to consider.⁵¹ Some, most notably James Ussher, were even prepared to contemplate schemes for modified episcopacy that would have retained the order while reducing the powers and jurisdiction of the bishops themselves.⁵²

While we should remember that not all royalists were episcopalians or even Protestants, historians now agree that support for the established Church was a crucial factor in driving men and women towards the king during 1641-2.⁵³ Indeed, at the outset of the Civil Wars, loyalty to the Church of England – its government by bishops and its liturgy – was inseparable from loyalty to Charles I. The king was the supreme governor of the Church, its nursing father, steadfastly committed to preserving episcopacy and opposed to puritan agitation for reform. Hence, the threat posed by sectaries to the established Church was a critical factor in the formation of a royalist party during 1641-2.⁵⁴ The interests of Church and state were therefore inextricably linked, and it is difficult to see how one, in 1642 at least,

⁵⁰ Peter Lake, ‘Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice’, in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 80–97.

⁵¹ See Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, pp. 83–180; and *idem* (ed.), ‘Petitions for Episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer on the Eve of the Civil War 1641–2’, in Stephen Taylor (ed.), *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Church of England Miscellany* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 103–68.

⁵² See Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 223–56.

⁵³ Morrill, ‘Religious Context’. On non-Protestant royalists, see, for example, William Sheils, ‘English Catholics at War and Peace’, in Durston and Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England*, pp. 137–57.

⁵⁴ Tim Harris, ‘Charles I and Public Opinion on the Eve of the English Civil War’, in Stephen Taylor and Grant Tapsell (eds.), *The Nature of the English Revolution Revisited: Essays in Honour of John Morrill* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 1–25; Richard Cust, ‘The Defence of Episcopacy on the Eve of Civil War: Jeremy Taylor and the Rutland Petition of 1641’, *JEH*, 68 (2017), pp. 59–80, at pp. 59–60.

could be an episcopalian without also being a royalist too. However, what is particularly interesting, but also problematic, about charting the manifestations of royalism and episcopalianism in the pulpit over the course of two decades is that the relationship between the two was liable to change over time. From the late 1640s onwards, allegiance to the king and to the pre-war Church began to pull in competing directions, as first Charles I and then his son began to contemplate acceding to presbyterian ecclesiastical demands as the necessary price for the restitution of monarchical power. Moreover, episcopalians in the 1650s now saw that their Church could actually exist without the patronage of the supreme governor: ‘the Interregnum proved that establishment was perhaps the *bene esse* rather than the *esse* of the Church of England, which could be justified as catholic, ancient, and episcopal’.⁵⁵

I therefore refer here to the royalist *and* episcopalian clergy because their preaching in these decades cannot be fully understood without reference to both their political and their ecclesiastical allegiances, which were in complex, dynamic relationship with one another. The episcopalianism of these men is integral to understanding their royalism but, crucially, could also push them towards positions and courses of action that are not necessarily best described as ‘royalist’ – as when, as chapter four shows, preachers at Newport urged the king to embrace martyrdom rather than consent to the abolition of episcopacy. The thesis is therefore careful in the way it deploys the labels ‘royalist’ and ‘episcopalian’: in some contexts, particularly during the First Civil War, it is apt to speak about a preacher as being royalist, to signal that his political support for the king – though still borne out of attachment for the established Church – is essential for understanding his words and actions at a particular moment. At other times, for instance when preachers are admonishing the king or defending an aspect of the pre-war Church, it makes more sense to stress their ecclesiastical

⁵⁵ Rose, *Godly Kingship*, p. 88.

allegiances and thus ‘episcopalian’ is used. It is also worth noting that chapter two draws on sermons preached prior to the actual outbreak of fighting and the formation of a coherent royalist party. Since it is obviously more difficult to talk about ‘royalists’ and ‘parliamentarians’ at this point, I occasionally refer to ‘conservative’ clergymen, which, although strictly anachronistic, helps to delineate clearly those opposed to the reforming agenda of parliament in Church and state during 1641-2.

Aims and Arguments

Applying the insights of scholarship on the early modern sermon, then, this thesis on one level aims to correct a fundamental asymmetry in the way Civil War preaching is portrayed, while at the same time deepening our understanding of the royalist and episcopalian clergy. It argues that preaching played a critical role for *both* sides during the English Revolution, and not just through the familiar fast-day sermons delivered before parliament. The pulpit became an indispensable, if deeply contentious, tool in efforts to mobilise and sustain public support for monarchy and episcopacy, not only during the Civil Wars but also in the years following the Regicide, when the establishment of the republican regime threatened to consign both institutions to permanent oblivion. The homiletic conventions and themes around which the early modern sermon had traditionally been structured – scriptural exegesis, casuistic reasoning, providentialist and soteriological discussion – now helped to advance a partisan agenda, as preachers struggled to establish the legitimacy of, and consolidate allegiance to, these causes. Continued adherence to king and Church was presented as a divine imperative, a matter of conscience and salvation, that left no room for backsliding, neutrality, or compromise. These clergymen claimed that their cause was ordained by God and that loyalists would be protected like the Israelites of the Old Testament, provided they remained

steadfast in their allegiance and their piety. Sermons therefore called on soldiers, civilians, and politicians to sacrifice their lives and estates rather than risk alienating the Almighty through apostasy. This providentialist narrative became ever more central to pulpit discourse as royalist military fortunes began to wane from the mid-1640s.

However, it is also a key contention of the thesis that the mobilising, propagandistic dimensions of these sermons should not be overstated: far from acting merely as pliant mouthpieces through which an ‘official’ royalist position could be articulated, preachers were consistently willing to lobby and pressurise senior figures within the king’s party – most notably Charles I himself – with the aim of bringing royalist strategy into line with their own ecclesiastical priorities. In this respect, the episcopalianism of these preachers could take precedence over, and even mitigate, their royalism: they were ready to threaten, admonish, and criticise the king from the pulpit when his actions seemed to endanger the future of an episcopal Church of England. Sermonising was in this respect a way of influencing, and not just amplifying, royal policy.

This thesis therefore has significant implications for the way we understand royalism more generally. For one thing, it stresses the role of religion in shaping royalist politics and identity. Sermons show that theological, scriptural, and providentialist ideas were central to the ways that the clergy viewed and presented the conflict to their various lay audiences, and that religious discourse was a key dimension of royalist attempts at political mobilisation. Rather than pleading for moderation or irenicism, it is argued that royalist preachers in fact exacerbated and sustained divisions in the commonwealth long after the actual fighting had stopped, perpetuating a worldview that pitted God’s chosen people against his enemies and precluded any prospect of ‘healing and settling’. More generally, the thesis seeks to re-establish the clergy as a vocal and assertive faction within the shifting coalition that constituted royalism, intimately involved with, and attempting to influence, events at critical

junctures during the Civil Wars. The sermon was a means by which these divines could resist marginalisation and preserve lay commitment to the Church of England, despite the willingness of many erstwhile supporters to abandon it, at a time when other modes of influence were denied to them. These findings further undermine some of the traditional distinctions between royalist and parliamentary religion that historians have now begun to challenge.

The thesis, however, also seeks to interrogate the relationship between royalist preaching and print, considering the textual legacies of the sermon as well as its transient oral performance. The particularities of the printed sermon have been somewhat overlooked as a result of the recent vogue for stressing the oral and aural dimensions of early modern preaching, even while Hunt and Morrissey have given excellent accounts of the processes by which a sermon moved from the pulpit and into the press.⁵⁶ More often, scholars have been prone to complain about the printed sermon as ‘merely’ an imperfect guide to the sermon as an event that took place in time and space. There is certainly a great deal of truth in such statements and chapters one and five make the case that, at different ends of the period, the printed record can distort our impression of what was actually being said by royalists and episcopalians in the pulpit. And yet, at the same time, it will be argued that printed sermons had their own unique advantages, enabling preachers to do certain things that were not possible before the small congregations they addressed physically in the parish church or at the royal court.

The 1640s was, of course, a particularly pivotal decade in the history of print culture. Historians often refer to a print ‘explosion’ in these years, precipitated by the collapse of the Caroline licensing system and an intensified public interest in the political and religious

⁵⁶ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, pp. 117–86; Morrissey, *Politics*, pp. 35–67.

questions of the moment.⁵⁷ As chapter one makes clear, the sermons of royalist and episcopalian clergymen both contributed to and were shaped by this outpouring of cheap, topical pamphlets. This is particularly significant, given that both royalists and preachers are traditionally cast as hostile to print – albeit for different reasons.⁵⁸ Those who supported the king tended to harbour suspicions about the populist, seditious dimensions of print and to associate it with a puritan plot to subvert all duly constituted authority. On the other hand, as Arnold Hunt has shown, Reformed theories of preaching drew a distinction between the power of sermons transmitted aurally in live performance and their comparative inefficacy when later read from the written page.⁵⁹ However, in the pages that follow it is argued that the experiences of the 1640s and 1650s forced these clergymen to reconsider their hostility to print, and indeed to popularity, and to appreciate its particular advantages in their wider attempts to preserve or restore the politico-religious fabric of the commonwealth.

Structure and Sources

The thesis draws primarily on contemporary printed and manuscript sermons, while using a range of other primary material – letters, diaries, declarations, treatises, newsbooks, and journals – to provide the context that is so crucial to reading these sermons. These latter sources also help us to get beyond the preacher’s words, crucial though they obviously are, and to see how contemporaries – both clerical and lay – thought about what preaching was or should be and the role it was perceived to be playing in the conflict. Most of the sermons

⁵⁷ See, among others, Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003); McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*; David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–1642* (Oxford 2007), pp. 281–309; Jason Peacey, ‘News, Pamphlets, and Public Opinion’, in Laura Lunger Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 173–85.

⁵⁸ Although see McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*; and Nicola Marie Whitehead, ‘The Publisher Humphrey Moseley and Royalist Literature, 1640–1660’ (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2014).

⁵⁹ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, ch. 1; Morrissey, *Politics*, pp. 61–7.

cited were printed at some point in the 1640s or 1650s, although sometimes those preached in these decades but not published until after the Restoration are used. While these, of course, have to be treated with some degree of caution, they are nonetheless extremely valuable, not least for their potential to throw light on the (self-)censorship of preachers across the period. Second-hand reports of a preacher's words, for example as related in parliamentary debates or legal depositions, are frequently employed, though again these require that historians be alert to ulterior motives and agendas.

Another way of tracing the operation of censorship and identifying some of the distinctive features of printed sermons is to compare them with extant manuscript sermons and sermon notes. As Mary Morrissey has noted, historians face practical problems when hunting down scribal sermon material: 'the familiar and laconic entry in so many manuscript catalogues, "sermon-notes, seventeenth-century", gives researchers enough information to avoid the designated manuscript if they already know they have no interest in early modern English religious culture, but it reveals next to nothing about the uses of the manuscript concerned'.⁶⁰ The recent launch of the Gateway to Early Modern Manuscript Sermons (GEMMS), an online database of early modern manuscript sermons held in collection across the UK, Ireland, and North America, is therefore extremely timely and this thesis has benefited greatly from it. However, frustratingly, even with GEMMS, manuscript notes of hearers that could be included in this study have proved elusive. Thus, while the thesis tries to grapple with the important question of how 'sermons may have influenced popular action and opinion', the paucity of evidence often limits the extent to which it can do so effectively.⁶¹

The thesis is arranged both thematically and chronologically. Each chapter begins with a broad overview of a particular theme – for instance, print culture, counsel, mobilisation –

⁶⁰ Mary Morrissey, 'Sermon Notes and Manuscript Communities', *HLQ*, 80 (2), pp. 293–307, at pp. 294–5.

⁶¹ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, p. 5.

before moving to consider in much more detail a particular case study or series of case studies of specific moments and individuals that illuminate the wider theme. This structure allows areas of continuity to be highlighted, while also taking into account the fact that the circumstances in which these preachers were delivering their sermons was rapidly and dramatically shifting in the years after 1642. It is also a response to the evidence available: particular moments during the 1640s saw a flurry of sermons printed in the space of a few weeks by royalist and episcopalian clergymen, while, at other times, months and even years passed with very few such sermons making it through the press. Similarly, some preachers were much more prolific than others in terms of their printed output. This inconsistency naturally poses problems for the historian, but it also raises important questions: why, for example, do we see five times as many sermons printed in Oxford between January and August 1644 than in the whole of the previous year? Moreover, focusing on these case studies of moments and individuals allows for the kind of forensic reconstruction of context – the ‘thick description’ – that forms a key part of the methodological approach taken in the thesis as a whole. Focusing on moments is more difficult for the 1650s when, as chapter five will argue, republican censorship made the publication of royalist and, to a lesser extent, episcopalian sermons a far more hazardous enterprise and the printed record is accordingly much sparser for this decade. Another problem with which a case-study approach must contend is the question of typicality: how representative are particular individuals or moments of the royalist and episcopalian uses of the pulpit more generally? This is a question I return to at the end of each chapter, drawing wider comparisons wherever the evidence allows.

Chapter one looks at conservative preaching in the months either side of the outbreak of the First Civil War, examining the ways in which clerical supporters of the king and established Church reconceptualised their ideas about sermon-giving in response to the mass print,

adversarial politics, and vociferous public debate that they confronted after 1640. The second chapter explores the role of preaching and ideas of holy war in royalist mobilisations, focusing on military sermons delivered to officers and troops in the king's armies during the First Civil War. Chapter three, meanwhile, examines the sermons delivered before the Oxford Parliament during the first months of 1644. While these have usually been seen as part of a wider royalist 'propaganda' campaign, it is argued here that they need to be read first and foremost as contributions to a fraught intra-royalist debate about the nature of any prospective peace settlement with parliament.

Chapter four explores the ways that royalist and episcopalian preachers used the pulpit to counsel the monarch between the end of the First Civil War and Charles II's defeat at the Battle of Worcester, while the fifth chapter looks at the royalist and episcopalian pulpit between the Regicide and the Restoration. It is particularly concerned with how clergymen within the republican state Church nonetheless used preaching as a way of sustaining loyalty to the monarchy and the Church of England and continuing to resist the revolutionary changes that had occurred since the early 1640s. Meanwhile, the final chapter explores the ways that royalist and episcopalian sermons were heard and consumed by the laity – both those sympathetic to these causes and their adversaries – taking as its primary case study John Evelyn and his extensive sermon notebook.

Chapter One: Pulpit, Press, and Public Politics on the Eve of the English Civil Wars

I did not dream that we should remonstrate downward, tell stories to the people, and talk of the king as of a third person.¹

Sir Edward Dering (1641)

This paper-age, wherein many strive to vent the froth of their inventions into the Presse, so that lying and scandalous Pamphlets fly about the City in every corner, and prove vendable ware.²

Edward Browne, *A paradox usefull for the times* (1642)

Between the meeting of the Short Parliament in April 1640 and the outbreak of civil war in England just over two years later, the Stuart kingdoms experienced a series of revolutionary changes in the relationship between ruler and ruled. Escalating tensions between Charles I and parliament, along with the collapse of the Caroline licensing system, helped usher in a new kind of politics, in which both the press and the public were ever more central. Some politicians were now prepared to consult the people on a consistent basis and enlist their support as they sought to control the future of the constitution and the Church of England. Historians are beginning to advance a more sophisticated model of the interrelation between

¹ Quoted in Jason Peacey, 'Sir Edward Dering, Popularity, and the Public, 1640–1644', *HJ*, 54 (2011), pp. 955–83, at p. 972.

² Edward Browne, *A paradox usefull for the times* (1642), sig. A3v.

‘high’ and popular politics in these years. David Como, David Cressy, and John Walter have all revealed the extent to which activism from below could help to shape elite decision making and drive events forward at critical moments of the crisis.³ Pamphleteering became an especially vital way that the public were kept informed of, and could themselves engage with, pressing constitutional and ecclesiastical questions. Scholars often talk of an ‘explosion’ of cheap, topical, and adversarial print in the early 1640s, while also recognising the extent to which these ‘paper wars’ generated anxieties among those who perceived the multitude as credulous and fickle, unable to discern the truth amid the bewildering array of partisan accounts now offered to them. Charles I and his supporters were particularly unnerved by the growing involvement of the people in politics, regarding it as an unwelcome turn towards ‘popularity’.

This chapter shows how preaching in support of the king and the established Church was prompted by, and contributed to, these dramatic developments in print and political culture. Sermons were already a well-established cultural platform in early modern England and, as such, both Charles I and parliament were understandably eager to ‘tune’ the pulpit and exploit it as another medium, alongside the press, that could be used to communicate regularly with the populace. The compliance of clergymen could not be taken for granted, however, and many were prepared to defy the express instructions of either king or parliament, or both, and instead preach in accordance with their own independent political or religious allegiances. The parish pulpit therefore increasingly became a site of controversy and contestation over which different groups battled for effective control. Those who preached against the reformations being pursued in Church and state left themselves exposed

³ David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–1642* (Oxford 2007), esp. pp. 110–28; David Como, *Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War* (Oxford, 2018); John Walter, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2017). See also: Julia Merritt, *Westminster, 1640–60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Manchester, 2013), esp. pp. 12–13.

to the ire of parliament, and clergymen were frequently arraigned before sequestration committees on the charge of having given seditious sermons.

It is argued that while conservative-minded clergymen on the eve of the Civil Wars decried the seditious, populist ends to which the press and pulpit were now being put, they also grudgingly recognised the growing significance of public opinion and thus the need to employ similar methods in defence of king, bishops, and prayer book – all of which were now under attack from their opponents. These clerics hoped that they could persuade the people to return to obedience and conformity, and this partly required publicly counteracting the claims of their opponents in the pulpit. It will be shown that, in the febrile atmosphere of 1641-2, preaching on all sides began to assume more topical and intertextual dimensions. The great mass of pamphlet material being churned out by the presses filtered into the pulpit, to be supported or refuted, while contemporary events were discussed in sermons to an extent that was unprecedented. There was in this respect a tension inherent in royalist and episcopalian preaching from the outset: while clerics now tailored their sermons to the demands of lively polemical debate, they simultaneously lamented the necessity of doing so and lambasted their opponents for instigating these unwelcome changes in preaching culture.

This chapter will also examine changing clerical attitudes towards publishing sermons, arguing that preachers could be empowered but also frustrated in their attempts to bring their words before a wider audience. At the same time, one must be wary of solely relying on the printed record for an accurate sense of preaching in these years and this chapter will highlight some of the constraints with which clergymen opposed to parliament's religious and political agenda had to contend when looking to publish their sermons. For all the talk of press freedom in these years, those critical of parliament were often limited in what they could print by censorship in the months before the Civil Wars. More strident, absolutist preachers encountered difficulties getting their work into print, while moderate defences were much

more frequently published. Despite the historiographical focus on print culture in these years, therefore, oral and scribal transmission of sermons remained key, and a narrow focus on the published record can give a distorted impression of what was actually being delivered from the pulpit.

Public Politics and the Pulpit

The deteriorating political situation on the eve of the Civil Wars, coupled with a loosening of restrictions on the press, quickly gave rise to a new kind of politics, in which the public were regularly appealed to, consulted, and mobilised by politicians and writers on all sides.⁴

Revolutionary developments in the way print was harnessed and consumed both resulted from, and exacerbated, existing tensions. As Jason Peacey has argued, despite historians' tendency to refer to an 'explosion' in print in the early 1640s, the changes in print culture in these years were in fact qualitative rather than quantitative: instead of an increase in the *volume* of print in circulation, the critical development was 'the emergence of a great deal more topical and ephemeral political and religious material, much of it poorly produced'.⁵

The pamphlets that were now being printed were cheap, short, and accessible in their content, in contrast to the vast scholarly tomes that had been a staple of the publishing trade in the past. Controversial or polemical pamphleteering was, of course, by no means an entirely new phenomenon. But whereas it had been an occasional and risky business in the preceding decades, authors were now able to publish topical content with relative impunity and thus unprecedented consistency. The upshot is that much of the material printed in the 1640s

⁴ See above, p. 25n.

⁵ Jason Peacey, 'News, Pamphlets, and Public Opinion', in Laura Lunger Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 173–85, at p. 173.

could be consumed by, and appealed to, a far wider and more public audience than ever before.

Print was a powerful means by which both sides could engage and mobilise popular opinion, encouraging open discussion of political and religious issues ‘out of doors’: questions and controversies were no longer confined within the walls of parliament or the court.⁶ Anxieties nonetheless remained. There was not yet a fully theorised conception of ‘*the public*’ as an entity that arbitrated and conferred legitimacy on political proceedings: Mark Knights has shown that such a conception would not begin to gain purchase until well into the later Stuart period, and even then reservations about popularity and public reason endured.⁷ Furthermore, both Peacey and David Como have argued that the tendency of historians to dwell on the ‘print explosion’ of the early 1640s means that parliament’s ‘determined experimentation with new methods for controlling the output of London’s presses’ from as early as 1641 has been somewhat overlooked.⁸

For their part, the king and his supporters were inherently more conscious of the dangers associated with print and popularity, a prejudice that was only exacerbated by the manner in which relations between king and parliament broke down during 1641-2.⁹ It was a common complaint of Charles I’s sympathisers that parliament had sought ‘to poyson the love and loyalty of the Kings Subjects’ with ‘apparent lyes, palpable slanders, and abominable

⁶ Walter, *Covenanting Citizens, passim*; Joyce Lee Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due: Loyalty to King Charles, 1642–1646* (1983); Jason Peacey, ‘Royalist News, Parliamentary Debates and Political Accountability, 1640–1660’, *PH*, 26 (2007), pp. 328–45; Tim Harris, ‘Charles I and Public Opinion on the Eve of the English Civil War’, in Stephen Taylor and Grant Tapsell (eds.), *The Nature of the English Revolution Revisited: Essays in Honour of John Morrill* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 1–25.

⁷ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005).

⁸ Jason Peacey, ‘The Revolution in Print’, in Michael J. Braddick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 276–90, at p. 287; David Como, ‘Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation in the English Civil War’, *JBS*, 51 (2012), pp. 820–57.

⁹ See, for example, Peacey, ‘Royalist News’; Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, 2005), p. 170; Clive Holmes, ‘Debate: Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity’, *P&P*, 205 (2009), pp. 175–82.

accusations, invented, printed, and scattered over all parts of this Kingdome'.¹⁰ At the same time, many royalists were wary of surrendering an advantage to parliament and, as a result, felt compelled to respond in kind, with Charles I himself acknowledging that he now had to 'take more pains this way, by Our own pen, than ever [a] king hath done' before.¹¹ There was in this respect an inherent contradiction in royalist politics, which 'identified popularity as the root cause of many of the evils it was fighting against whilst recognising that the changing context required politicians to play the "popular" game'.¹²

This new politics of lively print and public debate that emerged in the early 1640s had a profound impact on the theory and practice of preaching. Both sides recognised the crucial importance of the pulpit as a way of speaking to the general populace, a powerful medium of public communication and a vital point of contact between centre and locality.¹³ The clergy, overwhelmingly educated and literate, could be used to read out the printed declarations of king and parliament to their congregations, many of whom would themselves have been unable to read.¹⁴ This, however, required the active co-operation of the clergy, which could not always be taken for granted. Refusal to read the communications of one or both sides became an important way in which parish clergymen could signal and act upon their political allegiances during the early 1640s. Nicholas Holton of Streatham, for instance, was arraigned by the Committee for Scandalous Ministers in 1644 for 'reading ye Kings declaracion & refusing to read the Ordinances or Declaracions of ye Parliament', while the minister of Swaffham Bulbeck was likewise charged with failing to 'read any that came out by the

¹⁰ Griffith Williams, *The discovery of mysteries* (Oxford, 1643), p. 69.

¹¹ *His Majesties answer by way of declaration to a printed paper* (York, 1642), p. 3.

¹² Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, 'Revisionism and its Legacies', in Thomas Cogswell *et al* (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 1–20, at p. 17.

¹³ Tony Claydon, 'The Sermon, the "Public Sphere" and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England', in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1500–1750* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 208–34.

¹⁴ See Lloyd Bowen, 'Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639–40 and 1642', *HJ*, 56 (2013), pp. 297–319.

authority of Parliam[en]t except once, & that in such a manner as no person could understand him; but w[ha]t is sent out in ye name of ye King ag[ain]st Parliament he reads it w[ith] great courage & seeming joy'.¹⁵

As the action taken against these clerics suggests, parliament married a determination to promote its own agenda through the pulpit with a vigilance in suppressing hostile preaching wherever possible. Hence, the guidelines for implementing parliament's Protestation Oath in 1641 stipulated that each minister 'acquaint his parish in his sermon either forenoon or afternoon with the nature of the business, more or less as he shall think fit, for the better and more solemn taking of the said Protestation'.¹⁶ On the other hand, parliament was extremely sensitive to (perceived) criticism of its actions from the pulpit. Clerics could find themselves summoned to appear before parliament, and thereafter imprisoned, sequestered, or ejected, if found to have preached 'seditiously'. Many of the clergymen investigated by the Committee for Scandalous Ministers were accused of having given sermons against parliament, and seditious preaching is a recurring charge in *The first century of scandalous, malignant priests* – an account of the committee's work published in 1643 by its chairman, John White.¹⁷ Writing in 1648, the sequestered minister Robert Chestlin would claim that 'the Clergy owe their eight years persecution, and their continued Banishment from their Livings, for fear they should preach the people (now undeceived) into obedience to their King'.¹⁸

On 29 January 1642 it was reported in the Commons that Thomas Paske, the subdean of Canterbury, had said in a sermon in the cathedral that 'the people were departed from their

¹⁵ Bodl., MS Rawlinson D 924, fos. 177r, 183r.

¹⁶ Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, p. 260.

¹⁷ John White, *The first century of scandalous, malignant priests* (London, 1643). For the activities of the various Committees for Scandalous Ministers, see: J. W. F. Hill, 'The Royalist Clergy of Lincolnshire', *Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Journal* 2/1 (1940), pp. 34–107; Clive Holmes (ed.), *The Suffolk Committees for Scandalous Ministers, 1644–1646* (Ipswich, 1970); Graham Hart (ed.), *The Cambridgeshire Committee for Scandalous Ministers, 1644–45* (Cambridge, 2017).

¹⁸ Robert Chestlin, *Persecutio Undecima* (2nd edn., 1682), p. 5.

king' and that they 'must come as Benhadad's servants did with halters about their necks'.¹⁹ Parishioners of the Laudian William Haywood, meanwhile, petitioned parliament in June 1641, complaining that he had 'caused the Protestation to be read and taken in that ridiculous, absurd, and disdainful manner, with much scorne and jeering'.²⁰ Haywood would eventually be sequestered by the House of Lords partly on the charge of having 'brought Parliament into contempt' through his sermons.²¹ Thomas Swadlin was imprisoned by parliament on 29 October 1642, after having delivered a series of sermons at St. Botolph, Aldgate, which were later published as *The soveraignes desire peace*.²² Preaching sermons sympathetic to the royal cause in those areas most directly under parliamentarian control was thus a hazardous enterprise and, as will be shown, required considerable tact if a preacher hoped to avoid punishment.

Not all ministers, then, were prepared to support or acquiesce in the face of parliament's attempts to dismantle the Caroline Church of England and impose constitutional restrictions on the king.²³ Preachers, moreover, were acutely aware that in the pulpit they had at their disposal a potent instrument for intervening in political developments and influencing public opinion. Unsurprisingly, the tensions between king and parliament piqued the interest of preachers in both rural and urban areas, and ever greater numbers of sermons were dedicated to the political and religious questions of the moment.²⁴ Clergymen who seem previously to have preached only infrequently or from 'old notes' were apparently now energised, belatedly attaching value to regular sermonizing.²⁵ This was alleged to be particularly true of

¹⁹ *The private journals of the Long Parliament, 3 January to 5 March 1642*, ed. William Havelock Coates *et al* (New Haven, CT, 1982), p. 222. The reference is to 1 Kings 20:32.

²⁰ *The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Doctor Heywood* (1641), p. 8.

²¹ Arnold Hunt, 'Haywood, William', *ODNB*.

²² Thomas Swadlin, *The soveraignes desire peace* (1643).

²³ See also Cressy, *England on Edge*, pp. 248–78.

²⁴ See William Sheils, 'Provincial Preaching on the Eve of the Civil War: Some West Riding Fast Sermons', in Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (eds.), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 290–312.

²⁵ *WR*, p. 237.

those clerics who sided with the king against parliament. Robert Levet, vicar of Ditton in Cambridgeshire, was accused by parishioners of having ‘preached seldom till lately’ but was thereafter vociferous in denouncing the Solemn League and Covenant, saying ‘it was damnation to those taking it’. Similarly, Thomas Sanders of Caldecote reportedly declared in the pulpit that ‘Papists were the King’s best subjects’, having ‘not preached there for six months’ previously.²⁶ At Faulkbourne, Essex, Edward Strutt, who ‘discouraged taking of the Cov[enant]’, was noted to have ‘preached twice a day [for the] last 3 months, previously but once’.²⁷ Joseph Smith, rector of Sileby in Leicestershire, had hitherto ‘spent his time hunting & hawking’ during the years before the Civil War, yet now frequently ‘preached against the Parliaments partye’.²⁸

How exactly did these clergymen think that sermon-giving might assist their monarch and Church at this moment of crisis? Preaching offered a means of persuading the people to obedience, of winning hearts and minds for the royal cause. Ministers often expressed hopes that their sermons might act as ‘looking glasses’, in which those opposing the king might see their folly and repent, while his supporters would simultaneously have their allegiances confirmed and strengthened.²⁹ William Stampe encapsulated this dual purpose when he claimed that his sermon would be ‘enough to stop the foule mouthes of some: enough to warme the honest hearts of others’.³⁰ This aim naturally encouraged the use of print, with its potential to bring the sermon to as wide an audience as possible and thereby reach the unconverted. Thomas Barton anticipated that a sermon he had originally preached *coram rege* in 1643 would be read by ‘his countrymen who are misled, and therefore disaffected to

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 83, 86.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

²⁹ See, for example, Nathaniel Bernard, *Esoptron tes antimachias, or, A looking-glasse for rebellion* (Oxford, 1644); Edward Hyde, *The true catholicks tenure* (1662), sig. Ee2v; William Stampe, *Treatise of spirituall infatuation* (The Hague, 1651), sig. A3v.

³⁰ Stampe, *Treatise*, sig. A2v.

the royal cause', and consequently included an appendix to the printed edition in which he pleaded that 'an error timely seen may be happily recalled ... there [can] be recovery at a precipice'.³¹ Partisan, topical sermons were also likely to interest publishers and booksellers more than the kinds of pastoral homilies that had been commonly printed before 1640, and title-pages regularly insisted on the applicability of a sermon to 'these times'.

However, the impetus behind pro-royal preaching often came from a cleric witnessing his adversaries co-opt the pulpit for political purposes and feeling compelled to respond in kind. There was an inherently dialogic, reactive dimension to royalist sermons, a point the clergy themselves often conceded. At the outbreak of the fighting, for instance, Thomas Cranshaw, rector of Hardwick in Norfolk, attended a sermon given by a Mr Peck in nearby Hempnall, in which Peck had apparently 'persuad[ed] men to be liberall to ye Parliament'. The very next day, Cranshaw 'in his own p[a]rish ... did in his sermon speak to his parishioners not to afford the Parliam[en]t any Horse Plate or Money, for if they did, they did rebell ag[ain]st ye King, using many words to that purpose'.³² The indefatigable activity of the parliamentary press and pulpit in this respect spurred on the clerical supporters of the king to mount a response. At York Minster in late 1642, Robert Mossom, a graduate of Peterhouse, Cambridge, began a sermon by explaining the impetus behind his choice of subject matter: 'fit it is to presse loyalty to the People, when the People are so much pressed to disloyalty'.³³ The royalist military chaplain Paul Knell would later echo this sentiment in 1647, arguing that, 'as the pulpit and press have both helped to heighten this rebellion, so it is fit they should both endeavour the dethroning of it'.³⁴

³¹ Thomas Barton, *Logos agōnios; or, a sermon of the Christian race* (Oxford, 1643), p. 21.

³² Bodl., MS Rawlinson D 924, fo. 209r.

³³ Robert Mossom, *The king on his throne* (York, 1642), p. 1.

³⁴ Paul Knell, *Israel and England Paralleled* (1648), sig. A2.

As a result, sermons took a progressively topical and polemical turn during the early 1640s, becoming more than ever before a forum in which contemporary events were dissected and politico-religious debates conducted. Preachers had of course long claimed a right, and indeed a duty, to apply the doctrine of their sermons to the lives of their hearers. One of the most influential early modern preaching manuals, for example, claimed that ‘to apply aptly and properly the scriptures to present business and affaires is the principall vertue that belongeth to a preacher’.³⁵ However, discussion of ‘present business and affaires’ was now much more open, direct, and secular, concerned with ‘high’ political developments, and by no means confined to the concluding part of a sermon in which a preacher had traditionally drawn his application. In a sermon of 1644, for example, Nathaniel Bernard discussed parliament’s use of ‘a new broade seale’ and establishing of a ‘state committee’ as examples of their attempts to take ‘all authority into their own hands’, while Thomas Swadlin reported in the middle of one sermon how ‘one Pym [had been] endited and arraigned for saying, *He would, if he could, embrue his hands in the blood of King Charles*’.³⁶ Whereas such commentary had hitherto required the deft use of parallel, analogy, and innuendo, preachers now discussed political questions freely – a situation borne partly out of polemical necessity and partly out of greater press freedom.³⁷

Similarly, the publications that poured from the press in these years were consumed voraciously by the clergy, and thereafter often found their way into sermons – either as the target of attack or as supportive ballast. Later in the century, Myles Davies would reflect that the ‘Uncivil as well as Unchristian spirit of Degrading and Reviling of Authors and Writings,

³⁵ Quoted in Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 73.

³⁶ Bernard, *A looking-glasse*, p. 12; Thomas Swadlin, *Loyall subjects, or The blessed mans encouragement* (1647), p. 7.

³⁷ Kevin Killeen, ‘Veiled Speech: Preaching, Politics and Scriptural Typology’, in Hugh Adlington *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 387–403; Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 292–342.

was chiefly introduc'd and contagiously dispers'd by some of the Pulpit-Rioters of 41'.³⁸ The urge to refute or admonish the authors of printed pamphlets from the pulpit, however, was undoubtedly shared by clerics of all persuasions. In December 1642, William Creed, a fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, used a sermon in St. Mary the Virgin almost exclusively to rebut one of 'the many Libells of our days ... that calls it self the Unbishopsing of Timothy and Titus'.³⁹ Although Creed did not name the author, this was a tract first published in Amsterdam in 1636 by the puritan martyr William Prynne, which purported to undermine the 'pretended superiority of bishops over other ministers and presbyters jure divino'.⁴⁰ Creed adopted a sermon structure that allowed him to take and refute each of Prynne's key arguments in turn, in a manner that suggests his opponent's tract may even have been physically open in front of him while he prepared his discourse. For instance, Prynne had claimed that 'Timothy was ordained by the Presbyters', and Creed accordingly observed that 'we are told by some that Timothy was ordained by the Presbytery. But are they sure by the Presbytery alone, without the presence ... of an Apostolick man?'⁴¹ Marginal notes in printed editions helped readers to identify the texts under discussion and locate a sermon still more precisely in its polemical context.

However, it was not just hostile publications that could animate a preacher and help to shape his discourse: royalist works, particularly those printed in the name of the king, were similarly influential. Hugh Barcroft, a minister in Lincolnshire, was said to have 'many of *Mercurius Aulicus*'s Relations and hath shewed them to such of his friends as hee durst trust'.⁴² In 1642 John Mow, curate of Bardfield in Essex, refused to read parliament's Remonstrance, producing instead a recently published letter from Lord Paget and explaining

³⁸ Quoted in Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 222–3.

³⁹ Bodl., MS Rawlinson E 115, fo. 3v.

⁴⁰ William Prynne, *The unbishopsing of Timothy and Titus* (Amsterdam, 1636), title-page.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 106; Bodl., MS Rawlinson E 115, fo. 9r.

⁴² Hill, 'Royalist Clergy of Lincolnshire', p. 48.

that Paget was ‘as worthy a p[ar]liament Man as any of them all, until he saw the Parliam[en]ts Treachery ag[ains]t their King, and then he turned fro[m] them to the King’.⁴³ Thomas Lenthall, of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, admitted that a royal declaration published in May 1642 – in which ‘your Ma[jes]tye is pleased to intimate a certaine generall fault in us in that wee have not duly exhorted & enstructed the people in their obedience’ – had encouraged him to preach on this theme and prepare one of those sermons for publication.⁴⁴

The arguments of these ‘official’ publications were often then incorporated into the body of a sermon. In this way, print linked regional preachers with royalist political centres at York and Oxford, ensuring a degree of congruity between their own sermons and the publications emanating from these cities. The example of the Essex parson Robert Fisher shows this process clearly. Fisher was accused by the Committee for Scandalous Ministers of having said ‘that the King fights for the Protestant Religion’. When a parishioner, Mary Sparke, consulted Fisher about the lawfulness of parliament’s cause, citing a book she had read, he ‘blamed her for reading so much for the Parliam[en]t & so little for the King, And he com[m]ended a Booke w[hi]ch Prince Rupert had sett forth yt he came hither to fight for the Protestant Religion’.⁴⁵ Rupert’s book had evidently influenced the theme of Fisher’s sermon and the arguments he put forward in support of the king. Likewise, William Parks, vicar of Belton, Leicestershire, declared in a sermon that ‘they were all damned that took up arms for the parliament’, reading out the title-page of Henry Ferne’s *Resolving of conscience*, first printed at Cambridge in 1642: ‘resistance now made against the higher power is unwarrantable, and according to the Apostle damnable’.⁴⁶

⁴³ BL, Add. MS 5829, fos. 55r–56r.

⁴⁴ BL, Add. MS 34692, fo. 1r.

⁴⁵ BL, Add. MS 5829, fo. 36r.

⁴⁶ Cressy, *England on Edge*, p. 265.

Sermons in support of king or bishops generated their own controversy in turn and frequently drew printed responses from commentators both sympathetic and hostile. They were reported, applauded, and criticised in newspapers, discussed in the streets, and refuted in other pamphlets. In September 1643, a tract by the radical cleric John Saltmarsh was printed in London, entitled *Examinations; or, a Discovery of some Dangerous Positions in a Sermon on Reformation, preached ... by Thomas Fuller*. Saltmarsh accused Fuller of popery and scorned his notion of a limited and orderly ecclesiastical reformation, reprinting extracts from the original sermon and responding to each one in turn. Fuller adopted the same technique of animadversion in his response to Saltmarsh, *Truth Maintained*, composed and published at Oxford soon after. Similarly, Henry Parker devoted part of his 1644 *Jus populi* to attacking a recent sermon by James Ussher, in which the primate had claimed that ‘no Subject may upon any occasion take Armes, or use violence against the Supream power, no not in defence of Religion’.⁴⁷ This intertextuality and dialogue in which they engaged means that the sermons of both parliamentarians and royalists should be seen as both a product of, and a contribution to, the unique, adversarial pamphlet culture that emerged in the early 1640s.

However, this transition towards more openly partisan, polemical, and topical preaching was not an entirely unproblematic one for preachers to make. Certain subjects were traditionally felt to be beneath a preacher’s dignity or beyond his proper remit, and early modern congregations were prone to bridle at particularly divisive or admonitory preaching. During the Civil Wars, the minister of Mobberley in Cheshire was warned by parishioners that he should ‘not use pulpits to rail and scandalise’: ‘[W]hen he is in the pulpit preaching the word of God he [sh]ould have . . . regard thereunto and not clamour and envy against particular

⁴⁷ Henry Parker, *Jus populi, or, A discourse wherein clear satisfaction is given as well concerning the right of subjects as the right of princes* (1644), p. 55; James Ussher, *The soveraignes power and the subjects duty* (Oxford, 1644).

men so publicly'.⁴⁸ Nor was preaching on political matters universally accepted as the indisputable right of a dutiful and godly minister. Mary Morrissey has shown that audiences were not always ready to tolerate propagandistic or controversial elements in sermons, and 'kept a sharp eye out for preachers who strayed too far towards overtly partisan positions in political controversy'.⁴⁹ In July 1660, for instance, Samuel Pepys saw Henry King, bishop of Chichester, preach before Charles II, and later complained that he had 'made a great flattering sermon, which I did not like that Clergy should meddle with matters of state'.⁵⁰

Indeed, royalist preachers themselves frequently charged their parliamentary counterparts with perverting the office of preaching, overstepping the bounds of acceptable pulpit interference in politics, and giving the sermon genre new and monstrous forms. They claimed to abhor the bloodthirsty, war-mongering dimensions of puritan pulpit rhetoric in particular, which were presented as the very antithesis of the Christian minister's obligation to preach peace and charity. Lionel Gatford, imprisoned in 1642 by parliament for sermons preached in support of the king, explained that these parliamentary divines were failing both to discharge their clerical duties and keep within the bounds of their legitimate authority:

Have not some of our Preachers of late, runne up and down from pulpit to pulpit and there lifted up their voices like Trumpets, not to shew the people their transgression and the house of Jacob their sinnes, which they have a commission for, but to sound an alarme and incite warre? For which I believe they have no particular Commission, and their general Commission I am sure is quite contrary, they being sent to proclaime and publish and so to incite unto and perswade peace and not warres.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Quoted in Barbara Donagan, 'Did Ministers Matter? War and Religion in England, 1642–1646', *JBS*, 33 (1994), pp. 119–56, p. 150.

⁴⁹ Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558–1642* (Oxford, 2011), p. 134.

⁵⁰ *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews (11 vols., Oxford, 1955–83), I, 195.

⁵¹ Lionel Gatford, *An exhortation to peace* (1643), p. 22.

Furthermore, in their zeal for reformation, these ministers were alleged to have disregarded preaching conventions and decorum, eschewing the scriptural exegesis to which a minister was principally supposed to confine himself. Preaching a sermon ‘against schism’ in 1642, the Cambridge Arminian Richard Watson, fellow of Gonville and Caius, told his Great St. Mary’s audience that, ‘if I have digressed a little too farre from my text, I may the rather presume of a pardon, having been in the pursuit of such men as usually runne a great deal farther from theirs’.⁵² In reference to their undue preoccupation in the pulpit with current affairs and gossip, meanwhile, Gatford chastised ‘those new teachers, or teachers of newes (as the most of them deserved to be stiled) [who] would fain dreame you into an opinion’.⁵³ Jasper Mayne likewise lamented ‘how much Romance, how much Gazette, how much Legend hath for some yeares past for Sermon’.⁵⁴ Royalists and episcopalians were thus publicly scathing of the ways that print, polemic, and politics had infested the pulpit, even while they directly contributed to this process with their own sermons.

Moreover, it was a contentious issue amongst the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English clergy as to whether sermons should ever be printed at all, let alone for partisan, political purposes. While preparing a scribal copy of a sermon he had preached at Easter 1643 for a patron, William Creed acknowledged reservations about his enterprise: ‘I know things of this Nature loose much in the reading’.⁵⁵ Creed was rehearsing a familiar distinction in Reformed theories of preaching, recently elucidated by Arnold Hunt, between the power of sermons transmitted aurally in live performance and their comparative inefficacy when later read from the written page; even by the 1640s, the sermon was still often considered a unique genre that derived its special power and force from its orality.⁵⁶ After all, faith, says Romans

⁵² Richard Watson, *A sermon touching schisme* (Cambridge, 1642), p. 25.

⁵³ Gatford, *An exhortation*, sig. A3v.

⁵⁴ Jasper Mayne, *A sermon against false prophets* (Oxford, 1646), p. 27.

⁵⁵ Bodl., MS Rawlinson E 116, fo. 1r.

⁵⁶ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, ch. 1. See also, Morrissey, *Politics*, pp. 61–7.

10:17, 'cometh by hearing'. Given these assumptions about the *ars praedicandi*, as well as the suspicion with which many, especially royalists, viewed the whole business of print, preachers often had considerable difficulty justifying the publication of their work. They were usually keen to attribute it in forewords to the persistence of friends or patrons, or the necessity of producing an authorised version to prevent pirated copies from circulating – claims that provide further evidence of the tensions and contradictions inherent in the task of preaching royalism as the nation divided in the early 1640s.⁵⁷

Royalists, Episcopalians, and the St. Paul's Pulpit, 1641-2

These themes can be elucidated further by considering the sermons preached from one particularly important pulpit in the months preceding the outbreak of civil war. Having been convened by the king in late 1640, the Long Parliament had immediately embarked on a series of popular reforms to remedy the constitutional and religious grievances of the Personal Rule. The Triennial Act, the impeachment of the king's leading advisors, the removal of Ship Money, as well as the abolition of Star Chamber and the High Commission, had all been achieved by mid-1641 with the support of most MPs and peers, including future royalists like Edward Hyde and Viscount Falkland. However, thereafter the unity of parliament began to dissipate and the political nation to polarise, as voices within and outside the two Houses agitated for still more radical ecclesiastical reform. Debates over the abolition of episcopacy 'root and branch', coupled with waves of popular iconoclasm, increasingly pushed many Englishmen towards the king, whom they saw as a bulwark against religious fanaticism and social disorder.

⁵⁷ Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 75–8.

During 1641, these future royalists watched in horror as ‘episcopal authority crumbled, ecclesiastical discipline ceased to operate, and a variety of radical ideas and practices clamoured for attention’.⁵⁸ Swarms of sectaries were said to have emerged, ‘like Egyptian locusts, covering the whole land’, trumpeting heretical or blasphemous opinions.⁵⁹ Unlicensed preachers and lay prophets occupied pulpits and railed against the Church of England, while nonconformists like Henry Burton who had been persecuted by the Laudian regime in the 1630s were now invited by MPs to preach before parliament and to print their sermons.⁶⁰ Nonetheless, even after Charles I had fled London following his disastrous failure to arrest the Five Members in January 1642, many on both sides continued to hope that an accommodation could be reached and a bloody civil war averted.

Despite the king’s departure, clergymen who had, or would go on to have, firm royalist allegiances were still able to preach regularly in the city’s pulpits for some months after. The most prominent pulpit of all – at St. Paul’s Cathedral – hosted a number of divines sympathetic to the royal and episcopal cause up until mid-1642, when parliamentary supporters gained full control of the City Corporation and consequently the preaching rota at the cathedral.⁶¹ Sermons delivered at Paul’s Cross had traditionally been events of considerable public significance since at least the reign of Elizabeth I, which generated excited discussion in their build-up and their aftermath, and were occasionally used by the authorities to make announcements to the people.⁶² However, in her excellent recent study, Mary Morrissey has argued that the cultural importance of Paul’s Cross preaching began to

⁵⁸ Cressy, *England on Edge*, pp. 4–5.

⁵⁹ *Lucifers Lackey, or, The Devils new Creature* (1641), sig. A3.

⁶⁰ Merritt, *Westminster*, pp. 30–2.

⁶¹ Morrissey, *Politics*, p. 224. See also, David J. Crankshaw, ‘Community, City and Nation, 1540–1714’, in Derek Keene *et al* (eds.), *St. Paul’s: The Cathedral Church of London, 604–2004* (New Haven, CT, 2004), pp. 45–70, at pp. 60–4; and Torrance Kirby and P. G. Stanwood (eds.), *Paul’s Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520–1640* (Leiden, 2014).

⁶² See, for example, Arnold Hunt, ‘Tuning the Pulpits: The Religious Context of the Essex Revolt’, in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1500–1750* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 86–114.

decline after the accession of Charles I in 1625. The Caroline-Laudian regime, averse to sermon-centred piety, showed little interest in sustaining the sermon series: set-piece sermons to mark political occasions ceased until 1638 and only a handful of senior churchmen were employed to preach at the Cross during the entire decade. By 1635, the sermons had been transferred into the choir of the cathedral, which provided much less space for the auditory, and the Cross itself had been demolished with little fanfare. Attendances declined steadily, to the point that by the 1630s, Morrissey argues, ‘a sermon series that had once addressed the London community was now addressing only the London government’.⁶³

However, during 1641-2, when political tensions in the capital were reaching a fever pitch, these sermons seem once again to have regained the capacity to generate controversy and debate among a considerable section of the London populace. Shortly after Thomas Cheshire had preached at St. Paul’s on 10 October 1641, an unauthorised edition of his sermon, presumably transcribed and published by an auditor from their notes, appeared in print. This advertised the sermon’s topicality prominently, noting on the title-page that it contained ‘many memorable passages most worthy of serious observations in these Times’.⁶⁴ Cheshire himself then produced *A true copy of that sermon which was preached at St. Paul’s*, explaining that because ‘there is an imperfect, confused, surreptitious Copy printed, I am constrained to divulge this in the same terms I delivered it’.⁶⁵ That there was felt to be a sufficient market for a printed version of this St. Paul’s sermon to make it worthwhile publishing a pirated edition is revealing, while Cheshire’s response itself highlights the role of print in establishing authorial control over the afterlives of a sermon, despite (professed) ambivalence to the medium.

⁶³ Morrissey, *Politics*, p. 34.

⁶⁴ Thomas Cheshire, *A sermon preached in Saint Pauls church the tenth of October 1641* (1641), title-page.

⁶⁵ Thomas Cheshire, *A true copy of that sermon which was preached at S. Pauls the tenth of October last* (1641), sig. A2r.

Given the location of St. Paul's in a city that would eventually form the bedrock of parliamentary support during the Civil Wars, those who wished to articulate even minor criticisms of parliament or puritanism knew they would do so before an audience with, at best, mixed sympathies.⁶⁶ Members of the City Corporation had been the most regular attendees at St. Paul's sermons since the 1420s. By 1641, the Corporation was firmly divided: 'the Common Council elections of December 1641 had transferred power from the conservative aldermen, many of them Royalists, to their more radical opponents, but this shift in power would not be complete until 11 July 1642 when Lord Mayor Richard Gurney was impeached'.⁶⁷ However, as will be shown, it is clear that these sermons were enthusiastically attended by ordinary Londoners too: even if Morrissey is right that audiences were dwindling from the late 1620s, it would seem that these tense months witnessed a resurgent interest in what was being said from the cathedral pulpit. This in turn gave further reason for caution. Audiences at St. Paul's had a history of volatility, with riots breaking out and preachers being attacked on more than one occasion.⁶⁸ Although this danger was mitigated when the sermon series moved indoors during the 1630s, those commissioned to preach in the cathedral still had to be conscious when composing their sermons that an unfavourable audience reaction could have grave repercussions.

Ephraim Udall had been an opponent of the Laudian altar policy whose weekly lectures at St. Augustine by St. Paul, Watling Street, gained him a reputation as 'a most judicious and industrious preacher'.⁶⁹ After he had preached at St. Paul's on *The good of peace and ill of warre* on the last day of July 1642, Udall found that the 'good opinion some men had of this Sermon that heard it, who doe deplore the sad Condition of our distracted Nation at this time,

⁶⁶ For an important study qualifying the traditional picture of London as overwhelmingly parliamentary, see Ian Gentles, 'Parliamentary Politics and the Politics of the Street: The London Peace Campaigns of 1642-3', *PH*, 26 (2007), pp. 139–59.

⁶⁷ Morrissey, *Politics*, p. 156.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁶⁹ Thomas Reeve, *Lazarus his rest: preached in a sermon at the funeral of Mr. Ephraim Udall* (1647), p. 6.

moved them importunately to commit it to the Presse'.⁷⁰ Indeed, so sure were these auditors of the sermon's merit that they resolved to finance its publication themselves.⁷¹ Others, however, were apparently far less well-disposed to Udall and his sermon, and had initially arrived at St. Paul's in the hope of catching him out:

There were divers Writers, some that came of their owne accord, others sent thither, by some of no meane account for profession of Religion, to catch upon some [words] they expected would fall from me, for which they might call mee in question, and bring mee into trouble.⁷²

Udall admitted that his discourse had subsequently polarised opinion and prompted fervent debate: 'some said it was a good Sermon, others said nay, but it was malignant, and answerably it has still its accusers to them that heard it not, to whom it is now able to give its owne account'.⁷³ False rumours and reports continued to circulate after he had preached, forcing him into print to clarify the words he had actually spoken and thereby 'stop the mouths of all Diabolists', as well as to pre-empt the appearance of unauthorised printed copies made from sermon notes.⁷⁴ Udall's experience therefore testifies to the significance of St. Paul's sermons as events of considerable public interest in the fractious climate of early 1642, and the hope that print could counteract some of the problems associated with this controversy by providing a more 'authoritative' version of a sermon. Hostile prospective auditors had discussed the likely nature of Udall's sermon in advance and turned up with a strategy for undermining him, while those sympathetic were willing to pay publication costs

⁷⁰ Ephraim Udall, *The good of peace and the ill of warre* (1642), sig. A3r.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, sig. A3v.

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

to ensure it reached the widest possible audience. Subsequently, oral reports destabilised Udall's discourse and carried it well beyond his original, physical audience.

These reports could quickly reach MPs and peers at Westminster, less than two miles away, who themselves took a keen interest in what was being said in the St. Paul's pulpit. Mark Frank, a fellow of Pembroke College and enthusiastic advocate of Laudianism who was nonetheless asked to preach at the Cathedral on 4 May 1642 ('Sir Richard Gurney being then Lord Mayor', noted a later printed edition), delivered an incendiary discourse defending the king, bishops, and even the ceremonialism of the Laudian Church. Frank's earlier sermons have been noted by scholars for their debt to Lancelot Andrewes – 'vivid in style, imaginative in interpreting scripture, and strong on the sacraments in the life of the Church'.⁷⁵ Interestingly, however, and perhaps with his audience at St. Paul's in mind, Frank opted to begin his sermon of May 1642 by stating his determination to keep himself narrowly to his scriptural text (Jeremiah 35: 18–19):

The Text, you hear, is the Word of God; *Thus Saith the Lord*, what ere the Sermon be like to be: And, if the Preacher stir no further from the Text, than the Rechabites in it from the command of their Father, the Sermon is like to be no less; and to be heard accordingly. I know whose work I am about, *sic dicit Dominus*; I shall keep to that. *Thus Saith the Lord*, begins the Text; and it shall run through and end my Sermon.⁷⁶

But if this was an instance of stylistic adaptation calculated to win over a different kind of audience, with Frank eschewing the elaborate metaphorical conceits and learned references that had previously characterised his preaching, the remainder of the sermon exhibited far

⁷⁵ Kenneth W. Stevenson, 'Frank, Mark', *ODNB*. See also: P. G. Stanwood, 'Patristic and Contemporary Borrowing in the Caroline Divines', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 23 (1970), pp. 421–9.

⁷⁶ *The Sermons of Mark Frank*, ed. John Henry Parker (2 vols., Oxford, 1849), II, 413.

less tact and restraint. Frank demanded that his audience immediately ‘return, and hear, and hearken, and submit to your ancient fathers, your King and Church, your magistrates and clergy’. True obedience, he explained, meant acting ‘for no other reason, but because commanded by our father’. Alongside this tone-deaf defence of the king’s prerogative, he could not resist an additional swipe at those who had opposed Laudian ceremonialism (which presumably included most of his audience). Admonishing them directly, he announced that ‘when you can bring me law against my standing, bowing, kneeling, which yourselves know custom hath observed, where uniform order has been kept, I shall either submit or answer’.⁷⁷ Unsurprisingly, the sermon caused ripples and news of it soon reached parliament: in the Commons the MP Sir Edward Hales, who had either heard Frank’s sermon in person or conversed with someone who had, took particular issue with the preacher for having ‘sayd that the Protestation was yntended to a goode and relygous purpose but twas converted to treasonable ends’. The House twice ordered that the cleric ‘be sent for as a delynquent’ and his sermon remained unpublished until long after the Restoration.⁷⁸

Despite the risk of inviting the unwelcome attention of MPs, Frank was not alone in his determination to use the pulpit at St. Paul’s as a platform from which to respond to recent and unwelcome developments in Church and state. When Cheshire, a graduate of Brasenose College, Oxford, and self-proclaimed ‘minister of Gods word and holy sacraments’, preached in October 1641 he lamented the heresy and heterodoxy that were now swamping the pulpits and presses of the nation. One preacher, he alleged, ‘affirmes that parents ought not to teach their children the Lords Prayer: another, that popish innovations did first begin when the Apostles ordained the Bishops ... another will maintaine that there is no more holinesse in the Church, then in his Kitchin’.⁷⁹ Cheshire noted with particular disgust how the ‘book of

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 431–2, 443.

⁷⁸ BL, Add. MS 14828, fo. 105r; *CJ*, II, 572, 606.

⁷⁹ Cheshire, *A true copy*, p. 12.

Common prayer, wherein and wherewith we are specially to praise God in his publicke worship, compiled and cleansed from Popery by godly Martyrs, and sealed with their dearest bloods, [is] now utterly contemned and vilified, pamphlets printed against it'.⁸⁰

Preaching, however, offered Cheshire a way of counteracting these scandalous developments: his sermon was a blistering attack on sectaries and radicals, and a robust defence of the episcopal government and liturgy of the Church of England. He painted a nightmarish picture of a natural social and ecclesiastical order in the process of being overturned, where 'Coblers and Weavers, and Feltmongers, and Taylors and Botchers ... take it upon them to interpret Gods Word, directly contrary to Gods Word'. This chaos only underscored the need for episcopacy, now being opposed root-and-branch by many within and outside of parliament: 'what will become of us, if Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction may not be permitted to curbe these execrable insolencies?'⁸¹ Although Cheshire conceded that some bishops 'may have been faulty', this was no reason to dispense with the order altogether. This was precisely the line of argument put forward in many of the pro-episcopal petitions that, as Judith Maltby has shown, began to flood into parliament from the counties in these months, in response to radical, anti-episcopal petitioning campaigns.⁸² However, more provocatively, given the backlash against the Church reforms of the Personal Rule witnessed during 1640-1, Cheshire was also prepared to defend the Laudian altar policy. 'Let any indifferent Christ judge', he declared, 'whether it had not been meeter for the Lords Table to have stood raild in, as formerly for above forty yeares together, then to be so polluted'.⁸³ Here is another

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12.

⁸² Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998), chs. 3–5. For a slightly different interpretation of these petitions and their significance, see Peter Lake, 'Puritans, Popularity and Petitions: Local Politics in National Context, Cheshire, 1641', in Cogswell *et al* (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, pp. 259–89; and Richard Cust, 'The Defence of Episcopacy on the Eve of Civil War: Jeremy Taylor and the Rutland Petition of 1641', *JEH*, 68 (2017), pp. 59–80.

⁸³ Cheshire, *A true copy*, pp. 13, 17.

important reminder that, as Anthony Milton and Richard Cust have recently emphasised, ‘not everyone wanted to distance themselves from Laudianism in the early 1640s’.⁸⁴

Besides this general defence of the Church of England against those pushing for still more radical ecclesiastical reform, Cheshire felt compelled to engage in his sermon with the pamphlets and authors of the moment. He argued that parliament’s ‘late Protestation’ had enjoined subjects ‘to uphold Episcopacy’ and ‘maintain the right of the Subject’, and therefore – unlike Mark Frank – sensibly decided not to attack it.⁸⁵ However, Cheshire also observed that there was

a new Creed published, as if the Apostles had been deficient, wherein is Blasphemy, heresie, schisme, and damnable treason, compiled by one John Turner, a poore young Laicke, and (to gain the greater credit) he writes himself the prisoner of Jesus Christ, committed (as he well deserved) by the Bishops, lawfulnessse for every man to use the gift: the protestation protested, a most viperous proditorious piece of knavery: nay the Pulpits in many places doe ring of doctrines of devils.⁸⁶

The protestation protested, anonymously published by Henry Burton in June 1641, had attacked the government and liturgy of the Church of England as entirely unchristian and demanded thoroughgoing ecclesiastical reformation. It had already drawn responses in print from the likes of Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich, who declared it a ‘foolish, seditious, scandalous, prophane libell’.⁸⁷ The other work to which Cheshire refers in this passage is John Turner’s *The saints beliefe*, also published in 1641. Turner was a Chandler and separatist

⁸⁴ Cust, ‘Defence of Episcopacy’, p. 79; Anthony Milton, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s’, in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–1649* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 61–81.

⁸⁵ Cheshire, *A true copy*, pp. 17–18.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12

⁸⁷ See Joseph Hall, *A survey of that foolish, seditious, scandalous, prophane libell, the protestation protested* (1641); Como, *Radical Parliamentarians*, p. 94.

from Kent who had been imprisoned on several occasions for his beliefs by the Laudian regime during the 1630s. *The saints beliefe* reworked the Apostles' Creed in accordance with Turner's congregationalist convictions, claiming, for example, that 'every Church hath power from God to elect and ordaine their own Officers, receive in Beleevers, and Excommunicate any one of them that lives in transgression, without the helpe or assistance of any'.⁸⁸ Cheshire evidently deemed these printed works influential and dangerous enough to be worth refuting directly from the pulpit. His discussion of them underlines the way that sermons in the early 1640s became subsumed in an intertextual dialogue, and the vibrant world of pamphlets began to encroach on sermon culture.

By the time Thomas Morton came to preach at St. Paul's on 19 June 1642, the political situation had worsened considerably: Charles I had been forced to flee the capital and would raise his standard at Nottingham just over two months later, while parliament had passed a Militia Ordinance in March empowering it to command armed forces without the king's consent. Both sides were now firmly engaged in 'a national competition for allegiance'.⁸⁹ Morton, the elderly bishop of Durham, was a Calvinist who had distinguished himself with his anti-papal polemic under James I. Nonetheless, he was also a firm supporter of both episcopacy and the royal prerogative, preaching a famous sermon at Durham Cathedral in May 1639 in which he condemned the Covenanter uprising and reminded the Scots of their duty of unqualified obedience to the king. As a respected Calvinist, Morton was better suited than staunch Laudians to the task of trying to persuade the Scots to abandon their resistance – something Charles I himself recognised, ordering the 1639 sermon to be printed – and a similar rationale may have been behind the decision to select Morton to preach at St. Paul's in 1642.⁹⁰ Certainly, Anthony Milton has argued that royalist authorities 'conceived that the

⁸⁸ Quoted in Como, *Radical Parliamentarians*, p. 93.

⁸⁹ Cressy, *England on Edge*, p. 5.

⁹⁰ See Harris, 'Charles I and Public Opinion', p. 9.

defence of episcopacy would be more effective in the hands of respected Calvinist bishops than in those of Laudian enthusiasts'.⁹¹ This strategy was consistent with the king's own attempts to distance himself from the unpopular Church reforms of the 1630s, as signalled by his appointment of several Calvinist divines who were untainted by any involvement with Laudianism to bishoprics during 1641-3.

In his St. Paul's sermon, published soon after it was preached as *The presentment of a schismaticke*, Morton openly declared that his intention was to 'defend our own Corinth, the Church of England' against its detractors and thereby counter the deleterious effects of religious radicalism. Somewhat uncharitably, Morton defined as 'schismatics' all those who harboured 'criminations against our Church ... her Constitutions, episcopacy, Ceremonies, and Liturgies'.⁹² However, the bishop was also mindful that, given the sympathies many of his London audience must have had with the puritan position, his case could be made more forcefully if he emphasised his own impeccable Calvinist credentials throughout. Calvin was praised as 'that Admirable Man of God, and Pastor of the Church of God in Geneva, whom without preface of honour, I cannot name', while Beza was said to have 'wished that, *They who oppose the Constitutions of the Church might be punished as the enemies of the Church*'.⁹³ Here was a far more shrewd approach to persuading the audience at St. Paul's of the threat posed by ecclesiastical reform than the impolitic defences of Laudianism articulated by Cheshire or Frank.

Moreover, Morton exhibited a consciousness of the ways that changes in print and political culture had necessitated a new kind of preaching. While noting with contempt his adversaries' use of 'infamously famous Libels and Pamphlets', he nonetheless felt compelled

⁹¹ Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007), p. 119.

⁹² Thomas Morton, *The presentation of a schismaticke* (1642), pp. 8, 9.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 21.

to respond to the arguments advanced therein – specifically their citation of violent scriptural passages:

And something I could say concerning them same among us; If the report of Pamphlets were worthy the Pulpit: only this one thing, which I have read in divers of their printed Books; that in their invective against Church Government and Service, they excite their Auditors by such Texts of Scripture as speake directly of massacring. One I have yet in memory, the words of Jeremiah, *Cursed is he that doth the work of the Lord negligently*, where immediately followeth, *And cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from Bloud*.⁹⁴

Morton here highlights not only the influx of pamphlet debates into the pulpit but the unease that this precipitated for many conservative clergymen. This encapsulates the paradox at the heart of royalist and episcopalian preaching: Morton deemed ‘the report of pamphlets’ unworthy of the pulpit and yet was prompted to enter into precisely this kind of polemical exercise, lest these arguments go unbuffered and the public continue to be deceived.

Reaching his conclusion, he made explicit his sense that the current political climate had rendered polemical refutation in the pulpit an unhappy necessity: ‘I would not have brought disputes into the Pulpit, if the importunity of this our unseasonable Season had not exacted it of me’.⁹⁵

Other preachers at St. Paul’s in these months decided that the best way to convert their audience, while also avoiding recriminatory action by the authorities, was to employ a still more moderate and conciliatory rhetoric. Richard Gardiner, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, was noticeably circumspect when delivering his St. Paul’s sermon on the anniversary of the

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 22.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

king's accession, 27 March.⁹⁶ Although Gardiner had previously been an outspoken defender of the Laudian altar policy and religious festivals, he outlined in a printed foreword to his patron, the earl of Dorset, the deft rhetorical strategy he had adopted for his sermon: 'I have attired Truth with an inoffensive dresse, and tempered it with moderation; well knowing that gentle language hath oft beene prevalent, where the boystrous sword could not'.⁹⁷ Divisive, polarising rhetoric, Gardiner therefore suggested, was not only imprudent but ineffective at a moment when accommodation was still regarded as a genuine possibility. Gardiner was mindful not only of his own safety but how he could effectively persuade an audience of Londoners who, as Ephraim Udall's experience shows, were potentially far from sympathetic. His claims of moderation therefore went beyond mere polemical posturing.

To this end, Gardiner adjusted his preaching style as well. He had previously printed two sermons in 1638, both originally preached in Oxford on Easter and Christmas day respectively, which showcase a far more ornate, learned style befitting a scholarly university audience. Gardiner frequently inserts long Latin and Greek quotations (occasionally untranslated) and references to a wide range of non-scriptural authorities – Theophylact, Xenophon, or St Bernard.⁹⁸ High-flown metaphors are produced to show off Gardiner's verbal dexterity: 'you will be pleas'd to consider that my Eagle S-John soares, and towres beyond my Kenne, so that a flagging Fly cannot mount to the highest Point of such a Princely Bird'.⁹⁹ By contrast, preaching at St. Paul's in 1642, Gardiner immediately states his determination 'to keepe myself to the words of my Text' and patristic citations are used

⁹⁶ For a contrasting discussion of this sermon, see Morrissey, *Politics*, pp. 156–9.

⁹⁷ Richard Gardiner, *A sermon appointed for Saint Pauls Crosse* (1642), sig. A3v. On Gardiner, see Newton E. Key, 'Gardiner, Richard', *ODNB*; and Kenneth Fincham, 'The Restoration of the Altars in the 1630s', *HJ*, 44 (2001), pp. 919–40, at p. 929. Gardiner dedicated a Latin sermon to Laud in 1631: *Concio ad clerum habita in Templo Beatæ Mariæ Oxon* (Oxford, 1631).

⁹⁸ Richard Gardiner, *A sermon preach'd in the cathedral church of Christ in Oxford* (Oxford, 1638), unpag., pp. 3, 4, 8, 10.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, unpag.

sparingly.¹⁰⁰ As in the case of Frank, some condescension was evidently being made to the ‘plainer’ homiletic style more often associated with puritans, as part of a wider strategy of persuasion.

This – apparently earnest – desire to win over, rather than simply tarnish, opponents led others to replicate the moderate tone of Gardiner’s discourse. Although he would eventually find himself sequestered from his living in 1643 for outspoken opposition to parliament’s ecclesiastical policies, Ephraim Udall confined himself in his July 1642 sermon to extolling the benefits of peace and the horrors of war. ‘There is no greater evill and affliction in the world than War,’ he told his audience, ‘for it is attended upon by all the evils of punishment that God inflicts upon men for their iniquities’.¹⁰¹ Udall gestured to his royalist sympathies with the claim that ‘in warre the Lord’s anointed’ was liable to ‘fall as soon as the basest and most useless creature ... to the great sinne of those that expose his Royall Person to danger’. But his principal emphasis was on the benefits that the subject derived from kingship in times of peace: ‘wholesome Lawes are inacted, so are they put into execution, and maintained in their strength and vigor, and civill Magistrates that beare the sword, beare it not in vaine’.¹⁰² For this reason, he pleaded, ‘things of decency not commanded or determined in Scripture, [should be] left to the discretion of the Magistrate, whose Laws in these things are the bonds of outward peace’.¹⁰³

Matthew Griffith was chosen to preach at St. Paul’s as late as 2 October 1642, only weeks before the battle of Edgehill. Griffith had attended Christ’s College, Cambridge, and was presented to the rectory of St Mary Magdalen, Old Fish Street, in 1624, probably as a result of his friendship with John Donne. He would go on to be one of the king’s most ardent

¹⁰⁰ Gardiner, *A sermon appointed*, p. 4.

