

Durham E-Theses

*The evolving reputation of Richard Hooker : an
examination of responses to the Ecclesiastical Polity,
1640-1714.*

Michael Andrew Brydon

How to cite:

Brydon, Michael Andrew (1999) The evolving reputation of Richard Hooker : an examination of responses to the Ecclesiastical Polity, 1640-1714. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1163/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Evolving Reputation Of Richard Hooker:
An Examination Of Responses To The *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 1640-1714.

By

Michael Andrew Brydon

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the written consent of the author and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

This thesis is submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Durham,
1999.



19 JUL 2000

Abstract Of Thesis

The Evolving Reputation Of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses To The *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 1640-1714.

By

Michael Andrew Brydon

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the University of Durham,
1999.

This thesis considers the contribution of seventeenth-century responses to the *Polity* towards the creation of Hooker's Anglican identity. It begins with an examination of the growing tensions between the old Reformed understanding of Hooker, and the new Laudian desire to comprehend the *Polity* as the expression of a distinctive doctrinal religious settlement. Although the dominance of the latter group was temporarily eclipsed by the Civil War it was their understanding of Hooker which emerged as the authentic opinion of the English Church at the Restoration. The examination of the Restoration response to Hooker considers how his recently established image as an Anglican father was perpetuated, the methods used to suppress rival assessments, and the weaknesses of this interpretation. The accession of the Catholic James effectively challenged the Restoration Hooker-sponsored belief in passive obedience, and challenged his Anglican credentials through the large numbers of Catholics who cited the *Polity* in support of the Roman Church. The long term effects of this upon Hooker are evaluated during the reign of William and Mary. The Whig desire to justify William encouraged them to exploit Hooker's belief in an original political compact, and to encourage more latitudinarian ideas within the Church. Restoration ideologies, however, were far from moribund. Several Tories were able to reconcile their opinions to the change of monarchs, and others waited until the reign of Anne where they endeavoured to put the political and religious clock back. This dominance was only temporary, however, since the advent of the Hanoverians led to the swift resurgence of the Whigs. Nevertheless this did nothing to undermine the now universal belief that Hooker was the leading exponent of the English Church. Although Hooker had anticipated that the *Polity* would be read as, a Reformed text, it had been turned into a specifically Anglican work within a century of his death.

Table Of Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction	1
The Development Of An Anglican Hooker, 1640-1660	26
The Restoration Establishment Of Hooker's Anglican Reputation	57
Threats And Challenges To Hooker's Anglican Identity, 1670-1685	96
Catholic Attempts To Appropriate Hooker	120
William Of Orange And The Development Of Hooker The Whig	144
Queen Anne And The Tory Revival	166
Hooker's Reputation: A Conclusion	190
Bibliography	196

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgments

I was extraordinarily fortunate in having Dr Alan Ford as my supervisor. He has been more than generous with his time, information, and books. His advice undoubtedly played a large part in my successful application for a British Academy scholarship. Hopefully the experience of dealing with an unrepentant technological Luddite, and old-fashioned Prayer Book Anglican has not been too much for him. I am also grateful to Professor John Morrill who was kind enough to read my first musings upon the subject, and to arrange for me to stay at Selwyn College, Cambridge. In addition Dr Alison Shell and Mr Arnold Hunt, whom I met as a result of this visit, have been kind enough to comment upon my thesis.

Throughout my research I have been dependent upon the good will of the librarians and archivists at Durham University Library, Durham Dean and Chapter Library, Ushaw College Library and Cambridge University Library. One cannot speak too highly of their devotion to their readers. Neither the occasional breakdown of lighting, outbreak of mushrooms under the floorboards, or a royal visit have impaired the standard of service. I have greatly benefited from the assistance of Miss Rainey, Dr Doyle, Dr Fewster, Mr Norris, Miss Doyle, Mrs Hogan, Mrs Robinson, Mrs Drury, Miss Stevenson, Mrs Simmons, and Mrs Roberts.

St Chad's College has been a splendid place to be connected to over my "many" years of residence in the city of Durham. I have made numerous friends both within and outside the University. They have all offered encouragement, and provided suitable distractions when the pressure of work has become too much. In particular I am grateful for my association with the Rev'd and Mrs C.W.Ryland, Mr Matthew Andrews, the Rev'd Canon M.P.Kent, Mr Robin Jones, Mr Sean Power, Miss Elizabeth Collis, Miss Ellen Scott, Mr Mark Wilson, Miss Rebecca King, Mrs Bailey, Mrs Alderton, Mrs Parkinson, Mr Paul Huskinson, the Rev'd Simon Jones, Dr James Aitken, Mr Simon Dean, Mrs Richardson, the Rev'd Ben de la Mare, Mr and Mrs J.Hadden, the late Mrs Adamson, Mr Robert Dockerill, Mr Damien Howard, Mr Richard Bimson, Mr Mervyn Ellis, and Master Benedict Yates.

Finally I owe an immense debt to my parents and the rest of my family. Without their help and support I should never have embarked upon this study.

Introduction

C.J.Sisson claimed that in “the long and crowded roll of great English men of letters there is no figure of greater significance to the instructed mind than Hooker.” His *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, that late sixteenth century justification of the English Church, was a milestone in the history of religious thought.¹ The first “philosophical masterpiece” to be written in the vernacular, it has traditionally been acclaimed for setting out the classic depiction of the English via media. The Elizabethan Church was shown to have avoided the mistaken extremes of popery or puritanism, and to have based her polity upon the sound triumvirate of scripture, reason, and tradition.² Hooker had rejected the hardening disjunctions between these assorted sources of authority, and had brought them into a rational and coherent synthesis.³ Whilst the English Church clearly pre-dated Hooker this congruence of the divergent strands of the Reformation publicly marked “the beginning of what we now call Anglicanism.”⁴

This purpose of this thesis is not, however, to provide an abstract consideration of the contents of the *Polity*. It is concerned with the way that subsequent interpretations of the text have been responsible for creating this perception of an Anglican Hooker. In the introduction I have examined the way that this process has been assisted by the ambiguities of the *Polity*'s polemical structure, before charting modern scholarly attitudes towards the *Polity* from John Keble onwards. For over one hundred and fifty years it will be demonstrated that a belief in the *Polity* as a distinctive Anglican text has been predominant. Only recently has this view

¹ C.J.Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), p. ix.

² R.Eccleshall, *Order and Reason in Politics. Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 127-128; L.W.Gibbs, ‘The Source of the Most Famous Quotation from Richard Hooker’s Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,’ in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.XXI, Number 1, 1990, (pp. 77-86), p. 77; W.D.Neelands, ‘Hooker on Scripture, Reason, and “Tradition,”’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 75-94), p. 75.

³ J.S.Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition. An Historical and Theological Study of Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963), p. 1; H.McAdoo, ‘Richard Hooker,’ in *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, (Wantage: Ikon Productions, 1992), pp. 105-125.

⁴ Marshall, *Hooker*, p. 1.

been seriously challenged as part of the general reaction against the whole concept of Elizabethan via media Anglicanism, a concept which is deemed to owe more to the anachronism of early nineteenth-century religious commentators than to historic reality. It is the contention of this doctorate, however, that the early Victorians were merely building upon an impression of Hooker as the enduring example of the English Church, which had been created in the seventeenth-century.

Although the *Polity* is a more complex and ambiguous book than the widespread Anglican reading of Hooker suggests, it is not difficult to see from even a cursory reading why the “judicious divine” has acquired the reputation of being the leading father of the English Church. In the Preface he explains how the *Polity* was primarily prompted by the need to combat the growing puritan pressure for a more thorough reformation of the Church.⁵ They insisted that only those practices which were indisputably commended by scripture could be safely retained, and that the English Church was “a dying stock that had been lopped of its main branches in preparation for the final work of the axe at its root.”⁶ John Henry Newman ironically observed that Anglicanism was indebted to the puritans since without them the *Polity* would never have been written.⁷

The *Polity* was more than just another response to the puritan agenda since Hooker sought to provide a theologically grounded, historically accurate, and legally informed exposition of the constitution and practices of the Elizabethan Church of England. Books I-III defined the fundamental philosophical and theological principles for discussing the demands made upon the Church so that in Book IV Hooker could apply standards for the use of reason and scripture in the light of the earlier perspective. Book V then articulated what was publicly enjoined in the Church of England before the last three books considered how these public

⁵ R.Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Books I-IV*, G.Edelen, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press), Vol.I, *the Preface*, pp. 10-12.

⁶ H.C.Beeching, *Religio Laici. A Series of Studies Addressed to Laymen*, (London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1902), p. 43.

⁷ T.Lathbury, *A History of the Convocation of the Church of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1742*, (London: J.Leslie, 1853), p. 188.

duties were to be performed.⁸

Throughout all of these books the reader is acutely aware of Hooker's overriding aim to provide a locus of religious authority which negated the puritan adherence to a policy of *sola scriptura*. The seemingly dispassionate explication of the different kinds of law at the start of Book I was introduced to supply a philosophical foundation for the two basic principles upon which the success of the *Polity* rested. Firstly there was a clear distinction between matters of salvation and those external trappings which were things indifferent, and secondly each national branch of the universal church had the right to determine the form of these outward matters.⁹ Such a double premise meant that Hooker was able to reject the omniscience of scripture through his demonstration that there were other sources of knowledge, instruction, and wisdom that could be employed without detriment to its high position.¹⁰ Grace, rather than destroying nature, brought it to perfection.¹¹

The great danger of the contrary puritan position, in Hooker's view, was that it turned indifferent mundane practices into matters of prime importance that became central to Christianity.¹² "For whereas God hath left sundry kindes of lawes unto men, and by all those lawes the actions of men are in some sort directed: they hold that one onely lawe, the scripture, must be the rule to direct in all thinges, even so farre as to the taking up of a rush or strawe."¹³ Puritan attempts to enlarge the purpose of scripture failed to comprehend that it was "perfect and wanteth nothing requisite unto that purpose for which God delivered the same."¹⁴ It contained all that was necessary with regard to "the principles of Christian doctrine" but was

⁸ J.Booty, 'Book V,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol. VI, Part I, (pp. 183-231), p. 186; W.P.Haugaard, 'Books II, III & IV,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol. VI, Part I, (pp. 125-181), p. 139.

Books I-V were published during Hooker's own lifetime, but Books VI and VIII had to wait until 1649, and Book VII was not finally issued until 1662.

⁹ L.E.Gibbs, 'Book I,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol. VI, Part I, (pp. 81-124), p. 85.

¹⁰ J.Gascoigne, 'Church and State Unified: Hooker's Rationale for the English Post-Reformation Order,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 23-34), p. 30.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 26.

¹² Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.1, p. 196.

¹³ Ibid, Vol. I, Bk. II, Chpt. 1, p. 145; Ibid, Vol. I, Bk. II, Chpt. 8, p. 190.

¹⁴ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.II, Chpt.5, p. 190.

“more darke and doubtfull” in matters of discipline.¹⁵ To suggest that Christ had ever intended to prescribe an immutable form of Church polity only served to suggest that it was inadequate next to the complexities of the Mosaic law. “That Christ did not meane to set downe particular positive lawes for all thinges in such sorte as Moses did, the very different manner of delivering the lawes of Moses and the lawes of Christ doth plainly show.”¹⁶

Hooker insisted that in the same way as “Wisdom” had imparted her treasures to the world in diverse ways, so her method of teaching was not limited to scripture and could draw upon reason.¹⁷ Again and again Hooker reiterated that God’s eternal law over his creation was mediated through a series of laws, and that these laws were grounded in God’s own nature and character. “For that which all men have at all times learned, nature her selfe must needs have taught; and God being the author of nature, her voyce is but his instrument.”¹⁸ This meant that it was perfectly acceptable to commend actions which were not specifically specified by scripture. Practices were only to be rejected if they directly contradicted it.¹⁹ The due observation of law derived from reason would benefit all who observed it. “For we see the whole world and each part thereof so compacted, that as long as each thing performeth only that worke which is naturall unto it, it thereby preserveth both other things, and also it selfe.”²⁰

The *Polity’s* enthusiasm for reason, however, did not permit individuals to make their own judgments. If each man was permitted to follow the dictates of personal conscience it would merely result in confusion under the pretence of being guided by the spirit. This was why men’s experience had taught them that the Church was the only body which was qualified to interpret scripture through tradition and reason. “For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it even at the first an impudent thing for any man bredde and brought up in the Church to bee of a contrarye mind without a cause.”²¹ Such a recognition of the Church’s centrality meant that Hooker was anxious to stress the importance

¹⁵ Ibid, Vol.I, The Preface, p. 18.

¹⁶ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.11, p. 249.

¹⁷ Beeching, *Religio Laici*, p. 45.

¹⁸ Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.I, Chpt.8, p. 84.

¹⁹ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.I, Chpt.10, p. 129.

²⁰ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.I, Chpt.9, p. 93.

²¹ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.8, p. 231.

of her visible state. “Gods clergie are a state which hath beene and will be, as long as there is a Church upon earth, necessarie by the Plaine word of God himself; a state whereunto the rest of Gods people must be subject as touching things that appertaine to their subjects health.”²² The puritans had criticized episcopacy, but it was clear that it was the primitive form of government most in agreement with scripture.²³

These first principles having been established in the first four books, Hooker used the fifth book “more throughlie to sift” those ceremonies that Puritans “pretend to be so scandalous.”²⁴ It was more than just a straight forward rationale of the liturgy since it provided a profound exposition of the motivation behind Anglican belief, thought, and worship. “Church ministry, sacraments, liturgical principles and practice, are all discussed and not in the merely “parochial” setting, but in the context of participation in the Life of the Incarnate Lord through the grace of the Word and sacraments in the corporate fellowship of the Church.”²⁵ The services were rooted in scripture since they largely revolved around the public reading of the Bible, but they also demonstrated that the Church was able to draw upon tradition to justify the use of ceremonies for the public edification.²⁶ “If religion beare the greatest swaie in our hartes, our outwarde religious duties must show it, as farre as the Church hath outward habilitie.”²⁷

The puritan complaint that the external forms of the Church were often misunderstood provided insufficient justification for the removal of “good and profitable” ceremonies.²⁸ It was as foolish as the conclusion that because children hurt themselves with knives their elders should be forbidden from using them as well.²⁹ Such Prayer Book ceremonies were too important to the reverent administration of the Church’s sacraments for them to be abandoned

²² Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.11, p. 267.

²³ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.11, p. 264.

²⁴ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.IV, Chpt.12, p. 325.

²⁵ McAdoo, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 118; R.Targoff, ‘Performing Prayer in Hooker’s Lawes: The Efficacy of Set Forms,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 275-282), pp. 276-277.

²⁶ Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.II, Bk.V, Chpt.21, p. 87; Vol.II, Bk.V, Chpt.22, p. 92.

²⁷ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.IV, Chpt.4, p. 284.

²⁸ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.IV, Chpt.4, p. 284.

²⁹ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.IV, Chpt.12, p. 325.

on such flimsy grounds. They were vital aids to the demonstration that those who were born of God “have the seede of their regeneration by the ministrie of the Church, which useth to that ende and purpose not only the word but the sacraments, both havinge generative force and vertue.”³⁰ Baptism and the Eucharist were more more than just symbols, since they provided the effective means for God to convey His saving grace.³¹

Hooker, having established the importance of these public duties and practices, used his last three books to explore the forms of authority by which they were performed. The surviving form of Book VI is far from complete, but it is clear that Hooker primarily intended it to refute the office of lay elders through his defence of the spiritual discipline established in the English Church and commonwealth.³² In Book VII he then went on to establish that the best form of Church government was provided by episcopacy. He believed that the first bishops were the Apostles who afterwards endued others “with Apostolical power of their own.”³³ In spite of this impressive precedent for episcopacy, Hooker was loth to absolutize its claims to be the only legitimate form of religious government. His subtlety of argument meant that on occasions he even appeared to be undermining the episcopal case when he suggested that bishops were on the same level as presbyters.³⁴ Such hesitancy was primarily prompted by Hooker’s reluctance to unchurch those Protestants who had abandoned episcopacy. Bishops remained the most apostolic form of government, but they were not vital to the being of the Church.³⁵

In his concluding treatise on the power of ecclesiastical dominion, Hooker sought to vindicate the legal basis of the English religious establishment through his defence of the royal

³⁰ R.Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Book V*, W.Speed Hill, (ed), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol.II, Bk.V, Chpt.50, p. 207.

³¹ Ibid, Vol.II, Bk.V, Chpt.57, p. 247.

³² L.W.Gibbs, ‘Book VI,’ in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 249-308), p. 271; Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.III, Bk.VI, Chpt.I-II, pp. 1-6.

³³ R.Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Books VI, VII, VIII*, P.G.Stanwood, (ed.), (W.Speed Hill, (General ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), Vol.III, Bk.VII, Chpt.4. p. 157.

³⁴ Ibid Vol.III, Bk.VII, Chpt.II, p. 152.

³⁵ A.S.McGrade, ‘Book VII,’ in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 309-336), p. 336.

supremacy in religion. At the beginning he strove to demonstrate how the Church and State could together constitute a single entity whilst remaining distinct from each other. “As in a figure triangular the base doth differ from the sides thereof, and yet one, and the self same line, is both a base and also a side.”³⁶ Having established this Hooker then turned to the more specific issue of the civil magistrate’s claim to the title “Head of the Church.” Hooker argued that because there were two kinds of ecclesiastical power, the “ghostly” and the “external”, the Church was able to award the former to Christ whilst permitting the monarch to serve as a visible head. We “in terming our princes heads of the Church doe but testifie that we acknowledg them such governors.”³⁷

Such a royal supremacy in no way implied that the monarch enjoyed a divine mandate. “As for supreme power in Ecclesiastical affayres, the word of God doth no where appoint, that all kings should have it, neither that any should not have it. For which cause it seemeth to stand altogether that unto Christian kings there is no such dominion given.”³⁸ Englishmen were in no more subjection but such as they had willingly assented to for their own “behoof and securitie.”³⁹ This was why “suche thinges must be thought upon before hand, that power may be limited ere it be graunted.”⁴⁰ In England the polity had been prudently based upon the maxim that “Rex non debet esse sub homine, sed sub Deo et Lege” which meant that the grant of any favour contrary to the law was void.⁴¹ Lest this be misconstrued as encouraging resistance against rulers who ignored their legal commitments, Hooker stressed that it was a “heavenly tribunal” before which they would appear, since “on earth they are not accomptable to any.”⁴²

As we have already seen, the other seven books also had this dominant desire to demonstrate the reasonableness of obedience to the English Christian polity, so that what “the

³⁶ Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.I, p. 319.

³⁷ Ibid, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.IV, pp. 357-361.

³⁸ Ibid, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.III, p. 335.

³⁹ Ibid, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.III, p. 336.

⁴⁰ Ibid, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.III, p. 339

⁴¹ Ibid, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.2, p. 332.

⁴² Ibid, Vol.III, Bk.VIII, Chpt.9, p. 437.

Church hath received...must carry the benefite of presumption with it to be accompted meete and convenient.”⁴³ The motivation behind Hooker’s clear desire to advocate conformity is less obvious, however, and subsequently has been interpreted in a variety of different ways. These have ranged from the traditional belief that Hooker was attempting to promote a distinctive form of Anglicanism, to the more recent suggestion that he was merely seeking to maintain a moderate Calvinist settlement against reformist extremists.

This modern academic discussion of Hooker began with the publication of John Keble’s edition of the *Polity* in 1836. It was “a milestone of nineteenth century scholarship” since unlike his predecessors he drew heavily upon manuscripts, provided footnotes, and divided Hooker’s chapters into numbered sections for greater ease of reference.⁴⁴ Keble also provided an introduction in which he demonstrated the centrality of the *Polity* in defining the Anglican via media. To Hooker, and his successors, “we owe it, that the Anglican Church continues at such a distance from that of Geneva, and so near truth and apostolical order.”⁴⁵ His views on ceremonies and sacraments were based upon a “deep study of Christian antiquity” which was the antithesis of puritanism.⁴⁶ Since Hooker, for example attributed to baptism “a pardoning grace” along with the “first infusion of that which sanctifies” he was clearly opposed to “Calvin’s doctrine, of the absolute perpetuity of justifying and of the first sanctifying grace.”⁴⁷

Keble was clearly perplexed by the three posthumous books of the *Polity*, however, which were ambiguous in their support of episcopacy’s centrality to the being of the Church. Gratefully he embraced Isaac Walton’s seventeenth-century biography of Hooker which suggested that they may have been tampered with by hostile puritans.⁴⁸ So confident was

⁴³ Ibid, Vol.I, Bk.IV, Chpt.4, p. 286.

⁴⁴ G.Edelen, (ed.), *The Folger Library of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol.I, pp. xxv-xxvi; P.G.Stanwood, (ed), *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), Vol.III, p. v.

⁴⁵ J.Keble, (ed.), *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr Richard Hooker: With an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836), p. civ.

⁴⁶ Keble, *Works*, p. lxxxvii; P.B.Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context. Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 84, 207, 250.

⁴⁷ Keble, *Works*, pp. lxxxiv, cii.

⁴⁸ Ibid, pp. xxii, xxvi.

Keble of Hooker's Anglican credentials, however, that he also strove to gloss Hooker's apparent reluctance to accept a divine origin for episcopacy. He insisted that both the Erastianism of the court and Hooker's desire not to offend his non-episcopal continental brethren encouraged him to moderate the way his views were stated. Hooker also lacked that full evidence of episcopal origins "with which later generations have been favoured" since St Ignatius was still "under a cloud of doubt."⁴⁹ Nevertheless since Hadrian Saravia, that zealous Dutch proponent of episcopacy, was in close contact with Hooker we may use "the recorded opinions of the one for interpreting what might seem otherwise ambiguous in the other."⁵⁰ Certainly many of the puritans attributed similar opinions to Hooker.⁵¹

This early high Church interpretation of the *Polity* effectively defined Hooker's reputation as the epitomization of the Anglican tradition. Such was the growth of pious acclaim amongst Victorian devotees of the established faith that a statue of him was erected in the cathedral close at Exeter, and he was depicted as an Anglican worthy in numerous churches and chapels.⁵² Keble's edition of the *Polity* also continued to be in wide demand since it had run through six issues before being revised by R.W.Church and F.Paget in 1888.⁵³ At the end of the century Paget, the Oxford Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, commented in a further consideration of Book V that "but for the change which Mr.Keble's learning and diligence have made in the conditions under which Hooker is studied, he could not have considered" undertaking such a project.⁵⁴ Edward Dowden agreed that they were all indebted to Keble who had done so much to broaden their understanding of Hooker's Anglican

⁴⁹ Ibid, pp. lix-lxii

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. lxvii.

⁵¹ Ibid, pp. lxx-lxxi.

Unlike Book VII, Book VIII was largely irrelevant to Keble's discourse on Anglicanism, but he was still unable to accept the suggestion that it showed Hooker to be the original Whig without making some sort of retort. "Whereas even in respect of civil government, though he might allow them their theory of its origin, he pointedly deprecates their conclusion in favour of resistance. And in respect of sacramental grace, and the consequent nature and importance of Church communion, themselves have dared to claim sanction from him." Keble, *Works*, p. cv.

⁵² Good examples of images of Hooker may be seen in Chester Cathedral, King's College, London, Trinity College, Cambridge, Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and Winchester Cathedral.

⁵³ J.Keble, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr Richard Hooker with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, Revised by R.W.Church and F.Paget, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888).

⁵⁴ F.Paget, *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), p. 259.

personality.⁵⁵

Whilst all were united in their initial debt to Keble, it is clear that by the early twentieth century divergent emphases were beginning to grow up within this general acceptance of Hooker as an Anglican divine. Moderate tractarians, such as H.C.Beeching, continued to remain loyal to the Hookerian via media image of the Church where the reformation had cut away what “was really parasitical” but had retained what possessed in itself “a vital principle.”⁵⁶ Other more advanced heirs of the Oxford Movement, such as Darwell Stone and A.J. Mason, also stayed faithful to Keble through their attempt to apply Hooker in support of their Anglo-Catholic understandings of the eucharist and episcopacy.⁵⁷

Several supporters of this latter group chose to distance Hooker further from the Reformation, however, by emphasizing the existence of certain external similarities between Hooker’s depiction of a hierarchically ordered universe and the theological principles of Thomas Aquinas. Lionel Thornton, of the Community of the Resurrection, showed that Hooker’s reliance upon Aquinas is consistent and profound, and that he had built much of his theological emphasis upon Thomistic principles.⁵⁸ It was not just Anglo-Catholics, however, who recognized Hooker’s debt to mediaeval scholasticism. The Italian A.P.d’Entreves, who restricted his interest in the *Polity* to the political sections, emphasized Hooker’s debt to Aquinas so he could distance him from a more liberal political understanding.⁵⁹

Another school of opinion which overlapped with the via media and Thomist positions was to regard Hooker as representing the spirit of Erasmian humanism. This process began with Dowden who referred to the writer of the *Polity* as a Christian humanist who epitomized the Anglican position at the end of Elizabeth’s reign. “The spirit of the Renaissance is brought

⁵⁵ E.Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican*, (New York: Books for Libraries Freeport, Essay Index Reprint Series, 1969), p. 69.

⁵⁶ Beeching, *Religio Laici*, p. 43.

⁵⁷ A.J.Mason, *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, (Cambridge: 1914), p. 54; D.Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1909), pp. 239, 244-245.

⁵⁸ L.S.Thornton, *Richard Hooker. A Study of His Theology*, (London: S.P.C.K, 1924), pp. 27-30, 35, 92, 97-99, 103.

⁵⁹ W.J.Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker’s Doctrine of the Royal Supremacy*, (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1990), p. 12.

into harmony by him with the spirit of the Reformation; he is serious, reverent, devout; with seriousness and reverence he does honour to human reason;...he is at once humanist and theologian.”⁶⁰ Hardin Craig built upon this to suggest that Hooker’s humanistic balance between the power of reason and grace was akin to Erasmus’s teaching on the freedom of man to cooperate with God’s grace in the work of salvation. This clearly set Hooker apart from the Reformed Protestant belief in the total depravity of man’s nature, and in man’s justification by faith alone.⁶¹

In spite of the subtle differences all three groups remained united in their conviction that Hooker was distinctively Anglican, and stood apart from reformed orthodoxy. Although historians such as Sidney Lee continued to stress the Whig constitutional principles of Book VIII, this had no tangible impact upon the widespread perception of Hooker as an English Church father, and seems to have been regarded as a separate issue. Hooker’s contribution to his Church had so effectively been reckoned and fixed on the strength of the first five books alone that in 1907 the Everyman reprint of Keble’s edition actually chose to omit the posthumous books.⁶² Not until C.J.Sisson’s publication of *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Richard Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* was this image seriously modified in any way. Through his discussion of court records Sisson was able to correct distorted images of Hooker’s family life, and fully restore the credibility of the latter books.⁶³ This work was subsequently expanded upon by Novarr in his post-war exploration of the seventeenth century biographies of Isaac Walton. Walton, Novarr insisted, was a reluctant biographer, writing within a highly political context. His assignment, explicit or implicit, from the archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert Sheldon, was to rescue Hooker from the *Polity’s*

⁶⁰ Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican*, p. 69.

⁶¹ C.Hardin, *The Enchanted Glass: The Elizabethan Mind in Literature*, (New York: 1936), pp. 24, 28; M.M.Phillips, *Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance*, (London: The English Universities Press Ltd, 1961), pp. 150-151. For a more recent discussion of Hooker’s relationship with Erasmus see R.J.Schoeck, ‘From Erasmus to Hooker: An Overview,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 59-73).

⁶² Eccleshall, *Order and Reason*, p. 129; Torrance Kirby, *Royal Supremacy*, p. 11; W.D.J.Cargill Thompson, ‘“The Philosopher of the “Politic Society.” Richard Hooker as a Political Thinker,’ in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of the Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), p. 4; A.S.McGrade, ‘The Three Last Books and Hooker’s Autograph Notes,’ in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 232-247), p. 235.

⁶³ C.J.Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Richard Hooker*.

embarrassing enthusiasm for ideas which seemed to suggest that episcopacy was not divinely ordained and the monarchy was not absolute.⁶⁴

Such new analysis meant that the *Polity* finally began to be considered as an integrated whole. Peter Munz concluded that although Hooker's early books had striven to justify the English polity upon Aquinas's principles, he had been unable to reconcile them with the realities of the Tudor political situation. Aquinas provided the theoretical basis, but Hooker had been forced to have recourse to Marsilius of Padua when it actually came to practical justifications of the political status quo.⁶⁵ Gunnar Hillerdal, through a parallel exploration of Hooker's theological ideas, was similarly sceptical concerning the coherence of the *Polity*. Hooker, he insisted, had been unable to reconcile his Thomist philosophy of reason with his Protestant theology of salvation. Consequently the laws were constructed around two irreconcilable conceptions of grace and reason.⁶⁶

There were surprisingly few responses to these allegations of Hookerian inconsistency. Arthur McGrade was exceptional in his attempt to demonstrate that "coherence is not merely present in the *Polity*, but is in fact its greatest merit."⁶⁷ Hooker, he insisted, had planned the thesis so that the earlier books would be "general in import" and the "later ones particular." The first books were intended to serve as "meditations" whilst the later ones involved "decisions."⁶⁸ Cargill Thompson suggests that the lack of further responses to these criticisms of the *Polity* was primarily a result of a general waning of interest in the study of political thought in academic circles.⁶⁹ This may have been a contributing factor, but the real reason seems to have been the widespread continuation of the assumption that Hooker was a great systematic thinker who provided an Anglican defence *par excellence*. Works by H.C.Porter, H.R.McAdoo, and E.T.Davies confidently assumed that Hooker was the exponent of the

⁶⁴ D.Novart, *The Making of Isaac Walton's Lives*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 226-230.

⁶⁵ P.Munz, *The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952), pp. 49-57, 96-111.

⁶⁶ Cargill Thompson, 'The Philosopher,' pp. 11-12.

⁶⁷ A.S.McGrade, 'The Coherence of Hooker's Polity: The Books on Power,' in *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol.XXIV, No.2, 1963, (pp. 163-182), p. 163.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 165.

⁶⁹ Cargill Thompson, 'The Philosopher,' p. 11.

Anglican via media, whilst J.S.Marshall's *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition* provided a forceful reassertion of Hooker's claim to be regarded as the successor of Aquinas.⁷⁰

This tradition of interpretation has continued unabated and is currently most visibly represented in the Folger Library edition of the works of Hooker.⁷¹ Although W.Speed Hill, the general editor, suggested that Keble's edition now seems "unduly narrow in the focus of its commentary and unduly pious in its retention of Walton's *Life* as the gateway to the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*" most of these Anglican assumptions have continued to dominate the Folger work.⁷² For most of the editors Hooker continued to represent the quintessential Anglican divine whose writings illuminated this moderate tradition with its combination of Catholic and Protestant elements. In spite of his mild criticism of Keble, Speed Hill himself refers to Hooker in the preface as a major contributor to Anglican religious thought.⁷³ He provided the definition of the 'English Church as neither Roman nor Genevan - at once historic and reformed - and thus distinctively "Anglican."⁷⁴

W.P.Haugaard insists that the maintenance of this position was a constant struggle for the Church against proponents of the Genevan settlement. This was why Hooker had been so anxious to repudiate "the singular authority with which Calvin had been endorsed by many

⁷⁰ E.T.Davies, *The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker*, (London: S.P.C.K, 1946), pp. 27, 98; Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition*; H.McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism. A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1965), pp. v, vi, 4, 6-11, 26, 124, 143, 152, 182, 272, 309, 311, 319-320, 333; H.C.Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 333-334, 381-384; W.M.Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England 1660-1700*, (London: University of Georgia Press, 1993), pp. 64-66, 75, 77, 157-158.

⁷¹ The major significance of the Folger edition is discussed in B.Kaye, 'Authority and the Shaping of Tradition: New Essays on Richard Hooker,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 3-9), pp. 4-5; H.C.Porter's brief qualification on the appropriateness of the term Anglican in the sixteenth century is about as critical as any of the Folger school ever become of this notion. H.C.Porter, 'Hooker, the Tudor Constitution, and the Via Media,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker, Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University), (pp. 77-116), p. 80.

⁷² W.Speed Hill, (ed.), *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), editor's preface, p. ix.

⁷³ Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, p. vi.

⁷⁴ W.Speed Hill, 'Doctrine and Polity in Hooker's Laws,' in *English Literary Renaissance*, Vol.2, 1972, (pp. 173-193), p. 175. See also W.P.Haugaard, 'The Preface,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Mediaeval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), (pp. 1-80), pp. 5, 15; W.Speed Hill, 'Richard Hooker in the Folger Edition: An Editorial Perspective,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 3-20), pp. 15-16.

within the Reformed tradition.” Consequently he ignored the possibility of a “theological dialogue between Calvin’s reading of the New Testament and the needs of a Reformed Geneva.”⁷⁵ Cargill Thompson was less generous and suggested that Hooker had deliberately indulged in a “calculated piece of misrepresentation.”⁷⁶

Haugaard was sincerely impressed, however, by Hooker’s attempt to counteract the puritans by articulating an identity which was faithful to scripture, to the central insights of Reformation doctrine, and to the critically considered heritage of the intervening centuries. These characteristics had all been present in the Elizabethan Church, but it took Hooker to give them a “coherent theological exposition.”⁷⁷ John Booty similarly described how within the *Polity* Hooker managed to encapsulate the three distinctive “strands of Anglican authority, Scripture, tradition (in the church), and reason.”⁷⁸ By keeping faith with the moderate English tradition of Thomas Cranmer, he had successfully combined a strong emphasis on the sacrament as well as the word. This was what had subsequently made him so attractive to the Oxford Movement.⁷⁹

In contrast Egil Grislis, another of the Folger editors, preferred to treat Hooker as a “theologian, rather than as part of the history of an institution.” Nevertheless Grislis is just as much a proponent of the *via media* through his stress on Hooker’s desire for a religious consensus based on the Thomistic distinction between the revealed knowledge of scripture and that obtained via tradition and human reasoning.⁸⁰ Lee Gibbs, a companion contributor, also draws attention to the importance which Aquinas occupied in Hooker’s differentiation of laws.⁸¹ Grislis is adamant that such a considered defence of the status quo was not based on

⁷⁵ Haugaard, ‘The Preface,’ pp. 66, 68, 79.

⁷⁶ Cargill Thompson, ‘The Philosopher,’ pp. 14-15.

⁷⁷ Haugaard, ‘The Preface,’ p. 2.

⁷⁸ J.E.Booty, ‘Hooker and Anglicanism,’ in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 207-239), p. 230.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 232-233.

⁸⁰ Speed Hill, ‘Editor’s Preface,’ p. xii; E.Grislis, ‘The Hermeneutical Problem in Richard Hooker,’ in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 159-206), pp. 178-179, 182, 185-187.

⁸¹ Gibbs, ‘Book I,’ pp. 82, 123.

the selfish pursuit of clerical self-interest, but was motivated from an objective desire to demonstrate the reasonableness of religious conformity.⁸² This was not a totally forlorn hope for Hooker since “the mind of man desireth evermore to know the truth according to the most infallible certaintie which the nature of thing can yield.”⁸³

Such a firm recent restatement of Hooker’s Anglican credentials by the compilers of the Folger edition has ensured that via media notions continue to predominate in both popular and scholarly considerations of the *Polity*.⁸⁴ The most important and innovative contribution to this continuing line of debate is located in the work of Peter Lake and Anthony Milton. They have entirely rejected as anachronistic the traditional Keble-sponsored view that Hooker was part of a moderate Anglicanism going back to the Reformation. Hooker could still be referred to as an Anglican, however, not because he inherited this distinctive English tradition but because he invented it.⁸⁵ He was the founder of an anti-Calvinist movement which subsequently came to dominate the Church. In contrast to the stark Calvinist division between the godly and the profane he adopted a unique view of the visible church which was based upon the sacraments and public worship rather than preaching.⁸⁶

Any attempt to talk of sixteenth-century Anglicanism has been increasingly challenged, however, for reading later doctrinal differences back into an earlier period.⁸⁷ It has been deemed to be historically misplaced to talk about Anglicanism in the sixteenth century when the

⁸² Grislis, ‘The Hermeneutical Problem,’ p. 175.

⁸³ Ibid, p. 177; Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.II, Chpt.7, p. 179.

⁸⁴ Recent examples include A.Middleton, *The Peculiar Character of Anglicanism*, (Louth: The Prayer Book Society Ltd, 1998), pp. 27-30; M.Percy, *Introducing Richard Hooker and the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Affirming Catholicism, 1999), pp. 3, 12, 19.

⁸⁵ P.Collinson, ‘Hooker and the Elizabethan Establishment,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 149-181), p. 151; P.Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), pp. 173-82, 225-230; A.Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 8, 48-49, 426-427; P.B.Secor, ‘In Search of Richard Hooker: Constructing a New Biography,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 20-37), pp. 24-27.

⁸⁶ P.Lake, ‘Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I,’ in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 113-133), pp. 113-114; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 430, 451, 495

⁸⁷ Torrance Kirby, *Royal Supremacy*, p. 35.

epithet was the subsequent product of post-Restoration historiography.⁸⁸ Any use of the term mistakenly suggests that the Elizabethan Church had consciously developed a distinctive identity which separated her from the continent. Sixteenth century churchmen were “blissfully unaware that they were hammering out a theological position which was clearly distinct from that being pursued by the Reformation in general.” This ignorance was not the result of theological naivete, but simply because they would not have accepted that they were departing from the reformed position.⁸⁹

Naturally any reconsideration of the old historiography of the sixteenth century Church has called into question the traditional Folger-school interpretation of Hooker’s *Polity*.⁹⁰ First Torrance Kirby, and then Nigel Atkinson have sought to reposition Hooker within the mainstream Protestant reformed tradition.⁹¹ Alister McGrath describes how evangelicals have for too long accepted the catholic interpretation of Hooker as a writer determined to move the Church away from the Reformation, and have studiously ignored him in consequence.⁹² These revisionists are happy to accept the traditional exposition of the *Polity*’s enthusiasm for scripture, reason and tradition, but dispute that there is anything distinctively Anglican about it. Atkinson is swift to point out that Hooker would not have recognized this exclusivist depiction of his theological premises. We have his own declaration that he was hostile towards Rome and considered himself to be a theological proponent of the Reformation.⁹³ The Church of England might maintain different outward forms, but this did not mean that she was not of the

⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 34.

⁸⁹ N. Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason. Reformed Theologian of the Church of England?*, (St Ives: Paternoster Press, 1997), p. xvi.

⁹⁰ The absence of this religious historical shift ensured that earlier attempts by Sydney Carter and C.W. Dugmore to emphasize Hooker’s reformed credentials had largely failed. C. Sydney Carter, *The Anglican Via Media*, (Tynne and Jarvis Ltd, 1927); C.W. Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1942), pp. 10-22.

⁹¹ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*; W.J. Torrance Kirby, ‘Richard Hooker as an Apologist of the Magisterial Reformation in England,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 219-233); W.J. Torrance Kirby, *Royal Supremacy*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990).

These claims were not totally without precedent since in 1927 Sydney Carter had unsuccessfully attempted to re-emphasize Hooker’s reformed credentials. C. Sydney Carter, *The Anglican Via Media. Being Studies in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and in the Teaching of the Caroline Divines*, (London: J. Tynne and Jarvis Ltd, 1927), pp. 41, 57, 69, 70, 74, 79, 94, 162, 182.

⁹² A. McGrath, ‘The Foreward,’ in N. Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason. Reformed Theologian of the Church of England?*, (St Ives: Paternoster Press, 1997), (pp. vii-viii).

⁹³ Hooker, *Polity*, Vol. I, Bk. IV, Chpt. 14, p. 344; Vol. I, Bk. IV, Chpt. 9, pp. 302.

same “confession in doctrine.”⁹⁴

The belief that Hooker was attempting to place the Church outside the reformed tradition has largely originated from an unquestioning acceptance of the authenticity of the assessment of his early critics.⁹⁵ In particular the authors of *A Christian Letter* were responsible for giving the impression that many of his opinions were riddled with Romish anti-Protestant errors. His efforts to demonstrate the possible salvation of pre-Reformation Catholics were far too sympathetic towards “the chiefest pointes of popish blasphemie” for their liking.⁹⁶ Consequently they structured their response so that the official teaching of the Church were placed alongside Hooker’s teachings to emphasize his deviation from them. This gave them the appearance of defending the reformed religion from “the growth of heresy in its very breast.”⁹⁷ In particular they made the serious accusation that he owed more to Aristotle than the Reformation fathers, and was guilty of setting reason above scripture. By linking the *Polity* with Mediaeval scholasticism they made the damning allegation that he was attempting to undermine the Reformation by contradicting almost all the principal points “of our English crede.”⁹⁸

It is mistaken to believe, however, that the views of the writers of *The Christian Letter* were representative of mainstream Calvinist reformed religion within England. They were the lineal descendants of those Protestants who had chosen exile during Mary’s reign, and had returned to England assuming that the revival of the Edwardian Church was but the first step towards a more thorough reform. The original magisterial reformers had believed that there were only two necessary signs of the true visible Church, namely Word and Sacrament. This meant that it was perfectly acceptable for each national Church to order her outward structure in whatever way seemed most appropriate. Against this Bucer and Beza had subsequently

⁹⁴ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. xx.

⁹⁵ Keble, *Works*, p. xxiv.

⁹⁶ *A Christian Letter of Certaine English Protestants, Unfained Favourers of the Present State of Religion, Authorised and Professed in England: Unto that Reverend and Learned Man Mr R.Hoo Requiring Resolution in Certaine Matters of Doctrine (Which Serve to Overthrow the Foundations of Christian Religion, and of the Church among Us) Expresslie Contained in His Five Books of Ecclesiastical Pollicie*, (Middleburg, R.Schilders, 1599), p. 4.

⁹⁷ *A Christian Letter*, pp. 18-20; Folger Edition, Vol.IV, p. xvii.

⁹⁸ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. 5; *A Christian Letter*, p. 14.

enunciated the “un-Calvinist” opinion that only a totally scriptural form of government was the acceptable mark of the visible Church. Initially a broad spectrum of beliefs had to be tolerated within the recently revived English Church, but by the 1570s she was sufficiently secure for the hierarchy to attempt to define the religious boundaries of conformity. These efforts necessarily concentrated on outward actions, not private faith, because the recusancy statutes remained the main means of enforcing conformity.⁹⁹ Those sola scriptura Protestants who continued “to refuse to come to churche, as not lyking the surplis, ceremonies, and other services” consequently became widely known as puritans.¹⁰⁰

It was this extreme puritan manifestation of the Protestant faith that Hooker was opposing, and not the reformed religion itself. Hooker’s success in defending the Church of England was based not on his ability to define an Anglican position, but his adroitness in demonstrating that his own position was closer to that of the leading reformers than that of the puritans.¹⁰¹ His *Polity* sought to demonstrate that the established religious order was wholly in accord with reformed orthodoxy, and that it was a “misconceit” to fail to accept this, and urged instead urged further reforms.¹⁰² The puritans were shown to be doctrinally unsound since their theology was not that of the “magisterial Reformation,” and was an attempt to introduce into England the subversive ideas of the Anabaptists and Sectaries.¹⁰³ They were guilty of trying to out-reform the Reformation, and in the process were creating a theology which bore little resemblance to orthodox Christian belief.¹⁰⁴

Hooker’s tripartite defence of the English Church, in contrast, was well within the

⁹⁹ C.Litzenberger, ‘Defining the Church of England: Religious Changes in the 1570s,’ in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England. A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, C.Litzenberger and S.Wabuda, (eds.), (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), (pp. 137-153), pp. 140, 143.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, p. 137.

¹⁰¹ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. xxi; Collinson, ‘Hooker and the Elizabethan Establishment,’ pp. 161, 169, 171; Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker*, p. 2.

¹⁰² Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker*, pp. 21, 126.

¹⁰³ Ibid, pp. 6, 45.

¹⁰⁴ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. 130.

tradition of the magisterial reformers.¹⁰⁵ Torrance Kirby and Atkinson insist that only the mistaken desire to read the *Polity* as a distinctive Anglican text, has prevented any earlier recognition that his “laws of theological authority” were essentially the same as the leading Reformers.¹⁰⁶ Atkinson’s comparison of Hooker’s much-vaunted Thomistic usage of scripture, reason and tradition with that of Calvin and Luther demonstrates a significant continuity of belief. All three of them were in agreement that scripture enjoyed authoritative primacy since the testimony of God could neither “erre, nor lead into error.”¹⁰⁷ Consequently it was “unlawful” to “urge any thing as part of that supernaturall and celestialle revealed truth” upon the Church “and not to shewe it in Scripture.”¹⁰⁸ Calvin like Hooker did not attempt to extend the use of scripture beyond its proper bounds, however, and was content in matters indifferent to follow reason or tradition.¹⁰⁹ Any attempt to pursue a strict policy of sola scriptura would be disastrous. The puritan desire to locate proscriptive commands in the Old Testament obscured the central biblical aim of teaching salvation through Christ.¹¹⁰

Hooker was not coy about his agreement with the major continental reformers, since he was happy to cite them if they furthered his argument. He quoted Calvin favourably six times, and only disagreed with him twice. The *Polity* demonstrated his belief that his ability to distinguish between the differing laws united him to the major continental reformers. This was why he encouraged readers of the *Polity* to ponder his “writings with the same minde you reade Mr Calvines writings, beare yourself impartiall in the one as in the other; imagine him to speak that which I doe, lay aside your indifferent minde, change but your spectacles, and I assure myselfe, that all will be cheerelie true, if he make difference as all men doe, which have

¹⁰⁵ Dewey Wallace insists that Hooker’s doctrine of predestination was also formulated “in a manner consonant with Reformed theology” and that “Hooker’s supposed departures from scholastic predestinarian Calvinism were more significant in tone than they were in departing from prevailing formulations.” Torrance Kirby, *Royal Supremacy*, p.40; D.D.Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination. Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), pp. 66-67; Nockles, *Oxford Movement*, p. 257.

¹⁰⁶ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. xxii; Torrance Kirby, *Royal Supremacy*, pp. 85-87.

¹⁰⁷ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. 97; Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.II, Chpt.6, pp. 167-168.

¹⁰⁸ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. 79; Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.II, Chpt.V, p. 160.

¹⁰⁹ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. 79. The presence of this Thomistic distinction in Calvin’s thought illustrates that it is seriously misplaced to believe that there was anything specifically Anglican about the use of the scholastic tradition.

¹¹⁰ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, p. 122; Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.I, Chpt.14, p. 128.

in them this dexteritie of judgment between supernaturall trueth and lawes.”¹¹¹

This presentation of the *Polity* as a mainstream Protestant text is convincingly argued, and is certainly supported by the enthusiasm early seventeenth century Calvinist conformists displayed towards it. The views of Hooker, Luther, and Calvin were not identical, but it has been demonstrated that they enjoyed a similar theological outlook. Hooker’s rejection of extreme biblicism was far from being a unique English phenomenon, since both Luther and Calvin are full of examples demonstrating their recognition that scriptural authority was not required for all eventualities. It is a weakness, however, of the revisionists that they have failed to contrast the *Polity* with any other reformed writings than those of Luther and Calvin. Hooker was only ten years old when Calvin died, and Luther was dead before he was even born. Late sixteenth century Calvinism and Lutheranism owed a great debt to their founders, but were not necessarily synonymous with the teachings contained within their works.¹¹² Atkinson’s stress on reformed principles also means that he fails to acknowledge sufficiently the many differences between these two Protestant groupings, or to emphasize Hooker’s outright hostility to Lutheranism.¹¹³ Whilst Hooker has been carefully positioned in his “deep context” amongst the leading early figures of the Reformation, there has been a wholesale neglect of his contemporaries.

If Hooker was indeed anxious to portray himself as an adherent of Protestant reformed orthodoxy, rather than the advocate of a distinctive form of Anglicanism, it raises the question of how he came to be portrayed as the exponent of an English *via media*. In the case of the *Polity*, with its strong emphasis on the importance of formal public worship and the occasional reference to the “crazed” opinion of another continental protestant divine, it is certainly not difficult to extract such a reading. It is noticeable that the revisionists usually have to look outside the *Polity* to demonstrate definitively Hooker’s Protestant credentials. Atkinson openly admits that the Dublin Fragments provide his most careful consideration of reformed

¹¹¹ Hooker, *Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.I, Chpt.16, p. 138.

¹¹² P.O.G.White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 80-81.

¹¹³ “Even Richard Hooker could take it as read by his audience and opponents that the Lutheran Churches maintained errors greatly repugnant to the truth which might in their consequence overthrow the very foundation of faith.” Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 385.

orthodoxy, and Torrance Kirby insists that the fundamental shape of Hooker's thought can only be understood through examination of his sermons and tracts.¹¹⁴

The revisionists primarily lay the blame for the distortion of Hooker's reputation as a proponent of reformed orthodoxy upon the Anglican hagiography of the Oxford Movement.¹¹⁵ Keble and Newman are held responsible for developing the myth that Hooker's distinctive Anglican theology was the basis upon which the next generation of English divines were able to build, and maintain that the Church was a separate state which remained distinct from either Rome or Geneva through its embodiment of primitive truth and apostolical order."¹¹⁶ Several contemporaries of the movement, including Wordsworth, were certainly critical of their perceived misrepresentation of Hooker.¹¹⁷ The concept of an Anglican *via media*, however, was not an invention of the Oxford Movement. It can be traced back to the first few decades of the seventeenth century. In July 1624 Richard Montague, the dean of Hereford, expressed his well known desire for a Church that would "stand in the gapp against Puritanisme and Popery, the Scilla and Charybdis of antient piety."¹¹⁸ Previously the English Church had defined her identity through her differences in doctrine and discipline with the Church of Rome. Montague now construed it, however, in terms of a doctrinal difference between the Church of England and the Reformed as well. His views were far from representative of the contemporary Church of England, but they were indicative of the slow development of the belief in a distinctive English religious ideology. This was a progression which eventually came to dominate the Restoration Church when Hooker became the father of English Anglicanism.

A vast amount has been written on Hooker's own understanding of the *Polity*, but there has been very little consideration of subsequent historical interpretation and diffusion of the ideas of the judicious divine. Examinations of the creation of Hooker's posthumous reputation

¹¹⁴ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, pp. 28-29, 41, 56; Torrance Kirby, *Hooker*, pp. 3, 40.

¹¹⁵ Torrance Kirby, *Hooker*, p. 36.

¹¹⁶ Atkinson, *Reformed Theologian*, pp. x, xii, xvi-xvii, xix; Torrance Kirby, *Hooker*, p. 37.

¹¹⁷ Nockles, *Oxford Movement*, p. 87.

¹¹⁸ *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham: Together with Other Papers Illustrative of His Life and Times*, Part I, G.Ornsby, (ed.), (Durham: Surtecs Society, 1869), p. 21.

by Robert Eccleshall and Conal Condren have been notable exceptions.¹¹⁹ Both these studies make clear that it has never been possible for the *Polity* to inhabit a timeless continuum. As Quentin Skinner puts it, “to mount an argument is always to argue with someone” and “to reason for or against a certain conclusion or course of action.”¹²⁰ There is, in other words, a fundamental hermeneutical issue here, concerning the way in which the *Polity* has been used, and the various assumptions and biases which different readers have brought to it. Immediately following the publication of the first five books the *Polity* had clearly been used to authorize the evolving values of varied individuals and corporate bodies.¹²¹ Throughout the seventeenth century interpretation of the *Polity* visibly changed as new contexts endowed it with new meanings.¹²² By the end of the period Hooker had been used to elicit support for “the embryonic version of practically every modern doctrine.”¹²³ Consequently, in the jargon of modern hermeneutics, the *Polity* can be viewed as an open-ended text which initiated a perpetual chain of significations, rather than one which conveyed some specific content.¹²⁴

Scholarly examination of these various responses to Hooker in assorted writings has been discouraged until recently by the belief that there are few citations of the *Polity* in the century after his death. John Wall, for example, comments that in view of Hooker’s modern reputation as the pre-eminent English theologian of the sixteenth century, “one of the surprises facing students of the seventeenth century is the relative scarcity of contemporary or near-

¹¹⁹ C. Condren, ‘The Creation of Richard Hooker’s Public Authority: Rhetoric, Reputation and Reassessment,’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1997, (pp. 35-59); R. Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: The Reception of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,’ in *The History of Political Thought*, Vol. II, 1981, (pp. 63-117); B. Kaye, ‘Authority and the Shaping of Tradition: New Essays on Richard Hooker’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1997, (pp. 3-9), pp. 3-5; A. S. McGrade, ‘Foreward,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A. S. McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. xi-xxii), p. xi-xxii.

¹²⁰ Q. Skinner, ‘The Idea of Negative Liberty: Philosophical and Historical Perspectives,’ in *Philosophy in History. Essays on the Historiography of Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), (pp. 193-219), p. 201; Q. Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 101-102

¹²¹ A. C. Thisleton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, (London: Harper Collins, 1992), pp. 6, 35.

¹²² Ibid, p. 31.

¹²³ R. Eccleshall, *Order and Reason*, pp. 2-3.