¹⁰¹ Udall, *The good of peace*, p. 16.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 12.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

clerical supporters: shortly after he had preached at St. Paul's, he was imprisoned by parliament for further sermons 'stirring up and fomenting of seditious divisions and Mutinies in [the City], hindering the Public Defence of the Kingdom'.¹⁰⁴ Sequestered in early 1643, he played a role in the defence of Basing House, Hampshire, on 14 October 1645. On the eve of the Restoration, a strident and somewhat tactless royalist sermon Griffith printed, entitled *Fear of God and the King*, would see him briefly imprisoned by the Council of State and attacked in a pamphlet by John Milton.¹⁰⁵ By 1660, Griffith was prepared to justify retrospectively the policies of Charles I's Personal Rule, describing Ship Money as 'but a Flea-bite to each particular man, in comparison to those Insupportable Pressures, under which we have laien groaning and gasping ever since'.¹⁰⁶ He now insisted that if the king 'should command such a thing as you may not lawfully do, then you must not resist, but suffer patiently for not doing it'.¹⁰⁷

At St. Paul's in 1642, however, Griffith struck a much more cautious and conciliatory note. In an address included in the printed edition to 'the Right Worshipfull ... Citizens of London', he explained that his sermon had been 'prepared for you, and preached to you, and that by one of you ... I wish you as well as myself (seeing my welfare depends upon yours)'.¹⁰⁸ Like Udall, Griffith praised peace in the most exalted terms throughout his sermon: 'the cohabitation of neighbours in peace and unity, is so good and pleasant a thing indeed, that no man in words is fully able to express it'. Attentive listeners, however, would have realised that it was very much a peace on the king's terms he was proposing. Employing a careful metaphor, he dismissed as 'an inordinate and preposterous peace', any agreement

¹⁰⁴ *WR*, p. 49.

¹⁰⁵ Tai Liu, 'Griffith, Matthew', *ODNB*.

¹⁰⁶ Matthew Griffith, *The fear of God and the king* (1660), p. 64. For similar complaints about the fiscal burdens of parliamentary rule, see Robert Ashton, 'From Cavalier to Roundhead Tyranny, 1642-9', in John Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642-1649* (Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 185-207.

¹⁰⁷ Griffith, *Fear of God*, p. 10

¹⁰⁸ Griffith, *A patheticall perswasion to pray for publicke peace* (1642), sigs. A2r-v.

that left ‘the superiour faculty of the soul ... subjugated by, and subject unto the inferiour’.¹⁰⁹ Nonetheless, Griffith attempted to win his audience over primarily by emphasising the mutual benefits of kingship (‘under them we may live a quiet and peaceable life’) and the interdependence of ‘Prince and People, Magistrate and Minister, Nobility and Comminality, Clergy and Laity even all’.¹¹⁰

This emphasis on the reciprocity and mutual obligation that characterised the relationship between ruler and ruled had been similarly central to Richard Gardiner’s accession day sermon. He claimed that ‘the drift of the Discourse is to cement together affectionate obedience in the People, and cheerfull protection in the Sovereigne: the one being the highest felicity of the King, and the other the greatest blessing of the Subject’.¹¹¹ Kings were not, Gardiner argued, entirely unconstrained by law or duty. ‘There is a mutuall duty’, he declared, ‘which they are to discharge to their Subjects for their Service’, while ‘a good King makes the Law his will ... and therefore voluntarily imposeth upon himself a necessity of keeping it’.¹¹² Gardiner explicitly distanced himself from attempts ‘to inflame’ the royal ‘Prerogative to the evacuation of the Subjects Right; both must be kept entire to keepe up the King, and Kingdome’. Without their just rights and liberties, subjects would ‘hardly be accounted considerable members of a Commonwealth, because they have no pulse from any intrinsecall principle of their owne’.¹¹³ Significantly, Gardiner acknowledged that he was here amplifying and clarifying the rhetorical strategies he had encountered in printed royal declarations:

It is therefore the equity, and prudence of his gracious Majesty, sincerely to
profess that he is as tenderly affected to the Privileges, and rights of his Subjects,

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 27.

¹¹¹ Gardiner, *A sermon appointed*, unpag.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 19.

as to the pre-eminence of his own Crown; well knowing he cannot be a puissant King of a flourishing Kingdome, but by being King of a Free Nation.¹¹⁴

Gardiner was no less conciliatory on ecclesiastical issues. Despite his previous public statements of support for the Laudian altar policy, he now professed himself ‘resolved to approve no further these externall decorements, and other circumstantial in Gods house, then the Policy of the Land wherein I live’.¹¹⁵ He argued that the ‘two excellent duties of Praying, and Preaching’ should ‘goe hand in hand together’, and sought to avoid taking a decisive position on the vexed question of salvation: ‘godlinesse, and honesty, faith and good works must not be set at oddes, but connexed, and linked in our peaceable life’.¹¹⁶ This is a notable feature of many of these St. Paul’s sermons, which frequently combined cautious expressions of support for the king with attempts to disassociate the royalist and episcopalian cause from the controversial church reforms of the 1630s. In several cases, this reflected the initial choice preacher – Calvinists who had played little role in the implementation of Laudianism – but in Gardiner we have an example of a clergyman strategically trimming his sails to suit the prevailing wind. This was partly a conscious attempt to mirror the actions and public declarations of Charles; partly a result of deliberation on the best way to persuade an unsympathetic audience; and partly no doubt a product of anxiety about parliamentary reprisals.¹¹⁷ These St. Paul’s sermons therefore testify to the increasing significance of preaching as a way of shaping the febrile public debate taking place in these months, despite the reservations of some clergymen about doing so, and the ways that this determined the composition and character of their sermons.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 32.

¹¹⁷ See James Daly, ‘Could Charles I be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646’, *JBS*, 6 (1966), pp. 23–44.

Cathedrall Newes from Canterbury

However, it was not just in London that pulpits became sites of contestation and controversy. Canterbury Cathedral, and its pulpit specifically, acted as a focal point for divisions in a city beset by turmoil in the early 1640s. As Patrick Collinson notes, ‘the Cathedral was deemed by parliamentarians to be “delinquent”, collectively and *tout court*’ – a perception fuelled in no small part by the preaching there.¹¹⁸ Sermons formed an integral part of the evidence marshalled against the clergy in *Cathedrall newes from Canterbury*, a hostile account written in 1644 by Richard Culmer, the puritan curate of nearby Harbledown. Culmer depicted the cathedral as a hotbed of ‘malignancy’, with the clergy there routinely articulating provocative absolutist and Laudian views from the pulpit well into the early 1640s. When Charles I and Henrietta Maria visited Canterbury on their way to Dover in February 1642, they apparently heard a sermon in which ‘one of those Cathedrall Doctors’ declared ‘the Episcopall Government to be from Heaven’, while ‘on Ascension Thursday (as they call it) 1642, another Cathedrall Doctor Preacht there, that it was a duty of the Text, that all that have Knees should bow them at the Name of Jesus’.¹¹⁹ If all the ‘prelaticall and Cathedrall Sermons were extant’, claimed Culmer, ‘England would see ... how little our Laws and Liberties are beholding to Tyrannous Prelacy, and Cathedralls’.¹²⁰ For Culmer therefore, the true character of cathedral preaching was concealed from the wider public by a frustrating lack of printed corroboration. He could only point readers in the direction of the ‘Printed Prelaticall Sermon’ preached by Isaac Bargrave, dean of Canterbury, in support of the Forced Loan in 1627 to support his claims.¹²¹

¹¹⁸ Patrick Collinson, ‘The Protestant Cathedral, 1541–1660’, in Patrick Collinson *et al* (eds.), *A History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 154–203, at p. 194. See also: Ian Atherton, ‘Cathedrals and the British Revolution’, in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 96–116, esp. p. 104.

¹¹⁹ Richard Culmer, *Cathedrall newes from Canterbury* (1644), p. 10.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

Culmer was not alone in taking umbrage at what was preached in the Cathedral. The deputy-lieutenants of Kent wrote a letter to parliament in October 1643, complaining about ‘the sermons preached in the Cathedral’ and were asked by MPs to ‘return to the House the Names of such Ministers as are well affected ... and orthodox Men’ to replace the malignant clergy.¹²² Nor was it just the Cathedral pulpit over which local laypersons battled for control. Elsewhere in the city, at St. Mary Bredin, John Marston scandalised sections of his audience in June 1642 when he ‘exhorted his people to lay their hands on their hearts, consult their Bibles, and see where they could find any warrant for taking up arms against their king’. Others, however, took Marston’s side and his parishioners were apparently so divided by the sermon ‘that we can hardlye looke on[e] upon another in Charitie’.¹²³ Once again, those opposed to the preacher appealed to parliament, sending a petition dated 27 June in which they charged Marston with having sown ‘devison and distraccon’ and articulated ‘evill opinions’ about parliament.¹²⁴

One particular incident at Canterbury in these years demonstrates that royalist preaching was capable of generating even more violent responses from audience members of all persuasions. According to Culmer, when a cathedral preacher complained in the aftermath of Edgehill that ‘there was now in the land a conspiracy against the King, to take away his life’, it caused a two-day riot that spread throughout the city and only ended when the minister was imprisoned.¹²⁵ The precise details of the riot were subsequently contested in the anonymously published *Antidotum Culmerianum*, a riposte to Culmer’s *Cathedrall newes*, but the basic facts went unchallenged.¹²⁶ Contrastingly, Culmer also acknowledged that a sermon preached by a ‘Cathedralist’ in December 1643 condemning the recent iconoclasm in the cathedral had

¹²² *CJ*, III, 299.

¹²³ Collinson, ‘The Protestant Cathedral’, p. 194.

¹²⁴ Quoted in Eales, ‘Clergy and Allegiance’, p. 91.

¹²⁵ Culmer, *Cathedrall newes*, p. 10.

¹²⁶ *Antidotum Culmerianum: or, Animadversions upon a late pamphlet* (Oxford, 1644), p. 26.

‘caused the mutiny in Canterbury the next day’ against the city’s parliamentary leaders.¹²⁷ The potential for sermons to stir the passions and incite popular political action in this way gave the preacher great power while simultaneously exposing him to not inconsiderable dangers.

Sermons into Print: The Case of Thomas Lenthall

Sermons at Paul’s Cross had been regularly printed since the reign of Elizabeth I. The proximity of the Cathedral to the epicentre of London’s publishing trade doubtless assisted preachers who wished to enter print, while booksellers and publishers were often themselves among the auditors at St. Paul’s. George Thomason, for instance, noted on his edition of Thomas Westfield’s November 1641 sermon there that ‘this sermon I heard preached’.¹²⁸ However, Mark Frank’s example shows that, crucially, not *all* sermons at St. Paul’s were printed in these months. Given the public appetite for news and topical print, publishers were more inclined to oversee the printing of a sermon that dealt with the controversial issues of the moment. At the same time, preachers could not completely overstep the bounds of acceptable speech and still expect that publishers would be willing or able to take on their works. The printed record is to some extent misleading therefore and to understand better the limits of what could be safely preached, and still more *printed*, in support of the king before the outbreak of Civil War, it is instructive to scrutinise manuscript sources. Although such material was rarely printed before late 1642, there is nonetheless evidence to support Culmer’s claims that much more uncompromising defences of the king than those offered in the St. Paul’s sermons were being articulated in the pulpit elsewhere. These were occasionally then circulated in manuscript among royalist communities. This in turn

¹²⁷ Culmer, *Cathedrall Newes*, p. 12.

¹²⁸ Thomas Westfield, *A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of S. Paul* (1641), title-page.

demonstrates the problems of using only printed texts to assess the tenor of clerical royalism in these months and confirms the continued importance of manuscript for transmitting and circulating sermon material, even after the print ‘explosion’.

Thomas Lenthall had entered Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1632 and was subsequently elected to a fellowship there, only to be formally ejected by parliamentary visitors in 1644. He had by this time apparently already fled to the king’s army and afterwards converted to Catholicism.¹²⁹ When Roger Ashton, another fellow of Pembroke and vicar of Linton in Cambridgeshire, was ejected by the Committee for Scandalous Ministers in April 1644, it was partly as a result of having invited Lenthall and other ‘ill-affected preachers’ to deliver sermons in his church.¹³⁰ One particular sermon on Ecclesiastes 8:4, presumably preached at Linton originally, was transcribed into a commonplace book with a dedication to Charles I dated July 1642. The book also includes several poems by Richard Crashaw, who had entered Pembroke the year before Lenthall but moved to Peterhouse in 1635, copied out in the same hand as the sermon. It is not clear who the book belonged to or when exactly it was compiled: the hand does not appear to be Crashaw’s and it seems unlikely that Lenthall would transcribe a copy of his own sermon into a book alongside somebody else’s poems. More likely, the book belonged to a Cambridge associate of both Lenthall and Crashaw who had borrowed original manuscripts from the pair and copied them out before returning them. This kind of manuscript circulation was common in universities throughout the seventeenth century, and sermons in particular were often exchanged and copied.¹³¹

Pembroke before the Civil War was a bastion of Laudianism and a centre of especially belligerent royalism thereafter. Under Lancelot Andrewes, who became master in 1589, ‘the

¹²⁹ Robert Hawes and Robert Loder, *The History of Framlingham, in the County of Suffolk* (Woodbridge, 1798), p. 270; *WR*, p. 77.

¹³⁰ *WR*, p. 77.

¹³¹ See Mary Morrissey, ‘Sermon Notes and Manuscript Communities’, *HLQ*, 80 (2), pp. 293–307, at pp. 305–7.

college began to develop into one of the strongholds of the High Church party'.¹³² During the 1620s and 1630s, it was home to a circle of Arminians – notably Matthew Wren and Benjamin Laney, who both served as Master – with close ties to William Laud. When Laud and John Buckeridge required some verses for an edition of Andrewes's sermons, they enlisted, through their Pembroke connections, Richard Crashaw.¹³³ In 1628, whitewash was removed from the chapel walls so that the decorative medieval paintings could be once again visible and Crashaw subsequently praised Laney for introducing greater ceremonialism to the services held there.¹³⁴ The college bred a number of pugnacious future royalists during these years: both Mark Frank and John Hewitt, who would be executed in 1658 for his involvement in royalist plotting, had entered the college within a year or two of Lenthall and Crashaw.¹³⁵ After war broke out, Pembroke sent money and plate to the king, but the establishment of parliamentary control over Cambridge triggered a mass exodus from the college. When on 26 December 1643 the parliamentarian commissioner, William Dowsing, visited the college he found it virtually empty but for a few fellows.¹³⁶

In his dedication to the king, Lenthall explained that the 'demonstration of the impendent Ruine of Church & State ... have moved mee in this & other Surmons of this nature to the people to discharge my private conscience towards God & your Sacred Majestye'.¹³⁷

However, like other royalist preachers, Lenthall had evidently studied the printed royal declarations of 1642 closely, and interpreted one in particular as an appeal for more preaching on the king's behalf: in 'your Late answer in May ... your Maj[es]t[ie] is pleased to intimate a certaine generall fault in us in that wee have not duly exhorted & enstructed the

¹³² Aubrey Attwater, *Pembroke College, Cambridge: A Short History* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 54.

¹³³ Peter McCullough, 'Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1642–1642', *HJ*, 41 (1998), pp. 401–24, at p. 409.

¹³⁴ Attwater, *Pembroke College*, p. 68.

¹³⁵ For Hewitt, see below, chapter five.

¹³⁶ Attwater, *Pembroke College*, p. 73; *The Journal of William Dowsing*, ed. Trevor Cooper (Woodbridge, 2001), pp. 161–2.

¹³⁷ BL, Add. MS 34692, fo. 1r.

people in their obedience'.¹³⁸ In response to this call, Lenthall preached his sermon and subsequently set about preparing it for the press, in the hope that it might persuade the king's subjects to obedience.

The sermon itself was far more stridently absolutist than any that actually made its way into print during the first part of 1642, as signified by Lenthall's choice of text: 'Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?' He lamented the novel tendency to pry into the *arcana imperii*, noting that although people now required 'an account of the administration of the Common-wealth', it was 'the Devills forme of coming to Kings with insolent Questions'.¹³⁹ Rather than stressing the king's obligation to the law, Lenthall was eager to free Charles from any legal constraints and to suggest that the king could make law independently of parliament: 'May not his owne Laws say unto *Quid agis?* Directive they may, but Coactive they neither may, nor can. If the King bee in a Errour, he can make new Laws to defend his Errour saith St. Augustine'.¹⁴⁰ Lenthall's concluding sentence reiterated that 'Neither People, Nor Church, Nor Nobilitye: Nor inferior Magistrates of ye Land may say unto the King by way of Rebellious Contradiction: What dost Thou?'.¹⁴¹ This was precisely the kind of absolutist rhetoric that had landed Robert Sibthorpe and Roger Manwaring in so much trouble with parliament fifteen years earlier, and which the likes of Gardiner and Griffith – not to mention Charles I himself – had consciously avoided in their own discussions of kingship during 1642.¹⁴²

Significantly, however, Lenthall's sermon was initially circulated only in manuscript and did not make its way through the press until May 1643. When it did emerge, it bore a title-

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, fos. 9r–v.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, fo. 18r.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, fo. 25v.

¹⁴² On the sermons of Sibthorpe and Manwaring, see Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1625–1628* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 62–5.

page claiming that it had originally been preached in London ‘by a lover of truth’ and was shorn of the dedication that would have identified Lenthall as its author. This has led some contemporaries and subsequent historians to attribute the sermon erroneously to Matthew Griffith. Anthony Wood noted that, although Griffith’s ‘name is not set to it ... the general report then and after was, that ‘twas his’ – again demonstrating the role that (often false) rumour and report played in transmitting sermons to a wider audience.¹⁴³ The fact that Lenthall prepared a dated dedication in July 1642 suggests that he was either initially frustrated in his attempts to publish the sermon or deemed it an imprudent enterprise. He may have realised that his sermon was anomalous within the broader royalist propaganda effort or perhaps was unable to find a publisher willing to print such provocative statements at this stage.

By May 1643, however, both sides were in arms and early attempts to secure a peace settlement had come to nothing. This altered political context engendered a process of ideological escalation, whereby religious and political ideas rarely seen in print during 1641-2 now became commonplace.¹⁴⁴ The experience of armed rebellion encouraged many more royalist clergymen to articulate openly the kinds of views expounded in Lenthall’s sermon. In this respect sermons constituted just one aspect of a broader trajectory in royalist thought towards increasing absolutism as the 1640s progressed, epitomised by the writings of Griffith Williams and culminating in the publication of Sir Robert Filmer’s *Anarchy of a limited and mixed monarchy* in 1648.¹⁴⁵ In his 1644 *Jura Majestatis*, for instance, Williams had declared that the king was ‘free from lawes’ and that his sovereignty consisted of an ‘unrestrained

¹⁴³ *AO*, III, 712.

¹⁴⁴ For an account of this process on the parliamentary side, see Como, ‘Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation’.

¹⁴⁵ John M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (1968) p. 14. See also: Ian Campbell, ‘Calvinist Absolutism: Archbishop James Ussher and Royal Power’, *JBS*, 53 (2014), pp. 558–610.

power’ – statements that surely qualify Williams as an absolutist on even the most stringent definition.¹⁴⁶

George Downham, the otherwise obscure rector of Southrepps, Norfolk, delivered a sermon in Norwich cathedral in early 1643, which was later published in two editions with the telling and provocative title *Rex Meus est Deus*.¹⁴⁷ In seeking to drum up support for the king’s war effort, Downham was prepared to make far more expansive claims for the royal prerogative than anything printed on the eve of the Civil War. Like Lenthall, Downham invoked Ecclesiastes 8:4, asking his audience: ‘who may say unto [the king], what doest thou? Who of the Priests? Who of the Peeres? Who of the People? Who but He who put him in authority, Almighty God?’¹⁴⁸ For Downham, unquestioning obedience and honour were due to the king unconditionally, ‘be the subject never so much in the right, and the soveraigne in the wrong’. Only ‘prophane men’ believe that ‘our Kings are bound to observe the Lawes as well as we’.¹⁴⁹ Alongside these robust assertions of divine-right absolutism, Downham was also prepared to launch a blistering attack on the Calvinist doctrine of salvation, condemning the ‘carnall gospellers of these times that are all for faith and nothing for works, that believe they shalbe saved as soon as the rest, but they have nothing to shew for it’. Instead, ‘the means of salvation are held out to all, if thou or any thou in the world will do well thou shall be accepted’.¹⁵⁰

If fervent expressions of absolutism were commonplace by May 1643, why did the publishers of Lenthall’s sermon falsify its original date, location, and author? The threat of

¹⁴⁶ Griffith Williams, *Jura Majestatis* (Oxford, 1644), pp. 146,150. For debates over how absolutism in early modern England should be defined, see Johann Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (2nd edn, 1999), especially pp. 226–50.

¹⁴⁷ For the local context of this sermon, see Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and their Opponents in England: Religion in Norwich, c. 1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 247–8.

¹⁴⁸ George Downham, *Rex meus est Deus* (1643), pp. 22–3.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 29.

¹⁵⁰ See Reynolds, *Godly Reformers*, pp. 247–8.

punitive action from parliament was still real, of course, but Lenthall and many others at Pembroke had already fled Cambridge to ensure that they were out of parliament's reach. Many other preachers were by 1643 happy to put their names to sermons and treatises no less inflammatory. It seems rather that the recontextualization of the sermon was for polemical advantage rather than the protection of the author. This was, in fact, just one of a number of intriguing forged documents emanating from the London and Oxford presses during late 1642 and early 1643, as king and parliament sought both to win, and to give the impression of, wide public support.¹⁵¹ William Chillingworth, for instance, produced a fraudulent petition 'of the most substantial citizens of the city of London' in early 1643, which purported to show the widespread opposition of Londoners to parliament's conduct towards the king.¹⁵² Parliamentarians, for their part, reissued an anti-Laudian sermon by one Richard Spinkes in May 1643, claiming that it had been delivered before the king and that Spinkes had been imprisoned as a result. Spinkes had in fact died in 1634, and the sermon, widely circulated in manuscript among puritans during the 1630s, had actually been preached in the chapel of St. John's College, Cambridge, on 17 May 1632. The publication and recontextualization of Lenthall's sermon was another instance of the same strategy: by locating it in London, the sermon implicitly conveyed the impression that the king still enjoyed extensive and outspoken support in the city, despite the fact that he had been thus far unable to take it by force. By keeping the identity of the preacher anonymous, the publishers ensured that the purported provenance of the sermon could not be easily disproved – a successful tactic, given the widespread belief that Matthew Griffith was the author.

If even a fragment of the testimony given to the Committee for Scandalous Ministers can be relied upon, it provides further evidence of the kinds of absolutist, provocative, but crucially

¹⁵¹ For more on this phenomenon, see below, chapter four, and William White, 'Parliament, Print and the Politics of Disinformation, 1642–3', *Historical Research*, 92 (2019), pp. 720–36.

¹⁵² William Chillingworth, *The petition of the most substantial inhabitants of the city of London* (Oxford, 1642).

unpublished, sermons that were being preached before civil war had actually broken out. As early as 1641, William Fuller, the dean of Ely, was accused of telling his congregation at St Giles Cripplegate that ‘all our estates are at the Kings disposing’, a sentiment reportedly echoed in August of that year by John Squire, the vicar of St. Leonard’s, Shoreditch:

If the King demand either Land, Houses, Possessions and whole Estate; Nay, the very life itself of any subject, without any offence by him committed, unlesse he did voluntarily attribute & surrender it unto him, [then] he commit[s] a most abominable sin of damnation.¹⁵³

Whatever the truth of these allegations – and Squire at least vigorously denied the charges against him – they certainly highlight once again the dangers associated with the public expression of absolutist thought on the eve of the Civil Wars, a fact that helps to explain why such sentiments were confined to oral and scribal transmission until after war had broken out.

It should be noted here that there is another side to the distortive quality of print. As well as concealing more strident, even radical, expressions of royalism, printed sermons in these years do not often give much sense of the quotidian preaching that these ministers were simultaneously engaged in as part of their pastoral duties. Peter Hausted, vicar of Gretton in Northamptonshire and an outspoken advocate of the Laudian reforms in the 1630s, joined the earl of Northampton’s forces as an army chaplain in 1642.¹⁵⁴ Hausted had published a collection of sermons in 1636 that attacked puritans and advanced a defence of Laudian ceremonialism, while several royalist satires dating from the Civil War period have been

¹⁵³ *The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Dr. Fuller* (1641), sig. A3r; *Articles exhibited in Parliament against Master John Squire* (1641), p. 7.

¹⁵⁴ On Hausted’s career and writings during the 1630s, see Peter Lake and Isaac Stephens, *Scandal and Religious Identity in Early Stuart England: A Northamptonshire Maid’s Tragedy* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 85–96.

attributed to him: he was evidently not above the polemical use of print.¹⁵⁵ He was eventually killed at the Siege of Banbury Castle in July 1644 and a collection of manuscript sermons that he preached at Banbury during the early part of that year survive among the papers of Sir Christopher Hatton, at whose house, Kirby Hall, he may have occasionally preached.¹⁵⁶ We know that these were delivered before small audiences, since each sermon includes a marginal attendance register alongside the title, with only a handful of attendees recorded in each case.

In these manuscript sermons, Hausted confines himself exclusively to uncontroversial themes that are central to Christian teaching – the blessedness of poverty and the dangers of wealth; the importance of giving proper reverence to God; the dependence of every man, even the mightiest, on His mercy. It would be impossible to tell from the sermons in this collection alone that there was a civil war going on and, in fact, this makes sense given that Hausted was at Banbury apparently in the habit of recycling earlier sermons that pre-dated the war: marginal notes record the previous occasions on which each one had been preached – for instance, at Gretton, Hausted’s parish, during the late 1630s.¹⁵⁷

Similarly, Thomas Holbech, the ejected vicar of Epping, Essex, left a diary that documented his preaching activities between 1643 and 1645 as household chaplain to the earl of Middlesex.¹⁵⁸ This consisted of the date, location, and text on which Holbech had delivered his weekly sermons and, while it is obviously dangerous to infer too much from such scant information, only one of the texts recorded over the course of the two years (Lamentations 1:20: ‘abroad the sword bereaveth, at home there is as death’) clearly suggests a sermon that

¹⁵⁵ Peter Hausted, *Ten sermons, preached upon severall Sundayes and saints days* (1636); *Satyre against separatists* (1642); *Ad populum: or a lecture to the people* (Oxford, 1644). See also his elegy on the death of Colonel Robert Arden: Bodl., MS Ashmole 36, fos. 125r–v.

¹⁵⁶ Northamptonshire Record Office, FH/N/A/0250. I owe my knowledge of this manuscript to Richard Cust.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, unfo.

¹⁵⁸ Kent Archives, Maidstone, U269 Q13/6, unfo.

engaged with contemporary events. There was obviously a considerable difference between preaching to a small, private audience in the capacity of household chaplain to a nobleman and occupying a pulpit like that at St. Paul's, where the eyes of London, and indeed England, would be trained on the preacher. The latter encouraged and perhaps even necessitated reflection on contemporary events, and sermons like these were in turn more likely to be published as urgent attempts to influence public opinion on pressing political or ecclesiastical questions. The printed record can therefore also suppress the continued use of the sermon, even by fiercely partisan preachers, as a principal means of instructing their flock in the fundamentals of the Protestant faith – part of the more routine rhythms that constituted the clerical vocation.

Conclusions

This chapter has explored how clerical supporters of the king and established Church reconceptualised their ideas about sermon-giving in response to the mass print, adversarial politics, and vociferous public debate that they confronted after 1640. It has argued that there was a fundamental tension at the heart of loyalist preaching: uncomfortable, like many royalists, with 'popularity' and open discussion of the *arcana imperii*, the clergy were still more unsure that polemical and political controversies were worthy of a preacher's office. At the same time, their opponents' apparent success in manipulating the multitude through press and pulpit could not be ignored and demanded a response in kind. Royalists recognised that sermons were now an indispensable tool in their efforts to preserve the nation from those seeking radical religious and constitutional changes. Print, traditionally acknowledged as inferior to orality as a means of transmitting the words of a preacher, was now embraced as a

way of bringing sermons to the widest possible audience and establishing stable, authoritative versions over which the preacher could exercise a degree of authorial control.

In this context, the genre, form, and content of sermons were transformed. Royalist preachers adopted an ever more polemical and topical style: they engaged with the sermons and printed pamphlets of their opponents, naming these texts and rehearsing their arguments in an attempt to show the fallaciousness of the case against king, episcopacy, and Prayer Book. The proclamations of both Charles I and parliament, meanwhile, also stimulated responses from these preachers, and were frequently quoted at length in the pulpit. This intertextuality drew the sermon away from established homiletic structures, in which a minister maintained a narrow focus on his biblical text, elucidating for his audience its doctrine, use, and application. Similarly, both royalist and parliamentary preachers commentated more explicitly on unfolding, 'secular' events than ever before, eschewing the careful deployment of parallel and analogy that had previously been a prerequisite for political discussion. In this way, print and current events filtered into the pulpit and altered the kinds of addresses that congregations heard.

It was not only preachers, however, who saw the pulpit as a crucial medium. This chapter has also shown that, despite their neglect by historians, royalist and episcopalian sermons elicited considerable contemporary interest and controversy. They were an integral part of the fractious debates taking place in the streets, in parliament, and in the press. And consequently, politicians, pamphleteers, and the public all took a keen interest in what was being said by the king's supporters from the pulpit. Parliament was anxious to regulate and suppress hostile preaching; pamphleteers felt compelled to respond to specific sermons through the press; and these preachers were capable of provoking passionate, even violent, responses among their auditors, who might subsequently urge them to print their work for the good of the commonwealth or report them to the authorities for sedition.

Chapter Two: Royalist Mobilisations and the Pulpit, 1642-1646

This chapter examines the relationship between preaching and royalist mobilisations during the First Civil War. Documenting the ways in which the pulpit was used to generate support and resources for Charles I's armies, it draws on recent historiography that has emphasised the fluidity and contingency of Civil War allegiance: Michael Braddick has argued, for instance, that it 'might be better to think in terms of the responses to particular mobilisations rather than a fixed allegiance to one of two sides'.¹ Allegiance was something that needed to be constantly maintained and renegotiated, as both sides grappled with the forces of localism, neutrality, and desertion. Although the link between the clergy and military mobilisation has been underexplored, it is argued here that royalist preachers in the provinces throughout – and not just at the outset of – the conflict were central to the perennial struggle to secure men, money, and resources for the king from local populations far less enthusiastic about the war effort. As Andrew Hopper points out, 'all protagonists throughout the three kingdoms experienced tremendous difficulties in funding their armed forces'.² And while the precise extent of royalist financial disintegration during the First Civil War may have been overstated, it is undeniable that the king's party faced unique challenges in funding its armies – especially as the war progressed.³

Royalist preachers tied to the army exploited their traditional authority in matters of scripture, providence, and salvation as a way of mitigating the inconstancy and instability of

¹ Michael J. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (2008), p. 233. See also: Gavin Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil War: Extracting Resources and Constructing Allegiance* (Farnham, 2012); and Rachel Weil, 'Thinking about Allegiance in the English Civil War', *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), pp. 183–91.

² Andrew Hopper, 'The Armies', in Michael J. Braddick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, (Oxford, 2015) pp. 260–75, at p. 265; Ian Gentles, 'The Civil Wars in England', in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638–1660* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 103–50, at p. 103.

³ Ian Atherton, 'Royalist Finances in the English Civil War: The Case of Lichfield Garrison, 1643–5', *Midland History*, 33 (2008), pp. 43–67; Ann Hughes, 'The King, the Parliament, and the Localities during the English Civil War', *JBS*, 24 (1985), pp. 236–63.

popular allegiance. This chapters shows that the (in)famous parliamentarian divines were far from alone in using providential rhetoric and scriptural exemplarity to drive men to war and counteract backsliding, neutrality, and compromise. The royalist clergy urged the king's supporters to stake their lives in what they depicted as a holy war between God's people and his enemies, upon whom violent retribution must be exacted. Indeed, in keeping with the preceding chapter's emphasis on the dialogic, reactive nature of royalist preaching, it is argued that clerical supporters of the king actually learned from the apparent success of their opponents in mobilising troops from the pulpit: this is shown most clearly in the way that the Curse of Meroz – hitherto associated exclusively with the presbyterian Stephen Marshall and his fellow fast-day preachers – was co-opted by royalists to undermine neutrality and prepare troops for battle with the enemy. These sermons were in this respect polarising and divisive, aiming not to douse the flames of conflict or bring about a rapprochement but to escalate hostilities and drive the royalists onto complete victory.

However, an overemphasis on the more theoretical publications of prominent clerical royalists has distorted this dimension of their thinking, which has often been presented as fundamentally 'moderate', even 'secular'.⁴ It will be suggested here that discrepancies between sermons and printed treatises are partly a function of audience and purpose, as well as genre: the sermon necessitated exegesis, exhortation, and providentialist discussion – even more so when preached with the aim of mobilising fellow royalists. Treatises, by contrast, were often attempts to win over the unconverted or refute the case of a polemical adversary, and sought accordingly to establish the theoretical legitimacy of royalism in terms befitting

⁴ See, for example, J. W. Daly, 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation', *JBS*, 11 (1971), pp. 26–44; and Barbara Donagan, 'Casuistry and Allegiance in the English Civil War', in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.), *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 89–111, esp. p. 92.

rigorous, scholarly debate. This chapter therefore has important implications for the historiography both of royalism and of the English Civil Wars more generally.

John Bramhall and the York Minster Pulpit, 1643-4

As Ian Roy has shown, Charles I regarded army chaplains as integral to the regulation of the moral behaviour and spiritual welfare of royalist troops, and officers who had served abroad in the Swedish armies ‘knew the contribution made by Lutheran ministers to the Protestant crusade of the great Gustavus Adolphus’.⁵ Every royalist regiment was at the outset of the war ordered to appoint a chaplain and a hierarchy of chaplaincy was soon introduced across the armies.⁶ *Military Orders* for use in the king’s army were first published at York in 1642 and subsequently went through several editions. These instructed commanders to ensure that ‘Almighty God [is] reverently served, and Sermons and prayers duely frequented by their several Companies’, and warned that any soldiers ‘who often and wilfully absent themselves from Sermons, and from Morning and Evening Prayer, shall be proceeded against at discretion’.⁷ Thomas Fuller’s Restoration biographer explained that, while serving as an army chaplain, Fuller ‘performed the duty of his holy function, with as much solemn Piety and Devotion, as he used before in places consecrated to Gods Worship; and according to the form used and appointed by the Church of England’.⁸ Regular sermonising in particular was regarded as essential to maintaining the moral standards of the soldiery, all the more so given that the behaviour of royalist armies was felt by some to be alienating the Almighty and thereby inhibiting a royalist victory. Hence, in 1643 Charles I ordered the publication of

⁵ Ian Roy, ‘Royalist Reputations: The Cavalier Ideal and the Reality’, in Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 89–111, at p. 97.

⁶ See Margaret Griffin, ‘The Foundation of the Chaplaincy Corps’, *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 80 (2002), pp. 287–95.

⁷ *Military orders and articles established by His Majesty for the better ordering and government of His Majesties army* (Oxford, 1642), sig. A3v.

⁸ John Fell, *The life of that reverend divine, and learned historian, Dr. Thomas Fuller* (1661), pp. 25–6.

William Strode's *Sermon concerning swearing* that had been preached before him at Christ Church, Oxford.⁹ The deep concern of ministers with the moral behaviour of those within the army manifested itself in other kinds of texts too, such as Henry Ferne's *Camp at Gilgal* (1643) and Thomas Swadlin's *Soldiers Catechisme* (1645), which were both printed with the aim of ensuring the spiritual and moral propriety of the soldiery.

However, the sermons of army chaplains were frequently preached with more overtly military purposes in mind. For instance, royalist commanders might order that sermons be delivered before local populations in recently conquered territory, as an anecdote from Sir Henry Slingsby, a colonel in the northern royalist army, demonstrates. In 1644, Sir John Denham ordered local countrymen to defend Ulverston in Lancashire after his troops had captured the town. When the locals explained that they would but were unwilling to be taken out of their county, Denham ordered

an old parson, that had in former times been a priest of the Roman Church, to preach unto them, and his sermon was to dehort them from rebellion. His pulpit was a huge stone which he leaned upon, the countrymen standing round about him, very attentive to hear; this priest had for his pains paid him 50*l*, which had been formerly paid unto him as a pension by the king, out of the monaeyes Sir John had received of the King's rent.¹⁰

Denham clearly thought that the localist impulses of these Lancashire men might mitigate their loyalty to the crown and that this could be countered with a sermon on the dangers of rebellion – albeit from a former Catholic priest.

⁹ William Strode, *A sermon concerning swearing* (Oxford 1643).

¹⁰ *The Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, ed. Daniel Parsons (1836), pp. 127–8. Dehort: 'To use exhortation to dissuade (a person) from a course or purpose'. See: "dehort, v.", *OED*, www.oed.com/view/Entry/49146. Accessed 12 August 2019.

The ambivalent allegiances of towns specifically presented a perennial problem for parliamentary and royalist armies during the Civil Wars. As Roger Howell has shown, in many towns a significant proportion of the inhabitants sought first and foremost ‘to avoid commitments to either side in the conflict, desired to follow the course of neutrality as the safest stance, ultimately chose sides under pressure and without deep conviction, and readily sought accommodation with any regime that promised law, order, and the preservation of local privileges’.¹¹ This inevitably created tensions with local armies for whom towns were a vital source of shelter, men, and revenue. When Charles I requested a loan of £4000 from the inhabitants of Worcester, for example, he was told that it would be impossible to raise such a sum ‘in respect of the decay of trade of clothing, the weekly burdens and taxes laid on the inhabitants for making fortifications and scouring the ditches, etc.’¹² Arriving in Newcastle with the aim of fortifying the town against parliamentary attack, the earl of Newcastle ‘neither found any military provision considerable for the undertaking of that work, nor generally any great encouragement from the people in those parts’.¹³ Sieges in particular ‘were rarely unified affairs’ and often resulted ‘in tension and rebellion’ by the native inhabitants against the defending army.¹⁴ Finding a way to transcend the instinctive localism and neutrality of townspeople was therefore a pressing priority for those royalist preachers charged with delivering sermons before ordinary citizens, whose compliance – whether in supplying men or money or building fortifications – the army depended on.¹⁵

¹¹ Roger Howell, ‘Neutralism, Conservatism and Political Alignment in the English Revolution: The Case of Towns, 1642–9’, in John Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642–1649* (Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 67–87, at p. 70.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

¹³ Margaret Cavendish, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle*, ed. C.H. Firth (1886), p. 19.

¹⁴ Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 188 and pp. 186–206 more generally.

¹⁵ Howell, ‘Neutralism’, p. 71.

It was also common for sermons to be delivered to troops on the eve of battle – in many cases to ordinary soldiers as well as gentleman officers.¹⁶ Commanders in the king’s armies were keen to exploit the pulpit when preparing and galvanising their soldiers, as well as the local civilian population, ahead of a battle. On 28 January 1644, William Cavendish, now the marquess of Newcastle, appointed John Bramhall to deliver a sermon before him and his troops in York Minster prior to their departure to meet the Scottish army that had just crossed the border into England, while William Ranson delivered a similarly bellicose sermon before the marquess when the city was besieged by parliamentary troops a few months later. Both sermons were subsequently published by Newcastle’s ‘speciall command’.¹⁷ The marquess, ‘a prominent courtier and still more strident royalist’, had gone to great lengths after war broke out to raise and lead a private army in the north for the king.¹⁸

An account of services in the Minster during the Civil Wars was later written by Thomas Mace, a clerk of Trinity College, Cambridge, who was in York when it was besieged in 1644:

By This occasion, there were shut up within that City, abundance of People of the best Rank and Quality, viz. Lords, Knights, and Gentlemen of the Countries round about, besides the Souldiers and Citizens, who all or most of them came constantly every Sunday, to hear Publick Prayers and Sermon in that spacious Church. And indeed there Number was so exceeding great, that the Church was (as I may say) even cramming or squeezing full.¹⁹

¹⁶ Mark Stoye, *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State* (Exeter, 2002), p. 107.

¹⁷ John Bramhall, *A sermon preached in Yorke Minster, before his Excellence the Marques of Newcastle, being then ready to meet the Scotch Army, January, 28. 1643* (York, 1644); William Ranson, *A Sermon preached in the Metropolitanall Church of York* (York, 1644).

¹⁸ Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 229; Cavendish, *Life*, pp. 23–4.

¹⁹ Peter Wenham, *The Great and Close Siege of York, 1644* (Kineton, 1994), p. 69.

According to Mace, it was the convention that sermons in the Minster were heard only after the ‘whole Congregation [had] sang a Psalm, together with the Quire and the Organ’.²⁰ The sermons were thus delivered as part of a defiantly anti-puritan service, in front of soldiers, local gentry, and townsmen. This audience and occasion clearly necessitated a very different kind of message to that articulated at St. Paul’s in 1642 or indeed in the polemical treatises that many of these same clergymen published in the early 1640s. As Edward Vallance has noted of parliamentarian preaching in these years, it was often a case of ‘one message for the kingdom, another for the converted’.²¹ Sermons like those at York Minster in 1643-4 shared and reflected the particular agenda of the more hardline, military wing of the royalist coalition.

Originally from Yorkshire, John Bramhall had enjoyed a meteoric rise within the Church of Ireland during the 1630s, partly because of his tireless attempts to reclaim ecclesiastical lands and rights back from the laity. Nominated bishop of Derry in 1634, he fled back to Yorkshire in 1642 and attached himself to the marquess of Newcastle, who he would follow into exile on the continent after the royalist defeat at Marston Moor in July 1644. Bramhall is often cited as the archetypal ‘constitutional royalist’, having written polemical works attacking both the popular sovereignty espoused by Henry Parker and the absolutism of Thomas Hobbes.²² For instance, in an influential article, James Daly depicted Bramhall as the epitome of ‘moderation and compromise’, which, he contended, are ‘the most distinctive features of the peculiarly English genius in politics’. Indeed, Daly’s portrayal of Bramhall allowed him

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Edward Vallance, ‘Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications for the English Civil War’, *HLQ*, 65 (2002), pp. 395–419, at p. 419.

²² John McCafferty, ‘Bramhall, John’, *ODNB*; Daly, ‘John Bramhall’; David Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 220–3.

to claim that ‘the most important characteristic of seventeenth-century English royalism was not its defence of the king, but its defence of political moderation and limited government’.²³

Bramhall’s first printed sermon of the Civil Wars had been preached in York Minster in the summer of 1643, at a thanksgiving for Newcastle’s victory over the army of Sir Thomas Fairfax at Adwalton Moor. This discourse is particularly notable for the ways in which it presented and legitimated the cause for which Newcastle and his soldiers were fighting. Rather than striking a moderate or irenic pose, the primate was clear that continued violence against the enemy was justified on both religious and scriptural grounds. ‘The sword is never more justly drawne’, he claimed, ‘then to defend Religion: As we reade of those builders of Jerusalem, who laboured with their trowells in the one hand, and their swords in the other’. He insisted that, since ‘a private man may lawfully keep the possession of his house or land against acts of violence, much more may a whole Church hold the possession of their Religion’. Men could not rely on providential deliverance alone – which would be ‘plain tempting to God’ – and were obliged to take up ‘corporeall weapons’. While it was true that Christ had told Peter to put away his sword in the Garden of Gethsemane, this was only because Peter was a private man who lacked the dispensation necessary from the lawful magistrate to carry out acts of violence. Such dispensation was precisely what the parliamentarians themselves lacked and what therefore made their claims to be fighting on religious grounds illegitimate. Bramhall cited the Old Testament in support, noting how often it ‘prescribe[s] Military Rules and Precepts ... *Thou teachest my hands to warre and my fingers to fight*, said David’.²⁴

When he came to preach at York Minster on 28 January 1644, Bramhall’s intention was evidently to fortify the officers and troops amongst his audience for their impending

²³ Daly, ‘John Bramhall’, p. 26.

²⁴ John Bramhall, *A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of York* (York, 1643), pp. 12–14.

showdown with the Scots. His text was accordingly taken from 2 Samuel 10:12: ‘Be of good courage, and let us play the men, for our people, and for the Cities of our God, and the Lord doe that which seemeth him good’. Bramhall acknowledged that ‘it hath beene ever the custome of Generalls before an hazardous Battell, to cheere up the hearts of their Souldiers in a Patheticall Oration’ – perhaps gesturing to the instruction he had received from Newcastle in preparing his sermon.²⁵ He urged his audience to be ‘of a masculine vertue and spirit’, since ‘the only way to peace is Courage, which yeelds to no chances, is terrified with no dangers’.²⁶ Addressing Newcastle directly at one point, he declared that a ‘vigilant and resolute Commander, is like a light in a watch-tower, to direct his company to the safe harbour of Victory’.²⁷

Strikingly, Bramhall in this sermon adopted a rhetoric of martyrdom that reaffirmed once again the religious nature of the cause being contended:

I wish to every true English-man, the spirit and affection of that Souldier, who having his legs cut off in fight for his Country, yet desired to be cast into the breach, that he might dulle the edge of one sword more. It is better to die, then survive the honour of our Nation, and to suffer these things which are worse then death, Schisme, Slavery, Beggary, and whatever an insulting Enemy can inflict upon a degenerous people ... It is a sweet and comely thing for a man to die for his Country, *and for his Religion*.²⁸

In their bid to inspire their armies to victory, preachers like Bramhall turned to scripture, transposing and projecting the battles fought by the Israelites in the Old Testament onto the contemporary English context. This was partly, of course, a function of the sermon genre: the

²⁵ Bramhall, *A sermon preached in Yorke Minster*, p. 7.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 10.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 22–3, my emphasis.

explication and application of biblical passages was central to the preacher's task, and this necessarily encouraged a certain amount of parallelism. However, it was also a product of the intense biblicism that still characterised English society by the mid-seventeenth century. In Patrick Collinson's words, the early modern mind was 'saturated in scripture and able to move around in it with the familiarity and ease of a blind man who knows the position and feel of every stick of furniture in his own house'.²⁹ The Old Testament was habitually invoked as a guide to understanding contemporary people, groups, and events, which were assumed to have been prefigured in scripture.³⁰ Parallels between England and Israel were particularly deeply-embedded in the collective consciousness and had become a well-worn homiletic trope during the reigns of Elizabeth and James – nowhere more so than in the Jeremiadic sermons regularly preached at Paul's Cross. During the Civil Wars, moreover, 'each side embraced and intensified its claims to Israelite identity, as a way of legitimizing its cause and bolstering its hopes of success'.³¹ Royalists and parliamentarians alike presented themselves as latter-day Israelites, God's chosen people who, through His providential deliverance, would ultimately triumph over their enemies.

Bramhall himself was adamant that the Civil War had pitted God's people (the royalists) against His enemies (the parliamentarians). 'The People of God shall never want Enemies, and such as hate them in this World', he acknowledged, 'and therefore it is Wisdome to have in readinesse Bows and Swords, that is, all manner of Military Preparations'.³² Moreover, scripture provided a means of understanding and contextualising the developing conflict, a looking glass in which participants could see their own experiences and take inspiration and

²⁹ Patrick Collinson, 'The Coherence of the Text; How it Hangeth Together: The Bible in Reformation England', in W. P. Stephens (ed.), *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church* (Sheffield, 1995), pp. 84–108, at pp. 103–4.

³⁰ Killeen, *Political Bible*, p. 24.

³¹ Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 2010), p. 124.

³² Bramhall, *A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of York*, p. 7.

comfort: ‘We are not the first Nation, whom needlesse Jealousies have undone, or imaginary Feares have plunged into reall dangers’.³³ In January 1644, Bramhall invoked David’s war with the Ammonites and the Syrians in 2 Samuel 10, making a still more precise parallel with the occasion of his sermon. Like the English parliament, the princes of Ammon had found ‘themselves too weake, and therefore hire[d] an Army of mercenary Syrians, strangers to them both, to invade Israel’. However, the royalists could take heart from the denouement of this story: ‘by the valour and providence of Joab’, David’s general, ‘the Syrians are first beaten, and presently thereupon, the hearts of the Ammonites faile them’.³⁴ With ‘Church and Commonwealth ... both at stake’, the marquess of Newcastle, the latter-day Joab, must therefore ‘repell the Syrians, and the Ammonites will soone turne their backs’.³⁵

In tracing the significance of the Exodus narrative in parliamentary discourse, John Coffey has observed that puritan preachers ‘prompted their congregations to inhabit the biblical narrative’ and, as a result, ‘the godly developed a sustained sense of re-enacting sacred history’.³⁶ However, the same could and should be said of Bramhall and his fellow royalist clergymen. The king’s cause was presented by these preachers as a kind of holy war, which replicated the righteous conflicts fought by the Israelites against the ungodly in the Old Testament and therefore enjoyed divine legitimation. For all the scholarly discussion of the ‘secular’ political theory of churchmen like Bramhall, it is striking that, when in the pulpit at least, they presented the Civil Wars in biblical and providential terms, and this enabled them to legitimate violence. The implications of this violent religious rhetoric, moreover, were polarising and incendiary: it perpetuated, and even deepened, existing divisions, presenting

³³ *Ibid.*, *A sermon preached in Yorke Minster*, p. 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 22.

³⁶ John Coffey, ‘England’s Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance’, in Charles Prior and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *England’s Wars of Religion Revisited* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 253–80, p. 261.

hatred and enmity as a divine imperative and thereby undermining any residual inclination for conciliation that auditors may have had.

Edward Symmons, Stephen Marshall, and the Polemics of Peace

However, this bellicose preaching can be contrasted with the way that these very same churchmen depicted their cause in other kinds of printed texts. In tracts and treatises, usually aimed at a more public and therefore less exclusively royalist audience, clergymen would continue to insist that they sought only peace and that it was their adversaries who were appropriating the pulpit for military ends. There was, of course, a profound and enduring reluctance on both sides to be seen as the principal aggressors in a conflict that placed such intolerable burdens on local populations. Furthermore, a significant factor in Charles I's ability to win popular support during 1641-2 had been widespread antipathy to the perceived escalation in religious enthusiasm and radicalism. Royalists were accordingly eager to depict their opponents as engaged in a war of religion, and it was a recurring charge made by the clergy in particular that overzealous puritan preachers had abused the pulpit by harnessing it for political, war-mongering purposes.

Lionel Gatford, a cleric who had been imprisoned by parliament in early 1643 for strident royalism, published his *Exhortation to peace* later that year. An enlarged version of a sermon Gatford had presumably given in his parish of Dennington, Suffolk, the title-page advertised the sermon as providing 'an intimation of the prime enemies' of peace. In a prefatory epistle to readers 'throughout the divided Kingdome of England', Gatford depicted himself as 'a true Sonne of Peace, and a peaceable Son of Truth' and claimed that his sermon was 'flatly opposite, nay fully contradictorie to multitudes of exhortations, wherewith ... our very

Pulpits are profaned in these perilous times'.³⁷ In this respect, Gatford contended, he was simply performing his proper duty as a minister and as a preacher: 'how foul is the very tongue of such or such a Minister, that brings sad tidings, that incites to warre; certainly such a preacher either mistook his calling, or his commission or both'.³⁸

The pacific and moderate presentation that these preachers projected in works intended for a wide popular audience, and which was directly at odds with the frequent use of the pulpit in military contexts as a mobilising tool, is aptly demonstrated by their complex relationship with the famous parliamentarian divine, Stephen Marshall. Edward Symmons had matriculated at Peterhouse, Cambridge, in 1621 and was appointed rector of Rayne in Essex in 1630. After the Civil War broke out, he was ejected from his living by parliament for speaking out in defence of the king and prayer book, and thereafter became a prolific polemicist for the royalist cause.³⁹ Symmons was particularly exercised by the preaching and political influence of Marshall, minister of Finchingfield, Essex, the neighbouring parish to Symmons's own. *A loyall subjects beliefe*, which he published at Oxford in 1643, was an open letter to Marshall, purporting to refute his arguments 'for resisting the Kings personall will by force of armes'.⁴⁰ In 1644, Symmons composed *Scripture vindicated*, in which he responded directly to 'the mis-apprehensions, mis-interpretations, and mis-applications of Mr Stephen Marshall, [in] his sermon preached before the Commons House of Parliament, Feb. 23. 1641'.⁴¹ This was Marshall's famous *Meroz Cursed*, a fast sermon initially delivered before parliament, but subsequently printed three times in 1642 and preached on more than sixty occasions up and down the country.⁴² Symmons had been prompted to write his

³⁷ Lionel Gatford, *An exhortation to peace* (1643), sig. A2r.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³⁹ Edward Symmons, *A loyall subjects beliefe* (Oxford, 1643), unpag., 'To My Reverend Brethren of the Ministry'.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, title-page.

⁴¹ Edward Symmons, *Scripture vindicated from the mis-apprehensions, mis-interpretations, and mis-applications of Mr Stephen Marshall* (Oxford, 1644), title-page.

⁴² Tom Webster, 'Marshall, Stephen', *ODNB*.

response after conversing with a group of parliamentary soldiers being held prisoner at Brampton Bryan in Herefordshire. The prisoners told him that they had taken up arms against the king in order to fight against the Antichrist, represented by popery. Asked to defend their position, they pointed to Judges 5:23, in which God puts a curse on the inhabitants of Meroz for their refusal to assist the Israelites in battle against Sisera's army. The prisoners claimed they had learned the true meaning of this text after encountering Marshall's famous sermon on it.⁴³

Symmons's fellow royalists shared his sense of the dangers posed by Marshall's preaching, regarding him as the epitome of the sedition and populism that plagued the puritan pulpit. Edward Hyde later accused Marshall of igniting a 'strange wildfire among the people', while Henry Hammond declared him 'the Augustine, the truly polemical Divine of our times'.⁴⁴ In his *Of resisting the lawfull magistrate*, published in 1643, Hammond 'beseech[ed] Master Marshall hereafter to write more cautiously, lest hee provoke men to put him and the world in mind of other unjustifiable passages in his writings'.⁴⁵ Hammond, however, was out of luck. Marshall's providentialist arguments in support of the parliamentary war effort, and his use of the Curse of Meroz specifically, were taken up and repeated enthusiastically in the sermons preached by his fellow puritan ministers during the early 1640s.⁴⁶ The fast-day sermons of Thomas Wilson, Thomas Case, and Charles Herle all contained references to the Merozites, using this scriptural condemnation of neutrality to call for men and money in support of armed resistance against Charles I.⁴⁷

⁴³ Symmons, *Scripture vindicated*, sigs. A2v–A4v.

⁴⁴ *CHR*, II, 319; Henry Hammond, *Of resisting the lawfull magistrate under colour of religion* (Oxford, 1644), pp. 58.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 57–8.

⁴⁶ See Jordan S. Downs, 'The Curse of Meroz and the English Civil War', *HJ*, 57 (2014), pp. 343–68.

⁴⁷ Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament' in *idem* (ed.), *Essays in British History: Presented to Sir Keith Feiling* (1964), pp. 85–138, at p. 100. See also, Symmons, *Scripture vindicated*, p. 1.

It was these very sermons that had prompted Lionel Gatford to document the many ways in which parliamentary divines ‘daily wrest and pervert the word of truth to encourage to warre’.⁴⁸ He denounced their rhetorical trickery, their claims ‘that they are for peace, as much, or more then any, onely they would have peace with truth’.⁴⁹ This was likely a reference to a fast sermon preached by the presbyterian Herle a few months earlier, in November 1642. Herle had taken as his text Zachariah 8:19 – ‘therefore love the truth and peace’ – but had nonetheless proceeded to invoke the Curse of Meroz and chastise those who sought to ‘secure peace without truth’.⁵⁰ However, Gatford undoubtedly had Marshall in mind when he attacked a preacher who ‘echoes forth that bitter curse of the Angel of the Lord against Meroz, Judg 5. 23.’, rejecting the parallels between the current plight of the English Church and the Israelites battling against Sisera’s army that Marshall had drawn.⁵¹

In a recent article on the political significance of this biblical text during the Civil Wars, Jordan Downs has argued that Edward Symmons ‘knew that he could do little to combat the well-established message of *Meroz cursed*’ and that, ‘having exhausted their arguments against [Marshall] and his curse’ in printed pamphlets, he and his fellow ‘royalist ministers could think of little more than to simply ask Marshall to cease preaching on the text’.⁵² Thus, ‘royalists such as Symmons remained, unsurprisingly, outspoken critics of those who used the text as a means to mobilize support’.⁵³ This, however, oversimplifies the royalist response to parliamentary preaching and perpetuates the notion of royalist clergymen as disapproving onlookers, standing by while their parliamentary counterparts gave the conflict an unwarranted religious dimension. In fact, royalist preachers adopted precisely the same strategy, and indeed the very same passages of scripture, in their own attempts to

⁴⁸ Gatford, *An exhortation*, sig. A3v.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Charles Herle, *A payre of compasses for church and state* (1642), pp. 35, 39.

⁵¹ Gatford, *An exhortation*, pp. 23, 24.

⁵² Downs, ‘The Curse of Meroz’, pp. 356, 357.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 362.

mobilise against parliament, despite their public criticism of divines like Stephen Marshall in treatises and pamphlets.

On 3 March 1644, Symmons preached a sermon before royalist troops stationed at Shrewsbury under the command of Prince Rupert. This was only a few weeks after Rupert had ordered that the town increase the garrison there to 800 foot-soldiers and turn the castle into a powder magazine and military storehouse. On 31 January, the town corporation had voted a sum of £1000 to assist Rupert's army – although the money remained in arrears for some weeks after.⁵⁴ Symmons was therefore preaching at a moment when royalist army commanders were especially eager to ensure the support and co-operation of the townsmen, and especially the corporation, in their bid to improve fortifications. His sermon was subsequently published as a *Militarie sermon*, in which 'the nature and disposition of a rebell is discovered, and the Kings true souldier described and characterized'.⁵⁵ Symmons noted that the sermon had been 'heard by many gallant Gentlemen and Souldiers' but there were evidently also civilians in his audience: at one point he directly addressed 'you Gentlemen of the Countrey, Townsmen, and others who are not Souldiers'.⁵⁶ The printed edition contained a dedicatory epistle to Sir Michael Woodhouse, Governor of Ludlow and colonel in the Prince of Wales's lifeguard, who, shortly after Symmons had preached, would order the notorious massacre of prisoners captured during the siege of Hopton Castle. Symmons acknowledged 'my dependence on you and your respects to me' and expressed his hopes that Woodhouse would accept the sermon 'as agreeable to godlinesse, and ... as a demonstration of the inward affection which is due from your servant'.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Ronald Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642–1646* (2nd edn., 1999), p. 135; William J. Farrow, *The Great Civil War in Shropshire (1642–49)* (Shrewsbury, 1926), p. 59.

⁵⁵ Edward Symmons, *A militarie sermon* (Oxford, 1644), title-page.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. A2r, p. 30.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, A2r.

However, Symmons's relationship with the actual rank-and-file of the army was apparently far less harmonious. He later reported that on several occasions some of those attending his sermons – 'the prophaner sort of our Cavaleers' – had afterwards threatened to pistol him for 'preaching against their blasphemy and dissoluteness, their self-seeking, lust-pleasing, and King-neglecting baseness'.⁵⁸ This anecdote highlights the contradictions inherent in the attitude of royalist clergymen to the king's troops: while they extolled their courage and depended on them to wield those 'corporeall weapons' in defence of the Church, they were simultaneously appalled by what they perceived as the omnipresent license and immorality in which these soldiers engaged – a theme that will be developed more fully in the next chapter.

At Shrewsbury, Symmons explicitly acknowledged that his aim was 'to stirre up you, who are rightly authorized to be couragious, in the Execution of your charge' – indeed, 'to work an *hatred* in you of rebellion by any means'.⁵⁹ In his efforts to rouse the soldiery, Symmons, like Bramhall at York, drew parallels between their own predicament and that of the Israelites waging war against God's enemies in the Old Testament. He explained that the parliamentarian rebels were like 'the Canaanites in the Book of Judges who when they could get ability and advantage to themselves, did shake off the yoak of Israel, and took part with the enemies against their Governours: I wish these present times had not spoken too loudly to this purpose'.⁶⁰ The royalists, however, should see themselves, like the Israelites, as 'executioners of Gods justice': 'David and his men being authorized by Saul against the Philistines, were said to fight Gods battles'.⁶¹ Symmons therefore called for the troops before him to replicate the violence enacted on rebels in the Old Testament. 'I could tell you', he continued, 'how an halter caught Achitophell, and a tree Absalom; how Shebaes head was

⁵⁸ Edward Symmons, *A vindication of King Charles* (1647), unpag., 'To the Reader'.

⁵⁹ Symmons, *A militarie sermon*, pp. 18, 14, my emphasis.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

severed from his body, and how Bigtan and Teresh suffered death for having an ill purpose against the King'. Moreover, these 'punishment[s] ... [are] recorded in scripture, as ordained and allowed by God'.⁶²

However, the use made by Symmons at Shrewsbury of the Curse of Meroz is particularly significant, demonstrating not only the contrast between military sermons and printed polemic but also the extent to which the mobilising dimensions of royalist sermons were, in part at least, a matter of learning from the enemy. Symmons had had first-hand experience of the efficacy of this passage in stirring parliamentarians to armed resistance and was anxious to find a way of negating its force. In his *Scripture vindicated*, he attacked Marshall's application of the Meroz story specifically on the grounds that it was predicated on a misunderstanding about God's nature. While the God of the Old Testament had indeed been '*Deus ultionum*, the God of Revenge', since 'the coming of Christ, the times were changed to be times of mercy and favour, times of grace and pity, of patience and forbearance, of life and Salvation'.⁶³ It was not therefore feasible that God would now punish those who failed to come to his aid, as he had the Merozites.

When preaching before Rupert's army at Shrewsbury, however, Symmons took a very different, if not flatly contradictory, line. Rather than disputing the contemporary relevance of the passage or insisting on the primacy of the New Testament as a guide to Christian precepts, he now appropriated Judges 5:23 for the king's cause and gave it a royalist gloss. This was not only targeted at the soldiery: Symmons also wanted to ensure that the civilian governors of Shrewsbury did their part too in committing more money to maintaining the town's ramparts and defences.⁶⁴ In a concluding address to his audience, he offered a dire

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁶³ Symmons, *Scripture vindicated*, pp. 3–4.

⁶⁴ Symmons, *A militarie sermon*, p. 32.

warning to any who were recalcitrant in providing assistance to the king and his armies – a warning of exactly the kind that he had previously criticised Marshall for making:

For be rest assured that otherwise the curse of Meroz will be your portion, *Curse ye Meroz* (saies the Angell of the Lord) *curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not to help the Lord* (the Captain of the Lord, the Anointed of the Lord) *against the mighty*, or against his ungodly enemies, that did so mightily increase, and so mightily exalt themselves.⁶⁵

Again, then, we can observe a contrast between the theoretical tracts of these clergymen, intended principally to defend the king's cause against its detractors, and their sermons delivered in military contexts. In the latter, they were far more willing to conceive of and present the conflict in overtly religious terms. The contrasting approach to the Curse of Meroz in Symmons's tracts and in his sermon before the troops at Shrewsbury thus reflects the deep-seated tension between a desperate desire to defeat parliamentarianism on the battlefield and a polemical reluctance to appear as an advocate of religious violence.

Other royalist preachers followed Symmons's strategy in imitating the polarising, divisive references to Meroz found in the sermons of Stephen Marshall and other parliamentarian divines. For example, George Downham reminded his Norwich audience in 1643, shortly before an attempted royalist coup in the city, that 'we owe unto our Sovereigne ... to honour him with our goods, with our estates, yea, (if occasion serves) with our very lives'. Having 'read over the 5th of *Judg[es]*', Downham noted that dire punishment befell those 'who for collateral respected, prevaricated or withdrew themselves from [God's] Imployment ... for this was Meroz cursed, yea bitterly by the Angel of the Lord because they came not to help of the Lord'.⁶⁶ During the Siege of York the following year, William Ranson actually took

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁶⁶ George Downham, *Rex meus est Deus* (1643), pp. 26–7.

Judges 5:23 as his text, acknowledging that ‘it is a Text extremely vext and abused ... [few] passages of Scripture [are] more frequently alleged in the Printed Pamphlets & Seditious Sermons of those that blow the bellows of this unnaturall Rebellion which at this time rageth before us’.⁶⁷ Nonetheless, Ranson was clear that the example of Meroz condemned those ‘who by Feare or Faction, or some other sinister and perverse affection were with-held from affording their best assistance against the common enemy’ and ‘may teach us, when we have the like occasion to take better courses’.⁶⁸ This was particularly applicable to those inhabitants of York who thought they could save their city from destruction through neutrality, ‘who by their treachery and ungracious policy thought to preserve their City in a flourishing estate, whatsoever became of the rest of the Cities round about them’.⁶⁹

Oliver Whitby made similar use of this text at Worcester around this time. Whitby, the Arminian rector of St. Nicholas Olave, London, had deserted his cure to join the royalist army in October 1642 and soon became chaplain to Sir Gilbert Gerrard, the royalist governor of Worcester for much of the First Civil War.⁷⁰ Upon arriving in the city in December 1643, Gerrard had become rapidly disillusioned by both the moral license of the inhabitants and their reluctance to support the royalist war effort: ‘the citizens keep but poor guards’, he complained to Prince Rupert, and many ‘are very base’.⁷¹ The city council was refusing to hand over the £2000 it had promised to the king the previous September and the fortifications were in a state of utter disrepair. Finding his ambitions of reconquering Warwickshire for the king frustrated, Gerrard ordered a new programme of fortification building for Worcester, to which it was expected the inhabitants would contribute both money and manpower.⁷² At this point Thomas Hall, the presbyterian minister of Kings Norton in Warwickshire who was a

⁶⁷ Ranson, *A Sermon preached in the Metropolitall Church of York*, p. 4.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4–5.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁷⁰ *WR*, p. 62.

⁷¹ Bodl., MS Firth C6, fos. 52, 58.

⁷² Hutton, *Royalist War Effort*, pp. 128, 131–2.

prisoner in the city, heard Whitby deliver a sermon on ‘Judg(es) 5.23 ‘Curse ye Meroz’.

According to Hall, Whitby

forgot or rather perverted his Text, and blest them whom God had curst; for he blest 1) the profane men of that Citty for rising with the first against the Parliament. 2) He blest the light women of the Citty for their digging and helping to make works against the Rebels. But as for the Parliament, [woe] to them, for they had destroyed all Lawes, and left us nothing but a few votes at Westminster.⁷³

Whitby encouraged the inhabitants by commending them for enthusiastic support, which, in reality, had been noticeably lacking, while at the same time pointing to the fate of the Merozites as a warning against further reticence. It is likely that this sermon was commissioned directly by the frustrated Gerrard, in the hope of easing the potentially tortuous process of raising money and erecting fortifications. However, tensions between the royalist army and local citizens persisted. Henry Townshend recorded in his diary that on 17 June 1646, during the Siege of Worcester, local women went and spoke to the then governor, Henry Washington, asking him to ‘treat upon honourable terms for the preservation of the City’.⁷⁴ This display of lukewarm commitment to the royalist defence of Worcester again elicited a response from the pulpit. Shortly after, on 12 July, Townshend heard a sermon delivered by one ‘Dr. [Alexander] Gross’, which he described as an ‘invective, a very gross on(e), wherein he called women meddlers, open Arses, with much such Ribaldry’. Townshend had previously heard Gross preach on Psalm 3:1-2, ‘being David’s flying from Absalom his son upon his rebellion’. Both sermons were evidently aimed at those doubting

⁷³ C. D. Gilbert, ‘A Sermon in Civil War Worcester’, *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 16 (1998), pp. 177–82, at p. 178.

⁷⁴ *DHT*, p. 221.

inhabitants, who were like the Israelites saying of David that ‘God will not deliver him’: they were to trust in the Lord and they would triumph over their foes as the Israelites had.⁷⁵

This rhetoric thus served to consolidate and exaggerate further the binary opposition between royalist and parliamentarian: if one was not with the king, one was against not only him but God too. Providential punishment awaited those that refused to commit unwaveringly to the royalist cause, just as martyrdom was the fate of those who died in the king’s service. The violence of royalist preaching extended not only to enemies but to those who remained neutral as well, leaving no space for passivity or a middle ground. Neutralism was a powerful instinct with which both sides had to contend throughout the Civil Wars: Edward Hyde later claimed in his *History* that in all ‘parts of the kingdom ... the number of those who desired to sit still was greater than of those who desired to engage of either party’.⁷⁶ For some, neutralism was a simple product of the desire for self-preservation, while many were concerned first and foremost to protect their local communities against the ravages of warfare. Other neutrals were paralysed by a genuine inability to choose between king and parliament, both of whom claimed to be fighting for the Protestant religion and in defence of the subject’s liberties.⁷⁷ Whatever its cause, neutralism was something that royalist preachers were consistently anxious to counter. ‘Truly’, reflected Paul Knell during the Second Civil War, ‘that tongue deserveth to be cut out, that hand to bee cut off, that will not now be lifted up in his Majesties behalf, whose captivity every loyall subject should account his owne’.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 224, 250. On Gross, see C. D. Gilbert, ‘Two Sermons at the Siege of Worcester, 1646’, *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 20 (2006), pp. 139–41, at p. 140.

⁷⁶ *CHR*, II, 469. On neutralism, see Brian Manning, ‘Neutrals and Neutralism in the English Civil War, 1642–1646’ (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1959); and John Morrill, *Revolt in the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630–1650* (1976), pp. 36–42, 89–111.

⁷⁷ See, for example, *LJ*, V, p. 295.

⁷⁸ Paul Knell, *Israel and England Paralleled* (1648), unpag., ‘To all those that are Friends to Peace’.

It should be briefly noted at this point that, in contrast to the predominance of this polarising, war-mongering rhetoric in the royalist pulpit, those calling for restraint or rapprochement found themselves increasingly marginalised after the outbreak of war. A moderate Calvinist, Thomas Fuller had between 1642 and 1643 consistently pleaded for a reconciliation between king and parliament from the pulpit of the Savoy where he held a lectureship, only to find that his calls fell on deaf ears. Pressed to take the parliamentary covenant of August 1643, he belatedly joined the king at Oxford. His sense of isolation, however, was only temporarily alleviated by his relocation to the royalist capital. He soon found himself out of favour at the royal court there when, having been asked to preach before the king as a ‘reward’ for his ‘zeal and loyalty’, he delivered a sermon in St. Mary the Virgin ‘praising peace and rebuking the royalists for their godlessness’.⁷⁹ He also somewhat imprudently suggested that the king make ‘a fair condescension in matters of Church Reformation’ to hasten peace. Some at court apparently considered the sermon ‘to have been far too luke-warm, having a tendency to damage the royal cause, then, it seemed, in so prosperous a condition’, and Fuller thereafter found the Oxford pulpits barred to him.⁸⁰ His case reaffirms once again the importance to those in positions of authority – military or otherwise – of preaching that sought to drive forward the war effort.

Moreover, having fallen out of favour with the royalist leadership, Fuller reportedly resolved ‘strenuously to evince his faithful Loyalty to the King by another kind of argument, by appearing in the Kings Armies, to be a Preacher Militant to his Souldiers’. Although he did not relinquish his ‘desire and pursuit after peace’, he nonetheless ‘constant[ly] preach[ed] on the Lords day, animating in his Sermons the Souldiers to fight courageously and to

⁷⁹ James O. Wood, ‘Thomas Fuller’s Oxford Interlude’, *HLQ*, 3 (1954), pp. 185–208, at p. 186; J.E. Bailey, *The Life of Thomas Fuller* (1874), p. 280.

⁸⁰ Fell, *Life*, p. 23; Bailey, *Life*, p. 282; Wood, ‘Oxford Interlude’, p. 186.

demean themselves worthy of that glorious cause with which God had honoured them'.⁸¹

Indeed, according to John Fell, the author of a biography of Fuller published in 1661, on at least one occasion the military success of Fuller's regiment could be attributed directly to his preaching. At the Siege of Basing House in November 1643, Fuller engaged in

an importunate spiring of the Defenders in their sallies; which they followed so close and so bravely, suffering the Besiegers scarce to eat or sleep, that Sir William [Waller] was compelled to raise his siege and march away ... the Doctor [had] the pleasure of seeing that strong Effort of Rebellion in some way by his means repulsed and defeated.⁸²

Lionel Gatford and Cornishmen in the King's Army, 1645-6

Even as the First Civil War reached its conclusion, royalist preachers were still striving to raise the men, money, and morale that might sustain the war against the rampaging parliamentary armies. A manuscript copy of a sermon delivered by Lionel Gatford to 'the valiant and Loyall Cornish-men of all rankes and degrees whatsoever' survives among the papers of Edward Hyde, later earl of Clarendon, whom Gatford served as chaplain when both men were in exile on Jersey in the late 1640s.⁸³ Gatford, whom it will be recalled had in 1643 strongly condemned those parliamentary preachers who 'incit[e] to warre', was subsequently appointed as chaplain to the royalist garrison at Pendennis Castle, Cornwall, in 1645. Mark Stoye argues convincingly that Gatford's manuscript sermon was delivered at Tavistock in January 1646, where Cornish troops under the command of Sir Richard Grenville and the Prince of Wales had mustered, as royalists prepared for one last offensive

⁸¹ Fell, *Life*, pp. 24–6.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁸³ Bodl., MS Clarendon 25, fo. 46r.

against the New Model Army.⁸⁴ For Stoye, the sermon is notable as part of a wider ‘royalist campaign to harness Cornish particularist sentiment to the King’s cause’ but it also confirms and develops the central themes of this chapter regarding role of the pulpit in mobilisation.⁸⁵

Although Gatford was preaching to men enlisted in the royal army, his sermon reflected an anxiety that their continued willingness to fight for the cause could not be taken for granted – that the forces of localism might soon override any remaining affection for king and Church and instead push them towards neutrality. Getting men into an army during the Civil Wars was often only half the battle, with desertion and side-changing rife, particularly as parliament’s victory became ever more certain during 1645-6.⁸⁶ Hence, at one point, Gatford confronted potential objections of Cornishmen to bearing the burdens of the royalist war effort: ‘But will the most of this County say; we for our parts have done our duties, or at least fayrely indeavoured them; let but others doe as much as we and all will be well ... what can a handful of men, out of one poore County, doe against a whole kingdome?’⁸⁷

Gatford was particularly troubled by the recent proliferation of ‘peace-making Associations’ in neighbouring Devon, whose members ‘refuse to ioyne w[i]th the Kings Army already rayseed’ and were encouraging men in other counties to do the same.⁸⁸ In fact, these ‘clubmen’ had done much more active damage to the royalist cause in the south-west. Reacting against the plundering of Lord Goring’s ill-disciplined troops, clubmen in Devon and Somerset had joined forces with the parliamentarians in the summer of 1645 and greatly aided the advance of the armies under Sir Thomas Fairfax.⁸⁹ The relationship between the royalist military command and their Cornish troops, meanwhile, was fraught. Many of those

⁸⁴ Stoye, *West Britons*, p. 107; McElligott, ‘Gatford, Lionel’, *ODNB*.

⁸⁵ Stoye, *West Britons*, p. 108.

⁸⁶ Andrew Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides during the English Civil War* (Oxford, 2012), esp. pp. 78–99.

⁸⁷ Bodl., MS Clarendon 25, fo. 56r.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, fo. 59v.

⁸⁹ John Barratt, *Cavaliers: The Royalist Army at War, 1642–1646* (Stroud, 2000), p. 85.

under Cornishman Sir Richard Grenville had openly deserted in June 1645 when transferred to the command of Goring and marched far from their home county. In a contemporary account, Joseph Jane remarked that ‘the Cornish lookt upon themselves as left to susteyne all, and thought the burthen of the warr lay on them too heavy, and now in the end they were all growne hopeless’.⁹⁰ Meanwhile, Hugh Peter, in his capacity as a chaplain in the New Model Army, preached regular sermons inciting the Cornish to lay down their arms.⁹¹ Gatford (and presumably the army figures who instructed him) hoped that his own sermon in January 1646 could help to ‘incit[e] you to constancy and perseverance’ and quell any further thoughts amongst the soldiery ‘of deserting the Kings Army, and standing upon your own guard for the defence and protestation of your selves and your respective counties’.⁹²

At the heart of Gatford’s discourse was, somewhat counterintuitively, parliament’s Protestation Oath of 1641. However, this is more readily comprehensible when situated in the context of the clubmen’s own petitions and declarations over the previous year, which had consistently deployed the language of the Protestation to argue for peace. In a petition of July 1645, for instance, the Wiltshire Clubmen had reiterated their commitment to ‘the main four articles of that general Protestation to which the body of the kingdom hath formerly sworn’.⁹³ Gatford was thus in part drawing on and responding to this body of neutralist literature produced in the last months of the First Civil War, of which he evidently assumed the troops assembled before him were aware.

Gatford reminded his audience that all adult males had been required to swear an oath to defend the Church of England, the king, parliament, and the rights and liberties of the subject, and that they could not therefore in conscience shirk from doing so: ‘this vow and

⁹⁰ Amos Miller, ‘Joseph Jane’s Account of Cornwall’, *EHR*, 90 (1975), pp. 94–102, at p. 102.

⁹¹ Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegades*, pp. 92–3.

⁹² Bodl., MS Clarendon 25, fos. 56v, 61r.

⁹³ *The desires, and resolutions of the Club-Men of the Counties of Dorset and Wilts* (1645).

Protestation of ours was made to God [and he] will require the performance of any iust vow'.⁹⁴ While the king and his supporters continued to uphold the Protestation Oath, however, parliament had entirely subverted it. After all, those who took Protestation had sworn to uphold 'true reformed Protestant religion expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England, against all popery and popish innovations within this Realme contrary to the same doctrine'.⁹⁵ As if abolishing the established liturgy and government of the Church of England was not enough of a betrayal of this pledge, parliament now encouraged the 'Sacriledgious robbing and spoyling of Cathedralls and collegiat Churches of all their rents and revenues', dealing 'a sore blow ... to our Established Religion [that] will be felt in the next age, if not in this'.⁹⁶ Gatford was clear that the soldiers must therefore fight for the defence of their religion:

And what then shall we doe? Shall we that have promised, vowed, and protested in the presence of Almighty God to maintaine and defend as farre as lawfully we may w[i]th our lives, powers, and estates, the true reformed Protestant Religion expressed in the doctrine of ye Church of England. Shall we sit still and looke on? Whilst that our Religion, taken out of Gods own Gardin, the sacred Scriptures, planted amongst us by so many pious Apostolicall fathers of our Church ... is either rooted up or trodden down by the wilde beasts of the people, or cropt off and spoyled by some subtill foxes.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Bodl., MS Clarendon 25, fo. 55v. On the Protestation, see John Walter, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2017); and David Cressy, 'The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642', *HJ*, 45 (2002), pp. 251–79.

⁹⁵ Bodl., MS Clarendon 25, fo. 46r.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, fos. 48v–49r.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, fo. 52v.

Failure to do so would result in divine retribution – be it in this world or the next – as scripture testified. Financial ruin or even death were but trifles where eternal salvation was at stake:

as many of us as have taken but this one oath, called a Protestation, and doe not or shall not, w[i]th our lives, powers, and estates, as far as lawfully we may, maintaine and defend all those particular things and persons w[hi]ch we thereby vowed promised and protested to maintaine and defend, shall be found to have sworne falsely whensoever God shall enter into iudgement w[i]th us.⁹⁸

Gatford concluded his address with a stirring exhortation to the troops: ‘awake then, Awake in time, O ye besotted and bewitched people of England, and rowse up your selves, and more particularly ye Loyall hearted Stout-Spirited Cornwallians’. They must ‘shake off that stupefying drowsinesse that is stealing upon ye by the incantations of some that would fane lull you asleepe to cut your throats’.⁹⁹ Once again, the battles of the Old Testament provided a source of both comfort and inspiration. ‘Consult at your leasure amongst many others,’ he urged, ‘that pertinent relation of the great victory that God gave unto Abijah and his loyall subjects the men of Judah, over Jereboam and rebellious Israel – a relation set to be read over and over in these times especially by soldiers’.¹⁰⁰ Here was a very different message to that set out in Gatford’s 1643 printed work, *An exhortation to peace*.

Conclusions

This chapter has argued that the pulpit was integral to royalist mobilisations during the First Civil War. Preaching was one way in which those overseeing the royalist war effort

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, fo. 56r.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, fo. 63r.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, fos. 58r–v.

responded to the constant struggle first to raise, and then to maintain, co-operation and resources from reticent local populations. It was also a means of preparing troops – whose allegiances were not always as firm or fixed as their superiors may have wanted – for the prospect of joining battle against their fellow Englishmen. In doing so, these preachers in the king’s armies presented the conflict as a war of and for religion, of God’s people against his enemies, those who would protect the Church and true Protestant religion against those who were determined to destroy both. Such arguments were framed to demonise and even dehumanise the enemy, and to override the powerful impulses towards conciliation and compromise that stood in the way of an outright military victory over parliament. This chapter thus advances recent scholarship that has sought to move away from ‘essentialist’ understandings of allegiance and instead to think more closely about the ways popular support was (re)mobilised at different stages of the war.

More generally, the findings of this chapter contribute to and qualify our understanding of the role played by religion and theological discourse during the Civil Wars. Much has been made of the ways in which providence, scripture, and covenant theology shaped and galvanised resistance to Charles I. We are told that providence, for instance, ‘liberated the saints from laws, customs, habits, and conventions, and gave them the revolutionary energy and freedom to bring about the unprecedented changes of the late 1640s and early 1650s’.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, where they have been discussed, there has been something of a consensus that royalist ministers lacked the religious fervour of their parliamentarian counterparts and were reluctant to use their clerical status to incite war against the enemy. For Glenn Burgess, this was a contrast that royalists themselves consciously attempted to accentuate in Civil War polemic. He argues that their propaganda aimed ‘to undermine the legitimacy of their

¹⁰¹ Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (1993), p. 99; Stephen Baskerville, *Not Peace but a Sword: The Political Theology of the English Revolution* (1993), pp. 19–48, esp. 47–8.

opponents' cause by portraying it primarily as a war of religion (or fanaticism), while portraying the king as the defender of order and decency'.¹⁰²

Burgess is undoubtedly right to stress the polemical advantages of this dichotomy, as this chapter has shown. It is much less clear, however, that such depictions accurately reflected the ways that all royalists conceptualised the war or attempted to generate support for the king. On the contrary, royalist clerics presented fighting and dying for the king as a matter of Christian duty – a righteous, divinely-sanctioned war waged against the ungodly, comparable to those fought by Israel against the enemies of God in the Old Testament. They too called for violence and bloodshed to pacify a vengeful deity who would punish the wicked and guide his people to victory. They too encouraged their audiences to view the conflict through a scriptural lens, to understand it as the re-enacting of biblical events, and to fulfil their allotted roles in this sacred drama. In this, they mirrored the pulpit discourses of parliamentary divines, and even co-opted for royalist purposes the very scriptural texts that Stephen Marshall and others had notoriously wielded in the pulpit at St. Margaret's, Westminster. The incendiary, polarising utilisation of religious discourse was thus a feature on *both* sides of the conflict: that 'strange wildfire among the people' alluded to by Hyde in his *History* was in fact 'furiously kindled by the breath' of clerics at either end of the political and ecclesiastical spectrum.

Finally, this chapter has highlighted the ways that Civil War sermons could differ from other kinds of printed polemical works in the arguments they advanced and the ways that they justified the royalist cause. In particular, it has contrasted the pacific rhetoric of pamphlets aimed at a more public or less instinctively sympathetic audience with the willingness of military chaplains to preach messages of holy war and violence in provincial

¹⁰² Glenn Burgess, 'Wars of Religion and Royalist Political Thought', in Prior and Burgess (eds.), *England's Wars of Religion*, pp. 169–92, at p. 178.

settings and before audiences of committed royalists. As such, it underscores the need for sensitivity to genre and context when devising taxonomies of early modern political and religious thought. For instance, James Daly once held John Bramhall up as the epitome of the political moderation and compromise that, he argued, were the very essence of royalism. But this characterisation of Bramhall's thought was based almost entirely on the polemical tracts he wrote in response to first Henry Parker and then Thomas Hobbes. These texts were necessarily concerned with the abstract concepts of 'high' political theory – sovereignty, natural law, mixed monarchy – that Bramhall's adversaries had themselves invoked. Scrutinising Bramhall's Civil War sermons reveals other dimensions of his thought and activities: his zealous commitment to the war effort, the way he perceived the conflict in biblical and providential terms, and the centrality of the Church of England to his royalism.

Chapter Three: Prophetic Preaching and the Oxford Parliament of 1644

Early modern political crises routinely prompted calls for moral regeneration and renewal. From the Valois monarchy in the midst of the French Wars of Religion to the Williamite regime after the Glorious Revolution, rulers and their clergy were frequently united in seeing the restoration of political, religious, and social harmony to the commonwealth as dependent on a programme of thoroughgoing moral reformation.¹ This was equally true of Charles I and his clerical supporters during English Civil Wars. While the previous chapter established the polarising, mobilising dimensions of providential rhetoric in royalist sermons during the 1640s, the threat of divine retribution was not confined to those who refused to assist the king. These clergymen were just as insistent that a speedy reformation be implemented *within* the royalist camp, as license and indiscipline threatened to provoke God's wrath and spell disaster for their cause. Military victory, the clergy maintained, would be providentially bestowed and conditional upon sincere collective repentance. Concern with moral regeneration thus assumed a crucial political importance: it was inextricably linked to the royalists' military fortunes and the future peace of the commonwealth. The attempts of many within the king's party to secure a peace through pragmatic concessions to parliament, some of which would jeopardise the future of an episcopal Church of England, were accordingly regarded as fundamentally misguided. It was argued that a peace built on these foundations would ultimately prove no peace at all, but instead a chimera, and this act of rhetorical redescription allowed royalist clergymen to appropriate the language of peace as a way of legitimising further violence and mobilisation.

As the means through which early modern congregations were traditionally exhorted to repentance, moreover, the pulpit was necessarily integral in these clerical attempts to reform

¹ Mark Greengrass, *Governing Passions: Peace and Reform in the French Kingdom, 1576–1585* (Oxford, 2007); Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).

royalist moral behaviour in the early 1640s. Indeed, they could draw on a tradition of ‘Jeremiadic’ preaching that had become well-established in Elizabethan and Jacobean England, with the Paul’s Cross pulpit particularly renowned for this kind of prophetic preaching in the decades leading up to the Civil Wars. The Jeremiad, which mimicked the eponymous Old Testament prophet in its focus on God’s relationship with the nation and the urgent need to avert his impending wrath, would also become a staple feature of pulpit discourse in congregationalist New England. As a result, it has generated a vast scholarly literature on both sides of the Atlantic.² Despite its prevalence as a genre, however, historians have often depicted the early modern Jeremiad as ‘intrinsically seditious’ and oppositional, given ‘that the policies and actions of the royal government diverged from the preachers’ prophetic imperatives’.³ This revolutionary potential was subsequently realised in the fast sermons delivered before the Long Parliament, which, as Patrick Collinson and Alexandra Walsham have shown, could trace their ancestry to the ‘searingly judgemental addresses delivered at Paul’s Cross and other public venues’ earlier in the century.⁴ However, it is seldom recognised that this homiletic mode could also be put to work in defence of monarchy and for the protection of the established Church: it could buttress, rather than simply tear down, existing institutions, and in the context of the Civil Wars was co-opted to advance very particular partisan agendas.

The chapter explores these themes through a detailed case study of the sermons preached before the Oxford Parliament in the first months of 1644. Where these sermons have been

² See, among many others, Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1936); Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, WI, 1978); Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 281–325; Patrick Collinson, ‘Biblical Rhetoric: The English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode’, in Deborah Shuger and Claire McEachern (eds.), *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 15–45; Mary Morrissey, ‘Elect Nations and Prophetic Preaching: Types and Examples in the Paul’s Cross Jeremiad’, in Ferrell and McCullough (eds.), *English Sermon Revised*, pp. 43–58; Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Antichrist’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, CT, 2002), pp. 335–76.

³ Collinson, ‘Biblical Rhetoric’, p. 21.

⁴ Walsham, *Providence*, p. 283.

remarked on by historians, they have usually been treated as another facet of the ongoing paper wars between king and parliament. Although the sermons ‘published by Oxford University during the Civil War have yet to be seriously studied as a form of political polemic’, argues Kevin Sharpe, there is ‘little doubt that they belong alongside the news-books in the history of partisan advocacy’.⁵ This chapter, by contrast, situates these sermons in the very particular context of intra-royalist divisions at Oxford during these months. It argues that they should be understood not so much as appeals to public opinion or responses to the printed polemic of parliamentary adversaries, but as interventions in a fractious debate about the future direction of royalism and the acceptable terms of any peace settlement with parliament. Court divines at Oxford, desperate to prevent the lands, bishops, or liturgy of the Church of England from being sacrificed for the sake of a swift peace, attempted from the pulpit at St. Mary the Virgin to steer the moderate MPs of the Oxford Parliament away from thoughts of a settlement and towards the pressing issue of supply. In this they received encouragement, and perhaps direction, from both the king and several figures associated with his armies. The utilisation of Jeremiadic scriptural texts paralleling the royalist condition with that of the Israelites and demonstrating the threat of providential punishment formed a central aspect of this pulpit campaign: these cautioned against an ungodly peace made at the expense of the Church and urged collective repentance as the only way to ensure military victory.

This chapter therefore reveals another dimension of the royalist clergy’s bid to drive forward the war effort from the pulpit. At Oxford, however, they addressed those at the heart of political decision-making, rather than soldiers or the public at large, and sought to interfere with a peace process being debated by senior figures in both camps. What follows also

⁵ Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven, CT, 2010), p. 325. See also Barbara Donagan, ‘Casuistry and Allegiance in the English Civil War’, in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.), *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 89–111, at pp. 103–4; and Jacqueline Eales, ‘Provincial Preaching and Allegiance in the First English Civil War, 1640–6’, in Thomas Cogswell *et al* (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 185–210, at p. 194.

strengthens the case for incorporating the clergy into our understanding of the internal dynamics of royalism, presenting them as autonomous agents who sought to mould the king's cause in their own image and were not always prepared to follow the script issued to them by lay authorities. The clerical voice has too often been omitted entirely from even the most thorough and persuasive analyses of royalist politics, and while it is true that they no longer had a formal place on Charles I's privy council, this chapter argues that the pulpit nonetheless represented a vital instrument in their bid to resist marginalisation and rescue the Church of England from oblivion.

The Clergy and Royalist Politics at Oxford in 1644

Several historians have attempted to establish the underlying principles beneath the kaleidoscopic factions, alliances, and personal rivalries that existed at the royal court during the First Civil War.⁶ David Smith divided the king's supporters into 'constitutional royalists' and 'absolutists', while more recently David Scott has suggested that the salient divisions were in fact a question of strategy and potential foreign alliances rather than ideology. In particular, Scott argues that by 1644, 'there are signs that the strategy of seeking a military alliance with the Irish increased the tension between those courtiers who favoured a negotiated settlement and hard-liners such as lords Digby and Jermyn who were quite happy to enlist Catholic support'.⁷ As this suggests, however, there was a general and longer-standing cleavage between those sections of the king's council who advocated peace talks with parliament at every opportunity and those that favoured a military solution to the

⁶ Ronald Hutton, 'The Structure of the Royalist Party, 1642–1646', *HJ*, 24 (1981), pp. 553–69; David Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement* (Cambridge, 1994); David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–1649', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–1649* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 36–60.

⁷ David Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637–49* (Basingstoke, 2004), p. 71.

conflict. Ronald Hutton points out that the former group was largely comprised of men who had supported the ‘constitutional revolution’ at Westminster during 1641-2 but who had become increasingly alienated by parliament’s tactics against the king. It included the likes of Viscount Falkland, Sir John Culpeper, and Edward Hyde from the Commons and the marquis of Hertford, Lord Dunsmore, and the earls of Southampton, Northampton, and Bath from the Lords.⁸ Those who favoured war, by contrast, tended to be senior army officers or courtiers who had never approved of the king making concessions to parliament and – in the case of George Digby, Henry Jermyn, William Ashburnham, Henry Wilmot and Henry Percy – had been forced into exile for their part in plots to bring parliament to heel by military force during 1641. Henrietta Maria was, of course, the most notable and indefatigable member of this ‘win the war’ faction.⁹

One group that is rarely included in these taxonomies of royalism is the clergy. In a series of important recent studies, however, Anthony Milton has argued that these divines were not silently inactive or ‘mere cheerleaders for an existing royalist position, but ... people trying to make a pitch for what the royalist position would be, seeking to address, instruct, warn and make demands on their own side’.¹⁰ He has shown that ‘there were two issues about which royalist divines were most exercised – the abolition of episcopacy and the sale of bishops’ and other church lands’.¹¹ These were conditions that parliament would insist on in all peace negotiations from 1643 onwards. However, it was not just parliamentarians who the royalist clergy regarded as posing a serious threat to the church: many divines were equally suspicious of sections of the king’s lay support. The clerical estate had come in for

⁸ Hutton, ‘The Structure of the Royalist Party’, p. 554.

⁹ See William J. Bulman, ‘The Practice of Politics: The English Civil War and the “Resolution” of Henrietta Maria and Charles I’, *P&P*, 206 (2010), pp. 43–79.

¹⁰ Anthony Milton, ‘Sacrilege and Compromise: Court Divines and the King’s Conscience, 1642–1649’, in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 135–53, at p. 137.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

particularly harsh criticism in royalist writing, the ecclesiastical reforms and clericalist tendencies that had developed under Archbishop Laud having alienated a large proportion of the king's eventual supporters, as well as his opponents. Senior lay royalists had publicly avowed their antipathy to Laudianism in parliament during 1641-2. Falkland, for example, had attacked the sacerdotal and clericalist pretensions of Laudian divines, condemning their tendency to preach 'the sacredness of the clergy', while Edward Bagshaw, Lord Digby, and Sir John Culpeper had all likewise publicly denounced the ecclesiastical policies of the Personal Rule.¹² Meanwhile, the clergy's claims to political influence were undermined by the king's famous *Answer to the Nineteen Propositions*, drafted by Falkland, which refused to acknowledge the traditional status of bishops as one of the three estates.¹³

Furthermore, it was increasingly complained of among lay royalists at Oxford that the clergy's intransigence on the issue of episcopacy was obstructing a settlement with parliament that would bring an end to the war. Church government was indeed a critical sticking point in peace negotiations between king and parliament throughout the Civil Wars.

In January 1643, parliament had passed a bill for

the utter abolishing and taking away of all Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Sub-deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, Canons and Prebendaries, and all Chaunters, Chauncellors, Treasurers, Sub-treasurers ... and all other their under-officers, out of the Church of England.¹⁴

¹² Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007), p. 126.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 131. See also: Michael Mendle, *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (Tuscaloosa, AL, 1985).

¹⁴ *CJ*, II, 947; *LJ*, V, 572, 582.

Such root-and-branch reform was anathema to Charles, and Hyde later claimed that, given ‘the inclination and affection the King had to the Church’, this bill meant that ‘no peace could be safe for [parliament] but such a one as would be unsafe for the King’.¹⁵ Any hopes that royalists may have had that parliament would ultimately be willing to compromise on episcopacy suffered a severe blow with the introduction of the Solemn League and Covenant in September 1643. This committed parliament to ‘the extirpation of Popery’ and ‘prelacy’ – ‘a position from which the Houses would henceforth find it difficult to retreat’ – and the Uxbridge negotiations of 1645 would collapse partly as a result of mutual intransigence on the question of episcopacy.¹⁶ Not only had parliament resolved to abolish the order of bishops, however, it had agreed to alienate their lands, and insisted on this as a condition of subsequent peace negotiations.¹⁷

The royalist clergy were therefore keenly aware that parliament might demand the permanent abolition of episcopacy and the alienation of church lands as the price of any peace, and that lay royalists, suspicious of the clergy and desperate for an end to the fighting, might acquiesce. In 1649, Henry Leslie, the bishop of Down, would recall how,

when our sovereign was at Oxford, [there were] some who suffered with him, upbraided him, and added grief to his afflicted soul, even railing on him, because he did not help them, when indeed he could not. As our saviour was tempted; so was our sovereign, tempted to distrust, to perjury, to sacrilege, to atheism; tempted to deny God, by forsaking his religion, and destroying the Church, which his righteous soul abhorred.¹⁸

¹⁵ *CHR*, II, 438.

¹⁶ Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, pp. 145, 146–8.

¹⁷ Milton, ‘Sacrilege and Compromise’, p. 144. See also: Ian Gentles, ‘The Sales of Bishops’ Lands in the English Revolution, 1646–1660’, *EHR*, 95 (1980), pp. 573–96, at 574.

¹⁸ Henry Leslie, *The martyrdome of King Charles* (The Hague, 1649), p. 16.

These lay-clerical tensions within the royalist camp manifested themselves in attempts to control the output of the Oxford press. According to Griffith Williams, bishop of Ossory, when he had come to Oxford to print his *Discovery of mysteries* in 1643, ‘Secretary Falkland misliking a passage, that I had set down on episcopal power in *causa sanguinis*, would have had it called in, but his majesty would not suffer it to be suppress’.¹⁹ Despite the hostility of some laymen, however, the clergy refused to retreat quietly from the political scene and continued to be a vocal force within the king’s party. Indeed, as Milton has shown, the *Discovery of mysteries* had itself been highly critical of the anticlericalist direction royalist policy had taken. Williams was a moderate Calvinist whose ecclesiastical rise had been partly facilitated by Archbishop George Abbot and Laud had personally attempted to impede his preferment at various points in his career. Nonetheless, he entered print to warn of ‘a ‘plot still at work in the *royalist* camp, especially among those around Charles who supported an attack on the government and patrimony of the Church’.²⁰ Deprived of any formal place at the king’s council table, the press and the pulpit now assumed an even greater significance than previously for clergymen who had begun to feel marginalised.

Another pressing concern for the clergy in and around Oxford was the apparent ubiquity of immorality and license among the king’s followers. Royalist armies in particular ‘had acquired an unenviable reputation for ill-discipline and for public displays of sinfulness’, to the extent that the authorities had taken measures to reform the behaviour of both soldiers and civilians stationed at Oxford.²¹ Numerous proclamations issued in the name of the king and his bishops spoke of the need to outlaw ‘unlawful oaths’ and ‘scandalous acts in derogation

¹⁹ Griffith Williams, *The persecution and oppression ... of John Bale* (1664), p. 8.

²⁰ Anthony Milton, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s’, in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 61–81, at p. 70.

²¹ Geoffrey Browell, ‘The Politics of Providentialism in England, 1640–1660’ (PhD thesis, University of Kent, 2000), p. 51. See also Barbara Donagan, ‘Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War’, *P&P*, 118 (1988), pp. 65–95.

of God's honour'.²² A sermon preached by William Strode against swearing before the king at Christ Church in 1643 was later published by royal command. These measures were prompted by a fear, held jointly by the king and his clergy, that immorality and sinfulness had alienated God, and was responsible for the recent downturn in royalist military fortunes.

This was a fear shared by clergymen beyond the royalist capital. 'Concerning those wicked [men] on our side', acknowledged Edward Symmons, 'we will not deny but we have too many, and as they are our shame ... the Lord give them hearts and grace to amend their conditions, that they may cease at length to discredit a religious King and a righteous Cause'.²³ 'The wicked and deboist lives of Cavaliers' not only alienated the Almighty but provided 'the Maine argument which the Enemies have to keep the people in rebellion'. Symmons therefore begged the army commanders in his audience to 'more strictlie punish sin in those that are under you, according to those Military Orders set forth by His Sacred Majestie your religious Master'.²⁴ Preaching at York in May 1644, William Ranson likewise reminded his auditors that, 'since the Angels stand with us against our Enemies, it behooveth us to be cauteous in avoyding all things that may breake off our society with them'.²⁵ Moral reform and the military success of the royalist cause were thus, for these preachers, inextricably bound up.

The Meeting of the Oxford Parliament

Edward Hyde later claimed that it was he who had first suggested the idea to Charles I, during the autumn of 1643, of summoning to Oxford those MPs and peers who had

²² For example, *Military orders and articles established by His Majesty, and A proclamation for the inhibiting all manner of oaths ... by any of His Majesties army* (Oxford, 1643).

²³ Symmons, *A militarie sermon*, p. 12.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²⁵ Ranson, *A Sermon preached in the Metropolitall Church of York*, p. 15.

disassociated themselves from the Westminster parliament. The king was initially reluctant, believing that such an assembly would immediately put pressure on him to make peace with parliament, but eventually agreed, partly in the hope that MPs could be persuaded to vote through the subsidies that would enable him to continue fighting the war. To this end, Charles appointed Hyde and Sir John Culpeper, both privy councillors, to manage the parliament and ‘dispose the rest to think of the best expedient to provide present money, without which the army would not be able to march in the spring’.²⁶

By the time Charles formally opened the Oxford Parliament in Christ Church hall on 22 January 1644, it consisted of about a hundred members of the Commons and thirty peers; bad weather and the difficulty of finding lodgings in war-time Oxford had reduced the turnout.²⁷ The assembly – as Charles had anticipated – was a moderate body, whose members were overwhelmingly, though not exclusively, in favour of a swift accommodation with the Westminster parliament.²⁸ Few army officers were members and of those that were the majority were away from Oxford on active service.²⁹ ‘Since our coming to Oxford’, a later declaration admitted, the chief aim had been ‘to prevent the further Effusion of Christian Blood, and the Desolation of this Kingdom’.³⁰ The Parliament immediately set about considering the best means of procuring peace and showed little interest in the requisite finances and preparations for a renewed royalist war effort. On 27 January, 118 MPs and thirty-four peers sent a letter requesting that the king make peace overtures to the earl of Essex.³¹ At the same time, the assembly was highly critical of the royal army, examining a

²⁶ *CHR*, III, 293n.

²⁷ C.V. Wedgwood, *The King’s War, 1641–1647* (1958), p. 289.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 292; Browell, ‘Politics of Providentialism’, pp. 58, 61n; Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625–1660* (Oxford, 2002), p. 274.

²⁹ For the membership, see: *A catalogue of the names of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, that have served in the last four parliaments* (1656), pp. 20–5.

³⁰ *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England being a faithful account of all the most remarkable transactions in Parliament* (24 vols., 1751–61), XIII, 57.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 59–61.

number of officers charged with misconduct and demanding that estimates of military expenditure for the coming year be reduced.³² Alarmed by the direction his parliament was taking, the king delivered a second speech to the Lords and Commons on 7 February, spelling out more clearly this time his urgent need of supply. He reminded them that ‘providing for my Army ... is the best way for peace’, since the parliamentarians’ refusal to entertain seriously any notion of a settlement ‘proceeds from nothing but Contempt of our Forces’. ‘God hath made you Instruments’, he added pointedly, ‘to defend your Sovereign, and to preserve your Country’.³³

This speech initially had its desired effect: parliament voted first loans of £100,000 and excise taxes shortly after.³⁴ However, tensions and suspicions remained. The king was still in urgent need of money, forced to write letters to eminent supporters requesting voluntary donations in mid-February, while the Oxford Parliament continued to pressurise him into making peace overtures to their Westminster counterparts.³⁵ On 3 March Charles sent a message to the Westminster parliament asking them to nominate delegates for peace talks, while acknowledging that he was doing so ‘by the Advice of the Lords and Commons of Parliament assembled at Oxford’.³⁶ The king quickly came to resent the refusal of Oxford MPs to pledge wholehearted support for the war and decided that the assembly had become nothing more than a burden on the city’s scarce resources as campaigning season drew closer. He prorogued it on 16 April 1644, less than three months after it had first convened. Privately, he declared it a ‘mungril parliament’ and claimed that he was ‘well freed from the place of base and mutinous motions’, while Henrietta Maria admitted that she had always

³² Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, 2005), p. 383; Hutton, ‘The Structure of the Royalist Party’, p. 560

³³ *Parliamentary or Constitutional History*, XIII, 56.

³⁴ Hutton, ‘The Structure of the Royalist Party’, p. 560.

³⁵ *Parliamentary or Constitutional History*, XIII, 85.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 65–6.

been ‘afraid of that assembly at Oxford’.³⁷ Even Hyde later conceded that the Oxford Parliament had been an unsuccessful waste of time: ‘it had been very happy for the King if the winter had been spent only in those counsels which might have provided money, and facilitated the making his army ready to take the field in the spring’.³⁸

Arrangements for Sermons before the Oxford Parliament

Charles’s summoning of disaffected MPs and peers to Oxford saw a sudden upsurge in the number of sermons being preached and printed in the royalist capital. This is because, like its rival, the Oxford Parliament observed fast days – on the second Friday of every month – and marked these occasions by hearing two sermons in St. Mary the Virgin, the University church³⁹ A royal proclamation of October 1643 had stipulated that this fast day should be ‘religiously observed’ in ‘Churches and Chappels in all parts of this Our Kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales ... with publicke Prayers to God, and Preaching in all places where it may be had’.⁴⁰ The form of these royalist fast-day services was, of course, more traditional than those instituted by parliament in 1641. They referred to the minister as a ‘priest’ throughout and provided a set form of prayer, while readings were to be taken first from either 2 Samuel 15 (Absalom’s Rebellion) or Numbers 16 (the Conspiracy of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram) and then from Romans 13. These were followed by a prayer acknowledging the role that sinfulness and immorality had played in precipitating the

³⁷ John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State* (8 vols., 1721), V, 894; *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. Mary Green (1857), p. 285 (Henrietta Maria to Charles I, 14 Feb. 1644/5).

³⁸ *CHR*, III, 309.

³⁹ *A forme of common-prayer, to be used upon the solemne fast appointed by His Majesties proclamation upon the second Friday in every moneth* (Oxford, 1643). For more on royalist fast days, see Christopher Durston ‘“For the Better Humiliation of the People”: Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving during the English Revolution’, *Seventeenth Century*, 7 (1992), pp. 129–49.

⁴⁰ Natalie Mears *et al* (eds.), *National Prayers: Special Worship since the Reformation, Volume I: Special Prayers, Fasts and Thanksgivings in the British Isles, 1533–1688* (Woodbridge, 2013), p. 403.

conflict: ‘the Rebellious are strengthened against us, by our multiplied Rebellions against thee ... now in thy just Iudgements thou hast set our sinnes in order before our eyes’.⁴¹

The Oxford assembly would also hear a sermon on Sunday each week and during services held to mark special occasions on other days too. For example, Henry Leslie preached before the Lords and Commons on 27 March 1644 – a Tuesday – to mark the anniversary of ‘His Majesties inauguration to the crown’.⁴² Many, though by no means all, of these sermons were subsequently printed by official order. Thus, while only three sermons were unquestionably printed in Oxford in 1643, at least five times this number emerged the following year. After the Oxford Parliament adjourned for the last time on 10 March 1645, only a single further sermon was issued from the city’s presses before the conclusion of the First Civil War.

Formally, the king and court did not decide which preachers were appointed to deliver sermons before the Oxford Parliament. Just two days before the first fast sermon preached to peers and MPs by Henry Leslie, Convocation – the university’s governing body – resolved that the same delegates who had appointed the clerics that would preach before the king in Christ Church would also be responsible for choosing preachers for the Oxford Parliament.⁴³ Unfortunately, no list of these delegates exists. The backgrounds of the preachers who gave sermons to the Oxford Parliament varied greatly: some, like Henry Vaughan, were college fellows, while others like Griffith Williams and Henry Leslie were senior churchmen with a long history of preaching at court. Yet there were also more obscure clerics invited to preach, men like Nathaniel Bernard or Paul Gosnold, both of whom had travelled to Oxford after being deprived of their rural livings by parliamentary sequestration committees and about whom little is known besides their sermons.⁴⁴

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 405.

⁴² Henry Leslie, *The blessing of Judah explained, and applied to the present times* (Oxford, 1644).

⁴³ Oxford University Archives, NEP/supra/Reg Sb, fo. 37.

⁴⁴ *WR*, pp. 146, 336.

How and why the Convocation committee made their choices are difficult questions, but there was evidently an attempt to give those within the university an opportunity and not simply to rely on divines with established links to the court. There is nonetheless good reason to suspect a degree of collusion between certain preachers and senior figures at court in establishing the central message that would be delivered from the pulpit at St. Mary the Virgin. In his sermon of 27 March, Henry Leslie, the bishop of Down, told MPs and peers that they should ‘think it not strange that I should presume to exhort you unto this dutie: for when David, after his banishment, was to returne, he appointed the Priests to speake unto the People to bring him home’.⁴⁵ This was a reference to 2 Samuel 19:11, which Leslie included on the title-page of the printed edition: ‘And King David said to Zadok, and to Abithar the Priests, saying, speak unto the Elders of Judah, Saying, Why are yee the last, to bringe the King back to his House?’ Leslie seems here to have been suggesting that not only his warrant but his actual message came directly from the king.

Further clues are supplied in a fast sermon delivered by Richard Chalfont on 10 May. Chalfont was a fellow of Lincoln College and, according to Anthony Wood, ‘accounted a most painful and edifying preacher, though always puritanical’. Just two years after his Oxford sermon, Chalfont became chaplain to a company of merchants in Rotterdam.⁴⁶ Perhaps because of his puritan leanings, he was the only preacher before the Oxford Parliament actually to commend the steps they had taken to secure peace. He declared that ‘your endeavours have exprest your hearty desires, to compose our unnaturall divisions by an happy accommodation’ but, crucially, added that ‘the Royall tongue hath prevented me in the acknowledgement of your paines in this way’.⁴⁷ Chalfont’s example therefore indicates two things about the degree of official orchestration behind the sermons delivered to the Oxford

⁴⁵ Leslie, *The blessing of Judah*, p. 40.

⁴⁶ *AO*, III, 239.

⁴⁷ Richard Chalfont, *A sermon preached at the publique fast the tenth day of May 1644* (Oxford, 1644), p. 41.

Parliament: first, that Convocation appointed those within the university that had distinguished themselves as preachers, rather than vetting candidates thoroughly to determine their political and religious leanings. Secondly, that guidelines were given by the king or his advisers, even to the less familiar preachers, regarding what should and should not be addressed in their sermons. This would certainly be in keeping with Charles I's use of parliamentary sermons earlier in his reign. Lori Anne Ferrell, for example, has demonstrated how, during the 1620s, the king and William Laud relied on the pulpit as a way of controlling public opinion and managing parliaments. In particular, Laud's sermons emphasised the interdependence of Church and state and alluded to the king's urgent need of supply – themes that would recur time and again in the sermons given before the Oxford Parliament in early 1644.⁴⁸

The Sermons

These sermons should therefore be understood partly as an exercise in parliamentary management, undertaken by clergymen very probably in consultation with the king or his advisors and aimed at directing the Oxford Parliament away from thoughts of peace and towards preparations for war. The basic message contained within the sermons is remarkably consistent, providing further grounds for suspecting a degree of prior orchestration: they insisted that a programme of moral reform and collective repentance was the only way to avert God's wrath and that any peace made at the expense of the Church would only result in further providential disaster. Preparations for sustaining the war effort against parliament were therefore essential.

⁴⁸ Lori Anne Ferrell, 'Preaching and English Parliaments in the 1620s', *PH*, 34 (2015), pp. 142–54.

On 9 February 1644, Henry Leslie delivered the inaugural fast-day sermon to the Oxford Parliament. Leslie had preached regularly at the court of Charles I during the 1620s and was made first a royal chaplain in 1625 and then dean of Down and Connor two years later. His energetic attempts to reclaim Church lands in Ireland won him the approval of the Laudian establishment, and he was elevated to the bishopric of Down in 1635. When the Irish Rebellion broke out in 1641, however, Leslie had fled his diocese and eventually made his way to Oxford.⁴⁹ In his fast sermon, he took as his text Jeremiah 5:9: ‘shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord, and shall my soul not be avenged?’ This set the tone for the rest of the sermon, which followed closely the tropes and conventions of early modern Jeremiadic preaching. Casting himself as an Old Testament prophet, Leslie reminded his audience of the horrors that God visited upon those who did not swiftly repent: ‘His wrath is a consuming fire, before which when it is kindled, the wicked shall be consumed, as stubble before the fire: when God commeth to revenge, they shall cry unto the Mountaines, to fall upon them’.⁵⁰ Not only ‘particular persons’ but the ‘whole nation’ faced annihilation for its ingratitude and immorality. And contemporaries were living through an age of unparalleled wickedness, for which the late intestine conflicts were a just punishment. ‘If time would permit me’, Leslie thundered, ‘to speake of your gaming, dicing, of your Masques, and Stage-playes &c, I could make it appeare that there are many great sinnes allowed amongst us, which were not knowne unto the Jewes’.⁵¹

Leslie had issued similar forebodings in his 1625 sermon, *A Warning for Israel*, preached at Christ Church Cathedral in Dublin. Now, however, this providentialism assumed direct implications for the very particular royalist political situation of 1644. Leslie portrayed the move of MPs and peers to secure a negotiated settlement as a disastrously misguided attempt

⁴⁹ Bodl., MS Rawl. Letters 57, fos. 25r–30v. See also: Ciaran Diamond, ‘Leslie, Henry’, *ODNB*.

⁵⁰ Leslie, *A Sermon Preached at the Publique Fast the ninth of Feb in St. Maries Oxford* (Oxford, 1644), p. 15.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

to avert God's wrath. 'We shall doe well now, to offer up sacrifice because of the Slain', he conceded, but 'although now there is a sacrifice intended ... it is such as will make no atonement'. He chastised the members for their willingness to trade the Church of England in exchange for peace and prioritise political pragmatism over religious duty: 'many divelish politicians would now make a sacrifice of the Church, they call it a Reformation of the Church, but it would prove the destruction of it'. He warned that 'such a sacrifice will be so farre from pacifying Gods wrath, that it will incense it more against us'.⁵²

The threat of providential retribution, already foreshadowed in the civil war, should therefore militate against any peace treaty that compromised the future security of the Church, its episcopate, and its clergy. The only thing that could end the war was swift and collective repentance.⁵³ Leslie preached again at the end of March, this time comparing the predicament of the Oxford Parliament to the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead in 1 Samuel 11, who were besieged by Nahash and offered peace only on the condition he be allowed to strike out all their right eyes. So too, parliament 'will grant no Peace unto the King and Kingdome, but upon the condition that they be allowed to thrust out both our eyes, the eye of Learning, and the eye of Religion'.⁵⁴

Just over three weeks after Leslie's first sermon, on Sunday 3 March, George Wild ascended the pulpit of the University church to deliver a still more direct and robust critique of peace talk. Educated at Merchant Taylor's School and Archbishop Laud's *alma mater*, St. John's College, Oxford, Wild had become chaplain to Laud in the late 1630s, and was presented by him to livings at St. Giles, Reading, and Biddenden, Kent, in 1640. During the Civil Wars, he was appointed a royal chaplain and regularly preached before the king at Oxford.⁵⁵ The

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 31–2.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 32–3.

⁵⁴ Leslie, *The blessing of Judah*, p. 41.

⁵⁵ *AO*, III, 720.

foreword to the printed edition of his sermon before the Oxford Parliament situated it firmly in the context of the increasing agitation for a settlement amongst sections of the king's support. 'The Master-Builders in our Israel', Wild declared, are now 'in consultation about the speedy Reedifying of the Temple of Peace: unto which, whiles others bring in their Gold ... I, who am call'd to be a Labourer, do freely contribute, such as I have'.⁵⁶

However, for Wild, like Leslie, true peace required more than just the absence of conflict. Taking as his text Psalm 122:8-9 ('for my Brethren and Companions sake, I will now say, Peace be within thee'), Wild nonetheless immediately insisted that 'there may be an unjust Peace, and ... there may be a Just Warre'. We must be wary of 'such a Peace, as only skinnes the sore, but repairs not the body; a Peace that promises a subtle superficial Quiet in the Fathers dayes, but threatens the Sonnes with an intestine and more lasting Warre'.⁵⁷ Wild compared the peace terms offered hitherto by the Westminster parliament to those conditions of surrender demanded by Benhadad after he had besieged Samaria, and intimated that the response of Oxford MPs and peers should be the same as that of the Israelites. Their king had 'summon[ed] the Princes, the Nobles, and the Elders of Israel, whose generall Vote it was, by no meanes to yeeld to such inequitable and unprincely Conditions'.⁵⁸ Crucially, however, they did not only have a duty to reject these peace terms, but to make arrangements for a continued war that would ensure outright victory.

Wild was clear that it was the ecclesiastical terms of any potential settlement specifically that were unacceptable: 'if either the Liberty of our brethren, or the worship of our God be demanded as Prey or spoyle ... the promise of private ease and effeminate Peace, must not lock the Sword within the scabbard'.⁵⁹ He declared himself horrified at the prospect of

⁵⁶ George Wild, *A sermon preached upon Sunday the third of March in St Maries Oxford* (Oxford, 1644), sigs. A2r-v.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

abolishing tithes and the sacrilege represented by the alienation of church lands.⁶⁰ Following the lead of his patron Laud at the opening of the 1625 parliament, Wild was quick to insist on the mutual interdependence of Church and state: the fortunes of king, gentry, and clergy were inseparably intertwined. If the Oxford Parliament therefore were to ‘barter away the Glory of Gods House, to buy the Peace of your Own’, it would lead inexorably to ‘Anarchy in the State; and the Multitude, that innovating, unsettled, inconstant Creature, will find in time, as little use of a Peerage as of a Prelacy’.⁶¹

Throughout his discourse, Wild was in defiant and admonitory mood, scarcely concealing his fury at the ambivalence of many lay royalists, embodied by the moderate Oxford Parliament, towards the established Church and its episcopate. ‘Great talke has been of Abuses and of Reformation,’ he sneered at one point, ‘but, Woe unto such who make Beams of our Moates; who call every spot in the Moon a totall Eclipse ... who fancy and find Abuses where there are none’.⁶² Nor was Wild prepared, as so much royalist writing in the early 1640s had been, to condemn the Laudian Church reforms of the preceding decade.⁶³ Instead, he celebrated Moses’s ‘building and beautifying of the Tabernacle’ and expressed his hopes that the ‘just rights and *ceremonies* of the holy church, which preserve even the substance itself ... may be themselves preserved from violence and ruin’.⁶⁴ Most significantly of all, however, Wild openly praised Laud himself, citing the teaching of ‘a most Reverend Father in our Zion, who, like Saint Paul still preacheth it in his bonds, calling earnestly upon *you, that when you sit down to consult, for the Commonwealth’s sake, you forget not the Church*’. This quotation, as a marginal note confirms, is taken from the ‘arch-bishop of Cant[erbury] in his sermon upon Psalm 122.6’ – a sermon Laud had delivered before

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶³ James Daly, ‘Could Charles I be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646’, *JBS*, 6 (1966), pp. 23–44, at pp. 25–6; Milton, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism’, *passim*.

⁶⁴ Wild, *A sermon preached upon Sunday the third of March*, pp. 25–6, my emphasis.

parliament in 1625.⁶⁵ Wild was evidently not ready to accept the anti-Laudian consensus that had formed among the royalist laity.

By the time Griffith Williams, the bishop of Ossory, came to preach before Oxford MPs, he had already established himself as a prolific royalist and episcopalian polemicist. As well as the *Discovery of mysteries*, his *Vindicae regum* (1643) condemned the treatment in both England and Ireland of the king and his bishops, who were ‘pressed, opposed and abused betwixt two rebellious factions ... persecuted and crucified betwixt two hereticall and tyranicall parties’.⁶⁶ Williams was another who had preached at court frequently during the 1630s, publishing a collection of these sermons with a dedication to the king in 1636, under the title *The Best Religion*. His sermon to the Oxford Parliament came on the March fast day, just five days after Wild had preached. Unlike Wild, Williams had been no friend of Laud before the Civil Wars but he was no less determined to exonerate the bishops and clergy from the charges that so many – including the MPs before him – had laid at their feet. He noted that ‘since the beginning of [the Long] Parliament ... men of no note became famous in the House by making invective speeches against the Bishops, and he was deemed most eloquent that was most bitter against them’.⁶⁷ He admonished his audience for their previous complicity in these attacks on the Church during 1641-2. ‘Sins may be committed divers ways,’ he told them, ‘by our silence, conniving and not hindering the sin to be committed, when it lyeth in our power, and it is our duty so to do ... if any of you that are here, have or had your hearts at London in any of these ways, the Holy Ghost will tell you ... *I have somewhat against thee*’.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁶⁶ Griffith Williams, *Vindiciae regum; or, The grand rebellion: that is, a looking-glasse for rebels* (Oxford, 1643), p. 97.

⁶⁷ Griffith Williams, *A sermon preached at the publique fast* (Oxford, 1644), p. 19.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 29–22 [irregular pagination].

Like Leslie, Williams adopted a Jeremiadic sermon structure. He recounted the providential ruin that befell sinful nations, of which the Civil Wars were just the beginning, and insisted that collective repentance was the only way to assuage God's wrath: he had fittingly chosen Amos 3:16 ('seek the Lord and you shall live') as his text. Royalists, Williams acknowledged, were themselves guilty of 'sacriledge, perjury, drunkenesse, luxurie, and all kinds of uncleannesse'. Rather than earnestly repenting, however, the Oxford Parliament was on the verge of committing a still more heinous sin in sacrificing the Church in exchange for what would prove an unsustainable peace:

We should never be so desirous of peace, and to procure peace, be contented, it should be done upon unrighteous termes, it may be with the ruine of the Church; yet it cannot be; because it is not in the power of any man, no not of the King himself to conclude a peace, when God proclaimeth warre.⁶⁹

This was followed by a war-mongering exhortation to rival any of the bloodthirsty rhetoric for which parliamentarian preachers like Stephen Marshall are famed. 'As the wrath of God was never appeased', Williams continued, 'for the innocent blood of the Gibeonites, that Saul most unjustly spilt, until it was revenged by blood upon the House of Saul, so the innocent blood, that hath been spilt in this kingdom, can never be expiated, until an atonement be made by blood'. Thus, he urged his audience

if your peace may not be had with truth and according unto justice, gird you with your swords upon your thighs, O you mighty men of valour, and let *the right hand of the most highest teacheth you terrible things*, until as our prophet speaketh, *judgement shall run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.*⁷⁰

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 34–5.

The final sermon to the Oxford Parliament before they were prorogued by the king on 16 April was delivered by Henry Ferne. A graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, Ferne had been made archdeacon of Leicester by Bishop John Williams in 1641. Having twice preached before the king on the eve of the Civil War, Ferne so impressed that he was quickly made a royal chaplain-in-ordinary. His *Resolving of conscience*, published in late 1642 and aimed partly at refuting the arguments of Henry Parker's famous *Observations*, was one of the clearest and most persuasive theoretical defences of the royalist cause published in the 1640s. These works have gained Ferne a reputation, like John Bramhall, as an exponent of 'constitutional royalism', who shared the 'fear of an outright victory by either side [that was] highly characteristic' of this group.⁷¹ However, if Ferne's 1643 *Conscience satisfied* did indeed express his hopes that peace would be restored without 'an absolute prevailing of either side by armes', by 1644 he was evidently less willing to contemplate peace and more determined that the royalists should push for total victory. The ecclesiastical terms of settlement consistently proposed by parliament therefore seem to have had the effect of pushing even conciliatory churchmen towards a more aggressive posture.

In addition to these polemical treatises, Ferne had in 1643 penned a manual for the moral instruction of royalist troops, in which he warned that God's favour would be withheld unless they abstained 'from every wicked thing'.⁷² It is unsurprising, then, that his sermon at Oxford in April 1644 echoed much of what his fellow preachers had told MPs and peers in the weeks before. It was another Jeremiad, which attributed the royalist failure to gain victory to the immoral behaviour of some within the king's party and suggested that attempts to secure peace at the expense of the Church were accordingly misconceived. Ferne drew an analogy

⁷¹ See Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, p. 230. I disagree with Smith's claim that Ferne's Oxford sermon 'did not vitiate the clear preference for peace negotiations of the Constitutional Royalists' (p. 231): this is to underestimate the force with which Ferne argues against peace and in favour of continued war.

⁷² Henry Ferne, *The camp at Gilgal* (Oxford, 1643), p. 14.

between Charles I's calling of the Oxford Parliament and the story of Deborah and Barak in Judges 4. Those that refused to offer aid to the king, that 'come not in to help at the command of the Sovereign in these times of distresse', were compared to the Reubenites, who 'refuse[d] to bear the common burden of the war with their brethren'.⁷³ This was, strikingly, illustrated with reference to the Curse of Meroz: '*Meroz* is cursed ... the Lord will have them cursed, because being neare at hand, within hearing of the Battel, they came not out to helpe'.⁷⁴

Ferne then came to consider the question of peace that the Oxford Parliament had been so eager to consider: 'have you Thoughts of purchasing your peace at any rate that may cost you least, however deare to others? Do you think of laying all the meanes of the Church in the gap to make it up?' As Leslie had done, he depicted the parliamentarians as Nahash besieging Jabesh-Gilead and offering conditions to which the inhabitants could not possibly agree.⁷⁵ The conclusion that had been reached by Ferne's fellow preachers was thus again hammered home. 'If no Peace can be had', he declared, 'but upon unjust tearmes, then must I commend to you other Thoughts, to wit, Resolutions for a necessary Warre'.⁷⁶ The Oxford Parliament should actually learn from the zeal and intransigence of their adversaries, who 'will have no Peace, except their Truthes be received'.⁷⁷

Intriguingly, Ferne, who owed his ecclesiastical rise partly to the Calvinists Thomas Morton and John Williams, was prepared to offer a measured defence of the Laudian Church of the 1630s. He drew an analogy between popular opposition to the Laudian reforms and the Israelites' suspicion when the Reubenites erected an altar; these suspicions had ultimately been allayed when the Reubenites explained 'that the altar is not raised for a sacrifice, but for

⁷³ Ferne, *A sermon preached at the publique fast the twelfth day of April* (Oxford, 1644), p. 6.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4–5.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 25.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

a wittnesse and remembrance'. 'Had the zeale of these daies been of such a temper', Ferne reflected, 'the businesse had not come to Armes'. Later in the sermon, he was more explicit still in defending the ceremonial innovations of the 1630s: 'let me here by the way say thus much for the Established Ceremonies of our Church ... they are not for worship, they are for remembrance ... and outward expression of inward and invisible acknowledgements'. Strikingly, he denied that the Laudian altar policy (famously opposed by his patron, Williams) had represented an innovation, claiming that 'our first Reformers ... retained the word Altar in our liturgy according to the ancient indifferent use'.⁷⁸

Returning to his central theme, Ferne lamented how 'we have seen our people divided between the Church and the playhouse' and castigated those 'whose hearts are filled with no other thoughts, but those of pleasure, ease, pride, and wantonnesse'.⁷⁹ He urged the Oxford Parliament to do more to control licentious behaviour, by putting

a restraint put upon those mouths, that are so often opened in Oathes and Curses, upon those expensive meetings held for chambering and wantonnesse, excesse and riot in these times of publique wants: upon the neglects and contempts of these dayes of Humiliation, a Duty so necessary for our present condition.⁸⁰

Even after the Oxford Parliament had been prorogued in mid-April, a committee of the Commons continued to meet and hear sermons in Oxford. The recorded preachers, however, were now more obscure, reflecting perhaps the diminished importance of the pulpit during the recess. Both Nathaniel Bernard and Paul Gosnold, who preached before the committee on the June and August fast days respectively, were provincial clergymen who had been ejected from their livings by parliament and fled to the safety of Oxford. Even so, both preachers

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3 – 4, 7.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 20.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 22–3.

replicated the pattern of calling for royalists to eschew thoughts of any compromise with the enemy and instead commit themselves to securing an outright victory. ‘Let us take heed’, urged Bernard, ‘never to yield to, nor comply with Rebels in their Rebellion’ and ‘all cowardly thoughts of complying and yielding against so many lawes, so great reason, and thine owne conscience’. There was ‘no way for [the enemy] to be dealt with, but by resisting till we conquer him’.⁸¹ Gosnold agreed that ‘our peace we shall never recover, if the rebels may have their will’ but ‘their will they will have, if we be not provided to breake them of it’. He exhorted the remaining MPs to raise the revenues that were needed to support the king’s armies in the field: ‘provision cannot be made without money, money cannot be had without your contribution, therefore out with your purses, and pay for the peace of Jerusalem’.⁸²

From Pulpit to Print

Considering how these sermons came to be printed casts still more light on their relationship to royalist politics at Oxford, as well as demonstrating the ways that sermon meaning could change during publication. Most of the material printed in the city during the First Civil War went through the presses of the university printers, Leonard Lichfield and Henry Hall. Both printers were frequently used by the king for the issuing of official statements and speeches, and Lichfield in particular was reported to have been personally close to Charles and his inner circle. However, the precise degree to which their presses were controlled by those in authority is unclear.⁸³ The impetus behind the publication of the fast sermons often came from within the Oxford Parliament itself: as at Westminster, a fast sermon was frequently

⁸¹ Nathaniel Bernard, *Esoptron tes antimachias, or, A looking-glasse for rebellion* (Oxford, 1644), pp. 22, 24.

⁸² Paul Gosnold, *A sermon preached at the publique fast the ninth day of Aug. 1644 at St. Maries, Oxford* (Oxford, 1644), p. 16.

⁸³ Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2005), p. 124.

greeted with an order from MPs that it should be printed. Hence, a number of the printed title-pages advertise the sermon as having been ‘preached before honourable members of the House of Commons’ and ‘published by their speciall command’. Others, however, do not seem to have been printed at the behest of the Oxford Parliament and yet nonetheless claim to be published ‘by authority’. The exact nature of this authority was left decidedly vague: George Wild claimed that, in printing his sermon, he had ‘obeyed the Desires of such as might [have] commanded it’.⁸⁴ It seems then that elements of the royalist command were encouraging certain preachers to print their sermons delivered before the Oxford Parliament when they had received no direction to do so from the MPs themselves.

Moreover, even where sermons were printed at the request of the Oxford Parliament, the identities of the MPs moving for publication are often revealing. Griffith Williams’s printed sermon, for instance, contained a note ‘that masters Bodvell and Watkins thank the bishop and desire him to print the sermon’, signed by Noah Bridges, the secretary of the Oxford Parliament, and dated 9 March, the day after it had been delivered. John Bodvill was a Welsh royalist who sat as MP for Anglesey in the Long Parliament, until disabled on 5 February 1644 for attending the Oxford assembly. He had acted as commissioner of array for Caernarvonshire and would subsequently serve as a colonel during the defence of Anglesey in the latter stages of the First Civil War.⁸⁵ Similarly, Sir Francis Gamull (1606-1654), who requested that Henry Ferne print his sermon, was a colonel in the royalist army active in the defence of Chester. One of the MPs to move for Henry Leslie’s publication, John Mostyn, had joined his nephew in raising a regiment for the king in Flintshire.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Wild, *A sermon preached upon Sunday the third of March*, sig. A2r.

⁸⁵ John Edward Lloyd and R.T. Jenkins (eds.), *The Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940* (1959), p. 43.

⁸⁶ A.N. Prestige, *Sir Francis Gamull: Defender of Chester and his Family* (Salisbury, 2001), pp. 31–2; Simon Healy, ‘Mostyn, John’, in Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris (eds.), *The House of Commons, 1604–1629* (6 vols., Cambridge, 2010), V, 439–41.

This military interest in the publication of the Oxford Parliament sermons is confirmed by George Wild's dedicatory epistle to 'to the Honourable Sir William Boteler, Knight High Sheriffe of Kent, and Colonel of a Regiment of Horse for His Majesties Service'. Boteler was a 'staunch royalist' who, while MP for Bedford in the Long Parliament, had been imprisoned for several weeks after he jointly presented Sir Edmund Dering's 'Royalist Petition' to the House of Commons.⁸⁷ After the outbreak of the Civil War, he was imprisoned again but escaped in March 1643 and found his way to Oxford. He raised a regiment of horse for the king and was killed at the battle of Cropredy Bridge in June 1644. Whether Wild had first become acquainted with Boteler while he was rector of Biddenden in Kent, or whether they had met at Oxford, the cleric was confident that their shared outlook on the Church, the prospect of peace, and the necessity of continued war would ensure Boteler approved of the sermon:

I hope, this Your known detestation of Rebellion and Sacrilege; Your cleare and unbiac'd pursuit of Religion and Liberty; will encourage that in Another, which You Practice Your selfe. The confidence whereof invites Me to begge Your Protection to this Sermon, and the Author of it.⁸⁸

The military faction at Oxford evidently recognised a strategic advantage in having these sermons published, and patronage relationships between army figures and the clergy enabled them to orchestrate this. The fast sermons were published partly as a way of promulgating a particular, uncompromising vision of royalism, drowning out more moderate opponents within the royalist party by monopolising the press.

⁸⁷ Sir Philip Warwick, *Memoires of the Reigne of King Charles I, with a Continuation to the Happy Restoration of King Charles II* (1701), p. 272; *The Royalist Ordinance Papers, 1642–1646*, ed. Ian Roy (2 vols., Oxfordshire, 1964–1975), II, 451.

⁸⁸ Wild, *A sermon preached upon Sunday the third of March*, sig. A2v.

However, there was also a sense in which these sermons were repurposed and readdressed when published, becoming part of the ongoing battle for public opinion rather than contributions to intra-royalist debates about the relative merits of continued war and peace. Although Nathaniel Bernard's sermon had been originally and primarily intended to persuade the Oxford Parliament 'never to yield to, nor comply with Rebels in their Rebellion' and to 'banish ... all cowardly thoughts of complying', he subsequently hoped that its publication could reach a different audience and achieve a still more ambitious feat. The title of his published discourse was appropriately *A looking-glasse for rebellion* and Bernard included a prefatory message 'to all my friends in the East parts of this Kingdom: especially to them, that are of mine acquaintance, in Essex and London'. The preacher evidently envisaged a wide readership for his sermon, which would include those hostile to the royalist cause in the parliamentary heartlands. He explained that 'my aime in this worke [is] to procure a blessed change in them that are guilty, and a turning from such a sinne, as will poyson all their graces'. 'Men are usually not apt,' he added, 'to believe their owne faces foule, without a reflection'. His sermon would therefore show his adversaries, particularly those who had forced him from his Essex living in 1642, 'not only what you are like, but what you are'.⁸⁹

These sermons could double-up as appeals to public opinion because of the kinds of arguments the preachers had initially invoked to support their case for continued war against parliament. For instance, Henry Leslie's attempts to incite Oxford MPs to 'help [the king] against his Enemies' produced a vitriolic tirade against politicians at Westminster: 'these Egyptian taskmasters, have not only usurped the rights of his Crown; but with more than Spanish cruelty, Tyrannized over the Goods, Lives and Liberties of the Subjects'.⁹⁰ These sorts of passages, however, could serve equally well as generalised royalist polemic aimed at

⁸⁹ Bernard, *A looking-glasse*, sig. A2v.

⁹⁰ Leslie, *The blessing of Judah*, pp. 34, 40.

a more public audience. Meanwhile, other clergymen added material to the printed editions of their sermons that would enhance their capacity to reach and persuade a wider readership.

George Wild used marginal notes to direct his readers to political texts that would corroborate his argument: the king's response to the Grand Remonstrance, for example, was cited in the margins as evidence of the royalist determination to uphold established laws and protect the Church.⁹¹ It was also claimed in a marginal note that at a certain point during the actual delivered sermon, a petition of some Royalists in London for aid had been 'made known in the Church', and a collection taken.⁹²

The expansive reach of these sermons was aided by the existence of covert royalist presses and counterfeit publishing operations in London. Illicit presses were nothing new in early modern England and had been used to print subversive material since the mid-sixteenth century.⁹³ Publishers aimed to 'evade arrest and prosecution, not least by denuding works of the bibliographical clues by which printers could be identified, such as woodcut initials and colophons, as well as by employing common types and ornaments'.⁹⁴ The use of such presses to print royalist sermons in Civil War London is frequently attested to by the physical evidence of the publications themselves: although counterfeit sermons would claim on the title-page to have been printed in the royalist capital, they can often be identified by the use of ornaments otherwise unknown at Oxford and the fact that the printing is well below Oxford standard.⁹⁵ Often the sermon was indeed originally printed at Oxford but a forged copy was then reprinted in London. For example, a forgery of George Wild's sermon of 3 March 1644 gives itself away by the misprinting of certain words.⁹⁶ This suggests that covert

⁹¹ Wild, *A sermon preached upon Sunday the third of March*, p. 11.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁹³ See, for instance, Joseph Black, 'The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588–89), Anti-Martinism and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England', *Sixteenth Century*, 28 (1997), pp. 707–25.

⁹⁴ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 124.

⁹⁵ Falconer Madan, *Oxford Books, 1641–1650* (Oxford, 1912), p. 235.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 320–1.

royalist publishers saw some propagandistic benefit in these sermons delivered before the Oxford Parliament, and were determined to bring them before a London audience irrespective of the original intentions of the preacher.