¹²⁴ Thisleton, *New Horizons*, p. 49.

contemporary references to the “judicious divine.”¹²⁵ This belief is mistaken, however, since it can be shown that Hooker’s opinions played an important part in the religious and political disputes of the period. McAdoo describes how his influence was so prevalent that the list of those “whose presentation of the truths of faith owe so much to him reads like a latterday litany of the saints.”¹²⁶ In spite of the hyperbole, McAdoo is essentially correct that Hooker was seldom absent from the works of the leading writers of the period. Hooker was too valuable an authority to be marginalized by the seventeenth century polemicists. This thesis will examine various strands within the struggle for intellectual control of Hooker, and evaluate chronologically the influence of contemporary events upon interpretations of the *Polity*. Printed books rather than manuscripts are the primary source because of their availability to a wider audience. Whilst some manuscripts were clearly circulated they were only ever able to reach a limited section of society. In contrast the status of printed books as works intended for general circulation signals their determination to provide the definitive interpretation of the judicious divine.¹²⁷

The thesis begins with a consideration of the growing tensions between the old reformed understanding of Hooker, and the growing desire of individuals, such as Montague, to comprehend the *Polity* as an expression of a distinctive English settlement. The latter group it will be seen came to enjoy an ascendancy in the 1630s, but were heavily dependent upon royal support. When this crumbled the established Church fell with them, and the old reformed understanding of Hooker publicly reasserted itself. Only a small rump of churchmen remained loyal to the old religious settlement. In the face of outright puritan hostility even the former moderates amongst them were forced to become more extreme and embrace an Anglican interpretation of Hooker. When the Restoration finally came this view was consequently to emerge triumphant as the authentic opinion of the English Church.

The Restoration’s role in the creation of an Anglican identity for Hooker will then be considered. It will be demonstrated how his recently established image as an Anglican Church

¹²⁵ Speed Hill, ‘Richard Hooker in the Folger Edition,’ pp. 7-8; J.N.Wall, ‘Jeremy Taylor and Richard Hooker’s Contemporary Reputation,’ In *Seventeenth-Century News*, Vol.XXXV, No.4, 1977, (p. 112), p. 112.

¹²⁶ McAdoo, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 106; McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, p. 378.

¹²⁷ A.Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. vii.

father was perpetuated, and will consider the methods used to suppress rival interpretations. Particular attention will be paid to the discreet marginalization of the last three books of the *Polity* which contained ideas that were anathema to Restoration Anglicans. These chapters will seek to demonstrate the resilience of the Restoration settlement, but also to draw attention to some of its potential weaknesses. In particular the Church's use of Hooker to promote the doctrine of passive obedience placed her in an impossible dilemma following the accession of James II. His reign effectively discredited the Restoration political understanding of Hooker. It also threatened Hooker's Anglican credentials through the large number of Catholics who sought to exploit his religious vagaries in support of the Roman Church.

The long term effects of James's reign on the *Polity* will then be evaluated during the reign of William and Mary. James's enforced abdication brought Hooker's previously discounted doctrine of original compact back into favour, and more latitudinarian attitudes developed within the Church. Restoration ideologies, however, will be shown to have been far from moribund. Several individuals were able to reconcile them to the change in status quo, but others merely bided their time until the accession of Queen Anne. Although Anne's reign is outside the chronological span of the seventeenth century it is essential to include it in this discussion. It was not regarded as a break with the past by contemporaries, and the Tories, as already indicated, used it as an opportunity to attempt to put the religious and political clock back. They were reasonably successful, although they became increasingly conscious that the imminent accession of the Hanoverians would result in their eventual marginalization.

Through this chronological and thematic examination of the changing role of the *Polity* I hope to vindicate my contention regarding the centrality of the seventeenth century in the creation of Hooker's posthumous reputation and all subsequent understandings of his works. We will see how the *Polity's* view of the development of ecclesiology in historical terms made it highly adaptable through the text's ability to endorse the historicization of its own meaning. The century began with the assumption that Hooker was within a moderate reformed tradition, and ended with the belief that he was a distinctive Anglican figurehead. This was a momentous change. Whilst the boundaries of this Anglican definition continued to expand and contract in response to particular situations, the notion of the *Polity* as a distinctive English text has

remained remarkably constant ever since.

The Development Of An Anglican Hooker, 1640-1660.

Just eighteen months after becoming king Charles I publicized his views concerning the proper relationship between the religious and political polities in a titular letter to all bishops. “We have observed that the Church and State are so nearly united and knit together that though they may seem but two Bodies, yet indeed in some they may be accounted but as one...This nearness makes the Church call in the help of the State to succour and support her...and...the State call on for the Service of the Church both to teach that duty which her members know not, and to exhort them to, and encourage them to, and encourage them in that duty they know.” Such a belief in the intimacy of these two entities ensured that Charles enjoyed a close relationship with William Laud, his effective minister for religious affairs.¹ For just over ten years the two of them pursued a series of religious policies which sought to raise the standard of public devotion, increase the status of the clergy, emphasize the distinctive character of the English Church, and increase the quasi-divine status of the monarch.

Whilst there was considerable continuity with the Jacobean era it is not difficult to see why such an aggressive public programme has encouraged the belief that the Caroline era marked a distinctive break with the immediate religious past. Contemporary supporters of these new policies were clearly aware of this allegation since they sought to demonstrate that their position enjoyed both historical longevity and theological respectability within the English Church. Scripture, the Church fathers, and the writings of the English Reformation divines were all mobilized in their support. Foremost amongst this latter group was the *Ecclesiastical Polity* of the “judicious Mr Richard Hooker.” It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the success with which this Laudian grouping managed to mobilize Hooker in their support.²

Firstly their attempt to appropriate Hooker during Laud’s ascendancy will be considered against a background of criticism regarding their perceived misuse of what was essentially a reformed text. It will be shown how these Laudian aspirations ultimately appeared

¹ C. Carlton, *Charles I. The Personal Monarch*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 16

² G.E. Aylmer, *The Struggle for the Constitution. England in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Blandford Press, 1975), p. 77; F.D. Dow, *Radicalism in the English Revolution, 1640-1660*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), p. 4; K. Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, (London: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 143.

to end in failure with the summoning of the Long Parliament, and the subsequent dismembering of everything that the king and archbishop had held dear. Old reformed notions of Hooker were revived, and the *Polity* was cited in support of Commonwealth political positions which the judicious divine could never have anticipated. In spite of this, however, it will be demonstrated that the Laudian ideal never died out, since the forcible suppression of the Church, and subsequent royal execution, served to ensure that Hooker-sponsored Laudianism became the hallmark of supporters of the old Caroline settlement. When faced with the choice of abandoning their old loyalties, or providing a coherent alternative in the face of considerable hostility, the loyalists were forced to embrace this high Church rhetoric as their official opinion.

Though this belief in Hooker as the authentic representation of a distinctive English churchmanship would have been unimaginable to most early seventeenth century churchmen the roots of this eventual change of attitude are, nevertheless, to be located within the reign of James I. It is untenable to claim that the unanimity of “Jacobean Anglicanism” was destroyed by the advent of Laudianism.³ Anthony Milton describes how “the polemical demands of the debate with Rome” and the “increasing fears of the radicalization of puritan thinking” had already compelled many moderate conformists to adopt opinions which increasingly set them apart from continental Protestantism and made any comprehension of extremist puritans almost impossible.⁴ The growth of this dichotomy is clearly reflected in the evolving attitude towards the *Polity*.

At the beginning of the period John Spenser, Hooker’s friend and literary executor, wrote the famous 1604 prefatory address to the *Polity* in which he recommended it as an antidote to the “unhappie Controversie about the received Ceremonies and discipline of the Church of England, which hath so longtime withdrawne so many of her Ministers from their Principall worke.”⁵ In 1618 Thomas Morton, the moderate Calvinist bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, similarly commended the *Polity*, and warned that the “sinister” opponents of such

³ A.Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 531.

⁴ Ibid, p. 26.

⁵ R.Hooker, *The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie, Eight Bookes*, (London: Printed by Will Stansby, 1617), to the Reader.

ceremonies could only answer Hooker by manipulating his testimony in ways other than “his owne words do directly import.”⁶ Such statements were merely reiterations of Hooker’s belief in the reasonableness of peaceable conformity to the Elizabethan settlement, but they provided a polemical tradition which later high churchmen were able to exploit to their own advantage from a very different theological perspective.

As early as the 1620s John Cosin, then rector of Brancepeth and prebendary of Durham, used Hooker in defence of his elevated understanding of episcopacy. In his sermon at the consecration of Francis White, as bishop of Carlisle, he drew upon the *Polity* to defend the related ceremonies, and to define the nature of the spiritual gift communicated to a bishop.⁷ This growing deployment of Hooker as some sort of “proof text” for high Church opinions is also evident in the works of Richard Montague. Montague, the bishop of Chichester, clearly believed that his citation of Hooker in support of ceremonial practice should silence all criticism.⁸

Such a usage of Hooker, however, remained very much the exception in Jacobean England, since the *Polity* continued to be treated with general respect as a leading defence of the reformed nature of the Church of England.⁹ At the same time as Cosin was writing, Robert Sanderson, then a prebendary at both Southwell and Lincoln, had self-assuredly cited the *Polity* to remind his readers that the English Church was in agreement with the Calvinists regarding predestination. He retorted against the Arminians that the “modest and learned Hooker” could never have dreamed that men who were in agreement with him would find

⁶ T. Morton, *A Defence of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England. Viz the Surplisse, Crosse after Baptisme, and Kneeling at the Receiving of the Blessed Sacrament*, (London: Imprinted for William Barret, 1618), p. 204.

⁷ J. Cosin, *A Sermon at the Consecration of Dr. Francis White, Bishop of Carlisle, 3rd December 1626*, in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham*, Vol. I, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843), (pp. 85-116), pp. 101, 103; See also J. Cosin, *A Collection Of Private Devotions*, P. G. Stanwood, (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 9-13, 15, 18-19, 171-172, 191, 198, 203-204, 208, 232 318-321, 322, 345-347, 350-351, 352, 354.

⁸ P. Collinson, ‘The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference,’ in *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), (pp. 27-51), p. 36; P. Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), p. 228.

⁹ R. Bruick Knox, *James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967), p. 117.

themselves denounced as puritans.¹⁰ In spite of such eulogies, however, there were some slender indications that the dominant perception of the *Polity* as a leading reformed text was becoming less certain amongst Calvinist conformists. Whilst Hooker's Protestant credentials were never overtly questioned he was increasingly being limited to the discussion of marginal issues. Richard Holdsworth, a lecturer at Gresham's College, clearly revered Hooker, but his brief reference to the *Polity* in his discussion of the Apocrypha was far from crucial to his argument.¹¹ When discussing matters such as the nature of the Church, Hooker's prosaic ambiguity meant he was usually discounted in favour of more emphatically reformed writings.

12

Nevertheless anti-Laudians reacted in shocked disbelief when Hooker was subsequently cited in support of conceptions of the Church which they viewed as being both popish and Arminian.¹³ Such a Hookerian justification of the Laudian position was a direct challenge, because it allowed their anti-Calvinist opponents to berate them for not adhering to the universally respected teaching of the *Polity*. Hooker had directed his arguments against the excesses of the puritans, but the Laudians had extended this criticism to many mainstream Calvinists. They were able to do this because the *Polity's* distinction between the prayer of the individual Christian, and the corporate prayer of the Church, supported their pursuit of an enhanced role for the ceremonies and sacraments of the Church.¹⁴ The *Polity* showed that within public worship one was not only instructed by what was spoken, but that a degree of ceremony could awaken an awe and reverence for holy things. Bodily actions were an aid to worship and made it easier for the faithful to take their full share in the service.¹⁵

¹⁰ R.Sanderson, *Pax Ecclesiae by the Right Reverend Father in God Robert Sanderson, Late Lord Bishop of Lincoln*, in *The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson, (ed.), Vol. VI, (pp. 253-277), p. 506.

¹¹ R.Holdsworth, *Praelectiones Theologicae Habitaе in Collegio Greshamensis Apud Londinensis*, (Londini: Typis Jacobi Flesher, 1661), p. 108.

¹² Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 533.

¹³ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, p. 187; J.Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church. Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625-1641*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 118, 155; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 533.

¹⁴ G.W.O.Addleshaw, *The High Church Tradition a Study in the Liturgical Thought of the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1941), p.32; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp 470, 474.

¹⁵ Addleshaw, *High Church*, p. 77; Davies, *The Caroline Captivity*, pp. 10-11, 53; K.Sharpe, 'The Personal Rule of Charles I,' in *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), (pp. 53-78), p. 63; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p. 274.

This determination to use Hooker to promote the importance of the visible Church is clearly illustrated by the *Relation of the Conference between William Laud and Mr Fisher the Jesuit*. Laud commended Hooker for perceiving that the spiritual Church had to be located within the physical Church or it “is tied to no duty of Christianity. For all such duties are required of the Church as it is visible, and performed in the Church, as it is visible.”¹⁶ Hooker had also rightly recognized that the “beam of scriptural light” could not be manifested independently of the Church. Scripture needed to be read in conjunction with the tradition of the Church which, although of human creation, was a form of reason, and therefore led towards the divine rationality. Tradition remained an inducement to belief, although it was not in itself an authoritative sanction.¹⁷

It was upon this basis that the Laudians were able to vindicate their enforcement of the Church’s disputed ceremonies and practices upon recalcitrant incumbents. William Page, the master of Reading Grammar School, vigorously denounced those individuals who would not conform to Church practices which they viewed as being unscriptural. The arrogance of such individuals who set themselves against “the whole clergy” was appalling, since it should have been a sufficient honour for them to have contended with the “iudicious Hooker.”¹⁸ The “authority of B.Andrews, Hooker, Zanchy, [and] Whitgift” was at the very least equal to anything that his opponents could bring against them.¹⁹ Francis White, who was elected bishop of Ely in 1631, was similarly vigorous and instructed all those adhering to Calvinism to read the preface to the *Polity*, which he believed to impugn Calvin’s doctrinal authority.²⁰

This presentation of Hooker as a Laudian worthy was not just limited to the printed

¹⁶ Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 54; W.Laud, *A Relation of the Conference between William Laud Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr Fisher the Jesuit, by the Command of King James of Ever Blessed Memory*, in *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D. Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1849), Vol.II, p. 156 Note N; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 287-288.

¹⁷ C.Condren, ‘The Creation of Richard Hooker’s Public Authority: Rhetoric, Reputation and Reassessment,’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997), (pp. 35-59), pp. 45-47.

¹⁸ W.Page, *A Treatise or Iustification of Bowing at the Name of Jesus by Way of Answere to an Appendix [by W.Prynne] against It*, (Oxford, Printed by I.Lichfield, 1631), Dedicatory.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 147.

²⁰ Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, p. 228; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 430; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 293, 331.

page, but was also given physical expression by the erection of a monument to his memory at Bishopsbourne in 1635. John Warner, the then incumbent, was a high churchman who went on to become bishop of Rochester. Such was his devotion to the English Church that he chose to be sequestered from his living in 1646, rather than conform to the dictates of the Commonwealth.²¹ The monument consists of a bust of Hooker set between two columns carved to resemble books, designed to be indicative of his scholarship. Beneath this was an English epitaph by Sir William Cowper, the local landowner who had paid for its erection, which first associated the epithet “judicious” with Hooker’s name. Cowper insisted that Hooker’s real monument lay in his books, but since in life he had defended ceremonies it was only right that his death was marked by one. All those of an ambitious temperament were urged to learn from Hooker that only “humility is the true way to rise.”²²

Many opponents of Laudianism, however, adamantly rejected Cowper’s advice. Puritan controversialists, such as William Prynne, refused to allow this high Church appropriation of Hooker to go unchallenged, and endeavoured to embarrass his opponents through his own tactical use of the *Polity*.²³ Prynne was infuriated by the way Hooker was used to justify the enforcement of such rituals as the bowing at the name of Jesus. He demanded to know what “auncient authorities there are before...Hooker, which testify that bowing at the name of Jesus was used in the time of Arius?”²⁴ They had misread the *Polity*, he insisted, which considered it to be a ceremony “which no man is constrained to use as Mr Hooker, and others write: since many are urged if not enjoyed to use it: others questioned, if not censured for opposing it.”²⁵ Henry Burton, Prynne’s fellow puritan, was similarly outraged by what he viewed as the permeation of popish ideas, such as limited recreation on Sundays throughout the Church. Hooker, he reminded his readers, in a calculated polemical

²¹ A.G. Matthews, (ed.), *Calamy Revised Being a Revision of Edmund Calamy’s Account of the Ministers and Other Ejected and Silenced, 1600-1662*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), p. 33; A.G. Matthews, (ed.), *Walker Revised Being a Revision of John Walker’s Sufferings of the Clergy During the Grand Rebellion, 1642-1660*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), p. 13.

²² R. Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1666), p. 36.

²³ Collinson, ‘Jacobean Religious Settlement,’ p. 29; Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, pp. 229, 238; W. Prynne, *Histrio-Mastix. The Players Scourge, or Actors Tragedie, Divided into Two Parts*, (London: Printed by E.A. and W.A. for Michael Sparke, 1633), p. 3.

²⁴ W. Page, *A Treatise of Iustification of Bowing at the Name of Jesus. By Way of an Answer to an Appendix [By W. Prynne] against It*, (Oxford: Printed by I. Lichfield, 1631), p. 138.

²⁵ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, pp. 47-48; Page, *A Treatise of Justification*, p. 107.

move, had been a strict sabbatarian who recognized that one day was to be devoted exclusively to God as an act of homage. "We are bound...to account the sanctification of one day in seven...a duty which Gods immutable Law doth exact for ever." No "Magistrate or Prelates" had the right to dispense with this.²⁶

This discontent against the Laudian use of Hooker was not limited to aggressive puritans, but also emanated from many other moderate churchmen, who had perceived the *Polity* as a model for rational belief within an ecumenical church, rather than a justification of immutable Church forms. Laudianism was certainly a long way removed from the original intention of Hooker to rest the legal defence of Church forms and ceremonies upon the rights of duly established ecclesiastical authorities over things indifferent.²⁷ The existence of these more latitudinarian tendencies is clearly illustrated by the loose pre-Civil War group which met at Great Tew, the home of Viscount Falkland. They admired the Elizabethan religious settlement, but held notions of a divine liturgy or divinely instituted Church government to be anathema. Like Hooker, they preferred to award reason a vital role in the authentication of scripture, and the construction of suitable forms of ecclesiastical polity. This meant, for example, that episcopacy was viewed as a convenient institution which had been confirmed by prescription rather than *jure divino*.²⁸

There was no such thing, of course, as a clearly defined Great Tew reading of the *Polity*. Although its members shared a common set of principles they possessed rather diverse views when it came to interpreting Hooker. Whilst Falkland and most of the other members were broadly sympathetic towards the sixteenth century settlement, others used Hooker to pursue a more radical determination. William Chillingworth, an extreme rationalist amongst

²⁶ H.Burton, *The Lords Day, the Sabbath Day. Or, a Briefe Answer to Some Materiall Passages in a Late Treatise of the Sabbath-Day: Digested Dialogue-Wise between Two Divines A.&B.*, (Amsterdam: J.F.Stam, 1636), pp. 15-16, 26; Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, p. 174; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 330, 355, 758-765; M.R.Watts, *The Dissenters*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 67-68.

²⁷ Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement,' p. 29; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 496-497.

²⁸ R.L.Colie, *Light and Enlightenment. A Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), p. 22; R.Eccleshall, 'Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: The Reception of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,' In *History of Political Thought*, Vol.II, 1981, (pp. 63-117), pp. 71-72; H.Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans, Seventeenth Century Essays*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1987), pp. 190-199; B.H.G.Wormald, *Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion*, (Cambridge University Press, 1951), pp. 255-256.

English churchmen, was the most revolutionary member of Great Tew since he used Hooker to construct the “Tuvian via media” into a truly broad and comprehensive Church. In spite of Chillingworth’s awareness that Hooker was “but a man,” he quoted him freely to suggest that he was unaware of any possible difference between their respective viewpoints.²⁹ Within *The Religion of Protestants*, which set out his Church government ideal, there are five major acknowledgments of Hooker’s work.³⁰

He adapted Hooker’s belief in the Church of England as an all-embracing communion to demonstrate that the only way the Church could cope with dissent was to opt for intellectual liberty and toleration of differences.³¹ There was no room for authoritarianism within the Church. Chillingworth insisted that although the authority of the Church might provide the “first introduction,” Hooker had not said that it was “the last foundation whereon our belief...is rationally grounded.”³² Any acceptance of the Church’s discipline did not necessarily entail obedience to her teachings. Robert Orr described how Chillingworth regarded “Hooker’s defence of ecclesiastical authority as conditioned by a belief in intellectual liberty, qualified only by the fear of ‘extreme opinion’ which threatened the existence of the Church.”³³ Hooker was “as far from making such an idol of ecclesiastical authority, as the Puritans whom he writes against.”³⁴

The Christian assent to positive doctrines could never be based on the same foundation of certainty as direct sense experience. Hooker “a Protestant Divine of great authority” had acknowledged that although the truths of our faith are “certain and infallible...there is required

²⁹ W.Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation. Or an Answer to a Booke Entitled Mercy and Truth, or Charity Maintain'd by Catholiques, Which Pretends to Prove the Contrary*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1638), p. 309; R.Orr, *Reason and Tradition. The Thought of William Chillingworth*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 147.

³⁰ Orr, *Reason and Tradition*, p. 72.

³¹ Ibid, p. 148.

³² Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants*, pp. 64-65.

³³ Orr, *Reason and Tradition*, p. 150.

³⁴ Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants*, p. 311; H.R.McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism. A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1965), p.14; Wormald, *Clarendon*, pp.249-250.

of us a knowledge of them, and adherence to them, as certain as that of sense or science.”³⁵ Only reason could redress the excesses of extreme forms of Protestantism. Hooker had insisted that reason was a public as well as a private faculty, so that to refer a controversy to scripture did not submit it to individual private interpretation, but opened it up to public examination.³⁶ The fundamental importance of Christian dogma rested not upon authoritative decrees, but upon the outcome of a process of rational discussion. Any attempt to achieve a uniformity of opinion, which was “more to be desired than hoped for,” that made rational understanding capable of authoritative finality was to fall into an error which would only serve to undermine religion.³⁷ Unsurprisingly this rather strained usage of Hooker’s belief in reason to suggest that rational judgment was the ultimate source of appeal for religious concerns was highly contentious.³⁸ Archbishop Laud was clearly apprehensive at the direction of Chillingworth’s arguments, and took steps to have the work censored before its publication since it was far from compatible with his desire to demonstrate the immutability of Church government.³⁹

In spite of these occasional undercurrents of criticism, however, the Laudians appeared to be dominant by the mid 1630s. Peter Heylin, a protege of Laud, later recalled it as a golden era. The bishops were orthodox, the clergy obedient, ceremonies observed, the material possessions of the Church increased, and “the gentry thought none of their daughters to be better disposed of than such as they had lodged in the arms of a churchman.”⁴⁰ Whilst there was indeed plenty to encourage Heylin, the Laudian success was somewhat superficial. Visitations by Laud’s vicar-general might well be met with contrition, but this did not alter the fact that the penitents generally reverted to their old pattern of behaviour on his departure.⁴¹ Since Laudianism enjoyed a limited popular mandate its continued authority and enforcement was largely dependent upon the support of the established government.

³⁵ Orr, *Reason and Tradition*, p.151.

³⁶ Ibid, p.93.

³⁷ Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants*, pp. 310, 325; Orr, *Reason and Authority*, p. 153.

³⁸ Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 67.

³⁹ Orr, *Reason and Authority*, p. 112.

⁴⁰ Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, p. 272.

⁴¹ J.Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, (Harlow: Longman Group U.K. Limited, 1993), pp. 53-54; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 368-369; Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, p. 194.

Such a dependency upon Charles I ensured that the high churchmen acquired a vested interest in the maintenance of his personal unquestioned government, and a belief in the “Divine Right of Kings” became “the lynch-pin of high royalism.”⁴² This desire to exaggerate royal authority was clearly illustrated by the favourable comparisons which were drawn between Charles and Old Testament kings such as Zerubbabel who had rebuilt the Temple and David who had restored piety.⁴³ They also encouraged public ceremonial, such as the Garter ceremonies or touching for the king’s evil, which emphasized the king’s status as God’s lieutenant on earth.⁴⁴ Hooker could only play a very limited role in this royalist propaganda, since his published writings were not particularly political. This did not prevent the growth of a tacit assumption, however, that the Church’s champion must necessarily have also believed in divine right monarchy.

Such a belief was clearly encouraged by Charles’s known admiration of the *Polity*. From an early stage, Charles had recognized Hooker as one of his three “great authors.”⁴⁵ When he visited Oxford he received a pair of gloves, as historic custom dictated, but the university astutely also chose to present his guest, the Prince Elector, with a copy of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*.⁴⁶ This attempt to demonstrate Hooker’s impeccable royalist credentials would never have stood up to close scrutiny, but it was nevertheless successful in creating an impression of a man who was a zealous supporter of both Church and king. On the eve of the Civil War, David Owen, a high Church controversialist from Anglesea, felt able to state with confidence that Hooker was amongst those “worthy men, that have in the Church of England, learnedly defended the Princely right against disloyal and undutiful opponents.”⁴⁷

⁴² Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, p. 139; Dow, *Radicalism*, p. 11; D. Matthew, *The Age of Charles I*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswode, 1951), p. 131.

⁴³ K. Fincham, (ed.), ‘The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I,’ In *The Early Stuart Church*, K. Fincham, (ed.), (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1993), (pp. 23-49), p. 43.

⁴⁴ R. Ashton, *The English Civil War, Conservatism and Revolution 1603-1649*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), pp. 3-7; Fincham, ‘Ecclesiastical Policies,’ p. 44.

⁴⁵ Fincham, ‘Ecclesiastical Policies,’ p. 42; R. Perrinchief, *The Royal Martyr: Or, the Life and Death of Charles I*, (London: Printed by J.M. For R. Royston, 1676), pp. 261-262.

⁴⁶ P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus: Or the History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, (London: Printed for A. Seile, 1688), p. 318.

⁴⁷ D. Owen, *A Perswasion to Loyalty*, (London: [No Printer], 1642), to the Dutiful Subject.

Such an elevated concept of monarchical absolutism was not entrenched within the consciousness of Charles's subjects, and its successful maintenance depended upon his continued ability to act independently of Parliament. His unpopular taxation methods, combined with growing religious grievances, meant that both king and archbishop faced an unsympathetic elected chamber when the Scottish invasion necessitated the recall of Parliament.⁴⁸ The Commons were determined to demonstrate that the king's authority was exercised through Parliament, and even sought to use Hooker to buttress this claim. Henry Parker, "the most formidable parliamentary apologist of the first Civil War," made a rare reference to the unpublished manuscript of Book VIII to demonstrate that the courts of Parliament were "the fountains of civill bloud, spirits, and life; and soveraigne antidotes of publike mischiefes."⁴⁹ Hooker, he insisted, had recognized that the public good and stability of the monarchy depended upon consent. His demonstration that the religious and political polities were different expressions of the same community meant that he was able to squeeze together "the role of consent in church and state in a vice of tightening implication. Parliament was a court "not so merely temporall" that "it might meddle with nothing but only leather and wooll." Similarly when devising laws in the Church "it is the general consent of all that giveth them the forme and vigor of lawes." It was a clear case of the king being "major singulis universis minor."⁵⁰

Since the king had flagrantly ignored the established forms of machinery, which were designed to ensure co-operation, Parker went on to suggest that Parliament "might legitimately do...whatever was necessary to prevent national ruin."⁵¹ Such a scenario was highly contentious, however, and attracted very few public adherents. Even following the outbreak of civil war the limited manuscript circulation of Book VIII ensured that those individuals who quoted Hooker in support of active resistance to absolutism remained very much the

⁴⁸ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, pp. 101, 102, Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 36-38, Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, pp. 77-78.

⁴⁹ R.Eccleshall, *Order and Reason in Politics. Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 160; M.Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War. The Political Thought of the Public's "Privado,"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. xiv, 1, 63.

⁵⁰ Dow, *Radicalism*, pp. 17-18, 19; J.H.Franklin, *John Locke and the Theory of Sovereignty. Mixed Monarchy and the Right of Resistance in the Political Thought of the English Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 23-24; Mendle, *Parker*, pp. 65-66.

⁵¹ Eccleshall, *Order and Reason*, pp. 160-161; Franklin, *John Locke*, p. 27.

exception.⁵² Nevertheless, Parker had correctly recognized that Parliament was anxious to take advantage of the sitting to articulate their grievances against the growing royal-sponsored pretensions of the Church. “A laity by no means predominantly Puritan had come to share the Puritan indignation against the bishops, fiercely resenting the arbitrary powers of the Court of High Commission, and opposing with stubborn conservatism the ceremonial innovations of the new school.”⁵³

This is clearly illustrated by the parliamentary opposition of Falkland, self-appointed leader of Great Tew, and his friend Edward Hyde, later earl of Clarendon, to the growth of clerical and royal extremism. They were on the side of reform and were amongst the most vociferous critics of arrogant episcopal behaviour in the 1641 Parliament. Clarendon’s denunciations of episcopacy, and criticisms of the bishops for undermining the Protestant alliance, were such that Tulloch, a nineteenth century commentator on Great Tew, mistakenly interpreted them as being indicative of an inflexible Calvinism.⁵⁴ The parliamentary speeches of Clarendon and Falkland, however, are best regarded as part of a debate rather than a personal manifesto. Falkland’s belief in the virtue of individual freedom meant that he fiercely opposed a rigid Calvinist structure, and sought a national Church which was subordinate to the civil authority, whilst allowing as much latitude as the essentials of salvation permitted.⁵⁵ Tulloch ignored such evidence as Falkland’s satirical Huntingdon elegy, of 1633, in which he castigated the radical puritans for their belief that it was more pious to listen to sermons “then to doe.” Falkland’s citation of Hooker within the elegy demonstrates his clear commitment to the maintenance of the established Church:

“Who to be indiscreet, count to be stout
With whom the factions are alone devout,
Think all in state of grace, and void of sinne;

⁵² The clerical Philip Hunton’s citation of Hooker in support of resistance is limited to the first five books. P.Hunton, *A Treatise of Monarchy : Containing Two Parts*, (London: Printed for E.Smith, 1689), p. 51.

⁵³ R.S.Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, (London: Dacre Press, 1951), p. 3; Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, pp. 227, 315, 321.

⁵⁴ J.Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol.I, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1872), p. 82.

⁵⁵ Ashton, *English Civil War*, pp. 121-122, J.C.Hayward, ‘The Mores of Great Tew: Literary, Philosophical and Political Idealism in Falkland’s Circle,’ Cambridge (Unpublished) PhD, 1982, p. 133; Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 45-46; Wormald, *Clarendon*, p. 260.

Falkland and his supporters made a clear distinction between the proud prelatial Church maintained by Laud, and the reasonableness of the pre-Laudian religious settlement. Their understanding of Hooker compelled them to maintain a Church which was shorn of jure divino notions, but respected the civil magistrate, the Elizabethan Church, and the learning and martyrdom of past bishops. Indicative of this aspiration was Ussher's publication in 1641 of a collection of tracts which sought to support the institution of moderate episcopacy. This collection, which included works by Lancelot Andrews and Ussher, was prefaced with a short piece by Hooker entitled "A Discovery of the Causes of the Continuance of these Contentions Concerning Church-Government."⁵⁷ It served as a general exhortation for peaceableness in Church government, and for the avoidance of faction. "Want of sound proceeding in church hath made manie more stiffe in error now then before."⁵⁸ This desire for a peaceable Hooker-sponsored settlement was also demonstrated by the willingness of non-Laudian churchmen to modify the outward forms and practices of the established faith. The writer of *Certain Reasons Why the Book of Common Prayer Being Corrected Should Continue* revered Hooker's writings on the English liturgy since he that desires "answers to the severall objections against the Booke of Common-prayer, may read and receive it in that learned Work of Master Hookers *Ecclesiasticall Politie*."⁵⁹ Unlike staunch Laudian devotees of Hooker, however, he did not believe that a high regard for Book V was incompatible with being in favour of some sensible

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 121.

⁵⁷ R.P. Almasi, 'They are and are not Elymas: The 1641 "Causes" Notes as Postscript to Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S. McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 183-201), pp. 183, 187, 200; J. Ussher, (ed.), *Certaine Brief Treatises Written by Diverse Learned Men Concerning the Ancient and Modern Government of the Church. Wherein Both the Primitive Institution of Episcopacie is Maintained and the Lawfulness of the Ordination of the Protestant Ministers beyond the Seas Likewise Defended*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1641).

In 1642 at Oxford one W.R. published a pamphlet entitled *The Dangers of New Discipline*, which was largely a reprint of Chapters 8 and 9 of the Preface. Hooker's name is nowhere mentioned which suggests that the compiler was anxious to keep his source secret. G. Edelen, 'Publishing History the First Five Books of the Lawes,' in R. Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Preface Books I-IV*, G. Edelen, (ed.), W. Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977) Vol. I, (pp. xiii-xxvii), p. xxiii.

⁵⁸ R. Hooker, *The Causes of the Continuance of these Contentions Concerning Church Government*, in *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Books VI, VII, VIII*, P.G. Stanwood, (ed.), W. Speed Hill, (general ed.) (London: The Belknap Press of the University of Massachusetts, 1981), Vol. III, (pp. 455-459), p. 457. See also G. Cranmer, *Concerning the New Church Discipline an Excellent Letter Written by Mr George Cranmer to Mr R.H.*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1642), pp. 8, 23-24.

⁵⁹ I.W., *Certaine Reasons Why the Booke of Common-Prayer Being Corrected Should Continue*, (London: Printed by A.M. for Richard Lownds, 1641), p. 11.

modification of the Church's liturgy.⁶⁰

Such eloquent pleas for moderate reform, however, failed to secure sufficient support to be successful. Laudian-engendered hostility towards the Church ensured that the desire for a radical religious reformation became dominant.⁶¹ George Gillespie, a leading Calvinist writer, contrasted the purity of Scottish Presbyterianism with the popish corruptions of the English Church. "And of Mr. Hookers jest we may make good earnest, for in very deed as the reformation of Genevah did pass the reformation of Germany, so the reformation of Scotland did pass that of Genevah."⁶² The growth of millenarian expectations had also encouraged an apocalyptic fervour which sought to cleanse the country. Thomas Wilson warned that it was nonsense to talk of a "reduced episcopacy" when it could be demonstrated that this estate did not even enjoy divine approval: "O think it not enough to clip their wings when Christ is against the being of such a body."⁶³

The subsequent outbreak of Civil War only served to exacerbate the animosity felt towards the royalist Church. Richard Baxter, the puritan divine, writing to Edward Eccleston in the 1660s argued retrospectively that the failure to curb episcopal pretensions sufficiently early had contributed to the outbreak of war. He was a young man in the early 1640s but could not be ignorant "how Hookers principles began our warres..., that was a parliament of Episcopall men and Erastians, an Army of such Commanders that began it."⁶⁴ Growing hostility towards the Church ensured that the clergy were held up to ridicule, their churches were desecrated, and her worship and doctrine were treated with contempt. At Rochester "they strowed the Pavements with the torn mangled leaves of the Book of Common-Prayer, which with the 39 Articles, make up the third Book, wherein the Doctrine of the Church of

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 3.

⁶¹ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, pp. 109-112, Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 54-60.

⁶² G. Gillespie, *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland. Wherein Not Only Our Own Arguments against the Same are Strongly Confuted, but Likewise the Answers and Defences of Our Opposites, Such as Hooker, Mortoune, Burges, Sprint, Paybody, Andrewes, Saravia, Tilen, Spotiswood, Lindsey, Forbesse, &c. Particularly Confuted*, (Edinburgh: [No Printer], 1660), p. 272.

⁶³ Lamont, *Puritanism and the English Revolution*, p. 87.

⁶⁴ Ibid, p 82.

England is full contained.”⁶⁵ Those who attempted to adhere to the forms of the English Church had to endure scornful attacks. Baxter recalled some “separatists” looking in at the door of a church and saying, “the devil choke thee, art thou not out of thy pottage yet?” because the Prayer Book was still used.⁶⁶

It was not just the Laudian clergy who found themselves subject to abuse, since many moderate churchmen also found themselves criticized by militant Calvinists. William Chillingworth, throughout his lingering death in captivity, had the misfortune to be placed under the supervision of Francis Cheynell. Cheynell, an avowed Presbyterian, had been horrified by Chillingworth’s opposition to the doctrine of sola scriptura and his resolving of faith into reason. He hastened Chillingworth’s demise through abortive attempts to convert him, and then combined an account of his unrepentant death with a critique of his argument. Chillingworth, he insisted, had falsely elevated reason above supernatural truths, and wrongly used Hooker to suggest that “Reason is in some sort God’s word.”⁶⁷

Such localized acts of aggression against the continued existence of the English Church came to full fruition in a series of parliamentary statutes. Episcopacy was abolished, the cathedral foundations dissolved, and the Prayer Book was replaced by the Directory of Public Worship. By 1646 a self-congratulatory Parliament was able to record that they had successfully “laid the foundation of a Presbyterial Government in every Congregation.”⁶⁸ The English Church appeared to be destined for extinction. Trevor-Roper describes how in the storms of the 1640s the Laudian Church had gone down “at the first gust, and those who did not sink with it, or clamber into the obscure safety of captivity, swam severally to distant shores. In the long years of Puritan rule, not one of the high-flying careerists who had

⁶⁵ J.Barwick, B.Ryves, and G.Wharton, *Angliae Ruina: Or England’s Ruine*, (London: [No Printer], 1647/1648), p. 450.

⁶⁶ T.Lathbury, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1859), p. 195.

⁶⁷ F.Cheynell, *Chillingworthi Novissima. Or the Sicknesse, Heresy, Death, and Buriall of William Chillingworth*, (London: Printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1644), not paginated, approx. p. 31,41.

⁶⁸ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, p. 142; Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 74, 77, 80-90, 148-155; Parliament, *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament for Keeping of Scandalous Persons from the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, the Enabling of Congregations for the Choyce of Elders and Suplying of Defects in Former Ordinances and Directories of Parliament Concerning Church-Government*, (London: Printed for Edward Husband, 1646), p. 3.

flourished in the Laudian Church took any risks, or showed any faith in a future restoration.”⁶⁹

Although Trevor-Roper’s unqualified criticism of the Laudians is far too sweeping, he is correct to emphasize the resurgence of Calvinist influence. Whilst the Laudians had attempted to mould Hooker to complement a combative high church ideology other Protestant groupings had continued to recognize a very different understanding of the *Polity* as authoritative. The religious settlement of the Commonwealth created an environment in which this old reformed interpretation of the *Polity* could once again flourish. This anxiety to see Hooker restored to his true context was clearly illustrated by a special parliamentary vote, on the 27th of June, 1641, which made his surviving manuscripts over to Hugh Peters, the well known independent preacher, presumably with a view to publishing Books VI and VIII.⁷⁰ Peters does not actually seem to have made any use of the manuscripts, but there were other puritan sympathizers who made strenuous efforts to demonstrate that Hooker provided the basis for a peaceable reformed settlement.

In 1648 James Ussher, the scholarly archbishop of Armagh, helped to publish the first edition of Books VI and VIII in response to the growing tension after the failure of the Newport negotiations. It was vital, he insisted, that “he which so much desired the Unity of the Church, might have the divided members of his Labours united.”⁷¹ The irenicism of Book VI and Book VIII’s reasonable discussion of the jurisdiction of Magistrates were both clearly appropriate to a situation fraught with theological and ecclesiastical differences.⁷² Their appeal was “both fundamental and ecumenical, to the natural law, and beyond the national Church.”⁷³

⁶⁹ W.K.Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England. From the Accession of James I to the Convention of the Long Parliament, (1603-1640)*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1936), pp. 168-169; Morrill, *English Revolution*, p. 159; H.R.Trevor-Roper, ‘The Great and Good Works of Richard Hooker,’ in *The New York Review of Books*, Vol.24, 24 November 1977, (pp. 48-55), p.53.

⁷⁰ Letter of Dr King to Isaac Walton, in R.Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1666).

⁷¹ R.Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie; The Sixth and Eighth Books*, (London: Printed by Richard Bishop, 1648), Printer’s Notice.

⁷² P.G.Stanwood, ‘Textual Introduction. The Last Three Books,’ in Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, P.G.Stanwood, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), Vol.III, (pp .xiii-lxxv) p. xlii; H.A.Lloyd, ‘Constitutionalism,’ in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, J.H. Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 254-297), p. 279-283.

⁷³ Ashton, *English Civil War*, p.125; Stanwood, ‘Textual Introduction,’ p. xvii.

There were passages in Ussher's "Trinity manuscript" which contradicted this portrayal of Hooker through their more absolutist depiction of the monarch, but these were omitted from the printed edition. It was undoubtedly a deliberate decision to discount them in the unreceptive atmosphere of 1648, but could have been justified on account of their absence from the other surviving manuscript sources.⁷⁴

This considered treatment of the *Polity* failed to conciliate either king or Parliament, however, and on the 30th of January, 1649, Charles I was put to death.⁷⁵ Nevertheless Hooker's role as a reformed commentator was sufficiently adaptable for him to be subsequently cited in support of the religious and political life of the commonwealth. John Hall's *The True Cavalier* was one of the most ingenious attempts. Hall quoted large passages from the *Polity* to prove that, under the guidance of the civil magistrate, the Church was competent to abrogate and amend its ecclesiastical practices. Hooker had clearly defended the right of the Church and the "Chief Magistrate" to change her positive laws "as the difference of time or places shall require."⁷⁶ The chief magistrate was normally the king, although by an examination of "the intention of that Act whereby this power was exercised by the King, we shall finde that it,...did not limit it to persons so stiled onely, but that it might be kept for ever, did for ever unite it to the Imperial Crown of this Realm."⁷⁷ The preface to the *Polity* also described how the eighth book would deal with "the power of Ecclesiastical dominion or Supream Authority, which with us, the highest Governour or Prince, hath as well in respect of domestical jurisdictions."⁷⁸

⁷⁴ P.G. Stanwood regarded the Dublin Manuscript as the most accurate because it contained more of Book VIII than any other source, and because it was copied "from Hooker's autograph directly, it is obviously closest to the original design which Hooker outlined in his notes." Stanwood, 'Textual Introduction,' pp. lxiv, lxxviii.

⁷⁵ C.V. Wedgwood, 'The Trial of Charles,' in *The English Civil War and After, 1642-1658*, R.H. Parry, (Ed.), (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1970), (pp. 40-58).

⁷⁶ Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 35; J.Hall, *The True Cavalier Examined by His Principles; And Found Not Guilty of Schism or Sediton*, (London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb, 1656), pp. 30-3.

⁷⁷ Ibid, pp. 58-59.

⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 59. Hall makes the rather surprising comment that it is a great pity "that we had not the book it self to have been further satisfied herein, and in the power belonging to him." Since Hall's book was published in 1656 and Book VIII had been printed in 1648 this appears to be a naive remark. If Hall was able to remain ignorant of both the 1648 and 1652 publications of a book he supposedly yearned to read, it suggests that he had no real interest in Hooker's thought, and was solely motivated by a desire to score a propaganda coup over his royalist opponents.

Hooker had clearly believed that power was “due to the King as Monarch, and not the Monarch as King.”⁷⁹ Cromwell was now “monarch” and should be obeyed for surely scripture looked to “the present, when it enjoyed obedience to the Powers that are, and commands to pray for Kings and all that are in authority?”⁸⁰ It was to be hoped that the authority of Hooker and his adherents was “not so lost, but that their authority and yet arguments will remain of the same force still to keep us from all inclinations either to Schism or Sedition.”⁸¹ Since Cromwell was the legal governor and lawful authority was entitled to reform the Church in unessentials “no plea of former establishment, whether by Councils or Customes” could warrant any dissension from the currently sanctioned official position.⁸²

Those who clung to the forbidden Prayer Book liturgy were guilty of violating the English tradition as defined by Hooker. They had manifestly failed to heed Hooker’s warning not to be like Pharisees, “by whom divine things indeed were lesse, because other things were more divinely esteemed of then reason would allow.”⁸³ Their determination to be faithful to the old settlement had turned them into the new nonconformists, who arrogantly elevated conscience above the authority of the national Church.⁸⁴ When a man found himself in disagreement with the Church it was “a strong presumption, that God hath not moved their hearts to think such things, as he hath not enabled them to prove.”⁸⁵ Consequently a persistent refusal to conform could only be motivated “out of stubbornness and disrespect” to the Church.⁸⁶ If they truly esteemed Hooker they would “shew themselves Patterns of reverend subjection, not Authors and Masters of contempt towards Ordinances.”⁸⁷ The English Church had willingly conformed to the Prayer Book ordinances of King Edward VI so they should now also “conform to what an Act of Parliament and a protector of more power, hath determined

⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 59.

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 91.

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 87.

⁸² Ibid, p. 39-40.

⁸³ Ibid, pp. 38-39.

⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 32.

⁸⁵ Ibid, pp. 34-35.

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 30.

⁸⁷ Ibid, p. 31.

concerning another alteration of this kinde.”⁸⁸

In spite of Hall’s determination to equate the role of Lord Protector with that of a king there was no such natural correlation. Edward VI had come to rule as part of an established order of succession, but Cromwell had secured government by means of a military coup. Notwithstanding, Hall had effectively transferred onto Cromwell the Laudian and Hookerian rhetoric regarding the sovereign’s supremacy. Whilst the legitimacy of this action was somewhat spurious, it did serve to confer the appearance of respectability upon the new regime. Hall reminded his readers that although the changes made under the Commonwealth may have seemed radical, Hooker had rightly recognized that all things “cannot be of ancient continuance, which are expedient and needful for the ordering of spiritual affairs.”⁸⁹ The alterations to the structure of the church may have marked a break with the immediate past, but it was clear from the *Polity* that such measures demanded conformity without reservation. To act otherwise would resemble a man who set fire to his neighbour’s house whilst praying that it would not burn.⁹⁰

Notwithstanding such ingenuity, however, these Commonwealth proponents of a reformed Hooker failed to perpetuate their understanding of the *Polity* much beyond the late 1650s. At the Restoration it was the image of an Anglican Hooker, not a puritan one, which was to triumph. Although the statutory suppression of the English religious settlement had publicly sounded the death knell for Laudianism, it ironically also marked the start of its resurrection as the widespread official creed of the Church. “Truly”, says one historian, “whereas the exile under Queen Mary was one of the greatest evils that ever befell the English Church, the exile under the Commonwealth and Protectorate was one of the greatest blessings; for it purified and spiritualized men’s conception of the Church, and made them realise their churchmanship as they had never done before.”⁹¹ When confronted by outright hostility to any form of accommodation for the old religious settlement, individuals who had previously adhered to a more expansive vision of the Church were compelled towards opinions which

⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 52.

⁸⁹ Ibid, p. 37.

⁹⁰ Ibid, pp. 32-33.

⁹¹ R.S.Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, (London: Dacre Press, 1951), p. 79.

they had formerly regarded as Laudian innovations. Trevor-Roper regretfully comments that by 1660 “the temper of the old liberals of Great Tew, having being soured by events, was much nearer to that of the old Laudians than that of their old selves.”⁹²

This growth of enthusiasm for Laudian concepts of the Church amongst previous religious moderates is clearly illustrated by the evolution of Clarendon’s ecclesiastical opinions. At the start of the Long Parliament he had been vociferous in his criticism of royalist and Laudian abuses. J.C.Hayward refers to him as “the disciple of Hooker, whose theory of government has been described as reconciling Aristotle’s concept of the state as a natural institution with the Augustinian orthodoxy, that government is a consequence of the Fall.”⁹³ He was horrified, however, by the upsurge of radical puritanism, and faithfully supported both Church and king throughout the Civil War. In 1646 he began his great *History of the Rebellion* which was designed to serve as a “secular” companion to the *Polity*. His opening paragraph was clearly modelled upon Hooker, with its emphasis on the need to narrate the condition of his times with a clear view to posthumous regard. Like Hooker he was determined “to rise above controversy, to look beyond present misfortunes, and to produce a long-term validation of the English monarchy that would win support from an uncommitted posterity.”⁹⁴

The execution of the king, however, confirmed that in the short-term he would have to work with the high Church exiles, and their compatriots within England, if there was to be any realistic possibility of securing a restoration. This enforced association with the Laudian clergy ensured that Clarendon came to adopt a much more sympathetic attitude towards their political and religious opinions.⁹⁵ By 1649 he could write to Gilbert Sheldon, the former warden of All Souls, that he was “one of those few by whose advice and example I shall absolutely guide myself.”⁹⁶ Such a statement cannot be dismissed as shallow rhetoric when one examines some of the other overtly “Laudian” statements that Clarendon was making. He stated to Lord

⁹² Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 89-90; Trevor-Roper, ‘The Good and Great Works of Richard Hooker,’ p. 55

⁹³ J.C.Hayward, ‘The Mores of Great Tew,’ Cambridge University Ph.D., (Unpublished), 1982, p. 212.

⁹⁴ Trevor-Roper, ‘The Good and Great Works of Richard Hooker,’ pp. 54-55.

⁹⁵ Wormald, *Clarendon*, pp. 307-308, 312.

⁹⁶ Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, p. 55.

Hopkins his belief that the acts of a non-episcopal ministry were utterly invalid. It is better that were I “cast into the Indies [I] should live there all the days of my life without receiving the Sacrament, than that I should receive it at the hands of one who had no authority to give it than he was chosen by the company to that office.”⁹⁷ The adoption of such an opinion naturally compelled Clarendon to abandon his old latitudinarian understanding of Hooker, and to replace it with the Laudian belief that the *Polity* was the embodiment of the English via media. Throughout his exile he took a keen interest in the efforts of John Earle, the former chancellor of Salisbury, whose piety was subsequently likened by Walton to Hooker, to produce a Latin edition of the *Polity*. This it was hoped would demonstrate to their Roman adversaries the excellent basis of the English Church. The translation was never actually published but, following Earle’s death, Clarendon sent his son to retrieve the manuscript of this important work.⁹⁸

Clarendon’s interest in Earle’s translation of the *Polity* was not only indicative of Hooker’s importance to the Church loyalists, but demonstrated their awareness of the need to nurture the remnants of the old ecclesiastical organization if they were to survive. On the continent it was possible for the exiles to maintain public services, but this was clearly not an option in England. Notwithstanding, ordinations were secretly undertaken, the Prayer Book services privately performed, and those faithful to the English Church were quietly instructed in her doctrine and worship. They also strove to maintain their intellectual credibility through the production of polemical works. Initially Bishop Duppa had despaired: “What amongst these late philosophies and the Erastian and Socinian opinions too much in request, I doubt the Church is likely to be stripped by learned hands which seems sadder to me than all her sufferings from the rabble.”⁹⁹ This concern did not go unheeded, and the loyalist clergy produced a large scholarly output to demonstrate their continued affection towards the English Church. These works examined the subject of episcopacy, the theological standing of the Roman or other Protestant churches, and, most frequently of all, the structure of the Book of Common Prayer.

⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 56.

⁹⁸ Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, p.50; H.Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans, Seventeenth Century Essays*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1987), p. 191.

⁹⁹ Boshier, *The Restoration Settlement*, p. 39; Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 164-168; Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism*, p. 45.

In the case of the latter the Church loyalists unsurprisingly turned to Book V of the *Polity*, and swiftly confirmed it as the leading apology for a service-book which was the embodiment of primitive piety and practice. Henry Hammond, a distinguished Oxford fellow and unofficial leader of the “home Church”, clearly based the table of contents in his *View of the New Directory* upon the start of Book V. He then went on to insist that the criticisms made against the Prayer Book had only been “objections of little force to conclude anything, but only the resolute contumacious,...or malice of the objectors, which might at large be proved, both by the view of all the charges that former pamphlets have produced, all gathered together and vindicated by Mr Hooker.”¹⁰⁰ This, rather surprisingly, was the only explicit citation of Hooker in the whole tract. Since Hammond had lauded Hooker as the champion of the Prayer book one would have expected rather more references. Hammond, however, having referred to Hooker, at the beginning of his tract against the *Directory*, seems to have assumed his readership to have been so familiar with the arguments deployed by Book V, that they would have been able to recognize the parallel thrust of many of his arguments with those of the *Polity*.

Hammond’s coyness concerning direct references to Hooker was not unusual since other Church sympathizers such as the author of *A Defensive Vindication of the Publike Liturgy ...of the Church of England*, were equally reserved. At the start of the tract he faithfully transcribed a list of all the points which Hooker proposed to discuss in his fifth book: “all which exceptions Hooker answereth punctually and fully, and so as may give any intelligent and iudicious Reader abundant satisfaction.”¹⁰¹ There are no other direct references to Hooker so clearly one allusion was deemed to be sufficient. Certainly their opponents were aware of the Church party’s enthusiasm for Hooker. Francis Cheynell was in no doubt that the *Polity* was vital to Hammond’s defence of the Church. Hammond, he complained, continued to “refer us to Mr Hooker” without having made any serious attempt to answer the grievances

¹⁰⁰ H.Hammond, *A View of the New Directory and Vindication of the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1645), p. 11; McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, p. 368; Packer, *Transformation of Anglicanism*, pp. 15, 132-136.