Conclusions

This chapter has built on the preceding one in establishing clerical opposition to the agitation for peace emanating from moderate royalist circles, and their consistent willingness – be it in Oxford, York, or the provinces – to employ sermons as a means of resisting this pressure and calling for outright military victory over parliament. It has been shown that these preachers regarded the Civil Wars, and the royalists’ incapacity to defeat their enemies decisively, as providential punishment for the immorality that was rife among the king’s party: the solution was to combine earnest repentance and moral reformation with provision for continued war. Any settlement that traded away the bishops or church lands, by contrast, would only bring still greater divine punishment upon the nation and the royalist cause – it would not in fact prove a ‘peace’ in any real sense at all. Moral renewal thus assumed a specific political urgency in the context of early 1644 and the pulpit was the obvious platform from which to exhort this repentance. Preachers at Oxford drew on the tradition of the Elizabethan and early Stuart Jeremiad, and their arguments were buttressed with scriptural parallels between the predicament of the royalists and the Israelites’ wars in the Old Testament. Rather than a conventional lament against the sinfulness and ingratitude of the nation in general, however, the Jeremiadic genre was co-opted in 1644 as a tool of partisan politics, a way of directing royalist strategy and the proceedings of parliament towards military preparations and monetary contributions.

This chapter also has significant implications for our understanding of royalist politics. Building on the recent work of Anthony Milton, it has sought to restore the clergy as a significant and vocal faction within the broader royalist party, who used sermons as a means of resisting the marginalisation with which they were threatened by the anticlericalism so prevalent among the king's lay supporters. They were more willing to defend themselves, and even the Laudian reforms of the 1630s, than is often assumed; to make their voices heard on major political questions at critical moments during the Civil Wars; and to confront and attack those that opposed them, even prominent statesmen. Lacking the formal positions of secular power they had enjoyed during the Personal Rule, the press and pulpit assumed a far greater significance than previously. At Oxford in 1644, their anti-peace agenda coincided with that of Charles I and military figures but, as will be shown in the next chapter, the clergy were prepared to admonish the king personally when it seemed that he was himself failing to protect the government, liturgy, and lands of the Church of England.

Finally, these findings have further highlighted the complex relationship between the sermon preached and the sermon printed during the 1640s. A preacher's discourse could be de- and recontextualised during the publication process, and sermons that had originally been devised for one elite audience could nonetheless be 'recycled' as part of the continuing attempts of both sides to control public opinion. In this sense, Kevin Sharpe's claim that the Oxford sermons belong 'to the history of partisan advocacy' is not without foundation, even while it misses the crucial intra-royalist context in which these texts were initially devised. With the welcome recent turn towards understanding the early modern sermon as a live performance, less attention has been given to the processes of publication – printed sermons are often presented merely as frustratingly imperfect accounts of what had originally been preached. By contrast, this chapter has suggested that publication should itself be considered

a distinct event, which opened up new possibilities to the preacher and could have a transformative effect on the meaning conveyed by a sermon.

Chapter Four: Sermons and the Politics of Counsel, 1646–51

This chapter examines the ways that royalist and episcopalian preachers employed sermons as a way of counselling the monarch between the end of the First Civil War and Charles II's defeat at the Battle of Worcester in 1651. Historians have more often associated ecclesiastical counsel with puritans and the 'hotter' sort of protestant preacher, and the relationship between Charles I and his favoured clergymen in particular has traditionally been seen as a harmonious one, underpinned by the shared assumption of symbiosis between Church and state.¹ The divines that rose to prominence during the early Caroline years, we are told, 'were far from identifying with the tradition of plain-speaking Reformation Calvinism'.² Similarly, Charles I's aversion to public criticism and the attempts of his subjects to meddle with the *arcana imperii* – which he construed very broadly – is well-established.³ We are therefore more familiar with the propagandistic dimensions of Caroline preaching. For instance, the absolutist defences of the king's controversial Forced Loan in the late 1620s offered by several preachers gained them lasting notoriety: at an early meeting of the Long Parliament, John Pym denounced those divines who had 'preach[ed] for absolute monarchy that the King may doe what he list'.⁴ However, if the Laudian court clergy had indeed seen little need to admonish or even counsel the king from the pulpit during the 1630s, this chapter argues that the search for settlement that followed the Civil Wars forced some to reconsider this stance.

¹ See, for example, Christopher Hill, 'The Political Sermons of John Preston' in *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* (1958), pp. 239–74; Peter Lake, 'Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match', *HJ*, 25 (1982), pp. 805–25; Margaret Christian, 'Elizabeth's Preachers and the Government of Women: Defining and Correcting a Queen', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24 (1993), pp. 561–76; A. N. McLaren, 'Delineating the Elizabethan Body Politic: Knox, Aylmer, and the Definition of Counsel, 1558–1588', *History of Political Thought*, 17 (1996), pp. 224–52; Emma Rhatigan, 'Preaching to Princes: John Burgess and George Hakewill in the Royal Pulpit', *JEH*, 62 (2011), pp. 273–96.

² David Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 102.

³ See, for example, Jason Peacey, 'Royalist News, Parliamentary Debates and Political Accountability, 1640–1660', *PH*, 26 (2007), pp. 328–45.

⁴ Barbara Shapiro, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558–1688* (Stanford, CA, 2012), p. 167.

With parliament steadfastly demanding that the defeated Charles I assent to the complete abolition of bishops and the alienation of their lands, the interests of king and Church were in danger of becoming permanently disentwined. This prospect became still more conceivable after the Regicide, when Charles II dallied with presbyterianism in exchange for Scottish military support. These moments of crisis prompted royal chaplains, including those who had been enthusiastic advocates of Laudianism, to harness the pulpit as a means of dispensing urgent counsel. In doing so, they were able to draw on a well-established tradition, using the languages and conventions that had been enduring features of the Elizabethan and Jacobean court pulpit. This chapter thus draws on recent literature which has stressed that ecclesiastical counsel was regarded even by absolutists, conformists, and Anglicans as integral to the operation of the royal supremacy in the early modern period.⁵

Beginning with a discussion of how pulpit counsel was perceived and depicted in public discourse during the 1640s, the chapter then moves to a case study of the sermons delivered to Charles I during the Treaty of Newport in late 1648. It is shown that the king's trusted chaplains played on his longstanding anxieties about conscience, admonishing him from the pulpit for his previous pragmatism and insisting that he resist the ecclesiastical demands of the parliamentary commissioners. At times, these preachers followed the time-honoured rules for tactfully administering criticism from the court pulpit that had been worked out over the course of previous decades: sermons were presented as generalised reflections on the perennial concerns of a Christian life that applied equally to the entire auditory, with the king left to infer the application to his own situation privately. Others, however, were more direct and forthright, the gravity of the situation now encouraging open discussion of what would once have been *arcana imperii* and more explicit criticism of the beleaguered monarch.

⁵ See especially Jacqueline Rose, 'Kingship and Counsel in Early Modern England', *HJ*, 54 (2011), pp. 47–71.

Ultimately, these preachers were even prepared to threaten Charles I with the spectre of providential punishment, in this life or the next, should he fail to embrace a martyr's death.

After the Regicide, clerics continued to lobby on behalf of an episcopal Church of England from the pulpit at Charles II's exiled court. Now, however, they tailored their conciliar strategy to reflect the contrasting temperament and policy of a youthful king. Charles II's greater proclivity for pragmatism and his tendency to prioritise pleasure ahead of piety meant that arguments from conscience lost the purchase they had had at Newport. Instead, the political benefits of episcopalianism were now stressed, while the emotive force of Charles I's memory was invoked relentlessly to shame his son with the stigma of filial disobedience. There was also an even greater willingness to chastise the new king, particularly in the immediate aftermath of Worcester, which his preachers told him in no uncertain terms was providential punishment for his own sinfulness.

This chapter therefore shows that royalist preachers in the Civil Wars did not confine themselves to amplifying royal messages before people or parliament: they did not only preach *for*, but *to*, the king, and were increasingly willing to criticise and rebuke when the Church was adjudged to have been endangered. After all, these divines encouraged the king's martyrdom rather than sacrifice episcopal government, and on other occasions threatened him with eternal damnation or providential annihilation. The chapter provides further evidence too of the pulpit as a platform from which loyalists could intervene in proceedings at critical junctures of the Civil Wars. It gave divines desperate to retain the fabric of the pre-war Church of England an invaluable opportunity to address the monarch at a time when the direction of royalism was being fiercely contested and councillors were forced to compete to make themselves heard.

Nor was this always a case of unwelcome advice falling on deaf ears. Not only did Charles I exhibit a responsiveness to the Newport sermons in private, both he and his son recognised the value in showcasing before a wider public their receptivity to pulpit counsel. This is essential to understanding how and why one-way conversations between preacher and monarch were frequently printed. As the complex print afterlives of the Newport sermons attest, conciliar sermons could often become a very different kind of speech act when published: they could claim to reflect the monarch's own position and thereby serve to project a particular image of his kingship. Sermons originally borne out of frustration with royal pragmatism or impiety became, in the printing, evidence of the king's steadfastness and virtue.

Perceptions of Pulpit Counsel during the 1640s

Conspiratorial fears about evil counsel had been regularly, if not always publicly, articulated since the earliest years of Charles I's reign, and the constitutional crisis of 1641-2 only served to intensify popular suspicion towards courtiers and councillors.⁶ It was axiomatic in published defences of parliament's actions until well into the late 1640s that 'evill Counsellors have seduced his Majestie against his most loyall and faithfull Subjects'.⁷ This line of argument allowed the most committed supporters of parliament to present themselves as fighting for, rather than against, the king, while simultaneously insisting on the imprudence of any premature peace treaty. As one pamphleteer observed in 1643, the king, 'having the same maxims in his mind, and the same counsel in his ear', might simply revert to the policies of the Personal Rule as soon as he was restored to his full powers: 'there shall

⁶ See, for example, Noah Millstone, 'Evil Counsel: The Propositions to Bridle the Impertinency of Parliament and the Critique of Caroline Government in the Late 1620s', *JBS*, 50 (2011), pp. 813–39.

⁷ *Mercurius Civicus Londons Intelligencer*, 14 (24–31 Aug. 1643), p. 106.

not want both Divines and Lawyers, that shall say the King and his private Councill are sole judges of necessitie'.⁸

The court clergy came in for particularly harsh criticism from their opponents for their perceived promotion of Laudian clericalism and Caroline absolutism. They had, it was charged, 'preach[ed] ridiculous, impertinent, flattering, [and] corrupt matter, which is the shame of the Pulpit and the foolishnesse of Preaching ... so as to bring infinite contempt, odium, and envie upon the Sacred function of the Ministry'.⁹ Parliamentary pamphlets and newsbooks railed against the sycophancy of 'Court Prelates' who used theology to buttress expansive claims for the royal prerogative, while neglecting their ordinary parish preaching duties. In May 1644, for instance, *Mercurius Britannicus* described Jeremy Taylor as 'a better Taylor than a Preacher, [who] could fashion himself pretty well to the Court Divinity'.¹⁰ The *Scotch Mercury*, meanwhile, noted bitterly in 1643 that the king's 'divines have writ Bookes of his Prerogatives ... and they affirme he may call or mis-call whom he pleases, and slander his best subjects'.¹¹ Another parliamentary newspaper advised the 'mitred varlets' at Oxford 'to preach lesse dangerous doctrines to the Kings eare, and not tell him out of the Pulpit, that is Divinity which is but Devillish Policie'.¹² So corrupted were the pulpit discourses of these loyal clergymen by flattery and political pragmatism that they could scarcely even be characterised as sermons: 'they use now and then to get up into a Pulpit, and make a kinde of a Court or Cathedrall Exposition, but to say truly, they never preach'.¹³

Indeed, notions of evil and corrupt ecclesiastical counsel were so central to parliamentary polemic that some were even willing to concoct fictitious instances of 'malignant' churchmen

⁸ *A discourse upon the questions in debate between the King and Parliament* (1642), pp. 3–4.

⁹ John Gauden, *The love of truth and peace* (1640), p. 34.

¹⁰ *Mercurius Britanicus Communicating the Affaires of Great Britaine*, 37 (20–27 May, 1644), p. 188.

¹¹ *Scotch Mercury*, 1 (5 Oct. 1643), pp. 3–4.

¹² *Spie Communicating Intelligence from Oxford*, 2 (30 Jan.–5 Feb., 1644), p. 11.

¹³ *Mercurius Britanicus*, 25 (26 Feb.–6 Mar., 1644), p. 305.

preaching at court. George Thomason received a copy of *A sermon preached before the Kings most excellent Majesty at Oxford* on 16 March 1643, during the Treaty of Oxford. The sermon was advertised on the title-page as having been delivered by ‘H.K’ and printed at Oxford for one ‘W. Webb’. When news of this sermon’s publication reached royalist Oxford, however, the authors of *Mercurius Aulicus* were quick to contest its provenance. An entry for 8 April claimed that parliament had ‘printed a sermon pretended to be Preached before His Majesty at Oxford by Doctor H.K, which is an errant forgery, the supposed author having not been at Oxford since his majesties last coming thither, having been detained by the Rebels forces’. ‘Neither is it usual,’ *Aulicus* continued, ‘with His Majesty to cause those sermons to be printed here, which are preached Before his Majesty’.¹⁴ The ‘supposed author’ referred to here is Henry King, bishop of Chichester, who, as *Aulicus* points out, had at no time been in Oxford since the outbreak of fighting.¹⁵ Because of this, modern bibliographers have preferred to attribute the sermon to another ‘H.K’, Henry Killigrew.¹⁶

Despite this, *Aulicus* was correct in identifying the sermon as ‘an errant forgery’, neither printed nor even preached at Oxford. Rather, the publication is an almost exact reproduction of a sermon given *coram rege* by Anthony Rudd, bishop of St. David’s, at Greenwich in June 1603.¹⁷ The publishers of the ‘H.K’ edition, however, had removed any part of the original that would reveal its Jacobean origins: for example, in the 1643 version, Rudd’s allusion to the Tuesday fast instituted by James in memory of the Gowrie Conspiracy or the recent royal progress through England have been redacted.¹⁸ Rudd himself was an outspoken preacher and puritan sympathiser, who had famously attracted the displeasure of Elizabeth when telling her

¹⁴ *Mercurius Aulicus*, no. 14 (2–9 Apr.), p. 180.

¹⁵ Mary Hobbs, ‘King, Henry’, *ODNB*.

¹⁶ Samuel Halkett and John Laing, *A Dictionary of the Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature of Great Britain* (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1882–8), III, 2335–6; Madan, *Oxford Books*, p. 235.

¹⁷ Anthony Rudd, *A Sermon Preached at Greenwich before the Kings Majestie* (1603).

¹⁸ Compare *ibid.*, sig. B2r. with ‘H.K.’, *A Sermon Preached before the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, 1643), sigs. B2r, B3r.

in a sermon of 1596 to prepare for her impending death. Peter McCullough has shown that Rudd's address at Greenwich was one of several court sermons delivered in the months after James I's accession which offered the monarch advice on how he should rule his kingdom. Anxious about James's absolutism, Rudd and his fellow preachers urged the king to find 'the *aurea mediocritas* between kingly justice and mercy' and to listen to the godly counsel of his clergy.¹⁹

However, certain passages in Rudd's sermon could be extremely damaging for the royalist cause when (falsely) presented as a snapshot of the counsel being dispensed at Oxford in early 1643. The 'preacher' takes as his text Psalm 101:1: 'I will sing mercy and judgement, to thee, O Lord, will I sing'. However, the sermon reiterates throughout the necessity of taking vengeance on 'all mutinous, seditious and rebellious persons': 'execution must be done upon the enemies of God and his holy church, and Jeremie pronounceth him cursed that doth the worke of the Lord negligently'.²⁰ The speaker sternly reminds his supposed auditor the king that 'the duty of Princes and publick Magistrates, is ... to take vengeance on them that doe evill, committing impiety and iniquity'.²¹ The Curse of Achan, meanwhile, is invoked as proof that 'the executing of hainous and notorious offenders withholdeth the wrath of God from the publick state of the Realme'.²² 'Therefore', the author concludes, 'a wise king scattereth the wicked, and causeth the wheel to turn over them'.²³ By publishing this fraudulent sermon, hardline parliamentarians hoped to show the dangers of accommodation

¹⁹ Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 104, 105.

²⁰ 'H.K.', *A sermon preached*, sig. B.

²¹ *Ibid.*, unpag.

²² *Ibid.*, unpag. For the more famous uses of the Achan example on the parliamentary side, see Blair Worden, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Sin of Achan', in D. E. D. Beales and Geoffrey Best (eds.), *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 125–45.

²³ 'H.K.', *A sermon preached*, sig. C.

with a king who continued to surround himself with vengeful and insidious ecclesiastical councillors.

In the battle for hearts and minds it mattered what kind of counsel the king was perceived to be hearing from the pulpit. Hence, in contrast to these parliamentary allegations against his lay and clerical advisors, Charles was consistently at pains to demonstrate that the counsel he heard was dispensed by the right sorts of people and delivered through the appropriate channels. While conceding that the ‘mischief’ of Personal Rule had ‘been made plausible to us’ by those around him, the king nevertheless challenged his opponents to name ‘one person that contributed to the ills of those times, whom We do, or lately have countenanced or preferred’, and insisted that he had surrounded himself only with the ‘most eminent assertors of the public liberties’.²⁴ The king was now resolved to make decisions only with reference to ‘the greater and better part of our Privy Councell’ and ‘as farre as [they] shall be agreeable to the good and welfare of the Kingdome’.²⁵ However, the publication of sermons preached before the royal ear could further assuage popular fears regarding evil counsel, demonstrating both the eagerness of the court clergy to dispense orthodox doctrine and godly advice, and the monarch’s readiness to hear it.

Charles I was not the only Stuart monarch to recognise the public relations value that diligent attendance at sermons could hold. As Matthew Jenkinson has shown, throughout his reign Charles II ‘was willing to have almost 100 court sermons printed by royal command, demonstrating publicly that he was being counselled in the godly life, even if he had little intention of forgoing his priapic pleasures’.²⁶ Meanwhile, Tony Claydon has argued that the

²⁴ James Daly, ‘Could Charles I be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646’, *JBS*, 6 (1966), pp. 23–44, at p. 25; John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State* (8 vols., 1721), IV, 712.

²⁵ *His Majesties answer to a book, intituled, The declaration, or remonstrance of the Lords and Commons, the 19 of May, 1642* (Cambridge, 1642), p. 6.

²⁶ Matthew Jenkinson, ‘Preaching at the Court of Charles II: Court Sermons and the Restoration Chapel Royal’, in Hugh Adlington *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 442–59, at p. 455.

notion of godly reformation was integral to the propaganda strategy of the Williamite regime after 1688, with Mary's regular printing of sermons preached *coram regina* intended to demonstrate that her court 'was a centre of Christian instruction and edification, and advertise the fact that the queen listened regularly to the prestigious clerics who worked alongside her'.²⁷ The advertisement on a sermon's title-page that it had been printed by royal authority thus often served to magnify the monarch as much as the preacher.

The utility of printed sermons to Charles I in controlling perceptions of his kingship and his counsel is shown by Richard Holdsworth's pulpit address before the king in early 1642. Elected master of Emmanuel College in 1637, Holdsworth was a moderate Calvinist who had opposed the Laudian canons of 1640. In early 1641 he had joined with Archbishop James Ussher and Ralph Brownrigg, the future bishop of Exeter, in propounding a compromise scheme for 'reduced' episcopacy that might placate both king and parliament. Holdsworth was one of several Calvinist churchmen offered a bishopric by Charles I in October 1641 – which he refused – as part of the latter's newly-conciliatory ecclesiastical policy. However, events increasingly pushed Holdsworth towards the royalist cause, and he would be imprisoned in Ely House in 1643 for publishing a pamphlet condemning resistance to the king. By the time he preached before the king at Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, on 27 March 1642, Holdsworth was therefore in the process of committing himself more decisively to the king. His sermon is of particular interest because, as the title-page made clear, it was published 'by His Majesties Command' and therefore highlights the role played by ecclesiastical counsel in the royalist campaign to improve Charles's public standing. This was a sermon of which Charles evidently not only approved but wanted to be *seen* to approve: printing the sermon could demonstrate his responsiveness to the counsel of a respectable Calvinist minister. Holdsworth explained in a dedicatory epistle that 'your Majestie

²⁷ Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 97.

vouchsafed, first to require a copie in writing, then to command it to the Presse, then to afford it your Patronage'.²⁸

Holdsworth took as his text Psalm 144:15: 'Happy is that people that is in such a case: yea, happy is the people whose God is the Lord'. He mimicked the rhetorical strategies of the king's own declarations in 1641-2 throughout the sermon, emphasising the mutual interdependence between ruler and ruled that characterised a harmonious commonwealth: 'there is nothing singular, not an I, nor a Me, nor a Mine; but all plurall, We, Us, Our ... it is every mans duty, even in his prayers, to be zealous for the Communitie'.²⁹ Rather than elucidating the legal rights and prerogatives a king exercised, Holdsworth focused on 'the tendernesse of his love towards his people' and Charles's reign was recast as a story of a sovereign consistently sensitive to the grievances and wishes of his people. That he 'was pleased to signe the so much desired Petition of Right' was conclusive evidence that Charles 'knows how to recede from power, and in some cases even from prerogative, when besought by prayers'.³⁰ Likewise, 'the laws and statues which have been made this last yeare, are lasting and speaking monuments of these Royall recessions, as well to posteritie, as to our selves'.³¹ Any problems could be explained away as stemming from a failure of counsel rather than the king's personal faults.³²

Meanwhile, Holdsworth located the Caroline Church firmly in the Reformed tradition and stressed the continuity in worship between Elizabeth's reign and the present: 'there is no Nation in the world, which hath had the condition of religion so pure and prosperous, as we, for almost these hundred yeares'.³³ 'It is true also', he conceded, 'that of later yeares the love

²⁸ Richard Holdsworth, *A sermon preached in St. Maries in Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1642), unpag.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

of religion in most hath grown cold, and the puritie by some hath been stained and corrupted'. However, 'wheresoever the fault is, there is no man hath shewed himself more forward to reform it then the King himself'. Although Holdsworth declared he would 'not now discusse where the fault hath been', the implication was clear: only Archbishop Laud, now imprisoned in the Tower, should receive the blame for recent religious innovations, while Charles had worked speedily to remedy these corruptions.³⁴

Sermons like this one by the Calvinist Holdsworth, with its emphasis on the duties God requires of kings and the need for royal adherence to established law, provided a counter-narrative that could, it was hoped, dispel pervasive notions about the prevalence of flattering, absolutist, crypto-Catholic ecclesiastical counsel at court and undo some of the damage inflicted by Laudian clericalism. Similarly, in 1644, Richard Harwood declared that the fact his sermon had been not only delivered before the royal court but printed by official command vindicated 'the Kings Honour ... from the Blasphemies of those, who have made Lyes a refuge: for he that pleaseth to read, may here behold the liberty and boldnesse, we are still allowed against the Romanists, Even in the presence of our King, His Posterity, and the whole Counsell'.³⁵ The *Sermon concerning swearing*, meanwhile, preached by William Strode on 12 May that year and published 'by His Majesties command' displayed before the public the godly, orthodox, even puritanical nature of the clerics favoured by the king – an antidote to the prevailing image of the royal court as a hotbed of vice and license.³⁶ Printed sermons could in this respect enhance the king's reputation through what they conveyed to the public about the dynamics and character of royal counsel, as well as their own duty of

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 36–7.

³⁵ Richard Harwood, *King David's sanctuary* (Oxford, 1644), sig. A2v.

³⁶ William Strode, *A sermon concerning swearing* (Oxford 1643).

political obedience; they can often reveal as much about the agenda of the royal auditor as of the preacher.

Theories of Ecclesiastical Counsel in Early Modern England

However, early modern preachers had long claimed a right to counsel the magistrate even where it was less welcome. As ‘ambassadors of Christ’, ministers believed they possessed a unique dispensation to interpret God’s Word and intentions, and to exhort sinners to repentance on His behalf, regardless of their worldly station. In a court sermon of 1570, for example, Edward Dering had told his royal audience ‘I beseech your Maiesty to harken, I wyl speake nothing according to man ... but that which I wyll speake, shall be out of the mouth of the Lord’.³⁷ This special authority bestowed on them by God not only legitimised but actively necessitated interference in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs. An oft-quoted passage from Ezekiel 33:8 warned of dire consequences if this duty was neglected: ‘when I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die, if thou doest not speake to warne the wicked from his way ... his blood will I require at thine hand’. The dire salvific consequences of failing to reprove sin, moreover, meant that ‘ecclesiastical advice could perhaps be pushed more forcefully than its lay counterpart’.³⁸

This authority was reinforced by scriptural and patristic examples of fearless ecclesiastical counsel. In 2 Samuel 12, the prophet Nathan tells King David a parable of a rich man who steals a poor man’s ewe lamb. When David responds ‘the man that hath done this thing shall surely die’, Nathan famously proclaims: ‘thou art the man’, and the king is thereby forced to admit his sin in taking the wife of Uriah the Hittite. This biblical passage provided an

³⁷ Quoted in Christian, ‘Elizabeth’s Preachers’, p. 562.

³⁸ Rose, ‘Kingship and Counsel’, p. 50.

example not just of bold and godly counsel, but of the use of analogy and application to admonish those in power. It is therefore no surprise that preachers in the court pulpit so often cast themselves in the role of Nathan. Delivering a sermon at the Jacobean court that criticised royal foreign policy, George Hakewill reminded his audience that ‘good King David in all his weighty businesses, but specially in matters touching religion and the service of God, still used the counsell and direction either of Gad or Nathan, Prophets, or of Abiathar and Hiram, chiefe Priests’.³⁹ Meanwhile, Patrick Collinson has demonstrated just how important the encounters between Saint Ambrose of Milan and the Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian were to prominent figures in the Elizabethan Church. As Collinson argues, Ambrose’s appeal for these churchmen was not just in his frank counsel, but his concern to separate temporal and spiritual power, and to emphasise the primacy of the latter over the former.⁴⁰

If the theory was uncompromising, however, there were in practice well-established conventions for delivering counsel from the court pulpit. As Arnold Hunt points out, ‘court preachers had to tread a fine line between plain-speaking (and the risk of causing offence) and tactful ambiguity (and the risk of being misunderstood)’.⁴¹ The idealised view of the fearless preacher was tempered by a pragmatic awareness of the rhetorical conventions that bound those preaching before power, as well as an underlying fear of censure. Most divines were far more circumspect than the likes of Hugh Latimer or Edward Dering in the court pulpit. Hunt and Peter McCullough have shown that a ‘negotiated’ language was often employed at court – a series of safeguards and caveats that served to shield the preacher and

³⁹ Quoted in Rhatigan, ‘Preaching to Princes’, p. 287.

⁴⁰ Patrick Collinson, ‘If Constantine, then also Theodosius: St Ambrose and the Integrity of the Elizabethan *Ecclesia Anglicana*’, *JEH*, 30 (1979), pp. 205–229.

⁴¹ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 297.

ensure that their sermon stayed within the bounds of acceptable speech.⁴² Cornelius Burges's 1625 treatise *The fire of the sanctuarie*, which sought to codify these unwritten rules for offering pulpit criticism, suggested that admonishment should be framed so delicately that 'no creature may be able to discern it, but he to whom it was intended'.⁴³ On one level, this involved simply denying the obvious and intended application of the exegetical discussion. A preacher could seek to 'shield himself from the worst of royal discipline by tempering his critique with a disclaimer that the present audience was, of course, not the intended object of criticism'. Indeed, it was partly the absence of adequate denials in John Burges's notorious sermon before James I in June 1604 that had provoked royal censure. Thus, 'to handle the *arcana imperii* safely, [preachers] had to maintain the fiction that they did no such thing'.⁴⁴ Another technique was to present advice or tacit criticism as flattery: as Alexander Nowell, the Elizabethan dean of St. Paul's, had remarked when accused of flattering the queen in a sermon, he 'had no other way to instruct the queen what she should be, but by commending her'. This was, argues McCullough, 'a time-honoured way to instruct one's betters through praise of an ideal'.⁴⁵

Historians have often tended to associate pulpit criticism of the powerful with puritans or the 'hotter' type of Protestant. The clerics that styled themselves as prophetic preachers speaking truth to power, it is assumed, were radical figures. Men like Edward Dering, John Knox, John Preston, and Thomas Scott were outside of, and opposed to, the courtly and clerical elite. Their urgent sense of the need for further reformation of the Church, punitive measures against Catholics, or a belligerent Protestant foreign policy compelled them to challenge secular power in a way that moderate and conformist, let alone Laudian and

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 292–342; Peter McCullough, 'Out of Egypt: Richard Fletcher's Sermon before Elizabeth I on the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots', in Julie Walker (ed.), *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (Durham, NC, 1998), pp. 118–49.

⁴³ Quoted in Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, p. 299.

⁴⁴ McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, pp. 144–5.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

royalist, clergy never would. The latter, indeed, were sycophantic flatterers, unable or unwilling to offer unpalatable truths to their monarch. As a result, it has been argued that bold clerical advice disappeared from court preaching towards the end of James's reign, when the balance of ecclesiastical influence at court shifted away from the Calvinists and towards those labelled Arminians. Charles I apparently presided over a 'flattery-ridden court', and preachers wishing to offer the young king advice now had to do so through print, if at all.⁴⁶ It is noted that John Donne, a preacher often accused of 'sacrific[ing] conscience to political expediency', was himself investigated by Charles and Laud on suspicion of having tacitly criticised the young king's religious policy.⁴⁷ Even Kevin Sharpe's more sophisticated portrayal of Caroline court culture, which shows how subtle criticism of Charles's government was embedded in plays, poems, and masques, has nothing to say about clerical or pulpit counsel.⁴⁸

Recent work by Jacqueline Rose, however, has questioned aspects of this conventional narrative, presenting theories of ecclesiastical counsel as far more ubiquitous than has been allowed. Rose demonstrates 'the prevalence of counsel in conformist supporters of the established church across the early modern period'. A commitment to frank and honest ecclesiastical advice need not imply a desire to constrain or bridle monarchical power in any way – it was, in fact, entirely compatible with 'absolutist' notions of kingship and integral to the politics of the royal supremacy. For absolutist clerics, their counsel played an integral role in preventing monarchy from descending into tyranny. The king or queen was morally obliged to *hear* counsel, but there was no insistence that they could be compelled to *act* on it:

⁴⁶ See, for example, Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, p. 102; Hill, 'Political Sermons', p. 253.

⁴⁷ Jeanne Shami, 'Kings and Desperate Men: John Donne Preaches at Court', *John Donne Journal*, 6 (1987), pp. 9–24, at pp. 9, 19. Shami offers a more nuanced interpretation, resisting the image of Donne as a court flatterer. See also, Peter McCullough, 'Donne as Preacher at Court: "Precarious Inthronization"', in David Colclough (ed.), *John Donne's Professional Lives* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 179–206, esp. pp. 199–201.

⁴⁸ Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1987).

there was ‘a moral (directive) obligation, not an enforceable (coactive) one, and [this distinction] therefore kept royal supremacy intact’.⁴⁹

Nonetheless, Laudians and royalists remain far more renowned for an aversion to preaching and sermon-centred piety than for pulpit criticism. Their preference for ceremony and sacraments, and the conviction that the pulpit was a site of nonconformist subversion, led Laudian churchmen to resist the emphasis placed on preaching in Reformed soteriology.⁵⁰ This is reflected in their use of the term ‘priest’, rather than ‘minister’, which ‘stress[ed] their sacramental, priestly role rather than the didactic preaching one’.⁵¹ Theory was matched by ecclesiastical and liturgical practice. As Dean of the Chapel in 1626, Laud insisted that Charles I attend the entire service on Sundays and not, like his father, simply come in to hear the sermon, interrupting the liturgy in the process.⁵² This was followed by articles for improving Church governance in 1628, which directed that catechising should replace afternoon sermons in every parish, ‘when and wheresoever there is no great cause apparent to break this ancient and profitable order’.⁵³

How far, though, were senior Caroline churchmen prepared to offer unpalatable counsel to the monarch from the court pulpit? Here, a clear contrast with James I’s reign can be detected. Although we have encountered one notable instance of a Jacobean court preacher being punished for their temerity, provided it was sufficiently decorous James I had exhibited a willingness to tolerate admonitory preaching that counselled the king’.⁵⁴ By contrast, his

⁴⁹ Rose, ‘Kingship and Counsel’, pp. 48–9, 59.

⁵⁰ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1700* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 471–2; Peter Lake, ‘Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I’, in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 113–33.

⁵¹ Anthony Milton, ‘That Sacred Oratory: Religion and the Chapel Royal during the Personal Rule of Charles I’, in Andrew Ashbee (ed.) *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life and Times* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 69–96, at p. 70.

⁵² McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, p. 155.

⁵³ Esther Cope, *Politics without Parliaments, 1629–40* (1987), p. 61.

⁵⁴ Cyndia Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 59.

son ‘was not a king who tended to be amenable to counsel if it did not contain the advice which he wished to hear’.⁵⁵ Indeed, as David Cressy observes, ‘few kings were so prickly about their honour, or more insistent on the dignity of kingship, than Charles I’.⁵⁶ As a result, Charles is more famed for either repressing preaching or utilising it in support of royal policy. In the latter instance, the conversation was emphatically one-sided, with the king issuing ‘public appeals for obedience, rather than invitations to begin a discussion’.⁵⁷ His cherished values of order, deference, and hierarchy perhaps precluded receptivity to critical or admonitory counsel and certainly made open public discussion of the *arcana imperii* anathema. These were values that Laud and his acolytes shared, and it is notable that so many sermons by senior Caroline churchmen prior to the Civil Wars stress the mutual interdependence of Church and state.⁵⁸

Laudian court clerics may also have considered admonitory preaching unnecessary, as well as imprudent or undesirable. Not only did Charles fully embrace their ecclesiastical agenda, they had opportunities to counsel the monarch in more formal, less public settings.⁵⁹ Laud, William Juxon, Richard Neile, and Samuel Harsnett all served on the privy council before 1640. Juxon, then bishop of London, was also appointed Lord Treasurer in 1636 – the first clergyman to hold the post since the reign of Henry VII. The increasing availability of these formal conciliar roles to Laudians undoubtedly had ramifications for their approach to preaching at court. It is interesting to note, for instance, that Laud felt no need to preach

⁵⁵ Rose, ‘Kingship and Counsel’, p. 62.

⁵⁶ David Cressy, *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford, 2010), p. 115.

⁵⁷ Lloyd Bowen, ‘Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639–40 and 1642’, *HJ*, 56 (2013), pp. 297–319, p. 309. See also, Cressy, *Charles I and his People* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 87–96; and Thomas Cogswell, ‘The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s’, *JBS*, 3 (1990), pp. 187–215.

⁵⁸ Lori Anne Ferrell, ‘Preaching and English Parliaments in the 1620s’, *PH*, 34 (2015), pp. 142–54.

⁵⁹ The debate between historians as to who exactly was the driving force behind the Caroline church reforms testifies to the depth of agreement between archbishop and king. For contrasting accounts, see Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Moulding of Anglicanism, 1625–1641* (Oxford, 1992), and Kenneth Fincham, ‘William Laud and the Exercise of Caroline Patronage’, *JEH*, 51 (2000), pp. 69–93.

before the king on Palm Sunday when Archbishop of Canterbury – a tradition meticulously observed for two decades by his predecessor George Abbot. Anthony Milton explains this by noting that Laud ‘enjoyed a more intimate relationship with the king, and more regular access to him, than had been possible for ... Abbot’ and thus might have felt ‘sufficiently confident that he could influence the king in other ways’.⁶⁰ In this context, court preaching lost some of its importance as an opportunity to steer and direct the monarch.

Pulpit Counsel and The Treaty of Newport

In the crucible of civil war, however, Laudian and episcopalian clergymen would discover the necessity of conciliar preaching. This can be shown through a case study of those sermons preached before Charles I on the Isle of Wight during the Newport treaty negotiations of autumn 1648. Here, from the pulpit, court chaplains warned the king against accepting the ecclesiastical terms of settlement being demanded by parliament. Perhaps because these churchmen mostly followed the established rules for decorous preaching at court, the significance of these sermons has gone unnoticed: scholars have for the most part either ignored them or referenced them only as part of wider arguments about seventeenth-century theology or preaching style.⁶¹ By paying much closer attention to the circumstances and audience to which they were delivered, however, it will be shown how this theology was intended to convey political instruction, and the extent to which these royal chaplains were now prepared to criticise, admonish, and direct the monarch.

⁶⁰ Milton, ‘That Sacred Oratory’, p. 77.

⁶¹ Peter Lake, ‘Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson’, *JBS*, 27 (1988), pp. 81–116, at pp. 84, 98; Horton Davies, *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588–1645* (San Marino, CA, 1986), pp. 224–5.

As has been argued in preceding chapters, royalist clerics throughout the 1640s were outspoken in their belief that episcopacy could never be legitimately abolished. If they were occasionally willing to contemplate limitations on the jurisdictional powers of bishops or even their temporary suspension, they were simultaneously adamant that some measure of episcopacy had to be retained in any religious settlement. Having sought to preach the Oxford Parliament away from thoughts of peace in 1644, royalist divines had continued their campaign to preserve episcopal government in the press. Two of the most prominent figures in this publishing campaign would also give sermons before the king on the Isle of Wight during his imprisonment there between November 1647 and December 1648: Henry Hammond and Henry Ferne both printed works to coincide with the Uxbridge negotiations in early 1645, stressing the sanctity of episcopacy and condemning those within the king's camp prepared 'to sacrifice any thing to our own present conveniences'.⁶² Yet it was not only a section of the king's supporters whose commitment to bishops now seemed less than absolute: Charles himself demonstrated a worrying readiness to compromise on the fundamental aspects of church governance in the aftermath of the First Civil War. In December 1647, he had signed an engagement with the Scots, by which he agreed to the temporary establishment of presbyterianism in England in return for military assistance. The terms of the engagement were profoundly alienating to episcopalians, testing 'the limits of what many of the king's supporters would put up with'.⁶³

With the royalist military defeat in the ensuing Second Civil War, Charles entered into a series of negotiations with parliamentary commissioners between September and late November 1648 that became known as the Treaty of Newport. Here, the king's resolve over

⁶² Henry Hammond, *Considerations of present use concerning the danger resulting from the change of our church-government* (1644), p. 16. See also: Henry Ferne, *Episcopacy and presbytery considered, according to the severall respects* (Oxford, 1644).

⁶³ Sean Kelsey, "'A No-king, or a New'": Royalists and the Succession, 1648–1649', in Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 192–213, at p. 192.

the Church again appeared to fail him, as a host of significant ecclesiastical concessions were made in the space of a few weeks. On 9 October, having already agreed to the suspension of episcopacy for three years, he offered the parliamentary commissioners assurances that the form of episcopacy instituted thereafter would only be the modified version that had originally been proposed in 1641. Despite claiming that he would go no further in this ‘point of conscience’, Charles was repeatedly pressed by the commissioners to agree to the total abolition of episcopacy, which they claimed was ‘not grounded on the word of God’, and to the sale of bishops’ lands.⁶⁴ On 21 October he consented to the abolition of the entire English Church hierarchy except for bishops and on 5 November to the complete prohibition of the Book of Common Prayer.⁶⁵ With pressure continuing to build, Charles eventually agreed that Church lands would revert to the crown and that episcopacy would only be reinstated after three years on the votes of parliament – which, as contemporaries pointed out, effectively amounted to its permanent abolition.

Whether these concessions represented empty promises which Charles had no intention of honouring, or whether in fact ‘his attachment to the old church was not as inflexible as hagiography maintains’, is to some extent beside the point.⁶⁶ Charles’s true intentions could only be guessed at and, as Sean Kelsey has shown, not all royalists were as convinced of the wisdom of insincere concessions in any case.⁶⁷ While Charles may have tried to reassure the marquis of Ormonde that he should not be ‘startled at my great concessions ... for that they will come to nothing’, episcopalians were nonetheless deeply perturbed.⁶⁸ For instance, Edward Nicholas, one of Charles I’s privy councillors who had staunchly opposed his

⁶⁴ *DC*, pp. 387–8; Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, 2005), p. 444; David Underdown, *Pride’s Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971), p. 114.

⁶⁵ *MEA*, II, 419; Kelsey, “‘A No-King’”, p. 195.

⁶⁶ John Morrill, ‘The Church in England 1642–9’, in *idem* (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642–1649* (Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 89–114, at p. 99. For a contrasting view, see Kevin Sharpe, ‘Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I’, *HJ*, 40 (1997), pp. 643–665, esp. p. 645.

⁶⁷ See Kelsey. “‘A No-King’”, *passim*.

⁶⁸ *CC*, I, 185.

decision to ally with the Scots, told Ormonde that, while the king ‘hath not totally quitted the Church ...he hath reserved very little of it’ and ‘yielded to pay the greatest ransom that was ever paid’.⁶⁹ His chaplains in particular, given Charles’s recent history of unscrupulousness when it came to safeguarding the Church, could be forgiven for wondering whether the king might pay any ecclesiastical price to regain his secular powers. As the concessions snowballed between October and November 1648, it must have seemed that the ultimate and irreversible surrender of episcopacy was imminent.

By contrast, Charles could find ample encouragement in making these concessions from both the parliamentary contingent at Newport and some of his own lay councillors. On 17 October, the commissioners invited the presbyterian divines they had brought with them to the Isle of Wight, among them Stephen Marshall and Richard Vines, into the room where discussions were being held to give their thoughts on the king’s objection to the ecclesiastical terms and thereby to satisfy ‘his majestie’s conscience’.⁷⁰ Furthermore, many of the king’s lay advisers were, by this point, ‘increasingly prepared to countenance the disabling – or even the wholesale abolition – of episcopacy as the price of a lasting peace’.⁷¹ As early as September 1646, Henry Jermyn and John Culpeper had written to Charles, attempting to disabuse him of the notion that ‘you are obliged to perish in company with Bishops meerly out of pittie ... or that monarchy ought to fall, because Episcopacy cannot stand’.⁷² At Newport, councillors like the duke of Richmond and the earl of Lindsey ‘fostered close links with Parliament’s commissioners’ and ‘these personal contacts probably assisted the processes of negotiation, and led to the king’s giving more ground than some ... thought

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 189–90; Kelsey, “‘A No-King’”, p. 202.

⁷⁰ *DC*, p. 395. See also: *The humble answer of the Divines attending the Honorable Commissioners of Parliament, at the treaty at Newport in the Isle of Wight* (1648).

⁷¹ Anthony Milton, ‘Sacrilige and Compromise: Court Divines and the King’s Conscience, 1642–1649’, in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 135–53, at p. 141.

⁷² *SPC*, II, 263 (Henry Jermyn and John Culpeper to Charles I, 28 Sep. 1646).

prudent'.⁷³ The king himself would eventually express regret that he had 'consulted [any]body, but my owne selfe ... for with Job I would have willingly chosen misery, [rather] than sin'.⁷⁴

At the same time, the king continued to solicit the spiritual advice of his chaplains at Newport, as he had done throughout the 1640s. The peace proposals parliament had offered since the Treaty of Oxford in 1643, which essentially forced Charles to choose between the restoration of unity to the commonwealth and his belief in the divine origins of episcopacy, triggered intermittent crises of conscience. His letters and public pronouncements throughout the decade show the centrality of conscience to his decision-making and his profound unease at violating its dictates.⁷⁵ 'I know my obligation', he told Prince Rupert in 1645, 'to be both in conscience and honour, neither to abandon God's cause, injure my successors, or forsake my friends'.⁷⁶ As Anthony Milton has shown, the king regularly consulted his chaplains to determine the exact extent of any ecclesiastical concessions he could make, valuing, in his own words, their 'worth and learning ... particularly in resolving cases of conscience'.⁷⁷ In 1646, for instance, Charles wrote to William Juxon asking whether he could agree to the suspension of episcopacy for three years, providing he restored it again once his 'regal authority [was] settled'.⁷⁸ Robert Sanderson, another chaplain present at Newport, had been recommended to Charles by William Laud because of his casuistical training, and the king was said to have translated Sanderson's Latin lectures on the obligation of oaths during the last months of his life.⁷⁹ He is reported to have said that 'I carry my ears to hear other Preachers but I carry my Conscience to hear Mr. Sanderson, and to act accordingly', while he

⁷³ David Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 139.

⁷⁴ Warwick, *Memoires*, p. 326.

⁷⁵ See Sharpe, 'Private Conscience', *passim*.

⁷⁶ *LK*, II, 384.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 422; Milton, 'Sacrilege and Compromise', *passim*.

⁷⁸ *LK*, II, 423.

⁷⁹ Izaak Walton, *The lives of dr. John Donne, sir Henry Wotton ... and dr. Robert Sanderson* (1865), p. 348.

instructed his eldest son ‘to submit to his mother in all points save that of religion, for which he was to trust entirely to the bishop of Salisbury [Brian Duppa]’.⁸⁰

Those divines who attended the king on the Isle of Wight therefore potentially had a vital role to play in guiding his decision-making with the future of the Church of England at stake. Indeed, on 1 November, Charles requested that, in addition to those chaplains already present, bishops Ussher, Prideaux, Brownrigg, and Warner, along with Henry Ferne and George Morley, be allowed to join him.⁸¹ These episcopalian clerics were occasionally permitted to participate in discussions at Newport and offer formal, written responses to the proposals of the parliamentary commissioners. On 3 October, having received a paper from his chaplains answering the presbyterian divines’ objections to episcopacy, ‘his majestie caused it to be read in the presence of the bishops & divines of both sides, & desired that the commissioners, servants, & others ... might be also admitted to hear this’.⁸²

However, at least one piece of evidence suggests that, for all Charles’s ostensible dependence on them, the chaplains did not always enjoy the influence and access to the monarch that they so desperately desired. On 29 September, Robert Sanderson wrote to the Gilbert Sheldon, recently imprisoned by parliament along with Henry Hammond and Richard Holdsworth, lamenting that ‘I am not able to give you any account’ of the talks between the king and parliamentary commissioners that had occurred that morning: what his response had been to their demands, ‘we may [only] guess’.⁸³ The nature and extent of private consultation between Charles and his divines in these months is not easy to establish definitively. Izaak Walton later claimed that Sanderson had ‘many, both public and private,

⁸⁰ J. Sears Mcgee, ‘Sanderson, Robert’, *ODNB*; Ian Green, ‘Duppa, Brian’, *ODNB*.

⁸¹ *DC*, p. 398; *His Majesties declaration delivered at Newport in the Isle of Wight* (1648), pp. 5–6.

⁸² *DC*, p. 391; c.f. pp. 395–6.

⁸³ Bodl., MS Tanner 461, fo. 765; Henry Cary, *Memorials of the Great Civil War in England from 1646 to 1652* (2 vols., 1842), II, 11–12.

conferences with [the king], to his Majesty's great satisfaction'.⁸⁴ As Nicholas Oudart's diary shows, however, the king spent long, tiring days in the negotiating room and at other times his chaplains were forced to compete with lay counsellors for the king's attention.⁸⁵ Opportunities for private audiences in which the clerics could address Charles directly and at length were therefore surely precious.

Sanderson further told Sheldon in his letter that 'my Lord of Sarum [Duppa] desireth to be remembered to you, and commanded me to tell you that we never wanted you more than now'.⁸⁶ This gives a sense of the united group these clerics constituted at this moment of crisis – a distinct 'tribe' in the words of Matthew Wren – anxiously watching events unfold and seeking to co-ordinate their response.⁸⁷ Their efforts would collectively gain them the suspicion of both parliamentarians and some royalists. Bulstrode Whitelocke would later complain that 'the Kings Chaplains ... his eager divines' had helped to obstruct peace at Newport by 'continually whispering matters of conscience to him', while a sermon by James Ussher on the king's birthday allegedly prompted some royalists to ask the Archbishop why he sought 'to make the breach greater between His Majesty and the Parliament at such a time as this?'.⁸⁸

The Newport Sermons

There was thus an urgent need for the royalist chaplains at Newport to utilise all means available to them in counteracting malicious counsel and increasing the king's intransigence

⁸⁴ Izaak Walton, *The lives*, p. 347.

⁸⁵ *DC*, pp. 387–406.

⁸⁶ Bodl., MS Tanner 461, fo. 765.

⁸⁷ Peter King, 'The Episcopate during the English Civil Wars, 1642–1649', *EHR*, 83 (1968), pp. 523–37, at p. 535. See Cary, *Memorials*, II, p. 59, for a discussion between Richard Holdsworth and William Sancroft regarding the Treaty.

⁸⁸ *MEA*, II, 414; *A message from the Isle of Wight, brought by Major Cromwell* (1648), p. 1.

over the key issue of episcopacy. Sermons provided these divines with an invaluable opportunity to address and lobby Charles, to intervene in a process from which they otherwise found themselves intermittently excluded. During the treaty negotiations, the king heard a sermon every Sunday as part of a service conducted in his presence chamber, as well as on the monthly fast. These services were semi-public, apparently attended by members of the king's household and his councillors: Oudart, for example, occasionally took detailed notes of the sermons and in one instance the notes of another auditor were leaked and used in a hostile parliamentary account.⁸⁹ James Ussher's sermon was reportedly being debated and dissected in London the day after it had been preached.⁹⁰ Many, though not all, of the sermons preached during the treaty were subsequently printed, and some seem also to have circulated in manuscript.⁹¹ These sermons were in this respect events watched by a far wider audience than the royal court at Newport, and they enjoyed an important afterlife beyond their initial oral delivery.

Although the Newport preachers were not all of precisely the same doctrinal temperament, the message of their sermons was remarkably consistent. Emphasising the dire consequences of betraying the conscience for material gain, they urged the king – with more or less directness – to reject the ecclesiastical demands of the parliamentary commissioners, even at the expense of his throne or his life. Brian Duppa, bishop of Salisbury, preached his sermon on 25 October, published soon after as *The soules soliloquie and a conference with conscience*. This theme was carefully chosen: Charles had previously confided in Juxon and Duppa his conviction that to 'change episcopal into Presbyterian government ... is so directly

⁸⁹ *DC*, pp. 392, 398, 405; *A message from the Isle of Wight*.

⁹⁰ *SPC*, II, appendix, xlvi.

⁹¹ See the copy of Brian Duppa's Newport sermon in CUL, Dd. 5. 31. (F). Robert Sanderson's later claim that the version of his sermon printed in 1653 was unauthorised likewise suggests the circulation of scribal copies: Robert Sanderson, *Twenty sermons formerly preached: XVI ad aulam. III ad magistratum. I ad populum* (1686), unpag., preface.

against my conscience, that (by the grace of God) no misery shall ever make me'.⁹² By the time the bishop preached at Newport, moreover, the scale of the commissioners' ecclesiastical demands had been clear for some time. On 25 September, they had demanded the king agree not only to the abolition of episcopacy, but to the sale of bishops' lands and the compulsory taking of the Covenant.

In his sermon, Duppa initially followed established convention in refusing to address the king directly and instead insisting that his message was aimed at the audience in general: 'if any here sensible of their sinne or misery ... or God that speaks to them by me with a Teare, it shall be my Joy'.⁹³ However, he soon made the application to the king's situation clear. 'There are some here, that by this time, are beginning a Dialogue with their soules', he noted, 'you have a Royall Example for it, I am sure, for you have no better then a King that hath led the way'. If this was sufficiently decorous, Duppa's tone was nonetheless admonitory: 'how shall I move thee wretched and careless sinner? Shall I tell thee, that as thy soule is an immortall substance, so the wages of thy sinne is as Immortall as the soule, an immortall and everlasting death?'.⁹⁴ Charles, the bishop implied, had sinned in his willingness to contemplate sacrificing episcopal government and would face damnation like any other man if he continued on this path. 'He that willingly puts out the taper of his conscience, the light which God hath set there for him', Duppa observed presciently, 'like an Offender on the scaffold, he doth but blind his eyes to have his head cut off'.⁹⁵ Therefore, should the Devil 'offer thee all the kingdoms of this world for one Teare, to be spent in his service, O doe not give it to him, for on thy death bed, for that one Teare, perhaps thou wouldst give a thousand worlds'.⁹⁶

⁹² *LK*, II, 423.

⁹³ Brian Duppa, *The soules soliloquie: and, a conference with conscience* (1648), p. 2.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.

Other chaplains lined up to echo this message that prioritising earthly comforts over the injunctions of conscience posed grave danger to the soul. In the first of two sermons preached at Newport that autumn, Robert Sanderson declared that ‘all temporal advantages of Wealth, Honour, Power Pleasure, and the like, which are the utmost fruit that a sinner can fancy to himself of all his labours, have but the shew and semblance, not the truth and reality of fruit’. We must not ‘yield to satisfie the lusts of the flesh in anything’, he continued, or ‘eternal damnation and death [are] not to be avoided’.⁹⁷ Even where no other record of the sermon exists, the texts the preachers chose suggest a determination to reiterate this theme. On 8 October, for example, Thomas Turner, dean of Canterbury, opted to expound John 5:14 before his royal audience: ‘afterwards Jesus findeth him in the temple and saith unto him “behold thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come to thee”’.⁹⁸

Both Sanderson and Duppa retained a measure of decorum in the way they framed their counsel, eschewing any detailed or direct discussion of the Newport treaty. Others, however, exhibited far less restraint. William Haywood was a graduate of St. John’s College, Oxford, who had served as a chaplain first to William Laud and then the king during the 1630s. In 1641, some of Haywood’s parishioners at St Giles-in-the-Fields presented a petition to parliament complaining that his sermons contained ‘most damnable and erronious Doctrines, full of grosse Popish tenets’, and that his mannerisms during the service were ‘superstitious and idolatrous; manifested by strange anticke jestures of cringings and bowings’.⁹⁹ A pugnacious character, Haywood sought to clear his name in a series of publications, railing against those ‘illiterate Trades-men ... many of them not able to write their names’ who had apparently orchestrated the petition.¹⁰⁰ He was nonetheless sequestered by the Lords in

⁹⁷ Sanderson, *A sermon preached at Newport in the Isle of Wight, October 1648* (1653), pp. 17, 18.

⁹⁸ *DC*, p. 392.

⁹⁹ Hunt, ‘Haywood, William’. See also: *The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Doctor Heywood* (1641).

¹⁰⁰ *An answer to a lawless pamphlet* (1641), p. 6.

March 1643, on charges of having bowed towards the altar and brought ‘the Parliament into contempt’ with his sermons.¹⁰¹ He joined the king on the Isle of Wight in November 1647 and preached two sermons during the negotiations with parliament, one of which was printed soon after as *A sermon tending to peace*.

Despite this pacific title, the sermon preached on 15 October was in fact a vigorous denunciation of any treaty with parliament on the terms currently proposed.¹⁰² Taking as his text Romans 12:18 (*‘if it be possible as much as lyeth in you, live peaceably with other men’*), Haywood argued, in a manner that recalled the sermons delivered to the Oxford Parliament in 1644, that any such peace would be only seeming rather than actual and lasting:

An appearance of peace there may be for a time, as betwixt Herod and Pilot there was (you know upon what occasion) but as true friendship that cannot be, which is not founded in goodness, no more true peace: for peace and friendship go together: False peace and not to be trusted is the friendship of wicked men.¹⁰³

Evidently unperturbed by the prospect of meddling with *arcana imperii*, Haywood did not hesitate to dictate to Charles the conditions under which he could contemplate a settlement. Real peace, he claimed, ‘preserves, first, our own hearts and affections undisturbed within ... [it] upholds lasting concord and agreement with our neighbours without’. It must satisfy our conscience first and foremost and be made on terms that are without ‘deformity, schisme, or partiality, without hipocrisie, oppression, or injury, to live particular, without inconstancie’; only if these conditions are satisfied can the peace be sustainable and unifying.¹⁰⁴ Haywood was explicit in condemning any concessions made over the Church, declaring boldly that ‘if

¹⁰¹ Hunt, ‘Haywood, William’.

¹⁰² For the complex, contested meaning of ‘peace’ in this period, see Phil Withington, ‘The Semantics of “Peace” in Early Modern England’, *TRHS*, 6th series, 23 (2013), pp. 127–53.

¹⁰³ William Haywood, *A sermon tending to peace* (1648), pp. 4–5.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6.

no peace will be had unless ... we assist them in setting up a new fangled Religion after their fancie', then 'tis apparent sometimes it is not possible'.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, in a passage startlingly reminiscent of the parliamentarian fast-day sermons of 1641-2, the Laudian Haywood assured his audience that 'God himself (in case his publique worship be indangered) enjoyns us flatly to break the peace ... in case of temptation to manifest Idolatry, Blasphemy, Heresie, or Apostacie, from the true faith and worship of God: we can have no peace, nay, we can have no mercy'.¹⁰⁶

Like Duppa and Sanderson, Haywood reminded the king that we must not 'make light of our conscience, and forsake God and his truth for our quiet sake'.¹⁰⁷ However, he was still more forthright when it came to reminding Charles of what was expected of him as a ruler: 'where we are Magistrates, with power sufficient in our hands ... we must be stout; so in chastising the guilty not timerous, nor suffer dangerous offenders to scape unpunished'.¹⁰⁸ At this juncture, Haywood drew on the justificatory language for bold ecclesiastical counsel that had been so familiar to his Elizabethan and early Stuart predecessors. Preachers must, he claimed, 'by our reprovng amend, as David [was] mended by Nathans', even if their unwelcome words were more likely to enrage their royal auditors, 'as Ahab [raged] against Michah, and Herod at St. Iohn Baptist'.¹⁰⁹ Citing the famous passage in Ezekiel 33:8, Haywood stressed the unique relationship that the clergy enjoyed with God, and the urgent need therefore for the king to heed their spiritual advice. This legitimated the candour with which preachers should address their audience, since 'he that reprovcs transgressors (specially Gods Ministers) doth but his duty'.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

Throughout his sermon, Haywood showed intense hostility to puritans, who are so ‘sure of their election ... and yet so unquiet with their neighbours, so full of carping, censuring, wrangling, and fault-finding’. ‘A likely matter doubtless,’ he scoffed, ‘that the spirit of Peace should abide in their hearts, whose works tend to nothing but dissention’.¹¹¹ Far from tending to peace and reconciliation, then, this was a sermon calculated to dredge up long-standing animosities and accentuate mistrust between the negotiating parties. Preaching in mid-October, Haywood perhaps thought that, if the king continued to hold out, he could still be restored – be it peacefully or by force – on terms that preserved the essence of the pre-Civil War Church of England.

Preaching Martyrdom

By late November, when the last of the Newport sermons were being preached, such an outcome was no longer conceivable. The army’s *Remonstrance*, which was read in parliament on the 20th, made it clear that its leaders intended to put an end to this ‘evil and most dangerous treaty’, and bring ‘the capital and grand author of our troubles’ to justice.¹¹² When news of the *Remonstrance* reached Newport, it was clear that the alternative to an accommodation with the moderates in parliament was trial, and probably execution, by the army – and even this choice might be taken out of Charles’s hands at any moment. The king was forced to face up to the increasing likelihood of his own martyrdom. When the commissioners left Newport on 27 November, he told them that ‘we shall surely never see each other again’ and that he would endure ‘whatsoever [God] shall be pleased to suffer men to do unto me’.¹¹³ Two days later he wrote to the Prince of Wales that ‘we are sensible into

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹¹² Underdown, *Pride’s Purge*, p. 125. On the meaning of, and contemporary responses to, the *Remonstrance*, see Clive Holmes, ‘The Trial and Execution of Charles I’, *HJ*, 53 (2010), pp. 289–316, at pp. 305–9.

¹¹³ Cust, *Charles I*, p. 445.

what hands we are fallen; and yet we bless God we have those inward refreshments, that the malice of our enemies cannot disturb'.¹¹⁴

By this point, the king had agreed to the indefinite suspension of episcopacy but still not its outright abolition, nor to the permanent alienation of bishops' lands.¹¹⁵ Rather than salving his conscience and encouraging final concessions that might yet save his life, the clerics at Newport attempted in their sermons to ensure that Charles embraced martyrdom and remained steadfast over what was left of the Church. On 26 November, Robert Sanderson preached the second of his two sermons delivered on the Isle of Wight. Now animated by a far greater sense of urgency, the future bishop of Lincoln expressed his anxiety that,

being terrified by their adversaries, [Christians] should not be able to hold out in their holy profession to the end; nor to maintain faith and a good conscience with that courage, constancy, and perseverance they ought: but lose the Goal and the Crown, for want of finishing the course, they had so happily begun.¹¹⁶

Anticipating the central parallel of *Eikon Basilike*, Sanderson compared Charles's predicament to that of Christ and encouraged him in accepting the same fate at the hands of his enemies: the king now had the chance to join 'those glorious Martyrs and Confessors, so much renowned through the Christian world for their patience and constancy in suffering persecution, and laying down their lives for the testimony of faith and a good conscience'.¹¹⁷ Moreover, Christ had told his disciples that 'when their enemies have killed their bodies ... they have then done their worst: they can proceed no farther; they have no power at all over

¹¹⁴ *LK*, II, 455–6.

¹¹⁵ *MEA*, II, 458–9.

¹¹⁶ Sanderson, *Twenty Sermons*, p. 581.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 584.

their souls'. 'It is most true, they have not', Sanderson continued, 'and happy it is for us, and one singular comfort to us, that they have not'.¹¹⁸

To the allure of martyrdom, Sanderson added the threat of providential retribution: 'he that hateth not his life, as well as his House and Lands, for Christ and his Kingdom, is not worthy of either'. If a man 'hath been frightened out of his conscience and his duty, and done amiss, [and] say[s], I was compelled to do it against my mind, I could neither will nor chuse, and the like: are, as the most common, so the most vain and frivolous excuses in the world'.¹¹⁹

Charles could not therefore shirk his duty and later plead coercion. It was true that, 'for the obtaining of peace', we are permitted to do 'anything that may stand with a good conscience'. In the end, however, Sanderson was emphatic that capitulating to the remaining ecclesiastical demands of parliament would be 'to faint under the Cross ... to deny the Faith, to forsake our Religion, to violate the dictates of natural Conscience'; and this could not 'consist with that nobleness of spirit and magnanimity, which becometh a worthy Disciple of Christ'.¹²⁰

On the Wednesday fast day three days later, Henry Ferne – who had chided the Oxford Parliament four years earlier for its readiness to make peace at the expense of the Church – took up Sanderson's theme. Expounding Habakkuk 2:3 ('though it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come, it will not tarry') Ferne was prepared not only to make the case for martyrdom but to rebuke the king sternly for his previous willingness to entertain compromise over the church. 'Every one of us [is] indeed sensible enough of the present distress, feels where it pinches him in estate, liberty, or losse of any thing desirable,' he acknowledged, 'but we must drive home the sense of these calamities to an apprehension of

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 582–3.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 584, 586

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 590.

Gods wrath, & tremble under it as provoked by our sins'.¹²¹ God was punishing Charles and the royalists for their attempts to secure peace at all costs:

Take heed therefore, lest there be in any of you, an evill heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God, an heart that casteth away all patient and care of well-doing; and yet causeth a man to blesse himself, saying, I shall have peace though I walk in the imagination of mine heart, and adde drunkenesse to thirst.¹²²

Ferne was clear that any further concessions over the Church would only alienate the Almighty still further. While we 'look to God from whom we implore a blessing upon the Treaty, and expect a deliverance, if it come to this strait that we must quit the duty God requires of us, or lose what man offers us, then not to stand fixt and resolved for obedience is not to wait upon God, but attend Mans pleasure'.¹²³ The king should not seek to provide for his own safety but must wait on God for deliverance, even if this ultimately came in the next life. Ferne pressed the case for martyrdom in a darkly prophetic passage:

And thus it is with every righteous man, that waits, and is cut off by death before he sees the wish'd-for Nationall deliverance; a *Justus Vivet*, made good to him even in death it self, he has then his deliverance though the Nation has not ... For he is taken from the evill present, and to come, as good Josiah cut off in his prime by the enemies Sword, and what is denied him in this life, is made good in a better, and for a temporall outward peace expected, presently enjoyes an heavenly, and eternall.¹²⁴

What impact, if any, did this rhetoric have on Charles I? Bulstrode Whitelocke would later reflect that issues of church government 'swayed more with the king's chaplains than about

¹²¹ Henry Ferne, *A sermon preached before His Majesty at Newport in the Isle of Wight* (1649), p. 7.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

him, and they more with his majesty ... than the parliament and all their commissioners'.¹²⁵ Anthony Milton has recently argued that court divines 'may have played an important role in supplying the king with some of the fatal resolve that frustrated a settlement and made his death inevitable'.¹²⁶ This case study supports this view, while suggesting that sermons specifically could have had a significant impact on Charles's mindset and behaviour in the final two months of his life. We have already seen how reliant he was on his chaplains in spiritual matters and how seriously he regarded matters of conscience throughout his life. Furthermore, sermons were an aspect of worship that Charles took seriously, and certain details suggest those he heard and read at Newport in particular were of great importance to him. Charles asked for and received a copy of one of Henry Hammond's sermons in September 1648, even though Hammond was physically unable to be with him.¹²⁷ Ferne remarked how his own sermon 'had the fate to be [the] last, that was preached before His late Majesty, and the honour not long after ... to be call'd for by Him, that He might look upon it in the Copy'. When in December the king was moved to Hurst Castle and deprived of his chaplains, Ferne reports that 'He carried with Him the remembrance of what he had heard at Newport, and laid hold on the first opportunity of gaining a Copy of This [sermon]'.¹²⁸ Evidently a number of these sermons made enough of an impression on the monarch that he was eager to revisit them in manuscript during his final weeks.

It would be too simplistic, of course, to claim that it was hearing the sermons at Newport that explains Charles's ultimate willingness to embrace martyrdom. However, the central themes in these sermons were touched on by Charles when subsequently justifying his actions. In a letter to the Prince of Wales on 29 November, for instance, he recited almost

¹²⁵ *MEA*, II, 414.

¹²⁶ Milton, 'Sacrilege and Compromise', p. 152.

¹²⁷ Henry Hammond, *The Christians obligation to peace & charity* (1649), sig. A3r.

¹²⁸ Ferne, *A sermon preached*, unpag., foreword.

verbatim the words Robert Sanderson had preached two days earlier when he reflected that ‘we are sensible into what hands we are fallen; and yet we bless God we have those inward refreshments, that the malice of our enemies cannot disturb’.¹²⁹ At his final trial hearing on 28 January, he attributed his failure to plead to that which ‘is much dearer to me than my life, which is my conscience and my honour’. In doing so, as Richard Cust notes, he ‘refused to give the junto leadership what it wanted because, in the final analysis, he was more afraid of God’s judgement that he was of death’.¹³⁰ The Newport sermons had attempted to inculcate precisely this firm sense of his priorities. Finally, giving his final words on the scaffold on 30 January 1649, the king echoed the concluding words of Henry Ferne, who had assured him from the pulpit that ‘the next life [would] afford A Crown of glory that cannot fade away, a Kingdom that cannot be moved’.¹³¹ The pulpit counsel of his chaplains perhaps ultimately made the transition from a ‘corruptible to an incorruptible Crown’ an easier one to make.

Printing the Newport Sermons

It is a central contention of this thesis that the sermon as preached and as printed were two distinct events, and the circumstances surrounding the publication of the Newport sermons are therefore worth exploring further, not least because this brought them before a far wider audience. The act of printing begot a process of transmutation, altering the meaning and dynamic of these sermons: they were no longer simply conferences between preacher and king but something more public, with new resonances and fresh applications. In short, the printing of the Newport sermons represented a speech act – an attempt to intervene in and alter a new political landscape – distinct from the purposes for which the sermons had

¹²⁹ *LK*, II, 455–6.

¹³⁰ Richard Cust, ‘Charles I and Providence’, in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 193–208, at p. 207.

¹³¹ Ferne, *A sermon preached*, p. 20.

originally been preached. In reconstructing the printing process, we need also to consider the motivations of the publishers, who doubtless helped to orchestrate it: publication was a process of consultation and negotiation, the impetus for which may not necessarily have come from the preachers themselves.

A number of the Newport sermons were printed while the treaty was still ongoing, only days or weeks after they had first been preached. George Thomason received Brian Duppa's *Soules soliloquie* on 14 November, just over two weeks after it had been delivered. The publisher was Richard Royston, a pivotal figure in royalist printing throughout the decade with close links to several royal chaplains.¹³² By October 1648, he was already preparing for the publication of *Eikon Basilike*, a process with which Duppa himself would also become involved.¹³³ Duppa's sermon seems to have been hurried through the press, and there is some indication that it circulated in manuscript at the same time.¹³⁴ Although the printing of William Haywood's *Sermon tending to peace* cannot be dated as precisely, the reference on the title-page to 'this late Treaty' might suggest that the Newport negotiations had not yet concluded. Haywood relied on Henry Seile, another prominent royalist publisher in London, who had printed Haywood's vitriolic responses to his parishioners back in 1641-2 and would also later be involved in the publication of the *Eikon*.¹³⁵

The precise motivation behind making these sermons public is harder to reconstruct in the absence of any explanatory forewords. Publication was collaborative and doubtless the commercial appeal of sermons recently preached before the king and at the centre of the

¹³² See Bodl., MS Tanner 52, fo. 7.