¹⁰¹ J.R., *A Defensive Vindication of the Publike Liturgy, Established Ceremonies, and Settled Patrimony of the Church of England*, (London: Printed by J.R. for R.Whittaker and I.Williams, 1641), p.8.

of the Presbyterians.¹⁰²

By the 1650s this enthusiasm for using Hooker to defend the Prayer Book had become much more explicit. This was undoubtedly prompted by the known devotion of the late king martyr to the Prayer Book and the works of Hooker. Shortly before his death Charles had commended the *Polity* to his children as an aid to the maintenance of their allegiance to the English Church. Consequently Hammond now urged his readers to consult Hooker, and be thankful that they had received “Gods graces in that Godly learned man.”¹⁰³ A whole new generation of Church apologists such as Anthony Sparrow, the ejected rector of Hawkedon, and Peter Heylyn also began to pepper their works with references to the “incomparable Hooker”¹⁰⁴ They were incredulous that anyone should continue to reject the liturgy when all scruples have already been “satisfied by our learned and judicious Hooker, who hath examined it per partes, and justified it in each part and particular Office.”¹⁰⁵

This upsurge of enthusiasm for Hooker was not, however, solely based upon devotion to the instructions of the late king. Hooker was also clearly valued in his own right as an authoritative text against the puritan objections to the Prayer Book. In particular his demolition of the exclusive reliance on sola scriptura meant that the Church loyalists were able to counteract the puritan condemnation of a prescribed liturgy as unscriptural and contrary to “the Terms of Primitive simplicity and Catholicism.”¹⁰⁶ Hooker, Heylyn retorted, had shown that

¹⁰² H.Hammond, *A Copy of Some Papers Past at Oxford, betwixt the Author of the Practical Catechism and Mr Ch. a Brief Vindication of Three Passages in the Practical Catechism, from the Censures Affixt on Them by the Ministers of London, in a Book Entitled, [a Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ, &c], in the Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D. the Second Volume, Containing a Collection of Discourses in Defence of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.I, (pp. 153-198), p. 173; J.W.Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643-1660 with Special Reference to Henry Hammond*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), pp. 28, 52-53.

¹⁰³ H.Hammond, *The Grounds of Uniformity from I.Cor.14.40. Vindicated from Mr Jeanes's Exceptions to One Pasage, in the View of the Directory*, in *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D.*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.II, Part II, (pp. 240-247), p. 246.

¹⁰⁴ A.Sparrow, *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England*, (London: [No Printer], 1655), pp. 91-92; McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, p. 26.

¹⁰⁵ P.Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata: Or the Church of England Vindicated. Part Second. Containing the Defence Thereof in Retaining the Episcopal Government. And the Canonical Ordination of Priests and Deacons. Framed and Exhibited in an History of Episcopacy*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes for Henry Seile, 1657), p. 79.

¹⁰⁶ R.Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae: Or Mr Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*, S.Matthew, (ed.), (London: Printed for T.Parkhurst, F.Robinson, F.Lawrence, and F.Dunton, 1696), p. 435; Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, p. 100.

the Prayer Book was the liturgy most consonant to the inheritance of the early Church, and that all the ancient services were fixed and “never use to be voluntary dictates proceeding from any mans extemporal wit.” This merely led to unsatisfactory “effusions of indigested prayers” which is why God respects not only the solemnity of places but “the precise appointment, even with what words or sentences his name should be called upon amongst his people.”¹⁰⁷

The structure of Prayer Book services recognized this need for a dignified liturgy since it had been observed “by our incomparable Hooker...That if the Angels have a continual intercourse betwixt the Throne of God in Heaven, and his Church here militant upon the Earth, the same is no where better verified then in these two godly exercises of Doctrine and Prayer.”¹⁰⁸ The puritans, however, had completely failed to comprehend this. Sparrow comments of their desire to reform the funeral service by the removal of “prayers- praises, and holy lessons...what one thing is there whereby the world may perceive that we are Christians? Hook 1.5 Eccl.Pol.s.75.”¹⁰⁹ Equally indicative of the dual exercises of the Prayer Book, and just as fiercely opposed by the puritans, was the inclusion of certain psalms or biblical songs for daily usage within the offices. Heylyn drew attention to Hooker’s claim that this was a biblical practice, since the Jews had made use of the Cantate Domino in their public liturgy. That “very hymn of Moses...grew afterwards to be part of the ordinary Jewish Liturgie, and not that only, but sundry others since invented...Nor is there any thing more probable, then that unto their custome of finishing the Passeover with certain Psalmes, the holy Evangelist doth evidently allude, saying, that after the cup delivered by our Saviour unto his Apostles they sung, and so went forth to the Mount of Olives.”¹¹⁰ Heylyn clearly idolized Hooker since he admitted that he could not locate what ground he had for the first part of the assertion concerning the Jewish people. He was sure, however, that “although he has not pleased to let us know...he had good grounds for what he said.”¹¹¹

Hooker was also popular with the loyalists on account of his recognition of the

¹⁰⁷ Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, p. 100.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, p. 98.

¹⁰⁹ Sparrow, *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*, p.160.

¹¹⁰ Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, pp. 121-122.

¹¹¹ Ibid, p. 122.

importance of ceremonies, and refutation of the criticism that they were merely vestiges of popery.¹¹² Hammond regretted the puritan refusal to bow to the arguments of the *Polity*, and greeted their demand that “all admirers of Mr Hooker...should vindicate their great Patron of ceremonies” with amazement.¹¹³ The *Polity*, Heylyn reminded his readers had already demonstrated that contentious Prayer Book practices, such as confirmation, were not equivalent with the non-scriptural Roman sacrament. Hooker had demonstrated that confirmation was not to be understood as a separate sacrament since the Holy Ghost was received in baptism, and confirmation was merely a completion of the sacrament.¹¹⁴ Hooker described how, in the primitive Church, it was commonly “administered with Baptisme, as a concomitant thereof, to confirme and perfect that which the Grace of the Spirit had already began in Baptisme.”¹¹⁵ The subsequent strict reservation of confirmation to a bishop “was not because the benefit, grace, and dignitie thereof was greater than of Baptism.” It was rather an attempt to reconcile the bishop’s inability to perform all baptisms with his “spirituall superioritie” by reserving its completion to him for honour’s sake.¹¹⁶

Heylyn insisted that this criticism of confirmation, and other Roman ceremonies, had primarily arisen because the nonconformists lacked sufficient maturity to be able to draw a distinction between the usefulness of a ceremony, and the Roman misuse of it. Providing the popish abuse of a ceremony had been ended it was perfectly acceptable to retain a Roman practice. Hooker had successfully comprehended this, and recognized that the observance of a limited “ceremonial” could assist the conduct of public worship. Sparrow, therefore, confidently cited the *Polity* to show that outward gestures helped to denote an internal devotion. Standing at the Gospel was to be commended because this gesture demonstrated “a reverend regard to the son of God, above other messages, although speaking as from God. And against Arrians, Jews, Infidels, who derogate from the honour of our Lord, such ceremonies are most profitable. As judicious Mr. Hooker notes.”¹¹⁷

112 P.Heylyn, *Observations on the Historie of the Reign of King Charles*, (London: Printed for John Clark, 1656), p. 133.

113 Hammond, *Grounds of Uniformity*, p. 246.

114 P.Heylyn, *The History of Episcopacy. The Second Part from the Death of St. John the Apostle, to the Beginning of the Empire of Constantine*, (London: Printed for Henry Seile, 1657), p. 455.

115 Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, p. 257; Heylyn, *History of Episcopacy*, p. 452.

116 Heylyn, *History of Episcopacy*, p. 455.

117 Sparrow, *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 91-92, 141-142.

Such a polemical usage of Hooker was very successful in its attempt to consolidate the position of the Church loyalists in England. By the mid 1650s they had assumed an importance which would have been unthinkable ten years earlier. A London newsletter of 1653 declared that the clergy of “the old model begin to be very dear to the people in many parts of the nation: conventicles for Common Prayer are frequent and much desired in London.”¹¹⁸ Even the failure of the royalist rebellions in 1655, and the subsequent renewal of repression failed to halt their growth. Duppa philosophically commented that “when the persecution goes higher, we must continue to go lower, and to continue to serve our God as the ancient Christians did, in dens, and coves, and deserts.”¹¹⁹

It was somewhat paradoxical that at the same time as the loyalists were striving to counter the effects of a new state-enforced oppression there was a growing desire amongst many of the Presbyterians for some sort of accommodation with the Church loyalists.¹²⁰ Once the support of the civil power had been withdrawn their attempt to establish Presbyterianism in England collapsed, and they were subjected to increasing hostility from the independents. This forced the surprising realization that their residual royalism and belief in national forms of Church government had more in common with the loyalists. William Lyford, in *An Apologie for our Publick Ministrie*, even cited Hooker against the independents in support of the Presbyterian commissioning of ministers. Quoting from Book V he described how according to Hooker “The Ministerie of Divine things is a function, which as God did himself Institute, so neither may undertake the same but by Authoritie and Power given them in lawfull manner.” It was nothing but impudence for “Mechanicks, who have received Commission neither from God nor man, to intrude into Office.”¹²¹

A possible scheme to further this tentative rapprochement was provided by Nicholas Bernard’s posthumous publication of a short tract by Ussher. Bernard, who had been

¹¹⁸ Boshier, *The Restoration Settlement*, p. 11; Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 174-175.

¹¹⁹ Boshier, *The Restoration Settlement*, p. 41; Packer, *Transformation of Anglicanism*, pp. 147-149.

¹²⁰ R.Hutton, *Charles the Second King of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 151.

¹²¹ W.Lyford, *An Apologie for Our Publike Ministrie, and Infant Baptism*, (London: Printed by William Dugard, 1653), p. 21.

Ussher's chaplain, recognized the value of this work in showing how episcopal and presbyterial forms of government had been combined in the early Church. "And how easily this ancient form of the Clergie might be revived again, and with what little shew of alteration the Synodical conventions of the Pastors of every Parish might be accorded with the Presidencie of each Diocese and Province."¹²² This desire for religious co-operation was enthusiastically welcomed by moderate churchmen such as Gauden and John Fuller. The latter's *Church-History of Britain* deliberately sought to tone down the degree of personal animosity between Hooker and Travers.¹²³ In the "very midst of the Paroxisme betwixt Hooker And Travers, the latter stil bare...a reverend esteem of his adversary. And when an unworthy aspersion...was cast on Hooker,... Mr Travers being asked of a private friend, what he thought of the truth of that accusation, In truth (said he) I take Mr Hooker to be a holy man. A speech with coming from an adversary, found no less to the commendation of his charity who spake it ,then to the praise of his piety of whom it was spoken."¹²⁴ Consequently, when Hooker died, great was the grief of all Protestants for the judicious divine.¹²⁵

Fuller was the exception, however, since most Church loyalists viewed the desire for accommodation as nothing more than pure opportunism. From an apparently irredeemable situation they had preserved and fostered considerable affection towards the uniformity and order of the English Church. Heylyn was consequently scathing in his criticism of Fuller, who was apparently prepared to surrender this advantage.¹²⁶ When the Restoration of the monarchy took place he and his compatriots were determined that it should be accompanied by the full restitution of the English Church. Amongst the exiles, Sir Robert Shirley, that zealous layman, was equally anxious to obtain surety from the king "that in view of the sacrilege in the Reformed Churches of which the most judicious Mr. Hooker has left his judgment" that

¹²² W.M.Abbott, 'James Ussher and "Ussherian" Episcopacy, 1640-1656: The Primate and His Reduction Manuscript,' in *Albion*, Vol.22, 1990, (pp. 237-259), pp. 237, 256-258; J.Miller, *Charles II*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991); J.Ussher, *The Reduction of Episcopacie unto the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Ancient Church*, (London: Published by Nicholas Bernard, 1656), pp. 5-6.

¹²³ T.Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain; From the Birth of Jesus Christ, until the Year 1648*, (London: Printed for Iohn Williams, 1656), pp. 213, 214, 217.

¹²⁴ Ibid, p. 217.

¹²⁵ Ibid, p. 235.

¹²⁶ P.Heylyn, *Examen Historicum: Or a Discovery and Examination of the Mistakes, Falsities, and Defects in Some Modern Histries*, (London: Printed for Henry Seile and Richard Royston, 1659).

Church property would be restituted at the subsequent return of the monarchy.¹²⁷ This was not the aim of the Presbyterians who sought a new inclusive religious settlement.

Such a usage of the *Polity* was naturally anathema to high churchmen since it contradicted their own exposition of Hooker as the guardian of the pre-Civil War establishment. They responded by seeking to distance Hooker yet further from his earlier reformed credentials. It became particularly important to demonstrate that Hooker had supported old-style episcopacy. Book VII which had considered the role of bishops was totally unknown, but there were other parts of the *Polity* which could be successfully mobilized to suggest Hooker's tacit support for prelacy. Heylyn, for example, reminded his readers that Hooker had believed the Church's ordained ministry to be a threefold structure consisting of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.¹²⁸ The colleges of presbyters and deacons had been founded by the apostles and evangelists, and were consequently joined into one Church by being placed under the jurisdiction a bishop.¹²⁹ "A perfect image of which we have remaining in our Deanes and Chapters of Cathedral Churches."¹³⁰ The *Polity* was adamant that Presbyters were a distinct order and should not, therefore, be equated with bishops. The episcopate possessed a "charge of too transcendent, and sublime a nature, to be entrusted unto every common Presbyter, or discharged by him, who as our Hooker well observeth, though he be somewhat better able to speak, is as little to judge as another man."¹³¹

This desire to minimize Hooker's reformed sympathies was also apparent in high Church attempts to position him within a distinctive and continuous Anglican history. William Nicholson, for example, the dispossessed archdeacon of Brecon, produced *An Apology for the Discipline of the Ancient Church* which demonstrated how Hooker had shown that the English Church had remained totally loyal to the heritage of the primitive Church and had only

¹²⁷ *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library*, Vol.III, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872), No. 139.

¹²⁸ Heylyn, *The History of Episcopacy*, pp. 430-431.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 29.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 31.

¹³¹ P.Heylyn, *Extraneous Vapulans: Or the Observator Rescued from the Violent but Vaine Assaults of Hamon L'Estrange, Esq and the Back-Blows of Dr Bernard, on Irish-Deane*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Richard Lowndes, 1656), p. 155.

maintained those forms which were found to be in agreement.¹³² The creation of this via media image, however, was not just dependent upon new works. Older works were also reissued and suitably edited to vindicate the longevity of the Anglican position. This is particularly well illustrated by the theological evolution of Robert Sanderson's attitude towards Hooker.

Sanderson as we have already seen had been happy to quote the *Polity* in favour of predestinarianism against Arminianism in the 1620s. By the late 1650s it was unthinkable, however, for either Hooker or Sanderson, a former royal chaplain and Regius Professor of Divinity, to be associated with such overtly reformed views. Consequently Sanderson found himself under considerable pressure from Thomas Pierce and Hammond to reinvent himself. Several of his sermons were republished with all the anti-Arminian notes recast to refer only to Pelagian heresy, and he was compelled to construct a prefatory letter in which he explained how the follies of youth and opinions then predominant in the Church had misled him.¹³³ This repentance of his earlier error also served to rescue Hooker from his predestinarian leanings. Sanderson, in Hammond's edition of his letter to Pierce, recalled how as a young man he had attempted to resolve his doubts concerning predestination by reading Hooker. The *Polity* had helped to settle his mind concerning many points of Church government, and was "a good preparative to me (that I say not, antidote) for reading of Calvin's *Institutes* with more caution than perhaps otherwise I should have done."¹³⁴

Such a weighty recognition of Hooker's impeccable anti-Calvinist credentials meant that Pierce himself could confidently cite the *Polity* against the false claims of Calvinist predestinarians.¹³⁵ It was untenable for the English Church to claim that God died only for

¹³² W.Nicholson, *An Apology for the Discipline of the Ancient Church Intended Especially for that of Our Mother the Church of England: In Answer to the Admonitory Letter Lately Published*, (London: Printed for William Leake, 1659), pp. 117, 135, 185, 186, 190, 194, 196-197.

¹³³ P.G.Lake, 'Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson,' in *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol.27, 1988, (pp. 81-116), pp. 112-113; H.McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, pp. 32, 35, 38, 48; Packer, *Transformation of Anglicanism*, pp. 55-56.

¹³⁴ H.Hammond, *A Pacific Discourse of God's Grace and Decrees; In a Letter of Full Accordance Written to the Reverend and Most Learned Dr Robert Sanderson*, in *The Works of Sanderson*, J.Jacobson, (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.V, (pp. 289-335), p. 297.

¹³⁵ T.Pierce, *The New Discoverer Discovered by Way of Answer to Mr Baxter His Pretended Discovery of the Grotian Religion with the Several Subjects Therein Contained*, (London: Printed by F.G. for Richard Royston, 1659), pp. 103, 249.

the elect since “Mr Hooker saith that God hath a general inclination that all should be saved.”¹³⁶ Consequently Pierce could not allow to remain unanswered Richard Baxter’s insistence that Hooker’s first book demonstrated that even those very things of which God’s will is the Cause, yet as they stand in relation to each other they have many other causes and laws besides Gods absolute will” to remain unanswered.¹³⁷ Pierce roundly criticized him for trying “to wrest the suffrage of so great an author” and for adding “something in pretence of exposition to Hookers words.” His whole argument was “as contrary to that saying of Hooker...as any thing can be spoken.”¹³⁸ When Baxter complained that he was being misrepresented, Pierce responded by saying that he only condemned those “as were thought by judicious Hooker to be fit inhabitants for a wilderness, not a well ordered city.”¹³⁹

The possibility of restoring this “well ordered city” had been considerably furthered by the death of Cromwell in September 1658. Although the Church was initially subjected to renewed persecution, the growing confusion and disunity in England made the prospect of a Restoration more likely than for many years past.¹⁴⁰ With this prospect in sight the loyalists sought to ensure that it took place upon the same basis as the old Caroline settlement by publishing a series of well-aimed treatises affirming Hooker’s link to the royalist cause.¹⁴¹ This was a realistic ambition since their elevated understanding of both Church and king had secured a much larger basis of consent than they had ever enjoyed in the 1630s.

¹³⁶ T.Pierce, *The Divine Philanthropie Defended against the Declamatory Attempts of Certain Late-Printed Paper, Intitl'd a Correptory Correction. In Vindication of Some Notes Concerning Gods Decrees, Especially of Reprobation*, (London: Printed by J.M. and T.R. for J.Martin, J.Allestry, and T.Dicas, 1659), p. 68; H.Thorndike, *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England Being a Necessary Consideration and Brief Resolution of the Chief Controversies in Religion That Divide the Western Church: Occasioned by the Present Calamity of the Church of England*, (London: Printed by J.M. and T.R. for J.Martin, J.Allestry, and T.Dicas, 1659), p. 68.

¹³⁷ Pierce, *The Divine Philanthropie*, p. 115.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, pp. 114-115.

¹³⁹ T.Pierce, *Self-Condempnation Exemplified in Mr Whitfield, Mr Barlee, and Mr Hickman. With Occasional Reflexions on Mr Clavin, Mr Beza, Mr Zwinglius, Mr Priscator, Mr Rivet and Mr Rolloch: But More Especially on Doctor Twisse, and Master Hobbs*, (London: Printed by F.G. for R.Royston, 1658), an Advertisement to the Reader.

¹⁴⁰ G.Davies, *The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1955), pp. 283, 290; R.Hutton, *The British Republic, 1649-1660*, (London: Macmillan Education Ltd, 1990), pp. 124-125.

¹⁴¹ P.Heylyn, *The Stumbling-Block of Disobedience and Rebellion, Cunningly Laid by Calvin in the Subjects Way, Discovered, Censured, and Removed*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes for Henry Seile, 1658), pp. 238, 274; Wren, *Monarchy Asserted*, p. 47.

It is true that the old reformed perception of Hooker had enjoyed something of a revival, but as the works of Baxter, Hall, and Gee demonstrate it was no longer tied to the maintenance of the Elizabethan settlement. Instead it provided a respectable justification of the wide range of freedoms which they enjoyed under the broad puritan settlement of the Commonwealth. Most moderate churchmen, such as those within the Tew group, who had hoped merely to remove the Laudian excesses and return to the integrity of the Elizabethan Church, had been permanently disillusioned with Hooker-sponsored moderation by the turmoil of the 1640s. They had been compelled to abandon the Church of England, or to embrace the previously derided Laudian conception of the *Polity*. As one loyalist subsequently put it the Church “grew fastest when prun’d most: then of the best complexion and most healthy when fainting through loss of blood.”¹⁴²

In a way that would have been unthinkable in 1640 the previously condemned excesses of Laudian prelacy and royalism had come to recall a stable society, peaceable uniformity, and order in religion. This ensured that it was the rather narrow Laudian understanding of Hooker which emerged as the authentic voice of the English Church. He had become the vigilant guardian of both Church and State whose “learned pains...hath took off long since those expectations, which hath been made against the severall Offices, and whole course thereof, by those unquiet spirits who first moved these controversies.”¹⁴³ At the Restoration a difficult struggle still lay ahead to ensure that these high Church expectations were triumphant, but it was clear that Hooker could be drawn upon to show that the Church enjoyed such primitive purity of doctrine and practice that there was no error which could justify any man’s renunciation of her communion.

¹⁴² J.Fell, *The Life of the Most Learned and Pious Dr H.Hammond*, (London: Printed by F.Flesher for F.Martin, F.Allestry and T.Dicas, 1661), p. 205.

¹⁴³ Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, p. 311.

The Restoration Establishment Of Hooker's Anglican Reputation

When Charles II finally returned to London in May 1660 he was greeted with tremendous enthusiasm. "Escorted by troops of splendidly uniformed horsemen and foot-soldiers, and announced by a fanfare of trumpets, Charles entered the capital through streets bright with flowers and hanging tapestries." He was not, however, just accompanied by soldiers and civic dignitaries. Amongst those taking an honoured part in the procession were twelve Presbyterian ministers in their sober Geneva gowns. Outside St Paul's he actually made an official stop so that he could be formally greeted by the whole company of city preachers, and presented with a Bible. Farther along the processional route the king paused briefly before a second more marginal group of clergy consisting of the city's sequestered divines. They then made a discreet presentation of a second Bible, bound up with the Prayer Book.¹ This incident clearly demonstrates that whilst Charles may have "come into his own" it was far from clear that the Restoration would lead to an accompanying restitution of the Church, and reversal in the fortunes of the Presbyterians and Independents.

In the Declaration of Breda, Charles had promised religious toleration to all peaceful Christians with the intention to seek parliamentary approval of this measure after mature deliberation.² Most Restoration thanksgiving sermons, therefore, rejoiced in the return of the king, but only made the most general of references to any religious settlement. Edward Reynolds, whilst preaching to Parliament at S.Margaret's, carefully avoided commenting on the explicit form the Restoration Church should take, and merely warned that we should offend God if any settlement presumed "to see what is meet and convenient better then God himself, thereby taking upon us to be controllers of his wisdom, as learned Hooker speaks."³

¹ R.S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement. The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662*, (London: Dacre Press, 1951), p. 143.

² G.E. Aylmer, *The Struggle for the Constitution in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Blandford Press, 1975), pp. 160-161; R. Hutton, *The Restoration. A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 108; J. Spurr, 'Religion in Restoration England,' in *The Reign of Charles II and James VII and II*, L.K.J. Glassey, (ed.), (New York: St Martin's Press, Inc., 1997), (pp. 90-124), p. 91; M.R. Watts, *The Dissenters*, Vol. I, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 221.

³ E. Reynolds, *Divine Efficacy without Humane Power. Opened in a Sermon Preached at St Margaret's Church in Westminster before the Right Honourable the House of Commons, June 28, 1660. Being the Day of Solemne Thanksgiving for the Happy Return of the Kings Majesty*, (London: Printed by Tho. Ratcliffe for George Thomason, 1660), p. 30.

In spite of apparent royal approval for such conciliatory statements the traditional historiography, as epitomized by Robert Bosher, has emphasized that this was no more than a calculated ploy to conciliate the puritans temporarily. Charles had no intention of accommodating them, and discreetly worked to re-establish the old Caroline Church. Bosher insists that in the twelve months following the Restoration “the Anglicans, working quietly but purposefully under the powerful patronage of the Lord Chancellor, regained control of the Establishment. The nature of the settlement was not determined by the negotiations with the Puritans nor by the deliberations of Parliament, but by the *fait accompli* which was the crowning achievement of Laudian policy, and which the nation had accepted before the Savoy Conference opened or the Cavalier Parliament convened.”⁴ Bosher’s belief in a popular royal-sponsored Laudian party has been vigorously contested. I.M.Green insists that there was only ever a minority of churchmen who were unswerving supporters of the old settlement, and there is no evidence that Charles supported them. On the contrary he did all that he could to bring about a compromise settlement of the Church. He “nurtured the spirit of reconciliation” and sought to enshrine it by “a form of limited episcopacy.” Only the intransigence of the laity within a Cavalier dominated House of Commons ensured that the royal efforts were largely in vain, and resulted the triumph of a high Church religious settlement.⁵

Green’s explanation for the eventual triumph of the high Church party is supported by the treatment of the *Polity* at the start of the 1660s. The struggles of the Civil War and the Commonwealth had ensured that a Hooker-sponsored “Anglicanism” was the dominant ideology amongst the Church loyalists. Unity of opinion, however, could not compensate for the lack of clerical adherents, and the failure to secure a wide popular mandate. It will be demonstrated that whilst the high churchmen, and some other individuals, maintained a strong aversion to any form of compromise, there was nevertheless a widespread desire for a broad religious settlement. The works of John Gauden and Edward Stillingfleet were very much in the spirit of the Great Tew tradition when they suggested that Hooker offered the basis for such moderation. Such agreement floundered, however, upon the rocks of the 1661 Cavalier

⁴ Bosher, *Restoration*, p. 144.

⁵ I.M.Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 1-2, 24.

Parliament. The electorates' desire to select strongly royalist candidates produced a house of "young squires" with an ingrained hatred of puritanism for the sufferings they believed it to have caused, and a belief in the episcopal Church of England as a bulwark against the "poisonous principles of schism and rebellion."⁶

The cavaliers' enthusiasm for the old Caroline Church manifested itself in a series of legislative measures which confirmed her supremacy. This chapter will seek to show how such a triumph for the Church party naturally encouraged them in their usage of the *Polity*, and helped to confirm their identity of Hooker as the guardian of both Church and State. Such a reputation, it will be seen, was initially far from secure, since Gauden's publication of a life stressing Hooker's moderation, and his authentication of the unpalatable last three books dealt it a potentially damaging blow. Only through the publication of a new life by Isaac Walton was the Anglican ethos of the *Polity* indefinitely secured. Walton's genius in subtly discrediting the later books, and his successful positioning of Hooker within a continuous Anglican succession, will both be examined. It will then be shown how Walton's successful salvaging of Hooker's credentials enabled the high churchmen of the late 1660s to affirm his reputation as the irrefutable exponent of via media Anglicanism.

The enduring nature of this Hookerian Anglican settlement, following its swift re-establishment in less than two years, has been largely responsible for the impression that its restitution was inevitable. In 1660, however, as we have already seen, there was no certainty that this would be the case. The Presbyterians, rather than the churchmen, were in the dominant position. They enjoyed significant support in all three kingdoms, and were actively co-operating to achieve the permanent "Extirpation of Prelacy" and the firm establishment of "Presbytery, the Ordinance of Jesus Christ" throughout the British Isles. Charles's return was welcomed "not...upon any Terms, but upon the terms of the League and Covenant" by which he had bound himself in 1650.⁷ The attempt by the Long Parliament, in March 1660, to reimpose Presbyterianism by wholesale legislation was indicative of this desire to frustrate any form of Church revival.⁸ It was against this background that a conscious decision must have

⁶ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 180.

⁷ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 13; J. Miller, *Charles II*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991).

⁸ Boshier, *Restoration*, p. 139.

been made to publish a second edition of George Gillespie's *A Dispute Against The English-Popish Ceremonies Obtruded Upon the Church of Scotland*. In 1637 Gillespie had correctly identified the importance of Hooker's justification of the Prayer Book to the Laudians, and therefore sought to refute him. By 1660 the Presbyterians were equally afraid that churchmen, "indoctrinated" with Hooker, would attempt to reimpose some form of the old pseudo-Catholic Prayer Book.

The Prayer Book ceremonies, Gillespie had insisted, could not be accounted of little importance because Hooker had observed that "a Ceremony...worketh very much with People."⁹ The *Polity* had described how they served "to conciliate reverence...and to stir up devotion." This was no different from the Roman appointment of ceremonies "ut externam quandam Majestatem sensibus objiciant."¹⁰ The abandonment of all Roman ceremonies was the only way to avoid agreement with the papists in those things that were repugnant to God. Hooker, since he had recognized the need for the Israelites to stand separate from the surrounding pagan nations, had indirectly condemned the maintenance of Roman ceremonies from his own mouth.¹¹ In spite of this Hooker was still determined to retain the offensive ceremonies because he insisted that, in the early Church, if any man had disliked "conformity betweene the Church of God and Infidels, the cause thereof hath not been affectation of dissimilitude, but some special accident which the Church not being alwayes subject unto, hath not still cause to do the like."¹² Gillespie denounced this inconsistency of belief concerning non-Christian customs; "[w]ere not the Customs of Pagans to be held unbeseeing for Christians, as well as the Customes of the Jews?"¹³

Hooker, Gillespie argued, had also insisted that since the "controverted ceremonies" were not abused in England it was acceptable to retain them.¹⁴ They were "neither scandalous

⁹ G. Gillespie, *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland. Wherein Not Only Our Own Arguments against the Same are Strongly Confuted, but Likewise the Answers and Defences of Our Opposites, Such as Hooker, Mortoune, Sprint, Paybody, Andrewes, Saravia, Tilen, Spotiswood, Lindsey, Forbesse, &c. Particularly Confuted*, (Edinburgh: [No Printer], 1660), p. 10.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 77.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 150.

¹² Ibid, p. 154.

¹³ Ibid, p. 153

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 108.

in their own nature; nor because they were devised unto evil; nor yet because they of the Church of England abused them unto evil.”¹⁵ Gillespie retorted that public conduct on the feast days of the Church did not support this claim. Christmas was not spent praising the name of God, “but in riffling, dycing, carding, masking, mumming, and in all licentious liberty, for the most part, as though it were some Heathen Feast of Ceres or Bacchus.”¹⁶ Ceremonies which had been abused by the Catholic Church would always serve as “the Trophees of Antichrist, and the Reliques of Romes whoorish bravery.”¹⁷ Hooker, however, was insensitive towards the pleas of weaker brethren who begged to be allowed to abstain from those ceremonies which caused scandal to them. Instead he insisted that, since they were public forms for ordering the Church, they could only be changed if they ceased to be “fittest for the whole, although it may chance that for some particular men the same be found inconvenient.”¹⁸

Gillespie responded that it was bad divinity not to be concerned by the scandalizing of a few men who had drunk “in superstition,” and fallen “into sundry grosse abuses in religion.”¹⁹ The belief that the Church possessed the freedom to prescribe ceremonies was based on the equally flawed belief “that Christ hath not by positive Laws so far descended into particularities with us as Moses with the Jews.” Moral circumstances, such as the time of worship, were clearly left free, but concerning those ceremonies, which were proper to Gods holy worship, “shall we say that the fidelity of Christ the Son hath been less then the fidelity of Moses the servant?”²⁰

It was also clear to Gillespie that ceremonies, which depended upon the positive ordinances of men, were widely believed to possess a sacramental significance. They so “encroach upon the confines and precincts of the nature and quality of sacraments, that they usurp something more then any rites which are not appointed by God himself can rightly

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 107.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 108.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 107.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 108.

¹⁹ Ibid, pp. 108-109.

²⁰ Ibid, pp. 42, 231.

do.”²¹ A ceremony, such as confirmation, was idolatrous because it ascribed to human rites the power and virtue of achieving that which none but God could perform: “howbeit Hooker would strike us dead at once, with the high sounding name of the Fathers, yet it is not unknown, that the first Fathers from whom this Idolatory hath descended, were those ancient Hereticks, the Montanists.”²² The maintenance of holy days was equally superstitious, because Hooker’s stress on their holiness and necessity meant that worship was being placed in the ceremonies.²³ The practice of kneeling at Communion was an even more graphic illustration of idolatrous worship being placed in a ceremony. The act of prostration, before a mere creature, had effectively turned the elements into an idol.²⁴ Hooker’s defence of the custom, however, made him guilty not only of idolatry, but blasphemy as well. At the last supper the apostles had clearly received whilst sat at table, but Hooker persisted in commending the kneeling position which suggested that he believed that the Church had better warranty for their kneeling than Christ had for His sitting.²⁵

Such efforts by the Presbyterians to taint the *Polity* and the Prayer Book, however, failed to curb the Church loyalists’ enthusiasm for either of them. John Featley, nephew to Daniel Featley, Archbishop Abbot’s controversial chaplain, responded by issuing one of his uncle’s previously unpublished works against Presbyterianism. In it he furiously denounced the covenant for being opposed to episcopacy “as hath been justified by the word of God, and unanswerable arguments drawn from Scripture by Whitgift and Hooker.”²⁶ Other churchmen were equally eager to cite Hooker in support of the Church’s forms and practices. When, in January 1660, Jeremy Taylor was asked by two members of Trinity College, Dublin, to recommend a scholarly work which would complement their examination of the Prayer Book he urged them to “reade diligently and frequently the 5th booke of Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Policy* the first 4 books are also excellent but they principally minister to other purposes.”²⁷

²¹ Ibid, p. 193.

²² Ibid, p. 166.

²³ Ibid, pp. 117, 123-126.

²⁴ Ibid, p. 107.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 350.

²⁶ D.Featley, *The League Illegal*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1660), p. 18.

²⁷ C.McKelvie, ‘Jeremy Taylor’s Recommendations for a Library of Anglican Theology (1660),’ in *Irish Booklore*, Vol.4, No.2, (pp. 96-103), p. 100.

Meric Casaubon, the classical scholar and high churchman, similarly urged “men that have been buyers of books these 15. or 16. yeares past, to burn one halfe, at least, of those bookes they have bought,...and to betake themselves to reading of Hooker: not doubting, but by that time they had read him once, or twice over accurately, they would thank me for my advice, but God, much more, that put it into their hearts to follow it.”²⁸

This conviction, however, in the rightness of their position could not offset the limitations of the high churchmens’ influence in 1660. They were neither numerous enough to affect the situation at parish level, nor sufficiently well organized at court to control the settlement.²⁹ Instead Church patronage, which remained securely in royal hands, was used to promote a broadly based ministry. In a fraught atmosphere where the Presbyterians feared a return to prelacy, the episcopalians were anxious for a return to the old status quo, and the Independents feared both sides, it was not surprising that the king pursued a policy of moderation culminating in the Worcester House declaration in favour of moderate episcopacy. This desire for a generous compromise received widespread support, since in many regards it was merely a continuation of attempts in the late 1650s to establish a consensus regarding the combination of episcopal and presbyterial government. It also, however, showed considerable affinity with the earlier aspirations of the “Great Tew” circle to base a moderate reform of religious structures upon the principles of Hooker.³⁰

John Gauden, who was amongst the leading proponents of a broad settlement, claimed Hooker as “one of the ablest Personal and best Spirits that ever England employed or enjoyed” who “hath...abundantly examined every feature and dress of the Church of England, asserting it by calm, clear and unanswerable demonstrations of Reason and Scripture.”³¹ The endeavours of “that rarely-learned and godly Divine (so full of the spirit and wisdom of

²⁸ M. Casaubon, *A Vindication of the Lord’s Prayer, as a Formal Prayer, and by Christ’s Institution to Be Used by Christians as a Prayer against the Antichristian Practice and Opinion of Some Men*, (London: Printed by T.R. for Thomas Johnson, 1660), p. 82.

²⁹ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 24.

³⁰ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, pp. 167-168; C.Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down, Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*, (London: Temple Smith, 1973), p. 287; R.Hutton, *Charles the Second King of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

³¹ J.Gauden, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria, the Tears, Sighs, Complaints and Prayers of the Church of England Setting Forth Her Former Constitution Compared with Her Present Condition*, (London: J.G. for R.Royston, 1660), p. 83.

Christ)“ should have been sufficient “to have kept up the peace, order and honour of the Church of England.”³² Such devotion to Hooker, however, was according to Gauden perfectly compatible with reasonable religious reforms. It was better, for example, to reform the Prayer Book if it perpetuated the unachievable ideal of the homogeneous Christian state than to force tender consciences into dissent. There was a major distinction between those puritans Hooker condemned as “still clamouring for further reformation, and threatening violence, if they might not set up their fancies in Religion,” and those who genuinely wished to be reunited with the Church.³³ The former were guilty of attempting “to bury in silence, as their enemy, that rare piece of Mr Hookers *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which many of them had seldome either the courage or the honesty to read.”³⁴

Gauden stressed that this was not the case in 1660 when there was a genuine desire amongst the puritans to achieve a mutually acceptable settlement through the introduction of moderate episcopacy. He made the important admission that he had been “principled to no small jealousies of Bishops” before it became clear to him that no form of government surpassed that of bishops and presbyters.³⁵ “The incomparable and unanswerable Mr. Rich: Hooker” had long ago demonstrated that it was “a very strange thing, that such a discipline (meaning the Presbyterian) as ye speak of, should be taught by Christ and his Apostles in the Word of God, and no Church hath ever found it out, nor received it till this present time.”³⁶ Instead he urged that Hooker’s belief in “the use and honour of Catholick Episcopacy in the Churches of Christ” be accorded its rightful place.³⁷

Such primitive episcopacy was vastly removed from any belief in prelatical government. Even Calvin, as described by Hooker, had declared his approval for moderate reformed episcopacy. “He “passeth all Anathemas or curses on those that are against them: so far was Calvin from laying the Axe to the root of this Tree, which with Christianity, had ever,

³² Ibid, p. 83.

³³ Ibid, p. 320.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 83.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 691

³⁶ Ibid, p. 183.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 85.

as he confessed, born episcopacy.”³⁸ Edward Stillingfleet, that lifelong friend to nonconformists, was equally certain that moderate episcopacy was an acceptable form of Church government. His *Irenicum* insisted that ordination performed by presbyters, in cases of necessity, was perfectly valid since no Church government could be based upon a *Jus Divinum*, but was a matter for prudence to decide.³⁹ Critics were urged to consult the *Polity*, and they would “see the mutability of the form of Church government largely asserted and proved.”⁴⁰

The genuine seriousness with which Charles also viewed the prospect of limited episcopacy is clearly demonstrated by the appointments he made to bishoprics. Reynolds was consecrated bishop of Norwich, and Baxter and Calamy, although they eventually declined, were both offered sees. Some high churchmen, such as Cosin and Sterne, were also appointed, but most of the appointments went to men who had been closely associated with the “martyred king rather than the martyred archbishop.”⁴¹ This avoidance of high churchmen may also have been influenced by Clarendon’s desire to establish the Restoration settlement on the basis of mixed monarchy. Although a Church loyalist, he was clearly anxious to ensure that there was no repetition of the earlier high Church episcopal exaggerations of regal power. Any narrow revival of the belief in divine-right monarchy would have negated his acceptance of Hooker’s belief in the importance of an original compact to ensure good government and laws.⁴²

Clarendon’s account of the institution of laws was much more scriptural and historical than the *Polity*’s, since he avoided Hooker’s explorative enquiry into natural law. The conclusion, however, was identical since he still agreed that all government was “establish’d by firmness and constancy, by every mans knowing what is his right to enjoy, and what is his

³⁸ *Ibid*, p. **1.

³⁹ F.J.Powicke, *The Reverend Baxter under the Cross*, (London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1928), p. 220.

⁴⁰ E.Stillingfleet, *Irenicum, a Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds*, (London: Printed for H.Mortlock, 1661), p. 394.

⁴¹ Green, *Re-establishment*, p.97; Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 152; G.F.Nuttall, *Richard Baxter*, (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965), p. 88.

⁴² J.C.Hayward, ‘The Mores of Great Tew,’ Cambridge University Ph.D., (Unpublished), 1982, p. 212.

duty to do.”⁴³ He then extended Hooker’s belief that laws described duties to suggest that they also described rights. In order, however, to avoid suggesting that these were natural rights he was forced to accept a divine origin of government in order to preserve valued legal rights. This still removed the right of the sovereign to initiate and repeal laws at his own will whilst allowing him to follow Hooker’s stance concerning law.⁴⁴ Consequently Clarendon could be forcible concerning the supremacy and sacred nature of monarchy whilst insisting that the sovereign remained subject to the fundamental laws of the nation. The monarch retained the right in exceptional circumstances to break the law for the common good, but no new law could be made without the agreement of Parliament.⁴⁵

This desire for mixed monarchy was no mere academic theory, and Clarendon endeavoured to guide his public actions by it. In the Long Parliament of 1640 he had supported the impeachment of Stafford in the interest of constitutionalism. This desire to ensure that the constitution was respected then led him to end his temporary alliance with the Presbyterians when they sought to abolish episcopacy, and enhance the sovereignty of Parliament.⁴⁶ His *History of the Rebellion*, which he began in the 1640s, demonstrated his desire that Restoration society should adhere to this constitutionalism. Hayward believes that Clarendon deliberately manipulated the historical records “on the lawyer-like grounds that, if England was to survive into the future as a law-respecting and oath-preserving nation, it must not be known that Charles had exceeded his constitutional rights in the years 1641-6.”⁴⁷ On his return to England, in 1660, Clarendon maintained this adherence to law by not advising his sovereign to reverse the acts of Parliament which Charles I had reluctantly assented to on the eve of the Civil War. ⁴⁸

⁴³ M.Goldie, ‘Restoration Political Thought,’ in *The Reign of Charles II and James VII and II*, L.K.J.Glassey, (ed.), (New York: St Martin’s Press Inc, 1997), (pp. 12-35), pp. 12-13; Hayward, ‘Great Tew,’ p. 213; H.Tomlinson, *The Causes of War: A Historiographical Survey, in before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, H.Tomlinson, (ed.), (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), (pp. 7-26), pp. 8-9.

⁴⁴ Hayward, ‘Great Tew,’ p. 209; B.H.G.Wormald, *Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), p. 232.

⁴⁵ A.Quinton, *The Politics of Imperfection. The Religious and Secular Traditions of Conservative Thought in England from Hooker to Oakeshott*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), p. 33.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p. 33.

⁴⁷ Hayward, ‘Great Tew,’ p. 253.

⁴⁸ M.Ashley, *England in the Seventeenth Century, (1603-1714)*, (Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1962), p.121; J.Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, (Harlow: Longman Group U.K. Limited, 1993), p. 400.

However Clarendon's personal desire to pursue the path of political moderation, and Charles's separate ambition to ensure a generous religious settlement, were both thwarted by the growing strength of reaction amongst the Cavaliers. After the initial euphoria of the Restoration they became steadily more concerned that a puritan counter-revolution would be attempted. The growing association of religious dissent with political subversion is clear from the declarations which the rapidly expanded royalist militia presented to the king.⁴⁹ In late November this paranoia helped to ensure that the bill "for making the King's Declaration touching Ecclesiastical Affairs effectual" failed to secure a second reading, and, in January 1661, Venner's Insurrection served to confirm the royalist equation of nonconformity and sedition. This ensured that the May elections returned a strong royalist pro-Church house.⁵⁰

Such an electoral result ensured that religious comprehension was no longer a realistic possibility. This may not have been immediately apparent to many of the puritan divines, since the Savoy Conference was in the process of discussing possible reform of the Prayer Book. Baxter had held out high hopes for the conference, and had driven himself unrelentingly throughout the spring of 1661 with the hope of drawing the bishops into some sort of plan for pacific comprehension.⁵¹ Prynne also hoped to influence the outcome and produced his own set of recommendations to demonstrate that "a set standing form of Common-Prayer...is not absolutely necessary."⁵² Giles Firmin was similarly anxious to correct the "artificial order and method or frame of our prayers" and "should have told the learned Hooker" that it was better for the minister to use extempore prayer.⁵³

These proponents of liturgical reform were deeply conscious of Hooker's close association with the maintenance of the Prayer Book, and therefore sought to further their case

⁴⁹ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 182.

⁵⁰ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, p. 169; Bosher, *Restoration*, pp. 196, 205; Miller, *Charles II*, p. 76

⁵¹ J.Cope, *Joseph Glarvill, Anglican Apologist*, (St Louis: Washington University, 1956), p. 7; Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 180-181.

⁵² W.Prynne, *A Short Pacific Examination of Some Exuberances in, and Ceremonial Appurtenances to the Common Prayer*, (London: Printed by T.C. and L.P., 1661), p. 2

⁵³ G.Firmin, *The Liturgical Considerator Considered: Or a Brief View of Dr Gauden's Considerations Touching the Liturgy of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1661), not paginated, approx. pp. 10,18.

by demonstrating that their proposed modifications were compatible with the *Polity*. Prynne insisted that ceremonies such as kneeling, the cross in baptism, and the ring in marriage were not to be insisted upon since many churchmen such as Cartwright, Whitgift and Hooker had debated them both “pro and contra.” If there was no clear unanimity of agreement it was clearly better for them to “be omitted, or left arbitrary to all.”⁵⁴ This was clear from the continuing controversy regarding the wearing of the surplice. It continued to be a source of discord in spite of Hooker’s efforts to justify it to sensitive consciences. It was, therefore, better to leave these “unhappy Controversies, about Priests, Vestments and Ceremonies, which perplexed our Church, and gave great advantage to our Roman adversaries.”⁵⁵

Prynne also used Hooker to demonstrate that it was permissible to dispense with many of the repetitive intercessions. The usage of the Gloria Patri had become superfluous and unnecessary because, as the *Polity* related, it had been originally introduced “as a paraphrastic exposition of Ro.11.36 to manifest our sound judgment concerning the sacred Trinity against the Arian.” For the same reason it could also be shown from Hooker that the addition to the Gloria Patri of “As it was in the beginning...” was also “defective in itself.”⁵⁶ Firmin was equally unhappy with the petitionary rote of the Prayer Book and insisted that although the “Reverend Hooker” justified frequent usage of the Lord’s Prayer it does not negate the fact that it is “a vain, senseless repetition, and self-devised Worship”⁵⁷ “Our own Hooker” had demonstrated the antiquity of so much of the Prayer Book, but recognized that the prayers still remained the expressions of good and holy men rather than the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.⁵⁸

However, such a skilful deployment of Hooker to promote the nonconformist case fell upon deaf ears. The growing sense of reaction amongst the Cavaliers ensured that the high Church vision of Hooker was to be the dominant interpretation of the Restoration. By 1661 Irenaeus Freeman, another high churchman, could confidently lambaste the puritans for their

⁵⁴ Prynne, *Ceremonial Appurtenances*, p. 7.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 60.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 11.

⁵⁷ Firmin, *The Liturgical Considerator*, Approx. p. 14

⁵⁸ Ibid, Approx. p. 4.

constant complaints, and pronounce the worthlessness of their writings until they should successfully answer Hooker.⁵⁹ William Nicholson was equally enthusiastic in his citation of Hooker to support the Prayer Book forms of service. The “judicious Mr Richard Hooker,” he informed his readers, had conclusively shown the need for sacramental forms of service.⁶⁰

The less zealous puritan divines recognized this hardening of political and religious ideologies, and sought to adjust their position accordingly. This is clearly illustrated by Nicholas Bernard, that former supporter of Cromwell and limited episcopacy, who chose to demonstrate his newly recovered royalist credentials through his publication of *Clavi Trabales*. This included previously unpublished parts of Book VIII, which he claimed to have located amongst Ussher’s manuscripts. These new extracts were important to the high Church understanding of Hooker because they affirmed the sovereign’s religious supremacy, and his ultimate reckoning to God rather than to the populace.⁶¹ Consequently the preface to *Clavi Trabales* was gratefully contributed by Sanderson who had previously decried Hooker’s belief in a group decision to place legislative authority in the king-in-parliament.⁶²

Most puritans, however, were ill prepared for this usage of Hooker against them. Baxter’s contemporary account of the Savoy Conference shows that he was genuinely shocked by the unsympathetic hearing which the episcopal divines gave to their grievances. A tender conscience was declared to be another name for “a soft or foolish head.” Its possessor claimed to be pleading the will of God, but since he was actually acting from motives of pride or wilfulness he deserved no consideration. Hooker, his opponents insisted, had demonstrated “that no man is bound to part with his own freedom because his neighbour is

⁵⁹ I. Freeman, *The Reasonableness of Divine Service: Or Non-Conformity to Common-Prayer, Proved Not Conformable to Common Reason*, (London: Printed by Tho. Basset, 1661), p. 33.

⁶⁰ W. Nicholson, *A Plain, but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Catholic Church of England Enjoyed to be Learned of Every Childe, Before He Be Brought to Be Confirmed by the Bishop*, (London: Printed for Nathaniel Webb, 1661), pp. 18, 165.

⁶¹ N. Bernard, *Clavi Trabales; Or Nails Fastened by Some Great Masters of Assemblyes Confirming the Kings Supremacy. The Subjects Duty. Church Government by Bishops*, (London: Printed by R. Hodgkinson, 1661), pp. 92-94.

⁶² R. Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: In the Reception of the Ecclesiastical Polity in the Seventeenth Centuries,’ in *The History of Political Thought*, Vol.2, 1981, (pp. 63-117), p. 71; Spurr, ‘Religion in Restoration England,’ p. 99.

froward and humorous.”⁶³ He was even further outraged when Bishop Morley urged him to read Hooker so that he would reform his errors.⁶⁴ Nevertheless such was the growing strength of this Anglican understanding of Hooker that Baxter accepted it as the established interpretation, and amazingly rejected the *Polity* in preference for the opinions of his puritan opponents in his response to Morley. “You referre us to Hooker since whose writings, Ames in his fresh suit, and Bradshaw and Parker, and many others have written that against the Ceremonies, that never was answered, that we know of, but deserve your consideration.”⁶⁵ Unsurprisingly such a protest had little effect, and after the conference he was forced to reflect sadly that Hooker was now amongst the major proponents for an established liturgy.⁶⁶

This failure of the Savoy Conference to seek an expansive settlement ended all hopes of comprehension, and publicly marked the beginning of a swift reassertion of the high Church dominance.⁶⁷ By the end of the year Convocation had indicated that ministers whose ordination had only been undertaken by presbyters needed to be episcopally reordained, and Parliament had passed the corporation act to exclude non-Anglicans from local government.⁶⁸ Naturally, puritans such as Zechariah Crofton, an Irish nonconformist divine, resented this disparagement of their ministry. Crofton commented that it was “well observed by the Reverend Hooker that great Oracle of the Church of England” that those who have “received the power and Office of the ministry may not think to put it off and on like a cloak as the weather serveth.”⁶⁹ The writer of *A Peaceable Enquiry into that Novel Controversie about Reordination* insisted that Hooker would not have countenanced this flawed high Church

⁶³ R.Baxter, *The Grand Debate between the Most Reverend the Bishops, and the Presbyterian Divines*, (London: No Printer, 1661), pp. 91-92; R.Baxter, *An Account of All the Proceedings of the Commissioners of Both Persuasions, Appointed by His Sacred Majesty, According to Letters Patents, for the Review of the Book of Common Prayer*, (London: Printed for R.H., 1661), p. 93; Nuttall, *Baxter*, pp. 89-90; N.H.Keeble, *Richard Baxter. Puritan Man of Letters*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 4; Powicke, *Baxter*, p. 193; Spurr, ‘Religion in Restoration England,’ p. 91.

⁶⁴ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae: Or Mr Richard Baxter’s Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*, M.Sylvester, (ed.), (London: Printed for T.Parkhurst, F.Robinson, F.Lawrence, and F.Dunton, 1696), p. 440.

⁶⁵ Baxter, *The Grand Debate*, p. 92.

⁶⁶ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, pp. 316-320, 440.

⁶⁷ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 143.

⁶⁸ Spurr, ‘Religion in Restoration England,’ pp. 104-107; Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 182.

⁶⁹ Z.Crofton, *A Serious Review of Presbyters Re-ordination by Bishops*, (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1661), pp. 33-34.

understanding of ordination. The ordination service's use of the words "receive the holy Ghost" did not "imply the office (as some great ones would have it) sith the authority is delivered expressly in the next words, Take thou authority to preach."⁷⁰

These protests, however, were futile against the united force of the high churchmen, and their uncompromising parliamentary supporters. A further series of anti-puritan measures, culminating in the 1662 Act of Uniformity, ensured that the high Church understanding of Hooker, as the authentic unchanging voice of historic Anglicanism, was to be the dominant interpretation of the Restoration. This is clearly reflected by those treatises which were produced in support of the Cavalier Parliament's policies of religious reaction. A new generation of writers were proving to be just as determined, as their Laudian predecessors, to ensure that the *Polity* was associated with an elevated understanding of the English Church.⁷¹

John Barbon, a high churchman, stressed that his justification of the forms and practices of the English Church was really unnecessary since Hooker was amongst those "more dexterous and more sufficient Pens that have dealt in this Argument or Theme before me."⁷² He was the great prophet of the Church who had recognized "that Puritanisme would be the Mother of Anabaptistery in England."⁷³ Those individuals, who even after the troubles of the Civil War, continued to resist the authority of the Church would soon be corrected if they could only be persuaded to "try...their teeth...upon this file" of Hooker.⁷⁴ They would soon be defeated by his challenge to find one church that has not been governed by bishops, "sithence the times that the blessed Apostles were conversant."⁷⁵ The puritan allegation that bishops were made by the king was unsustainable since he merely nominated them, and did not consecrate them. "And yet, if it be so, see what Hooker saies for the meetness and reasonableness of that course in that segment of his *Politie*, which Dr Bernard ha's

⁷⁰ R.I., *A Peaceable Enquiry into that Novel Controversie about Reordination*, (London: [No Printer], 1661), p. 26.

⁷¹ Spurr, 'Religion in Restoration England,' p. 98.

⁷² J.Barbon, *Liturgie a Most Divine Service: In Answer to a Late Pamphlet Stiled, Common-Prayer-Book No Divine Service*, (Oxford: Printed by A.&L.Lichfield, 1662), Dedicatory, Preface.

⁷³ Ibid, p. 24.

⁷⁴ Ibid, pp. 24, 63.

⁷⁵ Ibid, The Preface.

communicated to the world in his *Clavi Trabales*.”⁷⁶

Sir Roger L’Estrange, the high Church politician, was equally adamant that he did not need to concern his readers over the relative merits of episcopal government since Hooker was “[e]quall to all the World...upon that Subject.”⁷⁷ Limited episcopacy was a nonsensical proposition based upon “the Imaginary Coalition of the two Church Parties.”⁷⁸ Barbon was equally suspicious of such a concept, and warned his readers that only canonical ordination could make a lawful minister. This was why S.Paul counselled that due care be taken before the laying on of hands to ascertain that they “have gifts and qualityes fit for the laudable discharge of their dutyes, or no; says the profound and sweet-breath’d Mr Hooker.” The writings of such a “rich and inexhaustible anti-Sectarian Penn” should have silenced all claims that a minister was made by his sound preaching of the word or ability in extemporeous prayer.”⁷⁹

Hooker’s words of warning, however, had remained unheeded by those puritans who continued to press for public worship to consist of sermons and extemporary prayer. Much to Barbon’s evident irritation they refused to subscribe to the Prayer Book because of its perceived popish content. Wearily he agreed with Hooker that “were it not...to satisfie the minds of the simple sort of men, there nice curiosities are not worth the labour, which we bestow to answer them.”⁸⁰ L’Estrange was equally adamant that the *Polity* showed that such practices “are not in regard of their Corrupt original, to be held Scandalous.” None of their opponents were “able to avouch, that any of them was otherwise instituted, than unto good.”⁸¹ Barbon concluded by reiterating Hooker’s admonition “That, in these miserable daies, under the colour of removing superstitious abuses, the most effectual means, both to testifie and strengthen true Religion, are plucked at, and, in some places even pulled up, by the very

⁷⁶ Ibid, p. 166.

⁷⁷ R.L’Estrange, *Interest Mistaken: Or the Holy Cheat: Proving from the Undeniable Practises & Positions of the Presbyterians, that the Design of that Party Is to Enslave Both King and People under the Masque of Religion*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1662), p. 72.

⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 71.

⁷⁹ Barbon, *Liturgie a Divine Service*, p. 13.

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 64.

⁸¹ L’Estrange, *Interest Mistaken*, p. 78.

roots.”⁸²

L’Estrange recognized that this over-zealous desire for reform would only be successfully counteracted through the demolition of the puritan doctrine of sola scriptura. The *Polity* which had striven to reconcile a belief in the sufficiency of the scriptures with the deployment of reason, was ideal for this purpose. The “Incomparable Hooker” had convincingly demonstrated that those things “which the Law of God leaveth Arbitrary, and at liberty, are all subject unto positive Laws of men.”⁸³ Any form of liturgy imposed by authority was legitimate providing it was “neither Unlawful in it self: nor wickedly applyed.”⁸⁴ Barbon also quoted Hooker to explain how matters of faith necessary to salvation, which are expressly contained within the scriptures, are to be differentiated from lesser questions of Church order and ceremonial.⁸⁵

The *Polity’s* provision of such a coherent theological basis for the Church’s actions totally vindicated the form of Prayer Book services. In particular it served to justify the Prayer Book’s emphasis upon the orderly public reading of scripture, rather than the sermon or expository prayer, as the central component of services. Hooker, Barbon reminded his readers, had stressed that the public reading of scripture had been a weekly practice of the Jews, “but that they alwayes had, in like manner, their weekly Sermons upon some part of the Law of Moses, we no where find.”⁸⁶ Thomas Elborow, another high churchman, similarly commended the public reading of Scripture, and cited Hooker’s justification for the public reading of lessons from both Testaments; “The Law is as a Pedagogue teaching the first rudiments; the institutions of highest perfection are contained in the Gospel.”⁸⁷

Hooker was equally important to the justification of set forms of intercession in the Prayer Book. Barbon defended the alternate prayer of minister and people, because Hooker

⁸² Barbon, *Liturgie a Most Divine Service*, p. 142.

⁸³ R.L’Estrange, *Interest Mistaken*, pp. 77, 80.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p. 77.

⁸⁵ Barbon, *Liturgie a Most Divine Service*, pp. 34-35.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, p. 52.

⁸⁷ T.Elborow, *An Exposition of the Book of Common-Prayer of the Church of England by Way of Question and Answer*, (London: Printed for T.Garthwait, 1663), p. 28.

had supported it as a “decent and orderly” form.⁸⁸ Those who were unhappy with appendage of the Gloria Patri to the end of each Psalm were instructed by Elborow to see Hooker’s defence of it.⁸⁹ Similarly whilst answering nonconformist criticism, concerning the length of prayers, Barbon merely referred their critics to Hooker.⁹⁰ Practices connected to public prayer, such as kneeling, or aids to public devotion, such as music, were commended because Hooker had recognised them as helpful spiritual aids.⁹¹ Specific services which were misunderstood by the puritans, such as the churching of women, were properly explained by the *Polity*.⁹² Likewise those who questioned the theology behind the baptism and marriage services or would expunge the prayers against sudden death and the burial service were counselled to see Hooker.⁹³

This aggressive “missionary” usage of the *Polity* was not without its successes.⁹⁴ Some nonconformist ministers, such as Zechariah Crofton, claimed that they were persuaded by their reading of Hooker to attend Anglican services. Unsurprisingly Crofton came under considerable attack when he urged his fellow nonconformists to submit to the discipline of the Church. Crofton, however, had not embraced high Anglicanism since he responded to his critics by likening the Church to a degenerate vine. Parts of it were rotten but it was still a vine.⁹⁵ These corruptions had long clouded the clearness of the water, but had not prevented sixteenth century Calvinists, such as Cartwright, from remaining within the Church.⁹⁶ Such a position, Crofton claimed, could be justified by reference to the principles of divines such as Hooker.⁹⁷

⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 82.

⁸⁹ Elborow, *An Exposition*, p. 27.

⁹⁰ Barbon, *Liturgie a Divine Service*, p. 80.

⁹¹ Ibid, pp. 36, 80.

⁹² Ibid, p. 143.

⁹³ Barbon, *Liturgie a Divine Service*, pp. 95, 125, 134, 142; L’Estrange, *Interest Mistaken*, p. 78.

⁹⁴ Spurr, ‘Religion in Restoration England,’ p. 111.

⁹⁵ Z. Crofton, *Reformation Not Separation: Or, Mr Crofton’s Plea for Communion with the Church, under those Corruptions, and by that Disorderly Ministration to Which He Cannot Conform, Nor by It Administer. In a Letter Written July 20 1661*, (London: (No Printer), 1662), p. 8

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 43.

⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 73.

For example Crofton admitted that, whilst he would not have allowed the wearing of the surplice, it had become part of the discipline of the English Church and should therefore be respected. "I observe a passage in Hookers *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which I have often thought worth the observation of our temporizing Non-conformists, who think (by good professions) to palliate their prophane compliances and preserve their credit." Crofton quoted from the twenty-ninth section of Book V where Hooker described how a group of ministers chose to wear "these Abominable RAGS" rather than suffer their preaching to be silenced. "Being thus hardly beset, we see not any other remedy, but to hazard your souls the one way, that we may the other way endeavour to save them." Crofton expostulated that it was a monstrous wickedness to knowingly opt for sin. Hooker had rightly responded to this scenario by commenting that he could not endure to hear "a man openly profess, he putteth fire to his Neighbours house, but yet so halloweth it with prayer, that he hopeth it shall not burn." In the case of the surplice and other such points of controversy their critics should either have made public their objections or willingly performed what was enjoined. Crofton remarked that if "this learned man had been as rational, religious and sound in other parts of policy, as he is in this, he would have made me a forward Builder in his Ecclesiastical Fabrick."⁹⁸

Crofton's reading of Hooker was clearly not in agreement with the triumphant Restoration writings of high Anglican divines. Nevertheless his reluctant recognition that the *Polity* compelled religious compliance to a high Church settlement was indicative of the victory of this distinctive form of Anglicanism. By the end of 1662 the position of the Church appeared to be unassailable. Episcopacy had been restored to the Church, the Prayer Book revised, and well over a thousand puritan clergy had been ejected for their refusal to conform.⁹⁹ Hooker had been successfully upheld as the guardian of Anglican liturgy, whilst his designated role as the supporter of prelacy was becoming more widespread. Naturally there were still nonconformists who differed in their usage of the *Polity*, and even some Anglican exceptions such as John Durel, the future dean of Windsor, who expressed muted disquiet concerning Hooker's justification of the abolition of the Genevan episcopate, but these were not representative of a wider tradition.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ Ibid, pp. 36-38.

⁹⁹ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 35.

¹⁰⁰ J.Durel, *A View of the Government and Publick Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas*, (London: Printed by J.G. for R.Royston, 1662), p.160.

The publication in 1662 of the first complete edition of the *Polity*, and the production of a life of Hooker was, therefore, intended to confirm symbolically the high church triumph over the puritans. The choice of Gauden to produce the life and supervise production of the new edition was a surprising decision. His conformity under the commonwealth, and his close association with moderate puritans, had done little to endear him to many of his clerical brethren. Whilst others suffered he was deemed to have “continued fix’d and undisturbed in his rich Benefice, joining himself to the sworn Enemies of the Church and Crown, by their solemn League and Covenant.”¹⁰¹ His known desire, however, to secure the bishopric of Winchester, by ingratiating himself with the high Church fraternity, seems to have led to the belief that he could be trusted to produce a suitably Anglican production.¹⁰²

This belief that Gauden was endeavouring to curry favour was not misplaced. He used his prefatory letter to Charles II to stress that the publication of the *Polity* would “adde a further Lustre to your Majesties glorious Name, and happy Reign, whose transcendent favour, justice, and munificence to the long afflicted Church of England, is a subject no less worthy of admiration than gratitude to all posterity.” Gauden commended Charles for his devotion to both Church and people, and knew “not what to present more worthy of your Majesties acceptance...then these elaborate Works of the Famous and Prudent Mr Richard Hooker now augmented, and I hope compleated with the three last books, so much desired and so long concealed.” Whilst the *Polity* acts as a “great and impregnable shield” to the Church, she also craves “your Majesties Royal Protection under God.”¹⁰³ His late father had known his duty to the Church, and “a few days before he was Crowned with Martyrdom, commended to his dearest Children, the diligent reading of Mr Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Polity*, even next the Bible.”¹⁰⁴

Such a recognition of the *Polity*’s worth had previously negated the need for a “Life

¹⁰¹ P.Barwick, *The Life of the Reverend Dr John Barwick, D.D.*, (London: Printed by J.Bettenham, 1724). pp. 363-364.

¹⁰² D.Novarr, *The Making of Walton’s Lives*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), p. 222.

¹⁰³ R.Hooker, *The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, J.Gauden, (ed.), (London: Printed by J.Best for Andrew Croke, 1662), an Epistle to the King.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, an Epistle to the King.

and Death of...[the Church's] great Friend, faithful servant, and valiant Champion," since Hooker's memory, like a jewel, was clearly set in his writings, and no author had deemed himself capable of producing a worthy companion.¹⁰⁵ The production, however, of some recent puritan lives (probably those of Samuel Clarke) which "have enviously passed by this Mr. Hooker" had necessitated his own unworthy attempt. Puritan disparagement or ignorance of the *Polity* had allowed it for too long to "lay gasping and sprawling for breath."¹⁰⁶ Hooker deserved to be better known because his life was like a golden lamp which shone with the bright light of reason and burned with the holy fervency of grace to the comfort of all true members of the English Church.¹⁰⁷

Within the *Polity* there was both a treasury and an armoury for those who possessed sufficient maturity of judgment to be able to bear the weight of his reasoning. He had convincingly shown how the English Church occupied a *via media* position between nonconformity and popery:

"Into a new extreme; he bade them stay,
And shew'd between each ditch the safest way.
He did Democracy and misrule hate,
And lov'd the Order both of Church and State."¹⁰⁸

Hooker had successfully "avoided superstition on either hand; neither calling that evil which was good, nor that good which was evil."¹⁰⁹ Such a stance was not popular with the puritans, but no matter how bitter the conflict Hooker was never guilty of bitterness or aggression towards his critics. Whilst the manner of his life, however, was mild, the impact of the *Polity* on the Church's opponents was such that it "did cast the tortoise of Non-conformity on its back."¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ J. Gauden, *The Life and Death of Mr Hooker*, in R. Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed by J. Best for Andrew Crooke 1662), pp. 1, 2.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, p. 2

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*, p. 38.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, p. 40.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 20.

Despite this portrayal of Hooker as the saintly but strong deliverer upon whose “grounds, rules and proportions...a true Polity in Church and State” could be based, the *Life* was not well received by the Anglican hierarchy.¹¹¹ Gauden was too balanced in his treatment of Hooker to provide an acceptable model for high Church Anglicans. He was too guarded to commit himself to any religious extreme, and was a link back to the Calvinist consensus of the early seventeenth century. In the *Life of Hooker* he attributed the Commonwealth abandonment of the Church not only to nonconformist excess but to a neglect by the Church “of the main matters in which the kingdome of God...do[es] chiefly consist.” The obsession of the 1630s Church with enforcing uniformity of ceremonies was derided for being more concerned with achieving “an outward conformity to those shadows, then for that inward or outward conformity with Christ.”¹¹²

Gauden’s *Life* was also tarnished due to its close association with the unpalatable last two books of the *Polity*. Book VIII was clearly modelled on the 1648 edition, and did not contain *Clavi Trabales’s* correction of the earlier emphasis upon an original compact. Moreover, in spite of Gauden’s claim that Hooker asserted the supremacy of sovereign princes, he had appended to the end of Book VIII an edition which infelicitously suggested that “such usurpers...as in the exercise of their power do more than they have been authorized to do cannot in Conscience binde any man unto obedience.”¹¹³

The contents of Book VII provided an equally unpleasant revelation for high churchmen. Rather than demonstrating episcopacy to enjoy a divine origin it merely showed it to enjoy divine approval, which meant that it was not an unalterable state of Church government.¹¹⁴ Sheldon, that exemplar of Restoration Anglicanism, had given the manuscript

¹¹¹ Gauden, *An Epistle to the King*.

¹¹² Gauden, *Life of Hooker*, pp. 4-5.

¹¹³ Goldie, *Restoration Political Thought*, pp. 14-16; R.Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed by J.Best for Andrew Crook, 1662), p. 224; Novarr, *Walton’s Lives*, p. 233; Quinton, *Politics of Imperfection*, pp. 26-27.

¹¹⁴ R.Hooker, *The Ecclesiastical Polity*, VIII, v, 5; R.Buick Knox, *James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967), pp. 129-131; M.R.Sommerville, ‘Richard Hooker and His Contemporaries on Episcopacy: An Elizabethan Consensus,’ in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol.35, No.2, 1984, (pp. 177-187), pp. 182-183, 184, 187.

to Gauden in the mistaken belief that its publication would conclusively demonstrate Hooker's credentials as a supporter of *jure divino* episcopacy. He was primarily an efficient administrator, so there may be some truth in Burnet's comment that "Sheldon was esteemed a learned man before the wars: but he was then engaged so deep in the politics, that scarce any print of what he had been remained."¹¹⁵

Peter Lake outlines the sort of interpretation which Sheldon must have constructed. Lake describes how Hooker provided all the basic assertions of the *jure divino* case for bishops. Book VII recounted how the "apostles were the first bishops; episcopacy was an institution of apostolic and therefore of divine foundation, the church in general, and the church of England in particular, had never been governed except by bishops." Hooker admitted that he had previously agreed with the widespread conjecture that bishops, following the death of the apostles, had been introduced to maintain peace and order, but he had repented of this mistake.¹¹⁶

Lake insists that this was misleading since Hooker had far from intended to suggest that episcopacy was a matter of divine injunction. Hooker's consideration of Jerome's attribution of episcopacy to the custom of the Church was indicative of this. Episcopacy, Hooker concluded, in spite of its apostolic foundations, enjoyed no divinely enjoined perpetuity, and might therefore be said "to stand in force rather by the custom of the Church choosing to continue in it" than by "any commandment from the word." Hooker's argument based "on the inherent congruence of the dictates of nature, reason and scripture,...felt no need to have constant recourse to direct divine injunctions, but preferred to emphasize the relative autonomy of human institutions and politic societies in applying the general principles of divine and natural law, safe in the knowledge that, as with...episcopacy, the demands of nature and reason were often identical to those of scripture."¹¹⁷

Gauden, in contrast to Sheldon, gratefully recognized Hooker's reluctance to rest the

¹¹⁵ Novarr, *Walton's Lives*, p. 222.

¹¹⁶ P.Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), p. 221.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid*, pp. 222-223.

episcopal case upon an overt divine command, and consequently sought to demonstrate that the *Polity* supported his desire for limited episcopacy. In 1660 he had insisted that if it had been possible for him to obtain access to Hooker's unpublished Book VII, it would have supported his stance of limited episcopacy. He had, however, been reliably informed that opponents of the Church "had the good (or rather evil) fortune, utterly to suppress those...books touching the vindication of the Church of England in its Ordination, Jurisdiction and Government, by the way of ancient Catholick, Primitive and Apostolick Episcopacy."¹¹⁸ When less than two years later he was unexpectedly given a copy of the book he had no doubt that it was an authentic text since he recalled that "by comparing the writing of it with other indisputable papers or known manuscripts of Mr Hooker's" he had ascertained that it was "undoubtedly his own hand throughout."¹¹⁹

Hooker's own views "touching episcopacy, as the Primitive, Catholick and Apostolick government of the Church" had finally been made available.¹²⁰ Through its publication Gauden clearly hoped to assure churchmen that limited episcopacy had a rational and respectable conformist precedent, at the same time as indicating to Presbyterians that their views could be comprehended by the newly re-established Church.¹²¹ The *Polity* demonstrated that the common people needed to be religiously governed "by such whose Learning, Age, Prudence, and Legal Authority derived from the Prince." Episcopacy was also to be preferred because it was in the best interests of the clergy to have a bishop with regard to their welfare. It would also suit the interests of the gentry and grand nobility who would respect a bishop more than a parochial minister. Finally the monarch could use bishops as their "religious eyes" in the governance of their subjects.¹²² Such a settlement would ensure that for as long "as Bishops and Presbyters" continued to exercise their duty in the ways of Piety, Prudence, Industry and Charity" the Church would enjoy God's protection.¹²³

¹¹⁸ Gauden, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, p. 84.

¹¹⁹ Gauden, *Life of Hooker*, p. 26.

¹²⁰ Ibid, Title Page.

¹²¹ J.M.Martin, 'Izaak Walton and His Precursors: A Literary Study of the Emergence of the Ecclesiastical Life,' Cambridge (Unpublished) Ph.D., 1993, p. 305.

¹²² Gauden, *Life and Death*, p. 24.

¹²³ Ibid, p. 40.

Whilst Gauden's understanding of Hooker was fairly accurate, such moderation was not in sympathy with the prevailing ethos of the Church and State by 1662. The suggestion that Hooker had supported views contrary to the Restoration establishment was deeply embarrassing. The renewed status quo was not so secure that it could afford to have the reputation of one of its leading authorities sullied. Much to the Restoration Church's embarrassment Sir Henry Vane had already chosen to defend his Civil War actions with reference to the *Polity*. At his trial he claimed that "politic power is the immediate efflux and offspring of the law of nature, and may be called part of it. To this, Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* agrees." Therefore during constitutional deadlock "it had resolved on parliament to act on behalf of the nation and, in so doing, safeguard the community's indissoluble right to political association."¹²⁴

This was the sort of usage of the *Polity* which the Church could not afford to have become widespread. If Hooker's opinions were shown to be "unsound" concerning episcopacy or the monarchy it would undermine the Anglican identity of the rest of the *Polity*. Even in the aftermath of Savoy, Prynne was still quoting the *Polity* to encourage abandonment of such practices as bowing at the sacred name, and kneeling at communion.¹²⁵ The *Polity*, he insisted, had acknowledged how God Himself, the supreme legislator, had left all the disputed ceremonies free and arbitrary.¹²⁶ Hooker, therefore, held that it was wrong to forbid nonconformist leaders from performing their ministerial function because they would not subscribe to ceremonies of man's own devising.¹²⁷

Some attempts were, therefore, made to discredit Gauden's manuscript copies of previously unpublished material, but since no other authentic manuscripts could be found this quickly failed.¹²⁸ However the coincidental posthumous publication, in the same year of

¹²⁴ J.H. Adamson and H.F. Folland, *Sir Henry Vane. His Life and Times 1613-1662*, (London: The Bodley Head Ltd, 1974); Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 171; H. Vane, *The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane, Kt*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1662), p. 42.

¹²⁵ W. Prynne, *A Moderate, Seasonable Apology for Indulging Just Christian Liberty to Truly Tender Consciences, Conforming to the Publike Liturgy*, (London: Printed for the Author by T.C. and L.P., 1662), pp. 40, 53, 68.

¹²⁶ Prynne, *A Moderate Seasonable Apology*, the Epistle Dedicatory.

¹²⁷ *Ibid*, the Epistle Dedicatory.

¹²⁸ Martin, 'Walton,' p. 307.

Thomas Fuller's *Worthies of England* went some way to correct the impression created by Gauden's life. It damaged Gauden's factual reliability by showing him to be mistaken in his belief that Hooker never married. Fuller also portrayed Hooker as a staunch adherent of the English Church. Regarding the conflict at the Temple, Fuller writes that "the pulpit spake pure Canterbury in the Morning, and Geneva in the afternoon, until Travers was silenced." Hooker's *Polity*, he insisted, was prized by all "save such who out of Ignorance cannot, or Envy will not understand it. But with a prejudice, that as Jephtha vowed to sacrifice the first living thing which met him, these are resolved to quarrel with the first word, which occureth therein."¹²⁹ Such a short biographical entry, however, naturally had its limitations. Fuller's own moderate churchmanship ensured that it did not overtly stress the high Church nature of Hooker's beliefs. It also failed to do anything to mitigate the embarrassment caused by Gauden's authentication of the disagreeable content of the latter books.

Any hopes that Gauden's unpalatable *Life* would be quickly forgotten were dealt a blow by the publication in 1663 of a biography of Sanderson which was clearly based on Gauden's account of Hooker.¹³⁰ In the same way that Gauden had pictured Hooker as a moderate churchman, D.F. attempted to show that Sanderson was of that party.¹³¹ Such enthusiasm for Gauden's *Life* from religious moderates only served to fuel Anglican fears that Hooker's high Church credentials were being damaged. Sheldon pragmatically recognized that only the production of a corrective life would bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion. He was fortunate that Gauden had died before the end of 1662, which meant that he felt free to commission Isaac Walton to produce a new biography. The new biography was intended to discredit Gauden's *Life*, undermine the reputation of the unpalatable posthumous books, and present Hooker as a true Anglican. Walton was trusted to achieve this since he was known to be a convinced royalist and a high churchman, who had already written a highly successful and suitably "Anglican" life of Donne.

Walton's agenda is clear from the very beginning when he described how he intended to write the life of "the happy Author of Five (if not more) of the Eight Bookes of *The Laws of*

¹²⁹ T. Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England*, (London: Printed by J.G.W.L. and W.G., 1662), p. 264.

¹³⁰ D.F., *Reason and Judgment: Or, Special Remarques of the Life of the Renowned Dr. Sanderson, Late Bishop of Lincoln*, p. 4; Gauden, *Life of Hooker*, p. 6; Novarr, *Walton's Lives*, p. 464.

¹³¹ Novarr, *Walton's Lives*, p. 465.

Ecclesiastical Polity."¹³² With mock politeness he insisted that any implied criticism of Gauden was unintentional, but within his life there were many errors and omissions "which my better Leisure, my Diligence, and my accidental Advantages, have made known to me."¹³³ He was at pains to show the superior factual basis of his life through the specificity of his dates, and the particularity of his accounts of Hooker's benefices.¹³⁴ By describing how he had been able to speak to William Cranmer, his two sisters, Ussher, Morton and John Hales concerning their knowledge of Hooker, Walton was also able to demonstrate the superiority of the sources which he had been able to draw upon.¹³⁵

Such new material provided Walton with the necessary evidence to discredit the latter books of the *Polity*. Building upon Wood's account of the unsympathetic family he implied that Hooker's wife had been unsupportive of his academic studies. He reported how Sandys and Cranmer, whilst visiting their old tutor at Drayton Beauchamp, had been shocked to discover that he was reduced to minding the sheep, and rocking the cradle. After Hooker's death, Walton who was consciously reviving Spencer's earlier account concerning the latter books' destruction by "evil disposed minds," described how Archbishop Whitgift sent his chaplain to enquire after the drafts of the final three books of the *Polity*, but he could obtain no satisfactory answer from her. On being summoned to Lambeth to see Whitgift in person she confessed that she had allowed two local puritan ministers access to the writings of her late husband's study. Whilst "there they two burnt and tore many of them assuring her, that they were writings not fit to be seen, & that she knew nothing more concerning them." The matter was never pursued any further than this since Hooker's widow unexpectedly died overnight at her lodgings. ¹³⁶

Sisson, Novarr, and Stanwood have convincingly shown that Hooker's wife has been unfairly maligned by history. They have demonstrated that, with the possible exception of Book VI, there is no first hand evidence that the last three books of the *Polity* ever existed in a

¹³² Isaac Walton, *The Life and Death of Richard Hooker, The Author of those Learned Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Rich.Marriott, 1665), p. 1.

¹³³ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, to the Reader.

¹³⁴ Novarr, *Walton's Lives*, p. 275; Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, pp. 47, 156-157.

¹³⁵ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665 pp. 3-6.

¹³⁶ C.J.Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), p. xii; Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, pp. 161-162.

more complete form, and that there was no deliberate attempt to destroy Hooker's manuscripts.¹³⁷ "The story, in its various forms, presents some impossibilities. Mrs Hooker's impeachment, her journey to London, her examination before the Privy Council, and her [sudden] death, are manifest myth. And the various versions are mutually destructive by their many incompatibilities."¹³⁸ Instead the evidence suggests that Hooker actually enjoyed a relatively successful marriage.¹³⁹ The famous story of Hooker being forced to mind the children during his incumbency at Drayton Beauchamp is an invention, since there were no children in 1584, and there is no evidence that he ever took up residence.¹⁴⁰ Sisson locates the origins of the story of the unsupportive wife within the lengthy and acrimonious chancery court cases which arose out of the claims of his daughters as legatees under his will. In particular the suggestion that Sir Edwin Sandys, Hooker's literary executor, had failed to pay the daughters their just share of the profits produced by the *Polity* created a bitter environment which came to reflect badly upon the whole family. This unpleasant and confused atmosphere encouraged the development of malicious rumours which blended truth with fiction. The memory of this scandal was preserved amongst Sandys's friends, notably the Cranmers, who subsequently became Walton's principal informants.¹⁴¹

Walton's debt to the Cranmers is made explicit in the appendix when he described how Mrs. Spenser "who was my Aunt and Sister to George Cranmer" had told him that her husband had been forced to finish the last three books of the *Polity* himself, because the manuscripts he had received at Hooker's death were unfinished.¹⁴² Even if Walton sincerely believed the information to be accurate, he must undoubtedly have welcomed it as another conclusive piece of evidence to damage the credibility of the posthumous books. This calculated desire, to cast authoritative aspersions upon the origins of the latter books, is graphically confirmed by Walton's deployment of other authorities against them. He praised

¹³⁷ R. Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity*, P.G. Stanwood (ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), pp. xix-x

¹³⁸ Sisson, *Hooker*, p. 87.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xiii.

¹⁴⁰ Novarr, *Walton's Lives*, p. 272; Sisson, *Hooker*, p. 20.

¹⁴¹ P.B. Secor, 'In Search of Richard Hooker: Constructing a New Biography,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S. McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 20-37), pp. 29-30; Sisson, *Hooker*, pp. 4-18.

¹⁴² Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, pp. 116-117.

Bernard for drawing attention to the possible corruptions in the final three books. Readers were advised to consult *ClaviTrabales* where “the omissions are by him set down at large in the said Printed book.” Here the regal supremacy was asserted because “there could be in Natural Bodies no Motion of any thing, unless there were some first which moved all things, and continued Unmoveable; even so in Politick societies, there must be some unpunishable, or else no Man shall suffer punishment...Which kinde of Preheminency if some ought to have in a Kingdom, who but the King shall have it? Kings therefore, or no man can have lawfull power to Judge.”¹⁴³

Bernard was not Walton’s only source of evidence for corruption of the last book since he was able to draw attention to the testimony of Fabian Philips, “a man of note for his useful Books. Philips offered to “make Oath if I shall be required that Doctor Sanderson the late Bishop of Lincoln did a little before his Death affirm to me he had seen a Manuscript, affirmed to him to be the hand-writing of Mr.Richard Hooker in which there was no mention made of the King or Supreme Governors being accomptable to the People.”¹⁴⁴ There was also a letter of Henry King, the bishop of Chichester, to Walton which was cited in its entirety. King described how Hooker’s manuscripts of the unpublished books had been safely deposited in Laud’s library until his martyrdom. They were then removed and given to Hugh Peters. “And though they could hardly fall into a fowler hand, yet there wanted not other endeavours to corrupt and make them speak that Language, for which the Faction then fought; which was, To subject the Sovereign Power to the People.”

King was incredulous that anyone even attempted such a fabrication. Hooker’s “known loyalty to his prince whilst he lived,” the devotion felt towards him by James I and Charles I, “and now the singular Character of his worth given by you in the passages of his life” all vindicate the *Polity* from the charge of being anti-royalist.¹⁴⁵ Elsewhere Walton recalled how Lord Say, the parliamentarian commissioner, whilst conversing with the king, had quoted from one of the then unpublished books. The king responded that “they were not

¹⁴³ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, pp. 168-170.

¹⁴⁴ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665. p. 171.

¹⁴⁵ Letter of Dr King to Isaac Walton, in I. Walton, *The Life of Mr Rich.Hooker, the Author of those Learned Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Rich.Marriott, 1665).

allowed to be Mr. Hooker's Books but, however he would allow them to be Mr. Hooker's and consent to what his Lordship proposed to prove out of those undoubted Books" if he would only accept the teaching of the undoubted five."¹⁴⁶

This careful marshalling of material was highly successful in its attempt to undermine the credibility of Gauden's un-Anglican account, and the reputation of the last three books of the *Polity*. Even until well into this century these books were viewed with a degree of suspicion. Walton's *Life* did much more, however, than merely limit the damage caused by Gauden's edition of the *Polity*. It was his *Life* of 1665 which was responsible for firmly establishing and perpetuating the image of the pious scholarly English divine which was to influence the English Church for over three hundred years.

Walton writes how "there is in every page of Mr. Hooker's book the picture of a divine soul, such pictures of truth and reason and drawn in so sacred colours, that they shall never fade, but give an immortal memory to the author."¹⁴⁷ Hooker's Anglican persona was stressed throughout the *Life* by emphasizing the affection he possessed towards the distinctive nature of the English Church. Walton, like Fuller, stressed, that his sermons at the Temple were always loyal to Canterbury whilst those of his opponent looked towards Geneva.¹⁴⁸ In his "first publick appearance to the World" Hooker had contradicted "a late opinion of Mr Calvins" when he stressed that it was God's primary will that all mankind should be saved; "but his second Will was, That those only should be saved, that did live answerable to that degree of Grace which he had offered or afforded them." Consequently Hooker's anti-Calvinist stance had been supported by other learned churchmen, such as Hammond and Jackson, who believed "that a contrary opinion trenches upon the Honor and Justice of our Merciful God."¹⁴⁹

Hooker's distinctive Anglican identity was also displayed through his close friendships with other proponents of the Elizabethan Church. Walton was particularly anxious to link him with uncompromising supporters of episcopacy. The *Life* was prefaced by a letter of 1598

¹⁴⁶ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 173.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p. 121

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p. 91.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 38.

from George Cranmer to Hooker which condemned the puritans for their bigotry towards all who supported the lawful authority of bishops.¹⁵⁰ Whilst Hooker was at Bishopsbourne Hadrian Saravia, then a prebendary of Canterbury, who had “studied and well considered the controversial points concerning Episcopacy” is shown to have actively sought out his company. Through his many tracts he declared his “Judgement concerning...his brethren ministers of the Low Countreys...and of the Bishops Superiority above the Presbytery.”¹⁵¹ Hooker’s relationship with Saravia was so “holy” that it increased “daily to so high and natural affections, that their two wills seemed to be but one and the same.”¹⁵²

Walton also emphasized Hooker’s association with Archbishop Whitgift to suggest that he shared his views regarding Church property.¹⁵³ He invented a speech for Whitgift concerning ecclesiastical property which he associated with an acceptable passage from the seventh book (slightly altered) which referred to princes as “Nursing Fathers” of the Church.¹⁵⁴ Walton, who was clearly inspired by the historical and antiquarian works of Sir Henry Spelman, emphasized those regal obligations towards the Church which were undertaken at the coronation. If the monarch allowed those who “serve at God’s Altar” to “be exposed to Poverty, then Religion it self will be exposed to Scorn, and become contemptible.”¹⁵⁵ Later Walton adopted this speech to make it even stronger in tone. Those who failed to uphold Magna Carta would suffer a “Curse like the Leprosie, that was intail’d on the Jews;...and, the fathers sin of sacrilege, will prove to be intail’d on his Son and Family.”¹⁵⁶

Whitgift, the great statesman, was also used by Walton as a foil to this shy retiring Hooker so that he could present a more complete and rounded aspect of godly conduct.¹⁵⁷ The

¹⁵⁰ Letter of George Cranmer to Mr Richard Hooker, Feb. 1598, in I. Walton, *The Life of Mr. Rich. Hooker, The Author of those Learned Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Rich Marriott, 1665), pp. 182, 192, 200-203.

¹⁵¹ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 124.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 127.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 63, 67, 70-80.

¹⁵⁴ Martin, ‘Walton,’ p. 330; Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 70

¹⁵⁵ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, pp. 76-77

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹⁵⁷ Martin, ‘Walton,’ p. 329.

enthusiastic zeal of Whitgift was greatly removed from the passive rectitude which Hooker always displayed towards his opponents. This desire to avoid conflict had been with Hooker from his birth. Walton recorded how Hooker, whilst at University, had described how “Scripture was not writ to beget Pride and Disputations...but Moderation and Charity, and Humility, and Obedience, and Peace, and Piety in Mankinde; of which, no good man did ever repent himself upon his Death-bed.”¹⁵⁸ Such a desire for calm meant that Hooker could easily be deployed in support of the status quo; discord and revolution were the responsibilities of those groups which sought to challenge the accepted conventions and structures of society. The puritan attempt, for example, to abolish episcopacy had resulted in social discord.¹⁵⁹

Hooker, therefore, had rightly recognized that “God abhors confusion as contrary to his nature”¹⁶⁰ Hooker’s conflict with Travers, the afternoon lecturer at the Temple church, demonstrated that he had been reluctantly forced into a public disagreement.¹⁶¹ By describing Hooker as being unwilling to enter into dispute, Walton implied that he was a conformist without actually saying so. Walton did not rehearse the arguments put forward by Hooker since his loyalty to the English Church was demonstrated by his behaviour as a “passive peaceable Protestant” who was “never known to be angry, or passionate, or extream in any of his Desires.”¹⁶²

By the time Walton came to write, the image of the peaceable Protestant had become a well established type within the tradition of Protestant hagiography. It frequently occurs within the nonconformist lives of Samuel Clark.¹⁶³ Walton was clearly aware of this literary device although his portrayal of Hooker as a peaceable Protestant was probably based upon the account he gives of himself in response to *A Supplication Preferred by Mr Walter Travers*. Hooker claimed that he derived no joy from arguing and wished that his opponents “had so ruled their hands...that I might never have been constrained to strike so much as in mine own

¹⁵⁸ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 35.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 54-57.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p. 106.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid*, pp. 106-107.

¹⁶² Secor, ‘In Search of Richard Hooker,’ pp.28-29; Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 25.

¹⁶³ Clarke, *A Collection of the Lives of Ten Eminent Divines*, pp. 4, 6, 15, 41, 44, 75-78, 114-115, 170, 183, 216, 325, 446-447, 472-473, 43, 493, 504-506.

defence.”¹⁶⁴ Walton, however, has clearly toned down the scale and the bitterness of the conflict if his account of the disagreement is compared with Hooker’s own response to Travers. Hooker’s own account claimed that Travers’s behaviour was not that which befitted a fellow brother in Christ. Even if the opinion of a fellow Christian was deemed to be offensive, could it ever be right to “controule it first with contrary speech and conferre with him afterwards upon it when convenient opportunitie serveth?”¹⁶⁵

Walton’s *Life* also proved to be innovatory through its moulding of Hooker’s private devotion and pastoral work, so that it was indicative of his peaceable conformist Anglican attitude. Walton always stressed “the greater efficacy of private actions over public utterances.” In an anonymous pamphlet he quoted a fictional nonconformist’s deathbed speech in which he regretted the hours “spent in disputes, and opposition to Government” describing them as “a Corrosive,... like gravel in his teeth” while at the same time finding “comfort” in those hours spent in devotion, and acts of Charity.”¹⁶⁶ Hooker had possessed more foresight than this nonconformist and quietly devoted himself to intellectual pursuits and the fostering of personal piety. He was a supremely humble man who had requested a small living so he could avoid “Contentions” and enjoy the necessary “study and quietness” he needed to write the *Polity*.¹⁶⁷ Whilst in his parish, he regularly fasted, visited the sick, and sought to maintain good will amongst his parishioners by encouraging them to settle their grievances amicably.¹⁶⁸

In appearance Hooker was “an obscure, harmless man, a man in poor Cloaths, his loins usually girt in a course Gown, or Canonical Coat; of a mean stature, and stooping and yet more lowly in the thoughts of his Soul; his Body worn out, not with Age, but Study, begot by his unactivity and sedentary life.”¹⁶⁹ This was clearly reminiscent of Saint John the Baptist who lived in the desert and wore coarse garments of camel’s hair. In Walton’s revision of the *Life* the connection was made even more explicit when he stated that Hooker seemed “like

¹⁶⁴ R.Hooker, *The Answer of Mr Richard Hooker to a Supplication Preferred by Mr Walter Travers to the H.H.Lords of the Privie Counsell*, (Oxford: Printed by Ioseph Barnes, 1612), p.31.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 24.

¹⁶⁶ Martin, ‘Walton,’ p. 326.

¹⁶⁷ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 112.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid, pp. 136-139.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 128.

S. John the Baptist, to be sanctified” from his mother’s womb.¹⁷⁰ These images of the Baptist were obviously intended to portray Hooker as the “voice crying in the wilderness” which prepared the nation for the firm establishment of the Anglican Church. Such was the impact of this “most Learned, most Humble, holy Man” that he had been raised up to join the most “glorious Company of the Patriarks and Apostles.”¹⁷¹

Walton had effectively created an Anglican Church father who historically vindicated everything that the Restoration religious settlement stood for. Lake convincingly argues that Walton developed the myth of an “apostolic succession of Anglicanism” by associating Hooker first with John Jewel, famous for his *Apology Of The English Church* , and then Whitgift.¹⁷² Walton recalled, for example, how Jewel presented Hooker with his “walking staff”, which he described as a “Horse, which hath carried me many a Mile, and I thank God with much ease.”¹⁷³ This anecdote was not merely included to demonstrate the importance of humility within the Church, but graphically displayed how Jewel nominated Hooker as his successor in the “great chain of Anglicanism.” This Anglican succession was also illustrated by showing the favour Hooker enjoyed on account of his religious convictions from both Elizabeth I and James I. Elizabeth had presented Hooker, “whom she loved well”, to the living of “Borne” and had mourned his death.¹⁷⁴ At his first meeting with Whitgift, James I is supposed to have enquired concerning the writer of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* , and to have been saddened by the news of his death.¹⁷⁵

Of course such a vision of Hooker as the voice of a via media Church had also been present in Gauden’s *Life*. There was even some indication of a continuous religious succession since Hooker was shown to have attended Jewel’s old college of Corpus Christi, and Whitgift was shown to have encouraged his academic pursuits.¹⁷⁶ Walton’s *Life*,

¹⁷⁰ I. Walton, *The Life and Death of Richard Hooker*, in R. Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1666), p. 4.

¹⁷¹ Ibid, p. 21.

¹⁷² Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, p. 229.

¹⁷³ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665 p. 19.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, pp. 115, 120.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, pp. 119-120.

¹⁷⁶ Gauden, *Life of Hooker*, pp. 10-11.

however, was radically different from Gauden. The latter had connected Hooker with the previous generation of Elizabethan divines, and monarchs, to demonstrate his Protestant and reformed lineage. Walton, in contrast, had harked back to the sixteenth century to demonstrate the longevity of Hooker's Anglican credentials. Even more startlingly, however, he strove on the way to link Hooker to the Laudian desire of the 1630s for conformity and reverent ceremonial, so that he could portray him as distinctively Anglican within a Protestant tradition.

Within the *Life* Walton approvingly recorded how Hooker had faithfully attended Prayer Book services, prayed for the bishops, and was zealous in his maintenance of the related ceremonies.¹⁷⁷ Although Puritans objected to kneeling at the Communion rail Hooker had knelt willingly "both when he prayed, and when he received the Sacrament."¹⁷⁸ This was a long way removed from those puritans who wrested the scripture to their own destruction.¹⁷⁹ Walton mournfully records that if others would only follow his example and abandon "their pertinacious Zeal" then "Peace and Piety" might flourish within the nation.¹⁸⁰ He insisted that he had only submitted to Sheldon's challenging request to write the *Life* so that it would serve as "a more publick Acknowledgment of your long continued, and now daily, Favours" to your humble servant.¹⁸¹

Such devotion to the established order meant that Hooker, like the loyal pre-Civil War Anglicans, had endured considerable criticism for attempting to adhere to the path of peaceable conformity. Although he trod "in the footsteps of Primitive Piety" he had suffered the same fate as Athanasius, and had been subjected to countless slanderous remarks from heretical enemies.¹⁸² During the Commonwealth the Bishopsbourne parish clerk was reported as saying that there had been so many sequestrations of "good men" from their livings, that "he doubted if his good Master Mr Hooker had lived till now, they would have sequestred him too."¹⁸³ This was a sad change from former days when he had received "many rewards" for

¹⁷⁷ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, pp. 25, 106, 134-135.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p. 106.

¹⁷⁹ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1666, p. 10.

¹⁸⁰ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 107-108.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid*, Dedication.

¹⁸² Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, pp. 138-139; Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1666, p. 24.

¹⁸³ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1665, p. 131.

showing Hooker's grave and monument to visitors.¹⁸⁴

Walton's account of Hooker successfully masked the major discontinuities within the history of the English Church, and had helped to create an historic Anglicanism which had existed since the Reformation. He could claim with some justification that the most learned members of the nation could never refer to Hooker without some "Epithite of Learned, or Judicious, or Reverend, or Venerable Mr Hooker."¹⁸⁵ Consequently it was his final prayer that the Restoration Church would continue to follow this worthy pattern of peaceable Anglican piety. "Lord bless his Brethren, the Clergy of this Nation with ardent desires and effectual endeavours to attain, if nott to his great Learning, yet to his remarkable meeknesse, his godly simplicity, and his Christian moderation...And let the Labors of his life, his most excellent Writings be blest with what he designed when he undertook them: Which was Glory to thee, O God on high, Peace in thy Church, and good will to mankinde."¹⁸⁶

This prayer was not to be disappointed since the *Life* became an established part of high Anglican hagiography. It was widely welcomed, because it had successfully counteracted the puritan image of a moderate churchman, and undermined the authority of the last three books.¹⁸⁷ Trevor-Roper cynically remarks that Walton's disparagement of Hooker's less palatable writings became an "essential brick in the temple erroneously reared to an imaginary high Anglican saint."¹⁸⁸ Such a careful presentation of Hooker, however, was vital if Anglican writers were to be able to cite enthusiastically the first five books, secure in the knowledge that they would not be contradicted by the latter books of the *Polity*. Without Walton's carefully crafted corrective it would have been almost impossible for individuals, such as Heylyn, to maintain their belief that the content of the *Polity* was synonymous with the Laudian Church of the 1630s.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 130.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 121.

¹⁸⁶ Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 1666, p. 26

¹⁸⁷ Novarr, *Walton's Lives*, p. 6.

¹⁸⁸ H.R. Trevor-Roper, 'The Good and Great Works of Richard Hooker,' in *The New York Review of Books*, Vol. 24, November 24, 1977, (pp. 48-55), p. 55.

¹⁸⁹ P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus: Or the History of the Life and Death, of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, (London: Printed For A. Seile, 1668), the Preface.

The publication of the *Life* marked the final triumph of the Church, and ensured that it was more securely re-established by the end of the 1660, than could ever have been anticipated at the start of the Restoration. The puritans had been silenced and Anglicanism, with Hooker as its bulwark against Calvinism, looked forward to the future with confidence.¹⁹⁰ Hooker was the authentic mouthpiece of an Anglicanism which compelled all English men to submit to the Church. Irenaeus Freeman pronounced the worthlessness of puritan writings until they should successfully answer Hooker.¹⁹¹ Simon Patrick, then rector of S.Paul's Covent Garden, cited Hooker as a means of demonstrating to nonconformists the efficacy of reason in conjunction with scripture, and Samuel Parker, a future archdeacon of Canterbury, described how the *Polity* was "as full and demonstrative a confutation of their own cause, as the matters combined in it."¹⁹²

William Assheton, who was a convert to Anglicanism, agreed with Hooker that there would be a time "when three words uttered with Charity...shall receive a far more blessed Reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit."¹⁹³ Whilst this was the ideal it was not yet a practicality since puritan passions and interests continued to push themselves forward. Early Church schismatic groups such as the Donatists had pleaded for toleration, and when they achieved it under the Apostate Julian wreaked havoc upon the orthodox.¹⁹⁴ The present Church would be better advised to follow Hooker's opinion that "the manner of mens writings must not alienate our heart from the Truth, if it appear they have the Truth."¹⁹⁵

Whilst Assheton praised Hooker's perception, his reference to Julian shows that he was also deeply aware that the public position of the Church remained heavily dependent upon

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, The preface, p. 52.

¹⁹¹ I.Freeman, *The Reasonableness of Divine Service: Or Non-Conformity to Common-Prayer, Proved Not Conformable to Common Reason*, (London: Printed by Tho. Basset, 1661), p. 33.

¹⁹² S.Parker, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1669), p. 230; S.Patrick, *A Continuation of the Friendly Debate*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1669), p. 234.

¹⁹³ W.Assheton, *Toleration Disapprov'd and Condemnd*, (Oxford: Printed by William Hall, for Francis Oxlad, 1670), p. 16.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 52.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, p. 3.

the State. This supports Green's view that the Church was allied to the gentry, and would never have been restored without their support. "It was this more than anything else which forced Charles to abandon first the idea of comprehension and then the possibility of a royal indulgence. It was probably this factor too which undermined the morale of the Puritan clergy, so that in August 1662 well over a thousand ministers, despairing of a royal indulgence, and surrounded by a gentry which for some time had shown its hostility towards them, left their living quietly, and resignedly."¹⁹⁶

Green, however, fails to consider that the Cavalier Parliament only adopted this stance because the Church loyalists had already persuaded them to go down the path of Hookerian Anglicanism. An ingrained high Church respect for the *Polity* was obviously not the leading motivation behind the Cavaliers' behaviour, but the importance of Hooker should not be underestimated. In the first two years of the Restoration Hooker had been cited in support of the royal supremacy, the exalted place of episcopacy, the retention of traditional ceremonies, and respect for traditional religious rights. Puritan attempts to suggest that Hooker was a broad reformed churchman were totally discounted, as Baxter had found to his cost at Savoy.

If Hooker had been considered in any way marginal to the Restoration's case, Gauden's and Vane's treatment of the *Polity* would not have caused such consternation. It was unthinkable to the high churchmen that their association with Hooker should be undermined. This setback to Hooker's Anglican identity, however, was only temporary. Walton's *Life* encapsulated the Restoration Anglican ideal, and ensured that unquestioning obedience to authority was portrayed as the only sure foundation for religious and political stability. The succeeding editions of the *Life* only served to reinforce the Anglican sense of gratitude to the champion of the "Church of England Rights, against the Factious Torrent of Separatists."¹⁹⁷

At the start of the 1670 edition Samuel Woodford, the poetical divine, endeavoured to encapsulate, in verse, the close association of Walton with Hooker:

¹⁹⁶ Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 200.

¹⁹⁷ King, Copy of a Letter Sent to Mr Walton, by Dr. King, Lord Bishop of Chichester, in I. Walton, *The Life of Mr Rich. Hooker, The Author of those Learned Books of the Laws Oof Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Rich. Marriott, 1665).

The Church is Hookers Debtor: Hooker His;
And strange 'twould be, if he should Glory miss,
For whom two such most powerfully contend
Bid him, cheer up, the Day's his own:
And he shall never die
Who after seventy's past and gone,
Can all th'Assaults of Age defie:
Is, master still, of so much youthful heat
A child, so perfect, and so sprightly to beget.¹⁹⁸

Regardless of its linguistic merits such a poem was certainly apt in its recognition that Walton had become inseparable from any normative reading of Hooker. Without Walton's corrective account, the *Polity* would never have been able to sustain its popularity as a defence of high Church principles. His *Life* had ensured that Hooker was the unrivalled champion of the Restoration settlement against all those who "would...rake into the scarce-closed wounds of a newly bleeding State and Church."¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁸ I. Walton, *The Life of Mr Rich. Hooker, The Author of those Learned Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb for Richard Marriot, 1670).

¹⁹⁹ King, Letter to Walton, 1665.

Threats And Challenges To Hooker's Anglican Identity, 1670-1685

Walton's interpretation of Hooker as the guardian of Anglicanism was to dominate the 1670s almost without challenge. In an environment where Anglican references to the judicious divine had become commonplace, few individuals had the confidence, capacity or influence to dispute it. Any contrary opinion remained very much an exception. Only with the advent of the exclusion crisis did the high Church understanding of the *Polity* suffer any realistic threat to its supremacy. Notwithstanding the seriousness of this challenge, however, it will be shown how the use of Hooker to justify the Restoration settlement survived unchanged, and emerged stronger than ever before.

Such future exclusion troubles could not have been imagined, however, by the triumphant Anglicans of the early 1670s. Walton's depiction of the peaceable Anglican divine had fully entered the national consciousness, and ensured that the whole weight of scholarly opinion was behind the high Church understanding of Hooker.¹ When, for example, Clement Barksdale, another Anglican biographer, and Anthony Wood, the Oxford historian, sought to produce their own accounts of the judicious divine, they unhesitatingly turned to Walton's *Life of Hooker* for their inspiration.² Walton himself also continued to use his biographical skills to consolidate Hooker's Anglican identity. His life of Sanderson clearly sought to confirm the anti-Calvinist nature of the *Polity*, and the dubious reputation of the posthumous books.³

The continued vitality of this perception of Hooker as a high Church divine was also apparent in popular Anglican apologetic. Earlier Hooker-dependent works such as Sparrow's *Rationale Upon the Book of Common Prayer* or Nicholson's *Catechism of the Church of England* were regularly reprinted, and new writers such as Francis Gregory, a high Church

¹ D. Novarr, *The Making of Walton's Lives*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1958), p. 6.

² C. Barksdale, *A Remembrancer of Excellent Men*, (London: Printed for John Martyn, 1670); A. Wood, *Historia Et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis Duobus Voluminibus Comprehensae*, (Oxford: E. Theatro Sheldoniano, 1674), Lib. II, p. 236.

³ R. Hooker, *A Sermon of Richard Hooker Author of those Learned Books of Ecclesiastical Politie. Found in the Study of the Late Learned Bishop Andrews*, (London: Printed for Richard Marriott, 1678) in I. Walton, *The Life of Dr Sanderson, Late Bishop of Lincoln*, (London: Printed for Richard Marriott, 1678), (pp. 254-276); T. Pierce, A Letter of March 1677/8 to I. Walton, in I. Walton, *The Life of Dr. Sanderson, Late Bishop of Lincoln*, (London: Printed for Richard Marriott, 1678); Walton, *Sanderson*, the Preface.

schoolmaster, or William Goulde, the rector of Ken, continued to cite his life and works as the model for all true churchmen to base their own upon.⁴ It was all very much in the tradition of Restoration Anglicanism, and marked no major discontinuity with the 1660s. The only really innovative use of Hooker was provided by Barksdale's compilation of *Judicious Hooker's Illustrations of Holy Scripture in his Ecclesiastical Polity*, which was effectively a short anthology of his more high Church texts. In the dedication Barksdale expressed his hope that "this little piece will be able, by Gods Grace, to make sure impression...of Meekness and Obedience upon every serious and impartial peruser." Only through such "a taste of Hooker will the more ingenious sort [be encouraged] to study that incomparable Book of his in defence of our Church-Laws and Liturgy, which ...might serve to compose dissensions and make up our breeches."⁵ Even a cursory reading of the *Polity* would illustrate to the Church's opponents that she possessed the necessary authority to commend things indifferent. "What things God doth neither command nor forbid, the same he permitteth with approbation to be done or left undone."⁶

Such widespread Hooker-inspired confidence should have convinced even the most casual of observers that the Anglican supremacy was dominant. Yet it was precisely at this moment that Charles II attempted to persuade a staunchly pro-Church Parliament that it was permissible for him to grant a declaration of religious indulgence.⁷ Although his private aim was to secure liberty for his Catholic subjects he seems to have forlornly hoped that widespread nonconformist support would provide a sufficiently popular mandate to silence

⁴ W.Goulde, *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of St Peter in Exon. On Palm Sunday. An.Do..1672*, (London Printed for R.Royston, 1672), pp. 1-2; F.Gregory, *The Triall of Religions with Cautions to the Members of the Reformed Church against Defection to the Roman*, (London: Printed by E.Flesher for R.Royston, 1674), Dedication; Anon, *Publick Devotion and the Communion Service of the Church of England Justified, and Recommended to All Honest and Well Meaning, (However Prejudicial) Dissenters*, (London: Printed for Ben Took, 1675).