¹³³ See Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 145–6; and Sean Kelsey, 'The Kings' Book: *Eikon Basilike* and the English Revolution', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution, c. 1540–1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 150–69.

¹³⁴ See CUL, Dd. 5. 31. (F).

¹³⁵ Nicola Marie Whitehead, 'The Publisher Humphrey Moseley and Royalist Literature, 1640–1660' (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2014), p. 190.

political action – as both title-pages clearly advertised – may have been a consideration for the publishers if not the clergymen themselves. However, both Royston and Seile were staunch episcopalians, as well as royalists, and likely shared the distaste of Duppa and Haywood at the prospect of the king embracing presbytery to regain his throne. It is probable therefore that these sermons were printed while the Newport negotiations were ongoing as a way of rallying the wider royalist community against the treaty and justifying the intransigence of the episcopalians, for which they were publicly castigated by both parliamentarians and fellow royalists.¹³⁶ The very act of publication, apparently without the king's permission, and the appeal to a wider public is significant, however, and another indicator of the changing attitude of these clerics towards the politics of counsel. Neither sermon claimed any warrant or authority from the king: instead, these clerics were prepared to publicise for their own ends words spoken in the king's presence chamber and, in Haywood's case, overt discussions of the *arcana imperii*.

The Isle of Wight sermons of Henry Ferne and Henry Hammond, meanwhile, were not printed until after the Regicide and, in this altered context, they performed a very different function and offered counsel to an entirely new audience. With Charles I dead, the struggle to control the direction royalism would take under his successor intensified: would the new king show the same commitment to an episcopal Church of England that his father had? Or would he acquiesce in the face of mounting pressure from those closest to him, not least Henrietta Maria, for an alliance with the Scottish presbyterians? The belated publication of sermons preached prior to the regicide represented an intervention in this debate, an attempt to offer ecclesiastical counsel *in absentia* despite being unable to address Charles II at his exiled court. The most compelling argument these clerics could make, moreover, was to hold up the example of the deceased Charles I as a model of episcopalian steadfastness, and these

¹³⁶ See Heywood, *A sermon tending to peace*, p. 15.

sermons represent some of the earliest attempts to appropriate the memory of the ‘martyred’ king for the cause of the Church of England.¹³⁷

For this to work, however, the clerics had to perform a deft hermeneutic manoeuvre, presenting sermons that had originally been preached out of frustration and anxiety regarding Charles I’s commitment to the Church as evidence that that commitment had in fact been unwavering all along. In other words, sermons originally preached *to* the king were now treated as though they spoke *for* him. This is partly why Ferne was so eager to flag up the fact that Charles had requested a copy of his Newport sermon, thereby suggesting that it accurately reflected the king’s own mindset and priorities. Indeed, Ferne made this motivation explicit:

It is not to gaine credit abroad, that now [this sermon] offers it selfe to publique view, but to doe that most Gracious Prince so much right, as to let thee, who ever thou art (though but occasionally) understand, how good a Christian He was, most constant in observing His times for such duties, very attentive in hearing, and carefully mindful of what he heard.¹³⁸

Again, then, these sermon publications were premised on the assumption that it was possible to judge a king by the counsel he heard and the ecclesiastical company he kept. Ferne in fact insisted that his sermon could effectively be considered the words of Charles I himself: ‘what therefore in his Sermon thou shalt read of Affliction, Faith, Patience, Waiting upon God ... thou must see in this great King, as in a mirror’.¹³⁹ The fact that the preacher had considered the counsel necessary in the first place was, unsurprisingly, not mentioned and any sense of friction between the king and his chaplains in late 1648 was completely suppressed. A

¹³⁷ On the origins and broader development of this process, see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003).

¹³⁸ Ferne, *A sermon preached*, sig. A2r.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, sigs. A2r–v.

sermon that had originally evinced deep suspicion of Charles's inclination for pragmatic compromise was now printed as purported evidence of his intransigence.

In early 1649, Henry Hammond published a sermon he had first delivered before the king on the Isle of Wight in December 1647, on the eve of the Second Civil War, as part of a collection entitled *The Christians obligation to peace and charity*. This contained nine other sermons preached to various audiences during the 1640s. Hammond had initially prepared the volume for publication shortly before the beginning of the Newport negotiations, while imprisoned at Oxford, having been asked by the king for a copy of the sermon he had heard Hammond deliver the previous December. In a dedicatory epistle to 'his sacred Majesty' dated 16 September 1648, his chaplain now explained that he had

taken the confidence to [make it] more publick, that it may demonstrate and testifie the realitie of your Majesties inclination to peace ... and the sincere desire of your private undisguised retirements, to make the way back to your Throne by none but Pacifick meanes, even when others thought it their duty by the Sword to attempt it for you.¹⁴⁰

Circumstances in fact prevented Hammond from printing the collection until sometime after 25 March 1649.¹⁴¹ By then, however, the sermons were not so much a message to Charles I's detractors as to his son. They aimed to exonerate the king from any complicity in initiating the Second Civil War and erase uncomfortable memories of his duplicitous dealings with the Scots. Throughout the collection, moreover, Hammond emphasised a theology of steadfastness and perseverance in the face of persecution, and the dangers faced by those who 'violate their Consciences in hope to get their bodies or estates off from the torture'.¹⁴² As

¹⁴⁰ Hammond, *The Christians obligation*, sigs. A3r–v. See also, Cary, *Memorials*, II, 11–12.

¹⁴¹ The date given on the title-page is 1649. If the sermon had been printed before 25 March, it would have been 1648.

¹⁴² Hammond, *The Christians obligation*, p. 6.

with Ferne's Newport sermon, Hammond's published collection refashioned words originally given as admonitory counsel into an account of Charles I's own principles in the lead-up to his final imprisonment and execution. These were principles of which it was hoped his son would take note: by controlling the memory of the late king and the meaning of his death, these clerics aimed to influence the military strategy and ecclesiastical leanings of his successor. Sean Kelsey and Geoffrey Browell have both argued convincingly that the *Eikon Basilike*, one of the most famous works of English literature and the foundational text for the Anglican cult of Charles the Martyr, was published in early 1649 as part of precisely the same episcopalian propaganda campaign: 'its message was that God rewarded kings who defended their consciences resolutely and who adhered to their solemn promises in the face of temptation'.¹⁴³ Sermons counselling Charles I were in this respect recycled and recontextualised as part of a wider episcopalian print campaign to influence the ecclesiastical policy of his successor.

The Pulpit and the Exiled Court (1649-51)

Those episcopalian clergymen who were able to preach at the exiled court in these months soon found themselves embroiled in a bitter factional contest to control the young king and dictate his strategy for regaining his throne.¹⁴⁴ The letters of Richard Watson to his correspondent William Edgeman during 1649-50 document this struggle and give a vivid sense of the animosity felt by supporters of episcopacy towards Scottish presbyterians and their sympathisers. Watson had attended Gonville and Caius, Cambridge, during the 1630s,

¹⁴³ Kelsey, 'The Kings' Book'; Geoffrey Browell, 'The Politics of Providentialism in England, 1640-1660' (PhD thesis, University of Kent, 2000), p. 73.

¹⁴⁴ For royalist political debates in these months, see: David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-1649', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-1649* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 36-60; and Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Noel Malcolm (3 vols., Oxford, 2012), I, 19-60.

where he became an enthusiastic supporter of the Laudian Church reforms.¹⁴⁵ Ejected from his fellowship in April 1644, he served as chaplain to the royalist commander Lord Hopton during the First Civil War, following him into exile in 1646. By December 1647 he and Hopton had joined the court of Charles II at St Germain, and thereafter participated in its peregrinations around northern Europe until mid-1649.¹⁴⁶ Like his patron, he was vigorously opposed to any negotiations with the Scots, documenting with disgust their attempts ‘to carry the King into that accursed Kingdom’ and branding them ‘the veriest villains [he] hath for his enemies’.¹⁴⁷ When Charles finally took the Covenant in 1650, Watson despaired that ‘our religion is gone, and within few dayes is expected the funerall of our liturgie which is dead already’.¹⁴⁸

Watson was not a royal chaplain and could not expect any regular audience with the king. He complained that discussions with the Scots ‘hath been carried on with strange privacie’, forcing him to rely on occasional rumours. If he felt marginalised, however, he was not alone.¹⁴⁹ Increasingly lay and clerical episcopalians at the exiled court ‘were rendered irrelevant, and actively excluded from the highest councils by the Louvrians and the Scots’.¹⁵⁰ Watson was thus forced in his letters to speculate as to the king’s ultimate intentions and movements.¹⁵¹ Nonetheless, Charles did at least regularly attend sermons and these occasions became still more important to episcopalian clerics during 1649 for their lack of access to the king at other times. They also likely felt compelled to respond in kind to the pulpit railings of the Scottish clergy loitering around the exiled court, who, the episcopalian

¹⁴⁵ *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349–1897*, ed. John Venn (Cambridge, 1897), pp. 286–7. See Watson, *Sermon touching schisme*, esp. pp. 5, 23.

¹⁴⁶ Jason Peacey, ‘Watson, Richard’, *ODNB*.

¹⁴⁷ *CC*, I, 252; *CCSP*, II, 20.

¹⁴⁸ *CCSP*, II, 58.

¹⁴⁹ Mark Williams, ‘The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649–1660’, *JBS*, 53 (2014), pp. 909–33, at p. 910.

¹⁵⁰ Timothy Raylor, ‘The Anglican Attack on Hobbes in Paris, 1651’, *HJ*, 53 (2010), pp. 153–64, at p. 157.

¹⁵¹ See, for example, *CCSP*, p. 14.

Edward Hyde complained, ‘in their sermons preach against us’.¹⁵² When Watson was eventually given the opportunity to preach before Charles and his sister, the princess of Orange, at The Hague on Palm Sunday 1649, the king was about to enter into negotiations with presbyterian commissioners from Scotland. Less than two weeks later, Hyde would report that, besides insisting that Charles II take ‘the damnable Covenant’, the Scots had tabled ‘the most extravagant propositions which were ever offered to his Father’.¹⁵³

The strategies that Watson and his fellow episcopalian preachers adopted for counselling Charles II reflect an acute awareness that they were dealing with a prince profoundly different to his father in temperament, priorities, and outlook. Ronald Hutton observes that, as Prince of Wales, Charles had ‘showed no sign of deep interest in any religion’, and Richard Ollard argues that ‘the seriousness and piety of Charles I were the direct antithesis of his son’s flippancy’.¹⁵⁴ Writing to Edward Nicholas in May 1652, Hyde himself acknowledged that allowances had to be made for a young king who lacked his father’s religiosity and was prone to fleshly temptations:

There are and always will be some actions of appetite and affection committed which cannot be separated nor banished from the age of twenty one and which we must all labour by good counsel to prevent and divert ... and must always remember that kings are of the same mould as other men, and must be given some time to be made perfect.¹⁵⁵

Furthermore, Charles II was more comfortable with policy and pragmatism than his father had been: it was ‘the cool recognition of self-interest that was to distinguish his own policy as

¹⁵² *SPC*, II, 516.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 473.

¹⁵⁴ Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989), p. 20; Richard Ollard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II* (1979), p. 113.

¹⁵⁵ *SPC*, III, p. 71.

king'.¹⁵⁶ As Hutton has argued, Charles was 'somebody who saw religious questions primarily in terms of *raison d'état*, of their applicability to the preservation and furtherance of his power at home and [a]broad'.¹⁵⁷ In this context, the language of conscience and salvation – which had been deployed so consistently in sermons before Charles I – lost some of its efficacy. It was replaced by preachers at the exiled court with more pragmatic, emotive appeals for continued royal patronage of the Church of England: warnings about sin and providence persisted, but the emphasis was less on eventual salvation and more on the providential rewards that might be bestowed in *this* life.

Easter 1649 occasioned several sermons published on the Regicide, both in England and abroad, each drawing out parallels with the Passion story. But while John Warner's anonymously published account of the 'devilish conspiracie, hellish treason ... and damnable murder' committed 'against the Anointed of the Lord' constituted a howl of protest against the new republican regime, Richard Watson's Palm Sunday sermon was a direct intervention in the politics of the exiled court.¹⁵⁸ By recapitulating in great detail the events that had led up to the 'late murder of our blessed Sovereigne Charles the First', Watson reminded his successor of the rebelliousness of both Scots and presbyterians and therefore the dangers inherent in the prospective alliance. After all, when Charles had surrendered to the Scots in 1646, they had 'Judas like kiss'd him and betray'd him into his prison ... their own guilt is a perpetual thunderclap in their eares, and a fixed flash of lightning in their faces'.¹⁵⁹ This was a theme that had already been elucidated at length in *Eikon Basilike*, published the previous month, which Watson commended as an 'everlasting stupendious monument of a booke, rais'd higher then the pyramids of Egypt in the strength of language, and well proportion'd

¹⁵⁶ Ollard, *The Image*, pp. 69–70.

¹⁵⁷ Ronald Hutton, 'The Religion of Charles II', in Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 228–46, at p. 245.

¹⁵⁸ John Warner, *The devilish conspiracy* (1649), title-page.

¹⁵⁹ Richard Watson, *Regicidium Judaicum, or, A discourse about the Jewes crucifying Christ their king* (The Hague, 1649), p. 24.

spring of expression'.¹⁶⁰ Quoting directly from the *Eikon*, Watson recounted how Charles I had, in his own words, been pressed to take the covenant 'against reason, conscience, honour, oath'.¹⁶¹

The Scots' track record of duplicity was set alongside the constancy of the martyred king towards the Church of England: 'never Church had such a Kinglie nursing father as this in his life'.¹⁶² At the end of his sermon, Watson offered a prayer that

our hopefull Jonathan, our gracious Sovraigne, with his fathers blessing not Sauls curse, [may] breake his fast every day in this honey, and thereby let his eyes be enlightened as Jonathans were, *I Sam. 14* That he may every day more and more see and avoyd the enemies of his peace.¹⁶³

The analogy with Jonathan was carefully chosen, combining flattery with threats and admonition. In 1 Samuel 14, Jonathan, a courageous warrior-prince, eats honey, oblivious to his father Saul's command that no man eat 'food before evening comes', until one of his soldiers makes him aware of this injunction. Charles II was likewise in danger of filial disobedience and needed to be warned urgently, to be made aware of those 'enemies of his peace' who, at present, he was unable to see.

Although the March negotiations with the Scottish commissioners came to nothing, divines at the exiled court continued throughout 1649 to use the pulpit to steer the king away from a presbyterian alliance and towards the patient piety of his predecessor. Henry Leslie, preaching before the king and his sister at Breda in early June, opted for precisely the same subject matter as Watson: 'the martyrdome of King Charles, [and] his conformity with Christ

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.

in his sufferings'.¹⁶⁴ Leslie was similarly vociferous in his denunciation of the Scots, claiming that they had actually 'acted many more parts than Judas did: for they were the first that took arms against him, engaging all his subjects by a Solemn League and Covenant, to destroy the Church and the king'.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, this rebelliousness was a necessary product of the very presbyterianism that they would now have Charles II implement across his kingdoms: 'I know it was not the fault of that nation, but of that religion wherein most of them were brought up ... the greatest part of that nation be infected with the leaven of Knox and Buchanan'.¹⁶⁶ Anti-episcopal sentiment, the bishop of Down warned, naturally encouraged anti-monarchism, as recent events had tragically demonstrated. 'These rebels', he noted, 'have risen up against a King and a Priest on the very same grounds: they are all holy, and therefore need no Bishop to direct them & the Lord is among them, & therefore they need no King to govern them'.¹⁶⁷

In stark contrast to the doctrines of presbyterians and Catholics, the Church of England was naturally disposed to uphold Charles II's monarchical rights and the doctrine of non-resistance. 'The Church of England did abhor that doctrine of resistance,' Leslie argued, 'that religion only, among all Christian religions, doth promise safety and security to kings, submitting them neither to Pope, Parliament, Presbytery, nor People; but unto God only, by whom and from whom they reign'.¹⁶⁸ The Church of England, Leslie was claiming, was unique in subordinating kings neither to any spiritual nor any political power. This line, which would be a mainstay of episcopalian discourse after the Restoration, represents a noticeable transition from the language of conscience with which clergymen had tried to persuade Charles I to resist a presbyterian settlement at Newport.

¹⁶⁴ C.f. Bodl., MS Rawl. Letters 57, fos. 28v–29v.

¹⁶⁵ Leslie, *Martyrdome*, p. 23.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 23 [irregular pagination].

Preachers at the exiled court simultaneously acknowledged that they were in a battle for the king's ear, that the court was a site of overly pragmatic, as well as godly, counsel, and that Charles quickly needed to learn how to distinguish between the two. As Edward Nicholas put it in 1651, too many councillors assumed 'that the king ought to governe himselfe by prudence and necessity' and treated 'Honour and Conscience [as] bugbeares'.¹⁶⁹ Timothy Raylor has argued that episcopalians regarded Thomas Hobbes, the king's former tutor, as the epitome of the corruption plaguing the exiled court, and sought to tarnish his reputation among the exilic community.¹⁷⁰

It is unsurprising then that complaints about the prioritising of pragmatism and 'policy' over religion were a recurring feature of the pulpit counsel delivered to Charles II in these years. Unlike Leslie or Watson, Henry Byam was a royal chaplain-in-ordinary at the exiled court, admired by Charles II for 'his learning and his loyalty', and therefore was able to preach before the king on a much more regular basis. Some of these sermons, delivered on Jersey during September 1649 while Charles was awaiting an opportunity to land in Ireland, were published as part of a posthumous collection in 1675. Byam was an ardent royalist who had raised a troop of horse for Charles I at the outbreak of the fighting and had been briefly imprisoned by parliamentary troops before managing to escape and join the king at Oxford.¹⁷¹ By 1649, he shared the antipathy of his fellow episcopalians towards any Scottish alliance. Adopting the pose of the fearless preacher speaking truth to power, he lamented the increasing influence at court of those who made religion subservient to pragmatism: 'unless with Aristippus we can wear all colours, and change our Religion as we do our Garments; or unless we'll speak *placentia*, run with the Times, and court [the] Ears of our itching Auditors,

¹⁶⁹ *CC*, I, 435.

¹⁷⁰ Raylor 'Anglican Attack', *passim*. See also: Sarah Mortimer and David Scott, 'Leviathan and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 76 (2015), pp. 259–70.

¹⁷¹ *AO*, IV, 836–7. See also, *WR*, p. 310.

our company may well be spared'.¹⁷² Charles should beware of the 'Achan, Jonah, Judas' within, since it is the 'sometimes Grandees of the Court, and the pretended servants to the same' who have often 'betrayed a Glorious Cause for King, Country, and Religion'.¹⁷³

What was the alternative policy these preachers advised Charles II to adopt? They evidently agreed with laymen like Edward Hyde and Edward Nicholas that the royalists should now wait on providential deliverance while reforming their moral behaviour and earnestly repenting. Nicholas told Ormonde in 1651 that 'to restore the Church and State to their full right ... must certainly be a work of time, wherein God's providence must be waited on with patience'.¹⁷⁴ 'I make no question', Byam reassured his royal audience, 'can we but have patience, and use we but the probable and lawful means for our Restoremēt; God will raise up his Power and come amongst us'.¹⁷⁵ Leslie likewise promised that 'God is the guardian of kings, hath a special care of their preservation ... and therefore in his own good time, when he hath chastised us of our sins, he will certainly, sir, look upon the justice of your cause'.¹⁷⁶ Religion and prudent policy need not be mutually exclusive – indeed, they were impossible to separate. At present, however, introspection was urgently required. Byam told the assembled court that 'you have gone from one Nation to another, from one Kingdom to another People, and are you all sound at heart? None tainted with Vices of those Countries you come from?'¹⁷⁷ This applied to Charles just as much as his courtiers:

'Tis said of many Kings in the Old Testament, That they did many brave things: But there came in a 'but' afterwards that spoiled all: But the High Places were not taken

¹⁷² Henry Byam, *XIII Sermons: most of them preached before His Majesty, King Charles the II in his exile* (1675), p. 52.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

¹⁷⁴ *CC*, I, 436; *SPC*, II, 518, 521–2. On Hyde's religion, see Martin Dzelzainis, "'Undoubted Realities": Clarendon on Sacrilege', *HJ*, 33 (1990), pp. 515–40; and Paul Seaward, 'Circumstantial Temporary Concessions: Clarendon, Comprehension, and Uniformity', in N. H. Keeble (ed.), *Settling the Peace of the Church: 1662 Revisited* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 57–84.

¹⁷⁵ Byam, *XIII Sermons*, pp. 50–1.

¹⁷⁶ Leslie, *Martyrdome*, p. 31.

¹⁷⁷ Byam, *XIII Sermons*, p. 118.

away; But the Calves in Dan and Bethel stood still; But he departed not from the Sins of Jeroboam.¹⁷⁸

The prayers designed for use in the king's chapel around this time seem calculated to drive home this message. 'Vaine is the help of man,' the congregation were directed to pray, 'it is not my Sword that will help me ... it is Thou can'st save us from our Enemies'.¹⁷⁹ The clergy were evidently using their jurisdiction over different aspects of the church service, and not just the sermon, to engender trust in providential deliverance and a suspicion of pragmatic courses.

The wisdom of waiting on providence was emphatically underscored by the Worcester defeat. On 19 November, John Evelyn attended a sermon by John Earle, the future bishop of Salisbury, preached *coram rege*. Earle, the king's former tutor, was reportedly 'the man of all the Clergy for whom [Charles II] had the greatest esteeme' but this did not prevent him from doling out daring criticism of the king from the pulpit.¹⁸⁰ Already in August, with the Worcester campaign underway, Earle had told fellow exiles that the 'cause of our present sufferings [is] our rebellion against God, and in this sence princes may be Rebels as well as people: for he is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords'.¹⁸¹

Then, addressing the king in November, Earle applied Psalm 116:11-12 – 'what reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that he hath done unto me?' – 'to His Majesties marvellous escape from Worcester and that whosoever escaped dangers, should be most vigilant not to fall into that sin, for which it is likely he *provoked* God to expose him to the perills: since all dangers and distresses are onely the effect of sin'.¹⁸² Like the chaplains at

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁷⁹ *A forme of prayer used in the Kings chappel* (The Hague, 1650), pp. 7–8. See also John Cosin's marginal annotations in his copy of this form of prayer: *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Bishop of Durham*, ed. George Ornsby (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1869), I, 302.

¹⁸⁰ Quoted in Ollard, *The Image*, p. 44.

¹⁸¹ BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 20v.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, fo. 24v, my emphasis.

Newport, Earle was unafraid to accuse the king of having sinned by neglecting the Church and to demand he prioritise ecclesiastical counsel ahead of ‘Lyers and Flatterers’. ‘A prince’, Earle declared, cannot ‘testifie his acknowledgements by a greater instance than by reforming his Court ... The Court of a King, ought to be the Mirror, and Idea of the best Religion and discipline’.¹⁸³ The following week, Earle tellingly opened his sermon by ‘observ[ing] the order in Daniel speaking to the High Priest, the affinity twixt a good King and a Priest’: kings, he suggested, should listen attentively to the counsel of their clergy. Earle then went on to rehearse ‘the care of princes, which they ought to have of the Church of God’ and – in case Charles had missed the subtext – he then directly ‘applie[d] [his argument] to the person and Condition of his Majesty present’.¹⁸⁴ This was staggeringly direct, and a far cry from the delicate, coded criticisms that early Stuart preachers had confined themselves to: perhaps, as with so much else, the convulsions of civil war, revolution, and regicide had freed Englishmen from the constraints of tradition, making the previously unsayable, sayable.

Conclusions

Preaching before the king at Whitehall on 24 March 1621, William Laud castigated those opponents of royal policy, who, he alleged, spoke ‘oftentimes with more freedome, than either Truth or Temper, so long as they find fault with the present government’. He observed that ‘the difficulties in publicke proceedings, and in the managing of great State affaires, are both innumerable, and inevitable; and this every discreet man should consider’.¹⁸⁵ Laud was convinced that the interests of Church and king were inextricably bound up with one another: ‘the walles of the State cannot be broken, but the Church suffers with it; nor the walles and

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, fo. 24v.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, fo. 25r.

¹⁸⁵ William Laud, *Seven sermons preached upon severall occasions* (1651), pp. 57, 68.

fences of the Church trampled upon, but the State must be corrupted by it'.¹⁸⁶ This view would be confirmed by the harmonious partnership he formed with Charles I upon the latter's accession to the throne in 1625, the experience of which only strengthened Laudian distaste for those who openly discussed, let alone criticised, royal policy.

By 1648, however, the mutual dependence of Church and state that had been so fundamental to Laudianism could no longer be taken for granted. With the commitment of first Charles I and then his son to the episcopalian cause now uncertain, court divines adopted the kinds of strategies that had been held up as evidence of the subversive dimensions of puritanism in the early Stuart decades: direct criticism of the monarch; open discussion of the *arcana imperii* in court sermons; the use of print to try and influence royal policy. This chapter has shown that these clergymen (re)discovered the unique conciliar value of the pulpit at a moment of crisis. It offered the chance for a direct audience with the monarch, to monopolise his attention and speak at him uninterrupted at a time when opportunities to deliver counsel were otherwise scarce. The established routines of royal sermon-attendance equipped episcopalian clergymen with a potentially powerful weapon in their bid to ensure their voice on the direction of royalism was heard – one that their lay counterparts did not possess. Nor did the laity have the authority to pronounce on issues of conscience and providence that preachers could claim. These were subjects that, in Charles I's case at least, the king took seriously and sermons may even have impacted on his political decision making during the last months of his life: it is worth therefore reintegrating them into a more holistic account of court and political culture during these critical months and not simply focusing on the terms of the negotiations being hammered out by lay politicians.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35. For Laud's understanding of the relationship between Church and state, see Sarah Mortimer, 'Kingship and the "Apostolic Church"', *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 13 (2011), pp. 225–46.

Moreover, the growing fissures between the Stuart and episcopalian causes necessitated an admonitory pulpit style that previously would once have been unthinkable. After all, when in 1604 the puritan John Burges had dared to dictate ecclesiastical policy to James I and criticise the monopoly on royal favour enjoyed by corrupt courtiers he had been swiftly imprisoned. To be sure, Burges had failed to incorporate adequate denials and deference into his sermon, and yet although the counsel of William Haywood, Henry Ferne, and John Earle was no more concealed, these sermons were tolerated – and occasionally even endorsed – by Charles I and his successor. It seems that in the aftermath of the Civil War, the boundaries of acceptable speech in the court pulpit had shifted, with danger and urgency begetting a new frankness. This chapter thus offers an important corrective to the image, perpetuated by historians and contemporaries alike, of the Caroline court clergy as sycophantic flatterers, unquestioning in their deference to the royal prerogative, and builds on the recent work of Jacqueline Rose and Anthony Milton, who have shown that conformist, and later Anglican, clerics too could legitimately claim a right to counsel the monarch. It helps us to move beyond the theory of ecclesiastical counsel in early modern England and to understand better how it worked in practice – the actual arguments and rhetorical strategies clergymen thought best suited to their task of persuading, or cajoling, the monarch to abandon his errant religious policy and commit himself once again to the interests of God’s Church.

Finally, the example of the Newport sermons demonstrates once again how printed sermons could be used to mount their own political interventions, and how the sermon could transmute in print, taking on new meanings when deployed in a different context and targeted at a new audience. Sermons of counsel, now opened up to the public gaze, lost their admonitory dimensions and instead became monuments to the piety and steadfastness of a martyred king.

Chapter Five: Preaching, Royalism, and Episcopalian ‘Conformity’ in Interregnum England

On 10 February 1649, William Sancroft, the future archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to his father, expressing his horror at the recent public execution of Charles I and disavowing any thought of ‘public exercise’ in the Church ‘till I may with safety pour out my vows for Charles the Second’. He consoled himself with the thought that ‘in the meantime, there are caves and dens of the earth, and upper rooms and secret chambers, for a church in persecution to flee to; and there is all our refuge’.¹ Subsequent generations of historians have, like Sancroft, tended to depict the Church of England during the 1650s as an oppressed underground movement, its clergy driven from their livings and forced to await the king’s return in domestic or continental exile. The activities of divines like Henry Hammond, Gilbert Sheldon, and Jeremy Taylor are consequently well-known: unwilling or unable to continue their ministries under the new political and religious authorities, they retreated to country estates and spent the Interregnum composing the devotional works and polemical treatises that would eventually help to shape the character of Restoration Anglicanism.²

More recent scholarship, however, has demonstrated that only a fraction of the parish clergy was actually ever ejected by parliament during the 1640s.³ These exilic divines were therefore a small, if vocal, minority, and there was far greater continuity of personnel within the English Church between 1642 and 1660 than was once supposed. Nonetheless, those

¹ Henry Cary, *Memorials of the Great Civil War in England from 1646 to 1652* (2 vols., 1842), II, 119.

² See above, p. 17n.

³ Ian Green, ‘The Persecution of “Scandalous” and “Malignant” Clergy during the English Civil War’, *EHR*, 94 (1979), pp. 507–31; Peter Lake, ‘Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson’, *JBS*, 27 (1988), pp. 81–116; John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646–1689* (New Haven, CT, 1990), ch. 1; Judith Maltby, ‘Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of “Anglicanism”, 1642–60’, in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158–80; Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity, 1646–60’, in Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 18–43. For the most recent and comprehensive account of these ejections, see Fiona McCall, *Baal’s Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013).

churchmen who, despite a nominal preference for the king and the Church of England, continued to minister publicly under successive puritan regimes remain somewhat obscure. Where they have been discussed – either by contemporaries or historians – it has often been to chide or dismiss them for their comparative passivity and pliancy. In 1655, for instance, Lionel Gatford, the erstwhile rector of Dennington, Suffolk, until ejected, imprisoned, and finally exiled by parliament during the 1640s, berated these so-called ‘conformists’ for having ‘never so much as opened their mouths in the behalf of me or any of my fellow-sufferers’. Instead, they had ‘either complayed with our enemies, or moved neither tongue nor pen against them’.⁴

In his pioneering mid-twentieth-century study of the Restoration Church, Robert Bosher attributed the survival of the Church of England during the 1640s and 1650s solely to the endeavours of a small circle of ‘Laudian’ clergymen who had either been deprived of their livings or opted for exile.⁵ For Bosher, while this group displayed ‘consistent and unyielding opposition to the new order both religious and political’ from outside the Interregnum Church, those who stayed within were, by and large, ‘moderate men whose Anglicanism was rather a matter of preference than conviction’ and who ‘accepted the new order’ while eschewing ‘heroic resistance’.⁶ By contrast, the work published by Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor in the last few years has revealed a situation that was a great deal more complex than this, and rendered untenable any straightforward dichotomy between the principled nonconformity of exiles and the pragmatic accommodation of those who held onto their livings.

⁴ Lionel Gatford, *A petition for the vindication of the publique use of the Book of Common-Prayer* (1655), p. 62.

⁵ Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, esp. chs. 2 and 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4–5, 24.

This chapter seeks to build on this recent scholarship by considering the ways and extent to which the survival of royalist and episcopalian identities manifested itself in the Interregnum pulpit. The preaching of conservatives in the 1650s has traditionally been overlooked, with much more attention paid to the proliferation of radical religious sects under the English Republic. Yet continued access to the pulpit offered an invaluable opportunity – in theory at least – to influence lay responses to the dramatic political and ecclesiastical upheaval of this decade. It is surely worth asking therefore what, exactly, episcopalian churchmen were saying when they mounted the pulpit in the 1650s, not least because this might have implications for the way we think about the question of conformity. Did these preachers quickly accept the new status quo in Church and state and encourage their congregations to do likewise? Did they now confine themselves to more devotional and abstract theology, fearful of inviting the ire of the republican authorities? Or were their sermons in fact more subversive and critical than the label ‘conformist’, with its connotations of collaboration and irresoluteness, would suggest?

It is argued here that many of those actively ministering during the 1650s were concerned to preserve not only the spiritual health of their flocks but also a vestigial loyalty to monarchy and to an episcopalian Church of England. In his sermon at the funeral of Nathaniel Hardy in 1670, Richard Meggott reflected on the significance of the pulpit to the survival of loyalism after the Regicide. Hardy had been converted to the royalist and episcopalian causes by Henry Hammond at Uxbridge in 1645 and subsequently served as the minister of a London parish during the Interregnum. ‘When the generality of Pulpits there, powred out little but Noyse or angry Nonsense’, Meggott claimed, Hardy’s ‘was a well of Water, where many an honest Jacob drank ... Some being undeceived, and many confirmed by him’.⁷ This metaphor

⁷ Richard Meggott, *A sermon preached at St. Martins in the Fields, at the funeral of the Reverend Doctor Hardy* (1670), p 25. For other funerary celebrations of loyalist preaching during the 1650s, see Robert Mossom, *A*

encapsulates the self-image of loyalist preachers during the darkest days of the English republic. The preaching of their adversaries was deemed to have destabilised the political, social, and religious order, fomenting on the one hand heresy and on the other rebellion against God's anointed. While some clergymen, confronted with this cacophony of sedition and error, retreated from public life altogether, others saw it as even more essential that they preach truth and comfort to the disconsolate. The pulpit was now an indispensable means through which 'to promote Piety and Persuade Loyalty'; to counter the deceiving tendencies of the puritan clergy and the impulse towards apostasy among former supporters of the Stuarts and the Church of England.⁸ In this respect, continued ministry in the 1650s might be viewed as a positive, reasoned choice and a course of loyal action – as an expression, rather than a dereliction, of duty to Church and king.

Sustaining loyalty partly entailed vocal opposition to the new regime, and the occasional preacher was even prepared to incite violent resistance to bring about a restoration of the pre-war order. An explicit call to arms, however, should not be regarded as the only way in which disaffected Englishmen could contest authority or contribute to the episcopalian or royalist causes. Recent work on the likes of Christopher Harvey, Izaak Walton, and William Dugdale has begun to show how superficially uncontentious historical and literary works could actually articulate polemical, partisan opposition to the Interregnum establishment.⁹ The same is true of the pulpit: the risks associated with seditious utterances in republican England

narrative panegyrical of the life, sickness, and death, of George ... lord bishop of Derry in Ireland (1666), pp. 6–8; Humphrey Gower, *A discourse deliver'd in two sermons ... not long after the death of the Right Reverend Father in God Peter Gunning* (Cambridge, 1685), pp. 16–18.

⁸ Mossom, *A narrative panegyrical*, p. 6.

⁹ Steven Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649–1689* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), p. 61; Judith Maltby, 'From Temple to Synagogue: "Old" Conformity in the 1640s–1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds.), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 88–120, at pp. 92–3, 103–4; Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 152, 158; Benjamin Guyer, 'Izaak Walton's "Holy War": The Compleat Angler in Polemical Context', *Sixteenth Century*, 47 (2016), pp. 283–303; Jan Broadway, "'The Honour of this Nation": William Dugdale and the History of St Paul's (1658)', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 194–213.

meant that most preachers adopted subtle strategies to communicate defiant messages to fellow loyalists while simultaneously shielding themselves from government reprisal. This was particularly true in printed sermons, with legislation passed by the Rump Parliament from 1649 proving increasingly effective in dissuading authors and printers from overt political dissent. Indeed, this chapter will argue that the printed record is again partially misleading in this respect, and that preachers were often prepared to express opposition to the recent changes more openly and more consistently in the parish pulpit than the sermons that made it through the press would by themselves suggest.

As well as advancing guarded criticism of the new authorities, however, preachers also sought to dissuade supporters of king and Church from the kind of compromises and accommodations that might ultimately prove fatal to both causes. In doing so, they expounded what might be termed a ‘theology of loyalty’: their audiences were encouraged to regard themselves as a distinct community of God’s people distinguished by their moral righteousness, akin to the Israelites of the Old Testament. They were fed a providentialist narrative that could reconcile their recent experience of defeat with continued adherence to pre-Civil War political and ecclesiastical forms. The logic of this theology was un conducive to reconciliation, and undermined the Rump and the Protectorate in their ‘quest for settlement’. Far from being passive pragmatists or lukewarm loyalists, it will be argued that, through the pulpit, these clergymen *within* the Interregnum Church could play their part in resisting the revolutionary changes that had turned the world upside down over the course of the preceding decade.

This chapter therefore adds to the wealth of scholarship that has succeeded in nuancing simplistic notions of ‘conformity’ and ‘collaboration’ during the Tudor Reformations of the previous century. Andrew Pettegree, Alexandra Walsham, and Peter Marshall, among others, have all resisted the tendency to bifurcate the responses of Protestant and Catholic

Englishmen to religious persecution into the heroic resistance of martyrs and exiles on the one hand and the unprincipled accommodation of cowed timeservers on the other.¹⁰ The chapter draws too on recent work that has explored how the English population responded to the experience of ‘godly rule’ and non-monarchical government in the 1650s, and particularly the ways in which disaffection was expressed and controlled through language.¹¹

Loyalist Preachers and their Congregations in the 1650s

By 1650, the Church of England as it had existed prior to the Civil Wars had ostensibly been swept away on a tide of religious reform enacted by the Long Parliament. Its distinctive rites and liturgy had been formally proscribed, its episcopal government abolished, and its supreme head – Charles I – publicly executed. Significant numbers of its clergy, meanwhile, had been sequestered or ejected by parliamentary committees, with others opting for the comparative safety of exile.

These ‘sufferers’ have from the outset dominated accounts of the Church of England during the English Revolution. Contemporary churchmen, particularly those who had themselves been ejected, were understandably eager to paint as sombre a picture of the Church’s fortunes as possible. Jeremy Taylor’s *Holy Living*, composed while Taylor was serving as chaplain in the Carmarthenshire household of the earl of Carbery, presented an image of a passive, withdrawn episcopalian rising above the polemical fray. In his preface, Taylor declared that he and his fellow loyalists now ‘have no remedy, but what we must expect from the

¹⁰ Andrew Pettegree, ‘Nicodemism and the English Reformation’, in *idem*, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 86–117; Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993); Peter Marshall and John Morgan, ‘Clerical Conformity and the Elizabethan Settlement Revisited’, *HJ*, 59 (2016), pp. 1–22.

¹¹ Derek Hirst, ‘The Failure of Godly Rule in the English Republic’, *P&P*, 132 (1991), pp. 33–66; Bernard Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–1660* (Oxford, 2012); Caroline Boswell, *Disaffection and Everyday Life in Interregnum England* (Woodbridge, 2017).

fellowship of Christs sufferings’ and that his work would not ‘mingle in ... unnecessary or vitious quarrels’. He claimed further that ‘the Ministers of Religion are so scattered that they cannot unite to stop the inundation, and from Chaires or Pulpits ... chastise the iniquity of the error and the ambition of evil Guides, and the infidelity of the willingly seduced multitude’.¹² From the exiled court at The Hague in 1650, William Stampe, the ejected minister of Stepney, declared with similar pessimism that ‘our Deare Mother’ is ‘vilified and scorned’: ‘Her Champions (that should maintaine her Doctrine against the frauds & fallacies of her subtile & malicious adversaries) expell’d and banished ... not daring to appeare against avouched & professed Heresies, and Blasphemies’.¹³ The obvious polemical value of this persecution narrative would only increase in the fraught atmosphere of post-Restoration religious politics, with staunch episcopalians eager to stress the extent of their past sufferings at the hands of nonconformists. John Walker’s famous *Sufferings of the Clergy*, published in 1714, consolidated this exaggerated, one-sided picture of clerical loyalism in the Interregnum: as Fiona McCall notes, Walker’s correspondents ‘depict clergy living, like the exiles in *As You Like It*, on the margins of society, in woods, mills, huts and heaths’.¹⁴

Nonetheless, it is possible to identify far greater continuity in the personnel and practice of the English Church between 1640 and 1660 than these accounts would suggest. The work of the parliamentary committees responsible for sequestration and ejection was only ever sporadic and inefficient at best, and even where ministers were successfully removed, legal loopholes and the absence of subsequent enforcement often allowed them to return – be it to their original parish or a new one that had recently been vacated.¹⁵ Fincham and Taylor, for

¹² Jeremy Taylor, *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, ed. P. G. Stanwood (2 vols., Oxford, 1989), I, 5, 7.

¹³ William Stampe, *Treatise of spirituall infatuation* (The Hague, 1651), unpag., ‘To the ... inhabitants within the parish of Stepney’.

¹⁴ McCall, *Baal’s Priests*, p. 198. For the polemical context of Walker’s project, see Matthew Neufeld, ‘The Politics of Anglican Martyrdom: Letters to John Walker, 1704–1705’, *JEH*, 62 (2011), pp. 491–514.

¹⁵ See Robert Ashton, *Counter-revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins* (New Haven, CT, 1994), pp. 229–66; BL, Add. MS 15671, fo. 154r; Arthur Tindal Hart, *William Lloyd, 1627–1717: Bishop, Politician, Author, and Prophet* (1952), p. 15.

instance, have highlighted the practice of ‘episcopalian congregationalism’ in the 1650s, whereby laymen invited preachers to a parish who shared their ecclesiastical and political conservatism.¹⁶ In doing so, they were, ironically, able to exploit a parliamentary ordinance of 1641, which had empowered parishioners ‘to maintain an orthodox Minister, at their own Charge, to preach every Lord’s Day where there is no Preaching, and to preach One Day in every Week where there is no weekly Lecture’.¹⁷ Hence, John Fell, the Restoration dean of Christ Church, noted how from the late 1640s ‘Orthodox Clergy began to appear again in the Pulpits of London through the zeal of some right worthy Citizens, who hungered for the true and sincere Word, from which they had so long been restrained’.¹⁸ Meanwhile, poorer London parishes, even those that had hitherto been predominantly puritan, had difficulty attracting suitably qualified candidates and were occasionally forced to appoint an ejected cleric, for whom the meagre stipend on offer was preferable to continued destitution.¹⁹

Episcopalian sermon ‘gadding’ was common too, with lay persons frequently attending services held outside their own parish. John Evelyn is a famous example of this practice, but a whole congregation regularly travelled from their parish across the city to prayer book services at St Peter, Paul’s Wharf, conducted by Robert Mossom and Jeremy Taylor.²⁰ Sir John Bramston would later recall that in these years he ‘usually frequented Saint Gregories, Dr. Mossam’s, Dr. Wild’s, Dr. Gunning’s, or some other congregations where the orthodox clergie preacht and administered the sacraments’.²¹ A special commission set up by the Protectoral authorities in 1658 complained that St. Peter, Paul’s Wharf was ‘supplied with the

¹⁶ Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Identity, 1640–1662’, in Anthony Milton (ed.) *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume 1: Reformation and Identity c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 457–82, at p. 472. See also, Ashton, *Counter-revolution*, pp. 231–2.

¹⁷ *CJ*, II, 283.

¹⁸ John Fell, *The life of that reverend divine, and learned historian, Dr. Thomas Fuller* (1661), p. 41.

¹⁹ Julia Merritt, *Westminster, 1640–60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Manchester, 2013), p. 245; Tai Liu, *Puritan London: A Study of Religion in the City Parishes* (1986), pp. 136–7.

²⁰ Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Identity’, p. 473. See also: Liu, *Puritan London*, p. 129; and John Wroughton, *The Civil War in Bath and North Somerset, 1642–1650* (Bath, 1973), p. 114.

²¹ *The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*, ed. Sir Richard Braybrooke (1845), p. 91.

Constant Use of the Common Prayer, and ... filled up with *Persons from all Parts of the City* who are disaffected to Reformation'.²² Nor should lay enthusiasm for the kind of preaching in the capital surprise us: both Keith Lindley and Julia Merritt have shown there was considerable support for the king in Westminster and the suburbs even during the 1640s, notwithstanding London's traditional reputation as a bastion of parliamentarianism and puritanism throughout the revolutionary decades.²³

Elsewhere, when Edward Hyde, recently ejected from his living at Brightwell near Wallingford, began preaching at Holywell, Oxford, in the mid-1650s, it was said that 'all the loyal party of that city flocked to hear his doctrine'.²⁴ The vice-chancellor of Oxford, John Owen, allowed another congregation of 300 episcopalians to meet every Sunday and worship according to the Prayer Book, refusing, despite pressure, 'to give them the least disturbance'.²⁵ Episcopalian preachers were therefore often able to address sympathetic audiences despite the official proscription of these causes. Indeed, their sermons acted as focal points for beleaguered loyalist communities, attendance at which doubtless constituted a form of lay protest against the establishment and a reassertion of traditionalist politico-religious identity. There is a real irony here, given that during the 1630s William Laud had tried to crack down on both the appointment of lecturers and sermon gadding as antithetical to the cherished conformist values of unity and order. Now, however, these became important means through which the episcopalian laity could ensure they heard preaching that reflected their political and religious sensibilities.

²² Liu, *Puritan London*, p. 140.

²³ Merritt, *Westminster*, pp. 149–53, 248.

²⁴ *AO*, III, 328.

²⁵ Montagu Burrows (ed.), *The Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658* (1881), p. xliii. See also, Vivienne Larminie, 'The Fell Era, 1658–1686', in Ian Gadd (ed.), *The History of Oxford University Press. Volume 1, Beginnings to 1780* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 79–106, at p. 81.

The number of clerics hostile to the puritan regimes who occupied pulpits, particularly in London, during the 1650s was thus considerable. By the middle of the decade, John Pearson was preaching at St. Clement Eastcheap, Bruno Ryves at Lincoln's Inn, Anthony Farindon at Milk Street, while John Evelyn frequently heard sermons by George Wild and John Hewitt at St. Gregory's.²⁶ St. Gregory's, like St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf and St. Mary Magdalene, Milk Street, served as a hub of episcopalian activity throughout the decade, conducting prayer book services and hosting a number of celebrated episcopalian preachers.²⁷ The likes of Nathaniel Hardy and Thomas Fuller, meanwhile, could frequently be heard delivering set-piece sermons in a variety of pulpits across the city, while Hardy was also the permanent minister at St. Dionis Backchurch during these years.²⁸

This situation was made possible by the *de facto* toleration episcopalians enjoyed from republican authorities, especially after Oliver Cromwell was installed as Lord Protector in 1653. Cromwell's policy of 'healing and settling' and his eagerness to champion 'an evangelical Protestant ecumenism' initially fostered a reluctance to persecute religious groups who were prepared to live peacefully, and this included conservatives as well as radical sects.²⁹ Thus, despite the claims of 'sufferers' like Taylor and Stampe that the Church of England's clergy had been almost universally 'expell'd and banished', the situation was in reality far less clear-cut. In fact, Tai Liu is surely correct to claim that, in London at least, 'the Anglican tradition had re-established itself ... long before the return of the monarchy', and

²⁶ BL, Add. MS 78364, fos. 34v, 41r-v; *DJE*, III, 169, 183. Evelyn claimed that 'the use of the old Liturgy &c' was tolerated by 'the Ruling Powers' at St. Gregory's: *DJE*, III, 150.

²⁷ *DJE*, III, 95.

²⁸ See, for example, Thomas Fuller, *The just mans funeral, Lately delivered in a sermon at Chelsey, before several persons of honour and worship* (1649); *idem*, *A sermon preached at St. Clemens Danes at the funeral of Mr. George Heycock* (1657); Nathaniel Hardy, *Divinity in mortality ... a sermon preached at the funerals of Mr Richard Goddard late minister of the parish of St Gregories by Pauls* (1653); *idem*, *A divine prospective ... In a funerall sermon preached at Katharine Creechurch* (1649).

²⁹ Paul Hardacre, *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague, 1956), pp. 106-9; John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689* (Harlow, 2000), p. 147.

this makes the lack of attention given to the activities of the loyalist clergymen who continued to minister publicly during the Interregnum all the more remarkable.³⁰

‘To Undeceive the People’: The Pulpit and Continued Ministry

What encouraged these clergymen to remain in, or seek out, livings in the Interregnum Church? Their perspective and priorities evidently differed from those like Henry Hammond or Gilbert Sheldon, who ‘would have no dealings with what they regarded as an illicit and schismatic Church, and instead chose exile abroad or service in England as private chaplains or schoolmasters to the upper classes’.³¹ Certainly, the need to survive and subsist was a significant consideration. Whereas Peter Heylyn, a vociferous critic of episcopalian ‘conformists’ in the later 1650s, was able to rely on the financial support of his relatives and retire to comfortable residences at Minster Lovell and Abingdon, Anthony Farindon’s ejection by parliament in 1644 had initially brought him, his wife, and his six children close to starvation.³² ‘How doe many’, asked Thomas Fuller, deprived of his living of Broadwindsor during the First Civil War, ‘subsist now adayes of nothing, and wandering in a wilderness of want (except they have Manna miraculously from Heaven) they have no meate on earth from their own meanes?’³³

It is doubtless true too that there were some clergymen who were more able to accommodate themselves to the republican regimes because they were, ultimately, less ardent in their devotion to king, bishops, or pre-war liturgical forms. George Hall, son of Joseph Hall and later bishop of Chester, told his fellow clergymen that, ‘as Christians’, they were

³⁰ Liu, *Puritan London*, p. 143.

³¹ Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Identity’, p. 474.

³² Milton, *Laudian and Royalist*, p. 147; W.B. Patterson, ‘Farindon, Anthony’, *ODNB*.

³³ Thomas Fuller, *Good Thoughts in Worse Times* (1647), p. 116.

‘bound to make all faire offers for [unity], and to lay downe all our Animosities’. ‘Why should some,’ he asked, ‘in the height of their zeal, for Liturgy, supposeth there can be no service of God, but where that is entirely used?’³⁴ Ralph Brownrigg, bishop of Exeter, met with presbyterians and Independents in 1652 to explore common ground and would later be criticised by Edward Hyde for ‘not being zealous enough for the church’. John Gauden was another who appealed for Protestant unity and whose enthusiasm for episcopacy appears to have been less than wholehearted.³⁵ In political terms, although Peter Heylyn had no living during the 1650s, some active clergy may have come to share his frustration with the Stuart monarchs and to regard the Protectorate as a legitimate, quasi-monarchical alternative to a restoration of Charles II.³⁶ Others were like the Gloucestershire minister John Marston who, despite some inclination towards royalism in the 1640s, ‘was never prepared to support the crown at the expense of his own safety’ and openly declared his allegiance to the Commonwealth after 1649.³⁷

It is a central contention of this chapter, however, that continuing to minister despite the official proscription of the Church of England could represent a positive, reasoned choice, rather than merely reflecting an absence of courage or conviction. Moreover, the conscious rejection of exile or withdrawal was partly based on the perceived significance of preaching at a time when the pulpit was believed to have been instrumental in undermining political stability and religious orthodoxy. ‘These times are preaching times’, declared the royalist minister Abraham Wright in 1655, puritans having ‘preach’d Congregations into Armies, and

³⁴ George Hall, *Gods appearing for the tribe of Levi, improved in a sermon* (1655), ‘To the Reader’, unpaginated, 27.

³⁵ Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity’, pp. 24, 25.

³⁶ See Milton, *Laudian and Royalist*, pp. 162–9.

³⁷ Jacqueline Eales, ‘The Clergy and Allegiance at the Outbreak of the English Civil Wars: The Case of John Marston of Canterbury’, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 132 (2012), pp. 83–110, at p. 101.

Churches into Garrisons; making the Pulpit a Magazine or Store-house for the War'.³⁸ For other royalists, these preachers were the authors of schism and heresy, as well as rebellion. As early as 1642, Henry Ferne had declared that "'Tis the spirituall whoredome of Lay-Preachers, and Shee-Divines that hath procreated these monsters in Religion, that hath engendered this Viporous Brood of Schismaticall Tenets, which like the Aegyptian flies darken the aire, blind the eyes of the vulgar with sencelesse ignorance'.³⁹

According to royalist and episcopalian clerics in the 1650s, then, the people had been, and were still being, led into religious error and political sedition by a toxic admixture of wilful deception and base ignorance. There was, accordingly, a need 'to undeceive the people, and take them off from their Superstitious idolizing of this kinde of Preaching'.⁴⁰ Andrew Pettegree has argued of those 'Nicodemite' Protestants who remained within the Marian Church that 'their duty to their own consciences was not outweighed by an obligation to continue to minister to their flocks; particularly as any successor was almost certain to be more enthusiastic for the reinstated Mass'.⁴¹ The same can be said of the conservative clergymen who retained livings in the Interregnum Church: they were deeply reluctant to leave their flocks unguarded and their pulpits vacant with 'Superstition, Heresies and Atheisme now raigning here'.⁴²

In 1649, for instance, Edward Hyde, the episcopalian minister and cousin of the eponymous royal councillor, warned of the need to protect 'the Church of Christ, against those wolves in sheeps clothing, those Godly seditious men, which should arise after [our] departing, and

³⁸ Abraham Wright, *Five sermons in five different styles, or waies of preaching* (1656), unpag. See also, *A proclamation for a generall fast to be held throughout this kingdome on the second Friday in every moneth* (Oxford, 1643).

³⁹ Henry Ferne, *The sovereignty of Kings* (1642), sig. A1v.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, sig. A4v, my emphasis.

⁴¹ Pettegree, 'Nicodemism', p. 102.

⁴² Peter Bales, *Infirmity inducing to conformity* (1650), p. 16. On the role of the minister in keeping his flock from errors and heresies, see Robert Mossom, *The preachers tripartite* (1657), sig. A2v and *passim*; BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 39v.

‘speak perverse things, to draw away disciples after them’.⁴³ ‘If hypocrisie get into the Pulpit,’ he continued ‘’tis no wonder to finde it in the pew ... no wonder if the laity forsake all religion’.⁴⁴ This prospect could cause consternation for those loyalist ministers subsequently forced out of their livings during the 1650s. Thomas Parker preached a farewell sermon to his congregation at Wakefield in 1656, having been ejected by a Protectoral ordinance of the previous autumn. Parker lamented how the ‘Church of England’ was now ‘abused, branded, and struggles under pangs and agonies’. He warned his audience that ‘after my departure, you will meet with Foxes and Wolves’ who believe ‘their Enthusiasms of greater concernment then the Ordinances of Christ’. He used his final address to remind the congregation of the fundamentals of the Christian faith, which he hoped would insulate them against the deceiving tendencies of predatory preachers.⁴⁵ The laity shared this sense of anxiety at the dearth of loyal, orthodox preaching. John Evelyn complained in August 1656 that ‘the Parish churches [are] fill[e]d with sectaries of all sorts, Blasphemous & Ignorant Mechanics usurping the Pulpets every where’, while from his cell in Durham Castle the staunch royalist Sir John Gibson prayed that God would ‘increase the number of true Preachers’.⁴⁶

In November 1652 Robert Sanderson, the rector of Boothby Pagnell in Lincolnshire and future bishop of Lincoln, wrote to a fellow episcopalian, explaining his reasoning and strategy for holding onto his living after the Regicide.⁴⁷ Sanderson was prepared to concede more ground to the new regime than many of his fellow episcopalians within the state church: he had taken – and defended – the Engagement and horrified Henry Hammond by modifying the Book of Common Prayer for use within his parish.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, the justification

⁴³ Edward Hyde, *The true catholicks tenure* (1662), p. 3.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 15–16.

⁴⁵ Thomas Parker, *A farewell sermon preached in Wake-field* (1656), pp. 2, 16–17.

⁴⁶ *DJE*, III, 181; BL, Add. MS 37719, fo. 202v.

⁴⁷ On Sanderson’s churchmanship and enduring hatred of puritanism, see Lake, ‘Serving God and the Times’.

⁴⁸ *The Works of Robert Sanderson*, ed. William Jacobson (6 vols., Oxford, 1854), V, 20–35; Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, ‘The Restoration of the Church of England, 1660–1662: Ordination, Re-ordination and

Sanderson gave for continuing to minister is revealing and was shared by those less amenable to compromise. He was not, he explained, prepared to deliver

over the sheep of Christ, that lately were under the hands of faithful shepherds, into the custody of ravening wolves, when such guides shall be set over the several Congregations as will be sure to misteach them one way or other, viz. by instilling into them Puritanical and Superstitious Principles, that they may the more securely exercise their Presbyterian tyranny over their judgements, consciences, persons, and estates; or else, by setting up new lights before them, to lead them into a maze of Anabaptistical confusion and frenzy.⁴⁹

More importantly, for Sanderson the shrewd preacher could still make good use of the pulpit to counteract the insidious spread of these puritanical principles and reaffirm the true doctrine of the Church of England:

We shall in our Sermons take occasion now and then, where it may be pertinent, either to discover the weakness of the Puritan principles and tenets to the people; or to show out of some passages and expressions in the Common Prayer Book, the consonancy of those observations we have raised from the Text, with the judgement of the Church of England.⁵⁰

This sense of the pulpit as a crucial channel for opposing the recent revolutionary changes and preserving a residual affection for traditional structures was integral to the rationale for persevering in the clerical vocation. Many royalist and episcopalian clergymen depicted their role in the Interregnum Church as analogous to the Old Testament prophets, struggling and

Conformity', in Stephen Taylor and Grant Tapsell (eds.), *The Nature of the English Revolution Revisited: Essays in Honour of John Morrill* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 197–232, at p. 210.

⁴⁹ Sanderson, *Works*, V, 47–8.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

outnumbered by the false teachers of Baal. John Allington was rector of Wardley-Cum-Belton in Rutland until 1655 and published several works decrying the Regicide and proscription of the Prayer Book in these years. He reflected shortly before his ejection that ‘those achievements which the Prophets of Baal might cry up for glorious providences ... Elijah and Micaiah could not rebuke and prophesy against’, since there was ‘but one of them to 400 Baals’.⁵¹ However, this only made the duty of the righteous minister even more important. While acknowledging that ‘such is the wickedness of ungodly men, that if a [minister] speak the truth, he must presently suffer’, John Hewitt nonetheless insisted that ‘one Micaiah, speaking from the Oracle of God, is better than many Balaams offering sacrifices, and cursed devotions from enchanted Altars; whose great conspiracy is only to work the ruine of God’s people’.⁵² Hewitt was the minister of St. Gregory’s in London and an ardent royalist who would eventually be executed in 1658 for his part in a plot to foment an armed uprising against the Protectoral government.⁵³ At his execution, he recalled how Oliver Cromwell ‘was pleased to tell me I was like a flaming Torch in the midst of a sheaf of Corn: he meaning, I being a publick Preacher, was able to set the Citie on fire by sedition and cumbustions, and promoting design’.⁵⁴

In June 1646, shortly after the fall of Oxford to the parliamentary armies, the poet and royalist cleric Jasper Mayne preached a sermon ‘against false prophets’ in St. Mary the Virgin, taking as his text Ezekiel 22:28: ‘Her Prophets have daubed them with untampered mortar, seeing vanity, and divining lyes unto them, saying, thus saith the Lord God, when the Lord hath not spoken’. Mayne identified the puritan clergy as the means by which the people

⁵¹ John Allington, *A continuation of the grand conspiracy by the insolent usurper and the regal intruder* (1660), p. 75.

⁵² John Hewitt, *Nine select sermons preached upon special occasions in the Parish Church of St. Gregories by St. Pauls* (1658), p. 167. See also: *SF*, IV, 57.

⁵³ See *The horrible and bloody conspiracy* (1658), esp. p. 8; William Prynne, *Beheaded Dr. John Hewytts ghost pleading* (1660); Jason Peacey, ‘Hewitt, John’, *ODNB*.

⁵⁴ *The true and exact speech and prayer of Doctor John Hewytt* (1658), p. 4.

had been deceived, and parliament's seditious intentions concealed beneath a veneer of righteousness. However, the most significant aspect of Mayne's sermon for understanding the participation of loyal episcopalians in the Interregnum church is the antidote he suggested for this omnipresent false prophecy. He urged his audience – comprised of his fellow loyalist clergymen – to 'preach Truth & Peace, and sound Doctrine to the People, with the same sedulity, and care, as they preach Discord, Variance and Strife. If this course be taken, and be with fidelity pursued, it will ... be in our power to dis-inchant the People'.⁵⁵

Orthodox, loyal preaching was then, for some episcopalians at least, the appropriate response to a revolution in Church and state that had been instigated in the first instance from the pulpit. For Edward Hyde, failure 'to preach to the people to fear God and the King, according to the Scriptures' would be 'to Apostatize from Religion and Loyalty'.⁵⁶ Similarly, John Hewitt insisted that 'the Truth of God will remain pure... and therefore we should defend it with all our might, for the truth will spread itself, though there be no other place but Pulpits to declare it in nor no other witnessing but by preaching, nor no witnesses but Prophets'.⁵⁷ Nathaniel Hardy agreed: 'when horrid impieties are reigning', he asked at the funeral of his fellow episcopalian minister Richard Goddard, 'who but an Ezekiel should warn the people? And when heresies are raging, who but a John should defend the truth?'.⁵⁸ He therefore urged his clerical auditors, 'particularly [those] who have yet the liberty of their Function', to 'endeavour as much as may be by our diligent Preaching ... to make up the losse of this our Brother'.⁵⁹

Others employed metaphors to describe the pulpit in these years that stressed its restorative, remedial powers. For Nathaniel Hardy's eulogist, his pulpit 'was a well of Water, where

⁵⁵ Jasper Mayne, *A sermon against false prophets* (Oxford, 1646), p. 37.

⁵⁶ Hyde, *The true Catholicks tenure*, p. 22.

⁵⁷ Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, p. 194.

⁵⁸ Hardy, *Divinity in mortality*, p. 1.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

many an honest Jacob drank’, while in an especially revealing account written on the eve of the Restoration, Matthew Griffith explained why he had chosen to re-enter active ministry in the 1650s after his initial sequestration the previous decade. The nation, he explained, had ‘begun to gangrene’ without the sequestered clergy:

And when some of us became sensible thereof, we took the confidence (being partly embolden’d by the connivance of the higher Powers that then were) to fall on the exercise of our Ministerial Function again, in such poor Parishes, as would admit us. Then I saw that it was high time, not onely to prescribe strong purgative medicines in the Pulpit ... fit and necessary to help carry away, and by degrees, the incredible confluence of ill humours and all such malignant matter as offended.⁶⁰

An important corollary of this is that several clergymen were prepared to criticise not only those who refused to speak the truth in the hope of protecting their livings, but those who had abandoned their flock altogether by opting for exile. During the Second Civil War, Paul Knell, a former royalist army chaplain, had castigated ‘you of the Clergie ... for temporizing, for fearing the face of man, for not daring to speak truth’.⁶¹ On the other hand, nearly a decade later, Thomas Fuller condemned those men who ‘plead themselves priviledged and exempted from serving their Generation, because of the badness thereof’. Fuller had served as a chaplain in Sir Ralph Hopton’s army during the First Civil War but was appointed perpetual curate at Waltham Abbey, Essex, in 1648 and continued to preach in London pulpits intermittently through the 1650s. Perhaps Fuller had in mind the likes of Hammond and Sheldon when he declared that ‘the Church and State he liveth in, may justly commence a suit’ against the man who ‘immureth himself in a Cloyster, crying his life up for an high

⁶⁰ Matthew Griffith, *The fear of God and the king* (1660), sig. A3r.

⁶¹ Paul Knell, *Israel and England Paralleled* (1648), p. 18.

piece of holiness, burying both his parts and his person therein'.⁶² Similarly, John Hewitt considered the question of 'whether it be lawful for [a man] to fly, or to stand still and undergo the cruelty of his adversaries'. He concluded that 'a blessed Minister of the Word and Sacraments ... must defend his flock, for the Church must not be forsaken for the fear of undergoing the wrath of men, lest his flight should betray them to errors and heresie'.⁶³

Those who actively and publicly preached during the Interregnum would, by contrast, subsequently look back on their own activities in these years with pride. Nathaniel Hardy, for instance, reflected in 1662 that he had thought himself 'many wayes obliged to be among the small number of those who did in their Pulpits earnestly deprecate, and vehemently declaim against' parliament's treatment of the king.⁶⁴ Two years before, Robert Mossom had dedicated a sermon to the newly-restored Charles II, 'from that Heart and Hand, which in all the variety of State-commotions, hath still own'd, and *publickly* own'd, the duty and devotion of Loyalty and Love'.⁶⁵ Although dating from the mid-1640s, the preaching diary of Thomas Holbech, composed after his ejection from his living at Epping, Essex, in late 1643, similarly illustrates how preaching could constitute an act of defiance in the face of persecution. The diary consisted of a list by date of the texts and locations at which Holbech had preached up until 1645 – often in the household of the earl of Middlesex at Copped Hall but occasionally in other, more public arenas around Cambridge or London. 'On Novemb[er] 4th 1643 being Saturday The Sequestration of my living was made knowne unto me', Holbech declared in a brief foreword: 'Every Sunday since I have beene in place of imployment as followeth'.⁶⁶

The juxtaposition of these two sentences conveys a sense of the minister's pride not only in continuing to discharge his vocation but in having thereby confounded the attempts of

⁶² Fuller, *A sermon preached at St. Clemens Danes*, pp. 552–3.

⁶³ Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, p. 171.

⁶⁴ Nathaniel Hardy, *A loud call to great mourning* (1662), sig. A2v.

⁶⁵ Robert Mossom, *England's gratulation for the King* (1660), unpag., 'To the King's Most Excellent Majesty', my emphasis.

⁶⁶ Kent Archives, Maidstone, U269 Q13/6.

parliament to silence him. Holbech would later explain to William Sancroft that he had resolved to continue ‘on my course without the least fayling either of service, sermons or com[m]unions in this solemenity, & upon the first of this present I preached for ought I know my last’.⁶⁷

Thomas Swadlin, meanwhile, published a collection of twelve sermons in 1661 which he claimed had been delivered on each anniversary of the Regicide since 1649. Sequestered in the early 1640s, Swadlin may have officiated for a time at Marylebone parish church during the 1650s.⁶⁸ After the Restoration he petitioned Charles II more than once for the restitution of his original living, and these published sermons seem to have been an attempt to demonstrate his immaculate track-record of loyalty to the crown.⁶⁹ In the volume’s first sermon, apparently preached in 1649, Swadlin declared that he would now publicly rail against the new powers for as long as he was able. It was his duty ‘not only in the Compunction of my Soul, to bewaile the losse of a Royal Person; but also in the Objurgation of my Tongue, by chiding those who were so Disloyal, as not to be afraid to put forth their hands to destroy the Anointed of the Lord’. On the other hand, ‘they that have more respect to their Posterity then to their Eternity, may consent by silence’.⁷⁰ Whether Swadlin was quite as fearless as he later claimed to have been is a matter for debate: what is significant is that here we have a minister seeking to procure favour with the Restoration regime not by suppressing his history of active ministry during the Interregnum but by drawing attention to it.

Despite the claims of some contemporaries and later historians then, it does not seem to have been universally conceded that retreat and withdrawal were the only, or indeed even

⁶⁷ Bodl., MS Tanner 52, fo. 100r.

⁶⁸ *WR*, p. 59; Daniel Lysons, *The Environs of London* (4 vols., 1792–6), III, 255; BL, Add. MS 34014, fo. 5r.

⁶⁹ *CSPD*, Charles II, 1660–1, pp. 455, 581.

⁷⁰ Thomas Swadlin, *King Charles his funeral* (1661), p. 2.

permissible, responses to the disasters that had befallen the Church and the kingdom. There was a principled case that could be made by loyalist clergymen for remaining within or returning to the English Church in the late 1640s and 1650s, and the potential for a preacher to resist the new politico-religious order effectively was integral to it. How far clerics actually used the pulpit in this way – given the constraints of republican censorship and the continued threat of ejection or imprisonment – is, of course, another question. The rest of this chapter will therefore attempt to determine the ways and extent to which loyalists exploited the potential offered by the Interregnum pulpit as a platform for partisan expression or political dissent in practice.

Print, Censorship, and Criticism: The Limits of Acceptable Speech

Up until the last months of 1649, many preachers had felt able to express publicly their royalist allegiances and their contempt for the new regime. In a sermon preached on 8 July 1649 at St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf and printed soon after, Francis Riddington, sequestered rector of Foston in Leicestershire, declared himself 'a loyall subject, and long sufferer for fearing God, and honouring the King' and prayed for 'our true, and rightfull Sovereigne Charles, Sonne and Heyre to his deceased father, to be our King'.⁷¹ The very same day, Peter Bales, like Riddington an obscure royalist minister, had delivered a sermon in the churchyard of St. Pancras in which he attacked 'the King-Deposing, King-Killing, ambitious, Jesuited Independents [and] the rigid, usurping Presbyterians'.⁷²

However, Bales's sermon, not printed until 1650, was one of the last sermons published under the Commonwealth to articulate unconcealed royalism, as the new regime tightened its

⁷¹ Francis Riddington, *King Solomons directory* (1649), title-page, pp. 17–18; *WR*, p. 245.