Between 1670-1680 Nicholson and Sparrow were both reissued twice. D.Wing, (ed.) *Short-Title Catalogue*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), Vol.II, p. 283, Vol.III, pp. 488-489.

⁵ R.Hooker, *Judicious Hooker's Illustrations of Holy Scripture in His Ecclesiastical Policy*, (London: Printed for the Collector, 1685), Dedication.

⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 2, 10, 12, 18, 27,45.

⁷ J.Miller, *Charles II*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991), pp. 189-192, 200-202; J.Spurr, 'Religion in Restoration England,' in *The Reign of Charles II and James VII and II*, L.K.J.Glassey, (ed.), (New York: St Martin's Press, Inc, 1997), (pp. 90-124); M.R.Watts, *The Dissenters*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), Vol.I, pp. 247-248; W.T.Witcombe, *Charles II and the Cavalier House of Commons 1663-1674*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966), pp. 247-248.

parliamentary objections. Nonconformists were certainly enthusiastic concerning the removal of the burden of state-sanctioned religious oppression. Baxter commented that he had never sought to deny the learned standing of Hooker, but regretted that his works had adopted a “military strain” when there were “many more, who by Love and meekness, and a peaceable familiarity (without sin) might have been disarmed.”⁸

Andrew Marvell, former secretary to Cromwell, also took the opportunity to criticize the Anglican usage of the *Polity*. His *Rehearsal Transposed* favourably contrasted the modesty and frankness of Hooker with the “ignorance and prejudice of those who quoted him without having always read him.”⁹ The Anglican obsession with ceremonies was being undertaken to the detriment of scripture.¹⁰ Hooker’s defence of scriptural sacraments had gained “those lasting and eternal trophies” over their opponents, but his use to justify non-scriptural practices remained unacceptable.¹¹ “And, whereas Mr Bayes [Bishop Parker] is always defying the Nonconformists with Mr Hookers *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and the *Friendly Debate*; I am of opinion, though I have a great Reverence for Mr Hooker, who in some things did answer himself, that this little Book of not full eight leaves [J.Hales, *Treaty of Schism*] hath shut that *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and Mr Baye’s too, out of doors.”¹²

Such nonconformist affection for Hooker was highly unusual by the 1670s. Most dissenters had accepted the Anglican interpretation of the *Polity*, and had discounted him as a prelatial writer.¹³ This tentative revival of interest in Hooker as a reformed theologian, along

⁸ R. Baxter, *The Church Told of Mr. Ed. Bagshaw's Scandals, and Warned of the Dangerous Snares of Satan, Now Laid for Them, in His Love-Killing Principles*, (London: [No Printer], 1672), p. 29.

⁹ F.J. Shirley, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1949), p. 207; J.M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalty of Andrew Marvell*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 187-188.

¹⁰ A. Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transposed; Or, Animadversions upon a Late Book, Intituled, a Preface Shewing What Grounds There are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery*, (London: Printed by J.D. for the Assign of John Calvin and Theodore Beza, 1672), p. 308.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 217.

¹² Hales was favoured by Marvell because of his belief that it was not schismatic to separate from the Church upon the grounds of “true and unpretended conscience... Where the Cause of Schism is necessary, there not he that separates, but he that is the cause of separation is the Schismatick.” Marvell, *Rehearsal Transposed*, pp. 175-177; J.Hales, *A Tract Concerning Schisme and Schismatics. Wherein Is Briefly Discovered the Original Causes of All Schisme*, (London: Printed for R.B., 1642), pp. 3-5.

¹³ P. Talbot, *A Treatise of Religion and Government with Reflexions upon the Cause and Care of Englands Late Distempers and Present Dangers*, (London: [No Printer], 1670), p. 106.

with the widespread nonconformist enthusiasm for the declaration of indulgence, was sufficient, however, to stiffen the Anglican resolve against any form of compromise.¹⁴ The Commons predictably refused to accept the royal dispensation, and made it clear that any form of financial grant was dependent upon its withdrawal. Parliamentary anxiety regarding Charles's rather lukewarm devotion to Anglicanism also resulted in the passing of the 1673 Test Act, which effectively removed Catholics from government and military posts.¹⁵ The Church of England was too secure for Charles's attempt to liberate his nonconformist subjects to be anything but a complete failure. In fact it only served to encourage a further parliamentary affirmation of the importance of Hooker to Anglicanism.

Whilst loyal Anglicans enjoyed such legislative support for their belief in the spiritual perfection of the Church there could be no serious challenge to their religious dominance, and they remained totally unsympathetic to those individuals who sought to worship outside the confines of the religious establishment. John Goodman, a vociferous high churchman, dismissed dissenting attempts to safeguard their spiritual purity as merely resulting in new forms of sectarianism. Hooker had demonstrated that their desire to hedge in access to the communion with strict rules and regulations had made it more like the private Roman mass they had striven to escape.¹⁶ John Nalson, the historian and royalist pamphleteer, insisted that if they could only be persuaded to read Hooker they would realize their errors and be reconciled to the Church. This judgment, he concluded, was implicitly echoed by the dissenting ministers' attempts to dissuade their adherents from consulting Hooker. The minister "will not fail to do all he can to perswade them not to lose so much time reading such frothy stuff, which is nothing but untemper'd Mortar, to dawb over the Temple of antichrist, which notwithstanding all that can be done to support it, must down, must fall very suddenly." Instead they will recommend some works of their own choosing which confirms the people in their

¹⁴ F.G.James, 'The Bishops in Politics, 1688-1714,' in *Conflict in Stuart England. Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, W.A.Appleton and B.D.Henning, (eds.), (London: Jonathan Cape, 1660), (pp. 229-257), p. 230; J.Miller, *Restoration England: The Reign of Charles II*, (London: Longman, 1985), p. 62.

¹⁵ R.M.Bliss, *Restoration England 1660-1688*, (London: Methuen and Co.Ltd, 1985), p. 36.

¹⁶ J.Goodman, *A Sermon Preached at Bishops-Stortford, August 29.1667 before the Right Reverend Father in God, Henry Lord Bishop of London, &c. At His Lordship's Primary Visitation*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1677), p. 3.

error.¹⁷

Nalson's rhetoric is somewhat exaggerated, but it is clear that Hooker was generally absent from the nonconformist library. The *Polity* was certainly not included amongst Baxter's list of recommended books for "the young beginner in Religion."¹⁸ This refusal to commend Hooker as a devotional work, however, did not mean that they were necessarily unfamiliar with him. It was, rather, a recognition that Hooker's association with Anglicanism was too strong for the *Polity* to play any constructive part in the advancement of any other religious cause. Most nonconformists, therefore, chose to ignore the *Polity* in its entirety. The only persistent exception to this consensus was Baxter who continued to draw attention to the embarrassing contents of Book VIII. Baxter was aware of the ambiguity surrounding the authorship of the final books, but was adamant that they were the sole work of Hooker. "And if any (causelessly) question whether the eighth (imperfect) Book be in those passages his own, let them remember that the sum of all that I confute, is in his first Book, which is old and highly honoured."¹⁹ He also insisted that even before Book VIII was published he had been familiar with its contents from a manuscript belonging to a friend.²⁰

Baxter's dogged interest in the unpalatable posthumous books made no impact, however, on the contemporary political debate. High churchmen such as William Falkner and John Nalson enthusiastically espoused Hooker's ecclesiastical doctrine, but completely discounted him in their political writings.²¹ There was nothing inconsistent about their

¹⁷ J.Nalson, *The Countermine: Or a Short but True Discovery of the Dangerous Principles of the Dangerous Principles, and Secret Practices of the Dissenting Party, Especially the Presbyterians*, (London: Printed for Jonathan Edwin, 1677), p. 6.

¹⁸ Baxter does cite Hooker in a further reading list which was primarily aimed at clergymen. Presumably he felt that their views would not be irrevocably formed by it; R.Baxter, *A Christian Directory or, A Sum of Practical Theologie, and Cases of Conscience*, (London: Printed for Robert White for Nevill Simmons, 1673), pp. 60, 926.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, to the Reader.

²⁰ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae: Or Mr Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*, M.Sylvester, (ed.), (London: Printed for T.Parkhurst, F.Robinson, F.Lawrence, and F.Dunton, 1696), Part III, p. 151.

²¹ W.Falkner, *Libertas Ecclesiastica, or, a Discourse Vindicating the Lawfulness of those Things Which Are Chiefly Excepted against in the Church of England, Especially in Its Liturgy and Worship*, (London: Printed by J.M. for Walter Kettilby, 1674), pp. 467, 515; J.Nalson, *The Countermine or a Short but True Discovery of the Dangerous Principles, and Secret Practices of the Dissenting Party, Especially the Presbyterians*, (London: Printed for J.Edwin, 1677), p. 7.

behaviour since they were merely avoiding those books which were widely believed to have been corrupted by hostile puritan sources. Baxter's opinions were easy to discount since his scrupulous obedience to his conscience generally made it impossible for him to co-operate successfully with any group. Only during his stay at Kidderminster did he ever manage to pursue anything approximating to a settled pattern of ministry. Although it is clear that Baxter was something of a maverick, it is important to examine his treatment of the *Polity* at some length. Notwithstanding his lack of influence in the 1670s his understanding of Hooker bore remarkable similarities to the subsequent post-1688 Whig interpretation. Baxter would have totally disapproved of the Whig enthusiasm for the *Polity's* belief in an original contract, but he had effectively prepared the way for them.

His use of the *Polity* in Restoration England had ironically been intended to display his conservative credentials, not to lay the basis for future Hooker-sponsored radicalism. When Bishop Morley appeared to question his loyalty he was able to refer him to his *Christian Directory* where there was "a large confutation of Mr Hooker, as to the body's...original and necessary power of legislation, and the King's receiving his power from the people, and his holding it in dependence on them."²² Baxter was also being Machiavellian, however, in his deployment of the *Polity*. By drawing attention to Hooker's dubious views regarding the monarchy he was subtly attempting to impugn the rest of the *Polity*. His challenge to the Anglican hierarchy became clear when he complained that in spite of Hooker's political failings he still remained "one of the most magnified authors with the Bishops."²³ It was equally incredible, he asserted, that Charles I had recommended him to his children. "They find that even the greatest Episcopal Divines, as approved by our Princes, and most Learned Defenders of Monarchy and Obedience, do yet set up the Laws above the King, and write more in than we can consent to." Book VIII may have been unknown to him, but the equally subversive Book I "was extant when King Charles I commended his Works."²⁴

Baxter insisted that whilst he remained reluctant to contradict the "authority of this

²² Miller, *Charles II*, p. 250; F.J.Powicke, *The Reverend Richard Baxter under the Cross*, (London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1928), p. 227.

²³ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, Part II, p. 424; W.Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium, Puritanism and the English Revolution*, Vol.III, (London: Crook Helm, 1979), pp. 98, 290.

²⁴ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, Part II, p. 424.



famous divine” he could not allow his belief that the whole body could be governors to stand unchallenged. Such a belief meant that the “Pars imperans” and “Pars subdita” were confounded. “Their authority is not derived from the people’s consent, but from God, by their consent, as a bare condition, sine qua non.”²⁵ Since the monarch’s authority came directly from God there could be no recipient between God and him to convey it to him.²⁶ To suggest that the whole body were governors was as ridiculous as the belief that if all “the persons in London subjected themselves to the lord mayor, he would thereby receive his power from them.”²⁷ If by some misfortune all the heirs to the throne were to die they would be an ungoverned community and have power to choose a new governor. They would not, as Hooker suggests, have “power to govern...As it is with a corporation when the mayor is dead, the power falleth not to the people.”²⁸ They can only “determine of the persons that shall have power from God.”²⁹

Neither did the people, as Hooker believed, play any part in the law-making process. “Wisdom doth but prepare laws and governing power enacteth them, and giveth them their form. But the whole body hath no such governing power, therefore they give them not their form.”³⁰ Men obey God without consenting to his will; so are they to respect the laws of their sovereign for “rex legem [facit].”³¹ The publication of Book VIII had misled the populace into believing that as “the fountain of Authority”³² they possessed “fore-prized Liberties, which they may defend, and the Parliament hath part of the Legislative Power, by the Constitution of the Kingdom.”³³ Any legislative power which Parliament possessed stemmed not from the people, “but it is as the Constitution twisteth them into the government. For if once Legislation...be denied to be any part of Government at all, and affirmed to belong to the

²⁵ W.Orme, *The Practical Works of the Rev.Richard Baxter: With a Life of the Author, and a Crucial Examination of His Writings*, (London: Mills, Jowett, and Mills, 1830), Vol.I, pp. 548-549.

²⁶ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, Part I, p. 48.

²⁷ R.Baxter, *The Christian Directory*, in *The Practical Works of the Rev Richard Baxter*, Vols.I-XXIII W.Orme, (ed.), (London: James Duncan, 1830), Vol.VI, p. 29.

²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 31.

²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 35.

³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 32.

³¹ Baxter, *Christian Directory*, Orme, (ed.), Vol.VI, pp. 31, 33.

³² R.Baxter, *A Christian Directory*, (1673), to the Reader.

³³ *Ibid*, Part III, p. 11.

People as such, who are no Governors, all Government will hereby be overthrown.”³⁴

Baxter did admit, however, that there were occasions when one might legitimately disobey the monarch. He referred with approval to Book VIII’s conclusion which insisted that it was not a “sin to break a Law which is no Law, as being against God, or not authorised by him.”³⁵ Baxter also cited with approval Hooker’s scenario where a king contradicts the advice of a physician and tells a man not to take certain medicines. If the man follows the king’s advice he knows that he is likely to die so he may legitimately ignore the king. It would be a sin against God who commands the preservation of life and a failure to acknowledge that such a matter belongs more properly to the physician than to the magistrate.³⁶ “Our Actions may participate of obedience in general, as being actions of subjects, when they are not obedience in the full and perfect formality as to the particular.”³⁷ Baxter still remained anxious, however, “lest any should misapply Mr Rich.Hooker’s [aforesaid] doctrine” and believe that they are never bound in conscience “to obey their Parents, their King, their Pastors, in any point wherein they exercise more power than God gave them...[since] there are many cases in which God bindeth children and subjects to obey their superiors, in such matters as they did sinfully command.”³⁸

This potential misuse of the *Polity* presented more than an abstract threat to the magistrate, since Baxter believed Hooker’s doctrine of popular monarchy to have contributed to the causes of the Civil War. Consequently he believed it to be his duty to ensure that Hooker was publicly exposed as bearing the responsibility for fatally weakening subjects’ obedience to their rulers.³⁹ He recalled how he himself had allowed Hooker and other episcopal divines to make him more receptive towards populism. Consequently “I was the easiyer drawn to think that that Hooker’s Political Principles had been commonly received by all.”⁴⁰ The subsequent publication of Book VIII had only served to increase the possibility of

³⁴ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, p. 41.

³⁵ Baxter, *Christian Directory, Fourth Part*, (1673), p. 37.

³⁶ *Ibid*, p. 22.

³⁷ *Ibid*, Parts I-III, p. 888

³⁸ *Ibid*, Parts I-III, p. 888.

³⁹ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, p. 96.

⁴⁰ Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium*, p. 229.

conflict. When Parliament had first sought learned support to justify their stance against the king, it had “much concerned them to find the most Learned episcopal divines speak so high for the Legislative Power of Parliaments...for the Eighth Book, which saith more than the Parliament ever said, was not then published.”⁴¹

Such major anxieties regarding the *Polity* ensured that Baxter encouraged his readers to discount Hooker. Instead he urged them to consult Thomas Bilson, the scholarly bishop of Winchester, and to adhere to his political philosophy. In a private letter of 1677 to his old friend Richard Allestree, the provost of Eton, he explained that his understanding of Bilson had been the real reason for taking Parliament’s side in the civil War. “The Newes of 200 000 murdered by the Irish and Papist strength in the King’s armies, and the great danger of the kingdom was published by the Parliament...I thought that both the defensive part, and the *salus populi*, lay on the Parliament’s side...my principles were the same with Bishop Bilson’s (of subjection) and Jewel’s, but never so popular as R.Hooker’s.”⁴² There were some superficial similarities between Bilson and Hooker, but these were marginal, because the former, unlike the writer of the *Polity*, had refused to make any concessions to concepts of popular sovereignty. Bilson only permitted disobedience to the monarch within carefully prescribed circumstances. A king forfeited obedience not from excessive use of his powers, but by misdirecting them. As Lamont puts it, “reason, not tyranny was the critical issue. If the king, helped deliver his realm into the hands of a foreign power, such as Rome, he had negated the whole point of his kingly powers.”⁴³ He could no longer command obedience from the populace who were perfectly entitled to pull their “necks out of the greedy jaws of that Romish Wolf.”⁴⁴ Baxter insisted that the nonconformist community had never gone beyond these grounds for resistance, and had never embraced the popular principles contained within the *Ecclesiastical Polity*.⁴⁵

As has already been seen, this ingenious attempt to defend nonconformity at Hooker’s

⁴¹ Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxteriae*, Part III, p. 11.

⁴² W.Lamont, *Baxter and the Millennium*, p. 99.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 92.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 99.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 99.

expense made no impact upon the English Church. Faithful Anglicans in no way felt compelled to abandon their mentor's position as "protector" of their rites and practices. Only the severe, unexpected and totally independent upheaval caused by the revelation of the Popish Plot in late 1678 suggested that there was any possibility of Baxter's political fears being fulfilled. This brought the problem of the succession into immediate public focus, and from the Spring of 1679 to the Spring of 1681 the central political issue was whether James should be excluded from the throne. The proponents of exclusion, who were soon labelled Whigs, insisted that James's Catholicism would lead to popery and absolutism. Their Tory opponents insisted that it was unfair "to condemn James untried" and insisted that their real aim was to overthrow the Church and the monarchy.⁴⁶ These allegations were not without some basis. Any attempt to exclude James was clearly an attack upon the Restoration Hooker-sponsored hereditary principle that kings could only be passively resisted. Even if the fears of turmoil were exaggerated there was sufficient unrest to make the likelihood of Civil War at least seem possible.⁴⁷

The Tories were naturally anxious to avoid any repetition of the upheaval of the 1640s, and consequently strove to preserve the historic succession as surety against this. Since the Whigs were in the ascendancy the Tories sought desperately a major polemical work to demonstrate that the crown could not be surrounded by institutional restrictions. This they achieved through the publication of Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha*.⁴⁸ It was an inspired choice, since Filmer, a staunch supporter of Charles I and friend of high churchmen such as Heylyn, already enjoyed a reputation as a royal absolutist through earlier published works such

⁴⁶ G.E. Aylmer, *The Struggle for the Constitution. England in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Blandford Press, 1975), p. 198; Miller, *Charles II*, pp. 290-300; J. Miller, *Restoration England: The Reign of Charles II*, (London: Longman, 1985), p. 63.

⁴⁷ R. Hutton, *Charles the Second King of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 358-364; M. Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 4; Miller, *Charles II*, p. 336.

⁴⁸ The historical context for its composition has been much debated, and scholarly opinion has placed it as early as the 1620s and as late as 1653. At present there is a general consensus that the manuscript was completed around 1631. This makes primarily make it an abstract attempt to justify royal absolutism, rather than a direct response to the confusion of the Civil War. The Tories of the 1680s would not, of course, have been preoccupied with the specific circumstances which precipitated the composition of *Patriarcha*. G. Burgess, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution*, (London: Yale University Press, 1996); R. Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, J.P. Sommerville, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. xxxii-xxxiv.

as his *Observations upon Aristotles Politiques*.⁴⁹ Brian Duppa, writing in 1654, agreed with his correspondent that “in the point of government I know no man speaks more truth than the knight you mention.”⁵⁰ Consequently when *Patriarcha* made its appearance it was gratefully received as a forthright defence of the “natural power of Kings” against the “unnatural liberty of the people.”⁵¹ It demonstrated how the case for the royal supremacy was based upon the secure premise that just as a father’s power over children does not stem from their consent, so the king’s power is not derived from the consent of his subjects, but from God alone.⁵² The reality of this claim was clearly illustrated at the start of the book of Genesis where it was recorded that God had invested Adam with monarchical power. This authority, he insisted, had consequently been passed down through Adam’s descendants, until it finally came to rest in the house of Stuart. Since government was shown to be dependent upon divine status there was no question of it requiring consent.⁵³

Rather unexpectedly Filmer was adamant that the *Polity* supported his belief in a constant succession from the Old Testament onwards. He described how his examination of the *Polity*, including a manuscript copy of Book VIII, had demonstrated that Hooker could find “no example in the scripture of the people’s choosing their own king.” Here Hooker was shown to have recognized that there was a major distinction between choosing a king and actually setting one above the people. Furthermore Hooker, according to Filmer, had insisted that it was totally mistaken to allege that the coronations of Saul, David, or Solomon “were a kind of deed, whereby the right of dominion is given: Which strange untrue and unnatural conceits set abroad by seedmen of rebellion, only to animate unquiet spirits, and to feed them with possibilities of aspiring unto the thrones, if they can win the hearts of the people, whatsoever hereditary title any other before them may have.” The right of sovereign dominion had been shown by all “law, equity and reason” to be indisputably tied to hereditary

⁴⁹ J.A.Downie, *To Settle the Succession of the State. Literature and Politics, 1678-1750*, (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd, 1994), p. 21; R.Filmer, *Patriarcha*, in *Sir Robert Filmer and Other Writings*, J.Sommerville, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. x, xiii.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p. xiv.

⁵¹ M.Ashley, *England in the Seventeenth Century, (1603-1714)*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd, 1962), p. 164.

⁵² Filmer, *Patriarcha*, pp. 10-12.

⁵³ Downie, *The Succession*, pp. 22-24; Filmer, *Patriarcha*, p. 12; G.J.Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought. The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), pp. 121-122, 136-149.

succession. “Those public solemnities before mentioned do either serve for an open testification of the inheritor’s right, or belongeth to the form of inducting of him into possession of that thing he hath right unto [Hooker VIII.ii.8.].⁵⁴ This was why Hooker had insisted that laws “do not take their constraining force from the quality of such as devise them but from the power that doth give them the strength of laws [Hooker I.x.8.].”⁵⁵

These were truly amazing statements for somebody to make who was familiar with Book VIII. Whilst the *Polity* and *Patriarcha* agreed that the family provided the point of departure for political society, Hooker’s belief in an original compact would have been complete anathema to Filmer. Hooker’s belief in a compact was based upon the presupposition that law was intrinsically excellent, and that all power perfected its self through a tightly defined law. *Patriarcha*, however, insisted that sovereign power operated through laws which possessed no authority beyond the will of their maker, and that it was impossible for any ruler to be limited least of all by his own compact.⁵⁶ Filmer was clearly not ignorant of these conflicting opinions, however, since he attempted to solve the dilemma by acknowledging the importance of Hooker compared to a dwarf such as himself. As a dwarf it was his job to rectify the errors and omissions from which even the “giants of scholarship” were not immune.⁵⁷

In spite of such ingenuity, however, Filmer’s political interest in Hooker remained exceptional. During the exclusion crisis Tories were anxious to ensure that Book VIII remained marginalized, and therefore preferred to keep Hooker out of their political arguments. Any inclination that they may have had to absorb Hooker’s broadly-based political doctrine was indefinitely postponed by the vitriolic response which their publication of Filmer provoked. Instead they were driven to magnify royal authority even further than their predecessors. For example Robert Brady, the historian, insisted that all the liberties and

⁵⁴ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, pp. 21-22; Schochet, *Patriarchalism*, pp. 127-130.

Since Filmer belonged to the pre-Walton generation he clearly had no qualms about accepting the validity of Book VIII.

⁵⁵ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, p. 57.

⁵⁶ J. Daly, *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*, (London: University of Toronto Press, 1979), p. 34.

⁵⁷ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, pp. 4-5.

privileges which the people could claim to possess “were the grants and concessions of the kings of this nation, and derived from the crown.”⁵⁸

Rather surprisingly Filmer’s qualified acceptance of Book VIII as the genuine work of Hooker failed to encourage any widespread Whig usage of it. By admitting that Hooker could have held political opinions which were not conducive to the Tory case he ought to have encouraged exclusionist usage of the *Polity*. The Whigs proved remarkably reluctant, however, to refer to Hooker. The only exception was Algernon Sidney, the republican writer, who produced his *Discussions Concerning Government* in response to *Patriarcha*.⁵⁹ It was not published until 1698, but it is clear that the manuscript was known to many of his contemporaries. In the *Discussions* Sidney demonstrated his considerable irritation at Filmer’s misuse of the *Polity*. He insisted that “if Hooker, be a man of such great authority, I cannot offend in transcribing his words, and shewing how vilely he is abused by Filmer.”⁶⁰ Absolute monarchy based upon paternal right, as described by Filmer, could not be located within the *Polity*. Hooker had plainly stated that it was “impossible that any should have a compleat lawful power over a multitude consisting of so many Families, as every politick Society doth, but by consent of Men, or immediate appointment from God.”⁶¹

Although kings were the first magistrates to be established in this way the *Polity* refused to accept the supposition that this made regal government the only acceptable form of political authority. “So that in a word, all publick Regiment, of what kind soever, seemeth evidently to have risen from...consultation and composition between men, judging it convenient and behoofeful.”⁶² Filmer’s belief in a continuous hereditary succession had never been a reality. The sons of Vespasian and Constantine, for example, had inherited the Roman Empire in spite of their fathers’ conquest having been by force. This had been totally contrary

⁵⁸ Miller, *Restoration*, p. 64.

⁵⁹ Burgess, *Absolute Monarchy*, p. 214; Downie, *The Succession*, p. 24.

⁶⁰ A. Sidney, *Discussions Concerning Government*, (London: Printed by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1698), p. 86.

Although not published until after Sidney’s death his *Discussions* had existed in manuscript form since 1680.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, p. 86.

⁶² J. Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623-1677*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 69; Sidney, *Discussions*, p. 85.

to Hooker's belief that "meer Tyranny...can create no right" of rule for them or their children.⁶³ The right to government could only be granted by the populace whose duty it was to ensure that only the "wisest, best, and most valiant Men, should be placed in the Offices where Wisdom, Vertue and Valour are requisite."⁶⁴ Filmer "not troubling himself with these things," however, had refused to acknowledge the importance which Hooker attributed to consent at coronations and institutions.⁶⁵ This made him guilty of bold censures, which "do not only reach Mr.Hooker, whose modesty and peacefulness of spirit is no less esteemed than his Learning; but the Scriptures also, and the best of the human Authors, upon whom he founded his opinions."⁶⁶

Such a belief in the importance of popular consent was not based upon "untrue and unnatural conceits set abroad by the Seedsmen of Rebellion; but real Truths grounded upon the Laws of God and Nature, acknowledged and practised by Mankind."⁶⁷ Without the consent of the populace it would be impossible for government to function effectively since the law making process depended upon their agreement.⁶⁸ Filmer had been anxious to reserve the power of law-making exclusively to the king, but this was not substantiated by the *Polity*.⁶⁹ It was true, Sidney accepted, that by law all revenues raised by customs or excise went to the monarch, but this was only because Parliament had assented to the legislation which made this grant.⁷⁰ For any monarch to reserve exclusively the right of law making to himself without the consent of his subjects would turn him into a tyrant.⁷¹

Filmer's contrary determination to use Hooker in his justification of a divine-right monarchy was only possible through his deliberate discounting of all opposite statements within the *Polity*. *Patriarcha's* attempt to justify this selective usage of Hooker through the

⁶³ Sidney, *Discussions*, p. 88.

⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 105.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 91.

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 86.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 87.

⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 457.

⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 457.

⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 458.

⁷¹ Ibid, p. 85.

image of the giant and dwarf was an arrogantly conceived conceit. In a sarcastic jibe Sidney commented that all were subject to error except Filmer “who is rendered infallible through Pride, Ignorance, and Impudence.” He also suggested that it was nonsensical to believe that Hooker could be wrong concerning his fundamentals, but right when he came to build upon it. We are asked to believe that the dwarf standing on the ground can now see that which the giant overlooked. “If there be sense in this, the Giant must be blind, or have such eyes only as are of no use to him.”⁷²

Sidney, of course, was equally guilty of “misunderstanding” Hooker, in his desire to use him to demonstrate that “the choice and constitution of government...is merely from the people.”⁷³ Hooker had believed in an original compact between people and governor, but would have been horrified by the way Sidney had manipulated it to suggest that the sovereign was merely the servant of the people. Such extremity sat just as uneasily with Book VIII as Filmer’s elevated understanding of divine-right. The different period and political context in which the *Polity* had been constructed meant that it did not sit easily with the claims engendered by either side in the exclusion crisis. This polemical unsuitability of the *Polity*, combined with Walton’s enduring disparagement of Book VIII, ensured that Filmer’s and Sidney’s political interest in Hooker remained exceptional.

Such complications did not affect the ecclesiastical significance of the *Polity*, however, whose theological positioning was once again discussed as a result of the exclusion crisis. For the first time since the early 1660s there was a real revival of the long-stifled discussion concerning the settlement of the Church. To the Tories the potential threat to the English Church was enormous since the Whig exclusionists enjoyed considerable nonconformist support. Nonconformists had been active in campaigning on behalf of Whig candidates at the elections to the three exclusion Parliaments, and in London most of the “rank-and-file” supporters were dissenters. Many of the leading men in the Whig movement were also united to the nonconformists by a history of opposition to the Anglican establishment. The earl of Shaftesbury, although he conformed under the provisions of the 1673 Test Act, remained a

⁷² Ibid, p. 13.

⁷³ Downie, *The Succession*, p. 99; Sidney, *Discussions*, p. 86.

fierce critic of the ecclesiastical structure.⁷⁴ This impression of a straight divide between members of the established Church and nonconformists was not totally accurate, since at least a quarter of the Anglican members of the Commons had supported the first reading of the exclusion bill.⁷⁵ Nevertheless there were sufficient numbers of vociferous anti-Anglican dissenters who were prepared to use the political crisis to promote their own religious ideas.

Baxter, for example, temporarily changed his attitude towards the *Polity* and proclaimed Hooker as a leading representative of the “Old Church of England” to whom the godly could have conformed. He bemoaned that “conformity now was quite another thing than it was before, and to us far more intolerable; that Bilson, Hooker and Usher would have been Nonconformists now, and that Stillingfleet had debased his earlier services to Protestantism.”⁷⁶ The Prayer Book had been brought in on the “pretense of easing us, and the Act of Uniformity,” but had served to make conformity so much “another thing than it was before” that Hooker would have been a nonconformist.⁷⁷ New conformity was pursued so zealously that it was guilty of a “thirst for blood.” Such a persecution would ensure “that Hooker, Bilson, Jewel &c are hanged (which must be done if you extend the punishment to all Nonconformists).”

This behaviour would make it clear to the people, however, that whilst holy men such as these were made to suffer, thousands of fornicators, drunkards, and atheists were left in peace.⁷⁸ The situation was deeply reminiscent of Hooker’s story concerning Ithacius and his drive to expunge the heresy of Priscillianism. Such was his obsession with this one issue “that every man careful of virtuous conversations, studious of scripture, and given to abstinence in diet, was set down in his Character for suspected Priscillianists: For whom it should be expedient to approve their soundness of faith, by a more licentiousness and loose behaviour.”

⁷⁴ T.Harris, ‘Introduction: Revisiting the Restoration,’ in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990), pp. 10-11; Miller, *Charles II*, pp. 315, 320; Spurr, ‘Religion in Restoration England,’ pp. 122-123.

⁷⁵ Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, p. 141.

⁷⁶ Lamont, *Baxter and the Millennium*, p. 246.

⁷⁷ R.Baxter, *Richard Baxters Answer to Dr Edward Stillingfleet’s Charge of Separation*, (London: Printed for Neil Simmons, 1680), the Preface.

⁷⁸ R.Baxter, *An Apology for the Nonconformists Ministry*, (London: Printed for Thomas Parkhurst, 1681), pp. 200-201; G.F.Nuttall, *Richard Baxter*, (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965), p. 60.

All Anglicans who had become obsessed with ensuring strict conformity needed to consider those words of Hooker “and perceive what service such do the Church.”⁷⁹

The Church need not be narrow and prelatical since Hooker provided the model for a broad comprehensive settlement. This had been recognized by Gauden who had taught him “to esteem the ancient and Catholike Government of Godly Bishops, as Moderators and Presidents among the Presbyters” as proposed by Ussher.⁸⁰ “Add to this, what he saith in Hookers life of the late Bishops, and remember that this man was one of the Keenest Writers against the adversaries of the Bishops in his time; And though he was made a bishop when the king was restored, yet he was the only Bishop” at Savoy which sought to facilitate a reconciliation.⁸¹ Baxter also commended Gauden’s publication of Book VII because it was now possible to build upon earlier references in Books III and V to show that Hooker could be “answered as far as our cause requireth.”⁸²

Although Hooker remained enthusiastic concerning old style prelacy, his arguments when compared to other treatises were “next to nothing nor worth a Reply.”⁸³ The logical conclusion of Book VII was not prelacy, but limited episcopacy. Hooker’s examination of early Church episcopacy had demonstrated the lawfulness of one bishop’s authority over a single church. Such a “definition visibly reacheth to no other sort of Bishops, but such as we oppose not.” The *Polity’s* affirmation of cathedrals as mirrors in which the face of apostolic antiquity was perfectly preserved, was an affirmation that “every City or Church” should have “a Bishop and Presbytery of their own.”⁸⁴ Attempts by Hooker to demonstrate that early Church bishops, such as Cyprian, enjoyed control over many churches were flawed since he “never once attempteth to prove that Cyprian had more Churches, yea, or Assemblies than One; but only that he was over the Presbyters in one Church or Assembly, and as an Archbishop as

⁷⁹ Baxter, *An Apology for the Nonconformists Ministry*, p. 225.

⁸⁰ R. Baxter, *A Treatise of Episcopacy*, (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons and Thomas Simmons, 1681), p. 219.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, p. 220.

⁸² *Ibid*, pp. 48, 112, 220.

⁸³ *Ibid*, p. 48.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p. 50.

over Bishops.”⁸⁵

Hooker’s apparent reluctance to define whether “the government of Lay-men (under the Bishop) belong to the Presbyters or not” was also somewhat frustrating for Baxter. It was important that they did share authority since this “is the matter of most of our difference; and we take him for no Pastor or Presbyter that is without the power of government, nor that to be a true Church (in sensu politico) that hath no other Pastor.”⁸⁶ S.Jerome, as quoted by Hooker, certainly appeared to support their joint government, since he had advised the bishops never to “disdain the advice of their Presbyters, but to use their Authority with so much the greater humility and moderation.” Hooker, whilst insisting that ordination must be undertaken by a bishop, had also conceded that the custom of England and the council of Carthage permitted that presbyters might impose hands along with the bishop.”⁸⁷ Neither was Hooker able to deny that “the ancient use was for the Bishops to excommunicate with the College of his Assistant Presbyters; but he taunteth Beza for thinking that this may not be changed.”⁸⁸ Baxter insisted that the Church’s belief that she possessed the authority to reserve the task of excommunication exclusively to the bishops was based upon the false supposition that all power was originally in the hands of a collective body. If the bishops were to insist on adhering to this principle then they had no choice but to permit “the Ordination of Presbyters alone, because the Church can give them power.”⁸⁹

So confident was Baxter in his manipulation of the *Polity* in support of limited episcopacy that he challenged anyone to find any thing in Hooker “against the points which I defend, or for that Prelacy which I oppose, any more worth the answering than this I have recited, let him rejoyce in the perfection of his eye-sight.”⁹⁰ Hooker had found so little to say with regard to “the main point in Controversie, our Diocesan Form of Prelacy” that it was

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 50.

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 48.

⁸⁷ Baxter, *Treatise of Episcopacy*, p. 50; Ussher had also cited the fourth Council of Carthage in support of the principle that bishops’ judgments given without the consent of their clergy were void. C.Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 250.

⁸⁸ Baxter, *A Treatise Of Episcopacy*, p. 51.

⁸⁹ Ibid, p. 51.

⁹⁰ Baxter, *A Treatise Of Episcopacy*, p. 113; Powicke, *Baxter Under The Cross*, pp. 220-221.

foolish to try and attempt to extract an argument from him in support of such episcopal pretensions as some high churchmen had attempted.⁹¹ Any objective reading of the *Polity* would demonstrate that within the primitive Church a form of episcopal government existed, which although not of divine institution, it would be right to seek to maintain. The primitive form, however, was “so far unlike the present frame of the English Hierarchy, that they are neither the same, nor yet consistent.”⁹² If anyone could be found to reduce Hooker’s eight books of “tedious Discourses into Syllogism..., I believe it will not fill up one half or quarter of a page; and it shall, God-willing, be soon answered.”⁹³

This attempt by Baxter to mobilize Hooker in his own defence was a clear challenge to the Restoration reputation of the judicious divine, and led to immediate Anglican howls of condemnation.⁹⁴ The author of *Speculum Baxterianum* was incredulous that Baxter, having read Hooker, was unable to conform and continued to plead for liberty of conscience.⁹⁵ William Denton, Charles II’s anti-Presbyterian physician, was equally impatient with those troublesome consciences which threatened Church and State. Hooker, Denton reminded his readers, had rightly recognized that the English Church possessed her own “Discipline of Government and Judicature” which was “Independent of any other Person, Church or Power.”⁹⁶ It was not necessary, therefore, for the Church to be reduced to the state which she was in at the end of the apostolic era. “A thing in the opinion of Judicious Hooker, neither possible or certain, nor yet absolutely convenient. For that which was used in their dayes, the Scripture (he saith) doth not fully declare, so that making those times the Rule and Canon of Church Government, they make a rule which not being possible to be fully known, is as impossible to be fully kept.”⁹⁷

⁹¹ Baxter, *A Treatise Of Episcopacy*, p. 51.

⁹² Baxter, *Apology For The Nonconformists*, p. 60.

⁹³ Baxter, *A Treatise Of Episcopacy*, p. 52.

⁹⁴ Edward Stillingfleet’s republication of *Irenicum* was an exceptional plea for moderation.

⁹⁵ M.A., *Speculum Baxterianum, Being Sober and Useful Reflections upon a Treatise of Mr Richard Baxter’s, Stiled [Sacriligious Desertion of the Holy Ministry Rebuked, and Tolerated Preaching of the Gospel Vindicated] with a Most Serious Preface to the Same, out of the Said Mr.Baxter*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1680), p. 48.

⁹⁶ W.Denton, *Jus Caesaris et Ecclesiae Vere Dictae. Or a Treatise of Independency, Presbytery, the Power of Kings, and of the Church, or of the Brethren in Ecclesiastical Concerns, Government Discipline, &c.*, (London: [Printed for the Author], 1681), p. 3.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 56.

Since Anglicanism was based upon such a sure ground, the writer of *Sober and Useful Reflections* felt perfectly justified in his defence of enforced conformity. Hooker, he was sure, would have been unsympathetic to the nonconformist pleas. Consequently he condemned Baxter vigorously for his false equation of the Church of England hierarchy's pursuit of conformity with Hooker's account of the misplaced zeal of Ithacius. It was sacrilegious effrontery for Baxter to compare the "Ithacian Masters" with Anglicans, and the "Ithacian Synod" to convocation.⁹⁸ His citation of the story had deliberately failed to complete the quotation or put it into its proper context. Hooker had concluded the passage by relating the sores caused by Ithacius with the wounds the puritans were inflicting upon the English Church. The words of the *Polity* reflected as much "upon Baxterianism, as remarkably as the foregoing do upon Ithacianism on the one, hand, and Martinism on the other."⁹⁹

The gradual subsidence of the panic caused by the popish plot ensured that such opinions increasingly came to dominate the debate. When Charles finally dissolved the Oxford Parliament of March 1681 it not only demonstrated the royal victory over the exclusionists, but served to confirm that the challenge to Hooker's Anglican identity had also been rebuffed. The Whigs had enjoyed remarkable electoral success between 1679 and 1681, but their behaviour was sufficiently reminiscent of the traumas of the Civil War to produce a sharp reaction.¹⁰⁰ At the Restoration Charles had been reluctant to support the Hooker-sponsored loyalty of the Cavaliers, but after the Whig "betrayal" he appealed unequivocally to it.¹⁰¹ The lord lieutenancies were remade in the Tory image, Whigs lost their positions as J.P.s or in the militia, and new town charters ensured that civic corporations could be remodelled in the royal interest.¹⁰²

Loyal Tories were in no doubt that Hooker would have approved of these actions. Sir

⁹⁸ M.A., *Speculum Baxterianum*, p. 17.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁰⁰ Bliss, *Restoration*, p. 3.

¹⁰¹ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, p. 205; Miller, *Charles II*, pp. 347-349, 373; Miller, *Restoration*, p. 66

¹⁰² Bliss, *Restoration*, p. 45; R.Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 419-420, 433-434; Miller, *Restoration*, p. 67.

William Dugdale, the Tory historian, reminded his readers that Book VIII only spoke otherwise because a group of Civil War puritans had obtained possession of Hooker's manuscripts and corrupted them to support a "malevolent design for the utter extirpation of monarchy."¹⁰³ They had omitted "divers passages which were unsutable to their purposes; and instead thereof inserting what they thought might give countenance to their present evil practises: amongst which was this, in terminis, that, though the King were singulis Major, yet he was universis minor."¹⁰⁴ The fabrication of the text had consequently ensured that many "well meaning people were miserably captivated and drawn to their Party." Contemporary individuals had no such excuse for flirting with ideas of mixed monarchy, however, since Hooker's true political credentials had been rediscovered through Walton's "perfect Narrative." He had corrected the numerous errors perpetuated by Gauden's account, and demonstrated the unreliability of the latter books.¹⁰⁵

James Tyrrell, the Whig historian, was appalled by the hold which this Tory belief in the "Divine and Patriarchal Right of absolute Monarchy" had achieved amongst the clergy and universities. It would not be long, he insisted, before they had given up all those privileges which their ancestors had been so careful to achieve.¹⁰⁶ Certainly by the 1680s a new generation of ministers trained in the high Church attitudes of Oxford and Cambridge had come to dominate the parishes. Their tutors had taught them that the doctrine of passive obedience was "in a manner...the badge and character of the Church of England."¹⁰⁷ This extravagant devotion towards the king reinforced their equation of political loyalty with religious conformity, and led to a vigorous renewal of the campaign against nonconformity. Urban nonconformist communities which had quietly flourished under sympathetic Whig corporations swiftly discovered that the new Tory magistrates were determined to enforce the full penalties of the law.¹⁰⁸ Robert Creighton, the bishop of Bath and Wells, insisted that it was a mistake

¹⁰³ W.Dugdale, *A Short View of the Late Troubles in England*, (Oxford: Printed for Moses Pitt, 1681), p. 38.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 39.

¹⁰⁵ Dugdale, *Short View*, pp. 39-40; Miller, *Charles II*, p. 349.

¹⁰⁶ J.Tyrrell, *Patriarch Non Monarcha, the Patriarch Unmonarch'd: Being Observations on a Late Treatise and Divers Other Miscellances, Published under the Name of Sir Robert Filmer Baronet*, (London: Printed for Richard Janeway, 1681), the Preface.

¹⁰⁷ I.M.Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 235.

¹⁰⁸ Miller, *Restoration*, p. 70.

to treat them gently, because it only served to confirm their schismatic behaviour. “The warm Sunbeams will sometimes but harden that Clay, which heavier Storms may soften and make pliable to the Government.”¹⁰⁹

Such renewed anti-nonconformist zeal was predictably justified by recourse to Hooker’s incontestable justification of the Anglican position. His clear rebuttal of the dissenters’ criticisms of the Church’s liturgy made him an ideal authority to support the 1680s drive towards uniformity. It was no coincidence, therefore, that in 1682 a new edition of the *Polity*, accompanied by Walton’s life, was published and other treatises which drew upon Hooker by William Falkner and L’Estrange were reissued.¹¹⁰ New polemical writers such as Nathaniel Resbury, the popular preacher, or John Dryden were also just as enthusiastic in their citation of Hooker.¹¹¹ When Dryden attempted to set out the dangers of nonconformity in his preface to *Religio Laici* he immediately turned to the *Life* for his inspiration. Like Walton he emphasized his own insufficiencies, and insisted that in the handling of such a weighty matter he would “lay no unhallow’d hand upon the Ark; but wait on it, with the Reverence that becomes me at a distance.” He was confident in his belief that the sectaries threatened the stability of civil and religious society, however, since this stance was supported by Hooker. Those who cared to consult his works “may see by what gradations they proceeded; from their dislike of Cap and Surplice, the very next step was Admonitions to the Parliament against the whole Government Ecclesiastical: then came out Volumes...in defence of their other Tenets: and immediately, practices were set on foot to erect their Discipline without Authority.” If such an admonition was not heeded we “should cause Posterity to feel those Evils, which as yet are more easy for us to present, than they would be for them to remedy.”¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ R.Creyghton, *The Vanity of the Dissenters Plea for Their Separation from the Church of England*, (London: Printed by F.Wallis, for Benj.Tooke, 1682), p. 4.

¹¹⁰ R.Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr Richard Hooker, in Eight Books of Ecclesiastical Polity, Compleated out of His Own Manuscripts*, (London: Printed for Robert Scot, Thomas Basset, John Wright and Richard Chiswel, 1682); W.Falkner, *Libertas Ecclesiastica: Or, a Discourse Vindicating the Lawfulness of these Things, Which are Chiefly Excepted against in the Church of England in its Liturgy and Worship*, (London: Printed by J.M. for Walter Kettilby, 1683), pp. 41, 214, 252, 354, 467, 515, 536-537; R.L’Estrange, *Interest Mistaken: Or the Holy Cheat*, 1681; Novarr, *Life of Walton*, p. 279.

¹¹¹ N.Resbury, *The Case of the Cross in Baptism Considered. Wherein Is Shewed, that There Is Nothing in It, as It Is Used in the Church of England, that Can Be Any Just Reasons of Separation from It*, (London: Printed for Fincham Gardiner, 1684), p. 14.

¹¹² J.Dryden, *Religio Laici. Or a Layman’s Faith. A Poem*, (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1682), the Preface.

The assured nature of such treatises was indicative of the confidence felt by loyal Anglicans at the end of Charles's reign. There was no obvious challenge to their supremacy, since the royal-sponsored period of reaction after the exclusion crisis largely silenced the Whigs. The earl of Shaftesbury, the unofficial Whig leader, died in exile in 1683, and the exposure of the Rye House Plot had only served to stiffen the Tory resolve. Throughout the country, popular addresses to the king, sermons, and ballads proclaimed obedience and non-resistance to be indicative of true Anglicanism, and the divine right of kings to be the essence of the English constitution.¹¹³ There was certainly no indication, in spite of the claims of the traditional historiography, that religion was being marginalized by the end of the Restoration period.¹¹⁴ On the contrary, Hookerian Anglicanism appeared to have reached the zenith of its success. Such was the apparent timelessness of the *Polity* that James Bonnell, the accountant general of Ireland, was moved to praise Hooker as an "author who writ with a primitive spirit but modern judgment and correctness."¹¹⁵

Some nonconformist sympathizers such as John Evans, the rector of St Ethelburga, London, still endeavoured to dispute this Anglican interpretation of Hooker, but they were exceptional. Hooker's reputation as a proponent of the Prayer Book ceremonies was too well established for his use of the *Polity* against kneeling reception at Communion to be taken seriously.¹¹⁶ The attempt by Codrington, a Bristol Whig, to use the *Polity* to undermine patriarchal notions of society similarly fell on deaf ears.¹¹⁷ The atmosphere of the 1680s was simply not receptive to any suggestion that government was achieved by the mutual consent of the people. After the upheavals of the Civil War, and the ominous indication of a possible repeat during the exclusion crisis, it was not surprising that most Anglicans were anxious for a more elevated defence of both Church and State. This they achieved through the divine-right argument which gave little scope to theories of sacred ordained natural laws, or to the problem

¹¹³ Bliss, *Restoration*, p. 48.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, p. 30.

¹¹⁵ H.McAdoo, 'Richard Hooker,' in *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, (Wantage: Ikon Productions, 1992), (pp. 105-125), p. 110.

¹¹⁶ J.Evans, *The Case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament Stated & Resolved, Part II*, (London: Printed for T,Basset, B.Took, and F.Gardiner, 1683), p. 45.

¹¹⁷ R.Ashcroft, *Revolutionary Politics &c. Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

The enduring legacy of Walton ensured that Anglicans could retain their devotion to Hooker's ecclesiastical doctrine, whilst quietly ignoring the political and religious sentiments of the posthumous books. The acquiescence of most writers to this belief, willingly or through ignorance, ensured that it was almost impossible for them to be quoted in a contrary way. Any dissension was minimal and could easily be discounted, as in the case of Baxter. It certainly did nothing to discourage late Restoration England from enthusiastically maintaining the rhetoric of Hooker, even if the reality was not an accurate fulfilment of the *Polity's* vision of the Christian Church and State. Charles II, despite his Roman leanings, vociferously supported the religious and political status quo during the last years of his reign. Such tacit support for the Hooker-sponsored ideal enabled him to strengthen and maintain the affection of his subjects, and ensured that his reign subsequently acquired the Tory reputation for having been a golden era. It was no accident that for many years the commemoration of his restoration as spiritual and temporal head was solemnly kept by the Church to mark the restitution of the "proper" order.

¹¹⁸ J. Gascoigne, 'Church And State Unified: Hooker's Rationale for the English Post-Reformation Order,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, Feb. 1997, (pp. 23-34), p. 32.

Catholic Attempts To Appropriate Hooker

Anglican attitudes towards Roman Catholicism in the seventeenth century were deeply ambiguous and even contradictory. Take the divergence of views amongst the members of the Restoration episcopal bench. Archbishop Sheldon argued that Anglicanism had merely thrown off the Roman corruptions and, therefore, stressed that the two churches were part of the same Church Catholic. In contrast Bishop Reynolds, who had been a member of the Westminster Assembly, preferred to stress Anglicanism's agreement with Scotch Presbyterianism and English nonconformity. The Church had lived with such indecision since the sixteenth century, however, and in normal circumstances it was usually possible for these differing opinions to co-exist. Only when the English Church was under pressure, such as under the Commonwealth or during the reign of James II, did her inconsistencies make her particularly vulnerable to Catholic polemicists.

Such polemicists were then naturally anxious to exploit these inconsistencies in pursuit of their missionary agenda. Chief amongst these was the rather nebulous content of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Since the writer of the *Polity* was at the forefront of the English Church's identity, it was particularly damaging to use him in support of Catholic polemic. Although Hooker's *Polity* was well within the Protestant mainstream, it had drawn a concerned response from the godly authors of *A Christian Letter* in his own lifetime. The writers expressed their conformity to the forms and practices of the Church, but expressed anxiety at what they viewed to be novel and crypto-popish ideas within Hooker's works.¹ Up until the 1620s the whole thrust of English theological polemic had been directed against Catholicism. Hooker's reluctance to combat Rome more aggressively was highly unusual, and suggested that some ulterior motivation might lurk below his "positively phrased agnosticism."² Although this was not the case, it provided a sufficient basis of suspicion for Roman Catholics to exploit to their own advantage. It is the purpose of this chapter to determine those areas in which Hooker's linguistic ambiguities were useful to the Catholic cause during the Commonwealth and Restoration, and to evaluate the success of the Anglican

¹ A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 17, 69.

² *Ibid* p. 198.

response. Since the accession of a Roman monarch radically challenged the Protestant dominance, the reign of James II will be considered separately, to elucidate the effect it had upon both Catholic and Anglican attitudes towards the *Polity*.

Hooker himself could never have anticipated that the *Polity* would become embroiled in such a Catholic versus Anglican debate. Since the *Polity* had been written to demonstrate the reasonableness of conformity to moderate puritans it would have undermined his whole argument to suggest that the English Church looked Romewards. It is not difficult, however, deliberately to misread the *Polity*. In his earlier *Discourse of Justification* Hooker had insisted that Rome's errors overthrew the foundation of faith by their consequences, and had associated her with the Babylon foretold in Revelation. The *Polity* was much more ambiguous regarding Rome's status as a true Church, however, and described her as being "part of the familie of Jesus Christ." Whilst even the most apocalyptic Calvinist accepted that the presence of antichrist within a Church did not necessarily make it false, Hooker appeared to be suggesting that Rome was on the same level as the reformed churches.³

The *Polity's* anxiety to locate the remnants of a true Church within Rome was solely motivated, however, by Hooker's desire to ensure the salvation of his forefathers, who had had no choice but to live in that communion before the Reformation. Hooker insisted that a merciful God could have granted salvation to Catholics and was adamant that he would rather die "if it be ever proved, That simply an Error doth exclude a Pope or Cardinal in such a case utterly from hope of life."⁴ This desire to ensure salvation for previous generations by defending Rome's status as a church was a perfectly respectable Calvinist position, since Robert Some, a former master of Peterhouse, had used these grounds.⁵ It was Hooker's ignoring of the whole concept of the true Church, and his insistence that the Roman doctrine of justification only overthrew the foundation of faith "by consequent" and not "directly" which caused alarm. Hooker permitted the adherence of pre-Reformation believers to a false doctrine

³ R.Hooker, *The Ecclesiastical Polity*, Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.10, p. 202; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 146-147.

⁴ I.Walton, *The Life and Death of Richard Hooker*, in R.Hooker, *The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1666), p. 18., Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 162.

⁵ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 133; See also J.Hall, *The True Cavalier Examined by His Principles; And Found Not Guilty of Schism Sedition*, (London: Printed by Tho.Newcomb, 1656), pp. 27, 29.

of merit without necessarily drawing the logical consequence that this tended towards the overthrow of Christ's merits alone. The latter distinction, of course, could easily have been used to secure the salvation of post-Reformation Catholics.⁶ Hooker himself had denied that any such a consequence should be drawn, and emphasized that the Catholic doctrine of justification by inherent grace was "the mystery of the Man of Sin."⁷ Catholics could only be saved if they were ignorant of the most important established doctrine of their Church, and by their belief in an article of faith which their Church rejected.⁸

By the 1620s, however, Hooker's belief that Catholics could only be saved by becoming Protestants had become increasingly diluted. Laudian writers followed Hooker by seldom linking the division between the visible and invisible Church with the doctrine of predestination.⁹ As has already been seen Laud actually cited Hooker in support of his belief that it was essential to locate the invisible Church within the visible one.¹⁰ The growing high Church emphasis on the importance of sacraments also served to cloud Hooker's anti-Roman credentials.¹¹ This adoption of Hooker by the Laudians to promote a less Calvinist and more catholic understanding of the Church indirectly made the *Polity* an attractive polemical tool to Roman apologists. Hooker was no closet papist, but the apparent ambivalence of the *Polity* towards Rome made it easy for Catholics to exploit his writings to demonstrate that Catholicism was his logical spiritual destination. As the celebrated convert Lady Falkland put it, the *Polity* had "left her hanging in the air; for having brought her so far (which she thought he did very reasonably) she saw not how, nor at what, she could stop, till she returned to the

⁶ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 286, 296.

This interpretation was supported by Covell's defence of Hooker which suggested that the disagreement between Rome and Protestantism over justification could be resolved since it was based upon a misunderstanding. Ultimately both sides agreed that any individual who had been saved would manifest their salvation through the production of good works. The puritans, who opposed Hooker, were guilty of suggesting that a justifying faith was void of good works. Those individuals who denied Rome to be a true Church were the same people who denied that the established faith was a true Church. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 147, 212.

⁷ R. Bauckham, 'Hooker, Travers and the Church of Rome in the 1580s,' in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 29, 1978, (pp. 37-50), pp. 47-50.

⁸ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 136, 211.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 158.

¹⁰ W. Laud, *Works*, Vol. II, p. 155 Note N.

¹¹ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 200; R. Mountague, *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeal from Two Unjust Informers*, (London: Printed by H.L. for Matthew Lownes, 1625), pp. 290-291.

Church from whence they were come.”¹²

Roman polemicists had long striven to demolish the English Church by stressing her inherent divisions, so it was not difficult to present Hooker as struggling to retain a catholic identity for his Church against a groundswell of Protestant hostility. Matthias Wilson, an English Jesuit, enthusiastically described how the “most learned Protestants...stand with us against their Protestant Brethren in most of the chiefest points of Religion controverted between us.”¹³ Conal Condren suggests that it was this Jesuitical determination to quote Hooker as being representative of the English Church which forced her defenders to grant him the “misleading role as spokesman of the Church of England.”¹⁴ English converts such as Hugh Cressy, Thomas Vane, and Thomas Bayly were certainly aware of the universal respect felt towards Hooker within the English Church, and were therefore able to deploy him to maximum advantage. Michael Questier describes how all polemicists were happy to distort their sources, since they were conscious that a more balanced exposition might hinder their reader from arriving at the correct decision concerning which Church possessed a monopoly of truth.¹⁵

This Catholic usage of the *Polity* exploited Hooker’s purported willingness to “acknowledge Papists to be of the family of Christ.”¹⁶ The doctrine of the universality of grace, and that Christ died for all, was affirmed “by Mr Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*.”¹⁷ This meant that it was possible for the Roman Church “to be reputed a part of the House of

¹² A.Cary, *The Lady Falkland: Her Life in Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland. The Tragedy of Mariam the Fair Queen of Jewry with the Lady Falkland: By One of Her Daughters*, B.Weller and M.W.Ferguson, (eds.), (London: University of California Press Ltd, 1994), (pp. 183-275), p. 190; See also H.P.Cressy, *Exomologesis: Or a Faithful Narration of the Occasion and Motives of the Conversion unto Catholike Unity*, (Paris: Chez Jean Billaine, 1680), p. 22.

¹³ M.Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned by the Expreste Verdict and Sentence of Protestants*, (Douay: [No Printer], 1654), the Preface A3.

¹⁴ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 540-541; C.Condren, ‘The Creation of Richard Hooker’s Public Authority: Rhetoric, Reputation and Reassessment,’ In *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, Feb.1997, (pp. 35-59), p.43.

¹⁵ J.W.Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660. With Special Reference to Henry Hammond*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), p. 73; M.C.Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 26.

¹⁶ P.Scot, *A Treatise of the Schism of England. Wherein Particularly Mr. Hales and Mr.Hobbs are Modestly Accosted*, (Amsterdam: [No Printer], 1650), p. 38.

¹⁷ Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned*, p. 308.

God, [and] a limb of the visible Church of Christ.”¹⁸ Unlike most other Protestant divines Hooker even acknowledged the insufficiency of faith that was not accompanied by good works.¹⁹ Such an opinion set him apart from Luther, and the writers of the *Christian Letter*, who claimed that faith did not justify “unless it be without even the least good works.”²⁰ Hooker, of course, had no problem in accepting that Christian belief persisted in the Roman Church since he recognized that the English Church had grown out of it. Consequently he was happy to acknowledge Rome to be part of Christ’s family and hoped “that to reform our selves, is not to sever our selves from the Church we were of before.”²¹

Hooker’s continued interest in the Catholic Church was not just promoted by a generous desire to further ecumenical relations, however, but out of a need to establish and confirm the English Church’s dependency upon Rome. Peter Talbot, a future Catholic archbishop of Dublin, described how it was a recognition that “if they reject us, themselves can not pretend to be a Church, having neither succession of Bishops, nor (without begging our testimony) any solid prooffe, that Scripture is Gods Word.”²² This latter allegation that without the Church Protestantism lacked any external authority for the authentication of scripture had long been one of the staple Catholic arguments against the break with Rome. Since Hooker had adamantly refused to countenance the puritan belief in sola scriptura it was not difficult to suggest that the *Polity* had perceived the need for the Roman magisterium.

Hooker was widely commended for his perception that scripture could not validate itself.²³ Sylvester Norris, a Jesuit who had been implicated in the Gunpowder Plot,

¹⁸ Ibid, pp. 345, 438.

¹⁹ Ibid, pp. 311, 314, 320, 336, 337-338.

²⁰ Ibid, pp. 64, 311, 314, 320, 336, 345, 337-338, 438.

²¹ Ibid, p. 446.

²² P.Talbot, *A Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith, and Heresie, with Reflexion upon the Nullitie of the English Protestant Church, and Clergy*, (Rouen: [No Printer], 1657), p. 33.

²³ T.Bayly, *A Legacie Left to Protestants, Containing Eighteen Controversies*, (Douai: [No Printer], 1654), p. 3; J.Mumford, *The Question of Questions Which Rightly Resolved, Resolves All Our Questions in Religion. This Question Is Who Ought to Be Our Judge in All these Our Differences?* ([No Place Of Publication]: [No Printer], 1686), p. 44; R.Smith, *Of the Al-Sufficient External Proposer of Matters of Faith*, (Paris: [No Printer], 1653), pp. 351,456; T.Thorold, *Labyrinthus Cantuarensis: Or Doctor Lawd’s Labyrinth. Being an Anser to the Late Archbishop of Canterburies Relation of a Conference between Himselpe and Mr Fisher, Etc.*, (Paris: Printed by John Billaine, 1658), p. 94; T.Vane, *A Lost Sheep Returned Home: Or, the Motives of the Conversion to the Catholike Faith*, (Paris: [No Printer], 1649), p. 12.

favourably recalled “this learned Protestant (whose calamity is the more to be deplored, in that retayning divers Catholike grounds, he forbare to build a fayth answerable therto)” who had admitted that it was impossible for scripture itself to determine the canon.²⁴ The *Polity*, according to Thomas Vane, asserted that scripture could not be self authenticating, because the “outward letter sealed with the inward witsse of the spirit, is not a sufficient warrant, for every particular man to judge and approve the scripture to be Canonically.”²⁵ Even if one book of scripture had listed which other texts should be included within the canon, it would “require another Scripture to give credit to it: neither could we ever come to any pause whereupon to rest unlesse beside Scripture there were something else acknowledged.”²⁶

Since Hooker had clearly recognized the need for an independent external authority, Richard Smith, the aged bishop of Chalcedon, claimed to be amazed at his inconsistency when he attempted to show by reason and the light of nature that we “have no word of God, but the Scripture.”²⁷ This made the “main ground of Protestants faith...no object of divine faith...which we are bound to believe under pain of damnation. Surely I see not, how Protestants can make agree these two points of their doctrine: There is no Word of God unwritten, necessarie to be beleved and, That scripture is the word of God, is a word of God unwritten, necessarie to be beleved.”²⁸ Thomas Thorold, an English Jesuit, was in agreement with Smith that these two conflicting opinions could not co-exist. “Now seeing Hooker affirms, that this sound and infallible Demonstration that Scripture proceeds from God, is not the word of God, or Scripture itself, he must either settle no infallible ground at all...or must say, that the Tradition of the Church is that ground.”²⁹ Hooker consequently recognized that the only tenable position for him to adopt was the latter one and flew “from scriptures unto tradition for the prooffe of this matter.”³⁰

²⁴ S.Norris, *The Pseudo-Scripturist*, (St Omer: English College Press, 1623), F3v.

²⁵ Vane, *A Lost Sheep*, p. 21.

²⁶ Ibid, pp. 16-17.

²⁷ Smith, *Of the Al-Sufficient Proposer*, pp. 351, 458.

²⁸ Ibid, pp. 458-459.

²⁹ Thorold, *Labyrinthus Cantuarensis*, pp. 93, 119.

³⁰ E.Maihew, *A Treatise of the Grounds of the Old and Newe Religion*, ([No Place of Publication]: English secret press, 1698), p. 49.

Smith agreed that it was the only logical destination since “the light of the scripture is not so great, that without the Church shew it to us, we can see it.”³¹ Thomas Bayly, who had been a royalist divine before his conversion in the 1640s, insisted that if Hooker had believed the scriptures to “have been written by men divinely inspired...why may they not also by men assisted by the holy Ghost be made infallibly known unto us?”³² Edward Knott, the Jesuit, went even further and confidently informed his readers that the *Polity* had admonished them “to do whatsoever the sentence of judicial and final sentence shall determine, yea though it seem to swerve utterly from that which is right.”³³ Smith concurred that this was the norm since Hooker had only allowed for the possibility of private revelation in the most exceptional of circumstances.³⁴ For Hugh Cressy, another English convert, such an insistence on the necessity of setting up one above “the rest in God’s Church to suppress the Seeds of Dissension” was tantamount to a recognition of the papal supremacy.³⁵

Since the *Polity* expected the Church both to verify and to direct the reading of scripture, Hooker had clearly recognized that she must be a visible authoritative body. This was rather different from most reformers who placed most of their emphasis upon the Church spiritual. Abraham Woodhead, who had been converted to Catholicism whilst visiting the continent in the 1640s, described how Hooker agreed with them that “the Holy Catholick Church...is a visible Church in all ages, consisting of Pastors as well as People, in external Profession, and Communion contra, distinct to Heretical, and Schismatical Churches, when such there happen to be in any age.”³⁶ The clergy provided a necessary “State, whereunto the

³¹ Smith, *Of the Al-Sufficient External Proposer*, pp. 364, 412, 457; Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned*, pp. 341, 344.

³² T.Bayly, *An End to Controversie between the Roman Catholique, and the Protestant Religions Justified, by All the Severall Manner of Ways, Whereby, All Kinds of Controversies, of What Nature So Ever, Are Usually, or Can Possibly Be Determined*, (Douai: [No Printer], 1654), p. 128; Bayly, *A Legacie Left to Protestants*, p. 3.

³³ Bayly, *An End to Controversie*, p. 54; E.Knott, *Mercy and Truth, or Charity Maytained by Catholiques*, in W.Chillingworth, *Works*, (London: Printed by B.Motte, for J.Walthoe, J.Knapton, B.Tooke, D.Midwinter, R.Robinson, and B.Cowse, 1719), Vol.II, p. 182; Smith, *Of the Al-Sufficient Proposer*, p. 455.

³⁴ Smith, *Of the Al-Sufficient External Proposer*, p. 239.

³⁵ H.P.Cressy, *Roman-Catholick Doctrines No Novelties: Or an Answer to Dr Pierce’s Court-Sermon, Miscall’d the Primitive Rule of Reformation*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1663), pp. 88, 305.

³⁶ P.Talbot, *A Treatise of Religion and Government With Reflexions upon the Cause and Care of Englands Late Distempers and Present Dangers*, (London: [No Printer], 1670), p.232; Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned*, pp. 117-118, 321; Woodhead, *A Rational Account of Roman-Catholicks Concerning the Ecclesiastical Guide in Controversies of Religion*, (London: [No Printer], 1673), pp. 154, 394.

rest of Gods people must be subject, as touching things that appertain to their Soules health.”³⁷ Talbot acknowledged that Hooker had striven to give ordination a spiritual character which was imprinted upon the soul by the imposition of hands, and not by the bare formality of the letters patent which were granted by a secular magistrate.³⁸ Extraordinary vocations were possible, but these had not happened, according to Wilson, since apostolic times.³⁹ Woodhead described how Hooker would not tolerate any disturbance of the peace of the Church, except for those quiet complaints which were made to their ecclesiastical superiors.⁴⁰

Hooker’s recognition of the importance of the visible Church was also confirmed by the similarity of his sacramental teachings to those of Rome. According to Wilson, Hooker had properly comprehended that the intention of the Church was vital to the successful administration of her sacramental ministry. Furthermore the *Polity* testified to his belief that certain sacraments imprinted an indelible character upon the individual.⁴¹ Baptism and the eucharist, of course, were recognized as sacraments within the articles of the English Church. Hooker, however, as Wilson recorded, also continued to regard practices such as confirmation sacramentally through his belief that the imposition of hands conferred an inward grace.⁴² Bayly provocatively pronounced that he would use Hooker amongst “their own prime Doctors to confute” all opponents of its sacramental importance.⁴³ It was even more contentious when Woodhead attempted to show that there was substantial agreement over Christ’s effective presence in the sacrament of the Eucharist. “Would not one think; touching the Substantial...Presence of Christ’s Body in the Eucharist all were agreed.” It only remained debatable “whether, when the Sacrament is administered, Christ be whole within man only; or else his Body and Blood be also externally seated in the very presence of the consecrated

³⁷ Woodhead, *A Rational Account*, p. 14.

³⁸ Bayly, *An End to Controversie*, p. 292; Talbot, *A Treatise of Religion*, p. 106.

³⁹ Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned*, p. 327.

⁴⁰ Woodhead, *A Rational Account*, p. 181.

⁴¹ Anon, *The Roman Church Vindicated and M S Convicted of a Manifold False-Witnesse against Her*, (London: [No Printer], 1674), p. 170; W. Stuart, *Presbyteries Triall: Or the Occasion, and Motives of Conversion to the Catholique Faith, of a Person of Quality, in Scotland. To Which Is Subioyned, a Little Touch-Stone of the Presbyterian Covenant*, (Paris: [No Printer], 1657), pp. 199-200; Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned*, p. 328.

⁴² Wilson, *Protestancy Condemned*, p. 325.

⁴³ Bayly, *An End to Controversie*, p. 289.

Elements themselves.”⁴⁴

Such a usage of Hooker was naturally unpopular with English churchmen who did not want the reputation of their great Anglican exemplar to be sullied by any suggestion that he was a secret papist.⁴⁵ It would clearly have become impossible to cite a Hooker who pointed Romewards against nonconformist criticisms of the perceived popery of the Prayer Book. And indeed, even as it was, nonconformists were suspicious of Hooker’s anti-papal polemic. As early as 1640 Robert Baillie, one of the most learned of the earlier Scotch Presbyterian divines, had suggested that Hooker was sympathetic towards Rome. During his attack on the Sarum rite order of the new Scottish Prayer Book he criticized Hooker for encouraging belief in the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ’s body and blood.⁴⁶ Subsequently other puritan divines such as Henry Jeanes and George Gillespie also condemned Hooker’s crypto-popery.⁴⁷

Although such Protestant attacks upon Hooker’s reformed credentials were exceptional, they were indicative of the sort of perceptions which high churchmen could not have afforded to become widespread. Jeanes received a swift response from Henry Hammond, and Charles I had been so angered by Gillespie’s *Dispute Against Popish Ceremonies* that he ordered it to be publicly burnt. Charles Carlton observes that whether “its reasonable complaint that the liturgy had been “pressed upon us by naked will and authority, without giving any reason to satisfy

⁴⁴ Woodhead based this claim on two passages lifted out of context from Book V’s discussion of the eucharist. “And thus Mr Hooker, 1.5.s.67.p, 357. - Wherefore should the world continue still distracted; and vent with so manifold contentions; when there remaineth now no controversie, saving only about the Subject, where Christ is? - Nor does anything rest doubtfull in this; but whether, when the sacrament is administred, Christ be whole within man only; or else his Body, and Blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated Elements themselves. - And p. 359 - His Body, and his Blood (saith he) are in that very subject, whereunto they minister life, not only by effect, and operation, even as the Influence, &c.” Woodhead, *A Rational Account*, p. 66.

⁴⁵ C.J.Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Richard Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), p. 8.

⁴⁶ R.Baillie, *Ladensium, the Canterburians Self-Conviction*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1640), pp. 107-108; J.Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, (Harlow: Longman Group U.K. Limited, 1993), p. 35.

⁴⁷ G.Gillespie, *A Dispute against the English -Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland. Wherein Not Only Our Own Arguments against the Same Are Strongly Confuted, but Likewise the Answers and Defences of Our Opposites, Such as Hooker, Mortoune, Sprint, Paybody, Saravia, Tilen, Spotiswode, Lindsey, Forbesse, &c.Particularly Confuted*, (Edinburgh: [No Printer], 1660), pp. 10, 107-109; H.Hammond, *The Grounds of Uniformity from I Cor.14.40. Vindicated from Mr Jeanes's Exceptions to One Passage in the View of the Directory*, in *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D. the Second Volume. Containing a Collection of Discourses in Defence of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.II, Part II, (pp. 240-247), p. 246; Packer, *The Transformation*, pp. 71-87.

our consciences,” or its absurd charge that Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes - two of the king’s favourite theologians - were Catholics, upset him the more one cannot say.”⁴⁸

In spite of Carlton’s scepticism concerning Charles’s motivations it is clear that other high churchmen were worried by the damage being done to Hooker’s reputation through growing attempts to appropriate him as a Catholic. They recognized that the Anglican stature of the *Polity* would only be secure if they could expose this usage of Hooker as fraudulent. This they endeavoured to achieve through detailed refutation of the false Catholic manipulation of Hooker’s text. Primarily they sought to answer the Roman claim that Hooker’s recognition of the inability of scripture to validate itself necessitated the authority of an infallible church to confirm it. Laud responded that it was not in God’s nature to demand of his creatures that they be able to demonstrate rationally the primacy of scripture. “Rather faith is the basic requirement, with such rational demonstration as may support faith.”⁴⁹ Hooker had rightly recognized that something external to scripture was needed but this merely provided the “first outward Motive” which led men to esteem it.⁵⁰

Edward Stillingfleet agreed that Hooker made the authority of the Church the primary inducement to faith, “and that rational evidence, which discovers itself in the Doctrine revealed to be that which it is finally resolved into? For, as his Lordship saith on this very place of Hooker, the resolution of Faith ever settles upon the farthest reason it can, not upon the first inducement.”⁵¹ It would therefore be more appropriate to talk of Hooker’s approval for “Humane-Tradition” rather than “Church-Tradition.” By human testimony Hooker was speaking of the sort “whereby we know there is such a City as Rome,...wherein the ground of

⁴⁸ C. Carlton, *Charles I. The Personal Monarch*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 198.

⁴⁹ J.E. Booty, ‘Hooker and Anglicanism,’ in *Studies in Richard Hooker*, W. Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 207-239), p. 222.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 222-223.

Thomas Thorold responded to Laud by accusing him of selective quotation. He insisted that Laud’s citation of the *Polity* to show that tradition opened the door to the comprehension of scripture was misleading. We should let Hooker “be his own Interpreter, and shew what he means by opening the knowledge of Scripture. He speaks thus. The Scriptures do not teach us the things that are of God, unless we did credit men, who have taught us, that the words of Scripture do signifie those things.” Thorold, *Labyrinthus Cantuarensis*, p. 95.

⁵¹ E. Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestants Religion*, in *The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character*, (London: Printed by J. Hepinshall, for Henry and George Mortlock, 1709), Vol. IV, (pp. 1-658), p. 226.

our perswasion can be nothing else but humane testimony.”⁵² The Catholic Church based authority upon a supposed supernatural infallibility, but Hooker had believed in a “rational Infallibility.” Such a rational authority could not prevent all forms of deception, but was sufficient to deal with all “reasonable doubting.” It was plain that “the utmost certainty which things are capable of, is with him Infallible certainty; and so a sound and Infallible ground of Faith is a certain ground, which we all assert may be had without your Churches Infallible Testimony.”⁵³ Any attempt “to shew that Hooker made the authority of the Church that unto which faith is lastly resolved” was an unfaithful representation of his meaning.⁵⁴

William Chillingworth’s *Religion of Protestants* which was directed against the use made of the *Polity* by his Catholic opponents Brerely and Knott went even further, and refused even to countenance Hooker’s belief in passive consent to the Church’s teaching concerning scripture.⁵⁵ Through a series of marginal notes, accompanying selected quotations from the eighth chapter of Book III, Chillingworth insisted Hooker had recognized that natural reason built “on principles common to all men, is the last resolution; unto which the Churches Authority is but the first inducement.”⁵⁶ This textual commentary was a clear attempt to disguise Hooker’s original emphasis upon the importance of the Church as the collective body which was responsible for ensuring that the “light of nature” was exercised in accord with scripture.⁵⁷

When Hooker asserted that the whole Church acknowledged the verity of scripture

⁵² Ibid, p. 226.

⁵³ Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account*, p. 226; T.Tennison, *A Discourse Concerning a Guide in Matters of Faith; With Respect Especially to the Romish Pretence of the Necessity of Such a One as Is Infallible*, (London: Printed for Ben.Tooke, 1683), p. 36.

⁵⁴ Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account*, p. 225.

⁵⁵ In 1628 William Chillingworth had become a Catholic due to his desire to restore “the Christian unity that had been shattered by the Reformation.” The “logic of Hooker” led to Rome because she was a rational comprehensive Church that respected her members intellectual integrity. Chillingworth’s brief sojourn on the Catholic continent swiftly convinced him that he had been mistaken, however, and he returned to England. H.Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans, Seventeenth Century Essays*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1987), p. 204.

⁵⁶ Booty, ‘Hooker and Anglicanism,’ pp. 227, 229; W.Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants. A Safe Way to Salvation. Or an Answer to a Booke Entitled Mercy and Truth, or, Charity Maintain’d by Catholiques. Which Pretends to Prove the Contrary*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1638), pp. 64-65.

⁵⁷ Hooker, R., *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Books I-IV*, G.Edelen, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol.I, Bk.III, Chpt.8, pp. 220-221.

Chillingworth chose to interpret this as a narrow reference to the national Church whose “Authority...makes an Argument which presseth a man’s modesty more than his reason.” Similarly when Hooker stated that it would be impudence to disagree with the whole Church on such a matter, Chillingworth rejoined that this implied that there “may be a just cause to be of a contrary mind, and that then it were no impudence to be so.”⁵⁸ Neither was Chillingworth’s understanding of the *Polity* challenged by Hooker’s claim that once the authority of scripture or the Church had been accepted, “the more we bestow our labour upon reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing it self doth answer our received opinion concerning it.” He merely countered, in a manner suited to his own convictions and contrary to Catholic teachings, that Hooker had sought to demonstrate that “the Authority of the Church is not the pause whereon we rest: we had need of more assurance, and the intrinsecal arguments afford it.”⁵⁹

Whilst Chillingworth’s learning continued to be widely respected, these were not views which commended themselves to most churchmen. The diminishing of the Church’s authority not only damaged Rome, but it also weakened the position of Anglicanism with regard to nonconformity. Such possible complications ensured that many churchmen consequently preferred to avoid lengthy considerations of specific Roman abuses of the *Polity*, and concentrated upon a more abstract portrayal of Hooker’s impeccable loyalty to his Protestant heritage. This was clearly the motivation of Timothy Puller, a *via media* Anglican, when he published his *Moderation of the Church of England* in response to the growing tension of the exclusion crisis. Generally Restoration churchmen had used Hooker to remind nonconformists of the importance of a formal liturgy. Puller in an attempt to appeal to a broader Protestant consensus, however, reminded his readers that Hooker had recognized the “truth and goodness” which could result from a well constructed sermon.⁶⁰ He also sought to distance Hooker from the Roman Church by defining his true opinions concerning Catholicism. This included a large section from the third book of the *Polity* in which Hooker described how the English Church had recoiled from the “gross and grievous abominations” of

⁵⁸ Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, p. 50.

⁵⁹ Booty, ‘Hooker and Anglicanism,’ p. 227.

⁶⁰ T. Puller, *The Moderation of the Church of England, Considered as Useful for Allaying the Present Distempers Which the Indisposition of Time Hath Contracted*, (London: Printed by J.M. for Richard Chiswell, 1679), pp. 176-177, 181.

Rome.⁶¹

Rome's pretension to a narrow infallible exclusivity was also condemned by William Denton, a physician and political writer, who cited Hooker to demonstrate that such power had been awarded neither by God or by the whole political society of men.⁶² William Brough, another high churchman, used the *Polity* to show that baptism into membership of the Church was not the restricted property of Rome. One only became separated from the Church by renouncing Christ's baptism, or by being baptized a second time.⁶³ Such a usage of Hooker was not solely limited to Anglicans. Thomas Barlow, a decided Calvinist and uncompromising opponent of the papists, went further in his condemnation than Brough or Denton, since he not only condemned Rome's claims to infallibility but denounced the pope as Antichrist. That Rome was occupied by Antichrist had been held by "Jewel, Witaker, Rainolds, Hooker, etc, and Arminius himself, as is evident in his writings extant."⁶⁴

Barlow's claim regarding Hooker was mistaken - certainly it is not substantiated by the *Polity*. It does testify to a determined desire, however, to show that Hooker was unsympathetic to Catholicism, and, through his mistaken belief concerning the *Polity*, draws attention to its inability to provide sufficient ammunition for an offensive against Rome. Hooker was primarily an anti-puritan writer rather than an anti-Catholic one. There had been no pressing need for the *Polity* to defend the Church from Catholicism since the challenge of the 1590s came not from the papists, but from the puritans. A definitive answer to the former had already been provided by John Jewel's *Apologia*.⁶⁵ Consequently Joseph Glanvill legitimately ignored Hooker, but listed Jewel as being amongst those excellent writings which

⁶¹ Ibid, p. 439.

⁶² W.Denton, *Jus Caesaris et Ecclesiae Vere Dictae. Or a Treatise of Independency, Presbytery, the Power of Kings, and of the Church, or of the Brethren in Ecclesiastical Concerns, Government Discipline, &c*, (London: Printed for the author, 1681), p. 208.

⁶³ W.Brough, *A Preservative against the Plague of Schisme. Or, an Antidote against the Separation of the Time*, (London: Printed for I.Clarke, 1652), p. 51.

⁶⁴ R.Beddard, 'Sheldon and Anglican Recovery,' in *The Historical Journal*, Vol.19, (1976), (pp. 1005-1017), p. 1007.

⁶⁵ J.Jewel, *An Apologie or Aunswer In Defence of the Church of England, Concerning the State of Religion Used in the Same*, (Londini: Reginalde Wolfe, 1562).

have “Confuted, exposed, [and] triumph’d over the numerous Errors of that Church.”⁶⁶ Hooker would not have been offended by his absence since he had lavished praise upon the writings of Jewel within the *Polity*.

Hooker’s enthusiasm for such a staunch Protestant was naturally an embarrassment to many Catholics. Talbot expressed his incredulity that Hooker should have commended a divine who was guilty of such impudency and hypocrisy. It was a “strange expression of Mr. Hooker in favour of Bp Jewell, which argues want of truth and sincerity in so learned a man as Mr Hooker was known to be.”⁶⁷ Bayly also recognized that Jewel was his true adversary. “Jewel (whom Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Policy* calleth the worthiest Protestant Divine that Christendom bred for so many hundred years past) made a challenge, that he would be tryed concerning the truth of his Religion, by the testimony of the Antient Fathers living within the time of six hundred years after Christ.”⁶⁸ Bayly may, of course, have deliberately chosen to contrast the anti-Catholic Jewel against the peaceable Hooker’s more reasonable approach to the Roman Church.

Isaac Walton, the Anglican “hagiographer,” also drew attention to Hooker’s peaceable attitude regarding Rome, but he endeavoured to use it to strengthen the appeal of Anglicanism. There was no stream of negative invective against Rome within the *Polity*, because the position of the English Church was not deemed to be threatened by Catholicism. Any growth in Catholic familiarity with Hooker was to be welcomed, because the *Polity* demonstrated the sound basis on which the English Church was constructed. Walton recalled how the enthusiastic reception given to the publication of the first four books of the *Polity* had prompted two leading exiled Catholics to procure copies. William Allen, who had been made a cardinal for his endeavours in the struggle to reconvert England, and Thomas Stapleton, a leading Catholic controversialist, were improbable individuals to display any enthusiasm towards a work that promoted the English Church. Walton insisted, however, that the *Polity* was such “a wonder to them” that they commended it to Pope Clement VIII.

⁶⁶ J. Glanvill, *The Zealous, and Impartial Protestant Shewing Some Great, but Less Heeded Dangers of Popery*, (London: Printed by M.C. for Henry Brome, 1681), p. 13.

⁶⁷ Talbot, *A Treatise of Religion*, pp. 293, 294.

⁶⁸ Bayly, *An End to Controversie*, pp. 309-310.

They described how “a poor obscure English priest had writ four such Books of Laws, and Church Polity, and in a style that exprest so Grave and such Humble Majesty with clear demonstration of Reason, that in all their readings they had not met with any that exceeded him.” Clement, according to Walton, was suitably impressed and instructed them to translate part of the *Polity* into Latin and then read it to him. At the end he exclaimed that there “is no Learning that this man hath not searcht into, nothing too hard for his understanding: This man indeed deserves the name of an Author; his Books will get reverence by Age, for there is in them such seeds of Eternity, that if the rest be like this they shall last until Fire shall consume all Learning.”⁶⁹ This was not just a charming anecdote since Walton had powerfully illustrated how the defender of an Anglican faith, which Catholics viewed as schismatic and corrupt, was so esteemed that he had even been revered by the head of the Roman Church. Any Catholic praise of Hooker was not to be treated as an embarrassment, but as a useful enhancement of his learned reputation.

This was a major claim and Walton was clearly anxious to show that it was not unfounded. He therefore included a letter by Henry King which expressed his pleasure that the *Life* had drawn attention to Hooker’s high standing with Clement VIII, and other leading Catholics such as Robert Stapleton. As a youth he had heard of the popularity of the *Polity* amongst Catholics from “persons of worth” that had travelled in Italy.”⁷⁰ King’s letter shows that there was some historical basis for Walton’s claim that English Catholics read Hooker from an early point, but the specific details of his story are probably invented. It seems implausible, for example, that Allen ever saw a copy of the *Polity* since he died in the same year that it was published. Doubts about the factual reliability of this story, however, should not detract from Walton’s success in providing a response to those critics who were concerned by the Roman usage of the *Polity*. Rather than fretting at the Catholic interest in Hooker he had shown that they should rejoice that Rome had been forced to recognize the *Polity* as a work of seminal importance.

Walton, however, was not able to equip the English Church against more tangible

⁶⁹ W.J.Bouwsma, ‘Hooker in the Context of European Cultural History,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 41-57), p. 43; Walton, *Life*, pp. 20-21.

⁷⁰ Letter of Doctor King to Isaac Walton, in R.Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1666).

dangers to her status. The accession of a Catholic monarch, as has already been suggested, did not sit easily with the Hooker-sanctioned Restoration settlement of Church and State. James had inverted the whole religious and political status quo when he insisted that Hooker, who had been such an inspiration to the English churchmanship of his martyred father, had prompted his conversion to Rome.⁷¹ It is not difficult to see how there was bound to be a conflict of religious interests between the Anglican Church and a Roman Catholic monarch. The entrenched opposition of the English Church to Catholicism would have made it a major feat for James to have acted as supreme governor without causing any sort of offence. His memoirs record that “it was impossible for the king to do the least thing in favour of religion, which did not give disgust, notwithstanding all his precautions not to break in upon his engagement; and that the liberties he permitted to Catholics should in no ways interfere with the possessions, privileges and immunities of the Church of England.”⁷²

Although James was undoubtedly grossly misrepresented by early biographers of his reign as an intolerant Catholic bigot, he did facilitate a climate in which the production of Catholic devotional works and treatises which were hostile to the religious claims of Anglicanism was positively encouraged.⁷³ At least 1348 Catholic books were published between 1641 and 1700, of which a third were printed during James’s brief reign.⁷⁴ Any references which they made to the *Polity* only served to support the Anglican belief that Catholicism was bent upon subverting the English Church. In a militant passage with a clear analogy for the current generation of Anglicans, John Everard described how the Commonwealth abandonment of the English Church had happened through “God’s sweetly-chastising Mercy” so these scattered members might be received back into the Catholic Church. This was all as Hooker had predicted, in the fifth book of the *Polity*, when he anticipated that the Protestant church was not likely to continue beyond another eighty years. “Nor could he judge otherwise,” writes Everard, “seeing it bears evidently the Principles of corruption and

⁷¹ J.S. Clarke, (ed.), *The Life of James II. King of England*, (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1816), Vol.I, p. 630.

⁷² Clarke, *James II*, Vol.II, p. 79.

⁷³ L.Echard, *The History of the Revolution and the Establishment of England in the Year 1688*, (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1725), p. 73; F.S.Ronalds, *The Attempted Whig Revolution of 1678-1681*, (Urbana: The University of Illinois, 1937), p. 167; F.C.Turner, *James II*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswode, 1948), pp. 238-239.

⁷⁴ T.H.Clancy, *English Catholic Books, 1641-1700*, (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), p. ix; J.R.Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), pp. 88-89.

mutability in its very constitution” and that “the first Governors of it being none of those to whom Christ promised his continual assistance to the worlds end.”⁷⁵

Many of the other proselytizing treatises which referred to the *Polity* were printings of earlier material, but the accession of a Catholic monarch gave them a new vibrancy and popularity. This enthusiasm for republishing earlier works is clearly illustrated by *Pax Vobis*, a work composed by an Irish Jesuit called Ignatius Brown, which had cited Hooker in support of the sacraments of confirmation and orders. There had been a solitary edition published in 1679, but by the end of James’s reign it had been reissued five times. The opportunity was also taken to publish works for the first time which had previously only existed in manuscript form. The title page of the Benedictine Richard Huddleston’s *A Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church* indicated that his nephew had waited until a favourable moment to publish his late uncle’s works, so that they might assist the “Common Good”. Like other missionary tracts from the 1640s and 1650s it predictably drew attention to Hooker’s recognition that scripture could not authenticate itself which meant that there was a need for a “Supream Tribunal.”⁷⁶

These treatises of Brown and Huddlestone display a common anxiety to show the areas of agreement between Anglicanism, as epitomized by Hooker, and Catholicism. By demonstrating such a parity of thought it was possible to show that many of the allegations made against Rome were Protestant distortions of the truth. It also served the useful polemical purpose of drawing attention to the numerous divisions within Protestantism between puritan polemicists and pseudo-Catholic writers. Under James II this largely implicit aim was given public expression through the works of John Gother. Gother, who effectively became the principal champion of the new generation of apologists, was familiar with Protestant perceptions of Rome since he had been brought up by Presbyterian parents that were hostile to Catholicism. In his leading work entitled *A Papist Misrepresented and Represented* he

⁷⁵ J.Everard, *A Winding-Sheet for the Schism of England, Contriv’d for to Inform the Ignorant, Resolve the Wavering and Confirm the Well Principled Roman Catholick*, (Dublin: [No Printer], 1687), p. 86.

⁷⁶ R.Huddleston, *A Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church. Composed Many Years Since by that Eminent Divine Mr Richard Huddleston of the English Congregation of St Benedict. And Now Published for the Common Good by His Nephew Mr. Jo. Huddleston of the Same Congregation. To Which Is Annexed His Late Majesty King Charles the Second His Papers Found in His Closet after His Decease*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1688), pp. 7, 9, 12.

described how he sought to “take off the Black and Dirt which has been thrown” at the Catholic Church and “let the World see, how much fairer she is, than she’s painted.”⁷⁷

Gother claimed to be surprised by the hostility with which Anglicans viewed Rome when they had so many things in common. Both groups were clearly conscious that the main threat to their exposition of the faith came from radical puritanism and not from each other. This has “been so very obvious to some great men of the Roman Communion, that they have applauded those of the English Clergy, who wrote against Dissenters, as excellent Defenders of the Catholic Cause.”⁷⁸ English churchmen such as Whitgift, Bancroft, Saravia and Sutcliffe were all worthy of commendation because of the way they had resisted “the Puritans.” Hooker was praised most extensively of all “for the Service he did the Church of Rome, in his Writings for the Worship, and Discipline of the Church of England has had the praises of the Romanists, as Mr Walton in his life has observ’d.” The importance of Hooker to the Catholics had also been recognized by “Dr King, sometime Bishop of Chichester” who had praised Walton for recalling how the *Polity* had been esteemed by Clement VIII.⁷⁹

This desire to show agreement with Hooker was particularly important with regard to the newly animated controversy of the nature of Christ’s presence in the eucharist. The controversy surrounding transubstantiation quickly acquired a new momentum when the celebration of the Mass was not just limited to a few embassy chapels, but was taking place in the monarch’s private chapel. Anglicans such as Gilbert Burnet were appalled at Catholicism for publicly disgracing the Christian religion by making God out of a piece of bread and then eating him.⁸⁰ Obadiah Walker, the master of University College, Oxford, who had received a licence to print Catholic works, helped mount the Roman offensive through the private publication of Abraham Woodhead’s eucharistic manuscripts. These older works of

⁷⁷ J.Gother, *A Papist Misrepresented, and Reflected: Or, a Twofold Character of Popery*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1685), p. 10; J.Gother, *The Papist Misrepresented and Represented. Second Part.*, (London: Printed by H.Hills, 1686).

⁷⁸ J.Gother, *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome, Evinced from the Concertation of Some of Her Sons with Their Brethren the Dissenters*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687), p. 60.

⁷⁹ Gother, *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome*, pp. 60-61.

⁸⁰ G.Burnet, *A Discourse Concerning Transubstantiation and Idolatry Being an Answer to the Bishop of Oxford’s Plea Relating to those Two Points*, (London: [No Printer], 1688), p. 8.

Woodhead were also supplemented by whole new crop of Eucharistic treatises. Some of this new generation of writers, such as Joshua Basset, an Anglican convert, continued to make reference to Hooker's sympathy for the Roman comprehension of the Eucharist.

Woodhead's writings, which made considerable reference to Hooker, were a particularly useful weapon to deploy against their Anglican opponents. He described how there were four commonly held Eucharistic positions. These were consubstantiation, transubstantiation, receptionism, and a development of the latter position, held by Hooker amongst others, which sought to retain some sort of presence other than that through the action of the Holy Ghost in the believer-recipient.⁸¹ Woodhead insisted that it was in fact a complete nonsense for Hooker to deny "the real or substantial presence of Christ's body" since he granted that "we receive by these instruments that which they are termed."⁸² It was clear that Hooker believed in the real presence and merely differed with the Catholic church over the manner of it.⁸³ "Mr Hooker well observes" that it is a question whether the presence is communicated "to the worthy Receiver only, or also to the elements or signs; or if present to the signs, whether not some other way present to them, than either" consubstantiation or transubstantiation.⁸⁴ This set him apart from individuals such as Jeremy Taylor who believed that only the "veretue and efficacy of Christ" were present.⁸⁵ Both Woodhead and Basset quoted the same passage from the *Polity* to show that Hooker had accepted that the Eucharist not only made the recipient a partaker of the "grace of that body and blood which was given for the life of the world," but was also able to impart "in true and real, tho mystical, manner, the very person of our Lord himself, whole, perfect, and entire."⁸⁶

⁸¹ A.Woodhead, *A Compendious Discourse upon the Eucharist. With Two Appendixes*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1688), p. 1.

⁸² Ibid, pp. 30-31.

⁸³ Woodhead, *A Compendious Discourse*, p. 28; A.Woodhead, *Two Discourses Concerning the Adoration of Our B.Saviour in the Eucharist*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1687), p. 24.

⁸⁴ Woodhead, *A Compendious Discourse*, p. 26.

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 27.

⁸⁶ J.Basset, *Reason, and Authority: Or the Motives of a Late Protestants Reconciliation to the Catholic Church. Together with Remarks upon Some Late Discourses against Transubstantiation*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687), pp. 67-68; F.Nicholson, *The Doctrine of the Church of England Concerning the Substantial Presence, and Adoration of Our B.Saviour in the Eucharist Asserted: With a Vindication of Two Discourses on that Subject, Publish'd at Oxford from the Exceptions of a Sacramentary Answer, Appendix I*, in A.Woodhead, *A Compendious Discourse on the Eucharist*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1688), (pp. 143-188), p. 148; Woodhead, *A Compendious Discourse*, p. 4; Woodhead, *Two Discourses*, p .6.

Consequently Woodhead and Basset were equally dismissive of attempts to distance Hooker from the Catholic Church, since the *Polity* made it quite clear that if Christ was present in the consecrated elements it was wrong for the world to remain “rent with ... manifold contentions.”⁸⁷ The Anglican insistence that Hooker had only believed the elements to be causes instrumental upon the worthy receiver was of no concern to Basset since “this is most consistent with the Protestant Notion of the Real Presence here contended for.”⁸⁸ Woodhead insisted that although Hooker appeared to differ from Rome over the subject of the Eucharistic presence his theological premises, if examined carefully, could be shown to be not that far removed from transubstantiation.⁸⁹ Hooker, himself, had openly admitted he was more sympathetic to transubstantiation than consubstantiation because it followed a shorter route to the same carnal conclusion.⁹⁰

Anglicans were naturally deeply offended by any suggestion that Hooker had shown their logical destination to be the theology of Rome. They were also sensitive to these allegations that they were in agreement with Rome because they fuelled the frequent nonconformist accusations that their forms and practices remained littered with popish idolatry.⁹¹ William Sherlock pretended to have only suffered mild irritation from Gother’s depiction of a Romewards-looking Church.⁹² The swiftness of his response, however, suggests rather more anxiety than he was prepared to admit. Sherlock was certainly not alone in his concern to respond to Roman propaganda, since over two hundred Anglican works of anti-papal polemic had been published by the end of James’s reign.⁹³

⁸⁷ Basset, *Reason And Authority*, p. 67.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p. 79.

⁸⁹ A. Woodhead, *Church-Government Part V. A Relation of the English Reformation, and the Lawfulness Thereof Examined by the Theses Deliver’d in the Four Former Parts*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1687), p. 167.

⁹⁰ Woodhead, *A Compendious Discourse*, p. 22.

⁹¹ N.N., *Old Popery as Good as New. Or the Unreasonableness of the Church of England in Some of Her Doctrines and Practices, and the Reasonableness of Liberty of Conscience*, (London: [No Printer], 1688), p. 9.

⁹² W. Sherlock, *A Vindication of Some Protestant Principles of Church-Unity and Catholick-Communion, from the Change of Agreement with the Church of Rome. In Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, an Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, Evinc’d from the Concertation of Some of Her Sons with Their Brethren the Dissenters*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1688), p. 1.

⁹³ E. Gee, *The Catalogue of All the Discourses Published against Popery, During the Reign of King James II. by the Members of the Church of England, and by the Nonconformists. With the Names of the Authors of Them*, (London: Printed by R. Baldwin, 1689).

Edward Gee, who was responsible for compiling a list of Anglican anti-Roman writings composed under James, suggested that the Catholics had not expected any resistance from the clergy of the English Church. They believed that they were not prepared to “mark themselves out for Destruction, by daring so much as to mutter anything, much less write against the King’s Religion, which it would have been very happy for the Priests...if they could have made it High-Treason at first, which I am confident they wanted no will to do.”⁹⁴ Gee is clearly exaggerating, but he is correct that it was difficult to criticize Catholicism without also appearing to attack the king. This could be done indirectly, however, through the production of works that stressed the validity of Anglican beliefs and practices. *A Companion to the Temple*, by Thomas Comber, the firmly Protestant precentor of York, was republished to reemphasize the devotional aspects of the Book of Common Prayer. His reference to Hooker was clearly made with the assumption that his Anglican testimony was sufficient to quash any conflicting opinion.⁹⁵

Most English clergy were, however, prepared to denounce publicly their Roman adversary since they “valued their Religion and their Church much more than their own Safety, or worldly Interest.”⁹⁶ Rather surprisingly Hooker’s contribution to this concerted Anglican response was almost nonexistent. The listing by William Wake, a zealous Protestant who attracted James II’s disapproval, of the *Polity* as one of the works he had consulted to write his *Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine Of the Church of England* was exceptional.⁹⁷ Hooker was absent from all but a couple of the 212 Anglican anti-popish works listed by Gee. Even when Hooker was quoted it was generally in response to the Roman “misinterpretation” of his writings rather than as part of a concerted attempt to deploy Hooker against

⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 4.

⁹⁵ T.Comber, *A Companion to the Temple: Or a Help to Devotion in the Use of the Common Prayer, Divided into Four Parts*, (London: Printed by Miles Flesher, for Robert Clavell, 1688), p. 42.

⁹⁶ Gee, *The Catalogue*, p. 4.

⁹⁷ N.Sykes, *William Wake Archbishop of Canterbury 1657-1737, Vol.I*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), pp. 17-32; W.Wake, *A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the Exceptions of Monsieur De Meaux, Late Bishop of Condom, and His Vindicator*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1686), p. 163.

This Anglican reluctance to use Hooker in a more combative way is best explained by the success with which he had been exploited by Roman Catholics. When Wake cited Hooker to criticize the refusal of Jacques Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, to countenance the possibility that unbaptized children might be saved, he suffered considerable Catholic criticism.⁹⁹ Joseph Johnston, a Catholic controversialist, charged Wake with deliberately misunderstanding Hooker and distorting the nature of the dispute between the bishop of Meaux and the Huguenots which had concerned “the Necessity of Baptism, and not the consequence of that Necessity.”¹⁰⁰

Roman enthusiasm for Hooker meant that Anglicans became reluctant to cite him in defence of their anti-Catholic position. It was far too easy for their religious opponents to manipulate any reference from the *Polity* to their own advantage. Henry Aldrich, a staunch Anglican canon of Christ Church, was doing something unusual when he used Hooker’s authority to dismiss the Roman claim that the English Church only held a Zwinglian view of the Eucharist. Only “if the Zwinglians hold as Mr Hooker says they do (whose authority for once we may safely prefer to the Discourser’s) they and we are agreed about the Eucharist in all that is essentially necessary: but then they hold more than a bare reception of the Benefits of our Saviour’s passion.”¹⁰¹ Aldrich had recognized that since so many Catholics had used the *Polity* to show support for a carnal presence, it would have been impossible to accuse Hooker of believing that the Eucharistic elements were no more than symbols.

⁹⁸ W. Wake, *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, in the Several Articles Proposed by Monsieur De Meaux, Late Bishop of Condom, in His Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1687), pp. 60-62.

⁹⁹ Sykes, *Wake*, Vol. I, p. 22; Wake, *A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, p. 37.

¹⁰⁰ J. Johnston, *A Reply to the Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England: Being a Further Vindication of the Bishop of Condom’s Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. With a Second Letter from the Bishop of Meaux*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687), p. 62.

¹⁰¹ H. Aldrich, *A Vindication of the Oxford Reply to Two Discourses There Printed A.D. 1687 Concerning the Adoration of Our Blessed Saviour in the Eucharist from the Exceptions Made to It in the Second Appendix To a Compendious Discourse on the Eucharist Published from the Same Press*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theatre, 1688), p. 50.

Such a deft manoeuvre was very much the exception. It was deemed to be much safer to put one's trust in sixteenth-century English divines whose Protestant credentials remained unquestioned. When discussing the failings of transubstantiation even Aldrich preferred to refer his readers to Thomas Cranmer's work on the Eucharist.¹⁰² Works by other Reformation martyrs were also published, sometimes for the first time, to show the purity of the English Church. As one commentator put it, all Protestants could not but "be glad to meet with any Relic...of our Blessed Martyrs."¹⁰³ The works of Bishop Jewel also continued to be received with great enthusiasm. William Sherlock in an appendix at the back of *A Papist Not Misrepresented by Protestants* included Jewel's Apologia, a letter concerning the council of Trent and a biography of him.¹⁰⁴ Many other leading Anglican writers such as William Clagett, Scrivener, and William Wake also quoted Jewel to the detriment of Rome.¹⁰⁵

This enthusiasm for the works of earlier Reformation divines, in preference to the *Polity*, did not mean that Anglicanism had quietly dropped the memory of Hooker. Any examination of literature on the Prayer Book, or tracts against the nonconformists, show that this was not the case. There was a reluctant acknowledgment, however, that the Catholics had skilfully and successfully manipulated their own creation of a high Church Anglican against themselves. This portrayal of Hooker as a pseudo-papist was clearly unacceptable, as the responses of Stillingfleet and Wake illustrate. Nevertheless there was a recognition that any discussion of Hooker, with regard to Catholicism, generally only served to advantage their opponents. The strictly anti-puritan polemical nature of the *Polity* meant that it was totally unsuited to this sort of debate. It was, therefore, considered to be more prudent to refrain from

¹⁰² H. Aldrich, *A Reply to Two Discourses Lately Printed at Oxford Concerning the Adoration of Our Blessed Saviour, in the Holy Eucharist*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1687), p. 50.

¹⁰³ N. Ridley, *An Account of a Disputation at Oxford Anno Dom, 1554 with a Treatise of the Blessed Sacrament: Both Written by Bishop Ridley, Martyr. To Which is Added a Letter Written by Mr. John Bradford, Never before Printed*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theatre, 1688).

¹⁰⁴ W. Sherlock, *A Papist Not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections. Upon the Answer to [A Papist Misrepresented and Represented]*, (London: Printed for Ric. Chiswel, 1686).

¹⁰⁵ W. Clagett, *A View of the Whole Controversy between the Representer and the Answerer With an Answer to the Representer's Last Reply: In Which Are Laid Open Some of the Methods by Which Protestants Are Misrepresented by Papists*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1687), p. 112; M. Scrivener, *A Course of Divinity: Or an Introduction to the Knowledge of the True Catholick Religion; Especially as Professed by the Church of England: In Two Parts; The One Containing, the Doctrine of Faith; The Other, the Form of Worship*, (London: Printed by Tho. Roycroft for Robert Clavil, 1674), p. 144; W. Wake, *A Discourse Concerning the Nature of Idolatry: In Which a Late Author's True and Only Notion of Idolatry is Considered and Confuted*, (London: Printed for William Rogers), p. 39.

using Hooker in anti-papal tracts, and to rely upon writers, such as Jewel, whose works had been deliberately written to counteract Roman pretensions.

William Of Orange And The Development Of Hooker The Whig

Restoration society had emphasized the dual importance of adherence to the English Church and passive obedience to the sovereign. Hooker was deemed to support these opinions since the discounting of the posthumous books, the calculated production of Walton's *Life*, and Filmer's *Patriarcha* had served to disguise his true opinions. The accession of James II, however, served to force a reappraisal of these assumptions. A series of royal measures to relieve Catholics of their legal burdens threatened the English Church, and placed the continued belief in passive adherence to the monarch under an impossible strain. The already diminished doctrine of passive obedience was further damaged by the extension of an invitation to William of Orange to enter England. At the popular level this invitation was justified by lauding him as the saviour of Protestantism against the Catholic James. Such a glossing of the situation, however, could not disguise the fact that the arrival of the Dutch forces had undermined the Restoration association of Church and State, and necessitated the development of an innovative political ideology which could justify a new civil settlement. In such a confused environment previously derided interpretations of Hooker, such as Sidney's *Discourses Concerning Government*, suddenly found a much more receptive audience.

It is the primary purpose of this chapter to elucidate the three strands of this Whig appropriation of Hooker, consisting of the radical belief that the general populace possessed natural political and legal freedoms, the more guarded emphasis on the parliamentary custodianship of historic legal rights, and the rise of religious latitudinarianism. The Tory response to this unwelcome renewal of interest in the *Polity* will then be considered. Some Tories, such as the non-jurors and their sympathizers, reacted by clinging stubbornly to their old high church belief in passive obedience. Others recognized the need for some sort of rapprochement with the new regime, but strove to reconcile it with the maintenance of their much cherished doctrine of non-resistance and devotion to the English Church. Only when the development of both Whig and Tory interpretations of the *Polity* has been charted will it be possible to evaluate what perception of Hooker came to dominate the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution.