⁷² Bales, *Infirmity inducing*, p. 8.

response to political dissent. On 9 July 1649, parliament declared that any minister who preached ‘against the present Government’ or made any ‘mention of Charles Stuart’ would henceforth be considered a delinquent.⁷³ Then, on 20 September, an act ‘against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books’ introduced substantial fines for those caught printing hostile publications. In targeting printers rather than writers, this act succeeded where others had failed, suppressing ‘all but a few of the most determined opponents of the Commonwealth’.⁷⁴ Printers were now forced to enter a bond of £300 ‘not to print any seditious or unlicensed books, pamphlets, or pictures, nor suffer his presses to be used for any such purpose’, and thus royalist writers were now unlikely to find a publisher willing to take the great financial risks that printing material openly hostile to the republic involved.⁷⁵ Moreover, the government showed an immediate willingness to enforce its measures against insubordinate preachers: within the space of a week in November 1649, the Council of State disciplined two clerics, one from Bristol and the other from Oldham, for ‘seditious preaching against [the] Government’.⁷⁶

Jason Peacey has argued that, under the Protectorate, ‘press control was undertaken with much greater rigour’, and this accelerated the shift away ‘from polemical tracts and pamphlets to more substantial and less overtly controversial literature’.⁷⁷ Importantly, however, neither the Rump nor the Protectoral authorities had the ability or the inclination to stamp out *all* forms of oppositional or critical literature: the predominant concern of these regimes was those statements ‘which were, strictly speaking, seditious, in the sense of

⁷³ *CJ*, VI, 257.

⁷⁴ C.H. Firth, ‘Royalists under the Protectorate’, *EHR*, 52 (1937), pp. 634–48, at p. 646; Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 173–8.

⁷⁵ *CSPD*, Commonwealth, 1649–50, pp. 522–5; Whitehead, ‘Humphrey Moseley’, p. 66.

⁷⁶ *CSPD*, Commonwealth, 1650, pp. 440, 442.

⁷⁷ Jason Peacey, ‘Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?’, *History* 91 (2006), pp. 176–99, at pp. 180, 184.

promoting unrest, advocating uprisings, and inciting rebellion or assassination, as well perhaps as promoting heresy'.⁷⁸

Nonetheless, the result of this legislation was to make both publishers and clergymen far more trepidatious about producing royalist and anti-republican sermons, especially in print, that lacked sufficient deniability. Political criticism and discussion now had to be handled far more delicately, with rhetorical strategies and 'dog-whistle' techniques employed to communicate messages to sympathetic audiences while simultaneously avoiding the ire of the republican authorities. This process is illustrated by an anecdote recalled after the Restoration by the judge Thomas Raymond. Raymond remembered how, at some point following the Regicide, 'it was my chance to be in London at sermon in St. Mary Alder-Maryes Church, it being death then for any men and specially ministers to speake in vindication of that good King'. The unnamed preacher began

to aggravate the great synnes whereof wee were guilty and having instances in several greate and crying ones, "Nay", said he, "wee have put to death our King, our most gracious and good King" – at which he made a little pause (the people amazed and gazing aboute expecting the preacher should be pulled out of the pulpitt) but he added – "the Lord Jesus Christ by our sinnes and transgression".⁷⁹

Raymond here testifies not only to an acute awareness on the part of preacher and audience of the danger of political opposition in the pulpit, but to the kinds of techniques employed to circumvent these strictures. Some of these – gesture, intonation, delivery – would be lost to the historian without an auditor's testimony but the wordplay and *double entendre* are typical, and detectable, features of loyalist sermon-giving throughout the Interregnum. In a sermon preached in 1649, the bishop of Rochester, John Warner, had likewise exploited the double-

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁷⁹ *Autobiography of Thomas Raymond*, ed. Godfrey Davies (1917), pp. 59–60.

meaning of the word ‘king’ to express his horror at the regicide, while purporting to discuss the Passion story. In print, Warner even referred to Christ ambiguously as ‘Ch:’ to drive home the intended comparison with the fate of Charles I.⁸⁰

So too, the apparently vague and generalised condemnation of ‘great synnes’ by the preacher Raymond heard, which in fact had a direct political application given the context and audience, replicated a tactic that was already familiar in oppositional preaching by the Interregnum. Arnold Hunt has shown how preachers critical of early Stuart religious policy ‘managed to find ways of communicating their views indirectly’ by ‘stating a general doctrine and leaving the audience to apply it’. In this way, a preacher might ‘ensure that he could not be held responsible for any construction his listeners chose to place on his words’.⁸¹ Robert Sanderson advocated a similar technique as a means of relaying certain messages to his congregation without danger of censure:

If where we cannot safely mention the particulars expressed in the [Prayer] Book, as namely, in praying for the King, the Queen, the Royal Progeny, and the Bishops, we shall yet use in our Prayers some such general terms, and other intimations devised for the purpose, as may sufficiently convey to the understandings of the people, what our intentions are therein, and yet not be sufficient to fetch us within the compass of the Ordinance.⁸²

Sanderson’s sermon notebook contained a list of texts suitable for times of ‘generall calamity’, when the ‘church [is] distressed by her enemies’. This included Judges 5:31 (‘so let all thine enemies perish O Lord’) and 2 Chronicles 20:12 (‘O our G[od], wilt thou not judge them?’): texts that suggest Sanderson was preaching to his congregation at Boothby

⁸⁰ Warner, *Devilish conspiracy*, pp. 21–3.

⁸¹ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 297, 304.

⁸² Sanderson, *Works*, V, 56–7.

Pagnall a message that combined criticism of those who had dismantled the Church of England with strategic ambiguity.⁸³

Here, then, was one way that loyalist ministers might safely articulate their opposition to the new religious and political regime. Thomas Tuke had been an outspoken royalist supporter in the 1640s, sequestered and imprisoned in 1643 for preaching against those who gave money to parliament and condemning ‘all Traitors, Rebels and turbulent Spirits’.⁸⁴ In 1651, Tuke printed *The Israelites promise*, a sermon he had first preached at Tattershall in Lincolnshire before his patron, Elizabeth Clinton, countess of Lincoln. Advertising his work on its title-page as an uncontroversial ‘sermon of serving and obeying God’, Tuke nonetheless proceeded to observe in the foreword how ‘some do think Christ is not in his throne, unlesse they do sit in thrones too, and reigne after their owne devices’. He told his audience that ‘God ... is a severe Judge, and a consuming fire to all desperate Rebels and Traytors; and will turn the wicked, and all the Nations that forget him, into hell’. ‘Hypocrites, Idolaters, Atheists, profane and wicked Rebels’, he concluded, ‘shall be raised up to perpetuall shame, and everlasting miseries’.⁸⁵ This was sufficiently imprecise to protect Tuke, his words carefully selected to preserve adequate deniability: it was the preacher’s primary duty, after all, to reprove sin and incite repentance in his congregation. Any fellow loyalists among Tuke’s audience, however, would have had no difficulty identifying the target of his admonitions. The Interregnum sermons of other episcopalian royalists are likewise filled with ostensibly vague references to ‘the evill witt of some men’ or these ‘captious times’, the ‘evil day’ that the audience were living through, when ‘the wicked swell’ and ‘the righteous man perisheth in his righteousness’.⁸⁶ In each case, the identity of the preacher, the sympathies of the

⁸³ BL, Add. MS 20066, fo. 11v.

⁸⁴ WR, p. 60.

⁸⁵ Thomas Tuke, *The Israelites promise* (1651), sig. A2r, pp. 18, 23.

⁸⁶ Bodl., MS Rawl. C 795, fo. 4v; MS Eng. Poet. E 30, fo. 103v; SF, III, 345; Hardy, *A divine prospective*, p. 2; *The Collected Sermons of Thomas Fuller*, ed. J.E. Bailey and W.E.A. Axon (2 vols., 1891), I, 520.

audience, and the occasion of delivery worked to give these words a far more subversive construction than may initially appear.

The example of John Allington, meanwhile, reveals a great deal about what preachers and authorities considered to be the limits of acceptable speech, how these constraints shaped the way sermons were composed and presented, and the responsiveness of lay audiences to oppositional sermon literature. Allington was educated at Cambridge and during the early 1650s was rector at Wardley-cum-Belton in Rutland. Although he seems to have been officially sequestered at some point during the 1640s – publishing *A brief apologie for the sequestered clergie* in 1649 – he was finally expelled from this living in 1655 for persistent use of the Prayer Book. He became a friend of John Evelyn and Jeremy Taylor during the Interregnum and would later be appointed a prebend of Lincoln Cathedral after the Restoration.⁸⁷ Allington's first sermon collection was entitled *The grand conspiracy of the members against the minde, of Jewes against their king* and apparently consisted of four sermons preached the previous decade. *The grand conspiracy* is striking simply for the number of editions it went through during the Interregnum. Two editions were printed in both 1653 and 1654, while subsequent editions were produced in 1655 and 1657. Each one was printed for the royalist bookseller Richard Royston, for sale in his shop at the Angel in Ivy Lane.

The titular sermon was superficially concerned with spiritual edification and the duties of the individual Christian: whether 'we ought to side with the Mind' or 'the outward sense, and corporall Members of the body', 'whether the law of the supreamest or of the lowest portion of the soul ought to sway the whole man'.⁸⁸ As the pun on 'members' indicates, however, this

⁸⁷ *LJE*, I, 143.

⁸⁸ John Allington, *The grand conspiracy of the members against the minde, of Jewes against their king, foure sermons* (1653), pp. 2–3, 8

was a façade, allowing Allington to criticise retrospectively the rebellious parliamentary MPs whose actions had ultimately brought about the Regicide. The relationship between the mind and the body was depicted as analogous to the relationship between the king and parliament: ‘that power and portion of the soul in which this Image of God is, that must needs be the supremest, noblest, and chief commanding portion, in that doubtlesse (if in any) there must reside the power of Law, War, and direction in all proceedings’.⁸⁹ These parallels were then drawn out by referencing political bodies and theory not as the main focus of discussion, but as apparently innocuous, helpful comparisons illuminating the central pastoral message: ‘the minde is (*as we have sworn our Sovereigne is*) the onely supream, sin we needs must, should we not follow her even in a wrong direction’. ‘For, as in all Monarchies’, Allington observed elsewhere, ‘it is the Law and Order of God Almighty that Subjects receive from, and not give unto their Sovereigne Laws; even so it is the Law of God, the mind unto the members, not the members unto the mind prescribe a Law’.⁹⁰

Realising that such analogies strayed close to the wind, however, Allington prudently inserted reminders that he, of course, had no intention of meddling in contemporary political issues: ‘I must not forget that my Text is between the mind and the Members, and that Rebellion at this time concerns me no farther, but only as it respects the outward and inward man, the Monarchy and Government of every good and regenerative soule’.⁹¹ Annabel Patterson has argued that a distinguishing feature of the ‘hermeneutics of censorship’ in early Stuart England was an ‘emphasis on the importance of authorial intention in controlling meaning, its disavowal of allusion, its appeal against selective reading’.⁹² In this respect, Allington’s calculated denials are another instance of the ways in which royalist clerics

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 15, my emphasis.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁹² Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, WI, 1984), p. 104.

imitated the pre-war pulpit rhetoric that puritan adversaries had used to criticise the Caroline political and religious establishment.

Despite these precautions, Allington's meaning seems to have been effectively transmitted to his fellow royalists. On 27 August 1654, John Evelyn attended a sermon preached by Allington at Wardley, while visiting acquaintances in Northamptonshire. Evelyn noted that it was 'an excellent discourse' and identified Allington as 'he who published those bold Sermons of the Members warring against the mind, or the *Jewes Crucifying Christ*: applied to the wiccked *Regicides* for which he was ruin'd'.⁹³ At no point, however, had Allington's sermon explicitly mentioned the 'wiccked Regicides' or made a direct application to the contemporary events. Indeed, he was careful to disavow any such intention. Rather, Evelyn himself was evidently able to make the application and understand the real meaning of *The grand conspiracy* in spite of the rhetorical techniques and strategic disclaimers with which Allington had hoped to protect himself from official censure. Nor, importantly, is Evelyn correct in saying that Allington was 'ruin'd' for the sermon: he had been officially sequestered prior to its publication and was only actually removed two years later for his liturgical practices. Royston and Allington were able to print five more editions of *The grand conspiracy* after its initial publication in 1653, seemingly without any impediment from the authorities. This is not to say that the authorities would not have understood Allington's message, rather that they were more perturbed by works that eschewed the kinds of precautions that he had taken: the kind of 'directly obvious ... immediately topical criticism' that Kevin Sharpe has claimed provoked censorship at the Caroline court.⁹⁴

⁹³ *DJE*, III, 134. Evelyn owned a copy of *The grand conspiracy*, according to his 1684 library catalogue: BL Add. MS 78632, fo. 25r.

⁹⁴ Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 37.

In one intriguing instance, we have an episcopalian preacher with royalist sympathies talking through his intentions in preaching a sermon and the precautionary measures he took first in pulpit and then in print. Writing in his late seventeenth-century autobiography, the Williamite bishop of Ely, Simon Patrick, recalled how, as a young man in 1657, he had been ‘appointed before I left Cambridge to preach a fast sermon at St. Mary’s’. Patrick admitted that he

was so stirred against the hypocrisy of the faction, who had lately decimated those loyal persons who were admitted before to compound for their delinquency (as they called it) that I made a vehement discourse against the hypocrisy of fasting and prayer, when we continue to be unjust, and oppress our neighbours.

Patrick then decided to print his sermon ‘under a feigned name’ – ‘Ric. Patius’ – and later expanded it into a book entitled *The Jewish Hypocrisy*. In the sermon, Patrick attacked the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, ‘who fasted indeed twice every week, but were still full of covetousness, rapine, and excess’.⁹⁵ Although we know that he employed the analogy to attack the sequestration and decimation policies of the Cromwellian government, he nonetheless, like Allington, directly denied this application in the sermon. ‘I do not take upon me’, he claimed, ‘to be as one of those prophets, nor to say that our nation is guilty of all these sins, and that our case is exactly parallel to that of the Jewish people’.⁹⁶ He simply invited every man ‘to enter into his own heart, and consider where there be any violence in his hands’ – any application to the current political climate was thus on the part of the hearer and not the preacher.⁹⁷ However, again there is evidence that the intended targets of the sermon and its partisan message were evident to its readers and hearers. When a man later

⁹⁵ *The Works of Simon Patrick*, ed. Anthony Taylor (9 vols., Oxford, 1858), IX, 418.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, VII, 448–9.

⁹⁷ See also Thomas Cartwright, *Gods arraignment of Adam: declared in a sermon* (1659), sig. A2r: ‘it was delivered in as general terms as I could think upon, that so they who are angry might accuse themselves’.

accused Patrick of presbyterian sympathies in the presence of John Dolben, Dolben apparently told him to read *The Jewish Hypocrisy* and reconsider his opinion. Having done so, the man confessed to Dolben his surprise that ‘the Presbyterians did not tear him [i.e. Patrick] to pieces’.⁹⁸

While these sermons could effectively communicate a preacher’s opposition to the new status quo and undermine the aspirations of the republic to legitimacy, it was evidently understood by most that encouraging violent resistance was a step too far. This chapter will argue that there is an important distinction to be made between what was being said in the pulpit and what actually made it into print, but there is evidence that, even privately, few clerics were convinced armed conflict was the way forward. John Vyner, for example, warned his congregation not to attempt to relieve their afflictions by ‘unlawfull means’, and even the forthright Allington insisted that royalists should ‘learn patiently to beare the yোক of ... a perverse King’.⁹⁹ A notable exception, however, is provided by John Hewitt, whose explicit incitement to violence against the authorities is an anomaly in printed royalist sermons during the 1650s. Hewitt himself was unique in embroiling himself in plots to restore the king, for which he was executed in 1657. Nonetheless, his sermons are significant in showing again the survival of pulpit royalism long after the regicide and that even the most incendiary material could be smuggled into sermon collections, albeit towards the end of the Protectorate, if these publications were presented in the correct manner.

Interregnum sermon collections often included a foreword, stressing the uncontroversial nature of the volume and the author’s peaceable, irenic intentions. The editors of a posthumous volume of sermons preached by Hewitt at St. Gregory’s claimed that ‘here lurks

⁹⁸ Patrick, *Works*, VII, 431.

⁹⁹ Christ Church Library, Oxford, MS 451, unfo.; Allington, *A continuation*, p. 45. See also Tuke, *Israels promise*, p. 20. I owe my knowledge of the notebook containing Vyner’s sermons to Anthony Milton.

no Snake under these Verdant Herbs ... in this inclosed Garden growes no Root of Schisme, no fruit of Disobedience' and urged readers to 'lay aside all partiall interests, and [then] we are bold to presume, that thou canst not but with unspeakable profit give them perusal'.¹⁰⁰ This collection, they claimed, was printed merely for 'the eternal welfare of every soul that shall peruse [it]'.¹⁰¹ The individual sermons were given titles that depoliticised and dehistoricised them, divorcing them from the original context and audience that would have made much more explicit the partisan credentials of the preacher: 'A Funeral Sermon'; 'A Sermon on St. Thomas Day'; 'On the Resurrection'. Hewitt's first sermon addressed 'mercy and judgement', discussing the extent of human corruption after the Fall – a subject that might seem to epitomise the 'universal', inoffensive character professed in the foreword.

By the volume's fifth sermon, however, unmistakably royalist sentiments begin to come through. Detailing 'the errors and mislookings of the times', Hewitt condemns 'the grosse opinions of those that say the Scepter of Christ, and the power of earthly Kings stand in opposition to one another, and thereupon cry down all rule and authority, saying like the heathen, Let us break their bands in sunder'. 'We must obey the temporal Lord for his sake who is the Heavenly Lord,' he continues, before making a startling and incendiary appeal for active resistance to the regime: true Christians are those 'who in defence of lawfull Superiours with their swords in their hands, had rather die fighting, then betray their liberty by a cowardly resignation of their lives and fortunes'.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, sig. A4; unpag., 'Epistle to the Reader'.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, unpag., 'Epistle to the Reader'.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 108–9. See pp. 168 and 185 for other instances of Hewitt's violent rhetoric, and a revealing reference to the Curse of Meroz.

The Career of Anthony Farindon

Provocative appeals such as Hewitt's were certainly exceptional in print, but it is important to note that the printed record alone may not always be an entirely reliable guide to what was being said in the Interregnum pulpit. By focusing primarily on a single case-study, this section will suggest that preachers were often bolder in their political expression and prepared to eschew the safeguards discussed when they had no intention of seeing their words published. Still more importantly perhaps, keeping the causes of royalism and episcopalianism alive from the pulpit did not necessarily demand direct criticism of the new powers, and this section will also show how preachers conveyed in their sermons a theology calculated to preserve the laity in their steadfast allegiance to the old politico-religious order.

Born in Sonning, Berkshire, in 1598, Anthony Farindon was admitted as a scholar to Trinity College, Oxford, in 1612. According to Anthony Wood, Farindon was regarded as 'a noted Preacher in [Oxford], an eminent Tutor in the College, and a worthy example to be imitated by all'.¹⁰³ Eventually proceeding BD in 1629, he became vicar of Bray in 1634 and, with the approval of Archbishop William Laud, was appointed divinity reader in the royal chapel at Windsor five years later. Laud doubtless approved of the tenor of Farindon's theology: later sermons suggest that he remained committed throughout his life to the anti-Calvinist doctrine and ceremonial worship that had proved such controversial features of the ecclesiastical reforms introduced during the 1630s.¹⁰⁴ His Laudian churchmanship and royalist political sympathies saw him ejected from his living by parliament during the First Civil War, after which he and his family were left on the brink of starvation, dependent on the charity of

¹⁰³ *AO*, III, 457.

¹⁰⁴ For example, Farindon claimed that practices such as kneeling and bowing were 'as inseparable from religion as light is from the sun' and claimed that churches should be 'adorned and beautified' so that God could be worshipped in 'the beauty of holiness'. See Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 297–8.

friends like Gilbert Sheldon.¹⁰⁵ However, in April 1653, Farindon was asked to be lecturer at St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street.¹⁰⁶

How had this come about? Until 1650, the minister at Milk Street had been Thomas Case, a presbyterian and staunch supporter of parliament. The leading parishioners in the 1640s shared Case's political and religious outlook: men like Richard Aldworth, Robert Story, and Francis Waterhouse were all presbyterians who served as Common Councilmen at some point during the decade.¹⁰⁷ However, Case opposed the trial of Charles I in January 1649 and the following year was ejected from Milk Street for refusing to take the Engagement pledging loyalty to the new Commonwealth. Thereafter, the parish had no full-time minister for a time, relying instead on Thomas Manton, another presbyterian, to provide weekly lectures.¹⁰⁸ Then, at some point in the early 1650s, Sir John Robinson moved into the parish. Robinson was a wealthy merchant and nephew of William Laud, reckoned by one contemporary to be 'as great a Cavalier as was in England'.¹⁰⁹ Although he seems not to have taken any active role in the Civil Wars, Robinson would work hard to secure a Stuart restoration after the death of Oliver Cromwell and was implicated in a royalist plot during 1659. His influence at Milk Street seems to have grown steadily after his arrival and, at a vestry meeting on 10 April 1653, it was agreed that 'Farington, Mr Robinsons friend, should preach till the parish doe tack care for p[ro]viding' a permanent minister. It is unclear how unanimously this decision was taken, though the fact that contributions to Farindon's stipend were to be kept voluntary at first perhaps indicates some dissent among the vestrymen.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ Bodl. MS Tanner 56, fo. 188.

¹⁰⁶ *SF*, I, xxxiii; *Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*, pp. 92–3.

¹⁰⁷ Liu, *Puritan London*, pp. 77–8.

¹⁰⁸ LMA, P69/MRY9/B/007/MS02596/002, fos. 112r, 116r.

¹⁰⁹ M. W. Helms, 'Robinson, John', in B.D. Henning (ed.) *The House of Commons 1660–1690* (3 vols., 1983), III, 340–3, at 340.

¹¹⁰ LMA, P69/MRY9/B/001/MS02597, p. 102.

By December of the same year, Farindon had been appointed minister, and in the years that followed, his church increasingly became a centre for those loyal to both the king and the pre-war religious order. The Book of Common Prayer, although illegal, continued to be used and Anthony Wood notes that Farindon ‘preach[ed] to the great liking of the loyal party’.¹¹¹ Milk Street attracted ‘so many scholars dislocated by religious and political changes that it was known as the “scholars’ church”’.¹¹² The likes of Henry Hammond, Robert Sanderson, John Pearson, and Peter Gunning are all known to have attended Farindon’s services in these years.¹¹³ The royalist Sir John Branscomb, having come across the church by accident during one of Farindon’s sermons, thereafter went home and told his father that ‘I had found a church where he might safely goe ... and where he might heare a most excellent orthodox preacher’. The preacher’s popularity was such that ‘in a short tyme the congregation soe increased that it was very difficult to get a place’.¹¹⁴ When Sir George Whitmore, the royalist former mayor of London who was also Robinson’s father-in-law, died in 1654, he was buried at Milk Street, with Farindon delivering the funeral sermon – despite Whitmore having resided in Hoxton, over two miles away, until his death. Importantly therefore, Farindon was at Milk Street addressing a congregation largely united in their attachment to the old political and religious order.

Although he would continue to minister unmolested until early 1656, Farindon was thereafter silenced in accordance with the government proclamation of the previous year, which had debarred ejected ministers from preaching in London. This ordinance intensified feelings of disappointment and disillusionment amongst episcopalian communities, prompting a great deal of soul-searching: John Evelyn called the day it was due to come into

¹¹¹ *AO*, III, 458.

¹¹² Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, p. 297; Patterson, ‘Farindon, Anthony’.

¹¹³ *SF*, I, xli; III, 397.

¹¹⁴ *Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*, p. 93.

force ‘the mournfullest day that in my life I had seene’.¹¹⁵ Ejection also placed Farindon once again in dire financial straits, forced, in his own words, ‘to struggle with all those temptations which poverty, scorn, and contempt commonly bring along with them’.¹¹⁶ He now relied partly on the generosity of his former parishioners at Milk Street, where a collection was taken for his subsistence on at least one occasion.¹¹⁷ He also finally acceded to the wishes of his friends and patrons, that he ‘leave ... posterity some proofs of his extraordinary powers, and at the same time provide for the wants of his family’ by printing his sermons.¹¹⁸ His *XXX Sermons Lately Preached at the Parish Church of Saint Mary Magdalen Milkstreet* appeared in mid-1657 and sold well, partially alleviating his poverty in the months before his death in 1658. Two more volumes of sermons were posthumously published, in 1663 and 1674, by the executors of his will.

Meanwhile, forced to replace Farindon, the vestrymen at Milk Street made two revealing appointments. John Hewitt, the outspoken minister of St. Gregory by St. Paul who would be executed for royalist plotting just over two years later, was to ‘offitiat[e] the Lecture Every Friday untill the parish take further order’, while Thomas Cartwright was ‘unanimously chosen minister of the parish’.¹¹⁹ Cartwright was the grandson of the eponymous Elizabethan presbyterian and a recent graduate of Queen’s College, Oxford. His youth and his presbyterian lineage may help to explain why he was selected ‘unanimously’ and without any opposition from non-episcopalian parishioners. While at Oxford, however, Cartwright had in fact chosen to be episcopally ordained by bishop Robert Skinner and would, later in the 1650s, become Sir John Robinson’s chaplain.

¹¹⁵ *DJE*, III, 164.

¹¹⁶ *SF*, III, 399.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, xxxix; III, 374.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, lvii.

¹¹⁹ LMA, P69/MRY9/B/001/MS02597, p. 111.

Indeed, Robinson would arrange for Cartwright to preach at St. Paul's on 5 September 1658 – just two days after Cromwell's death – before 'the right honorable the Lord Major, aldermen, and Common-Council'. Cartwright used the opportunity to attack the hypocrisy and faux-religiosity of the magistrates, and condemned their 'corroding and satirical censures of them that differ from you in forms of worship'.¹²⁰ The sermon was printed the following year as *Gods arraignment of Adam*, with a foreword addressed to Robinson acknowledging that it had been 'expos'd to ... such uncharitable censures' that its author was now forced 'to return to your name for shelter and protection'.¹²¹ Although Cartwright admitted that he had known 'when I preach'd it, that telling the truth was not the way to insinuate into many of my Auditors affections', he had nonetheless adopted certain protective strategies: 'it was delivered in as general terms as I could think upon, that so they who are angry might accuse themselves'.¹²² By appointing Hewitt and Cartwright therefore, the parishioners at Milk Street were ensuring that the church remained a centre where those opposed to the new order could continue to hear sympathetic preaching.

Pulpit vs. Print

Farindon acknowledged in one of his Milk Street sermons that 'I confess it not safe to make too bold a descant upon those [recent] calamities', and was accordingly eager in the preface to his 1657 edition of sermons to deny any political motivation behind its publication.¹²³ His intention was only to 'strike at those common errors at which so many stumble' and 'to present ... those more necessary and essential truths, by the embracing of which we lay hold

¹²⁰ Cartwright, *Gods arraignment*, p. 21.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, sig. A2.

¹²² *Ibid.*, sig. A2r.

¹²³ *SF*, IV, 60.

on happiness'.¹²⁴ He cautiously commented on the changes in ecclesiastical government that 'it is not necessary to be under this or that discipline, though the best, further than in affection and desire: for, in the midst of the changes and chances of this world, we cannot be what we would, nor governed as we please'.¹²⁵ Furthermore, in the volume's first sermon – strategically placed, perhaps – Farindon pointedly claimed that 'I do not stand up against power', since 'when power speaks, every mouth must be stopped, logic hath no sinews, an argument no strength, antiquity no authority'.¹²⁶

Farindon was clearly eager to present himself to the authorities as harmless and to distance himself from the hapless royalist military plots that had provoked a backlash against the episcopalian clergy in 1655. Nor is this surprising: having been ejected a second time from his living, he could quite literally not afford to have his published work suppressed on grounds of sedition, and we have already seen that these types of disclaimers were commonly employed by those royalists and episcopalians who printed sermons during the Interregnum. Once again, however, one should not make the mistake of taking these statements entirely at face value, and conflating how preachers like Farindon wanted the authorities to interpret their printed sermons with what they were actually attempting to do in the pulpit.

Indeed, comparing the different editions of Farindon's sermons – one printed before, and two after, the Restoration – is highly revealing: it sheds further light on the limits of acceptable speech in Cromwellian England and suggests a wide gulf between what was being delivered in the pulpit and what actually made its way into print. Calculated to appease the authorities and appeal to as wide a readership as possible, the volume of sermons that Farindon published in 1657 was carefully assembled and edited to make his preaching seem

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 17.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 24. This comment earned Farindon a rebuke in a letter from Brian Duppa: Bodl., MS Tanner 52, fos. 207r-v.

¹²⁶ *SF*, I, 30.

as anodyne as possible. After a preface establishing his irenic aims and universal message, the opening four ‘festivall sermons’ are concerned with the Nativity, the Passion, and the Resurrection. Throughout the collection, the sermons steer clear of openly controversial topics, proclaiming, for instance, that ‘the only true religion [is] to do good and abstain from evil’ and confining any polemical attacks to ‘the Romish party’. Overt commentary on the recent turmoil is rare, and confined to lamentations that, ‘though men’s opinions in other matters had been as different as their shape and complexion, yet their agreement in the known duties of religion would have been a fence and bulwark strong enough to have kept contention from breaking in with fire and sword’.¹²⁷

At other times, Farindon actually moves pre-emptively to discourage any political readings of his sermons. His funeral sermon for the former Lord Mayor and active royalist Sir George Whitmore contains an interesting passage that may well have been revised during the editing process. Having praised Whitmore’s constancy in suffering for his beliefs, Farindon then passes up the opportunity to praise his political loyalties directly – to determine whether ‘he suffer[ed] as an evil-doer ... [or] for conscience towards God’. ‘I come not hither to dispute that,’ he explains cautiously, ‘but am willing to refer it to the great trial, which shall open every eye to behold the truth’.¹²⁸

Moreover, it seems that in at least one instance Farindon has removed particularly provocative sections of a sermon for the press. A lengthy section in a discourse on 1 Samuel 3:18 is not found in the original 1657 edition of his *XXX Sermons* but does appear in the 1672 edition of this volume.¹²⁹ In this passage, he rails against ‘all the oppressors and murderers of the world, who have been so unhappy as to be happy in bringing their bloody purposes to an

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 442–4.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 214.

¹²⁹ Compare Farindon, *XXX sermons lately preached at the parish church of Saint Mary Magdalen Milkstreet* (1657), p. 29, with *idem*, *XXXII sermons preached at the parish-church of St. Mary Magdalene Milk-street* (1672), pp. 291–8.

end ... a conquered evil is not always so evil as a victorious Philistine'. He claims that, despite his earthly prosperity, a man who is 'conquering in the field ... chasing [his enemies] before him, treading them under his feet' may in fact be on the verge of 'eternal destruction': 'they may survive the edge of the sword who amongst the bad [are] the worst'.¹³⁰ Intriguingly, the redacted section also contains Farindon's observation that, 'as Tertullian spake in another case, *In publicos hostes omnis homo miles est*, "Against traitors and common enemies every man is a soldier"'. In his *Killing noe murder*, published the same year as Farindon's volume, Edward Sexby had used precisely this extract from Tertullian to advocate Cromwell's assassination: '*Contra publicos hostes et majestatis reos, omnis homo miles est*, says Tertullian: against common enemies and those that are traitors to the commonwealth, every man is a soldier'.¹³¹ Whether or not Farindon was aware of Sexby's pamphlet, he was evidently concerned that the passage might be construed as inciting violence against the authorities.

The two decades following the Restoration saw two further collections of Farindon's sermons emerge, one published in 1663 and the second in 1674. These consisted of sermons that Farindon had not incorporated into his first collection during the Interregnum. Nicholas Tyacke and Kenneth Fincham have already noted that the 1663 edition contains 'extended discussions of reverence in divine worship and the sanctity of churches, classic Laudian themes which Farindon in 1657 had felt best to [leave] unpublished'.¹³² However, the post-Restoration editions contain much more overt and vitriolic criticism of Farindon's puritan enemies – gone are the irenic, conciliatory platitudes of the 1657 collection. There are now myriad references to these 'blackest days ... the darkest times', when 'superstition flattereth

¹³⁰ *SF*, I, 457–9.

¹³¹ David Wootton (ed.), *Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England* (Harmondsworth, 1986), p. 375.

¹³² Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 297.

... when profaneness is bold'.¹³³ Farindon castigates those who are trying to 'build up religion upon the ruins of Christianity, and to purge the church with blood; [who] count it a savoury language and the holy tongue to revile their prince'.¹³⁴ The royalist polemical tropes of the 1640s are often rehearsed, with the religious hypocrisy and deceptive use of language by the king's opponents recurring complaints. They had destroyed the Church and 'call[ed] it "the defence of the Protestant religion", as if the Papist were to be carried out upon the atheist's shoulders'.¹³⁵ The religious changes of the last decade are denounced as lacking scriptural warrant: 'must some new fancy be set up, which will not bear the light of scripture, but flieth and is scattered before it as the mist before the sun?'¹³⁶

The new civil powers are likewise inveighed against in the sermons of these post-Restoration collections, with accusations of tyranny recurring throughout both. The 1674 edition contains two sermons preached by an unnamed friend of Farindon's at Milk Street after he had been silenced in 1656. The first of these explores the question of righteous suffering, taking its text from Jeremiah 12:1: 'wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?' The anonymous preacher provocatively announces that there will 'be some (perhaps in this very congregation) ... who demand of God, why he gives them up into the hands of a tyrant, to suffer what they deserve not'.¹³⁷ Farindon himself observes elsewhere how God 'makes [the wicked] mighty in power, and to reign as kings; (and would that they did reign as kings, and not as tyrants!)' and elsewhere seems to compare Cromwell to an Old Testament tyrant, asking 'why should

¹³³ *SF*, III, 360.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 57.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.* On accusations of language manipulation during the 1640s, see Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven, 1994), pp. 35–44; Grant Tapsell, "'Parliament", "Liberty", "Taxation", "Property": The Civil War of Words in the 1640s' in *idem* and George Southcombe (eds.), *Revolutionary England, c.1630–c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes* (London, 2017), pp. 73–91.

¹³⁶ *SF*, III, 294.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 371.

wicked men prosper in their ways and the righteous be trodden under foot? Why should Pharaoh sit on a throne and the Israelites labour at the brick-kiln?’¹³⁸

Openly royalist sentiments, conspicuously absent in the 1657 publication, are found in numerous sermons from the 1674 edition especially. In one, a commentary on 1 Peter 2:13-16 (‘Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake’), Farindon declares that ‘the king rules *in nomine Dei*’, and that therefore ‘none can draw him from that pitch and height where God hath placed him: but he is still supreme’.¹³⁹ It is unclear precisely when this sermon was actually delivered, and the use of the present tense to refer to the king’s reign may suggest a date before 1649. However, other sermons undoubtedly dating from the Interregnum are no less direct and provocative. One prophesying ‘the destruction of God’s enemies’ contains yet another passage condemning the rhetoric and linguistic deceptions of parliamentarians, who ‘call discharging of great ordinance at [the king] “fighting for him”; and murdering of Charles “preserving the king alive” ... those the truest prophets who, like Balaam, will rise up early in the morning to curse Israel for reward’.¹⁴⁰

There is even buried in this sermon the tantalising suggestion that Farindon at some point held a more complex, ambivalent attitude towards the notion of active resistance. Reaching his conclusion, he tells his audience that ‘if we will avoid the bitter curse of Meroz, there is something else to be done ... We must “come to the help of the Lord”; help him by helping his anointed; help him by opposing the wicked man; help him by promoting the endeavours of loyal subjects’.¹⁴¹ Farindon does not stipulate exactly what helping God’s anointed – i.e. Charles II – or opposing his enemies would entail. The reference to the Curse of Meroz is, however, suggestive: we have already seen in chapter two the ways in which this scriptural

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, IV, 55; III, 101–2.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 632, 634.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 57.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 67.

text was used by clergymen on both sides during the Civil Wars to mobilise military support. It is a key contention of this study that political or subversive preaching need not entail criticism of the authorities, let alone calls for violent resistance; yet this passage suggests that Farindon's expressions of passive obedience at the beginning of his 1657 edition may have been more a case of tact and necessity than conviction – his economic circumstances dictating a more cautious attitude to the subject of resistance in print than he had previously ventured in the pulpit.

Other evidence strengthens this impression, given by Farindon's publications, that far more unrestrained and controversial sermons were often preached by loyalist clerics during the 1650s than contemporary sermon publications would initially suggest. This is partly supplied by manuscript material. For instance, a sermon notebook that records the sermons of John Vyner, minister at St. Margaret's Westminster in the 1650s, contains plenty of royalist material and dwells consistently on the Church of England's 'sad and miserable Condition under the regall power of hir enemies'.¹⁴² The imprisoned royalist layman Sir John Gibson, meanwhile, copied into his commonplace book extracts from a sermon 'preached upon the thirtieth day of January beinge Sunday 1659 (i.e. 1660)' by an unnamed preacher to commemorate the execution of Charles I. This suggests the circulation of dangerous sermons in manuscript among royalist circles and corroborates the later claim of Anthony Wood that sermons commemorating the regicide – overtly royalist, political events – were given annually during the Interregnum, none of which were subsequently printed. Furthermore, as well as a 30 January sermon, Nathaniel Hardy apparently also preached what became known as 'the Loyal Lecture' to his congregation at St. Dionis, Backchurch in these years, 'whereby many of the suffering clergy were relieved'.¹⁴³

¹⁴² Christ Church Library, Oxford, MS 451, unfo. Cited in Merritt, *Westminster*, p. 247.

¹⁴³ AO, III, 895.

Hostile contemporaries were certainly convinced of the political threat posed by the survival of royalism in the Interregnum pulpit. In 1652, the Digger Gerard Winstanley complained to Oliver Cromwell that

In many Parishes there are old formal ignorant Episcopal Priests established; and some Ministers who are bitter Enemies to Commonwealths Freedom and Friends to Monarchy are established Preachers, and are continually buzzing their subtle principles into the minds of the people, to undermine the Peace of our declared Commonwealth, causing a disaffection of spirit among neighbours who would otherwise live in peace.¹⁴⁴

The continuing vigilance of the republican authorities against ‘seditious’ preachers reveals similar anxieties on the part of those in power. In April 1650 the Council of State expressed its unease at ‘how the commonwealth suffers much, both in safety and reputation, by the intemperate declamations and seditious invectives of some men in their pulpits’.¹⁴⁵ Robert Ashton of Aiskew was tried at the York Assizes on charges of having used the Book of Common Prayer and ‘solemnized the same day of the King’s departure, every moneth, in a long white garment’.¹⁴⁶ In Derbyshire, Smerwick Clarke was said to speak ‘against the Army saying ... that God will not deliver by them’ and to ‘carr[y] about with him the Kinge’s picture upon a bookes lief, and usually sheweth it to such as have been enemys to the state’.¹⁴⁷ The minister of Market Drayton in Shropshire, meanwhile, was charged in September 1649 with having said of his congregation: ‘it is my duty to be carefull of their soules which shall be manifested by preaching Loyalty to their king’.¹⁴⁸ These accusations

¹⁴⁴ Gerard Winstanley, *The law of freedom* (1652), p. 6.

¹⁴⁵ *CSPD*, Commonwealth, 1650, p. 74.

¹⁴⁶ *Depositions from the Castle of York*, ed. James Raine (Durham, 1861), pp. 36–8.

¹⁴⁷ *Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals*, ed. J. Charles Cox (1890), p. 67.

¹⁴⁸ BL, Stowe MS 184, fo. 156r.

have to be treated with caution, of course, but they are plausible when set alongside the other evidence of pulpit royalism discussed here.

In other cases, sermons that could only be printed after the Restoration confirm discrepancies between pulpit and print in the 1650s. John Allington is again a case in point. Only after the Restoration did Allington and the publisher Richard Royston decide to print a volume, provocatively titled *A continuation of the grand conspiracy by the insolent usurper and the regal intruder*, which comprised two sermons preached by Allington during the mid-1650s. The author's hostility to the Cromwellian regime was thus made immediately clear on the title-page. Allington would later remind his patron, Sir Thomas Trevor, that when these sermons had dared 'not see light, they had the light of your Countenance', suggesting that it was fear of government reprisal that had delayed the publication and again gesturing to the importance of manuscript for transmitting sensitive sermon material.¹⁴⁹

Allington's first sermon, originally delivered in 1655, was a blistering attack on the Protectorate's lack of political legitimacy and the *de facto* arguments invoked in its defence: 'that which is got by the sword, must be kept by the sword, and that which is got by the Devil, must be kept by the Devil'.¹⁵⁰ Rather than strategic disclaimers, Allington here openly elucidated the application of his arguments to England in the 1650s. He condemned 'those grand impostors, who make religion, reformation, Gods worship and his service [a] mere stalking horse for their own greatnesse' and declared that the men 'who first created the sad misery of this Nation' were actually more duplicitous than the devil himself.¹⁵¹ Elsewhere, the policies of the Protectorate against royalists were openly denounced: 'it is no new thing now, if thousands loose their possessions, be sequestered, ejected, decimated, for plots and

¹⁴⁹ John Allington, *The period of the grand conspiracy* (1663), sig. A5v.

¹⁵⁰ Allington, *A continuation*, p. 21.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.

practices, for underminings and endeavours, which they no more thought on than poor Naboth did of blaspheming Ahab'.¹⁵² Although he never mentions any politicians or factions by name, these passages were evidently still considered too direct and subversive to publish during the Interregnum.

'A Theology of Loyalty'

It is nonetheless essential not to overstate the critical dimensions of Farindon's sermons, even in the later collections: combining and lifting quotations out of context can give the impression that the sermons of Farindon and his fellow loyalists were concerned with nothing but denouncing the civil and religious authorities. In her study of parliamentary fast sermons, Ann Hughes makes the important point that even a preacher like Stephen Marshall, 'best known for his dynamic sermons before the parliament, spent most of his time on less controversial series of sermons on central issues of Protestant faith'.¹⁵³ Not every sermon by partisan preachers during the 1640s and 1650s was necessarily brimming with polemical and political content: as suggested in chapter one, the clergy were evidently preoccupied with more 'routine' pastoral and didactic preaching too. However, at the same time, we should be wary of drawing too sharp a distinction between 'pastoral', theological sermons on the one hand and political or polemical ones on the other. Seemingly abstract or inoffensive theological discussion could, when communicated to a particular audience in a particular context, have controversial implications, as opponents of early Stuart religious policies had realised.¹⁵⁴ Alexandra Walsham has made a similar point with regards to Catholic recusant

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 71.

¹⁵³ Ann Hughes, 'Preachers and Hearers in Revolutionary London: Contextualising Parliamentary Fast Sermons', *TRHS*, 6th series, 24 (2014), pp. 57–78, at p. 57.

¹⁵⁴ See, for example, Kevin Killeen, 'Veiled Speech: Preaching, Politics and Scriptural Typology', in Hugh Adlington *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 387–403; and Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, pp. 292–342.

literature, which, she argues, ‘collapses any uneasy distinction between “devotional” and “polemical” writings’.¹⁵⁵ Nor did sermons need to criticise those in power directly to communicate an oppositional or subversive message.

In order to understand fully how Farindon and others used the pulpit during the 1650s, it is important to emphasise the danger that waning support and apostasy posed for the future prospects of the monarchy and an episcopal Church of England by the mid-1650s. From the beginning, the English Republic had realised the importance of reconciling their erstwhile opponents to the new religious and political status quo. The 1652 Act of Oblivion, for example, had pardoned all treasons and felonies committed before 1651, and the ambition of ‘healing and settling’ governed much of Oliver Cromwell’s political conduct once he had been established as Protector. Only the incessant threat of royalist insurrection provoked a temporary change in this placatory approach during 1655-6. In defence of the new regime, republican supporters consistently pointed to the providential sanction implied by their military successes. ‘So many,’ noted Peter Bales bitterly, ‘doe wax proud of their owne innocency; because they are still prosperous and successful in all their wicked and unjust designes: as if the successe should infallibly prove the justnesse of the cause’.¹⁵⁶ At a material level, meanwhile, royalists were incentivised to make their peace with the republic by the need to save their estates. Delinquents were warned that the failure to compound would result in forfeiting their entire estate, and this helped to convince even many exiles to return to England.¹⁵⁷

Despite the tirelessness of some royalists in plotting to bring about a Stuart restoration, moreover, others were slowly beginning to accept the post-regicidal regimes. Lloyd Bowen

¹⁵⁵ Walsham, *Church Papists*, p. 26.

¹⁵⁶ Bales, *Infirmity inducing*, p. 31.

¹⁵⁷ Hardacre, *Royalists*, p. 64.

argues that there was ‘a greater degree of acclimatisation to the Protectorate compared with the Commonwealth, suggesting that Cromwell’s policy of “healing and settling” did have some degree of success in reconciling Royalist malcontents and critics to his rule’.¹⁵⁸ While the likes of James Howell and Andrew Marvell had quickly transferred their allegiance to the republic, by the mid-1650s even previously ardent supporters of the king such as Edmund Waller, Abraham Cowley, and John Cleveland were making their peace with the Protectorate. The notion that their defeat was a mark of divine disfavour and that providence therefore necessitated an accommodation with the new rulers was a particularly powerful one among erstwhile loyalists.¹⁵⁹ Justifying his retirement as a royalist writer in 1656, Cowley conceded that when ‘the unaccountable Will of God has determined the controversie ... we must lay down our Pens as well as our Arms’.¹⁶⁰ Apostasy had been a persistent source of anxiety for loyalist clergymen ever since the king’s defeat in the First Civil War. Thomas Swadlin, for instance, had complained as early as 1647 about those men ‘who serv’d the King, and tarryed with him so long as the sun shined, and the weather was calme; but so soone as ever the raine began to fall, and the windes to blow, they presently run away to compound & save something’.¹⁶¹ The experience of regicide and republic would only increase pessimism about the loyalist cause, and John Copleston would later reflect that the Interregnum had been ‘a time of the greatest difficulty, when the enemies of both Church and State, God and their King, were most prevalent, and many people began to be content they should be so’.¹⁶²

In this context, it is significant that so many of Farindon’s Interregnum sermons are concerned with constancy and perseverance in the face of suffering – themes that may

¹⁵⁸ Lloyd Bowen, ‘Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism’, in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 44–66, at p. 51. C.f. David Underdown, ‘Settlement in the counties, 1653–1658’, in Gerald Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646–1660* (1972), pp. 165–82.

¹⁵⁹ See, for example, Edward Gee, *A Plea for Non-Scribers* (1650), appendix, p. 13.

¹⁶⁰ Abraham Cowley, *The Essays and Other Prose Writings*, ed. Alfred B. Gough (Oxford, 1915), p. 9.

¹⁶¹ Thomas Swadlin, *Loyall subjects, or The blessed mans encouragement* (1647), p. 6.

¹⁶² John Copleston, *Moses next to God* (1660), unpag.

initially seem to typify the concerns of ‘pastoral’ preaching.¹⁶³ He consistently warns his auditors about the dangers of betraying the conscience or prioritising earthly comforts over Christ’s injunctions: ‘he doth not remain in the gospel who is ready, upon every change of weather, upon every blast and breathing of discontent, to change his seat’. Instead, ‘I had rather commend perseverance unto you as a condition annexed to every virtue’.¹⁶⁴ He reassures them that God will punish the wicked in his own time. If we wait ‘a little while ... the wicked, which “flourish like a green bay tree”, shall wither and shrivel and be cut off’.¹⁶⁵ We must therefore ‘stand fast in our obedience, which is our liberty, against all the wiles and invasions of the enemy, all those temptations which will show themselves in power and craft to remove us from our station’.¹⁶⁶ This may seem innocuous enough at first, and puritans and Catholics had of course drawn on a similar rhetoric in response to their own persecution prior to the Civil Wars, but it should be remembered that Farindon was preaching at Milk Street to an audience with residual royalist and episcopalian sympathies.¹⁶⁷ The threat of apostasy that hung over them meant that, in stiffening resolve and legitimising continued loyalty, preachers like Farindon could perform a valuable service to both causes. As he himself observed, in ‘these black and gloomy days’ it is ‘most necessary, [for] so many weak hands ... to be held up, and so many feeble knees strengthened’.¹⁶⁸

Just as importantly, these sermons consistently encourage his audience of episcopalian royalists to retain a polarised view of the world and to consider themselves a persecuted,

¹⁶³ On the place of suffering in Protestant thought and the origins of the idea that suffering is a mark of true faith, see Alexandra Walsham, ‘The Happiness of Suffering: Adversity, Providence, and Agency in Early Modern England’, in Joanna Innes and Craig Muldrew (eds.), *Suffering and Happiness in England, 1550–1850* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 45–64.

¹⁶⁴ *SF*, III, 355, 358.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, 52.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 345.

¹⁶⁷ See, for example, J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–1670* (New Haven, CT, 1976), pp. 15–67; Walsham, *Church Papists*, p. 32; Peter Lake, “‘A Charitable Christian Hatred’: The Godly and their Enemies in the 1630s”, in Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (eds.), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 145–83.

¹⁶⁸ *SF*, III, 99.

godly community, beset on all sides by wicked and profane enemies. Farindon rarely offers denunciations of the sinfulness of his own congregation; instead, the sin of others, outside of, and opposed to, this righteous community is emphasised. The preacher and his audience are assumed to be on the same side, ‘so united in our devotion’, rather than in the adversarial relationship of prophet and sinner.¹⁶⁹ His message is partisan throughout his sermons, with the language of ‘us’ and ‘them’ consistently deployed: ‘when we are despised, [the law of Christ] will honour us; when we are silenced, this will speak for us; when we are driven about the world, this will make it a journey to Paradise’.¹⁷⁰ He often condemns, for example, those ‘enem[ies] of the truth’ who had ‘unseasonably disturbed the public peace and their own, whose business it was ... to teach pastors to govern and divines how to preach; every day to make a new coat for the church, to hammer and shape out a new form and discipline’. He wonders how a man who ‘at pleasure breaketh these ties and ligaments which nature and religion have linked him in a body politic ... under pretence of religion, [could] boast or comfort himself in relation to Christ’, since ‘he that is not a good member of the commonwealth is not a true member of the Church’.¹⁷¹

Although Farindon may not have deemed it prudent to employ such labels, this is a clear attack on the hypocritical, schismatic, and seditious tendencies of puritans. Patrick Collinson has argued that puritan preaching on sin was socially as well as religiously divisive, ‘since the preacher often represented himself as in collusion with a captive audience of the converted, “us”, who shared in the preacher’s detestation of the sins committed by “them”’.¹⁷² Similarly, the implications of Farindon’s words were antithetical to the prospect of harmony or

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 360.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, I, 337, 351.

¹⁷² Patrick Collinson, ‘Biblical Rhetoric: The English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode’, in Deborah Shuger and Claire McEachern (eds.), *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 15–45, at p. 35.

rapprochement between the different religious, political, and social groups that had contested the Civil Wars.

Indeed, ironically, Farindon's rhetoric often strikes a distinctly puritanical note. His audience are presented as *the* righteous, those with a monopoly on God's favour and the potential to do his work. They are distinguished by their moral superiority and comforted by the assurance of their own salvation: 'our very silence and our meekness shall purchase for us the inheritance of the earth'.¹⁷³ Their present experience of persecution and suffering should only serve to confirm their sense of themselves as God's chosen people, his 'saints'.¹⁷⁴ God, Farindon reminds his congregation time and again, 'many times suffers his best saints and his selected servants to be beat upon by the waves of affliction, and to feel the lash of persecution'.¹⁷⁵ Ultimately, however, scripture is clear that the righteous will prevail over their adversaries. In a sermon assuring his auditors of the certainty of their enemies' destruction, Farindon observes how, at the time the Psalms were composed, 'the wicked, were gathered together, and consulted against God and *his church*: as we see it this day'.¹⁷⁶ He is thus clear that the Church of England is God's church, its enemies his enemies, and that providence will ultimately ensure its restoration. 'God will never fail his church', he concludes, 'though the devil rage, and wicked men take counsel together'.¹⁷⁷ His audience should not therefore forsake it or wonder instead whether providence has declared in favour of the recent religious changes instituted by their puritan opponents, those 'wicked men' to whom Farindon refers.

¹⁷³ *SF*, IV, 61.

¹⁷⁴ Farindon was not the only episcopalian preacher to refer to followers of the Church of England as 'saints'. Richard Steward, for instance, preached in Paris on 2 October 1650, showing 'that God would certainly avenge his Saints, however deferr'd': *DJE*, III, 20.

¹⁷⁵ *SF*, IV, 43; cf. III, 360.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 643, my emphasis.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

This attempt to construct a plausible counternarrative to the providentialist triumphalism of republican adversaries, which could reconcile God's continued support for monarchy and the Church of England with the otherwise troubling facts of defeat and persecution, was a crucial feature of loyalist sermons throughout the Interregnum. For instance, Thomas Fuller's *Just mans funeral*, preached at Chelsea in 1649, expounded Ecclesiastes 7:15 – 'there is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness' – a text that clerical supporters of the king and Church of England would regularly turn to between regicide and restoration.¹⁷⁸ Fuller reassured his fellow loyalists from the pulpit that their very suffering constituted evidence of the righteousness of their cause, that patient endurance was a necessity for a Christian, and that God would ensure their ultimate triumph – ideas that directly undermined the providentialist arguments with which successive republican regimes hoped to establish authority and loyalty.

This providentialist narrative in turn filtered down to, and fortified, the laity. The royalist John Wenlock told a republican supporter who had pointed to the regime's defeat of the Stuarts as evidence of divinely bestowed legitimacy:

Alas, friend, that is no good argument on your side, for we do know that God doth many times permit wicked men to prosper in their ways, to their own destruction; and if you were an historian, you would know that God hath suffered the Turks so to prevail against the Christians for many hundreds of years because of their sins.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ Fuller, *Just mans funeral*. See also, Nathaniel Hardy, *A sad prognostick of approaching judgement; or, The happy misery of good men in bad times* (1658), p. 18 and *passim*.

¹⁷⁹ Quoted in Hardacre, *Royalists*, p. 83.

Wenlock's example of the Turks was commonly invoked in the pulpit. 'Prosperity!' scoffed Farindon's friend in 1656, 'if this proves the goodness of a cause, how many arguments can the Turk allege to assert his Mahomet?'¹⁸⁰

Old Testament analogies and parallels could serve to consolidate this divisive picture of the English people still further. That both parliamentarians and royalists had sought during the 1640s to present themselves as the ancient Israelites during the Civil Wars, the champions of a divinely sponsored cause, is well-established.¹⁸¹ What is less often considered are the implications and impact of these Old Testament parallels. The Israelites were a holy, special people set apart by God and beleaguered on all sides by the ungodly. The invocation of the Israelite model was therefore antithetical to reconciliation: it confirmed the righteous purity of a given group and allowed no room for compromise with their enemies. For Farindon, royalist and episcopalian experience in the 1650s was to be understood as analogous to the suffering the Israelites had undergone at the hands of the Philistines and in captivity. For instance, he relates a passage from 1 Samuel 4:11, in which the Philistines defeat the Israelites and capture the Ark of the Covenant and observes that 'it is a common sight in this Egypt of the world to see Pharaoh with his diadem, and Israel with a basket'.¹⁸² As Kevin Killeen has argued, it was a commonplace for early modern Englishmen that biblical history repeated itself in the present, and that scripture therefore provided a guide to understanding how God's providential plan would unfurl.¹⁸³ Farindon's parallels between his audience and the Israelites thus provided comfort and consolation. As they had suffered like the Israelites, so they would be delivered from captivity as the Israelites had been; and, again, this

¹⁸⁰ *SF*, III, 371; Bales, *Infirmity inducing*, pp. 31–2

¹⁸¹ Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 2010), chs. 3–4.

¹⁸² *SF*, I, 447; IV, 43.

¹⁸³ Killeen, 'Veiled Speech', p. 391.

reassurance constituted grounds for remaining steadfast in loyalty to the institutions and practices that ‘wicked men’ had overthrown.

Preaching and Sequestration

Other episcopalian preachers within the state Church, meanwhile, exhibited a particular anxiety to counter the economic motivations for apostasy. Seeing the dangers that they posed to the future survival of the monarchy and episcopacy, these clergymen denounced from the pulpit the punitive measures taken by first Commonwealth and then Protectorate against royalists. Bruno Ryves, for instance, had been both a chaplain to Charles I and the editor of the royalist newspaper *Mercurius rusticus* during the Civil Wars. After 1646 he continued to preach in pulpits around London, before finally being elected as a lecturer at Lincoln’s Inn in 1654.¹⁸⁴ By this time he had already printed his *Two sermons* on Luke 12:15 (‘take heed and beware covetousness’), the original location for which remains unclear.¹⁸⁵ On Cromwell’s direct orders, Lincoln’s Inn were forced to dispense with Ryves and appoint another preacher on 4 November 1656.¹⁸⁶

These sermons focus on the punitive measures taken against royalists by the government: ‘so sweet a thing it is, to grow rich by Rapine, and Oppression, and to make other mens fortunes, the prey of Treason and Rebellion’. However, Ryves’s ire is not reserved solely for the authors of these policies – he is equally critical of those royalists who caved under their pressure. He explains that covetousness ‘is the root of Apostacy, and falling off from God’ and hence ‘the Apostle here is positive, *the Love of Money is the Root of all Evil*’. Ryves is

¹⁸⁴ Joad Raymond, ‘Ryves, Bruno’, *ODNB*.

¹⁸⁵ Henry Hammond mentions Ryves having preached at St. Martin’s Orgar on 20 May 1649. It is possible that Ryves preached there on more than one occasion, and that the printed sermons were delivered there. See BL, Harley MS 6942, fo. 14r.

¹⁸⁶ *CSPD*, Commonwealth, 1656–1657, p. 153.

clear in this respect that to apostatize for financial gain is to be guilty of covetousness. He castigates ‘men, that for gain, set Christ himself to sale’ and laments that ‘too many such merchants, we have, now adayes’ who ‘measure, not only honesty, and Loyalty, but Religion itself by’ their love of money. They are comparable to Demas in the Pauline epistles, who ‘thought it easier to close with the world, or as we usually call it, *make his peace*, then run the hazard of losing his estate, by adhering to a persecuted truth’.¹⁸⁷

Ryves then outlines a theology of covetousness designed to persuade his auditors to eschew these pragmatic concessions. God, he claims, will often punish those who seek wealth above all else, ‘by giving him that wealth but denying him a heart to use it’. More urgently, the eternal salvation of these royalists was at stake. ‘If therefore, there be any which hear me this day’, Ryves continues, ‘who are not resolved upon the question, which is best, to save your souls, or your estates’, they should consider the words of Christ in Matthew 16:16: ‘what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?’¹⁸⁸ Drawing on Augustinian ideas of Original Sin, Ryves then suggests that, in saving an estate for posterity parents, may transmit their own sinfulness to their children: ‘thy wealth, may prove to thy posterity, but an instrument, to serve some lust, to commit, some sin’.¹⁸⁹ The impulse to ensure the financial security of one’s heirs is, for Ryves, countered by the risk entailed to their eternal salvation. To these dark warnings and admonitions he adds the glory of martyrdom, echoing the Catholic recusant polemic of the late sixteenth century.¹⁹⁰ God ‘calls us to Martyrdome, to resistance unto blood, and to the laying down of our lives, for the

¹⁸⁷ Bruno Ryves, *Two Sermons* (n.p., 1652), pp. 14, 17, 18.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 28.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁹⁰ See, for example, Susannah Brietz Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 117–57.

Testimony of his Truth' and 'losse of goods, is but the least, and the lowest, of the sufferings of the Saints'.¹⁹¹

Nor was Ryves alone in deploying theological discourse as a means of counteracting the impulse towards settlement and accommodation that financial penalties had stimulated among episcopalian royalists. As early as 14 November 1647, Thomas Swadlin had preached a sermon later published under the title of *Loyall subjects, or The blessed mans encouragement*, in which he castigated those erstwhile royalists who had abandoned the king's cause after his military defeat.¹⁹² In the 1650s, John Hewitt warned his audience that they must not seek to 'free [their] goods from danger by simulation, or making a lie'.¹⁹³ Compromise for the sake of economic expediency, however, was a temptation for the clergy and a threat to the Church of England, as well as the laity and the king. Robert Mossom, for example, referred 'it to the consciences of most Ministers, whether the sequestered Living was not the strongest Argument to convince their Judgements, to a deserting as well as a dissenting, from what they had subscribed'.¹⁹⁴

A theology of steadfastness and righteous suffering therefore recurs throughout the Interregnum sermons of these ministers. Audiences were exhorted time and again not to let their 'faith be shaken or moved by tribulations, or any kind of sufferings whatsoever, knowing this, that after you have fought a good fight, and kept the faith, *there shall be laid up for you* (and all other his faithfull servants) *a crown of righteousness*'.¹⁹⁵ Royalists and episcopalians were urged to emulate the example of Christ and the Apostles, and the language of martyrdom was often invoked. 'Be ye not offended at God's providence', implored Robert Mossom, 'nor discouraged in your piety; Our Blessed Lord and his Holy

¹⁹¹ Ryves, *Two Sermons*, p. 29.

¹⁹² Swadlin, *Loyall subjects*, p. 6.

¹⁹³ Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, p. 176.

¹⁹⁴ Mossom, *Preachers tripartite*, p. 9.

¹⁹⁵ Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, p. 195.

Apostles have foretold us of what we finde ... the Fiery trial of Heresie and Persecution'.¹⁹⁶

Mossom placed those loyalists willing to suffer persecution for their faith in the tradition of the Marian martyrs, reminding his congregation at St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf that 'our English Church' had been 'made Illustrious by Martyrdom, as with a Royal Crown'.¹⁹⁷

Farindon, then, was far from unique in encouraging his audience, *pace* the claims of their victorious new governors, to regard themselves as God's chosen people, confident in their moral superiority and eventual salvation. Indeed, the language used in these episcopalian sermons consistently paralleled the self-identification of puritans in the early Stuart period. 'Even now', declared the former royal chaplain George Gillingham in July 1655, the world 'would fall to ruine, & mankind be universally damned, but for the elect few'.¹⁹⁸ At St. Margaret's, Westminster, the following year, John Vyner insisted that despite the hardships of 'God's Church and people', they must retain their moral purity: their sins 'are so much more the dangerous' as they are 'Gods Children [and] are ... in the state of grace'.¹⁹⁹ This moral superiority became a badge of honour for the episcopalian laity, and in August 1656 John Evelyn described attending a 'greate meeting of zealous Christians who were generally much more devout & religious, than in our greatest prosperity'.²⁰⁰

Conclusions

On 29 December 1657, the presbyterian minister Edward Bowles wrote to John Thurloe from York with a report of a sermon he had attended on Christmas Day. The preacher, one Mr

¹⁹⁶ Mossom, *Preachers tripartite*, p. 20.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1. C.f. Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, p. 194.

¹⁹⁸ BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 35r.

¹⁹⁹ Christ Church Library, MS 451, unfo.

²⁰⁰ *DJE*, III, 181.

Geldart, had apparently told his audience ‘that he doubted not to declare him a Schismatick, who did not observe Christmas-day’.²⁰¹ Still more provocatively,

in his prayer he had this passage, *Lord, when thou makest inquisition for blood, remember that, which hath been shed within the walls of our Jerusalem*; and prayed for his owne party under the name of orthodox, and for a reparation of their losses in these times, with other untoward expressions, which I cannot remember.²⁰²

Bowles reflected that Geldart ‘is inconsiderable in learning or life, but serves to uphold the enmity betwixt the seeds’ and yet, although ‘I have long desired and studied a way for his removal ... I know not well how to accomplish it’.²⁰³

Bowles’s story neatly brings together the central themes of this chapter. Here we see both royalist and episcopalian sentiments being articulated from the pulpit in the midst of the Interregnum, with particular criticism reserved for the sequestration policies that had encouraged many to make their peace with the regime. However, Geldart evidently thought it prudent to employ certain rhetorical safeguards to protect himself, hence his use of the term ‘orthodox’, to refer, as Bowles was quick to recognise, to ‘his own party’. This epitomises the kinds of ‘dog-whistle’ communicative strategies that this chapter has shown loyalist preachers to have engaged in, especially in print, when speaking to sympathetic audiences to avoid incriminating themselves. They could be confident that their audiences would apply their ostensibly abstract or generalised theological discourse to the immediate politico-religious situation: they would understand, for instance, the blood shed within the walls of

²⁰¹ *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. Thomas Birch (7 vols., 1742), VI, 711. The preacher is likely the John Geldart identified by the Clergy of the Church of England Database as the rector of Holy Trinity Goodramgate, York, from 1662.

²⁰² *Ibid.*

²⁰³ *Ibid.*

Jerusalem that Geldart beseeched the Lord to remember as referring to that of the martyred Charles I.

Furthermore, Bowles identified the polarising, divisive implications of the preacher's words, which ran directly counter to the ambition of successive republican regimes for healing and settling. Geldart reiterated a binary vision of the world divided between the orthodox – those who shared his political and religious allegiances – and the heterodox, who were to be reviled. Oliver Cromwell had accused the royalists in 1655 of 'very much confin[ing] their marriages and alliances within their own party, as if they meant to entail their quarrel, and prevent the means to reconcile posterity'.²⁰⁴ Certainly, the messages they were hearing from the pulpit could only have served to encourage and legitimate them in their desire to separate themselves off from their puritan neighbours. Thus, while the socially and politically divisive implications of puritan theology in the decades before the Civil War have been explored by Patrick Collinson and others, this chapter has shown that a similarly bifurcating theological discourse was employed by conservatives to resist revolutionary change from the pulpit during the Interregnum.²⁰⁵

Although historians have noted the failure of successive puritan regimes to eradicate popular sentiment for traditional religion, the role of the clergy and their sermons in ensuring this 'Anglican survivalism' and contributing to the 'failure of godly rule' has rarely been touched on.²⁰⁶ We are far more familiar with the radical dimensions of the Cromwellian Church – the growth of sectaries, the rise of lay preaching, public disputations between orthodox and radical puritans – which helped make England 'a fluid marketplace' for religious ideas by the

²⁰⁴ Hardacre, *Royalists*, p. 81.

²⁰⁵ Patrick Collinson, 'The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful', in Ole Grell *et al* (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 51–76.

²⁰⁶ See, for example, John Morrill, 'The Church in England 1642–9', in *idem* (ed.) *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642–1649* (Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 89–114. C.f. Hirst, 'Failure of Godly Rule'.

mid-1650s.²⁰⁷ That there were conservative voices attempting to shape this public debate from within, to make themselves heard amid the fray, is often missed: these clerics have more often been associated with passivity and inactivity between the Regicide and the Restoration. In his 1960 study of Interregnum royalist conspiracy, for example, David Underdown chastised the clergy in England for their lack of contribution to these subversive schemes, arguing that they ‘did little beyond helping to preserve the spiritual health of the pious’.²⁰⁸ If their participation in violent plots and uprisings was indeed minimal, this chapter has suggested that, through their preaching, the clergy may nonetheless have made a more significant, and indeed subversive, contribution to the causes of Church and king in these years than Underdown allowed. After all, words, as historians are increasingly realising, could be potentially powerful ‘weapons of the weak’ and ‘an important form of political action’ in early modern England, often serving to challenge and undermine established power relations.²⁰⁹

This, in turn, has implications for our conception of episcopalian ‘conformity’ during the Interregnum – a subject scholars are only belatedly beginning to explore. Robert Bosher once characterised the attitude of many episcopalians within the state church during the 1650s towards the ‘hardliners’ in exile as one of respect and admiration: ‘to the party that remained wholly aloof from the establishment, their respectful veneration was like that of the High Church clergy of Queen Anne’s day toward the Non-Jurors’.²¹⁰ The implication is that all royalist and episcopalian clerics would have been exiles, if only they had possessed the

²⁰⁷ Ann Hughes, ‘The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England’, in Anne Laurence *et al* (eds.), *John Bunyan and his England, 1628–88* (1990), pp. 31–50, at p. 39. C.f. Bernard Capp, ‘The Religious Marketplace: Public Disputations in Civil War and Interregnum England’, *EHR*, 129 (2014), pp.47–78.

²⁰⁸ David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649–1660*, (2nd edition, Hamden, CT, 1971), p. 183.

²⁰⁹ See Caroline Boswell, ‘Provoking Disorder: The Politics of Speech in Protectorate Middlesex’, *JBS*, 53 (2014), pp. 885–908, at pp. 888–9; and Andy Wood, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 89–184.