The complexities of these post-1688 endeavours to adapt the Hooker-sanctioned belief in the essential unity of Church and State to an unsympathetic environment had been clearly anticipated by the exclusion crisis. Then it had been recognized that the Restoration ideology would be placed under considerable strain if James were to succeed to the throne. The Whigs had been adamant that James could not be trusted, since a Catholic monarch would seek to make himself absolute after the fashion of Louis XIV. He would do away with Parliament, subvert the rule of law, and govern with a standing army.¹ The Tories remained loyal to their principle of no resistance, and insisted that James would respect the Restoration settlement.² This distinction between James's private practice of an idolatrous faith but public maintenance of a Protestant Church was clearly fraught with danger, and was swiftly exposed as impractical on his accession when it became clear that his supposedly private devotions were influencing his public actions.³

Anglican reluctance to embrace royal policies swiftly led to nonconformist accusations of hypocrisy regarding their much vaunted doctrine of passive non-resistance. The writer of *Vox Cleri* typically demanded why the Church sought to restrain that power which she "hath acknowledged to be Imperial, Unlimited, Absolute, Free, Unconditional, and Independent...and by which alone she hath declared the Law ought to be interpreted?"⁴ Such accusations were not totally fair since many Anglicans still continued to struggle to find a way to express their loyalty whilst dissenting from the king's religious policies. This is clearly illustrated by the most famous crisis of James's reign, the "Declaration of Indulgence" and the

¹ M.Ashley, *James II*, (London: J.M.Dent and Sons Limited, 1977), pp. 114-115, 163, 188-199, 207-211; T.Harris, ' "Lives, Liberties and Estates" : Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990), p. 220; J.Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, (Harlow: Longman Group U.K. Limited, 1993), p. 428; J.R.Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), pp. 120-121; F.C.Turner, *James II*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948).

² M.Goldie, *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990), p. 87.

³ Ashley, *James II*, p.191.

⁴ *An Answer to the City-Conformists Letter, from the Country-Man, about Reading His Majesties Declaration*, (London: Printed by Mary Thompson, 1688), p. 6; N.N., *Old Popery as Good as New. Or the Unreasonableness of the Church of England in Some of Her Doctrines, and the Reasonableness of Liberty of Conscience*, (London: [No Printer], 1688); *Vox Cleri pro Rege: Or the Rights of the Imperial Sovereignty of the Crown of England Vindicated. In Reply to a Late Pamphlet Pretending to Answer a Book, Entitled the Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of England Concerning the King's Prerogative in Dispensing with Penal Laws*, (London: [No Printer], 1688), the Preface.

subsequent trial and acquittal of the seven bishops.⁵ The bishops strove to remain loyal to their doctrine of passive obedience, but respectfully refused to countenance an illegal royal dispensing power which sought to set aside at pleasure ecclesiastical and civil laws. Although the trial was an episcopal triumph they were anxious to ensure that the whole event was quickly forgotten and consequently urged the crowds to “fear God and honour the king.”⁶

James’s continued devotion to Catholicism was made bearable, of course, by the knowledge that his reign would not last indefinitely. Charles II had died at the age of fifty-five and James was already fifty-two when he became king. The daughters of James II had been brought up within the principles of the national Church so the eventual succession of a Protestant seemed to have been guaranteed.⁷ If James had not fathered a son there would have been no need for his opponents to have offered their famous invitation to William of Orange. Following William’s successful invasion it was generally agreed that it was not in the national interest that James should continue to rule as before. Reluctant revolutionaries such as Sancroft and his other episcopal colleagues struggled to retain James so that they might cement the old alliance of crown and bishops, but they were exceptional. James’s departure to France meant that there was no realistic chance of their being successful.⁸ After the refusal of William to accept a Regency, and Mary to rule on her own, the Convention Parliament declared them to be joint sovereigns. This was linked with the famous “Bill of Rights” which defined the extent of the royal prerogative. Such are the bare facts of history; they fail, however, to convey the immense difficulty involved in achieving this settlement. To many it was far from clear that Parliament had the authority to depose one king and to put another in his place. The heated debates of the two houses were widely reported, and a vast number of publications ensured that the discussion was brought into the public arena for years to come.

Enthusiasts for the 1689 settlement brought forward a plethora of arguments to support

⁵ Ashley, *James II*, pp. 224-228, 229; Jones, *Revolution*, pp. 122-127; K.E.Kirk, (ed.), *The Apostolic Ministry*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947), p. 438.

⁶ H.A.L.Rice, *Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non-Juror*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1964), p. 138.

⁷ Ashley, *James II*, pp. 218, 228-229; H.Belloc, *James II*, (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1934), p. 203; Jones, *Revolution*, p. 52; H. and M. Van Der Zee, *William and Mary*, (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 232-233.

⁸ W.A.Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries. Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 239.

their case. Foremost amongst these “authorities” was Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Polity*. The post Revolution Whig interest in the political writings of Hooker demonstrated their desire to maintain a semblance of continuity, and to confer respectability upon the new settlement. John Reeves, a late eighteenth century royalist writer, described how the Whigs strove to show that the principles on which the Revolution proceeded were founded in clearest reason and wisdom. “Having so strong an interest in keeping the eyes of the Nation fixed on that event, they went great lengths for the advancement of these opinions.”⁹ Since Hooker’s name had been so closely associated with the Restoration political and ecclesiastical settlement its adoption by supporters of the Revolution was a telling persuasive move. “The more James could be seen as the enemy of tradition, the easier it became to see him as ceasing to be a king; as being a victim of providence (through the instrument of a just invasion); as providing the extreme circumstances that might mark the limits of obedience.”¹⁰

Traditionally John Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government* have been viewed as the most important and authoritative post-1688 Whig deployment of Hooker. He inserted sixteen extracts from the *Polity* into his second treatise, and in his lists of recommended reading for young men he referred to it as one of “the most talked of” works concerning politics.¹¹ The *Treatises* were originally written as a response to Filmer’s *Patriarcha*, but their publication date ensured that they rapidly became associated with the maintenance of the 1688 settlement.¹² Locke clearly recognized their relevance since some of the text was amended to apply to the later situation.¹³ The preface hoped that his work would be “sufficient to establish the throne of our great redeemer, our present king William; to make good his title, in the consent of the people,...and to justifie to the world, the people of England, whose love of their just and

⁹ J.Reeves, *Thoughts on the English Government*, (London: Printed for J.Owen, 1795), p. 61.

¹⁰ R.I.Aaron, *John Locke*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 7; C.Condren, ‘The Creation of Richard Hooker’s Public Authority: Rhetoric, Reputation and Reassessment,’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, (pp. 35-59), pp. 53-54.

¹¹ J.Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, P.Laslett, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 56, 270.

¹² J.A.Downie, *To Settle the Succession of the State. Literature and Politics, 1678-1750*, (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd, 1994), pp. 24-25; J.Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, P.Laslett, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 51; Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 141; G.J.Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought. The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), pp. 213, 244-245.

¹³ Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1967), p. 46.

natural rights, with their resolutions to preserve them saved the nation when it was on the very brink of slavery and ruine.”¹⁴

Locke’s usage of Hooker was highly significant because, like Sidney, he took the radical step of inverting Hooker’s political theory into an anti-establishment principle. Hooker had striven to vindicate the ideal of an evolving consensus within public affairs. Locke, however, vested this political wisdom within the individual rather than the corporate body.¹⁵ He believed that the individual possessed natural political virtue, enshrined in law, of which he could never be deprived. “This equality of Men by Nature, the Judicious Hooker looks upon as so evident in it self, and beyond all question, that he makes it the Foundation of that Obligation to mutual Love amongst Men, on which he Builds the Duties they are of another, and from whence he derives the great Maxims of Justice and Charity.”¹⁶ The state of nature has a law to govern it, “and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind...that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another.”¹⁷ All men remain in this State of Nature until “by their own Consents they make themselves Members of some Politick Society.”¹⁸

Locke was adamant that within this political polity the power of government could never be vested within one individual. Patriarchal government only existed within the closed confines of the family during the minority of children. The *Polity* showed that once a man possessed sufficient reason to comprehend those laws which are bound to guide his actions he was of an age to govern himself.¹⁹ Hooker had, admittedly, recognized that initially the chief man in every household was a king, and that consequently when several groups had first joined together “Kings were the first kind of Governours amongst them, which is also, as it seemeth, the reason why the name of Fathers continued still in them, who, of Fathers, were

¹⁴ Downie, *The Succession*, p. 41; Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1967), the Preface.

¹⁵ R.Ashcroft, *Revolutionary Politics. Locke’s Two Treatises of Government*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 571; R.Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: The Reception of the Ecclesiastical Polity in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,’ in *The History of Political Thought*, Vol.II, 1981, (pp. 63-117), p. 19.

¹⁶ Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 270.

¹⁷ A.J.Simmons, *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 41.

¹⁸ Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 277.

¹⁹ Downie, *The Succession*, p. 25; Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), pp. 308-309; J.Miller, *The Glorious Revolution*, (London: Longman, 1983), pp. 25-26.

made Rulers.” This, however, was not the only form of political regiment which had been set up. Many different forms of government had risen from “Consultation and Composition between Men, judging it convenient, and behoveful; there being no impossibility in Nature, considered by it self, but that Man might have lived without any publick Regiment.”²⁰

The purpose of any civil society was to avoid and remedy those inconveniences of the State of Nature. There would always be an anti-social minority who failed to adhere to the law of nature which would result in socially destructive behaviour.²¹ In the “Golden Age” when governors were virtuous men and subjects were less vicious it had been possible to live without law, but it had subsequently become apparent that the remedy of government for society “did but increase the Sore which it should have cured. They saw that to live by one Man’s Will, became the cause of all mens misery. This constrained them to come unto Laws wherein all Men might see their Duty before-hand, and know the Penalties of transgressing them.”²² Individual rights were not fully secure “till the Legislature was placed in collective Bodies of Men, call them Senate, Parliament, or what you please.”²³ Such bodies could then redress the inconveniences of society through the production of universal laws.²⁴ This civil Law which was “the Act of the whole Body Politick, doth therefore over-rule each several part of the same Body.”²⁵ Although these were only human laws in respect of man they were to be measured against “the Law of God, and the Law of Nature; so that Laws Humane must be made according to the general Laws of Nature, and without contradiction to any positive Law of Scripture, otherwise they are ill made.”²⁶

The importance which Locke placed in law to protect the community made it impossible

²⁰ Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 316; Schochet, *Patriarchalism*, pp. 252-254, 259.

²¹ A. Quinton, *The Politics of Imperfection. The Religious and Secular Traditions of Conservative Thought in England from Hooker to Oakeshott*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), p. 20, Schochet, *Patriarchalism*, p. 256.

²² Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 342.

²³ Downie, *The Succession*, p. 42; J.H. Franklin, *John Locke and the Theory of Sovereignty. Mixed Monarchy and the Right of Resistance in the Political Thought of the English Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 93; Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 329; Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, pp. 23-24.

²⁴ Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994) pp. 326, 357.

²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 330.

²⁶ *Ibid*, p. 358. Here Locke is quoting from the second book of the *Polity*. All his other quotations are from the Preface or Book I which suggests that he had not read much further.

for anyone to seize arbitrary power without contradicting existing legal forms. Failure to adhere to law meant that the monarch forfeited the right to obedience from his subjects.²⁷ Hooker had shown that this power of making laws belonged to the whole polity, so for any prince to usurp the right, unless he had received special commission from God or consent from the whole society, was no better than tyranny.²⁸ Human laws were “available by consent” so any attempt to “constrain Men to any thing inconvenient doth seem unreasonable.”²⁹ Whilst Locke was clearly anxious to retain the right to deny consent to a contractual government he had allowed for tacit consent which meant that any legislative authority, providing it was not completely intolerable, could lay claim to the agreement of its subjects.³⁰ Collectively we consent to be commanded when the society, “whereof we be a part, hath any time before consented, without revoking the same after by the like universal agreement.”³¹ Consequently Locke felt that there was no justification for those individuals who by crying up the regal power would return them all to their former state of slavery. “But I thought Hooker alone might be enough to satisfie these men, who relying on him for their *Ecclesiastical Polity*, are by strange fate carried to deny those principles upon which he builds it.”³²

The contentious nature of these claims ensured that Locke always strove to retain his anonymity. This did not prevent his *Two Treatises*, however, from widely circulating amongst his contemporaries. Four editions were published between 1688 and 1715, and a summary of Locke’s principal points was even placed in *La Bibliotheque Universelle* by Jean Leclerc who was both the editor and a personal friend.³³ Locke’s influence was also evident in Whig political treatises. In 1690 a tract called *Political Aphorismes* appeared which was effectively a plagiarization of the *Two Treatises* supplemented by new passages from the first book of the *Polity*.³⁴ William Molyneux’s protest of 1698 concerning English Parliamentary interference in

²⁷ Ibid, p. 426.

²⁸ Ibid, p. 356.

²⁹ Ibid, pp. 356, 358.

³⁰ Aaron, *John Locke*, pp. 271-274, 283; J.Daly, *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*, (London: University of Toronto Press, 1979), p. 90, Schochet, ‘John Locke and Religious Toleration,’ in *The Revolution of 1688-1689. Changing Perspectives*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), (pp. 147-164), p. 163.

³¹ Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 356.

³² Ibid, p. 426.

³³ F.J.Shirley, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*, (London: S.P.C.K, 1949), p. 217.

³⁴ Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 101.

Ireland, similarly used Hooker in an unmistakably Lockean way. Molyneux, an expert in optics and a friend of Locke, affirmed the universal application of contractual principles by tracing the evolution of political society from a decision by equals to relinquish their natural liberty in return for the benefits of lawful government.³⁵

Although Locke was undeniably well known to his peers his direct influence was rather more proleptic. He went on to become the esteemed philosopher of Hanoverian England, but to the seventeenth century his reading of Hooker was rather more limited in its appeal.³⁶ Whig writers such as the lawyer William Atwood, or James Tyrell, the historian, appeared to be enthusiastic in their citation of Locke, but actually repudiated his suggestion of government dissolution during constitutional deadlock, preferring instead the view that Parliament had a responsibility to fill the vacant throne.³⁷ The majority of Whigs clearly found Locke's belief that government was merely held in trust for the people to be too radical. Such enthusiasm for popular sentiment seemed to provide an opening for social disorder. If power reverted to the populace as a result of royal absolutism, it suggested that the people could threaten the established hierarchy by inaugurating a government of their choice.³⁸

Instead of any dangerous flirtation with such radical notions most Whigs preferred to extract a conservative model of the constitution from within the common law tradition. This tradition was based upon the confident assertion that Englishmen were in possession of ancient parliamentary rights which the monarch was obliged to maintain.³⁹ Hooker was invaluable to

³⁵ W.Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England*, (London: Printed for W.Boreham, 1720), p. 127.

³⁶ Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 440-441.

³⁷ W.Atwood, *The History, and Reasons, of the Dependency of Ireland upon the Imperial Crown of the Kingdom of England Rectifying Mr Molineux's State of the Case of Ireland Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England*, (London: Printed for D.Brown and T.Leigh, 1698), p. 195; Eccleshall, 'Richard Hooker,' p. 99; Franklin, *John Locke*, pp. 105-106, 109-111, 114. Tyrell's reluctance to embrace Locke's political theory is particularly surprising since he was a close friend, and his theory of property was remarkably similar. R.Tucke, *Natural Rights Theories. Their Origin and Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 170.

³⁸ R.Baxter, *Richard Baxter's Penitent Confession, and His Necessary Vindication, in Answer to a Book, Called the Second Part of the Mischiefs of Separation, Written by a Unnamed Author*, (London: Printed for Tho.Parkhurst, 1691), p. 11.

³⁹ C.C.Weston, 'English: Ancient Constitution and Common Law,' In *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 374-411), p. 374.

this heavily diluted form of contractualism, because he possessed the necessary authority to give it historic respectability. This belief in a limited contract appealed to the majority of Whigs because, like the Tories, they were anxious to ensure the security of property by restricting the lower classes to their traditional role of social dependence. In order to ensure that power did not pass to the masses during the crisis of 1688 they were able to adopt the belief that James II had abdicated, leaving the throne vacant to be filled by Parliament rather than the general community.⁴⁰ This claim was something of a legal fiction since as the exiled James himself pointed out the term “was never before used to signify anything but a free and voluntary resignation of a crown.”⁴¹ Sir George Treby, a Whig lawyer who became solicitor-general, resolved the matter in favour of Parliament, however, by insisting that departure was historically the same as abdication since “it is a phrase and thing used by the learned Mr Hooker in his *Book of Ecclesiastical Polity*, whom I mention as a valuable authority.”⁴²

Such an emphasis upon the role of Parliament avoided the whole issue of natural rights through its demonstration that the contract between king and people was enshrined within the ancient constitution.⁴³ It was quite legitimate because Hooker had shown that approbation not only came from those who personally declared their consent, “but also when others do it in their Names, by Right at least originally derived from them; As in Parliaments, Councils, and the like Assemblies.”⁴⁴ Although power had come from the people there was no question of it going back to them; “the Government being settled, we are all obliged to preserve the constitution, as long as we possibly can, and as long as all Degrees keep in their Places, and act according to the Laws of the Constitution, we cannot change it for a Better.”⁴⁵ Through the

⁴⁰ Jones, *Revolution*, pp. 314-315; Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, pp. 22, 27-28; L. Pinkham, *William III and the Respectable Revolution. The Part Played by William of Orange in the Revolution of 1688*, (Hamden: Archon Books, 1969), pp. 225-227; Van Der Zee, *William and Mary*, p. 272.

⁴¹ Anon, *The Life of James II. Late King of England*, (London: Printed for F. Knapton, F. Nicholson, F. Sprint and T. Ballard, 1702), p. 338.

⁴² Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 100.

⁴³ *Ibid*, pp. 98, 100.

⁴⁴ *A Friendly Debate between Dr. Kingsman, a Dissatisfied Clergy-Man, and Gratianus Trimmer, a Neighbour Minister, Concerning the Late Thanksgiving Day; The Princes’s Descent into England; The Nobility and Gentries Joining with Him; The Acts of the Honourable Convention; The Nature of Our English Government; The Secret League with France; The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, &c*, (London: Printed for Jonathan Robinson, 1689), p. 29; W. Atwood, *The Fundamental Constitution of the English Government Proving King William and Queen Mary Our Lawful and Rightful King and Queen in Two Parts*, (London: Printed by J.D., 1690), p. 4.

⁴⁵ *A Friendly Debate*, p. 28.

accession of William and Mary the politically constituted monarchy had ensured that this ancient and legal monarchy was maintained by repairing a temporary breach in England's constitutional arrangements.⁴⁶

James had mistakenly believed that he was competent to breach the constitution by changing the form of government from "an imperial crown" to that of papal vassal.⁴⁷ In contrast William Denton, a physician and Whig political writer, showed how Hooker, "that English Oracle," had recognized that government was not solely for the benefit of the governor, but for the "profitableness" of the governed.⁴⁸ The writer of *Political Aphorisms* reiterated the sentiment that English kingship was conditional, as the Polity had recognized that the monarch had a responsibility to ensure that the structure of society was preserved through the judicious use of law.⁴⁹ "Laws they are not therefore which Publick Approbation hath not made so."⁵⁰ Robert Atkyns, the lord chief baron of the exchequer, admonished his readers that Hooker had recognized common law to be "the very Soul that animates this Body Politick, as learned Hooker describes it, the Parts of which Body are set to work in such Actions as common good requires." Without such law the political body was held together with nothing but a rope of sand.⁵¹

Such liberal reappraisals of Hooker's political credentials as a divine right royalist naturally affected his reputation as a high churchman. Both king and Church had been so closely linked by the Restoration that the displacement of the old political ideology was bound to have some sort of parallel effect upon the religious one. The accession of William and Mary

⁴⁶ R.T. Carroll, *The Common-Sense Philosophy of Religion of Bishop Edward Stillingfleet*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), p. 36.

⁴⁷ Anon, *A Friendly Debate*, p. 6.

⁴⁸ W. Denton, *Jus Regiminis: Being a Justification of Defensive Arms in General. And Consequently of Our Late Revolutions and Trascidies(?) to Be the Just Right of the Kingdom*, (London: [No Printer], 1689), pp. 23, 40.

⁴⁹ Anon, *Political Aphorisms: Or, the True Maxims of Government Displayed*, (London: Printed for Tho. Harrison, 1690), p. 12.

⁵⁰ P. Allix, *An Examination of the Scruples of those Who Refuse to Take the Oath of Allegiance*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1689), p. 21; *Political Aphorisms*, p. 5.

⁵¹ R. Atkyns, *An Enquiry into the Power of Dispensing with Penal Statutes. Together with Some Animadversions upon a Book Writ by Sir Edw. Herbert, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. Entitled, a Short Account of the Authorities in Law, upon Which Judgment Was Given in Sir Edward Hales's Case*, (London: Printed for Timothy Godwin, 1689), pp. 6-8.

certainly marked a visible break with the immediate religious past in the same way that the restoration of Charles II had negated the commonwealth years. These similarities were clearly recognized by Gilbert Burnet who urged the new government to seize the unexpected chance to reconcile the dissenters to the Church in a “spirit of Love.” They had lost “the happy opportunity that was offer’d in the year 1660” by attempting to enforce their submission.⁵² This desire for a new religious settlement was also present amongst the nonconformists ranging from Baxter’s desire to revive the old Church Protestantism of Hooker to William Tong’s Presbyterian attempt to show that the *Polity* supported the abolition of episcopacy.⁵³

William demonstrated his approval of such sentiments by pressing the Church of England to be more accommodating towards the nonconformists.⁵⁴ The comprehension proposals of the king’s ecclesiastical commission were too much, however, for most of the Church. Convocation’s lower house was completely intractable on the subject and William Jane, their high Church procurator, finished his statutory Latin speech with the words “Nolumus leges Anglicae mutari.”⁵⁵ Consequently the comprehension bill was rejected by Parliament, and only the accompanying bill for toleration became law. The latter act had only been intended to deal with a small group of intransigents who would not be accommodated within the national Church, but found that it now applied to nearly half a million individuals.⁵⁶ Although the act was only supposed to liberate the nonconformists from the strictures of their

⁵² G. Burnet, *An Apology for the Church of England with Relation to the Spirit of Persecution for Which She Is Accused*, (Amsterdam: [No Printer], 1688), p. 3.

⁵³ R. Baxter, *Richard Baxter’s Penitent Confession, and His Necessary Vindication, in Answer to a Book Called, the Second Part of the Mischiefs of Separation, Written by an Unnamed Author*, (London: Printed for Tho. Parkhurst, 1691), the Preface; W. Tong, *A Defence of Mr M.H.’s Brief Enquiry into the Nature of Schism and the Vindication of It. With Reflections upon a Pamphlet Called the Review, &c. And a Brief Historical Account of Nonconformity from the Reformation to the Present Time*, (London: Printed by T.S. for Tho. Parkhurst, 1693), p. 123.

⁵⁴ It is recorded that William viewed his wife’s Anglican faith with great suspicion and strongly disapproved of Dr Hooper who acted as chaplain to her. Coming one day to her private chapel he noticed among her books Eusebius’s *Church History* and Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Polity*. “I suppose,” he observed bleakly, “that Dr Hooper persuades you to read these books.” J.L. Anderdon, *The Life of Thomas Ken*, (London: John Murray, 1854), Vol. I, p. 160.

⁵⁵ Aylmer, *Struggle for the Constitution*, p. 221; S.C. Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church and People*, (London: John Murray, 1959), pp. 16, 20; Schochet, *Patriarchalism*, pp. 160-161; L.G. Schworer, ‘The Coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689,’ in *The Revolution of 1688-1689. Changing Perspectives*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 109.

⁵⁶ G.V. Bennett, ‘Conflict in the Church,’ in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, G. Holmes, (ed.), (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1969), (pp. 155-175), p. 161; Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, pp. 47-49.

Anglican brethren, it was also taken as an excuse by many non-dissenters to absent themselves from their parish churches.⁵⁷ Anglicanism had survived as the established faith, but had ceased to be the national Church of the English people. High churchmen were infuriated by this result and blamed it upon the pernicious “State Whiggism [that now] runs through this Nation.” The Whig bishops had laid aside “the passive Obedience and prerogative Notions of the High Church of England-Men; notwithstanding that they keep up the Episcopal Order, the Pomp, Ceremony, and discipline of the Church of England.”⁵⁸

The hostility of high churchmen to the Whig appointees, who replaced their non-juring friends, also made it difficult for them to recognize that many were men of high principle, with a similar affection for the Church. Burnet, for example, had earned himself their undying opprobrium through his attempts to comprehend the dissenters. This undisguised suspicion of his opponents meant that his strong pastoral concern for his diocese and his deep sense of devotion to the Church were largely overlooked. Burnet was also far from ignorant concerning Hooker’s principles, since he recorded in his autobiography that he had begun his “study with relation to our home matters with Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Polity*...which did so fixe me that I never departed from the principles laid down by him, nor was I a little delighted with the modesty and charity that I observed in him which edified me as much as his book instructed me.”⁵⁹ Like his high Church opponents he was attracted to Hooker’s distinction between those things which were essential to salvation and matters indifferent. The chief end of religion was to live well, and the scriptures had been designed with this in mind. There was no need for complex theological sophistry or logic since “true Religion is power and life, and far above

⁵⁷ Bennet, ‘Conflict in the Church,’ p. 162; G.Rupp, *Religion in England, 1688-1791*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 55; Schochet, ‘John Locke,’ pp. 147, 155.

⁵⁸ G.Hickes (?), *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated in Answer to a Letter Sent to the Author...1693*, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.III, (pp. 172-206), p. 203; F.G.James, ‘The Bishops in Politics, 1688-1714,’ in *Conflict in Stuart England. Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, W.A.Appleton and B.D.Henning, (eds.), (London: Jonathan Cape, 1960), (pp. 229-257), pp. 233-234; Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, p. 62.

⁵⁹ G.Burnet, *Bishop Burnet’s Autobiography, in a Supplement to Burnet’s History of My Own Time Derived from His Original Memoirs, His Autobiography, His Letters to Admiral Herbert, and His Private Meditations All Hitherto Unpublished*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), (pp. 451-514), p. 460; H.McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism. A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1965), p. 188; W.M.Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England 1660-1700*, (London: University of Georgia Press, 1993), pp. 157-158.

these shadows.”⁶⁰

Burnet differed from his Anglican adversaries, however, through his belief that a national Church existed to promote inessential forms and ceremonies for the sake of decency.⁶¹ Such a pragmatic interpretation of the *Polity* was far removed from the Restoration belief that it gave expression to an understanding of the Church as a divine body. Instead it seemed to vindicate the high churchmen’s anxiety that the established Church was becoming no more than a vehicle for promoting state respectability and morality.⁶² There was certainly a great deal of hostility towards proponents of views which emphasized the spiritual independence of the Church. This is clearly illustrated by the polemical dispute between Edward Welshman, a Whig conformist clergyman, and Henry Dodwell, a non-juror who returned to the communion of the Church of England. Welshman refused to contemplate Dodwell’s thesis that it was heretical to have removed the non-jurors since “we have hereby undermined our whole Religion, and put it in the power of the Civil Magistrate” to subvert it utterly.⁶³ Hooker, he insisted, had demonstrated that historically the Church had only ever been a separate body when it was present in societies which were opposed to it.⁶⁴ In Christian England it was impossible, however, for the two entities to remain separate when they consisted of the same people.⁶⁵

This refusal to exaggerate the spiritual independence of the Church was also illustrated by a rather pragmatic attitude towards the Prayer Book. The non-jurors and their sympathizers had regarded it as the perfect embodiment of primitive doctrine and piety which was above criticism. The Whig latitudinarians whilst valuing the Prayer Book as an expression of the English Protestant faith, still, believed that a more flexible attitude towards it was both

⁶⁰ M.Greig, ‘Thought And Polemic Of Gilbert Burnet, Ca 1673-1705, Cambridge University Ph.D. (Unpublished), 1991, p. 25.

⁶¹ Ibid, pp. 29, 33.

⁶² Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, pp. 64-65.

⁶³ E. Welshman, *A Defence of the Church of England from the Charge of Schism and Heresie, as Laid against It by the Vindicator of the Deprived Bishops*, (London: Printed and Sold by Randal Taylor, 1693), p. 2.

⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 7.

⁶⁵ Welshman, *Defence of the Church*, p. 8; E. Welshman, *A Second Defence of the Church of England from the Charge of Schism and Heresy, as Laid against It by the Vindicator of the Deprived Bishops, and, the Doctrine of the Church of England Concerning the Independency of the Church on the Lay-Power*, (London: Printed for Will. Rogers, 1698), p. 12.

constructive and within the spirit of the original compiler. William Denton, the ardent Protestant physician, recounted how Hooker had shown the ceremonies of the Church to be “so innocent” that all might follow them, but there was no lawful power under heaven that had the right to command “submission to them upon penalties and Severities” if any possessed “conscientious scrupulosities” towards them.⁶⁶ It was to be regretted, Denton insisted, that churchmen continued to try and make use of divine authority by putting “false glosses” upon plain pieces of scripture.⁶⁷

This contrived use of the *Polity* to embarrass extreme Church loyalists reached its epitome in Stephen Nye’s mischievous anonymous attempt to involve Hooker in the Socinian controversy. Nye, the Unitarian rector of Little Horne, Hertfordshire, deliberately included Hooker amongst those nominal Trinitarians whose writings actually undermined their own claim.⁶⁸ After a lengthy consideration of Hooker’s defence of the doctrine he concluded that the judicious divine had provided no more than an elaborate paradox in the face of so evident and natural a truth as the unity of God.⁶⁹ Consequently it was to be regretted that most high churchmen were so stubborn in their refusal to examine Hooker impartially, and admit that he could be mistaken. This, Nye insisted, was indicative of their perception that to surrender the *Polity* on any point was “to dishonour the Church of England it self; to part with Father Hooker, is to endanger the very Surplice and even the Cross in Baptism; nay, that Book of Books the Common-Prayer.” If Hooker was acknowledged to be wrong concerning the Trinity it would only encourage the nonconformists to be critical of other parts of the *Polity*. “Will they not be apt to pretend too, he may have erred in his profound Dissertations and Discourses for the Rites and Disciplines of the Church?”⁷⁰

⁶⁶ W.Denton, *Some Remarks Recommended unto Ecclesiasticks of All Perswasions*, (London: [No Printer], 1690), pp. 24, 39.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 46.

⁶⁸ S.Nye, *Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Occasioned by Four Sermons Preached by His Grace the Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, (London: [No Printer], 1694), pp. 18, 35, 38, 44; J.Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, (London: Yale University Press, 1991), p. 385; N.Sykes, *William Wake Archbishop of Canterbury 1657-1737*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), Vol.II, p. 153.

⁶⁹ S.Nye, *Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, by Dr.Wallis, Dr Sherlock, Dr South, Dr Cudworth, and Mr Hooker; as Also on the Account Given by those that Say the Trinity Is an Inconceivable Mystery*, (London?: [No Printer], 1693), pp. 10, 26-29, 32.

⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 27.

Such a comment is not particularly fair since it is clear that many Anglicans were genuinely concerned by the doctrinal implications of Socinianism.⁷¹ Nye is correct, however, that many Anglicans chose to confront the challenge to their continued dominance through an insistence upon unswerving loyalty to the religious and political ideas of the Restoration. Nine bishops and four hundred clergymen chose to be dispossessed of their livings rather than take the oath of obedience to William and Mary, and countless others who subscribed continued to manifest disquiet over the post-1688 settlement. It was impossible for them to concede that Hooker would have supported any alteration to the old status quo. Consequently they professed incredulity that so many of their Anglican brethren had sought to justify their abandonment of unconditional obedience by reference to the *Polity*. Hooker, Abednigo Seller insisted, would have “hated the Deductions that some Men make from him, that because Government arose out of Compact, therefore the people may call their Princes to an account.”⁷² This was a complete distortion of the *Polity* as Filmer’s *Patriarcha*, that staple polemical pillar of the pre-1688 regime, had already demonstrated.⁷³

Such unswerving Tory devotion to Filmer, however, was unable to stem the growing Whig interest in Hooker’s posthumous books. They could only seek to resist it by recounting Walton’s increasingly tired aspersions upon the reliability of the later books.⁷⁴ Anthony Wood, who was clearly conscious of this reappraisal of the disputed books, blamed the growing influence of nonconformity. The dubious political content of Book VIII meant that dissenters, such as Baxter, took “a more than ordinary delight in so often telling the World, that the Abettors of these seditious positions have so great a Church-man, as our author was justly esteemed on their side.”⁷⁵ Wood’s annoyance at this specific nonconformist abuse of the

⁷¹ W. Sherlock, *The Present State of the Socinian Controversy and the Doctrine of the Catholick Fathers Concerning a Trinity in Unity*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1698), p. 1.

⁷² A. Seller, *The History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation*, (Amsterdam: Printed for T. Johnson, 1689), p. 29.

⁷³ R. Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Works of Sir Robert Filmer*, P. Laslett, (ed.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949), p. 34; Locke, *Two Treatises*, (1994), p. 52; Schochet, *Patriarchalism*, p. 214.

⁷⁴ Seller, *Passive Obedience*, pp. 30-31; A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford, from the Fifteenth Year of King Henry the Seventh Dom. 1500, to the End of the Year 1690*, (London: Printed for Tho. Bennet, 1691), p. 263.

⁷⁵ Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, pp. 263-264.

Polity was part of the wider high Church refusal to accept that 1688 had changed the position of Anglicanism in any way. John Norris, a fellow of All Souls and rector of Bemerton, insisted that the Act of Toleration had altered nothing since it did not “affect the Preceptive part of the Law,...or Null the obliging force of it. All therefore that it can do is only to remove the penalty.”⁷⁶ This anxiety to believe that the Restoration status quo was still intact was reinforced by the production of new treatises which stressed the continued validity of the old Hooker-sponsored religious order.⁷⁷ Conciliatory works such as John Hacket’s life of Archbishop Williams, which suggested that Hooker had always recognized that true national conformity would only ever be achieved through the compelling spiritual example of the Church, were exceptional.⁷⁸

This continued usage of Hooker to promote old Tory concepts of Church and State was naturally repugnant to the Whigs who had pressed the *Polity* into their own service. The writer of *Animadversions On A Discourse Entitled, God's Ways Of Disposing Of Kingdoms* mourned that there were still so many individuals who continued to ascribe to princes those powers above law which were never given by the consent of the nation. If there was to be “such consent of Men, as the Learned and Judicious Mr Hooker thought absolutely necessary for the making of Laws; this consent either must lose the nature of consent, or want authority.”⁷⁹ Those of a Whig sympathy were also somewhat incredulous that after James’s

⁷⁶ J.Norris, *The Charge of Schism Continued: Being a Justification of Christian Blessedness for His Charging the Separatists with Schism, Notwithstanding the Toleration*, (London: Printed for Samuel Manship, 1691), p. 17.

⁷⁷ P.M., *The Church of England and the Continuation of the Ceremonies Thereof, Vindicated from the Calumnies of Several Late Pamphlets; More Particularly that Entitled, the Vanity, Mischief, and Danger of Continuing Ceremonies in the Worship of God*, (London: Printed for S.Cock, 1690), p. 11; J.Clutterbuck, *A Plain and Rational Vindication of the Liturgy of the Church of England Collected Out of the Discourses of Some of the Reverend Bishops and Doctors of the Same Church, by Way of Question and Answer*, (London: Printed by J.L. for William Keblewhite, 1694), The Epistle, pp. 40, 54-55; Morrill, *English Revolution*, p. 445.

⁷⁸ John Hacket, a conciliatory churchman who became bishop of Coventry and Lichfield at the Restoration, had produced this classic biography in the 1650s. Its pacific emphasis, however, ensured that it was not actually published until the 1690s when the passing of the toleration act had permanently removed the possibility of enforcing coercive measures against the dissenters. J.Hacket, *Scrinia Reservata: A Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D.D. Who Some Time Held the Places of Ld Keeper of the Great Seal of England, Ld Bishop of Lincoln, and Ld-Archbishop of York. Containing a Series of the Most Remarkable Transactions of His Life, in Relation Both to Church and State*, (London: Printed by Edw.Jones, for Samuel Lowndes, 1693), Part II, pp. 111-112.

⁷⁹ Anon, *Animadversions on a Discourse Entitled, God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms*, (London: Printed For W.Rayner, 1691), p. 4.

stormy reign any loyal churchman should seek to maintain the doctrine of passive obedience.⁸⁰ Timothy Wilson reminded Seller, his Tory opponent, that although Hooker would never have condoned violence it was clear from Book VIII that monarchical government depended upon an original compact. Consequently the Parliamentary representatives of the people were permitted to serve as “the repairer of [any] Breeches” that might occur in this settlement.⁸¹ Robert Eccleshall suggests that the Whigs, in spite of their virulent protests, had reason to be grateful to the high churchmen for maintaining this persistent strain of extreme Toryism, because it enabled them to “fabricate their own brand of conservative, but nonetheless distinctive, constitutionalism.” Whilst some Tories continued to promote non-resistance within a patriarchal state it was not difficult for the Whigs to move away from their previous anti-establishment postures without appearing to compromise the spirit of the Revolution.

The perpetuation of this extreme royalism, however, should not disguise the fact that there were other Tories who sought to retain their principle of passive obedience and embrace the post-1688 regime. This desire to accommodate their political creed within changed circumstances was immediately apparent in the early discussions surrounding the legitimacy of William and Mary. Much to the irritation of the Whigs the new oath of allegiance, which had been largely drafted under the auspices of Daniel Finch, the Tory earl of Nottingham, deliberately dropped the customary reference to “rightful and lawful” rule which meant that it was possible for many Tories, with genuine scruples, to swear obedience on the grounds that William and Mary were still their *de facto* rulers if not their *de jure* ones.⁸²

The writer of *A Vindication of Those who have taken the New Oath of Allegiance* stressed that the understanding of the oath’s implications depended totally upon the comprehension of the word allegiance. “That great Man, Mr Hooker, who was so exact both for Sense and Expresson, relating the story of Calvin’s returning to Geneva, from whence he had been banish’d, tells us, That of the Ministers themselves which had staid behind in the City

⁸⁰ T. Bainbridge, *Seasonable Reflections, on a Late Pamphlet, Entitled, a History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation: Wherein the True Notion of Passive Obedience Is Settled and Secured from the Malicious Interpretations of Ill-Designing Men*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavell, 1689/90), p. 3.

⁸¹ Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 101.

⁸² Carter, ‘The Revolution and the Constitution,’ in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1969), (pp. 39-58), p. 41; Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, p. 31; Morrill, *English Revolution*, pp. 452-453; Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, p. 110.

when Calvin was gone, some upon knowledge of the Peoples earnest intent to recall him to the Place again, had beforehand written their Letters of Submission and assur'd him of their Allegiance for ever after." Both here and in the case of William and Mary the word allegiance signified no more than a peaceable compliance to the de facto ruler.⁸³ This was an enduring distinction which allowed Tories to remain nominally faithful to the Stuarts whilst reluctantly conceding regal authority to William.

Not all Tories were so guarded, however, in their support for the revolution settlement. William Lloyd, who had been one of the seven bishops tried by James, is said to have reconciled many clergy through a highly contentious work where he described how princes could only resolve differences between each other through the "Law of Nations." This was made up of such customs as were observed among all princes, in the same way that English common law consisted of all customs observed in the country. The last resort of this "Law of Nations" was war, where God, who had "given Princes the Power of the Sword," would display His judgment by awarding victory to one of them. Hooker had said of the "Law of the Nations, that it can be no more prejudiced by the Lawes of any Kingdom than these can be by the Resolutions of private Men."⁸⁴ Such an extreme justification of the results of the Revolution went far beyond what was acceptable to the majority of Tories. In the House of Lords, that most conservative of institutions, a proposal that Lloyd's book should be burnt was defeated by only eleven votes.

At the other extreme to Lloyd were the Hooker-sponsored attempts of some Tories to provide a constitutional justification of 1688. Thomas Long, a prebendary of Exeter, described how the English Church's support for passive obedience had walked a middle way between absolutism and populism. Although "the king be not strictly jure divino, (i.e.) so as to make other species of government unlawful; yet he is the minister of God, and not of the people,

⁸³ Anon, *A Vindication of Those Who Have Taken the New Oath of Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary; Upon Principles Agreeable to the Doctrines of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Randal Taylor, 1689), pp. 7-8.

⁸⁴ W.Lloyd, *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms. Part I*, (London: Printed by H.Hills for Thomas Jones, 1691), pp. 31-32.

though the people be conveyed, medias populo.”⁸⁵ Whilst the monarch enjoyed this supremacy, however, he had never been granted absolute power. Human agreement had freely set up this form of government as being the best way “to suppress Violence, redress Injuries, and distribute Justice.” To this purpose Hooker had recognized that public society rested upon the twin foundation of human sociability and “an order expressly or secretly agreed on touching the manner of their union in living together.”⁸⁶ In England these two pillars of society were upheld within a constitutional monarchy where authority was divided between king and people gathered in Parliament. If, therefore, the monarch broke his coronation oath by acting in a despotic manner it was permissible to resist since “laws they are not, which public approbation hath not made.”⁸⁷

Unsurprisingly such a belief in conditional kingship was not popular, since it was rather too close to Whig contractual theories for most Tories. They were only prepared to embrace the constitutionalism embodied in common law. By grafting the doctrine of non-resistance onto it, it was possible to resist any radical ideas that might have arisen in the aftermath of the Revolution settlement. Lewes Sharpe, rector of Moreton Hampstead in Devon, denounced Whig contractual theories in *The Church of England's Doctrine of Non-Resistance Justified and Vindicated*. Royal power, he insisted, came from God and not the people, which meant that sovereignty was unconditional and irresistible. Common law authorities such as Bracton and Fortescue, however, demonstrated that the monarchy need not be absolute. England's “dominium politicum et regale” was the outcome of “the Sovereign's Condescentious Acts of Grace” rather than the result of an initial communal decision. Through this location of sovereignty in the prince rather than the king-in-parliament, Sharpe was able to uphold the case for non-resistance by drawing upon the usual accounts of England's judicial superiority. It was not impossible for the monarch to ignore his own self-imposed limitations, but Sharpe insisted that this had never happened. He avoided any direct comment on the upheavals under James, but seems to have been prepared to adjust to any settlement, providing

⁸⁵ T.Long, *The Historian Unmask'd or Some Reflections on the Late History of Passive Obedience Wherein the Doctrine of Passive-Obedience and Non-Resistance Is Truly Stated and Asserted*, (London: Printed by R.Baldwin, 1689), p. 8.

⁸⁶ T.Long, *A Resolution of Certain Queries Concerning Submission to the Present Government*, (London: Printed by R.Baldwin, 1689), p. 1.

⁸⁷ Eccleshall, ‘Richard Hooker,’ p. 107; Long, *The Historian Unmask'd*, p. 51; Long, *A Resolution of Certain Queries*, p. 2.

the social fabric remained unchanged. Hooker was quoted to show that the subversive would always find an audience, and Sharpe warned against those intent on exacerbating conflict with lies about the exercise of sovereign authority.⁸⁸

None of these ingenious Tory machinations, however, had really come to terms with the enduring consequences of 1688. They were founded largely upon an expectation that a counter-revolution might take place at some point. Mainstream Tories, who were as anxious as the Whigs not to see a return to rule by James, still anticipated that at some point they would witness the restoration of the house of Stuart. This was no naive Tory belief, because the possibility was also recognized by many of the Whigs. Throughout William's reign there was a constant passing of non-committal messages between the exiled king at St Germain and leading ministers of the crown, who were anxious not to be completely stranded if there should be a change of regime. George Saville, marquis of Halifax, a moderate Whig, warned his friend, Sir John Reresby, the former governor of York, that they both had wives and children so must not become too associated with William.⁸⁹ It was not until the succession act of 1701, following the death of the duke of Gloucester, that it was made clear that after Anne the Stuart line was at an end in England.⁹⁰

These covert Whig activities, however, did nothing to diminish their hostility to the old Restoration understanding of Hooker as a proponent of passive obedience. Their confident public dissemination of the "Glorious Revolution" as a confirmation and continuation of English rights and privileges ensured that most proponents of passive obedience were forced to abandon or severely modify their belief. Such an emphasis on the balanced constitution, as expressed in common law, also succeeded in disguising that there had been a major upheaval in 1688. It demonstrated that it was possible to use the *Polity* to provide a conservative justification of the change of monarchs without having to embrace Locke's belief that political power was vested within the people. Only in eighteenth century England did the *Two Treatises* achieve widespread respectability, and, consequently, the view that Hooker was the original

⁸⁸ Eccleshall, 'Richard Hooker,' p. 108.

⁸⁹ M.Ashley, *England in the Seventeenth Century (1603-1714)*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd, 1962), p. 184.

⁹⁰ J.Miller, *The Life and Times of William and Mary*, (Golborne: George Weidenfeld and Nicolson Limited, 1974), p. 192.

Whig become dominant.⁹¹

The traditional historiography of the Church has encouraged the belief that this Whig political shift was accompanied by the triumph of religious latitudinarianism. Whilst there was “a hardening of Protestant feeling” it is clear that this was not the case.⁹² Never at any point was there any likelihood that Hooker would be abandoned as the guardian of via media Anglicanism. Although Whig sympathizers on the episcopal bench welcomed the opportunity to pursue a less rigorous form of Anglicanism they continued to recognize the *Polity* as a seminal work in the understanding of their Church. In the case of the high churchmen they found that it was perfectly possible, in spite of the improved position of the nonconformists, to maintain their old view of the Church with Hooker serving as the epitome of a Prayer Book Anglican. Nevertheless the Glorious Revolution had effectively undermined the old Restoration belief in the essential homogeneity of Church and State. Nonconformists were now tolerated and there had been a definite shift in power towards Parliament. The new sovereigns had not succeeded to the throne as divinely appointed Anglican monarchs, but because Parliament had facilitated it.⁹³

Such a change was not necessarily apparent to contemporaries, however, since the sensible Whig usage of Hooker was able to fashion an image of legitimate political action. Building upon the earlier writings of Sidney and Parker they had been able to create a progressive constitutional Whig interpretation of Hooker which appeared to enjoy considerable longevity. This had drawn heavily upon the first book of the *Polity*, but there had also been a flurry of interest in Book VIII which had done much to restore the credibility of the posthumous books. Those arguments used by Hooker against religious radicals, who disturbed the status quo, continued to provide an universally popular defence of the Church, but were now also skilfully adopted by the Whigs in support of the balanced constitution. In the same way that set of sixteenth century opinions had been transplanted to the defence of the

⁹¹ By the nineteenth century, Henry Hallam, writer of the *Constitutional History of England*, was so anxious to force Hooker into the mould of an original Whig that he endeavoured to persuade himself that his political theory was the same as Locke's. R. Eccleshall, *Order and Reason in Politics. Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 129-130.

⁹² Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church*, p. 237.

⁹³ Carter, 'The Revolution,' p. 40.

Restoration settlement, Hooker had been interpreted anew in support of the the parliamentary government which flourished after 1688. Here the rhetoric of Hooker's doctrine of consent achieved the dual task of rebutting arbitrary power whilst constructing a convincing portrayal of an established power structure.⁹⁴

⁹⁴ C. Condren, 'The Creation of Richard Hooker's Public Authority: Rhetoric, Reputation and Reassessment,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, (pp. 35-59), p. 54; Eccleshall, 'Richard Hooker,' p. 116.

Queen Anne And The Tory Revival

When the first shock of the Revolution had passed, a conservative reaction began which resulted in a deep suspicion of the new regime. The Whig interpretation of Hooker as a proponent of a balanced constitution remained dominant, but was increasingly challenged by the revival of Restoration ideologies. Many Tories had taken the oath to William in a highly equivocal sense, and their reluctance to abandon their belief in passive obedience made them increasingly hostile towards the "Dutch usurper."¹ All were united in looking forward to the accession of Anne who was a Stuart by birth, and a staunch supporter of the Church. When her reign arrived they were not disappointed, since there was a resurgence of Tory parliamentary influence resulting in the enforcement of new legislative measures against the nonconformists, and a widespread revival of popular support for passive obedience. Towards the end of Anne's reign, however, this Tory enthusiasm was somewhat tempered by the knowledge that the imminent accession of the Hanoverians would result in the permanent displacement of the Stuarts.

The temporary revival of Tory fortunes clearly threatened to reverse the growing influence of the Whig understanding of the *Polity*. It is the purpose of this chapter to measure how successful the Tories were in renewing this high Church interpretation of Hooker. Anglican apologetic, political treatises, biographies of Hooker, and new editions of the *Polity* will be examined and evaluated. Naturally there was sizeable Whig resistance to these attempts to reverse the consequences of 1688, and the effective strength of this opposition will be considered. Long-term Tory hopes to retain authority, of course, were thwarted by the impending arrival of the Hanoverians. Their reluctant recognition of this unpleasant reality compelled many of them to reconsider their attitude towards the *Polity*. It will be demonstrated that this change of ruling house was crucial in the formation of eighteenth century Whig and Tory attitudes regarding Hooker.

¹ G.V.Bennett, *White Kennet 1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), p. 26; G.Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, (London: Macmillan, 1967), p. 61; E.Gregg, *Queen Anne*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), pp. 152, 154-155, 162-163; J.Miller, *The Glorious Revolution*, (London: Longman, 1983), p. 31.

This eventuality was of little concern, however, to Tories on the eve of Anne's reign. They were determined to reassert the religious and political principles of the Restoration, and longed for the accession of the Stuart Anne when they believed that this would be possible. Over ten years of Whig rule had modified Tory attitudes, however, since there was a growing recognition that the removal of legal sanctions was irreversible, and that they could no longer hope to enforce their religious will upon the nation. To compensate for this more emphasis was placed upon encouraging conformity through the convincing demonstration of the compelling strengths of Anglicanism. This is clearly illustrated by John Prince, the vicar of Totnes and Berry Pomeroy, who presented Hooker as a commanding Anglican exemplar in his account of *The Worthies of Devon*. Prince was adamant that the learning of this "renowned Author," combined with his personal piety, meant that he would rest with "the most glorious Company of the Patriarchs and Apostles" until he should awake to receive his heavenly glory.² "In short His whole Life seemed a Lecture of Piety, and a deep Veneration of the Majesty of God, Whom he said by his Grace, he loved in his Youth, and feared him in his Age."³

Prince's biographical details placed him firmly in the tradition of Walton, since he recounted such stories as Jewel's presentation of his staff to the young Hooker, or the judicious divine's tending of the sheep.⁴ He was also indebted to Walton's disparagement of the later books, which allowed him to criticize indirectly the increased use which the Whigs were making of them. Once again the destruction of the supposedly completed manuscripts was blamed upon Hooker's wife, and the subsequent corruption of the surviving drafts upon hostile puritans.⁵ Whether Gauden "derived them from any Manuscript of Mr. Hooker's own Hand-writing, is by learned Men made a Question, and so I leave the matter."⁶ It was safer to join with Clement VIII, Charles I, Ussher, Morton and Hales in commending the "Worth and

² J. Prince, *Danmonii Orientales Illustres: Or, the Worthies of Devon. A Work Wherein the Lives and Fortunes of the Most Famous Divines, Statesmen, Swordsmen, Physicians, Writers, and Other Eminent Persons, Natives of that Most Noble Province, from before the Norman Conquest down to the Present Age, Are Memoriz'd in an Alphabetical Order, out of the Most Approved Authores, Both in Print and Manuscript*, (Exeter: Printed by Sam Farley, for Awnsham and John Churchill, 1701), pp. 398, 399.

³ Ibid, p. 397.

⁴ Ibid, pp. 393, 395.

⁵ Ibid, pp. 397-398.

⁶ Ibid, p. 398.

Excellency” of the other five undisputed books.⁷

The Tory recognition that the wholesale removal of legal sanctions against their proponents necessitated a more positive justification of their position did not, however, prevent them from seeking other new ways to enforce their collective religious will upon the nation. This desire was most clearly manifested by Francis Atterbury’s attempt to establish the lower house of Convocation as the spiritual counterpart to the House of Commons. Atterbury, that scourge of “Erastianism in high places,” hoped to free the house from its dependence upon the Whig house of bishops, and to give the pro-Tory lower clergy the opportunity for free debate. He asserted that Convocation had been a national synod, and saw this confirmed in the “Praemunientes” clause of the royal writ which bade bishops bring their representative clergy with them to Parliament.⁸ Such a claim exploited the ambiguities enshrined within the structure of the sixteenth century religious establishment which had assumed that the supreme governor would direct the Church, through the bishops and Convocation, but allowed for Parliament to confirm the articles of religion which they defined. Hooker had recognized the potential for confusion resulting from the divide between theory and practice, and had sought to justify the whole settlement in terms of parliamentary action. Since all members of the Church were also members of the state they were not two societies, but one, “ministered to in respect of their religious and secular needs by two sets of officials under one supreme governor.”⁹

William Wake, then a canon of Christ Church, was certainly anxious to maintain the belief that Parliament embraced both spiritual and temporal concerns, and led the Whig response to Atterbury. Wake’s scholarly answer was not well received, but he did expose the flaws within Atterbury’s case. He carefully examined the historical sources, and conclusively demonstrated that whilst the monarch had summoned an assembly to grant general taxes this

⁷ Ibid, p. 398.

⁸ Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 29; Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, pp. 66-67; G.Rupp, *Religion in England, 1688-1791*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 57.