²¹⁰ Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, p. 28.

requisite courage and conviction. I have suggested, by contrast, that many of these ministers had positive reasons for actively rejecting exile or withdrawal, and that these reasons were based in no small part on continued access to the pulpit. Similar arguments have, of course, been made of conformity during the Tudor reformations of the sixteenth century. In his study of Marian Nicodemites, for instance, Andrew Pettegree warns against the ‘assumption that the only real manifestation of true faith consisted of faithful witness’ in exile and reminds us that ‘there were many reasons ... not all of them ignoble, to hold people in England during Mary’s reign’.²¹¹ The same is surely true of episcopalians under the English Republic.

Furthermore, this chapter’s insistence on the continuing significance of the pulpit for those facing religious persecution provides a counterpoint to recent scholarly literature that has stressed the significance of print to religious minorities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Print, observes Alexandra Walsham, provided those ‘whom the authorities were intent upon rendering mute with a powerful device for communicating with both their co-religionists and the wider world’, while Neil Keeble has argued of Restoration nonconformity that ‘it was upon publication that its ultimate survival depended’.²¹² A number of recent studies have also explored the role of books and writing in the development of ‘Anglicanism’ between the Civil Wars and the return of Charles II in 1660.²¹³ However, it has been argued here that for many episcopalian royalists in the 1650s the parish pulpit, as well as the press, performed a vital function in sustaining identity, community, and loyalty against the countervailing pressures of persecution and material hardship.

²¹¹ Pettegree, ‘Nicodemism’, p. 88.

²¹² Alexandra Walsham, ‘Preaching without Speaking: Script, Print and Religious Dissent’, in Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds.), *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 211–34, at p. 212; Neil Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester, 1987), p. 82.

²¹³ See, for example, Marika Koblusek, ‘A Tortoise in the Shell: Royalist and Anglican Experience of Exile in the 1650s’, in Philip Major (ed.), *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640–1690* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 79–90; and Mark Williams, ‘The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649–1660’, *JBS*, 53 (2014), pp. 909–33.

Finally, the findings of this chapter may also serve to qualify the growing tendency in recent literature to divorce episcopalianism and royalism during the 1650s. Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor have suggested that ‘the link between episcopalianism and royalism was much less close than is often assumed, at least after 1649’.²¹⁴ They point out that ‘many people who had been episcopally ordained continue[d] to serve in the English church through the later 1640s and 1650s and [gave] assurances of their allegiance, or at least peaceable conduct, to the Commonwealth and Protectorate’.²¹⁵ This is certainly true but, as the example of Anthony Farindon shows, we should also be alive to the possibility that the printed record might sometimes distort our perception of the strength of royalist sentiment among Interregnum episcopalians. Recent work by Jason Peacey and Jason McElligott has stressed not only the effectiveness of republican censorship but also the extent to which it was explicitly political, seditious material that authorities were on the look-out for. It is understandable therefore if clerical authors, mindful of this censorship and eager to derive the financial benefits of publication in hard times, were reluctant to trumpet their political allegiances too loudly in print. Nonetheless, digging below the surface, it seems that many clerics like Farindon continued to regard the fate of monarchy and episcopacy as inextricably bound together well into the later 1650s. And the fact that most refused openly to advocate violent resistance did not mean that they in any way accepted the regime change or relinquished their hopes of an eventual Stuart restoration.

²¹⁴ Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Conformity’, p. 35.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Chapter Six: Transmission and Reception

Some of the most exciting recent work on early modern preaching has begun to explore the sermon as a performative event, as well as a printed text, and attempted to reconstruct the experience of hearing what was delivered from the pulpit.¹ It has been argued that ‘to understand Protestantism it is not enough to read the clergy, we must also engage with their congregations’ and that one way of doing so is to scrutinise sermon notes’.² However, one question that this literature has largely passed over is how the particular religious and political identities of laypersons might have shaped, and been shaped by, the experience of sermon hearing. A recent article by Ann Hughes on the context of parliamentary fast-day sermons in revolutionary London has suggested that the significance of the partisan, controversial dimensions of preaching for actual audience members – as opposed to later historians – should not be overplayed. Hughes argues that those who took notes on these famous sermons did so primarily for the purpose of spiritual edification, and therefore ‘recording the immediate political context or the polemical arguments of the fast sermons was not necessarily their priority’.³ Furthermore, little attempt has yet been made to think about episcopalian hearers specifically – sermon note-taking is still implicitly assumed to have been a predominantly puritan activity – or to utilise fully one of the most remarkable sources available to us for studying this phenomenon: the sermon notebook of the diarist John Evelyn.⁴

¹ See above, p. 8n.

² John Spurr, *The Laity and Preaching in Post-Reformation England* (Friends of Dr Williams’s Library 66th lecture, 2013), p. 35.

³ Ann Hughes, ‘Preachers and Hearers in Revolutionary London: Contextualising Parliamentary Fast Sermons’, *TRHS*, 6th series, 24 (2014), pp. 57–78, at p. 57.

⁴ Evelyn’s notebook is discussed by Spurr in *The Laity and Preaching*, pp. 22–4, 28–31, and in ‘“A Sublime and Noble Service”: Evelyn and the Church of England’, in Frances Harris and Michael Hunter (eds.) *John Evelyn and his Milieu* (2003), pp. 145–63. See also: Timothy Raylor, ‘The Anglican Attack on Hobbes in Paris, 1651’, *HJ*, 53 (2010), pp. 153–64; Mark Williams, ‘The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649–1660’, *JBS*, 53 (2014), pp. 909–33.

This chapter therefore considers in more detail issues of transmission and reception, asking how the kinds of sermons that this thesis has drawn on were read, heard, circulated, recycled, and remembered by audiences. It focuses on several cases studies of individual hearers and readers, both lay – like Evelyn and Sir John Gibson – and clerical, like William Sancroft. Specifically, it tries to ascertain how important the ‘royalist’ and ‘episcopalian’ dimensions of these sermons were to those that consumed them: did the partisan arguments of the preacher appeal to the laity and hold their attention, or were they passed over and disregarded as tangential to the pious routines of which sermon going was part? The patchiness of the evidence here, particularly with regards to sermon notes, should immediately be noted and generalisations on such large and complex questions would be difficult to make in any case. Nonetheless, by carefully scrutinising and contextualising those sources that are available – and Evelyn’s notebook especially – several important themes emerge. One is the ability of audience members not only to grasp and internalise a preacher’s argument, but to pick up on hints and subtexts that were alluded to only fleetingly or opaquely. This is particularly significant given that it was argued in the preceding chapter that Interregnum preachers relied heavily on rhetorical ambiguity to communicate controversial messages to their audiences safely.

It is argued throughout this chapter, moreover, that political or polemical elements of preaching were often an integral part of its appeal and, in some cases, could make the sermon a more memorable event, one particularly worth recording. This is shown to be true of John Evelyn, at least during his time in Paris during the early 1650s. Sermons offered Evelyn a way of coping with the unique challenges that the experience of exile posed to his episcopalian and royalist identity, and he was therefore particularly responsive to preaching that supplied providential or polemical arguments with which he could refute the relentless attacks of his adversaries. However, as will be shown, Evelyn was far from the only

layperson drawn to those ideas and messages delivered from the pulpit that were most conducive to strengthening his politico-religious allegiances and corroborating a worldview in which king, bishops, and prayer book would one day be restored to their rightful place.

Hearers, Consumers, and Pirates in Interregnum London

We might begin with a deceptively simple question: who purchased printed royalist sermons and why?⁵ The existence of pirated editions of sermons given by several staunchly royalist preachers during the Interregnum is here especially revealing. We can safely infer that these would not have been produced unless publishers considered them profitable, and so it seems that there was a ready market for these sermons in spite – or more likely *because* – of their controversial, partisan nature.⁶ This is best illustrated by the example of John Hewitt and the sermons purporting to have been preached by him that were published soon after he was executed in 1658. *Nine Select Sermons* appeared with a foreword dedicated to Hewitt's wife, Lady Mary, presumably to lend the edition an air of legitimacy: it expressed 'confident hope' of 'your Ladyship['s] ... Honourable Protection'.⁷ The publishers responsible were Thomas Rooks and Henry Eversden, neither of whom seems to have had any particular episcopalian or royalist connection. However, their edition immediately provoked a backlash from Hewitt's friends and relatives. A new volume was produced, entitled *Repentance and conversion*, with a foreword composed by George Wild and John Barwick, explaining that the *Nine Select Sermons* had been entered into the Stationers' Register 'without the consent or knowledge of the right honourable Lady Mary Hewitt' and were 'none of Dr. Hewyt's

⁵ On the broader context of royalist print, see Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007).

⁶ Mary Morrissey, 'Sermons, Primers, and Prayerbooks', in Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 491–509, at pp. 503–4.

⁷ John Hewitt, *Nine select sermons preached upon special occasions in the Parish Church of St. Gregories by St. Pauls* (1658), sig. A3v.

sermons, but only imperfect notes taken from him as he preached (or perhaps from some others) in short writing'.⁸ This had persuaded Wild and Barwick to publish an authoritative version 'to prevent the fictitious Chimeras of many crazy brains, that would shroud themselves under [Hewitt's] Name'.⁹

The posthumous celebrity of Hewitt, and the controversial manner of his death, had evidently convinced the enterprising Eversden and Rooks that his sermons would sell well. This in turn suggests that a degree of topicality or controversy could entice potential sermon readers and that sermons were not therefore simply purchased for the purposes of private devotional study. It was surely anticipated that Hewitt's sermons would be read in the context of his recent execution for treason (the title-page stressed that he was the '*late* reverend John Hewytt') – that readers would scan them for dangerous, and therefore exciting, hints of political comment and subversion. Indeed, this made their publication a hazardous business for Eversden and Rooks, who tried to ward off unwanted scrutiny from the Protectoral authorities with a lengthy foreword denying that Hewitt's words might have any partisan appeal and claiming they were being printed only for 'the eternal welfare of every soul that shall peruse them'.¹⁰ Nonetheless, they did not try to deny the origins of their copies, nor the problems associated with audience note taking. They admitted that they were reproducing 'notes taken by the pen of a ready writer, the swiftness of whose emotions is able to overtake the most voluble tongue', while evidently disagreeing – or hoping their readers would disagree – that this rendered the sermons 'none of Dr. Hewyt's' at all, as his fellow clerics believed.¹¹

⁸ John Hewitt, *Repentance and conversion* (1658), unpag.

⁹ *Ibid.*, sigs Bv–B3v. See also: *A second advertisement concerning Dr. Hewyts pretended sermons* (1658).

¹⁰ Hewitt, *Nine select sermons*, unpag.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

Nathaniel Hardy was still more damning about the circulation of pirated sermons. In 1658, he felt compelled to publish an authoritative version of a sermon he had preached earlier that year at St. Gregory by St Paul's, London, which had quickly found its way through the press without Hardy's knowledge or consent. Hardy deplored the inaccuracy which resulted from hearers' notes, lamenting that 'eminent divines' should be forced to 'do penance in the Printers Sheets, for the incontineny of their wanton Auditors, who between the pen and the press beget and bring forth a Bastard brood of Sermons, which they must father'.¹² He gave the example of Hewitt, and the 'two Books of Sermons printed and published under his Name, and ... pretended to be his'.¹³ Similarly, Hardy felt he had had his sermon 'ravished ... before my face' and was now printing his copy so that his sermons would not 'come forth mangled hereafter'.¹⁴ He particularly objected to the claim made by the publishers of the pirated edition that his sermon had been 'Intended for the solemnization of Doctor Hewits Funerall'. This was not strictly true: Hardy had been 'engaged to preach that turn at St. Gregories before the Doctors death; yea, when there was some hopes of his life' – although in the event the sermon was delivered five days after Hewitt's decollation, on 13 June.¹⁵ It was, however, obvious enough to members of the congregation that the recent execution of Hewitt was the context in which Hardy's sermon – a meditation on how 'the righteous perish' and 'mercifull men are taken away' – was to be understood, even if it was not technically a funeral sermon. Furthermore, the publishers of the pirated edition, apparently believing that any sermon presented as a eulogy for someone recently executed as a traitor would entice readers with its promise of controversial, even incendiary, subject matter, decided to advertise it as such on the title-page.

¹² Nathaniel Hardy, *A sad prognostick of approaching judgement; or, The happy misery of good men in bad times* (1658), sig. A2r.

¹³ *Ibid.*, sig. A2v.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, sigs. A2v, A3r.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. A3v.

In all, Hardy seems to have been overly severe in his criticism of the pirated edition, his anger perhaps borne out of a belief that its publishers had placed him in danger with the authorities by tying his discourse so directly to Hewitt. Hardy was forced to concede that his audience had indeed been correct in interpreting his sermon as a comment on Hewitt's recent execution, though the sermon had never presented itself as such or referred to Hewitt by name: 'I deny not but that sad Providence intervening, occasioned me to pitch my thoughts on that subject'.¹⁶ Given Hardy's indignant protests, moreover, one would expect the pirated copy to bear almost no resemblance to the official edition printed by Hardy later in the year. In fact, while the paragraphing, sentence structure, and precise choice of words often differ, the notes taken by a member of Hardy's audience do a very good job of capturing his sense and the structure of his argument. For example, Hardy's version contains a passage expressing regret that 'I want both time and tongue to give you a narrative of his life, which was a constellation of many bright stars, many excellent Graces which were obvious to all that know him throughout the whole course of his conversation'.¹⁷ His auditor transcribes this as 'I want time and tongue to go over his life, and all that knew him will acknowledge this, that the whole course of his life was a constellation of virtues and graces, both as he was a Christian, and as he was a Minister'.¹⁸ Nor is it clear that Hardy's is the more accurate record of what was actually spoken: while the note-taker may have guessed at words and phrases that he had not heard properly when drawing up his notes after the service, it is equally probable that Hardy diverged from his original script, embellishing and rephrasing as he went along, and that this explains any minor discrepancies between the two editions. In any case, the ability to para- and rephrase the preacher's words indicates a greater degree of comprehension, a closer engagement with the argument, than a simple verbatim reproduction.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, unpag.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹⁸ Nathaniel Hardy, *A sermon preached at St. Gregories* (1658), p. 22.

While the print history of Hewitt's and Hardy's sermons highlights the marketability of controversial, topical, or polemical sermons, some caveats should be added. Mary Morrissey and others have argued that consumer interest in such texts was ephemeral and therefore, on the whole, they sold far less well over time. Those that went through extended print runs over a number of years tended to have a more pastoral focus, addressing subjects such as the godly life that had an obvious and enduring appeal to successive generations of readers.¹⁹ Thus, across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, printed collections of sermons as a whole 'downplay[ed] the context in which they were preached, focussing instead on pastoral or theological instruction'.²⁰ However, this is not to say that royalist sermons lost their relevance after the Restoration: in fact, the sermons of the 1640s and 1650s were frequently resurrected later in the century, precisely because of their partisan, political content and their very specific links to the Civil War context. To take just one example, Paul Knell's *Israel and England Paralleled*, first preached on 16 April 1648, was republished during the Exclusion Crisis as 'very seasonable and useful for all such as retain the principles of the people in those times'. As late as 1711, in the aftermath of Henry Sacheverell's hugely controversial pulpit attack on dissenters and the Tory electoral landslide of 1710, Knell's sermon was again being printed, this time 'as a new-years-gift for the dissenters'.²¹ Since, as Jonathan Scott and others have shown, the troubles of the mid-seventeenth century continued to play a critical role in shaping England's political and religious landscape long after the Restoration, royalist sermon literature dating from those turbulent years could be used to draw polemically-charged parallels with the present.²²

¹⁹ Morrissey, 'Sermons, Primers, and Prayerbooks', p. 504.

²⁰ Rosamund Oates, 'Sermons and Sermon-going in Early Modern England', *Reformation*, 17 (2012), pp. 199–212, at p. 206.

²¹ Paul Knell, *Israel and England paralleled* (second edition, 1681), title-page; *idem* (fourth edition, 1711), title-page. A third edition was printed in 1695.

²² Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, 2000), part III; See Jonathan Sawday, 'Rewriting a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the

Scribal Circulation

Print, as the preceding chapters have consistently shown, was not the only medium in which lay persons read and consumed sermons: manuscript circulation had obvious advantages for royalists and episcopalians, particularly in areas or at times when their activities were likely to be closely monitored by parliament or, after 1649, the republican regime.²³ Alexandra Walsham notes that ‘script had the advantage of being more immediate and intimate and offering authors greater scope for selecting and controlling their audience’.²⁴ The sharing and reading of manuscripts doubtless helped to consolidate a sense of community and strengthen political identities, as Stephen Roberts has argued of Henry Townshend. Townshend was part of a royalist scribal community in Civil War Worcestershire, which included many of the higher clergy in the diocese, collating, transcribing, and exchanging manuscript materials he received from his contacts both in parliament and close to the king at Oxford.²⁵

Similarly, we saw in chapter one how a manuscript sermon composed by Thomas Lenthall was circulated within Pembroke College, Cambridge, during 1642 and transcribed into a commonplace book before it eventually found its way into print the following year. This scribal copy of Lenthall’s sermon contains some faint, but suggestive, underlinings.

Somebody who owned or read the manuscript seems to have gone through and selected particularly apposite quotations. For instance, the reader underlines and draws a box around Lenthall’s claim that ‘Soveraigntie in one person is most natural, most honourable, most necessary, most divine’.²⁶ He later picks out a similar quotation about the impossibility of

Restoration’, *Seventeenth Century*, 7 (1992), pp. 171–99; Matthew Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013).

²³ On the scribal circulation of sermons in early modern England, see Mary Morrissey, ‘Sermon Notes and Manuscript Communities’, *HLQ*, 80 (2), pp. 293–307.

²⁴ Alexandra Walsham, ‘Preaching without Speaking: Script, Print and Religious Dissent’, in Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds.), *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 211–34, at p. 212.

²⁵ Stephen Roberts, ‘The Uses of Scribal Publication in the Making of a Royalist: Henry Townshend of Worcestershire, his ‘Diary’ and Parliament, 1640–3’, *Midland History*, 41 (2016), pp. 152–67.

²⁶ BL, Add. MS 34692, fo. 5v.

dividing sovereignty: ‘two governors in a Common-wealth are like Esau & Jacob 2 princes in the wombe of Rebecca, soe they in one Kingdome rend it & teare it in peeces: Rome could not endure two brothers’.²⁷ Assuming that the reader was one of Lenthall’s fellow students – and the selecting and recording of useful quotations was an established reading strategy at early modern universities – he may well have been equipping himself with the tools to dispute with those at Cambridge who sympathised with parliament.²⁸

Manuscript copies of sermons were often presented by preachers to their patrons too. William Creed, a student at St. John’s, Oxford, dedicated a fair copy of a sermon he had preached in the college chapel on Easter Day 1643 to the president, Richard Baylie, while Sir Christopher Hatton received a bound volume of manuscript sermons from his parish minister, Peter Hausted, at some point shortly before the latter’s death in 1644.²⁹ A sermon by Lionel Gatford, who served as chaplain to Edward Hyde on Jersey in the late 1640s, can be found amongst Hyde’s papers in the Bodleian.³⁰ Intriguingly, Hyde, who made a habit of copying out apposite extracts from printed texts into commonplace books, seems to have read Gatford’s sermons closely and lifted material from at least one of them when composing his *History of the Rebellion* – suggesting that the narrative of the Civil War perpetuated by these preachers, and particularly the role they ascribed to their puritan counterparts, was not unimportant.³¹ In his 1643 *Exhortation to peace*, for example, Gatford had observed how it ‘was a complaint taken up by Erasmus against some Clergy-men in his time and in the times not long before him, that when any Princes were inclinable to warres, *Alius e sacro suggest*

²⁷ *Ibid.*, fo. 6r.

²⁸ See Christopher Burlinson, ‘The Use and Re-Use of Early-Seventeenth-Century Student Notebooks: Inside and Outside the University’, in James Daybell and Peter Hinds (eds.), *Material Readings of Early Modern Culture: Texts and Social Practices, 1580–1730* (New York, NY, 2010), pp. 229–45.

²⁹ Northamptonshire Record Office, FH/N/A/0250.

³⁰ Bodl., MS Clarendon 25.

³¹ See, for example, Bodl., MS Clarendon 127, fos. 58r–62v, which contains extracts from Sir Francis Bacon’s *Of the proficience and advancement of learning* (1605). I am grateful to Paul Seaward for advice on this point.

promittat omnium admissorum condiationem.³² Hyde incorporated this passage almost verbatim into his *History*: ‘it was a complaint of Erasmus of the clergy in his time, that when princes were inclinable to warres, *Alius e sacro suggest promittat omnium admissorum condiationem*’.³³ He also borrowed Gatford’s reference to Ezekiel, which is ‘too true of too many of the Prophets of this Nation, *There is a conspiracy of her Prophets in the midsts thereof, like a roaring lyon ravening the prey*’.³⁴

Sermons seem sometimes to have been copied and circulated in scribal form even where a printed edition of the sermon existed. For instance, a scribal copy of Brian Duppa’s *The soules soliloquie*, which he preached before Charles I at Newport in 1648, is included in a book of sermon notes in the Cambridge University Library. It is unclear whether this was a manuscript transcription of the printed edition or a scribal copy that circulated independently but, as John Spurr has shown, there are numerous discrepancies between the two versions.³⁵ In either case, it seems highly likely that the transcriber was making his own copy from a version lent to him by an acquaintance. Duppa’s sermon is one of only two in the notebook to be copied out in full. While the other sermon notes have no date or location and only include the name of the preacher, the transcriber records that Duppa’s was given ‘before K[ing] Ch[arles] I at Newport’, indicating that it may have been its context and connection to the court that warranted it being copied out extensively. Likewise, the edition of Lenthall’s sermon printed in 1643 was fully transcribed in manuscript by the antiquary Thomas Dingley much later in the seventeenth century, again testifying to the afterlives of these sermons long after the return of Charles II.³⁶ Dingley accompanied Henry Somerset, first duke of Beaufort,

³² Lionel Gatford, *An exhortation to peace* (1643), p. 22: ‘they promise from the sacred pulpit pardon of all offences whatsoever, to all such as will fight under such and such princes banners’.

³³ *CHR*, II, 321.

³⁴ Gatford, *An exhortation*, 26; *CHR*, II, 321. The reference is to Ezekiel 22:25. Compare also: Gatford, *An exhortation*, p. 23, with *CHR*, II, 320.

³⁵ CUL, Dd. 5. 31, (F) fos. 77r–84v; Spurr, *The Laity and Preaching*, p. 19.

³⁶ BL, Stowe MS 663.

on his progress through Wales in 1684, later writing an account of it.³⁷ Beaufort had married the daughter of the royalist martyr Arthur Capel and had been imprisoned in 1659 for his part in a plot to restore Charles II: Dingley may well have shared his patron's royalist sensibilities and this would help to explain his painstaking transcription of a decades-old Civil War sermon.³⁸

Partisan Hearers

It is also worth trying to consider how partisan hearers responded when confronted with the sermons of their opponents, particularly given that ministers were supposed to hold authority and status in spiritual matters. To what extent did they feel compelled to engage with alternative points of view? Did they go out of their way to avoid being exposed to such sermons, or could they quite happily sit through them, filtering out polemical elements and extracting any universal Christian message that might remain? Were listeners ever converted by royalist or parliamentarian preachers from one side to the other? Richard Culmer, no neutral observer admittedly, suggested that the incessant Laudian and royalist preaching in Canterbury Cathedral during the 1630s and early 1640s eventually drove away any godly elements of the congregation: 'good Men have long since altogether abhorred, and deserted their Cathedrall preachments'.³⁹ On the other hand, the fact that Culmer was able to supply such rich detail about so many sermons that had been given from the Cathedral pulpit would seem to indicate that either he, or some of his puritan allies, continued to attend services there despite their profound distaste for what they knew would be preached.

³⁷ Thomas Dingley, *The Account of the official progress of His Grace Henry the first Duke of Beaufort... through Wales in 1684* (1688).

³⁸ Molly McClain, 'Somerset, Henry, first Duke of Beaufort', *ODNB*.

³⁹ Richard Culmer, *Cathedrall newes from Canterbury* (1644), p. 8.

Indeed, evidence from the Committee for Scandalous Ministers suggests that, in the early 1640s, those most hostile to the minister were often also the most careful listeners of the sermons he gave – if only so that they had more ammunition when it later came to pushing for his ejection. The Leicestershire cleric Rice Jem, for example, complained that there were ‘Herrodians in his Congregation that went about to catch him in his words’, while Ephraim Udall had likewise accused members of his St. Paul’s audience of turning up in the hope of ‘call[ing] mee into question, and bring[ing] me into trouble’.⁴⁰ This in turn was reflected in the ways that some preachers composed their sermons: Jem decided to eschew commentary on controversial subjects ‘untill tymes were better’ after a member of his congregation took ‘speciall notice’ of a pro-episcopal passage in one of his sermons. More generally, Fiona McCall suggests that the loyalist clergy became increasingly cautious in the early 1640s, employing more ambiguous language when discussing contemporary politics in order to avoid entrapment by their parishioners.⁴¹

Evidence of preachers winning over their opponents is much harder to find: Richard Meggott may have claimed that ‘some [were] *undeceived*’ by Nathaniel Hardy’s loyal preaching during the Interregnum, but I have found no first-hand accounts of such conversions.⁴² Discussing seventeenth-century ‘propaganda’ more generally, Tim Harris argues that ‘a person confronted with views hostile to the ones he or she already holds is likely to ignore or reject them, or even interpret them in a way that confirms (rather than challenges) his or her existing prejudices’.⁴³ Hostile hearers were more often prone simply to dismiss a preacher outright on the basis that he was perverting or abusing scripture and therefore unworthy of his calling. When Thomas Hall, the presbyterian minister of Kings

⁴⁰ Ephraim Udall, *The good of peace and the ill of warre* (1642), sig. A3r.

⁴¹ Fiona McCall, ‘Scandalous and Malignant? Settling Scores against the Leicestershire Clergy after the First Civil War’, *Midland History*, 40 (2015), pp. 220–42, at p. 225.

⁴² See above, p. 194.

⁴³ Tim Harris, ‘Propaganda and Public Opinion in Seventeenth-Century England’, in Jeremy D. Popkin (ed.) *Media and Revolution: Comparative Perspectives* (Lexington, KY, 1995), pp. 48–73, at p. 50.

Norton, Warwickshire, was imprisoned in Worcester in 1644, he attended a sermon delivered in the cathedral by Oliver Whitby, chaplain to the city's governor. A detailed account of the sermon subsequently made its way into the posthumous life of Hall, probably written by John Reynolds, ejected minister of Wolverhampton. According to the biographer, Hall conceded that Whitby was an 'able man but full of gall against the Parliament' and on this occasion 'forgot or rather perverted his Text' (Judges 5:23) by praising 'the profane men of that Citty for rising with the first against the Parliament' who 'had destroyed all Lawes, and left us nothing but a few votes at Westminster'.⁴⁴ Hall was ostensibly as dismissive of this royalist sermon as one might expect a committed parliamentarian supporter to be. And yet the very fact that he left such a full account of it to his biographer, who in turn included it in his account of Hall's life, is revealing. Whether Hall had made notes of the sermon on the day or not, the preacher's words seem to have made a profound impression on him and to have lingered in the collective memory of his nonconformist circle long after the Civil Wars were over.

However, there is also some evidence that contemporary hearers and readers in essence could sometimes take the opposite approach to that adopted by modern scholars of early modern sermons: that is, they divorced the sermon from its immediate political and religious context, skipping over topical elements in search of sound, 'universal' doctrine and paying little heed to the partisan affiliation of the preacher. This is something that Ann Hughes has argued of those hearing parliamentary fast-day sermons in the 1640s and it is certainly interesting to see that the sermons of royalist and episcopalian clergymen were bought and read by those we would instinctively consider their clerical adversaries and vice versa. Auction lists show the presbyterian Thomas Manton to have owned a copy of Henry

⁴⁴ C. D. Gilbert, 'A Sermon in Civil War Worcester', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 16 (1998), pp. 177–82, at pp. 177–8.

Hammond's *The Christians obligation to peace and charity* (1649), although the listing made no mention of the fact that the titular sermon had been preached before Charles I at Carisbrooke Castle in 1647 (something the printed title-page made clear) and instead referred to the second sermon in the collection on 'Christ's easie yoke'.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, a collection belonging to Thomas Barlow, the Restoration bishop of Lincoln, shows him to have read preachers as diverse as William Laud, Brian Duppa, Nathaniel Hardy, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Reeve, and Thomas Jacomb.⁴⁶ If this is perhaps unsurprising, given that Barlow was a moderate and conciliatory Calvinist, it is much more striking to find a fair copy of Griffith Williams's fast sermon given before the Oxford Parliament in 1644 transcribed in a notebook belonging to John Howe, a presbyterian minister ejected in 1660.⁴⁷ After all, this was a sermon in which Williams had described how 'the ruin of the Church' would result 'with a presbyterian discipline, that new-sprung out-landish weed of man's invention, and no plant of God's plantation'.⁴⁸ It has been shown throughout this thesis that royalist clergymen read closely and responded to the polemical arguments of parliamentary preachers: perhaps Howe's transcription of Williams's sermon was the product of a similar impulse, to familiarise oneself with the arguments of an adversary, rather than focusing on uncontentious aspects of the sermon.

Sir John Gibson

The commonplace book of Sir John Gibson, compiled when he was imprisoned in Durham Castle during the 1650s, casts further light on both the circulation and the reception of sermons in these years. Gibson's commonplace book is a bewildering cornucopia of poems,

⁴⁵ *Catalogus Variorum & Insignium Librorum . . . Thomas Manton* (1678), p. 48.

⁴⁶ Bodl., Linc. B. 3. 2.

⁴⁷ Dr. Williams's Library, London, MS I.f.1.

⁴⁸ Griffith Williams, *A sermon preached at the publique fast* (Oxford, 1644), p. 36.

scriptural quotations, sermons, ballads, prayers, and portraits that nonetheless give a unique glimpse into the mindset of a royalist layman. The compiling of the book, indeed, seems to have been in some sense an exercise in royalist self-fashioning, a reassertion of Gibson's identity as someone who had and continued to suffer for king and Church: the fact that he actually seems to have been incarcerated in Durham Castle primarily as a debtor is, unsurprisingly, not mentioned. Moreover, the book suggests religion – that is to say the Bible, providence, and the writings of the patristics and contemporary episcopalian clergymen – was central to the way that Gibson understood the royalist cause during the Civil Wars and Interregnum. If some have seen royalism as an instinctive reflex based on tradition or personal loyalty, Gibson offers an important counterexample.⁴⁹ On one of the first pages of the book, under the heading 'Royall and Loyall', he listed several scriptural proof-texts on the impermissibility of rebellion that had recurred time and again in the sermons of the royalist clergy during the 1640s: Ecclesiastes 10:20 ('Curse not the King'); 1 Samuel 26:9 ('Who can strike forth his hand against the Lord's anointed?'); and 1 Samuel 15:23 ('For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft').⁵⁰ Gibson need not have taken these quotations from sermons he had heard – he may well have simply been going through the Bible and picking out apposite scriptural texts – but it is telling that it was with reference to scripture that he chose to justify his royalism. And this in itself suggests something about how royalist sermons may have been received by the lay persons who likewise supported the king, providing scriptural or theological arguments that legitimised loyalty and reaffirmed identity.

It seems from Gibson's commonplace book that sermons also performed a consolatory function for the loyalist laity during the darkest days of the English Republic. A large part of

⁴⁹ Peter Newman, 'The King's Servants: Conscience, Principle and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism', in Morrill *et al* (eds.), *Public Duty*, pp. 225–41, at p. 225; Gerald Aylmer, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England, II: Royalist Attitudes', *TRHS*, 5th series, 37 (1987), pp. 1–30, at p. 30.

⁵⁰ BL, Add. MS 37719, fo. 5r.

Gibson's commonplace book is made up of transcriptions of Chrysostom's sermons, which had been recently translated into English by Sir John Errington of Rudby, a fellow royalist prisoner at Durham.⁵¹ On one level, this reflects the increasingly central place of the patristics in episcopalian identity during the revolutionary decades. While Laudians had exalted Church tradition, royalists had found in writers like Tertullian and Augustine welcome support for their arguments against nonconformity and rebellion.⁵² However, increasingly in the 1650s, the Church Fathers were ransacked for their consolatory meditations specifically, appropriate for those who had suffered defeat and exile: the early Christians, of course, had undergone more than their fair share of persecution.⁵³ Gibson must have felt a measure of reassurance while copying down Chrysostom's claim, one also made by so many Interregnum episcopalian preachers, that 'Our Lord foretold that his [people] should suffer persecution; Blessed shall you be when men shall persecute you'.⁵⁴

Elsewhere, we find 'a Preamble to a text preached upon the thirtieth day of January, beinge Sunday. 1659 [i.e. 1660]. Decoll[atio] Charol. Reg'. No details of the preacher or location are given, and it is unclear how Gibson came across the extract. While other parts of his commonplace book contain passages and even actual clippings from printed works, no printed version of this sermon exists. Instead, it seems that the sermon must have been circulating in manuscript among Gibson's royalist acquaintances and thereby came into his possession despite his incarceration. We have already seen that royalist scribal sermon transmission was common in the 1640s, and it seems probable that it became even more so during the 1650s when such material would have had a still harder time making it to press,

⁵¹ Adam Smyth, "'Rend and Teare in Peeeces": Textual Fragmentation in Seventeenth-Century England', *Seventeenth Century*, 19 (2004), pp. 36–52, at p. 37.

⁵² See Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 155–202.

⁵³ See John Spurr, "'A Special Kindness for Dead Bishops": The Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism', in Paulina Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA, 2006), pp. 307–28, at pp. 313–14.

⁵⁴ BL, Add. MS 37719, fo. 52r.

given the vigilance of the republican authorities.⁵⁵ Why did Gibson take the time to transcribe this sermon? Clearly, its royalist implications specifically – he was careful to note its context as a sermon marking the anniversary of the regicide – appealed to him and fit with the book’s wider purpose as an expression of Gibson’s steadfast loyalty to the Stuarts. Rather than filtering out controversial content, here is another example of a reader drawn to a sermon precisely because of its political, not to mention subversive, nature.

Furthermore, given that the extract has come from a longer piece, it seems that Gibson or the acquaintance from whom he received the manuscript had carefully selected this particular passage. Taking as his text Psalm 32:5 – ‘I said I will confesse my transgressions unto the Lord and thou forgave the iniquity of my sin’ – the anonymous preacher immediately drew attention to the occasion of his sermon, noting that ‘it is not unknowne to those that are of age and understanding what did befall to us on this day’.⁵⁶ The rest of the sermon was a reflection on providence and how God could have allowed such a disaster to befall the nation, rehearsing the refrain commonly heard from the pulpits after 1649 that the Regicide was just punishment on a sinful nation: ‘I doe not for these our miseries blame any, but the many headed traitor, namely our sinnes’.⁵⁷ Yet the preacher also lamented that ‘all our enemies have opened their mouthes against us’, reinforcing divisions between the king’s supporters and his opponents.⁵⁸

Again, then, Gibson was recording a sermon that offered a particular understanding of the providential logic behind the disastrous experiences of defeat that had befallen those loyal to the Church of England and the monarchy over the preceding two decades, and thereby helped Gibson to make sense of his own suffering. The notes that Nicholas Oudart made on sermons

⁵⁵ See Jason Peacey, ‘Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?’, *History* 91 (2006), pp. 176–99.

⁵⁶ BL, Add. MS 37719, fo. 194r.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, fo. 194v.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

delivered by the king's chaplains at Newport during the treaty negotiations there in 1648 reveal a similar predisposition to this providentialist discourse. For the most part, Oudart was extremely sparing in his description of what these preachers had said: on Sunday 12 November he noted that 'Dr [Joseph] Gulson preached. Text, you shall sweare by me in truth, judgement & righteousness'.⁵⁹ Perhaps this is to be expected given that, as chapter four argued, these sermons were aimed primarily – if not exclusively – at Charles I himself, as he agonised over the concessions he could make regarding the Church. However, when Brian Duppa strayed onto the subject of suffering, and the providential logic behind it, Oudart recorded a much fuller description of his words:

God's goodness to afflict his people. Prosperity no sign of the right way, as sometimes Bellarmine made it the seventh note of the true church; but afterwards in a sermon to the Leaguers in France, was driven to contradict himself in a diameter, & to say that tribulation is one of the surest characters of God's children, as Daubiny relates.⁶⁰

Like Gibson, Oudart appreciated the preacher's ability to demystify the apparent capriciousness of the Almighty and to bestow legitimacy on those who found themselves persecuted for their beliefs and allegiances.

John Evelyn

One of the best pieces of evidence for lay responses to preaching in the whole seventeenth century is provided by the sermon notebook, curiously understudied, of John Evelyn. During the late 1680s, Evelyn transcribed into a large folio volume what he described as 'a breife

⁵⁹ *DC*, p. 403.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

Account of divers Sermons recollect'd at my after Retirements'.⁶¹ These accounts were copied from notes he had made while attending services over the course of the previous three decades, beginning while he was in exile in Paris in 1650, and were intended to be used in conjunction with his famous diary.⁶² Evelyn had arrived in Paris the previous year, joining his wife, Mary, and her father, Sir Richard Browne, Charles II's Resident in the city. While there, Evelyn regularly attended services conducted by several exiled episcopalian clergymen in Browne's chapel at Faubourg Saint-Germain, which provided a focal point for Protestant royalists in and around the courts of Henrietta Maria and Charles II. Evelyn reported in late 1649 that 'every Sunday and Hollyday ... wee have either Dr. Morley, or Dr Cosens without fayle who give us excellent sermonds, and duely administer the sacrement'.⁶³ By comparing the notes Evelyn took on sermons delivered there by John Cosin, the Arminian dean of Peterborough, during 1650-2 with Cosin's own notes for those same sermons, it is possible to examine much more fully processes of transmission: how a preacher's words were actually interpreted – or distorted – by his audience, whatever his own intentions and preoccupations had been. It will be argued that doing so complicates still further Hughes's picture of apolitical sermon listeners filtering out the polemical or controversial aspects of a preacher's message to extract only a spiritual kernel applicable to their everyday lives.

The first thing to establish about John Evelyn as a hearer is how assiduous he was in attending and recording sermons. In 1651 alone, he copied into his notebook notes on close to forty sermons, and his diary shows that he heard many more that he did not take notes on besides. Over the next three decades, Evelyn would record enough sermons to fill a bound folio volume of almost three hundred pages.⁶⁴ He was a discerning critic too, judging a

⁶¹ BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 1v.

⁶² Spurr, "A Sublime and Noble Service", p. 148.

⁶³ BL, Add. MS 78296, fo. 139.

⁶⁴ BL, Add. MS 78364; Spurr "A Sublime and Noble Service", p. 147.

preacher's ability and recording most extensively only those whose sermons were of a sufficiently high standard. A diary entry for 1650 notes, somewhat brutally, that 'Mr. Crowder (the Dukes Chaplain) preachd on 56 Psal. 8. 9, Against Atheists: This Gent: has not the Talent of Preaching', and no record of the sermon is therefore found in the notebook.⁶⁵ By contrast, Evelyn was in awe of the preaching of Cosin and John Earles. A sermon by the latter on 3 September 1651 was 'prosecuted according to his excellent talent', with Evelyn adding a reminder to 'see your *Sermon notes* on this day', while after another he reflected that 'I hardly in my whole life heard a more excellent discourse'.⁶⁶

It is also clear from comparing his notes with those of the preacher that Evelyn was a 'good' listener of sermons, able to follow the intricacies of an argument and recapitulate a sermon in his own words: to borrow from modern educational parlance, there is ample evidence of 'deep learning' on Evelyn's part. A long and slightly rambling paragraph of John Cosin's linking Septuagesima with Adam's disobedience is paraphrased succinctly and accurately by Evelyn as 'to every holy man, our captivity under the power & dominion of sinn; is a lesson to remind us, of our miserable condition by nature'.⁶⁷ The wording differs entirely to that in Cosin's notes, but the sense is retained and perhaps even clarified. Elsewhere, Cosin claims that the mistaken allegorical interpretation of The Fall 'came first either from the fancy of the heathen poets, whom they read rather than the Scriptures, or from Julian the apostate and his master, Porphyry, whom in this case they are willing to follow.' Again, Evelyn summarises this argument accurately, but with minor alterations in wording and sentence structure: 'the mythologies raised hereupon proceeded first from the fantastic inventions of poets, from Julian, and his blasphemous Mr. Porphyry'.⁶⁸ More generally, Evelyn's diary and notes

⁶⁵ *DJE*, III, 19.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 38–39.

⁶⁷ *WJC*, I, 298; BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 9v.

⁶⁸ *WJC*, I, 226; BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 11r.

demonstrate the profound emotional and intellectual impact episcopalian sermons could have on their audiences – not just on Evelyn himself. On 13 August 1651, Earles preached a sermon on Psalm 107:11, showing ‘that it was better to be humble & penitent Malefactors, than profane & wicked Loyalists’. ‘The Discourse was so passionate’, Evelyn notes, ‘that few could abstaine from teares, at his description of our abuse of Gods infinite mercys’.⁶⁹ Similarly, on 30 December 1655, George Wild preached a farewell sermon at St. Gregory’s, London, and according to Evelyn ‘so pathetic was his discourse, [it] drew many teares from the auditory’.⁷⁰

Comparing Evelyn’s sermon notebook with his diary and letters shows how he incorporated the theology communicated in the sermons he heard in Paris into his worldview and his understanding of the recent revolutionary upheavals. When his cousin, Thomas Keightley, was on the brink of converting to Rome in early 1651, Evelyn wrote a long letter attempting to dissuade him. Keightley was apparently ‘scandalized at the present calamity, and fate of our Church’ and this had helped to draw him towards Catholicism. ‘Judge you the truth of a Religion because it flourishes?’ Evelyn asked him; ‘suspect you the Persecuted? Renounce Christianity. Those that live piously must suffer’.⁷¹ This was a message Evelyn had heard time and again from the pulpit in Browne’s chapel during late 1650. On 20 November, James Hamilton, later bishop of Galloway, was recorded by Evelyn as claiming that ‘those who thinke to sayle to Heaven in a Calme, or upon mere pacification, must never hop[e] to arrive there. All that will live Godly in C.J must suffer persecution ... a Christian [must] be prepared resolutely to suffer for his profession’.⁷² Like Anthony Farindon to his congregation

⁶⁹ *DJE*, III, 39.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁷¹ *LJE*, I, 88, (Epistle XXIII: John Evelyn to Thomas Keightly, 25 Mar. 1651).

⁷² BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 6r.

at Milk Street, Hamilton was quick to hold up the Israelites as proof that God's chosen people sometimes had to suffer:

the persecutions, and afflictions of the Israelites ... their 40 yeares wandering through the Deserts: which indeede was no other, than a type of the suffering which the church of God should undergoe under the New Testament, before our entrance into the heavenly Canaan.⁷³

Evelyn subsequently employed this parallel himself, reminding Keightley that 'the church of the Jewes was once without Temple, without Priest, without Altar, and without Sacrifice, and yet as deare to God as ever'.⁷⁴ Here, then, we have an instance of sermons equipping Evelyn with the intellectual resources and theological framework with which to defend his continued loyalty to king and Church, and rebut the arguments from providence that were enticing others away from these institutions.

That sermons provided Evelyn with ways of understanding the fraught contemporary political situation and with repositories of arguments for continued loyalism is supported by his own note-taking practices. These qualify Hughes's suggestion that 'the more political or controversial messages' of sermons in the 1640s and 1650s 'were not necessarily the most relevant elements for the purposes of personal note-taking'.⁷⁵ It is striking, for instance, that anti-Catholic attacks often take up a much more significant proportion of Evelyn's summaries than is justified by the full text of Cosin's sermons. Occasionally, this seems to be because Cosin has strayed from his original script and, caught up in the moment, launched a more vitriolic assault on Catholicism than he had originally intended. A passage in Cosin's notes for a sermon given on 26 March 1651 discusses the idolatrous practices of Aaron without

⁷³ *Ibid.*, fos. 6r-v.

⁷⁴ *LJE*, I, 88.

⁷⁵ Hughes, 'Preachers and Hearers', pp. 70-1.

making any direct comparison with the Catholic liturgy. Evelyn, however, records that Cosin ‘condemne[d] the Papists, who mayntaine ... image-worshipping, and the like, to keepe their priests & others from sodomy, and the ignorant sort devout’.⁷⁶ Evelyn’s record is too detailed simply to be an instance of mishearing or misremembering, or to represent his own interpretation of Cosin’s meaning. That it is found in Evelyn’s notes at all nonetheless immediately suggests that his note taking was not intended solely as part of ‘a personal regime of piety’, with polemical content disregarded and didactic and pastoral messages prioritised.⁷⁷

This is confirmed by Evelyn’s summary of the sermon Cosin preached on 21 May 1651. Although Cosin’s notes run to approximately 5,000 words, Evelyn made a summary of no more than 500: he was forced therefore to condense the preacher’s message and only include what he regarded as the most important themes. The sermon was primarily a discourse on the Ascension and covered a range of related topics: the journey of the apostles from Jerusalem to Samaria; the typological unity between the Old and New Testaments; and, most importantly, the necessary conditions for imitating Christ’s ascension. Cosin at one point uses the Ascension to make a fleeting remark about the implausibility of the Real Presence: ‘they are but in a cloud still that fancy his fleshly presence to be still among them ... his spiritual presence that we must hold to now, and that is as real a presence as any His body or his flesh ever was, or ever can be’. Evelyn, however, gives entirely disproportionate coverage to this aside in his summary. Having passed over in a sentence Cosin’s arguments demonstrating that Christ is ‘never to be seene more in a visible forme, till he should come againe’, he notes that

⁷⁶ *WJC*, I, 246; *BL*, Add. MS 78364, fo. 12r.

⁷⁷ Spurr, *Laitie and Preaching*, p. 32.

it is to be deduced, that his corporeal presence in the B: Sacrament of the Eucharist cannot possibly be maintained by text of scripture; nor indeede was it pretended to be so, till of later tymes ... the Popes began to arrogate all interpretations and knowledge to himselfe, and brought in this monstrous, impossible and impracticable doctrine.⁷⁸

This represents the end of Evelyn's account, whereas Cosin had concluded his sermon on a far more didactic note. 'Let the end of all be, that as Christ is gone up to heaven before us, so we may prepare to go up thither after him', he had exhorted and, stressing the value of humility, declared that 'he that can set his heart upon His ascension here, shall not fail to be with him in person hereafter'.⁷⁹

If this was the message he wanted his audience to take away, Cosin would have been disappointed with Evelyn's diary entry for that day. This recorded that 'the Deane' had preached 'on 1. Acts 9.10.11., describing the Ascention' and included an even more truncated summary of the sermon: 'that since our B: Saviour was to be received into the Heavens til his 2d Comming; how vaine it was to fancy a corporal presence in the B: Sacrament, as the Romanists would impose'.⁸⁰ The passages that had evidently made the greatest impression on Evelyn were the handful of sentences on the doctrinal errors of Catholicism. Thus, when he came to reflect later on what the 'point' of the sermon had been and to distil its essence, he interpreted Cosin's discourse as primarily a polemical attack on the Church of England's enemies. In short, it was the controversial, rather than the pastoral, content that he 'took away' and remembered.

This pattern is repeated across diary entries for 1650-2, in which certain sermons receive much more extensive coverage than others. On 13 November 1650, Evelyn heard 'The Deane

⁷⁸ *WJC*, I, 270; *BL*, Add. MS 78364, fo. 16v.

⁷⁹ *WJC*, I, 275.

⁸⁰ *DJE*, III, 36.

on 17: Act 19', and recorded Cosin's arguments that 'St. Paules doctrine was as new to the Athenians as the Protestant to the Papists, though nothing was older, & so it was to the Jewes: How new then is much of the Romish superstition & additions: halfe Communion, Masse in an unknowne tongue: &c:'. By contrast, on 27 November, his entry reads simply: 'the Deane, on 1 Corinth: 10. 3. 4. 5. shewing how the Jewes had from the first the Symbols of the spiritual foode'.⁸¹ The more didactic sermon is summarised only in the briefest and most general terms, while Cosin's polemical arguments against Rome are recorded with far greater precision and detail, suggesting again that these were the aspects of a sermon that made the strongest impression on Evelyn. Of course, Evelyn was more detailed in his sermon notes in many cases, and often recorded non-polemical passages there, but the diary summaries are so valuable for the historian because they force Evelyn to condense the argument and extract the moral from a sermon, thereby showing what, in an hour-long oration, had stayed with him.

Even when the preacher's original notes are not available for comparison, Evelyn's notebook shows disproportionate coverage given to the more controversial parts of a preacher's address. For the 13 November sermon, Cosin's general arguments about the danger of seeking after novelty – which presumably constituted the majority of the actual sermon – are summarised with comparative brevity, taking up just half a folio. When it comes to recording Cosin's arguments against Rome, Evelyn is much more precise, and the transcription resembles more a verbatim account than a synthesis of the arguments: 'if needs they will have newes, it is their new fangles and devises which we leave to them who thus accuse us: their new communions, masses in an unknowne tongue, their saint-adoration and setting forth of new Gods to the people'. 'Ours', Evelyn's notes continue, is a religion 'established upon the word of God, not the dictats of the Pope, the doctrine and succession

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 22–3.

from the Apostles; on three creeds, fowre general councils, the Fathers of the primitive tymes, and finally from the universal assent of the purest ages of Christianity'.⁸²

Evelyn's interest in polemical refutations of Rome was undoubtedly in large part a product of his disorientating experiences in exile during these years. As Mark Williams has recently shown, exile placed considerable strain on the devotional culture and identity of those royalists residing in Catholic countries. They found themselves 'simultaneously in need of cross-confessional aid and beset by questions posed by what had previously been the religious "other," now transformed into the prospective ally'.⁸³ Henrietta Maria strove to win converts to Catholicism from among the exiled community in Paris, abetted in this enterprise by Catholic polemicists who claimed that the Church of England 'had perished by the proper axioms of its own Reformation, and hath no more subsistence in the world, nor pretence to the privilege of a Church'.⁸⁴ There were constant fears and rumours circulating within the exilic royalist community during the 1650s that Charles II himself was on the brink of conversion to Rome and in May 1650 came dispiriting news that the king was about to ban use of the Book of Common Prayer in services at the Louvre and in Browne's chapel.⁸⁵ Then, within the space of a few months in late 1650 and early 1651, two young Englishmen close to Evelyn had abandoned the Church of England. One was his cousin, Keightley, the other was John Cosin, son of the eponymous preacher. Evelyn, in letters and in person, attempted persistently to dissuade both from converting.

Yet Keightley and Cosin were just two instances of broader divisions among the exiled royalist community in Paris. The elder John Cosin's letters from the 1650s document his own

⁸² BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 5v-r.

⁸³ Williams, 'Devotional Landscape', p. 915.

⁸⁴ Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662* (1951), p. 52.

⁸⁵ Williams, 'Devotional Landscape', p. 917; Gillian Darley, *John Evelyn: Living for Ingenuity* (New Haven, CT, 2006), p. 102.

indefatigable struggles ‘to defend our own religion against divers others that were sent and brought thither to oppose it’. He recalled how, when he first arrived in Paris, Roman Catholic priests had sought to lure away members of the Church of England, telling them that ‘you have lived a long while in heresy, which hath brought God’s anger and indignation upon you: your kingdom of England is ruined: your Church is lost’.⁸⁶ Hence, so many of Cosin’s sermons from these years, delivered while he was serving as chaplain in Browne’s chapel, demonstrate a preponderant concern with keeping the exiled community steadfast in their loyalty to the beleaguered Church of England. He urged them not to ‘stumble either in our religion or loyalty, but that we may be firm to our trial, and constant to our profession; still, above all, loving the gates of our Sion, that is, of our religion, more than all our other dwellings in Jacob’.⁸⁷ Witnessing the conversions around him, and constantly challenged in France by the sneers of Catholics, Evelyn was concerned to arm himself with the polemical weapons to defend the Church of England against its detractors. This dictated the way that he listened and responded to sermons throughout his years in Paris.

However, it is not only anti-Catholic arguments to which Evelyn seems drawn. A sermon by John Earles on 9 July 1651 in the notebook is long and varied, concluding that ‘in this sad state of things as to our church, our persons, and possessions, [we should] seriously bethink ourselves of our profession ... that great is our reward if for well doing we patiently suffer’. A somewhat oblique passage hidden in the middle of the notes observes that ‘it is for want of this [i.e. observing the law of God] that peace is so far from our habitations, and persons; we make slight of the law of God, and complaine that men breake the peace of the Sovereigne’.⁸⁸ When Evelyn came to summarise the sermon in his diary, however, this passage was brought to the fore and clarified: ‘Dr. Earles preached on 119 Psal: last part: *Greate is the peace*

⁸⁶ *WJC*, IV, 242–3.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 205.

⁸⁸ BL, Add. MS 78364, fos. 5v–r.

which they have, who love thy Law, & are not offended at it: Concerning: That the want of Peace in England was, our making slight of the Law of God &c.'⁸⁹ The notes on Earles's sermon do not actually mention England anywhere specifically, but Evelyn was able to make the contemporary application himself and evidently regarded this as the sermon's central argument. If his notetaking was principally about extracting 'universal' lessons for a Christian life, Evelyn might have been expected to focus on Earles's conclusion, and to characterise the sermon more along the lines of 'Dr. Earles on the necessity of patient suffering'. Evelyn, however, was intrigued by what sermons had to say about contemporary political affairs, and how they could explain recent events in theological and providential terms. Again, an unusually short summary in the notebook of a sermon recorded Earles's argument on 13 August 1651, that 'the cause of all present sufferings are our rebellions against God: and in this sense Princes may be Rebellious as well as people ... it were better to be a humble malefactor, then a proude or a wicked Loyalist'.⁹⁰ In short, contemporary *applications*, and not just universal *doctrines*, were essential for Evelyn.

After Evelyn had returned to England from Paris and settled in Deptford in 1652, he was temporarily left without regular access to preachers he admired and who shared his politico-religious sympathies. He was also no longer surrounded by Roman Catholics casting aspersions on the Church of England and its legitimacy. The number of sermons he attended – or at least recorded having attended – declined sharply as a result: only three sermons, for instance, were entered into the notebook for the whole period between January and August 1652. By early 1653, however, he had found Richard Owen, the sequestered minister of nearby Eltham, to preach and administer the sacrament to his family at Sayes Court. His notes on Owen's sermons are particularly extensive, no doubt in part because it was simply

⁸⁹ *DJE*, III, 37.

⁹⁰ BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 20v.

easier to hear a preacher in a smaller room surrounded by only a handful of auditors.⁹¹ On one occasion, Evelyn recorded Owen's assurances that 'God, the just & righteous judge, [would] avenge, & deliver his servants according to his promise' and that 'deliverance will surely certainly come at last, tho in regard of our impatience & imperfection it seeme long [at] first'.⁹² Although Owen's language was ambiguous, Evelyn interpreted this as a reference to royalist and episcopalian suffering under the republican regime. Later in life, reading back over his notes, he would note in the margin next to the passage promising deliverance 'as it did in 1660: of which this was a kind of prophesy'.⁹³

When Owen was not preaching in his home, Evelyn begun sermon gadding across London, seeking out those episcopalian ministers who, as detailed in chapter five, had managed to find livings or lectureships in the city. During the mid- to late 1650s he heard Jeremy Taylor, George Wild, Peter Gunning, George Gillingham, and John Hewitt: indeed, St. Gregory by St. Paul's, where Wild and Hewitt both preached throughout the decade, was a regular place of worship for Evelyn since he believed (incorrectly) that 'the ruling powers conniv[ed] at the use of the Liturgie &c in this Church alone'.⁹⁴ When it appeared that a Protectoral ordinance of late 1655 would remove the possibility of episcopalian ministers preaching publicly, Evelyn and his fellow loyalists were devastated. He described the last day that any 'Minister of the Church of England might preach or administer the sacrament, or Teach Schoole' as 'the saddest day that this poore nation had seene, since the Reformation ... at which both Papists & Presbyterians rejoiced'.⁹⁵

Nonetheless, Evelyn did not confine himself solely to hearing episcopalian preachers in the later 1650s. He also occasionally attended services at his local church, where Thomas

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, fos. 29r–v.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 31r.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ *Diary*, III, 150.

⁹⁵ BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 35v.

Mallory, whom Evelyn described in the margin next to one sermon as ‘a Presbyterian and an Independent – I know not which of the two’, was minister until ejected in 1661.⁹⁶ Evelyn admitted that, despite Mallory’s religious outlook, he was still able to derive some spiritual benefit from his sermons because ‘he ordinarily preached sound doctrine & was a peaceable man’.⁹⁷ His notes on these sermons tend to be comparatively brief and confined to any uncontentious themes he was able to tease out. He summed up the message of one as ‘that the causal and effectual cleansing of sinners was by blood, & that of Christ onely’ and another as ‘the sweetness of the mercy & love of God, in opposition to the perverse & untractable nature of man, who must be compelled to embrace his owne happinesse’.⁹⁸ By contrast, when he heard a stranger preach at Deptford ‘in an enthusiastic style’, he ‘minded him but little’ and consequently no notes on the sermon are found in the notebook.⁹⁹ Evelyn’s loyalist allegiances did not entirely preclude receptivity to the sermons of non-episcopalians therefore, provided that these preachers did not showcase their puritanism too obviously or touch on those theological questions that divided them from episcopalian laymen like Evelyn. It is worth noting here, with Judith Maltby, the unwillingness of episcopalians in the 1650s to ‘unchurch’ altogether their theological and ecclesiological antagonists who were now in the ascendancy: ‘however deep in error the mainstream Protestant opponents of the Church of England might be, it was in a sense a family quarrel, whereas the Church of Rome was seen as outside the household’.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, fo. 30r.

⁹⁷ *Diary*, III, 80–1.

⁹⁸ BL, Add. MS 78364, fo. 32r.

⁹⁹ Quoted in Darley, *John Evelyn*, p. 139.

¹⁰⁰ Judith Maltby, ‘Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of “Anglicanism”, 1642–60’, in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158–80, at p. 167. See also: *idem*, ‘The Prayer Book and the Parish Church: from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Restoration’, in Charles Hefling and Cynthia L. Shattuck (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to The Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 79–92, at p. 91.

William Sancroft

This detailed case-study of John Evelyn's hearing processes immediately raises the question of typicality: how unique was Evelyn as an episcopalian, royalist sermon goer and note taker? Sadly, we have nothing comparable to his notebook for other lay persons in these years, spanning as it does several decades and containing hundreds of sermons. As John Spurr notes, 'it is rare for a seventeenth-century individual's spiritual life and devotional regime to be recorded in the kind of detail afforded by Evelyn's diary and archive'. Indeed, for Spurr, there is something almost quasi-clerical about the depth and extent of Evelyn's devotional practices.¹⁰¹ By contrast, it is not hard to find examples of hearers less assiduous in their record keeping. The likes of Henry Townshend, Anthony Blagrave, and John Egerton, the second earl of Bridgewater, were content for the most part simply to record the preacher and his choice of text, with at most a few words summarising the argument.¹⁰² Townshend's diary entry noting that 'on Sunday the Reverend Bishop made an admired sermon on 2 Cor., 8, 20, in the Collegiate Church of Worcester' is in this respect typical.¹⁰³ Nor was it universally agreed that remembering sermons in great detail was necessarily important or desirable. Evelyn himself recorded a sermon given by George Wild, in which the preacher spoke on 'the hearing of many Sermons: That though we forget them, they were profitable, & did us good, like Water passing through a Cive, albeit it stayed not there, yet in passing through it clenched'.¹⁰⁴ We should not necessarily conclude, however, that these other hearers were uninterested or unengaged. They often showed themselves to be active and discerning critics like Evelyn, as when Townshend commented that a sermon 'by Mr. Gr[oss]. On Psalm 3 v. 1,

¹⁰¹ Spurr, "'A Sublime and Noble Service'", pp. 149, 160.

¹⁰² Bodl., MS Eng Misc. E 118, fos. 16v, 24v. On the earl of Bridgewater's sermon notebook, see Charles L. Hamilton, 'Jean D'Espagne and the Second Earl of Bridgewater', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, 24 (1983–1988), pp. 232–9. I am grateful to Vivienne Larminie for this reference.

¹⁰³ *DHT*, p. 78.

¹⁰⁴ *DJE*, III, 151.

2, Being David's flying from Absalom his son upon his rebellion' was 'such a piece as never had ... parallel for an invective'.¹⁰⁵

A sermon notebook belonging to William Sancroft, the future archbishop of Canterbury, provides an interesting comparison with Evelyn. It dates from 1641, when Sancroft was studying for his MA at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and regularly attending sermons in chapels and parish churches around the town. The notes are very much those of a future cleric in training: he is far more interested than a layman like Evelyn in the technical structure of the sermon, dividing his notes into sections under the heading 'observation' or 'use' and numbering the different stages of the argument. Annotations suggest that he returned to the notes after services, re-reading and correcting them as necessary.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, Sancroft seems, perhaps unsurprisingly, particularly drawn to discussions of a minister's duty and vocation, noting down most regularly and in the most detail comments such as 'the honour of a minister appears if wee doe but consider the requisite qualifications: integrity & faithfulness, wisd[om] & prudence, eminency in both'.¹⁰⁷

However, neither the preachers that Sancroft heard nor he himself entirely ignored the tense contemporary political context of that year. For instance, Sancroft heard and made detailed notes on a sermon preached by Robert Sheringham of Caius College in Great St. Mary's church. Although Sheringham is well-known for the stridently absolutist views he would go on to express in the later 1640s and 1650s, his sermon in 1641 took a much more moderate position on the nature of royal power and the place of parliament in the commonwealth.¹⁰⁸ Sancroft noted Sheringham's claim that 'Kings depend on their subjects', without whom a

¹⁰⁵ *DHT*, p. 224. On this sermon and the identification of the preacher, see C. D. Gilbert, 'Two Sermons at the Siege of Worcester, 1646', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 20 (2006), pp. 139–41, at p. 140.

¹⁰⁶ Bodl., MS Sancroft 83, p. 38.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 10–11.

¹⁰⁸ See Edward Vallance, 'Royal Absolutism in the 1650s: The Case of Robert Sheringham', in Glenn Burgess (ed.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (2012), pp. 33–46.

king ‘can neither subdue his rebels, nor conquer his forraine enemies’.¹⁰⁹ In an apparent criticism of the Personal Rule, Sheringham declared that the king was obligated to protect ‘his people, their sympathies & antipathies’ and that, ‘as the subject [is bound] to obedience, soe ye K[ing] to maintaine their rights ... Soe that noe K[ing] can assume an arbitrary unlimited power on ye goods or lives of his subject’. ‘God alone’, noted Sheringham pointedly, ‘is absolute’.¹¹⁰ Despite, or more likely because of, its political, topical content, Sancroft gave Sheringham’s sermon disproportionate coverage in his notes: it takes up four pages of his notebook, while he gets three separate, less openly controversial sermons onto the following two pages.¹¹¹ These notes were not, it seems, just about deriving a spiritual moral for the individual Christian life or teaching a minister how to preach and save souls.

Did Sancroft agree with Sheringham’s criticisms of Charles I? It is certainly conceivable: even many of the most ardent future royalists were willing to concede that the controversial fiscal policies of the Personal Rule had been a mistake.¹¹² However, it is also possible to identify instances in which Sancroft was prepared to record preachers with whom we can be confident that, as ‘a Church of England loyalist [who] held to the conjoint rule of king and bishop, and adhered to the Book of Common Prayer’, he disagreed.¹¹³ For instance, he heard and took notes on a sermon by Richard Culverwell, who hailed from a family of religious radicals, and also William Gurnall - a nonconformist ejected at the Restoration and educated, like Sancroft, at Emmanuel.¹¹⁴ He recorded too the claims of one Robert Ward of Queens’ College that ‘the great sinne of Idolatry to which [the Israelites] were so prone, we know it in Eng[land] to doe Evill’.¹¹⁵ This might be best explained by the purpose of Sancroft’s note-

¹⁰⁹ Bodl., MS Sancroft 83, pp. 37–8.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

¹¹¹ Compare *Ibid.*, pp. 37–40, with 41–2.

¹¹² See James Daly, ‘Could Charles I be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646’, *JBS*, 6 (1966), pp. 23–44, at pp. 24–6.

¹¹³ Robert Beddard, ‘Sancroft, William’, *ODNB*.

¹¹⁴ Bodl., MS Sancroft 83, pp. 5–9.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

taking, which differed from somebody like Evelyn: he was attempting to master the formal art of preaching – the arguments, structures and generic conventions – and his notes were perhaps therefore aids with which to recollect at a later date not so much *what* the preacher had said but *how* he had said it.

Conclusions

What implications do these findings have for our understanding of sermon hearing more generally? We should be wary of drawing too many sweeping conclusions, given the small sample of hearers here focused on and the questions of singularity that this inevitably raises. Nonetheless, Ann Hughes has argued that ‘the tendency of note-takers to underplay the more immediate, political references’ in Civil War sermons could be interpreted as ‘evidence for their overall failure as propaganda or inspiration’.¹¹⁶ Correspondingly, if we are able to find evidence that hearers were in fact very responsive to controversial arguments and contemporary applications, the sermon’s efficacy as an instrument of political communication and persuasion has to be taken more seriously. It has been argued that the activities of publishers and booksellers suggest at the very least that there was a significant, if short-term, market for sermons dealing with topical questions. In Evelyn, Gibson, and others, moreover, we have important instances of laypersons internalising the theological explanations of royalist and episcopalian defeat that preachers espoused in their sermons, and in some cases subsequently reproducing them to friends and relatives. Sermon hearing thus seems to have helped the laity in making sense of their suffering in terms that vindicated their loyalties and partisan identities, and in providing arguments they could use when defending themselves, their communities, and their cause from detractors. More generally, we have seen

¹¹⁶ Hughes, ‘Preachers and Hearers’, pp. 76–7.

evidence of genuine engagement on the part of these lay hearers – demonstrated not only by their ability to follow the arguments of sermons and pick up on any royalist subtexts but also in the evidence of strong emotional reactions to particular preachers.

However, it should be remembered this was a case of strengthening those already committed to the cause: the capacity for preachers to reach and persuade the hostile or unconverted must remain more of an open question. In fact, this chapter has suggested that partisan hearers were broadly unresponsive to the preaching of those with whom they disagreed, although they could sometimes still find a sound spiritual message to focus on if the sermon was not overly polemical. This is not to say that they were uninterested in hostile preaching – it has been argued here and throughout the thesis as a whole that both parliamentarians and royalists were obsessed with the way their enemies used the pulpit. They read and listened to one another's sermons closely, particularly where they intended to respond to the arguments made or, in the case of the laity, build a dossier of evidence that could be used to indict the preacher for his malignancy.

Conclusion

On 25 March 1660, Matthew Griffith, erstwhile chaplain to the late Charles I, delivered a sermon in the Mercers' Chapel, London, that provoked something of a furore. Although he had been sequestered by parliament in early 1643 for his vocal support of the king, Griffith later recalled how, during the 1650s, he and many of his fellow sufferers had taken 'the confidence ... to fall to the exercise of our ministerial function again, in such poor parishes as would admit us'.¹ He had thus been a regular preacher in and around London during the Interregnum, even if none of his sermons from these years subsequently appeared in print.² His sermon in the spring of 1660, however, was swiftly published under the title *Fear of God and the King*. It included not only a dedication 'to his Excellency, George Monck' but, as advertised on the title-page, an appendix providing 'a brief Historical account of the Causes of our unhappy Distractions, and the onely way to Heal them'.³ Monck had marched down with an army from Scotland and occupied London the previous month, and the Rump Parliament dissolved itself just days before Griffith preached in the Mercers' Chapel, giving rise to intense speculation as to the new constitutional arrangements that might follow.⁴ Samuel Pepys recorded that 'great is the talk of a single person', though whether this would be Charles II, Monck, or another was as yet unclear.⁵ Sensing that the winds were changing, and that the nation had reached a potentially decisive moment, Griffith and several other preachers jettisoned any lingering caution and resolved to use their pulpits to rally support in the capital for a Stuart restoration.⁶

¹ WR, p. 49; Matthew Griffith, *The fear of God and the king* (1660), unpag., 'To his Excellency, George Monck'.

² David Lloyd, *Memoires of the lives ... of those ... personages that suffered* (1668), p. 521.

³ Griffith, *Fear of God*, title-page.

⁴ See Neil Keeble, *Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 17–26.

⁵ *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (11 vols., 1971–83), I, 74.

⁶ For other preachers, see *Ibid.*, p. 91; Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662* (1951), pp. 108–9.

The sermon itself, which took as its text Proverbs 24:21 ('my Son, Fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that be seditious, or desirous of change') was in the circumstances a bold, if relatively conventional, restatement of monarchical power and passive obedience.⁷ God and the king were 'both Gods, and both Kings' and thus 'the King is not to be disobeyed ... you must not resist but suffer patiently'.⁸ 'Rebellion is the sin of witchcraft', Griffith reminded his audience, and those who instituted it would ultimately find themselves 'cheated, beggar'd, and utterly ruin'd by [their] own inventions'.⁹ However, the account of the Civil Wars appended to the printed edition of the sermon was still more incendiary. Here, Griffith railed against 'the Old Puritan Faction, whom this Church and State, ever since the Reformation, have found to be inveterate and irreconcilable Enemies to Peace and Truth', and whose intention had been to murder the king 'from the first rise of the Rebellion'. He even defended Charles I's Ship Money policy in the 1630s as 'but a Flea-bite ... in comparison to those Insupportable Pressures, under which we have laien groaning and gasping ever since'.¹⁰ The publication ended by declaring that, 'without the restitution of King Charles to his native rights, we can in reason look for no solid settlement of Religion, or Law, Liberty or Property, Peace or Plenty, Honour or Safety'.¹¹

The sermon immediately elicited passionate responses on all sides. It was apparently so popular in the city that 'the whole impression of 500 was sold off' within two days.¹² The Council of State promptly ordered Griffith's arrest on 2 April and kept him imprisoned at Newgate until 8 May, the day that Charles II was declared king.¹³ Griffith also found himself

⁷ This is Griffith's own gloss on Proverbs 24:21: the Authorised Version simply reads 'meddle not with them that are given to change'.

⁸ Griffith, *Fear of God*, pp. 1, 11.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 65, 80.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 910 [irregular pagination].

¹² *CCSP*, V, 643.

¹³ *CSPD*, Commonwealth, 1659–60, p. 572; *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg, 1659–1661*, ed. William L. Sachse (1961), p. 69.

assailed in print by none other than John Milton, for whom the sermon constituted definitive proof of his theory, already set out in *The readie and easie way*, that some ‘deceivers’ were intent on ‘returning [us] to our old bondage’.¹⁴ Milton’s pamphlet, which constituted a methodical refutation of Griffith’s exegetical interpretations, was in turn attacked by Roger L’Estrange, in a work printed on 20 April and entitled – somewhat cruelly – *No blind guides*.

However, Griffith’s strident preaching also disconcerted prominent figures at the exiled court, who feared this triumphalist, vengeful rhetoric would ultimately prove counterproductive. Edward Hyde received reports at Breda ‘of the very unskilful Passion and Distemper of some of our Divines, in their late sermons’ and was warned that ‘some of the Presbyterians who have formerly been forward enough, begin a little to flag now, and fear the settlement of Episcopacy’.¹⁵ He informed John Barwick that the king himself was ‘extremely apprehensive of Inconvenience and Mischief to the Church and himself, from Offences of that kind’, and asked Barwick and George Morley to use ‘your Credit and Authority with such men’ in order to get them to refrain from ‘awake[ning] those Jealousies and Apprehensions, which all men should endeavour to extinguish’.¹⁶ Monck too was said to be ‘highly offended’ by the sermon, since Griffith had shown himself ‘too zealous for the royal cause before [Monck] durst own it’.¹⁷

The story of *Fear of God and the King*, then, contains within it many of the central themes of this thesis. Most obviously, it demonstrates the tendency for supporters of monarchy to use sermons, both from the pulpit and in printed form, to try and direct the course of events at critical junctures during the English Revolution. Preaching was a vital way that conservatives

¹⁴ John Milton, *Brief notes upon a late sermon* (1660), p. 1; Tai Liu, ‘Griffith, Matthew’, *ODNB*; Austin Woolrych, ‘Introduction’, in *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Don M. Wolfe (8 vols., New Haven, CT, 1980), VII, 201–4.

¹⁵ Quoted in Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, p. 109.

¹⁶ *The Life of the Reverend Dr. John Barwick* (1724), pp. 517–18, 519–20.

¹⁷ *AO*, III, 711.

could engage with the public sphere and sway popular opinion, thereby counteracting the demagoguery of over-passionate, deceptive puritan preachers. At the same time, royalist and, to a lesser extent, episcopalian preaching was itself often capable of generating considerable public debate, controversy, and dialogue. Whether it was the members of the Council of State who imprisoned Griffith; the pamphleteers who attacked or defended him; the hundreds of readers who flocked to purchase his sermon; or the royalist high command in exile seeking to muzzle him – laypersons on all sides treated sermons as events of real public significance and took a keen interest in what exactly was being said in the pulpit. The preachers themselves, meanwhile, fed off, and contributed to, a brave new world of cheap print and vociferous public debate that, by the spring of 1660, was just beginning to open up once again as the Rump's authority disintegrated: this despite an initial anxiety, felt as both royalists and as preachers, towards print.¹⁸ This thesis has accordingly emphasised the extent to which royalist and episcopalian preaching constituted one side of an ongoing dialogue – with fellow preachers, with pamphleteers, with political figures.

Griffith's case also highlights some of the generic shifts that this need to harness the power of preaching for immediate partisan purposes engendered in the sermon over the course of the 1640s and 1650s, and the ways in which printing could transform a sermon. Publication provided Griffith with an opportunity to augment the royalist message of his sermon with a still more direct historical discussion of the Civil Wars, which he had been unwilling or unable to deliver orally in the pulpit to his initial audience. By doing so, he made the printed edition into a composite document, a hybrid of different genres, and accentuated the contrast between the experience of reading and of hearing his sermon. But the sermon itself was also indicative of the kinds of changes that pulpit discourse had been undergoing since the early

¹⁸ See Gerald Maclean, '1660', in Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 619–28.

1640s. In making the case for obedience to the king, and refuting the arguments that had been made by his enemies, Griffith engaged in direct topical discussion and political theorising: he claimed, for instance, that ‘the co-ordination which some Seditious persons have so fiercely maintain’d of late, is point-blank against, not only Religion, but right reason’ and denied the distinction between ‘the Kings politick capacity, and his personall’ that parliamentarians had tried to make.¹⁹

The kinds of arguments that had been exchanged in pamphlets in the early 1640s had filtered into the pulpit, and sermons began to develop new structures and styles that could accommodate the immediate demands of polemical dialogue. Having unpacked his text cursorily, Griffith even declared that he would ‘a little enlarge my Discourse, according to the mode of these Reforming Times, which commonly insists most upon Use and Application’.²⁰ This constituted a candid acknowledgement that homiletic styles had changed and that the parts of a sermon that had traditionally involved immediate discussion of hearers’ lives – and therefore current events – were now being prioritised. In short, attitudes towards not only the printing but the actual composition of sermons shifted in response to the emergence of adversarial politics and pamphleteering in the early 1640s.

More broadly, this thesis has sought to demonstrate the necessity of viewing the royalist and episcopalian clergy as active, outspoken, and autonomous agents throughout both the 1640s *and* the 1650s, who sought to shape – and not only defend – the royalist cause in the pulpit. Griffith’s career epitomises this: imprisoned on multiple occasions for his loyal preaching, he continued to minister in the 1650s, even if the absence of corroboration in terms of printed publications might initially obscure his activities. As chapter five argued, sincere, indeed *active*, royalism and continued public ministry within the Interregnum Church were not

¹⁹ Griffith, *Fear of God*, pp. 40, 41.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

incompatible. However, sometimes the desperation of these clerics to ensure a future for an episcopalian Church of England brought them into conflict with other elements of the king's party and their sermons could consequently prove controversial in royalist circles too.

Griffith, for example, decided to embark on a divisive strategy in pulpit and press that earned him the disapprobation of the exiled court. Despite the enduring commitment of many episcopalian clergymen to the crown well into the 1650s, this thesis has reiterated that episcopalianism and royalism were not one and the same and could, in fact, occasionally pull in competing directions – both before and after the Regicide.

This thesis therefore sweeps away any lingering notion that clergymen on the king's side were passive, moderate, or irenic, their sermons merely clichéd and outmoded rehearsals of Jacobean divine-right theories.²¹ It is perhaps fitting that Griffith was said to have died after having ruptured a vein 'in the earnest pressing of [a] necessary point' while preaching: it was not only puritans who could display intense zeal, enthusiasm, and fury in the pulpit.²² Indeed, a theme throughout the preceding chapters has been just how divisive and polarising royalist and episcopalian pulpit rhetoric often was. Scripture and providence were presented to audiences in such a way as to render any compromise with God's enemies – that is, those who opposed king and Church – unthinkable. Fear of neutralism, backsliding, and apostasy continually exercised these preachers throughout the 1640s and 1650s, and they accordingly exploited their purported spiritual authority as Christ's ambassadors to conflate questions of politico-religious allegiance with the question of divine judgement and salvation. This develops our understanding of both the confessional dimensions of royalism and the political roles played by the episcopalian clergy during the Civil Wars and Interregnum. It also complements recent literature that has emphasised the fluidity and instability of popular

²¹ See, for example, Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 21.

²² Lloyd, *Memoires*, p. 517.

allegiance, and the corresponding need to pay greater attention to the means by which each side mobilised support.

This has also been, indirectly, a study of censorship during the revolutionary period – its impact, limitations, and implications. Part of the reason the output of the royalist clergy is particularly interesting is that for so much of this period they were to a greater or lesser extent constrained in what they could say by the threat of imprisonment or ejection, and could not enjoy the benefits of the ‘free press’ that historians often refer to in this period. Sermons were well-suited to these conditions: sophisticated rhetorical techniques had been honed by Elizabethan and early Stuart preachers who wished to engage safely with controversial subject matter, and there is no little irony in the fact that these strategies now came to be deployed by those of a decidedly antipuritan temperament. But there is also a wider methodological point arising from this thesis about the dangers of print for the historian when it comes to tracing and defining the nature of royalism in these years. It is clear when we employ other kinds of sources that preaching was often more provocative, complex, indeed *royalist*, than the printed record would at first suggest. This is particularly important for our understanding of the Interregnum Church and episcopalian participation in it.

Historians are increasingly aware of the extent to which the Civil Wars left a mark on the political, religious, and cultural history of England during the Restoration and beyond – and the artificiality of 1660 as a dividing line for periodisation – and it is hoped that this thesis similarly provides context for understanding the preaching, mentalities, and behaviour of episcopalian clergy into the later seventeenth century.²³ Specifically, there has been growing interest in recent years in loyalist engagement with the Restoration ‘public sphere’, seen, for instance, in Mark Knights’s study of loyal addresses to the monarch or the recent collection

²³ See, for example, Janet Clare (ed.), *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures* (Manchester, 2018).

of essays on Roger L'Estrange, the belligerent polemicist and tireless press censor.²⁴ At the same time, Tony Claydon has argued that 'public affairs were treated extensively in the late Stuart pulpit' and that sermons 'played a vital role in creating and sustaining the public sphere after 1660'.²⁵ I have tried to show the need to trace these developments further back, to the 1640s and 1650s, when loyalists were forced to recalibrate their attitudes to preaching, print, and popularity. At the height of the Exclusion Crisis, Roger L'Estrange famously declared in his *Observer* that 'it is the press that has made 'em mad, and the press must set 'em right again': this was a conclusion, the preceding chapters have suggested, royalist and episcopalian churchmen had already come to by the mid-1640s.²⁶

However, this study has not, of course, been exhaustive and it is worth here pointing out some potential avenues for future research. For instance, the demands of space mean this thesis ends with the return of Charles II in May 1660, even though, as I hope to show elsewhere, the pulpit continued to play a critical role in debates regarding the Church of England in the months and years that followed the Restoration.²⁷ As the horrified reaction of Charles II and Hyde to Griffith's sermon makes clear, the court had a more moderate, inclusive vision for a future religious settlement than many episcopalian clergymen.²⁸ The years before the Act of Uniformity was implemented in 1662 thus saw a concerted preaching campaign, whereby the stricter episcopalian clergy, anxious about the direction religious

²⁴ See, for example, Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch (eds.), *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture* (Aldershot, 2008); Mark Knights, 'The Loyal Address', in Paulina Kewes and Andrew McCrae (eds.), *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations* (Oxford, 2019), pp. 319–35; Edward Vallance, "'From the Hearts of the People": Loyalty, Addresses and the Public Sphere in the Exclusion Crisis', in Tony Claydon and Thomas Corns (eds.), *Religion, Culture and National Community in the 1670s* (Cardiff, 2011), pp. 127–47; and *idem*, *Loyalty, Memory and Public Opinion, 1658–1727* (Manchester, 2019).

²⁵ Tony Claydon, 'The Sermon, the "Public Sphere" and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England', in Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1500–1750* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 208–34, at p. 211.

²⁶ *The Observer*, I (13 Apr. 1681).

²⁷ See William White, 'Episcopalian Preaching between the Restoration and the Act of Uniformity, 1660–2' (forthcoming).

²⁸ See Paul Seaward, 'Circumstantial Temporary Concessions: Clarendon, Comprehension, and Uniformity', in N. H. Keeble (ed.), *Settling the Peace of the Church: 1662 Revisited* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 57–84.

policy under Charles II was taking, sought to offer counsel in sermons addressed to the monarch. This included regional clergymen who, unable to preach before the king in person, printed their sermons in the hope that the king would read them. They reminded the new king that providence was reciprocal, and that his restoration thus brought with it a divinely bestowed duty to reinstitute ‘true’ religion. Furthermore, in direct contravention of the Act of Oblivion, they – like Griffith – used their sermons to rake up the troubles of the preceding decades in the hope of demonstrating both the imprudence of trusting presbyterians and the necessity of reinstating pre-war episcopal government. In light of the findings of this thesis, this should not surprise us. I have emphasised the deep distrust that some episcopalian churchmen began to feel towards both Charles I and his son from the late 1640s and the ways that preaching offered a way to negotiate these tensions. I have also stressed that these same churchmen became increasingly comfortable with the use of pulpit and press to direct royal policy, eschewing previous reservations about indecorous encroachment on the *arcana imperii*.

The Civil Wars and Interregnum left their mark on post-Restoration preaching culture in other ways too. Arnold Hunt notes that the years after 1640 witnessed a ‘decline of the reading / preaching distinction ... by which live preaching was held to be inherently different from, and superior to, the reading of a written text’.²⁹ It seems very probable that this process was accelerated by the sheer, unprecedented frequency with which the clergy produced and the laity encountered printed sermons during the revolutionary decades. Certainly, this thesis has depicted a process by which preachers began to appreciate the advantages and opportunities afforded to them by print, even if these could still not always be openly acknowledged. Another, related development which has been particularly well-documented is

²⁹ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 393.

the emergence from the late 1650s of an ‘Anglican plain style’ that appealed to the reason and understanding, rather than affections and emotions, of auditors.³⁰ Here, then, is another instance of the dialectical evolution of the English sermon in the mid-seventeenth century that has been at the core of this thesis. It is not possible to treat the Civil War preaching of different political and religious groups entirely in isolation, given the extent to which sermons in these decades were a response to, and influenced by, the preaching of adversaries.

As historians, aided by projects like GEMMS, find and sift more manuscript sermon material, it will help to advance our understanding of royalist and episcopalian preaching beyond the findings of this thesis in a number of significant ways.³¹ First, although chapter six sought to show some of the ways in which these sermons were heard, read, and circulated, turning up more hearers’ notes will prevent overreliance on those like John Evelyn whose typicality must for now remain an open question. Secondly, this thesis has been largely focused on preaching at moments of particular significance, since its purpose has in large part been to draw attention to the dynamic interrelation between preaching and political events. This can, however, give a distorted impression of preachers’ activities in these years and Ann Hughes is surely right to point out that even the most controversial of ministers spent much of the revolutionary years engaged in more routine and didactic sermonising. One problem, as I have argued, is that it was topical, polemical sermons that were most likely to find their way into print, at least during the 1640s, and so evidence of quotidian preaching is inevitably harder to detect. And although I have tried wherever possible to discuss regional preaching, it was largely sermons delivered at the political centres – Oxford, York, London, the exiled court – that were published. However, as historians investigate further the turbulent ecclesiastical situation at a local level, the actual mechanisms by which parishes under

³⁰ See above, p. 16n.

³¹ <https://gemms.itercommunity.org/>.

parliament or the republic operated, we may also discover more about the regional dimensions of preaching. This, in turn, will help to deepen our sense of episcopalian identity and culture.

It has been another aim of this thesis to refocus attention on the complex relationship between preaching and print, and to show that the recent scholarly consensus on the need to reconstruct sermons as oral performance risks eclipsing some of the most interesting dimensions of sermon transmission. I have tried to show how print enabled clergymen not only to reach wider audiences but to make new interventions through the recycling and recontextualization of their sermons. Nor was it only the clergy that utilised sermons in this way: once a sermon had been preached or published, laypersons were subsequently able to co-opt and deploy it for their own (often very different) purposes. Scholars of early modern preaching may therefore wish to delve deeper into the practices of forging, pirating, and reissuing sermons, which seem to have been much more common than has hitherto been recognised. A good starting point in this regard would be to examine the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century afterlives of those sermons initially published during the revolutionary period.

Perhaps most importantly, we await a comprehensive study of parliamentary and republican preaching in these decades. Despite the thesis's emphasis on dialogue, the extent to which it has explored the other side of that dialogue has necessarily been limited. A full investigation into parliamentary preaching – and not just the famous set-piece fast-day sermons – will help scholars to appreciate even better the complex, dialectical dynamics of Civil War preaching and the ways in which these years represented a pivotal stage in the evolution of the sermon both as a literary genre and a tool of partisan, political expression. For evidence of just how turbulent, creative, indeed revolutionary, the English Revolution was on *all* sides, historians would do well to look again at the pulpit.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

Cambridge

University Library

Dd. 5. 31. (F): Sermon notes from 1640s Cambridge

London

British Library

Add. MS 5829: Records of the Committee for Scandalous Ministers in Essex

Add. MS 14828: Parliamentary notes of Sir Framlingham Gawdy

Add. MS 15671: Proceedings of the Committee for Plundered Ministers

Add. MS 20066: Sermon notebook of Robert Sanderson

Add. MS 34014: Protectoral records of those lodging in and around London

Add. MS 34692: Sermon of Thomas Lenthall

Add. MS 37719: Commonplace book belonging to Sir John Gibson

Add. MS 78296: Letters of John Evelyn

Add. MS 78364: Sermon notebook of John Evelyn

Add. MS 78632: Catalogue of John Evelyn's Library

Harley MS 6942: Correspondence of Henry Hammond and Gilbert Sheldon

Stowe MS 184: Papers of Sir Edward Dering

Stowe MS 663: Copy of a sermon made by Thomas Dingley

Dr. Williams's Library

MS I.f.1: Copies of sermons made by John Howe

MS 61.1: 'Narrative of the Life & Death of Mr Thomas Hall'

London Metropolitan Archives

P69/MRY9/B/001/MS02597: Vestry minutes of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street

P69/MRY9/B/007/MS02596/002: Churchwardens accounts of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street

The National Archives

LC 5/125: Lord Chamberlain's Rolls for the Selection of Lent Preachers

Maidstone

Kent Archives

U269 Q13/6: Preaching Diary of Thomas Holbech

Northampton

Northamptonshire Record Office

FH/N/A/0250: Sermons of Peter Hausted

Oxford

Bodleian Library

MS Ashmole 36, fo. 125r: Peter Hausted elegy on the death of Colonel Robert Arden

MS Clarendon 25: Sermon of Lionel Gatford to Cornish troops, 1646

MS Eng. Misc. E 118: Diary of Anthony Blagrave

MS Eng. Poet. E 30: Funeral sermon by Henry King, 1657

MS Firth C6, fos. 52, 58: Letters of Sir Gilbert Gerrard

MS Rawlinson C 795: Anonymous sermon preached ‘during the Usurpation’

MS Rawlinson D 924: Proceedings of the Committee for Scandalous Ministers in Cambridgeshire

MS Rawlinson E 115: Sermon by William Creed, 1642

MS Rawlinson E 116: Sermon by William Creed, 1643

MS Rawlinson Letters 57: Life of Henry Leslie

MS Sancroft 83: Sermon notebook of William Sancroft

MS Tanner 52: Correspondence of various episcopalian churchmen

MS Tanner 56, fo. 188: Letter from Anthony Farindon to Gilbert Sheldon

MS Tanner 461, fo. 765: Letter from Robert Sanderson to Gilbert Sheldon

Christ Church Library

Christ Church Library, Oxford, MS 451: Notebook of sermons heard in Westminster in the 1650s

Oxford University Archives

NEP/supra/Reg Sb, fo. 37: Convocation records

Printed Primary Sources

Ad populum: or a lecture to the people (Oxford, 1644)

Allington, John, *The grand conspiracy of the members against the minde, of Jewes against their king, foure sermons* (London, 1653)

----- *A continuation of the grand conspiracy by the insolent usurper and the regal intruder*
(London, 1660)

----- *The period of the grand conspiracy* (London, 1663)

An answer to a lawless pamphlet (London, 1641)

Antidotum Culmerianum: or, Animadversions upon a late pamphlet (Oxford, 1644)

- Articles exhibited in Parliament against Master John Squire* (London, 1641)
- The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*, ed. Sir Richard Braybrooke (London, 1845)
- Bales, Peter, *Infirmity inducing to conformity* (London, 1650)
- Barton, Thomas, *Logos agōnios; or, a sermon of the Christian race* (Oxford, 1643)
- Bernard, Nathaniel, *Esoptron tes antimachias, or, A looking-glasse for rebellion* (Oxford, 1644)
- Bramhall, John, *A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of York* (York, 1643)
- *A sermon preached in Yorke Minster, before his Excellence the Marques of Newcastle, being then ready to meet the Scotch Army, January, 28. 1643* (York, 1644)
- Browne, Edward, *A paradox usefull for the times* (London, 1642)
- Byam, Henry, *XIII Sermons: most of them preached before His Majesty, King Charles the II in his exile* (London, 1675)
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, during the Commonwealth, 1649–1660*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1875–86)
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II, 1660–1685*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1860)
- Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library*, ed. Octavius Ogle, William Henry Bliss, William Dunn Macray and F. J. Routledge (5 vols., Oxford, 1869–1970)
- Carte, Thomas, *A Collection of original letters and papers, concerning the affairs of England, from the year 1641 to 1660* (2 vols., London, 1739)
- Cartwright, Thomas, *Gods arraignment of Adam: declared in a sermon* (London, 1659)
- Cary, Henry, *Memorials of the Great Civil War in England from 1646 to 1652* (2 vols., London, 1842)
- A catalogue of the names of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, that have served in the last four parlaments* (London, 1656)
- Catalogus Variorum & Insignium Librorum . . . Thomas Manton* (London, 1678)

- Cavendish, Margaret, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle*, ed. C.H. Firth (London, 1886)
- Chalfont, Richard, *A sermon preached at the publique fast the tenth day of May 1644* (Oxford, 1644)
- Charles I in 1646: Letters of King Charles the First to Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. J. Bruce (Camden Society, 63, 1858)
- Cheshire, Thomas, *A sermon preached in Saint Pauls church the tenth of October 1641* (London, 1641)
- *A true copy of that sermon which was preached at S. Pauls the tenth of October last* (London, 1641)
- Chestlin, Robert, *Persecution Undecima* (2nd edn., London, 1682)
- Chillingworth, William, *The petition of the most substantiall inhabitants of the city of London* (Oxford, 1642)
- A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. Thomas Birch (7 vols., London, 1742)
- Copleston, John, *Moses next to God* (London, 1660)
- Cosin, John, *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin*, eds. John Henry and James Parker (5 vols., Oxford, 1855)
- *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Bishop of Durham*, ed. George Ornsby (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1869)
- Cowley, Abraham, *The Essays and Other Prose Writings*, ed. Alfred B. Gough (Oxford, 1915)
- Culmer, Richard, *Cathedrall newes from Canterbury* (London, 1644)
- Depositions from the Castle of York*, ed. James Raine (Durham, 1861)
- The desires, and resolutions of the Club-Men of the Counties of Dorset and Wilts* (London, 1645)
- Dingley, Thomas, *The Account of the official progress of His Grace Henry the first Duke of Beaufort... through Wales in 1684* (London, 1688)
- A discourse upon the questions in debate between the King and Parliament* (London, 1642)
- Downham, George, *Rex meus est Deus* (London, 1643)

- Duppa, Brian, *The soules soliloquie: and, a conference with conscience* (London, 1648)
- Evelyn, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. Esmond S. de Beer (6 vols., Oxford, 1955)
- *The Letterbooks of John Evelyn*, ed. Douglas Chambers and David Galbraith (2 vols., London, 2014)
- Farindon, Anthony, *XXX sermons lately preached at the parish church of Saint Mary Magdalen Milkstreet* (London, 1657)
- *XXXII sermons preached at the parish-church of St. Mary Magdalene Milk-street* (London, 1672)
- *The Sermons of the Reverend Anthony Farindon*, ed. Thomas Jackson (4 vols., London, 1849)
- Fell, John, *The life of that reverend divine, and learned historian, Dr. Thomas Fuller* (London, 1661)
- Ferne, Henry, *The sovereignty of Kings* (London, 1642)
- *The camp at Gilgal* (Oxford, 1643)
- *Episcopacy and presbytery considered, according to the severall respects* (Oxford, 1644)
- *A sermon preached at the publique fast the twelfth day of April* (Oxford, 1644)
- *A sermon preached before His Majesty at Newport in the Isle of Wight* (London, 1649)
- A forme of common-prayer, to be used upon the solemne fast appointed by His Majesties proclamation upon the second Friday in every moneth* (Oxford, 1643)
- A forme of prayer used in the Kings chappel* (The Hague, 1650)
- Frank, Mark, *The Sermons of Mark Frank*, ed. John Henry Parker (2 vols., Oxford, 1849)
- Fuller, Thomas, *Good Thoughts in Worse Times* (London, 1647)
- *The just mans funeral, Lately delivered in a sermon at Chelsey, before several persons of honour and worship* (London, 1649)

- *A sermon preached at St. Clemens Danes at the funeral of Mr. George Heycock*
(London, 1657)
- *The Church History of Britain*, ed. J.S. Brewer (6 vols., Oxford, 1845)
- *The Collected Sermons of Thomas Fuller*, ed. J.E. Bailey and W.E.A. Axon (2 vols.,
London, 1891)
- Gardiner, Richard, *Concio ad clerum habita in Templo Beatæ Mariæ Oxon* (Oxford, 1631)
- *A sermon preach'd in the cathedral church of Christ in Oxford* (Oxford, 1638)
- *A sermon appointed for Saint Pauls Crosse* (London, 1642)
- Gatford, Lionel, *An exhortation to peace* (London, 1643)
- *A petition for the vindication of the publique use of the Book of Common-Prayer*
(London, 1655)
- Gauden, John, *The love of truth and peace* (London, 1640)
- Gee, Edward, *A Plea for Non-Scribers* (London, 1650)
- Gosnold, Paul, *A sermon preached at the publique fast the ninth day of Aug. 1644 at St. Maries,*
Oxford (Oxford, 1644)
- Gower, Humphrey, *A discourse deliver'd in two sermons ... not long after the death of the Right*
Reverend Father in God Peter Gunning late Lord Bishop of Ely (Cambridge, 1685)
- Griffith, Matthew, *A patheticall perswasion to pray for publicke peace* (London, 1642)
- *The fear of God and the king* (London, 1660)
- Hall, George, *Gods appearing for the tribe of Levi, improved in a sermon* (London, 1655)
- Hall, Joseph, *A survey of that foolish, seditious, scandalous, prophane libell, the protestation*
protected (London, 1641)
- Hamilton, Charles L., 'Jean D'Espagne and the Second Earl of Bridgewater', *Proceedings of the*
Huguenot Society, 24 (1983–1988), pp. 232–9
- Hammond, Henry, *Considerations of present use concerning the danger resulting from the change*
of our church-government (London, 1644)
- *Of resisting the lawful magistrate under colour of religion* (Oxford, 1644)

- *The Christians obligation to peace & charity* (London, 1649)
- Hardy, Nathaniel, *A divine prospective ... In a funerall sermon preached at Katharine Creechurch*
(London, 1649)
- *Divinity in mortality ... a sermon preached at the funerals of Mr Richard Goddard*
late minister of the parish of St Gregories by Pauls (London, 1653)
- *A sad prognostick of approaching judgement; or, The happy misery of good men in*
bad times (London, 1658, repr. 1660)
- *A loud call to great mourning* (London, 1662)
- Harwood, Richard, *King David's sanctuary* (Oxford, 1644)
- Hausted, Peter, *Ten sermons, preached upon severall Sundayes and saints days* (London, 1636)
- *Satyre against separatists* (London, 1642)
- Haywood, William, *A sermon tending to peace* (London, 1648)
- Herle, Charles, *A payre of compasses for church and state* (London, 1642)
- Hewitt, John, *Nine select sermons preached upon special occasions in the Parish Church of St.*
Gregories by St. Pauls (London, 1658)
- *Repentance and conversion* (London, 1658)
- Heylyn, Peter, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1671)
- His Majesties answer by way of declaration to a printed paper* (York, 1642)
- His Majesties answer to a book, intituled, The declaration, or remonstrance of the Lords and*
Commons, the 19 of May, 1642 (Cambridge, 1642)
- His Majesties declaration delivered at Newport in the Isle of Wight* (London, 1648)
- Hobbes, Thomas, *Behemoth*, in *English Works*, ed. William Molesworth (11 vols., London, 1839–
45), VI
- *Leviathan*, ed. Noel Malcolm (3 vols., Oxford, 2012)
- Holdsworth, Richard, *A sermon preached in St. Maries in Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1642)
- The horrible and bloody conspiracy* (London, 1658)

The humble answer of the Divines attending the Honorable Commissioners of Parliament, at the treaty at Newport in the Isle of Wight (London, 1648)

Hyde, Edward, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. William Dunn Macray (6 vols., Oxford, 1888)

Hyde, Edward, *The true catholicks tenure* (London, 1662)

Journal of the House of Commons (10 vols., London, 1802)

Journal of the House of Lords (39 vols., London, 1767–1830)

The Journal of William Dowsing, ed. Trevor Cooper (Woodbridge, 2001)

Knell, Paul, *Israel and England Paralleled* (London, 1648, 2nd edn., 1681, 4th edn., 1711)

Laud, William, *Seven sermons preached upon severall occasions* (London, 1651)

Leslie, Henry, *The blessing of Judah explained, and applied to the present times* (Oxford, 1644)

----- *A Sermon Preached at the Publique Fast the ninth of Feb in St. Maries Oxford*
(Oxford, 1644)

----- *The martyrdome of King Charles* (The Hague, 1649)

Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria, ed. Mary Green (London, 1857)

Letters of the Kings of England, ed. J. O. Halliwell-Phillips (2 vols., London, 1848)

The Life of the Reverend Dr. John Barwick (London, 1724)

Lucifers Lackey, or, The Devils new Creature (London, 1641)

Mayne, Jasper, *A sermon against false prophets* (Oxford, 1646)

Meggott, Richard, *A sermon preached at St. Martins in the Fields, at the funeral of the Reverend Doctor Hardy, Dean of Rochester* (London, 1670)

Mercurius Aulicus (Oxford, 1643–4)

Mercurius Britannicus Communicating the Affaires of Great Britaine (London, 1643–6)

Mercurius Civicus Londons Intelligencer (London, 1643–6)

A message from the Isle of Wight, brought by Major Cromwell (London, 1648)

Military orders and articles established by His Majesty for the better ordering and government of His Majesties army (Oxford, 1642)

Miller, Amos, 'Joseph Jane's Account of Cornwall', *English Historical Review*, 90 (1975), pp. 94–102

Milton, John, *Brief notes upon a late sermon* (London, 1660)

----- *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Don M. Wolfe (8 vols., New Haven, CT, 1980), VII

Morton, Thomas, *The presentation of a schismaticke* (London, 1642)

Mossom, Robert. *The king on his throne* (York, 1642)

----- *The preachers tripartite* (London, 1657)

----- *England's gratulation for the King* (London, 1660)

----- *A narrative panegyricall of the life, sickness, and death, of George ... lord bishop of Derry in Ireland: as it was delivered at his funerals* (London, 1666)

National Prayers: Special Worship since the Reformation, Volume I: Special Prayers, Fasts and Thanksgivings in the British Isles, 1533–1688, ed. Natalie Mears, Alasdair Raffe, Stephen Taylor, and Philip Williamson (Woodbridge, 2013),

Parker, Henry, *Jus populi, or, A discourse wherein clear satisfaction is given as well concerning the right of subiects as the right of princes* (London, 1644)

Parker, Thomas, *A farewell sermon preached in Wake-field* (London, 1656)

The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England being a faithful account of all the most remarkable transactions in Parliament, from the earliest times (24 vols., London, 1751–61)

Patrick, Simon, *The Works of Simon Patrick*, ed. Anthony Taylor (9 vols., Oxford, 1858)

Peck, Francis, *Desiderata Curiosa* (London, 1779)

Pepys, Samuel, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (11 vols., Oxford, 1955–83)

The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Doctor Heywood (London, 1641)

The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Dr. Fuller (London, 1641)

- The private journals of the Long Parliament, 3 January to 5 March 1642*, ed. William Havelock Coates, Anne Steele Young and Vernon F. Snow (New Haven, CT, 1982)
- A proclamation for a generall fast to be held throughout this kingdome on the second Friday in every moneth* (Oxford, 1643)
- A proclamation for the inhibiting all manner of oathes, other abuses and prophanations by any of His Majesties army* (Oxford, 1643)
- Prynne, William, *The unbishoping of Timothy and Titus* (Amsterdam, 1636)
- *Beheaded Dr. John Hewytts ghost pleading* (London, 1660)
- Ranson, William, *A Sermon preached in the Metropolitall Church of York upon the 19. day of May* (York, 1644)
- Raymond, Thomas, *Autobiography of Thomas Raymond*, ed. Godfrey Davies (London, 1917)
- Riddington, Francis, *King Solomons directory* (London, 1649)
- Reeve, Thomas, *Lazarus his rest: preached in a sermon at the funeral of Mr. Ephraim Udall* (London, 1647)
- The Royalist Ordinance Papers, 1642–1646*, ed. Ian Roy (2 vols., Wheatley, 1964–1975)
- Rudd, Anthony, *A Sermon Preached at Greenwich before the Kings Majestie* (London, 1603)
- Rugg, Thomas, *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg, 1659–1661*, ed. William L. Sachse (London, 1961)
- Rushworth, John, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State* (8 vols., London, 1721)
- Ryves, Bruno, *Two Sermons* (n.p., 1652)
- Sanderson, Robert, *A sermon preached at Newport in the Isle of Wight, October 1648* (London, 1653)
- *Twenty sermons formerly preached: XVI ad aulam. III ad magistratum. I ad populum* (London, 1686)
- *The Works of Robert Sanderson*, ed. William Jacobson (6 vols., Oxford, 1854)
- Scotch Mercury* (London, 1643)
- A second advertisement concerning Dr. Hewyts pretended sermons* (London, 1658)

- A Sermon Preached before the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Oxford* (Oxford, 1643)
- Slingsby, Sir Henry, *The Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, ed. Daniel Parsons (London, 1836)
- Spie Communicating Intelligence from Oxford* (London, 1644)
- Stampe, William, *Stampe, Treatise of spirituall infatuation* (The Hague, 1651)
- State papers collected by Edward, earl of Clarendon*, ed. Richard Scrope and Thomas Monkhouse
(3 vols., Oxford, 1767–86)
- Strode, William, *A sermon concerning swearing* (Oxford, 1643)
- Swadlin, Thomas, *The soveraignes desire peace* (London, 1643)
- *Loyall subjects, or The blessed mans encouragement* (London, 1647)
- *King Charles his funeral* (London, 1661)
- Symmons, Edward, *A loyall subjects beliefe* (Oxford, 1643)
- *A militarie sermon* (Oxford, 1644)
- *Scripture vindicated from the mis-apprehensions, mis-interpretations, and mis-
applications of Mr Stephen Marshall* (Oxford, 1644)
- *A vindication of King Charles* (London, 1647)
- Taylor, Jeremy, *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, ed. P. G. Stanwood (2 vols., Oxford, 1989)
- Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals*, ed. J. Charles Cox (London, 1890)
- Towshend, Henry, *The Diary and Papers of Henry Townshend, 1640–1663*, ed. Stephen Porter,
Stephen Roberts and Ian Roy (Bristol, 2014)
- The true and exact speech and prayer of Doctor John Hewytt* (London, 1658)
- Tuke, Thomas, *The Israelites promise* (London, 1651)
- Udall, Ephraim, *The good of peace and the ill of warre* (London, 1642)
- Ussher, James, *The soveraignes power and the subjects duty* (Oxford, 1644)
- Walton, Izaak, *The lives of dr. John Donne, sir Henry Wotton, mr. Richard Hooker, mr. George
Herbert, and dr. Robert Sanderson* (London, 1865)

- Warner, John, *The devilish conspiracy* (London, 1649)
- Warwick, Sir Philip, *Memoires of the Reigne of King Charles I, with a Continuation to the Happy Restauration of King Charles II* (London, 1701)
- Watson, Richard, *A sermon touching schisme* (Cambridge, 1642)
- *Regicidium Judaicum, or, A discourse about the Jewes crucifying Christ their king*
(The Hague, 1649)
- Westfield, Thomas, *A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of S. Paul* (London, 1641)
- White, John, *The first century of scandalous, malignant priests* (London, 1643)
- Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *Memorials of the English affairs* (4 vols., Oxford, 1853)
- Wild, George, *A sermon preached upon Sunday the third of March in St Maries Oxford* (Oxford, 1644)
- Williams, Griffith, *The discovery of mysteries* (Oxford, 1643)
- *Jura Majestatis* (Oxford, 1644)
- *Vindiciae regum; or, The grand rebellion: that is, a looking-glasse for rebels*
(Oxford, 1643)
- *The persecution and oppression ... of John Bale* (London, 1664)
- Winstanley, Gerard, *The law of freedom* (London, 1652)
- Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss (4 vols., London, 1813–20)
- Wootton, David (ed.), *Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England* (Harmondsworth, 1986)
- Wright, Abraham, *Five sermons in five different styles, or waies of preaching* (London, 1656)

Secondary Works

- Adamson, John (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–1649* (Basingstoke, 2009)

- Adlington, Hugh, Peter McCullough and Emma Rhatigan (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011)
- Appleby, David, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007)
- Ashton, Robert, 'From Cavalier to Roundhead Tyranny, 1642–9', in Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War*, pp. 185–207
- *Counter-revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins* (New Haven, CT, 1994)
- Atherton, Ian, 'Royalist Finances in the English Civil War: The Case of Lichfield Garrison, 1643–5', *Midland History*, 33 (2008), pp. 43–67
- 'Cathedrals and the British Revolution', in Braddick and Smith (eds.), *Experience of Revolution*, pp. 96–116
- Attwater, Aubrey, *Pembroke College, Cambridge: A Short History* (Cambridge, 1936)
- Aylmer, Gerald, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England, II: Royalist Attitudes', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 37 (1987), pp. 1–30
- Bailey, J. E., *The Life of Thomas Fuller: with Notices of His Books, His Kinsmen, and His Friends* (London, 1874)
- Barrett, John, *Cavaliers: The Royalist Army at War, 1642–1646* (Stroud, 2000)
- Baskerville, Stephen, *Not Peace but a Sword: The Political Theology of the English Revolution* (London, 1993)
- Bercovitch, Sacvan, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, WI, 1978)
- Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349–1897*, ed. John Venn (Cambridge, 1897)
- Black, Jeremy, 'The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588–89), Anti-Martinism and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England', *Sixteenth Century*, 28 (1997), pp. 707–25
- Blench, J. W., *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English sermons 1450–c.1600* (Oxford, 1964)

- Bosher, Robert S., *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662* (London, 1951)
- Boswell, Caroline, *Disaffection and Everyday Life in Interregnum England* (Woodbridge, 2017)
- Bowen, Lloyd, ‘Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism’, in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 44–66
- ‘Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639–40 and 1642’, *Historical Journal*, 56 (2013), pp. 297–319
- Braddick, Michael J., *God’s Fury, England’s Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London, 2008)
- Braddick, Michael J. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2015)
- Braddick, Michael J. and David Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011)
- Brigden, Susan, ‘Youth and the English Reformation’, in Paul Slack (ed.), *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 77–107
- Broadway, Jan, ‘“The Honour of this Nation”: William Dugdale and the History of St Paul’s (1658)’, in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 194–213
- Bulman, William J., ‘The Practice of Politics: The English Civil War and the “Resolution” of Henrietta Maria and Charles I’, *Past and Present*, 206 (2010), pp. 43–79
- Burgess, Glenn, ‘Wars of Religion and Royalist Political Thought’, in Prior and Burgess (eds.), *England’s Wars of Religion*, pp. 169–92
- Burlinson, Christopher, ‘The Use and Re-Use of Early-Seventeenth-Century Student Notebooks: Inside and Outside the University’, in James Daybell and Peter Hinds (eds.), *Material Readings of Early Modern Culture: Texts and Social Practices, 1580–1730* (New York, NY, 2010), pp. 229–45
- Burrows, Montagu (ed.), *The Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658* (London, 1881)
- Campbell, Ian, ‘Calvinist Absolutism: Archbishop James Ussher and Royal Power’, *Journal of British Studies*, 53 (2014), pp. 558–610

- Capp, Bernard, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–1660* (Oxford, 2012)
- ‘The Religious Marketplace: Public Disputations in Civil War and Interregnum England’, *English Historical Review*, 129 (2014), pp. 47–78
- Christian, Margaret, ‘Elizabeth’s Preachers and the Government of Women: Defining and Correcting a Queen’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24 (1993), pp. 561–76
- Clare, Janet (ed.), *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures* (Manchester, 2018)
- Claydon, Tony, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996)
- ‘The Sermon, the “Public Sphere” and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England’, in Ferrell and McCullough (eds.), *English Sermon Revised*, pp. 208–34
- Clegg, Cyndia, *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, 2008)
- Coffey, John, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558–1689* (Harlow, 2000)
- ‘England’s Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance’, in Prior and Burgess (eds.), *England’s Wars of Religion Revisited*, pp. 253–80;
- Cogswell, Thomas, ‘The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s’, *Journal of British Studies*, 3 (1990), pp. 187–215
- Cogswell, Thomas, Richard Cust and Peter Lake, ‘Revisionism and its Legacies’, in Cogswell *et al* (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, pp. 1–20
- Cogswell, Thomas, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge 2002)
- Colclough, David, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2005)
- Collinson, Patrick, ‘If Constantine, then also Theodosius: St Ambrose and the Integrity of the Elizabethan *Ecclesia Anglicana*’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), pp. 205–229
- ‘The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful’, in Ole Grell *et al* (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 51–76

- ‘The Coherence of the Text; How it Hangeth Together: The Bible in Reformation England’, in W. P. Stephens (ed.), *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church* (Sheffield, 1995), pp. 84–108
- ‘The Protestant Cathedral, 1541–1660’, in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (eds.), *A History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 154–203
- ‘Biblical Rhetoric: The English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode’, in Deborah Shuger and Claire McEachern (eds.), *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 15–45
- Como, David, ‘Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation in the English Civil War’, *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012), pp. 820–57
- *Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War* (Oxford, 2018)
- Cope, Esther, *Politics without Parliaments, 1629–40* (London, 1987)
- Crankshaw, David J., ‘Community, City and Nation, 1540–1714’, in Derek Keene, Arthur Burns, and Andrew Saint (eds.), *St. Paul’s: The Cathedral Church of London, 604–2004* (New Haven, CT, 2004), pp. 45–70
- Cressy, David, ‘The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642’, *Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 251–79
- *Charles I and his People* (Oxford, 2005)
- *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640–1642* (Oxford 2007)
- *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford, 2010)
- Cust, Richard, *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1625–1628* (Oxford, 1987)
- *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, 2005)
- ‘Charles I and Providence’, in Fincham and Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, pp. 193–208
- ‘The Defence of Episcopacy on the Eve of Civil War: Jeremy Taylor and the Rutland Petition of 1641’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68 (2017), pp. 59–80

- Daly, James, 'Could Charles I be Trusted? The Royalist Case, 1642–1646', *Journal of British Studies*, 6 (1966), pp. 23–44
- 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation', *Journal of British Studies*, 11 (1971), pp. 26–44
- Darley, Gillian, *John Evelyn: Living for Ingenuity* (New Haven, CT, 2006)
- Davies, Godfrey, 'English Political Sermons, 1603–1640', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 3 (1939), pp. 1–22
- Davies, Horton. *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588–1645* (San Marino, CA, 1986)
- Davies, Julian, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Moulding of Anglicanism, 1625–1641* (Oxford, 1992)
- De Groot, Jerome, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke, 2004)
- Donagan, Barbara, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', *Past and Present*, 118 (1988), pp. 65–95
- 'Did Ministers Matter? War and Religion in England, 1642–1646', *Journal of British Studies*, 33 (1994), pp. 119–56
- 'Casuistry and Allegiance in the English Civil War', in Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.), *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 89–111
- 'Varieties of Royalism', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalism and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, pp. 66–88.
- Downs, Jordan S., 'The Curse of Meroz and the English Civil War', *Historical Journal*, 57 (2014), pp. 343–68
- Dunan-Page, Anne and Beth Lynch (eds.), *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture* (Aldershot, 2008)
- Durston, Christopher, "'For the Better Humiliation of the People": Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving during the English Revolution', *Seventeenth Century*, 7 (1992), pp. 129–49

- Durston, Christopher and Judith Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006)
- Dzelzainis, Martin, “‘Undoubted Realities’: Clarendon on Sacrilege’, *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), pp. 515–40
- Eales, Jacqueline, ‘Provincial Preaching and Allegiance in the First English Civil War, 1640–6’, in Cogswell *et al* (eds.) *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, pp. 185–210
- ‘The Clergy and Allegiance at the Outbreak of the English Civil Wars: The Case of John Marston of Canterbury’, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 132 (2012), pp. 83–110
- Farrow, William J., *The Great Civil War in Shropshire (1642–49)* (Shrewsbury, 1926)
- Ferrell, Lori Anne, *Government by Polemic: James I, the King’s Preachers, and the Rhetorics of Conformity, 1603–1625* (Stanford, CA, 1998)
- ‘Preaching and English Parliaments in the 1620s’, *Parliamentary History*, 34 (2015), pp. 142–54.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1500–1750* (Manchester, 2000)
- Fincham, Kenneth, ‘William Laud and the Exercise of Caroline Patronage’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 51 (2000), pp. 69–93
- ‘The Restoration of the Altars in the 1630s’, *Historical Journal*, 44 (2001), pp. 919–40
- Fincham, Kenneth and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford, 2007)
- Fincham, Kenneth and Stephen Taylor, ‘Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity, 1646–60’, in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 18–43
- ‘Vital Statistics: Episcopal Ordination and Ordinands in England, 1646–1660’, *English Historical Review*, 126 (2011), pp. 319–44
- ‘The Restoration of the Church of England, 1660–1662: Ordination, Re-ordination and Conformity’, in Stephen Taylor and Grant Tapsell (eds.), *The Nature of the English Revolution Revisited: Essays in Honour of John Morrill* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 197–232

- ‘Episcopalian Identity, 1640–1662’, in Milton (ed.) *Oxford History of Anglicanism*, pp. 457–82
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006)
- Firth, C. H., ‘Royalists under the Protectorate’, *English Historical Review*, 52 (1937), pp. 634–48
- Ford, Alan, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford, 2007)
- Gentles, Ian, ‘The Sales of Bishops’ Lands in the English Revolution, 1646–1660’, *English Historical Review*, 95 (1980), pp. 573–96
- ‘The Civil Wars in England’, in John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638–1660* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 103–50
- ‘Parliamentary Politics and the Politics of the Street: The London Peace Campaigns of 1642-3’, *Parliamentary History*, 26 (2007), pp. 139–59
- Gilbert, C. D., ‘A Sermon in Civil War Worcester’, *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 16 (1998), pp. 177–82
- ‘Two Sermons at the Siege of Worcester, 1646’, *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 20 (2006), pp. 139–41
- Green, Ian, ‘The Persecution of “Scandalous” and “Malignant” Clergy during the English Civil War’, *English Historical Review*, 94 (1979), pp. 507–31
- Greengrass, Mark, *Governing Passions: Peace and Reform in the French Kingdom, 1576–1585* (Oxford, 2007)
- Griffin, Margaret, ‘The Foundation of the Chaplaincy Corps’, *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 80 (2002), pp. 287–95
- *Regulating Morality and Religion in the King’s Armies, 1639–1646* (Leiden, 2004)
- Guibbory, Achshah, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 2010)
- Guyer, Benjamin, ‘Izaak Walton’s “Holy War”’: *The Compleat Angler* in Polemical Context’, *Sixteenth Century*, 47 (2016), pp. 283–303

- Haigh, Christopher, 'Where was the Church of England, 1646–1660?', *Historical Journal*, 62 (2019), pp. 127–47
- Halkett, Samuel and John Laing, *A Dictionary of the Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature of Great Britain* (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1882–8)
- Hardacre, Paul, *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague, 1956)
- Harris, Tim, 'Charles I and Public Opinion on the Eve of the English Civil War', in Taylor and Tapsell (eds.), *Nature of the English Revolution*, pp. 1–25
- Hart, Arthur Tindal, *William Lloyd, 1627–1717: Bishop, Politician, Author, and Prophet* (London, 1952)
- Hart, Graham (ed.), *The Cambridgeshire Committee for Scandalous Ministers, 1644–45* (Cambridge, 2017)
- Hawes, Robert and Robert Loder, *The History of Framlingham, in the County of Suffolk* (Woodbridge, 1798)
- Henning, B. D. (ed.), *The House of Commons 1660–1690* (3 vols., 1983)
- Hill, Christopher, 'The Political Sermons of John Preston', in *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* (London, 1958), pp. 239–74
- *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and some Contemporaries* (London, 1984)
- *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London, 1993)
- Hill, J. W. F., 'The Royalist Clergy of Lincolnshire', *Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Journal*, 2/1 (1940), pp. 34–107
- Hirst, Derek, 'The Failure of Godly Rule in the English Republic', *Past and Present*, 132 (1991), pp. 33–66
- Holmes, Clive, 'Debate: Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity', *Past and Present*, 205 (2009), pp. 175–82
- 'The Trial and Execution of Charles I', *Historical Journal*, 53 (2010), pp. 289–316
- Holmes, Clive (ed.), *The Suffolk Committees for Scandalous Ministers, 1644–1646* (Ipswich, 1970)

- Hopper, Andrew, *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides during the English Civil War* (Oxford, 2012)
- ‘The Armies’, in Braddick (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, pp. 260–75
- Howell, Roger, ‘Neutralism, Conservatism and Political Alignment in the English Revolution: The Case of Towns, 1642–9’, in Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War*, pp. 67–87
- Hunt, Arnold, ‘Tuning the Pulpits: The Religious Context of the Essex Revolt’, in Ferrell and McCullough (eds.), *English Sermon Revised*, pp. 86–114
- *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge, 2010)
- Hughes, Ann, ‘The King, the Parliament, and the Localities during the English Civil War’, *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), pp. 236–63
- ‘The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England’, in Anne Laurence, W.R. Owens, and Stuart Sim (eds.), *John Bunyan and his England, 1628–88* (London, 1990), pp. 31–50
- ‘Preachers and Hearers in Revolutionary London: Contextualising Parliamentary Fast Sermons’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 24 (2014), pp. 57–78
- Hutton, Ronald, ‘The Structure of the Royalist Party, 1642–1646’, *Historical Journal*, 24 (1981), pp. 553–69
- *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989)
- ‘The Religion of Charles II’, in Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 228–46
- *The Royalist War Effort, 1642–1646* (2nd edn., London, 1999)
- Jenkinson, Matthew, ‘Preaching at the Court of Charles II: Court Sermons and the Restoration Chapel Royal’, in Hugh Adlington *et al* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 442–59
- Jones, R. F., ‘The Attack on Pulpit Eloquence in the Restoration: An Episode in the Development of the Neo-Classical Standard for Prose’, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 30 (1931), pp. 188–217

- Keblusek, Marika, 'A Tortoise in the Shell: Royalist and Anglican Experience of Exile in the 1650s', in Philip Major (ed.), *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640–1690* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 79–90
- Keeble, Neil, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester, 1987)
- Kelsey, Sean, 'The Kings' Book: *Eikon Basilike* and the English Revolution', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution, c. 1540–1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 150–69
- "'A No-king, or a New'": Royalists and the Succession, 1648–1649', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, pp. 192–213
- Killeen, Kevin, 'Veiled Speech: Preaching, Politics and Scriptural Typology', in Adlington *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, pp. 387–403
- *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2017)
- King, Peter, 'The Episcopate during the English Civil Wars, 1642–1649', *English Historical Review*; 83 (1968), pp. 523–37
- Kirby, Torrence and P. G. Stanwood (eds.), *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520–1640* (Leiden, 2014)
- Knights, Mark, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005)
- 'The Loyal Address', in Paulina Kewes and Andrew McCrae (eds.), *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations* (Oxford, 2019), pp. 319–35
- Lacey, Andrew, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003)
- Lake, Peter, 'Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match', *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), pp. 805–25
- 'Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson', *Journal of British Studies*, 27 (1988), pp. 81–116
- 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 113–33

- “‘A Charitable Christian Hatred’”: The Godly and their Enemies in the 1630s’ in Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eases (eds.), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 145–83
- ‘Puritans, Popularity and Petitions: Local Politics in National Context, Cheshire, 1641’, in Cogswell *et al* (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity*, pp. 259–89
- ‘Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice’, in Fincham and Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, pp. 80–97.
- Lake, Peter and Isaac Stephens, *Scandal and Religious Identity in Early Stuart England: A Northamptonshire Maid’s Tragedy* (Woodbridge, 2015)
- Lake, Peter and Michael Questier, *The Antichrist’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, CT, 2002)
- Lake, Peter and Steven Pincus, ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), pp. 270–92
- Larminie, Vivienne, ‘The Fell Era, 1658–1686’, in Ian Gadd (ed.), *The History of Oxford University Press. Volume 1, Beginnings to 1780* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 79–106
- Liu, Tai, *Puritan London: A Study of Religion in the City Parishes* (London, 1986)
- Lloyd, John Edward and R.T. Jenkins (eds.), *The Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940* (London, 1959)
- Loewenstein, David and John Morrill, ‘Literature and Religion’, in David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* (2003), pp. 664–713
- Lysons, Daniel, *The Environs of London* (4 vols., London, 1792–6)
- Maclean, Gerald, ‘1660’, in Raymond (ed.), *Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, pp. 619–28
- Maclure, Millar, *The Paul’s Cross Sermons, 1534–1642* (Toronto, 1958)
- Madan, Falconer, *Oxford Books, 1641–1650* (Oxford, 1912)
- Malcolm, Joyce Lee, *Caesar’s Due: Loyalty to King Charles, 1642–1646* (London, 1983)

- Maltby, Judith, “‘By this Book: Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church’, in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 115–37
- *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998)
- ‘From *Temple* to *Synagogue*: “Old” Conformity in the 1640s–1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey’, in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds.), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 88–120
- ‘The Prayer Book and the Parish Church: from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Restoration’, in Charles Hefling and Cynthia L. Shattuck (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to The Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 79–92
- ‘Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of “Anglicanism”, 1642–60’, Durston and Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England*, pp. 158–80
- Maltby, Judith (ed.), ‘Petitions for Episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer on the Eve of the Civil War 1641–2’, in Stephen Taylor (ed.), *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Church of England Miscellany* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 103–68
- Marshall, Peter and John Morgan, ‘Clerical Conformity and the Elizabethan Settlement Revisited’, *Historical Journal*, 59 (2016), pp. 1–22
- Matthews, A. G., *Walker Revised: being a Revision of John Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion, 1642–60* (Oxford, 1948)
- McCall, Fiona, *Baal's Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013)
- ‘Scandalous and Malignant? Settling Scores Against the Leicestershire Clergy after the First Civil War’, *Midland History*, 40 (2015), pp. 220–42
- McClaren, A. N., ‘Delineating the Elizabethan Body Politic: Knox, Aylmer, and the Definition of Counsel, 1558–1588’, *History of Political Thought*, 17 (1996), pp. 224–52
- McCullough, Peter, ‘Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1642–1642’, *Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), pp. 401–24

- ‘Out of Egypt: Richard Fletcher’s Sermon before Elizabeth I on the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots’, in Julie Walker (ed.), *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, pp. 118–49
- *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998)
- ‘Donne as Preacher at Court: “Precarious Inthronization”’, in David Colclough (ed.), *John Donne’s Professional Lives* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 179–206
- McElligott, Jason, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007)
- McElligott, Jason and David Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007)
- *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010)
- McGee, J. Sears, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620–1670* (New Haven, CT, 1976)
- Mendle, Michael, *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (Tuscaloosa, AL, 1985)
- Merritt, Julia, *Westminster, 1640–60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Oxford, 2013)
- Miller, Perry, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1936)
- Millstone, Noah, ‘Evil Counsel: The Propositions to Bridle the Impertinency of Parliament and the Critique of Caroline Government in the Late 1620s’, *Journal of British Studies*, 50 (2011), pp. 813–39
- Milton, Anthony, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1700* (Cambridge, 1995)
- ‘That Sacred Oratory: Religion and the Chapel Royal during the Personal Rule of Charles I’, in Andrew Ashbee (ed.) *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life and Times* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 69–96
- *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007)

- ‘Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s’, in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War*, pp. 61–81
- “‘Vailing his Crown’: Royalist Criticism of Charles I’s Kingship in the 1650s’, in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, pp. 88–105
- ‘Sacrilige and Compromise: Court Divines and the King’s Conscience, 1642–1649’, in Braddick and Smith (eds.), *Experience of Revolution*, pp. 135–53
- ‘Coping with Alternatives: Religious Liberty in Royalist Thought 1642–47’, in Robert Armstrong and Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin (eds.), *Insular Christianity: Alternative Models of the Church in Britain and Ireland, c. 1570–c.1700* (Manchester, 2013), pp. 149–69
- Milton, Anthony (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume 1: Reformation and Identity c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017)
- Mitchell, W. F., *Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: A Study of its Literary Aspects* (London, 1932)
- Monta, Susannah Brietz, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005)
- Morrill, John, *Revolt in the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630–1650* (London, 1976)
- ‘The Church in England 1642–9’, in Morrill (ed.) *Reactions to the English Civil War*, pp. 89–114
- ‘The Religious Context of the English Civil War’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 34 (1984), pp. 155–178
- Morrill, John (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642–1649* (Basingstoke, 1982)
- Morrill, John, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays Presented to G. E. Aylmer* (Oxford, 1993)
- Morrissey, Mary, ‘Interdisciplinarity and the Study of Early Modern Sermons’, *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999), pp. 1111–1123
- ‘Scripture, Style and Persuasion in Seventeenth-Century Theories of English Preaching’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 53 (2002), pp. 686–706
- *Politics and the Paul’s Cross Sermons, 1558–1642* (Oxford, 2011)

- ‘Sermons, Primers, and Prayerbooks’, in Raymond (ed.), *Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, pp. 491–509
- ‘Presenting James VI and I to the Public: Preaching on Political Anniversaries at Paul’s Cross’, in Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2016), pp. 107–22
- ‘Sermon Notes and Manuscript Communities’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 80 (2017), pp. 293–307
- *The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642–1646* (Manchester, 1993)
- Mortimer, Sarah, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010)
- ‘Kingship and the “Apostolic Church”’, *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 13 (2011)
- Mortimer, Sarah and David Scott, ‘Leviathan and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 76 (2015), pp. 259–70
- Neufeld, Matthew, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013)
- ‘The Politics of Anglican Martyrdom: Letters to John Walker, 1704–1705’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 62 (2011), pp. 491–514
- Newman, Peter, ‘The King’s Servants: Conscience, Principle and Sacrifice in Armed Royalism’, in Morrill *et al* (eds.), *Public Duty*, pp. 225–41
- Oates, Rosamund, ‘Sermons and Sermon-going in Early Modern England’, *Reformation*, 17 (2012), pp. 199–212
- Ollard, Richard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II* (London, 1979)
- Packer, J. W., *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643–1660* (Manchester, 1969)
- Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, WI, 1984)

- Peacey, Jason, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2005)
- ‘Cromwellian England: A Propaganda State?’, *History* 91 (2006)
- ‘Royalist News, Parliamentary Debates and Political Accountability, 1640–1660’, *Parliamentary History*, 26 (2007), pp. 328–45
- ‘Sir Edward Dering, Popularity, and the Public, 1640–1644’, *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 955–83
- ‘News, Pamphlets, and Public Opinion’, in Laura Lunger Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 173–85
- ‘The Revolution in Print’, in Braddick (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, pp. 276–90
- Pettegree, Andrew, ‘Nicodemism and the English Reformation’, in *idem*, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 86–117
- Prestige, A. N., *Sir Francis Gamull: Defender of Chester and his Family* (Salisbury, 2001)
- Prior, Charles and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *England’s Wars of Religion Revisited* (Farnham, 2011)
- Quantin, Jean-Louis, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 2009)
- Raylor, Timothy, ‘The Anglican Attack on Hobbes in Paris, 1651’, *Historical Journal*, 53 (2010), pp. 153–64
- Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003)
- *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641–1649* (Oxford, 2005)
- Raymond, Joad (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* (Oxford, 2011)
- Reynolds, Matthew, *Godly Reformers and their Opponents in England: Religion in Norwich, c. 1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005)
- Rhatigan, Emma, ‘Preaching to Princes: John Burgess and George Hakewill in the Royal Pulpit’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 62 (2011), pp. 273–96

- Roberts, Stephen, 'The Uses of Scribal Publication in the Making of a Royalist: Henry Townshend of Worcestershire, his 'Diary' and Parliament, 1640–3', *Midland History*, 41 (2016), pp. 152–67
- Robinson, Gavin, *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil War: Extracting Resources and Constructing Allegiance* (Farnham, 2012)
- Rose, Jacqueline, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011)
- 'Kingship and Counsel in Early Modern England', *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 47–71
- Roy, Ian, 'Royalist Reputations: The Cavalier Ideal and the Reality', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, pp. 89–111
- Sawday, Jonathan, 'Rewriting a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7 (1992), pp. 171–99
- Scott, David, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637–49* (Basingstoke, 2004)
- 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–1649', in Adamson (ed.), *English Civil War*, pp. 36–60
- Scott, Jonathan, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, 2000)
- Seaward, Paul, 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), pp. 227–39
- 'Circumstantial Temporary Concessions: Clarendon, Comprehension, and Uniformity', in N. H. Keeble (ed.), *Settling the Peace of the Church: 1662 Revisited* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 57–84
- Shami, Jeanne, 'Kings and Desperate Men: John Donne Preachers at Court', *John Donne Journal*, 6 (1987), pp. 9–24
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1987)
- 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), pp. 643–665

----- *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven, CT, 2010)

Shapiro, Barbara, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558–1688* (Stanford, CA, 2012)

Sheils, William, ‘Provincial Preaching on the Eve of the Civil War: Some West Riding Fast Sermons’, in Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (eds.), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 290–312

----- ‘English Catholics at War and Peace’, in Durston and Maltby (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England*, pp. 137–57

Simon, Irene, *Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South, Tillotson* (Paris, 1967)

Skinner, Quentin, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996)

Smith, David, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement* (Cambridge, 1994)

Smith, Geoffrey, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (Basingstoke, 2003)

Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven, 1994)

Smyth, Adam, ‘“Rend and teare in peeces”: Textual Fragmentation in Seventeenth-Century England’, *Seventeenth Century*, 19 (2004), pp. 36–52

Sommerville, Johann, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (2nd edn., London, 1999)

Spalding, J. C., ‘Sermons before Parliament (1640–1649) as a Public Puritan Diary’, *Church History*, 36 (1967) pp. 24–35

Spurr, John, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646–1689* (New Haven, CT, 1990)

----- ‘“A Sublime and Noble Service”: Evelyn and the Church of England’, in Frances Harris and Michael Hunter (eds.) *John Evelyn and his Milieu* (London, 2003)

----- ‘“A Special Kindness for Dead Bishops”: The Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism’, in Paulina Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006), pp. 307–28

- *The Laity and Preaching in Post-Reformation England* (Friends of Dr Williams's Library 66th lecture, 2013)
- Stanwood, P. G., 'Patristic and Contemporary Borrowing in the Caroline Divines', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 23 (1970), pp. 421–9
- Stoye, Mark, *Loyalty and Locality: Popular allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994)
- *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State* (Exeter, 2002)
- Tapsell, Grant, 'Royalism Revisited', *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 881–906.
- "'Parliament", "Liberty", "Taxation", "Property": The Civil War of Words in the 1640s' in *idem* and George Southcombe (eds.), *Revolutionary England, c.1630–c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes* (London, 2017), pp. 73–91
- Taylor, Stephen and Grant Tapsell (eds.), *The Nature of the English Revolution Revisited: Essays in Honour of John Morrill* (Woodbridge, 2013)
- Thrush, Andrew and John P. Ferris (eds.), *The House of Commons, 1604–1629* (6 vols., Cambridge, 2010)
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, 'The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament' in *idem* (ed.), *Essays in British History: Presented to Sir Keith Feiling*, (London, 1964)
- Underdown, David, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971)
- *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649–1660*, (2nd edn., Hamden, CT, 1971)
- 'Settlement in the counties, 1653-1658', in Gerald Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646–1660* (London, 1972), pp. 165–82
- *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603–1660* (Oxford, 1985)
- Vallance, Edward, 'Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications for the English Civil War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 65 (2002), pp. 395–419
- 'Royal Absolutism in the 1650s: The Case of Robert Sheringham', in Glenn Burgess (ed.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London, 2012), pp. 33–46

- “‘From the Hearts of the People’”: Loyalty, Addresses and the Public Sphere in the Exclusion Crisis’, in Tony Claydon and Thomas Corns (eds.), *Religion, Culture and National Community in the 1670s* (Cardiff, 2011), pp. 127–47
- *Loyalty, Memory and Public Opinion, 1658–1727* (Manchester, 2019)
- Wabuda, Susan, *Preaching during the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2002)
- Wallace, John M., *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (London, 1968)
- Walsham, Alexandra, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993)
- *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999)
- ‘Preaching without Speaking: Script, Print and Religious Dissent’, in Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds.), *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 211–34
- ‘The Happiness of Suffering: Adversity, Providence, and Agency in Early Modern England’, in Joanna Innes and Craig Muldrew (eds.), *Suffering and Happiness in England, 1550–1850* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 45–64
- Walter, John, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2017)
- Walzer, Michael, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (London, 1966)
- Webster, Tom, ‘Preaching and Parliament, 1640–59’, in Adlington *et al* (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, pp. 404–422
- Wedgwood, C. V., *The King’s War, 1641–1647* (London, 1958)
- Weil, Rachel, ‘Thinking about Allegiance in the English Civil War’, *History Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), pp. 183–91
- Wenham, John, *The Great and Close Siege of York, 1644* (Kineton, 1994)
- Whiteman, Anne, ‘The Restoration Church of England’, in Geoffrey Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (eds.), *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662–1962* (London, 1962), pp. 19–88
- Wilcher, Robert, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628–1660* (Cambridge, 2001)

- Williams, Mark, 'The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649–1660', *Journal of British Studies*, 53 (2014), pp. 909–33
- Williamson, George, 'The Restoration Revolt against Enthusiasm', *Studies in Philology*, 30 (1933), pp. 571–603
- Wilson, John F., *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (Princeton, NJ, 1969)
- Withington, Phil, 'The Semantics of "Peace" in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 23 (2013), pp. 127–53
- Wood, Andy, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007)
- Wood, James O., 'Thomas Fuller's Oxford Interlude', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 3 (1954), pp. 185–208
- Woolrych, Austin, *Britain in Revolution, 1625–1660* (Oxford, 2002)
- Worden, Blair, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Sin of Achan', in D. E. D. Beales and Geoffrey Best (eds.), *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 125–45
- Wroughton, John, *The Civil War in Bath and North Somerset, 1642–1650* (Bath, 1973)
- Zaret, David, *The Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Princeton, NJ, 2000)
- Zwicker, Steven, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649–1689* (Ithaca, NY, 1993)

Unpublished Sources

- Browell, Geoffrey, 'The Politics of Providentialism in England, 1640–1660' (PhD thesis, University of Kent, 2000)
- Hartman, Mark, 'Contemporary Explanations of the English Revolution' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1978)
- Manning, Brian, 'Neutrals and Neutralism in the English Civil War, 1642–1646' (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1959)

Rigney, James, 'The English Sermon, 1640–1660: Consuming the Fire' (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1994)

Whitehead, Marie, 'The Publisher Humphrey Moseley and Royalist Literature, 1640–1660' (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2014)

Web Sources

Clergy of the Church of England Database:

<http://theclergydatabase.org.uk>

Gateway to Early Modern Manuscript Sermons:

<https://gemms.itercommunity.org>

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography:

<http://oxforddnb.com>

Oxford English Dictionary:

<http://oed.com>