⁹ J.H.M.Salmon, ‘Catholic Resistance Theory, Ultramontaniam, and the Royalist Response, 1580-1620,’ in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 219-253), p. 245.

was distinct from the ancient provincial synod of Canterbury.¹⁰ Other Whigs, who were discontented with Atterbury and his supporters, took a less historical approach and chose to expose what they saw as the failings in his distinction between the Church and the State. William Wright and Edward Welshman, who were both strong proponents of the Whig hierarchy, denounced their respective high Church opponents for ignoring Hooker's belief in the "Christian Commonwealth," and for embracing a Roman Catholic belief in the independence of ecclesiastical power.¹¹ Hooker's eighth book had already exposed the failings of the Jesuitical objection to the English religious settlement, and shown that "it cannot be maintained that a Church, and Commonwealth, which receives the true Religion, are two distinct Societies; unless we restrain the Name of a Church in a Christian Commonwealth, to the clergy, excluding all the rest of Believers, both Prince and People."¹²

Wright cited the *Polity* to show that the supremacy rested with the prince since it was clear "that the Kings amongst the Jews were supreme in Ecclesiastical Affairs; and that the Priests never had that Power unless they were Kings as well as Priests." Only the "Supreme Temporal Magistrate" had the power to call and dissolve solemn assemblies about the Church; "and that according to the Patern of the Jews, the like Power in Causes Ecclesiastical is by the Laws of this realm annexed unto the Crown."¹³ Welshman insisted that this was enshrined, as Hooker had recognized, in the oath of supremacy which not only excluded all foreign power, and acknowledged the king's power over spiritual persons in temporal matters, but recognized his supreme authority over spiritual persons in spiritual matters.¹⁴ The only time that kings had not been capable of such authority was when they had "profess'd themselves open Enemies unto Christ," but this was no longer the case. Whilst the king lacked any "power purely Spiritual, such as in the Ministry either of the Word or Sacraments" the exercise of it by

¹⁰ S.C.Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church and People*, (London: John Murray, 1959), p. 20; Rupp, *Religion in England*, p. 57; N.Sykes, *William Wake Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), Vol.I, pp. 107-115.

¹¹ E.Welshman, *A Second Defence of the Church of England from the Charge of Schism and Heresy*, p.13; W.Wright, *A Letter to a Member of Parliament; Occasioned by a Letter to a Convocation-Man, Concerning the Rights, Power, and Privileges of that Body. Together with an Inquiry into the Ecclesiastical Power of the University of Oxford, Particularly to Decree and Declare Heresy, Occasioned by that Letter*, (London: Printed for W.Rogers, 1697), p. 18.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 19.

¹³ *Ibid*, p. 22

¹⁴ Welshman, *A Second Defence*, p. 14.

others remained subject to him. If this was not the case it would have left a Christian monarch amongst the ranks of the “Heathen Persecutors.”¹⁵ Wright refused to consider the allegation that this made the nation’s religion changeable at the will of the prince since this had been shown to be false by Hooker. The *Polity* had asserted that the alteration of religion belonged “unto the Power of Dominions and are termed amongst the Deeds of the King.” This was a recognition that the king, the “Christian Temporal Magistrate,” was “to exercise that Power according to the Laws of his Country.”¹⁶

These careful Whig attempts to use Hooker to appease the increasingly vociferous conservative reaction, however, fell upon death ears. They were in no mood to listen to pleas from the likes of John Tutchin, the Whig pamphleteer and poet, that they might all be friends together.¹⁷ Gareth Bennett described how when “William [finally] died and that “Sunshine” day came, the enthusiasm in manor house and country parsonage knew no bounds.” Anne further encouraged them by stating that her principles “must always keep me entirely firm to the interests and religion of the Church of England, and will incline me to countenance those who have the truest zeal to support it.”¹⁸ Whilst Anne’s personal convictions always remained those of a high Church Tory her public support was somewhat modified by a wish to be above faction. She was also suspicious of Atterbury’s theories regarding Convocation which seemed to limit her personal prerogative in ecclesiastical matters.¹⁹ A broadly sympathetic monarch, however, was still sufficient to encourage the high churchmen in their attempt to reaffirm the exclusivist status of the Anglican faith. The 1702 election was dominated by the Tory battle cry of “No Moderation,” and supportive preachers delivered aggressive sermons that urged all faithful churchmen to destroy the influence of the dissenters and occasional conformists over the established Church.²⁰ Even in Scotland the supporters of the old episcopalian Church held out the wishful expectation that the accession of Anne might lead to a revival in their fortunes. The act of union prompted one to state that whilst the doors of mercy were always open to

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 14.

¹⁶ Wright, *A Letter to a Member of Parliament*, p. 16.

¹⁷ J.Tutchin, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty: Or Whiggish Loyalty and Church Loyalty Compar’d*, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), (pp. 557-571), p. 566.

¹⁸ Bennett, *White Kennet*, p. 56; Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 62.

¹⁹ G. Every, *The High Church Party 1688-1718*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), p. 108.

²⁰ Bennett, *White Kennet*, p. 57.

those who had been deluded the "Obstinate [must] be rul'd with the Rod of Iron."²¹

In Scotland the numerical dominance of Presbyterianism ensured that this remained no more than an unrealistic Anglican dream, but in England the high churchmen were able to mount a successful offensive against the increased standing of the nonconformists. New works of Anglican apologetic were produced, and there was a vigorous pursuit of policies which served to obstruct the free practice of nonconformity. Old historiography has predominantly concentrated on the latter, which has created the impression that the high churchmen of Anne's reign were old-fashioned, stuffy, and lacking in originality. In fact many of their number such as George Hooper, or Archbishop John Sharp, were considered to be men of considerable learning, perception, and experience.²² The academic erudition possessed by members of this group was clearly demonstrated by the production of Anglican classics such as Charles Wheatley's *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*. Wheatley, who was the vicar of Furneaux Pelham, produced a treatise that was so popular that it continued to be republished well into the nineteenth century. The production of such religious works was important to the standing of the high churchmen, since it helped to maintain their academic credibility. Without such a successful appearance of intellectual reliability it would certainly have been much harder to have maintained their traditional interpretation of the *Polity*.

This Tory desire to reaffirm their enthusiasm for the *Polity* was clearly demonstrated by the publication of two new editions in 1705. The first was essentially a reissue of the standard text of 1662 with minor corrections of accumulated printing errors.²³ Walton's prefatory corrective *Life*, however, had been materially enlarged. John Strype, the ecclesiastical historian and biographer, had incorporated new material which primarily expanded upon Walton's depiction of Archbishop Whitgift as a zealous proponent of the Church. He was shown to have opposed Travers's elevation to the mastership of the Temple,

²¹ Anon, *The Shortest Way with: [Taken from Dr. Sach-ll's Sermon, and Others.] Or, Proposals for the Establishment of the Church*, (London: [No Printer], 1703), p. 16; Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 28.

²² Rupp, *Religion in England*, p. 70.

²³ R.Hooker, *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol.I, p. xxiv; R.Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker, in Eight Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity Completed Out of His Own Manuscripts. Dedicated to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, Charles II*, (London: Printed for R.C., S.S., B.W., M.W., G.C., 1705).

and to have supported Hooker during his dispute over the possibility of popish salvation.²⁴ Strype's publication of the allegations made against Hooker showed Travers to be an inflexible puritan in contrast to the judicious divine's more considered discussion of the matter. Hooker remained adamant that even amongst papists "they that desire forgiveness of secret sins, which they know not to be sins, and that are sorry for sins that they know not to be sins, (such) do repent."²⁵ Whitgift agreed that whilst ignorance could never excuse a fault, "the less their fault was, in respect of Ignorance, the more hope we have, that God is merciful to them."²⁶

These interpolations embellished Hooker's high Church credentials, but were really no more than minor tinkering with a well established tradition. Rather more radical was Benjamin Bragg's publication of an anonymous divine's *Faithful Abridgment of that Learned and Judicious Richard Hooker*.²⁷ This was the first condensed version of the *Polity* to be produced, and its compiler used the preface to make clear his hope that this new demonstration of Hooker's "subtil Genius" would serve as a corrective to Whig religious and political principles. "When our Church is beset by a Herd of Men, whom nothing but Anarchy or a Common-wealth can please...it's high time to pour in the Antidote, and strive to recover her: this Book hitherto has foil'd them, and we hope this Abridgment, coming out so seasonable in this Hurry of Whigism, may be a means to open the Eyes of some blind Zealots...; or at least to call back your Indifferent or Moderation Men, more bravely to defend her Canons and Constitution."²⁸

By reading Hooker all true sons of the Church would be instructed in the "Force of our Ecclesiastical Laws" and would be able to counteract the continued nonconformist hostility to "all Governments they have not the greatest Share in, and every Opinion that runs counter to

²⁴ R.Hooker, *The Ecclesiastical Polity and Other Works Of Richard Hooker: With His Life by Izaak Walton and Strype's Interpolations*, B.Hanbury, (ed.), (London: Holdsworth and Ball, 1830), pp. lxxi-lxxiii, lxxxvii, xcvi.

²⁵ *Ibid*, pp. xcii-xciv.

²⁶ *Ibid*, p. xcvi

²⁷ R.Hooker, *A Faithful Abridgment of the Works of that Learned and Judicious Richard Hooker. In Eight Books of Ecclesiastical Polity. And of all the Other Treatises Which Were Written by the Same Author with an Account of His Life*, (London: Printed by Benjamin Bragg, 1705).

²⁸ *Ibid*, the Preface.

Calvinism.” Their behaviour during the Civil War, under Charles II, and abuse of toleration under William, proved that they remained a threat to both the religious and political settlement.²⁹ More subtle was the threat posed by the increasing “Lukewarmness” of men who were not wholly for Hooker or Travers. It was possible to counteract a known enemy, but a secret one, like a snake in the grass, was almost impossible to detect. They should either stand with our “Judicious and Pious Hooker” or openly admit themselves to be of a contrary opinion so “that we may know the utmost of their Force and be better how to encounter their Number.”³⁰

This Tory determination to combat the opinions of their opponents was also marked within the flurry of high Church polemic encouraged by Anne’s reign. Like the compiler of the *Abridgment* they retained an obvious enthusiasm for Hooker as the epitome of the peaceable, pious Anglican divine. Wheatley drew upon him in his classic illustration of the Prayer Book, and William Nicholls, the literary cleric, similarly perpetuated this presentation of Hooker as an Anglican worthy. This portrayal was not just limited to England since copies of his work were also sent to the king of Prussia, and to many other eminent continental scholars.³¹

What impact these and other Hooker-sponsored attempts to promote the claims of Anglicanism made upon the “unconverted” is impossible to say, but they remain an important part of Queen Anne high Church rhetoric which has been largely overlooked. Even if they resulted in few conversions, they were undoubtedly beneficial to the morale and confidence of the Church party. Since it is so difficult to gauge their impact, it is not surprising that historians have preferred to concentrate upon the more obvious measures which the Church

²⁹ Rather surprisingly no attempt was made to gloss Hooker’s reluctance to countenance divine right episcopacy, or his belief in an original compact. Walton’s *Life* which was published at the start was clearly deemed to provide a sufficient corrective.

³⁰ *Ibid*, the Preface.

³¹ W. Nicholls, *A Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England: In Two Parts. Containing the Objections of Dissenters, Fairly Represented from Their Own Celebrated Writers; And Fully Answer’d from Scripture, the Primitive Fathers, and Our Pious and Learned Reformers. With an Introduction, Giving a Succinct History of the Separation Through the Several Reigns of Our Kings and Queens*, (London: Printed for J. Batley and H. Parker, 1730), pp. XIV, 20, 266, Additional Notes on the Common Prayer. By Bishop Cosins, Bishop Andrews, &c; C. Wheatley, *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: Being the Substance of Every Thing Liturgical in Bishop Sparrow, Mr L’Estrange, Dr Comber, Dr Nichols, and All Former Ritualists, Commentators, or Others, upon the Same Subject; Collected and Reduced into One Continued and Regular Method, and Interpass’d All Along with New Observations*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1819), p. 1.

Tories attempted to have enacted against the dissenters. They were no longer able to employ legal means to compel conformity, but it was still possible for them to impede nonconformist hopes and aspirations. This is clearly illustrated by the fierce scrutiny which the dissenting academies were placed under. The distinguished reputation which these institutions were acquiring had offended Tory sensitivities, which were jealous of the Anglican hegemony enjoyed at Oxford and Cambridge.³² Samuel Wesley, a distinguished divine and poet who was father to the founder of Methodism, was at the forefront of this campaign against the independent academies. He emphasized that they were not permitted by the act of uniformity, and were a clear threat to the stability of the nation since they were founded upon the religious principles which had resulted in the “Blood and Confusion” of the Civil War.³³

Wesley insisted that the puritan plea that they would conduct themselves quietly if admitted to the universities, or permitted their own academies, was not supported by their behaviour in Elizabethan England or during the Civil War. Hooker, as illustrated by both the *Polity* and Walton’s *Life*, had predicted that they would betray and ruin the universities. This “Meek and Holy Man...whose righteous Soul they so long vexed” had warned that “Their Opinions undermin’d the Universities, and that Men were inclin’d to expect the Dissolving those Corporations by them.”³⁴ The arrogance of the dissenters was such that they termed their opinion “the CAUSE, and the CAUSE of God.” Such confidence had encouraged them to caution the Elizabethan Parliament and Convocation, that the failure of their suits and supplications would result in other means being used, which would cause their “Hearts to ake.” Hooker warned that if the puritan threats prevailed it would lead to a disputation concerning the right of lawful authority to resist the pleas of the disciplinarians. “There is most just cause to fear lest our hastiness to embrace a thing of so perillous consequences, shou’d cause Posterity to feel those Evils, which as yet are more easie for as to prevent them ’twou’d be for them to remedy.”³⁵

³² Rupp, *Religion in England*, p. 172.

³³ F.G.James, ‘The Bishops in Politics, 1688-1714,’ in *Conflict in Stuart England, Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, W.A.Appleton and B.D.Henning, (eds.), (London: Jonathan Cape, 1960), (pp. 229-257), p. 247; M.R.Watts, *The Dissenters*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), Vol.I, pp. 264, 368; S.Wesley, *A Reply to Mr. Palmer’s Vindication of the Learning, Loyalty, Morals, and Most Christian Behaviour of the Dissenters towards the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavel, 1707), pp. 12, 14.

³⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 13, 123, 125.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 123.

Hooker's dark forebodings for the future had been proved accurate as the puritan inspired execution of Charles I demonstrated. Wesley stressed that such an action would have been abhorrent to Hooker who attributed the prince's power to God and held him accountable to none other.³⁶ Isaac Walton's biography, which Wesley clearly still rated as an indispensable companion to the *Polity*, warned that the dissenters were still a threat to the monarchy.³⁷ This opinion was clearly vindicated by Samuel Palmer, a leading nonconformist proponent of dissenting academies, whom Wesley claimed believed that a tyrant could and ought to be put to death. In this "he and his party go beyond their own Interpolations of Hooker, beyond King John's Charter,...both of which secure the Prince's Person, tho' he shou'd become a tyrant in Exercise."³⁸ Wesley was far from being alone in making such political allegations against the nonconformists, and their Whig sympathizers. William Oldisworth, a miscellaneous writer, who was associated with the Tory paper *The Examiner*, was equally vociferous in denouncing the Whigs for their subversive opinions. Oldisworth insisted that the *Polity* had ascribed to kings an original right of dominion, and demonstrated that no king could be subject to any other predominancy. This clearly contradicted the Whig belief that the people could judge and depose their monarch.³⁹

These allegations of Wesley and Oldisworth were very much in the political tradition of their Restoration predecessors, and were part of a wider struggle to reassert Hooker's credentials as a "Fellow sufferer" for high Church beliefs against the creeping post-1688 Whig appropriation of the *Polity*.⁴⁰ In a forlorn attempt to stem Whig enthusiasm for the last three books of the *Polity* the high churchmen maintained their belief that the nonconformists had "vilely mangled" the latter books, and made them "speak that after his Death which his Soul abhorred while he was Living."⁴¹ Wesley described how these republican interpolations,

³⁶ Ibid, p. 11.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 89.

³⁸ Ibid, p. 89.

³⁹ W. Oldisworth, *A Dialogue between Timothy and Philatheus. In Which the Principles and Projects of a Late Whimsical Book: Entitled the Rights of the Christian Church, &c. Are Fairly Stated and Answer'd in Their Kind: And Some Attempts Made towards the Discovery of a New Way of Reasoning, Intirely Unknown Both to the Ancients and Moderns*, (London: Printed by W.B. for Bernard Lintott, 1709), Vol.III, p. 228.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 227.

⁴¹ Wesley, *A Reply*, p. 123.

which pleased “some People so highly that for their sake they cou’d almost forgive him all the rest of the Book” were not in the copy which Bishop Sanderson had seen in Hooker’s own writing. Neither were republican sentiments supported by Walton’s reproduction of the missing fragments of Book VIII which had survived amongst Ussher’s papers.⁴² Oldisworth was equally dubious about the reliability of Book VIII and stressed that “this Chapter is for good reasons believed to be spurious: at least not to be very correct, which is plain from the Language, extreamly faulty, and unlike Hooker’s exactness.”

There was a growing awareness, however, amongst perceptive high churchmen that it was no longer sufficient merely to discount the latter books as corrupt. Although he maintained the traditional Tory scepticism concerning their reliability, Oldisworth also endeavoured to show that even the supposedly corrupted texts were far from supportive of Whig opinions. His close examination of the text of Book VIII was a reluctant recognition that increasing numbers of people were acknowledging it as an authentic work, and that only through the presentation of a thorough Tory assessment could he hope to prevent them from adhering to the Whig interpretation. Oldisworth described how much of the Whig case depended upon Hooker’s supposed statement “That what Power soever Kings and States had in religious Matters before the Coming of Christ, they are fully authorized by the Gospel to exercise the same, in all Affairs pertinent to the State of the true Christian Religion.” This was supposed to demonstrate that the Church could not enjoy any form of separate independence from the state. Oldisworth insisted, however, that it merely referred to the external “Regimen of the Church” and did not vindicate the Erastian notions of the Whigs.⁴³

Book VIII, even in its corrupt state, recognized that there was a difference between “the Secular and Temporal Orders...notwithstanding the Union of Church and Commonwealth.” This was clear from Hooker’s recognition that an excommunicated man was not “Discommuned, or Banished the State, and a Man Discommuned is not therefore Excommunicated and excluded the Church; He tells us elsewhere, that Power may be of Divine Institution, tho’ it grew from agreement among Nations: A Maxim that ought to be your Aversion; And to shew the apparent Distinction between the Power of the Church and State.”

⁴² Ibid, p. 14.

⁴³ W. Oldisworth, *A Dialogue between Timothy and Philatheus*, Vol.III, pp. 227-228.

It was absurd for the Whigs to suggest that kings might personally determine matters of doctrine, excommunicate, or order how the sacraments should be administered. Oldisworth demands what more “could an Author say to explain himself more clearly or to contradict you strenuously.”⁴⁴ When such ridiculous notions were put forward it was not difficult for Hooker and his sympathizers to “exert the sprightly remains of youthful Wit, and laugh all their Enemies to scorn” for being as dull, as they are deceitful.⁴⁵

In the face of this Tory revival Whig writers who attempted to rescue Hooker from their grasp met with immediate hostility. Matthew Tindal, who was a writer of Whig low Church pamphlets, caused a sensation in 1706 with the publication of his *Rights of the Christian Church*. In it he asserted that Hooker had defended regal supremacy over the Church. “And ’tis to the Law of Nature that Mr Hooker refers us, in supposing “That what Power soever King’s and States had in Religious Matters before the Coming of Christ, they are fully authoriz’d by the Gospel to exercise the same in all Affairs pertinent to the State of the true Christian Religion.” The *Polity* had recognized that the monarch was perfectly entitled to exercise control over the Church, since he could only exceed his authority by usurping the natural rights of the people.⁴⁶ Such claims were a clear affront to the Tory belief that there could be one society with two independent powers within it. He was answered by many writers, including his old tutor, the non-juring George Hickes, who reported him as saying that he “was writing a book which would make the clergy mad.”⁴⁷ In that aim he was undoubtedly successful since over twenty reponses were produced.

In spite of such anxieties it is clear that the Whig interest in Hooker was forcing the Tory political attitude towards the *Polity* to evolve quietly. Their growing recognition of the

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 228.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. viii.

⁴⁶ M.Tindal, *The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted, against the Romish, and All Other Priests Who Claim an Independent Power over It. With a Preface Concerning the Government of the Church of England, as by Law Establish’d*, (London: [No Printer], 1706), p. 309.

⁴⁷ G.Hickes, *Two Treatises, One of the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order. Formerly Written, and Now Published to Obviate the Erroneous Opinions, Fallacious Reasonings, and Bold and False Assertions, in a Late Book, Entituled, the Rights of the Christian Church. With a Large Prefatory Discourse, Wherein Is Contained an Answer to the Said Book*, (London: Printed by W.B. for Richard Sare, 1707).

latter books was something of a withdrawal from the previous ultra-Tory glossing of the *Polity*, and was indicative of the steady acknowledgment of Hooker's political doctrine which had been taking place under William. The Restoration position that sovereignty was exclusively vested within the king was being gradually abandoned, and replaced with a belief in a trinitarian legislature. This provided a system of checks and balances which meant that remedial action could be taken, if necessary, to redress a constitutional imbalance. The advantages of such a settlement were stressed by Offspring Blackall. He had been a faithful chaplain to William, but this had not prevented accusations in 1705 that he had continued a non-juror for two years after the Revolution. In *The Subjects Duty* he described how he knew "not how to begin a Discourse upon this Subject better, than in those Words wherewith the judicious Mr Hooker begins his Learned Discourse of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Policy." Hooker had recognized that it was always easier "to perswade a Multitude that they are not so well govern'd as they ought to be," than it was to convince them of their good fortune.⁴⁸

Sovereignty, he insisted, was absolute and irresistible, but could be vested in any form of government from a republic to a patriarchy. There was "no one Sort or Form of Government that can truly be said to be of Divine Institution. The Power of Government...is from God...but the designation and appointment of particular Persons to the Administration, this is Humane."⁴⁹ In England the outcome of human decision had been a king-in-parliament. Such an authority should be held in "the highest Honour" by their subjects, but if a prince does not conform to divine law "it is impossible that they should be both comply'd with by an Active Obedience."⁵⁰ This eventuality, however, should not arise because the government was incapable of harming the populace "but with their own Consent, by Representatives of their own Choosing; and it may be reasonably hop'd, that they will never be so foolish as to give their Consent to their own destruction."⁵¹

⁴⁸ O.Blackall, *The Subjects Duty. A Sermon Preached at the Parish-Church of St Dunstan in the West, on Thursday, March 8th 1704/5. Being the Anniversary Day of Her Majesty's Happy Accession to the Throne.* (London: Printed by J.Leake for Walter Kettelby, 1705), p. 5; Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 398.

⁴⁹ Blackall, *The Subjects Duty*, p. 18.

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 11.

⁵¹ R.Eccleshall, 'Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: The Reception of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,' In *History of Political Thought*, Vol.II, 1981, (pp. 63-117), p. 109.

Non-jurors, such as Charles Leslie, who continued to promote absolute non-resistance within a patriarchal state were very much the exception.⁵² Such extremism made it easy for the Whigs to denounce him as a distorter of the English political polity through his location of legislative power exclusively within the crown, and not within the king-in-parliament. *The Observer*, a Whig newspaper, quoted the “Words of a noted Royalist and Great Divine of the Church of England, the fam’d Mr.Hooker” from the much cited tenth chapter of Book I of the *Polity* to show that “you may see that what we old Whigs call Constitution is no new Doctrine, nor the invention of Republicans and Dissenters.” Hooker’s support for Whig principles demonstrated that the opponents of absolutism “have as Great Men on their Side, as ever our Church bred.”⁵³

Most non-jurors prudently avoided discussing the Whig usage of Hooker; Leslie was an exception since he was prepared to pronounce Hooker’s political doctrine to be wrong. “If Mr.Hooker says the same things as Mr.Hoadly, I must oppose Mr Hooker as well as Mr Hoadly, and desire some reasons, beside their authority. ...It is long since I thought Mr Hooker to have gone wrong in this matter, and I have seen the mischief it has done. He is quoted by Mr. Lock, by *Observers* and *Reviews*, and most of the republican writers; but I have not attacked him because of the reputation he has (otherwise) deservedly obtained in the Church of England; yet I would not be misled by him.” Few were as bold, or as honest, as Leslie in registering their divergence from Hooker on being confronted with his unpalatable political doctrine. Even in disagreement, however, in terms reminiscent of Filmer, he strove to be as deferential as possible. All were agreed that Hooker was a learned man, but like all intelligent men it was possible for them to make errors of judgment.⁵⁴

Leslie’s enforced abandonment of the *Polity* marked an exceptional public triumph for the Whigs. In contrast most mainstream Tories, as has already been shown, had moved away from the political opinions of the non-juring constituency, and had been able to adapt their

⁵² P.B.Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context. Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 55, 56.

⁵³ Eccleshall, ‘Hooker,’ p. 102; Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 31; G.J.Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought. The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), p. 221.

⁵⁴ Eccleshall, ‘Hooker,’ pp. 102-103.

understanding of passive obedience to the changed circumstances of the post-1688 settlement. Indeed many of their opinions indicated a growing convergence with Whig ideology. This increasing degree of consensus, however, should not be exaggerated since any Tory rehabilitation of the *Polity* was far from complete. Old animosities between the ultra-Tories and the Whigs could still resurrect themselves with remarkable force. Whig over-confidence was exposed when their misguided attempt to impeach Sacheverell demonstrated that extreme notions of passive resistance were far from dead. Henry Sacheverell, a high Church divine and pamphleteer, had used his assize sermon of 1709 to uphold non-resistance and to denounce the Whig government's policies of toleration towards dissenters. The Whig-dominated Commons furiously condemned the sermon as seditious, and sought to make a public example of him. He was accused of attempting "to traduce and condemn the late happy Revolution; to contradict and arrain the Resolution of both houses of Parliament; to create Jealousies and Divisions amongst her Majesty's Subjects, and to incite them to Sedition and Rebellion."⁵⁵

Public opinion was behind Sacheverell and large crowds cheered his progress to the trial. Sir John Saint Leger complained how Sacheverell had passed by his door "in a Flaming and Open Chariot," when he deserved to have been dragged through the streets on a sledge.⁵⁶ The ultra-Tories were well aware that the public excitement surrounding the trial afforded a major opportunity to assert the doctrine of passive obedience, and sought to demonstrate that it had been "the General opinion of our most Orthodox and Able Divines from the Time of the Reformation to This Day."⁵⁷ Sir Constantine Phipps, a Jacobite lawyer who was defending Sacheverell, quoted from a "Treatise of Church Government: To which is added a Treatise of the Regal Power, and of the Novelty of the Doctrine of Resistance, Publish'd by Dr Bernard in his *Clavi Trabales*."⁵⁸ There was nothing at all unusual about this, but Phipps also took the

⁵⁵ *A Compleat History of the Whole Proceedings of the Parliament of Great Britain against Dr Henry Sacheverell: With His Tryal before the house of Peers, for High Crimes and Misdemeanours; The Reasons of those Lords that Enter'd Their Protests; And the Speeches of Several Lords before Judgment Was Given*, (London: Printed by J.Baker, 1710), p. 13; J.A.Downie, *To Settle the Succession of the State. Literature and Politics, 1678-1750*, (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd, 1994), pp. 74-76; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 297; Holmes, *British Politics*, pp. 92, 168.

⁵⁶ J.Saint-Leger, *The Managers Pro and Con: Or, an Account of What Is Said at Child's and Tom's Coffee-Houses for and against Dr. Sacheverell*, (London: Printed for H.Clements, 1710), p. 3.

⁵⁷ *Collection of Passages Referr'd to by Dr Henry Sacheverell in His Answer to the Articles of His Impeachment*, (London: Printed for H.Clements, 1710), p. 3; Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 187.

⁵⁸ *A Compleat History of the Whole Proceedings*, pp. 212-213.

genuinely surprising step of quoting from the previously discounted eighth book. This book had been considered to be the complete antithesis to the Tory belief in passive obedience and Restoration writers such as Walton had been at pains to tarnish its reputation. The Glorious Revolution, however, had encouraged a more favourable appraisal of its contents. Phipps clearly recognized this shift of opinion, and sought to capitalize upon it rather than to resist it.

“That Subjection which we owe to lawful Powers, doth not only import, that we should be under them by Order of our State, but that we shew all Submission towards them, both by Honour and Obedience; He that resisteth them resisteth God: And resisted they be, if either the Authority it self, which they exercise, be denied, or if Resistance be made, but only so far forth, as doth touch their Persons, which are invested with Power.” Non-resistance might also consist of a refusal to acknowledge the laws and statutes which were be enacted by their power. Mere obedience to the laws, however, was still insufficient if it was “contemptuously or repiningly done, because we can do no otherwise. The Apostles Precept therefore is, Be subject even for God’s sake, be Subject not for Fear, but of meer Conscience, knowing, that he which resisteth them, purchaseth to himself Condemnation.”⁵⁹

Authority may appear to have been conferred upon princes by men, but they hold it through divine right. “Payment of Tribute unto Caesar, is the plain Law of Jesus Christ unto Kings by Human Right; Honour by very Divine Right is due.” It was no where prescribed that government must be by princes, “yet the Law of God doth give them, which once are exalted unto that place of Estate, Right to exact at the Hands of their Subjects general Obedience in whatsoever Affairs their Power may serve to Command, and God doth ratifie Works of that Sovereign Authority, which Kings have received by Men.” Only if we are prepared to defy all “Law, Equity and Reason” can we refute that hereditary birth is the means by which political authority is handed on. Public ceremonies, such as the coronation, do not grant the crown to the prince, but publicly confirm his “Possession of that Thing he hath Right unto.”⁶⁰

This use of Hooker was completely unexpected by Sacheverell’s Whig opponents. Just before his impeachment Benjamin Hoadly, the Whig leader of the low Church divines,

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 212.

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 213.

had used Hooker to denounce the absolutist form of government put forward by the patriarchalists. Before such a form of government became acceptable it had to be proved that the power of fathers was absolute over the lives of their descendants. Until this was demonstrated “unlimited non-resistance can” not be inferred from the scheme “espoused and established by the Excellent and Judicious Mr. Hooker, which founds the Authority of Governours upon the Voluntary Compact of Men.”⁶¹ Hoadly then made the point three times that “Mr Hooker the greatest Defender of the Church” had, in fact, recognized that under an absolutist government it was “glorious to assist Subjects in their Resistance to their Sovereigns, and their endeavours to rid themselves of their Tyranny and Oppression.”⁶²

Hooker, he declared, “the darling of the Old Church of England,” could be used to undermine the opinions of those who clung to outlandish political opinions. The *Polity* demonstrated the legitimacy of a constitution in which legislative power was shared between the monarch, commons and lords. Hooker’s account of the consensual basis of English government had been skilfully deployed to establish the reasonable and central character of Whig political opinions. Hoadly insisted that if Hooker had lived longer he would have been dubbed “a Man of Revolutionary Principles,” even though his intention was “to bring his Adversaries to a due sense of the Authority of Governours and Laws.” Eccleshall describes how the effect was to depict “Whigs as heirs to one who had defined the political, as well as ecclesiastical via media.” They had secured the structures of political society, but recognized that good government required constitutional safeguards to prevent the ruler from ruining “those Societies of which they are the Guardians and Patrons.”⁶³

At the trial itself, Major-General James Stanhope, who had served with distinction in the Peninsula War, and was one of the managers of the impeachment charges, had confidently cited Hooker. He insisted that, but for his “fear of tiring their Lordships, he might, from many Passages out of...Hooker, evince beyond Contradiction that the Constitution of England was founded upon Compact; and that the Subjects of the Kingdom have in their several publick and

⁶¹ B.Hoadly, *The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Consider'd. In a Defence of the Doctrine Deliver'd in a Sermon Preach'd before the Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, Sept.29, 1705.*, (London: Printed by W.B. for James Knapton, 1710), the Preface, p .xi.

⁶² Ibid, pp. 148, 154, 156.

⁶³ Eccleshall, ‘Hooker,’ pp. 103-104.

private Capacities as legal a Title to what were their Rights by law, as a Prince to the Possession of his Crown.”⁶⁴ Consequently when Phipps began quoting Hooker to the detriment of this opinion there was an immediate furore. Stanhope insisted that the trial also heard a passage from the eighth book which affirmed the limited nature of kingship in communities which established constitutional restraints.⁶⁵ Sir Joseph Jekyll, the staunch Whig chief justice of Chester, “call’d the Book; because, the place they desir’d to have read might explain the Passages read by them.” Stanhope, on establishing that the cited edition of the *Polity* was published in 1705, commented that “if they should be mistaken in the Edition, he hop’d they should not be hindred in their Reply from reading those Passages in the Edition he had consulted.”⁶⁶

Eccleshall insists that such a retort to the eclectic Tory usage of the *Polity* demonstrated that it was safer for them to cite Hooker’s condemnation of faction than it was to embrace the intimate, and sometimes embarrassing, details of his political doctrine.⁶⁷ But he may be mistaken in his belief that such rumblings of Whig discontent silenced the newly recovered Tory enthusiasm for Hooker. The trial, as he admits, generated an enormous amount of literature in support of Sacheverell’s stance. This consisted of new editions of already published works, such as Seller’s *History of Passive Obedience*, which was revised to make specific reference to Sacheverell, but there was also a large crop of original works which underlined the *Polity*’s importance to the ultra-Tory case.⁶⁸

The enthusiasm of Sacheverell’s counsel for the works of Hooker was highlighted by the publication, just after the trial, of a collection of all the sources that they had referred to. Two lengthy extracts from *ClaviTrabales* and Book VIII were included. The work was very popular and had run through four editions by the end of the year.⁶⁹ Furthermore both passages appeared one year later in *The Primitive Doctrine of the Church of England*

⁶⁴ *A Compleat History of the Whole Proceedings*, p. 86.

⁶⁵ *A Compleat History of the Whole Proceedings*, p. 212; Eccleshall, ‘Hooker,’ p. 104.

⁶⁶ *A Compleat History of the Whole Proceedings*, p. 213.

⁶⁷ Eccleshall, ‘Hooker,’ p. 109.

⁶⁸ A. Seller, *A Defence of Dr Sacheverell. Or, Passive Obedience Prov’d to Be the Doctrine of the Church of England, from the Reformation to these Times*, (London: [No Printer], 1710).

⁶⁹ Anon, *Collections of Passages Referr’d to by Dr Henry Sacheverell in His Answer to the Articles of His Impeachment*, (London: Printed for H. Clements, 1710), p. 6.

Vindicated.⁷⁰ Moreover the Whigs suffered the indignity of criticism for their supposed misuse of the *Polity*. George Smalridge, an Anglican clergyman who went on to become bishop of Bristol in 1714, vehemently criticized the Whig attempts to deploy Hooker against Sacheverell. "But the scraps of those Excellent Authors serv'd only to show their own Inimitableness, and expose the Declaration they were tagg'd to. Indeed these Purple Patched quite put me out of conceit with the Coat: And the Soldier might have pass'd Muster much better, had it not been for the affection of the Scolar."⁷¹ The whole trial became something of a humiliation for the government. Although Sacheverell was found guilty by seventeen votes his sentence was so lenient that it was generally regarded as a victory for the Tory party.

The widespread public acclaim which these Tory views were receiving by the end of Anne's reign suggested that once again they were in the ascendancy. A large number of the populace had been happy to embrace Sacheverell's belief that the policies of the low churchmen encouraged nonconformist treachery towards Church and State.⁷² This renewed enthusiasm for the traditional Hooker-sponsored settlement was confirmed by the 1710 election when the Tories won a majority. Once in power they passed an occasional conformity bill which ensured that it was no longer possible for nonconformists to evade legislation designed to keep them out of public office. Three years later another Tory electoral victory ensured the passing of the act of schism which confined the educational activity of dissenters to the families of noblemen. The will of the high Church lower house of Convocation was still being thwarted by the upper house, but the leading Whig bishops, such as Tenison, Lloyd and Cumberland, were becoming increasingly aged and infirm. The translation of high churchmen, such as John Robinson, the bishop of Bristol, to the see of London, seemed to indicate that in time men of his persuasion might reasonably hope to dominate the episcopal benches.⁷³

The standing of the Whigs had clearly taken a severe battering, and their self-esteem

⁷⁰ Anon, *The Primitive Doctrine of the Church of England Vindicated, According to the Apostolick Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance*, (London: Printed by J.Baker, 1711), pp. 8-9.

⁷¹ G.Smardridge, *The Thoughts of a Country Gentleman upon Reading Dr Sacheverell's Tryal. In a Letter to a Friend*, (London: Printed by the Booksellers of London, 1710), p. 77.

⁷² Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church*, p. 82; Holmes, *British Politics*, pp. 48, 93; H.Sacheverell, *D.Sacheverell's True Character of a Low =Church=Man Drawn to the Life*, (London: [No Printer], 1710), p. 3; Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-14*, (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1984), p. 61.

⁷³ Every, *The High Church Party*, p. 147; Szechi, *Jacobitism*, pp. 59-60, 151.

and confidence were obviously shaken. Whilst the Whig association with the *Polity* had been challenged, however, it would be foolish to deny that their contractual argument, although temporarily abated, continued to hold considerable sway. The widespread unpopularity of the Whigs, and popular enthusiasm for Sacheverell owed more to a general disillusionment with the government over foreign policy than to the success of any abstract political treatise. Any revival of enthusiasm for the ideas of non-resistance could only be temporary because the frail health of Queen Anne meant that the accession of the Hanoverians was imminent. Tories would then be faced with the stark choice between Jacobitism, or some further diminishment of the doctrine of passive obedience as they understood it. High churchmen were already publicly apprehensive regarding this eventuality, since the thought of a Lutheran prince, who did not speak English, being proclaimed supreme governor of the Anglican Church was complete anathema to them.⁷⁴

The increasing uncertainty about the succession which was generated by the behaviour of Jacobite sympathizers restored Whig confidence. Only four years after Sacheverell's impeachment Sir John Willes, a Whig lawyer who displayed more interest in politics than legal matters, felt able to publish a defence of England's trinitarian constitution which drew extensively upon Hooker. Government he reminded his readers was instituted not for "the sake of any one particular Member, or for the aggrandizing of any one Family; but for the Good of the whole Society." This was no novel notion since the tenth section of the first book of the *Polity*, (that old Whig "proof text"), vindicated the legitimacy of this belief. "Mr Hooker is an Author of unquestionable Credit, and has been always esteemed a Man of great Learning as well as a truly Orthodox Divine: And therefore his Authority will be of much greater Weight than any thing that I can say."⁷⁵

The three pages of text which were quoted by Willes demonstrated that absolute monarchy was inconsistent with civil society and that all governments arose from composition and agreement unless the commission was "immediately and personally" received from God. There was no need to elaborate upon the words of the *Polity* which have been "so full and

⁷⁴ Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church*, p. 87; Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 94, D.D.Szechi, *Jacobitism*, pp. 3, 153-158, 164, 194-199.

⁷⁵ J. Willes, *The Present Constitution and the Present Succession Vindicated: In Answer to a Late Book Entitled, the Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted*, (London: Printed for J. Baker, 1714), p. 1.

clear,” but two rules of government, “which are founded upon Mr Hooker’s Principles, might be drawn from them. Firstly government “was made for Man, and not Man for Government; consequently, the good of the People is the supreme Law in all Countries. And therefore all Notions of Government, which are inconsistent with the good of the People, must necessarily be false and erroneous.” Secondly there is no place in scripture that specifies any universal form of government. Only the principle of obedience from subjects to their governors can be located; “But to what particular Persons it is to be paid, must be determined by the Laws of each Nation. And those Laws likewise (as we have been taught by a very learned Prelate) must be the Measure of every Subject’s Obedience.”⁷⁶ The succession laws of each country may vary in the same way that the laws of inheritance differ without transgressing any law of reason. “Since then the Hereditary Right of the Crown of England is plainly a Creature of the Law, and subject to a Law meerly human, it follows from Reasons, as well as Practice, that the Legislative Power of the Nation have an Authority to limit and bind the Crown, and the Descent and Inheritance thereof.”⁷⁷

Individuals, such as Willes, ensured that the Whigs regained a strong voice, and that their political opinions were the ones in the ascendancy at the accession of the house of Hanover. The non-Jurors and ultra-Tories had lost their polemical battle to maintain the portrayal of Hooker as the upholder of divine right monarchy as a majority view. It was left to the 1715 and 1745 rebellions to extinguish the final fading hopes of any enforced return to the old Restoration political status quo. Instead Georgian England eagerly embraced the myth of the historic balanced constitution.⁷⁸ The historian James Tyrrell claimed that all ideas of arbitrary monarchy were completely alien to Elizabethan divines such as Hooker and Bilson.⁷⁹ Hooker was a greater man than Filmer; although he placed “the Originall of all Governments in the Heads of Fathers of Families...yet it is plain that he makes a clear Distinction between Oeconomical government, and that Politick or Civil Power, which arises from Compact

⁷⁶ Ibid, pp. 5-6.

⁷⁷ Ibid, p. 62.

⁷⁸ W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries, Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 18.

⁷⁹ J. Tyrrell, *Bibliotheca Politica: Or, an Enquiry into the Antient Constitution of the English Government, With Respect to the Just Extent of the Regal Power, and the Rights and Liberties of the Subject. Wherein All the Chief Arguments Both for and against the Late Revolution, Are Impartially Represented and Consider'd*, (London: Printed for D. Browne, A. Bell, J. Darby, A. Bettesworth J. Pemberton, C. Rivington, J. Hooke, R. Cruttenden and T. Lox, J. Battely and E. Symon, 1718), p. 4.

between Men.”⁸⁰

Tory attempts to maintain the confessional state also foundered with the accession of George I.⁸¹ In spite of their efforts under Anne, toleration finally came to mean genuine freedom for the dissenters. It was imperfect since the universities remained closed, the test act remained in force, and there was much social intolerance, but unlike 1688 it did mark a clear public break with the past.⁸² The differences between high Church and low Church obviously still remained, but they became much less conspicuous after the Bangorian controversy resulted in the suppression of Convocation.⁸³ The prolonged suspension of this body deprived the high churchmen of a public platform from which to air their views, and ensured that their theology came to bear a much diminished influence upon public life.

This greatly impeded the Church Tories, but did not result in a wholesale abandonment of their old principles. Whilst the accession of George I had effectively undermined any widespread attempt to maintain the perception of Hooker as a high Tory political writer this ideal was never totally extinguished. Peter Nockles has demonstrated that throughout the eighteenth century the notion of the natural union of a divinely ordered Church and State continued to persist. In particular he draws attention to the way that the excesses of the French Revolution helped to engender “a renewed awareness of the jure divino grounds of ecclesiastical power, as of the grounds of monarchical authority, the origin of government and political obligation.”⁸⁴ Neither did the new Whig supremacy compel the Tory abandonment of the *Polity* as an important authority regarding the English Church. Old-fashioned Caroline theology of a “Non-Juror type” became increasingly diluted, but could still be located within Hanoverian Anglicanism. *The Unbloody Sacrifice* by John Johnson, a diligent parish priest with non-juring sympathies, and the teaching given to John Keble and Edward Pusey by their parents, clearly demonstrate that it continued to enjoy a small, but respectable following.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Ibid, pp. 96-97.

⁸¹ Miller, *Glorious Revolution*, p. 32; Nockles, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 54.

⁸² Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church*, p. 91.

⁸³ Ibid, pp. 115, 132.

⁸⁴ P.B.Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context. Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 54, 63.

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 115.

Hooker's importance as a commentator upon the English Church, however, was not just marginalized to this faithful remnant, but proved to be equally enduring amongst the Whig mainstream. Whilst always opposing the high Church interpretation of the *Polity* they had continued to esteem Hooker as a figure whose opinions and life commanded respect. At the height of the Sacheverell trial, Edward Bentley, the former chaplain to Stillingfleet, had apparently seen nothing incongruous in commending Walton's Life of the "Judicious and Pious Mr. Hooker, Author of the justly admired Books of Ecclesiastical Polity" to the readers of his biography of the late Whig bishop. The influence of Walton, even upon the Whigs, was still surprisingly strong since Bentley retained the traditional bias that Walton was an "Ingenuous and Faithful Biographer," but Gauden who had been guilty of "taking Things upon trust, without a due Examination, thereby suffered himself to be led into divers notorious mistakes concerning him."⁸⁶ This Whig desire to present Hooker as the voice of moderate "Erastian" Anglicanism was unable to come to full fruition until the accession of the Hanoverians, but swiftly went on to become the dominant interpretation of Georgian England.

Its importance was encapsulated in leading Whig works such as William Warburton's *Alliance between Church and State*. Warburton, a stereotype of an eighteenth century Whig bishop, approved of Hooker's criticisms of the puritans' attempts to subordinate secular power to ecclesiastical, and commended the *Polity* for resisting attempts to claim that any form of Church government could ever be divinely ordained. Like Locke he insisted that Hooker had recognized that all government was the result of an original social contract. The State had entered into an alliance with the Church for political reasons, and consequently protected it by test and endowment laws. In return the Church had abandoned its right to be an independent power.⁸⁷ Warburton used block capitals to emphasize that "THE TRUE END FOR WHICH RELIGION IS ESTABLISHED IS NOT TO PROVIDE FOR THE TRUE FAITH, BUT FOR CIVIL UNITY."⁸⁸

⁸⁶ R. Bentley, *Life and Character of that Eminent and Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet Lord Bishop of Worcester Together with Some Account of the Works He Has Publish'd*, in *The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr. Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character*, (London: Printed by J. Hepinstall, for Henry and George Mortlock, 1709), Vol. I, (pp. 1-46), p. 1

⁸⁷ J. Gascoigne, 'The Unity of Church and State Challenged: Responses to Hooker from the Restoration to the Nineteenth-Century Age of Reform,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 21, No. 1, (pp. 60-79), p. 64.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p. 66.

Such a concept would have been unthinkable to most seventeenth century churchmen, who possessed a strong belief in the sanctity of the Church. Warburton's conclusions, however, were the natural long-term consequences of the 1688 settlement. The changed status of the post-1688 Church had made the abandonment of many cherished Restoration beliefs inevitable. Such an ideological justification of the Church had only been delayed for so long due to the relentless pressures of the high churchmen to maintain the confessional State. Until the death of Anne the Tory belief in a high Church Hooker could still claim to be the accepted authority, although its swift displacement by the Whig presentation of the *Polity* suggest that much of its apparent vigour was superficial. The accession of the house of Hanover immediately forced the widespread abandonment of past beliefs, since it became increasingly clear that there could never be a return to the ideology of the Stuart State. This meant that the Whig conceptions of Hooker which had been slowly emerging, in spite of the highly successful Tory reaction, were bound to be triumphant. High Church interpretations were too vigorous to fade totally away, but they had to wait until Keble's nineteenth-century edition of the *Polity* to recover their earlier dominance.

Hooker's Reputation: A Conclusion

At the start of the seventeenth century Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* was viewed as a Reformed text. Only those sola scriptura puritans, against whom it was directed, regarded it as anti-Protestant. There was certainly no perception that there was anything distinctively Anglican about the *Polity*. Hooker had merely reiterated the belief of an earlier generation of reformers that the national Church was able "to make canons for the use of Ceremonies, and by law to impose an obedience to them, as upon her children" without express scriptural sanction.¹

This heavy emphasis upon conformity to external Church forms, however, rather than internal assent to doctrine, meant that Hooker was subsequently embraced by the Caroline divines. Hooker's expansive style combined with his obvious concern for the sacraments, the dignity of worship, and a universal liturgical uniformity ensured that he became a valuable authority in their quest for religious stability. Such a development was far from universal, however, since both moderate conformists and a minority of puritans were genuinely horrified by this portrayal of Hooker as the proponent of a distinctive divine-right English Church. When royal power crumbled in the early 1640s they were initially united in their desire to curtail these Laudian pretensions. After this initial co-operation, however, it became swiftly apparent that there was no agreed agenda concerning what to put in its place. Moderates merely wanted to return to the Hooker-sponsored status quo of the Elizabethan Church whilst zealous reformers sought to establish Presbyterianism or Independency.

The advent of civil war resulted in an outright parliamentary hostility towards both Church and king which forced many moderates to embrace Laudian positions they would previously have derided as extreme. Charles's execution conclusively demonstrated that conciliation had failed, and that Hooker-sponsored Laudianism provided the only realistic alternative. By the eve of the Restoration proponents of the old English Church had abandoned Hooker's desire for broad comprehension, and had replaced it with a determination to enforce

¹ R. Eccleshall, 'Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: The Reception of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,' in *The History Of Political Thought*, Vol.2, 1981, (pp. 63-117), p. 83.

obedience to the immutable divinely ordained order of Church and State.² Chapter II demonstrates that at the Restoration there were concerted attempts to use Hooker to promote a broad religious settlement but the combined opposition of a staunch Cavalier Parliament and zealous high churchmen ensured that it was the Laudian understanding of the *Polity* which triumphed. In 1659 Stillingfleet had insisted that scripture provided no eternal form of sanction for any form of religious government, but by the Restoration he maintained that the Church was a distinctive society instituted by “Christ’s own Appointment” with specific officers to support it.³

Gauden’s 1662 publication of the first complete edition of the *Polity* was expected to confirm this Anglican triumphalist reading. In fact Gauden’s failure to incorporate the “missing” passages from *Clavi Trabales* into Book VIII gave the impression that Hooker had believed in an original compact, and the previously unknown Book VII fell far short of the expectation of Restoration episcopalians. Whilst zealous high churchmen remained devoted to the congenial contents of the first five books they were anxious to find a way to disregard the substance of the last three. The recent animosities of the Civil War were far too recent for them to entertain any concept of moderation. Fortunately Walton’s *Life* offered them a solution with its presentation of a scholarly peaceable Anglican divine whose posthumous books had been corrupted by hostile puritan forces.

This was a remarkably successful piece of Anglican apologetic which was almost universally accepted. Restoration churchmen were able to embrace a Hooker-sponsored belief in the perfection of the English Church, and to assert that royal supremacy was a personal attribute of the sovereign.⁴ Although in the eighteenth century Coleridge voiced his suspicions against the high Church party it was not until well into this century that widespread belief in the

² J. Gascoigne, ‘The Unity of Church and State Challenged: Responses to Hooker from the Restoration to the Nineteenth-Century Age of Reform,’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, Feb.1997, (pp. 60-79), p. 60.

³ Ibid, p. 81.

⁴ W.S.Crowley, ‘Erastianism in England to 1640,’ In *The Journal of Church and State*, Vol.32, No.5, 1990, (pp. 549-566), p. 563.

authenticity of the later books has been fully restored.⁵ Chapter III shows that there were challenges to the Restoration settlement culminating in the exclusion crisis, but these all ended in failure. Although Charles had been reluctant to associate himself with the Tories he was even less anxious to make himself the prisoner of the Whig faction, and successfully strove to undermine their political dominance through parliamentary dissolution and electoral manipulation. Such royal success ensured that Hooker's high Church identity not only emerged intact, but was considerably enhanced as part of the ensuing Tory reaction. It is not surprising that churchmen subsequently recalled Charles's reign as the perfect embodiment of Hooker's vision of the Christian Commonwealth.

Although Charles's reign was largely peaceful the increasing importance that Restoration churchmen attributed to bishops encouraged the conception that the Church was autonomous from the State. The claims of the bishops to hold office by divine-right clearly posed a potential threat to the royal supremacy. Only when the monarch was happy to be guided in his Church policy and deliberately avoided religious confrontation could the two claims successfully co-exist. This latent problem became explosively real on the accession of James II when his pro-Catholic policies forced the bishops to choose between their loyalties to him or to the Church. Chapter IV has demonstrated that this sudden proliferation of royal-sponsored Catholic polemicists quoting Hooker only served to complicate further this episcopal dilemma. With great difficulty the bishops sought to resolve this conundrum by stressing their loyalty to James whilst resisting those acts which they perceived to be illegal.⁶ The bishops were disastrously divided in their response, however, to the enforced abdication of James, and the proffering of the crown to William and Mary. Nine of them were unable to reconcile with this with their earlier pledge of allegiance to James and chose to become non-jurors rather than submit to a new oath. Although marginalized they were determined to maintain the Restoration Hookerian belief that it was the State's responsibility to succour the Church, and the Church's obligation to "sanctify the state in a spirit of service."⁷

⁵ R.F.Brinkley, (ed.) *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. 143; W.Speed Hill, (ed.), *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, (Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977); C.J.Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Richard Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940).

⁶ Gascoigne, 'The Unity Of Church,' pp.61-62.

⁷ P.B.Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context. Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 54.

The Whig supporters of 1688, however, ensured that Hooker did not vanish from mainstream religious and political thought with the exodus of the nonjurors. In Chapter V I argued that they prudently recognized that if Hooker could be shown to support the results of the Glorious Revolution he would confer respectability upon it. There were some radical theories of social contract but most Whigs only sought to use Hooker to defend the existing fabric of society whilst providing constitutional safeguards against the abuse of monarchical power. Those arguments which Hooker had directed against religious radicals were now cited in favour of the balanced constitution. The majority of politically-conforming Tories were not prepared to accept this belief in conditional kingship, and preferred to justify their acquiescence to the new regime by embracing the constitutionalism embodied in common law. By attaching the doctrine of passive resistance to this they were able to remain faithful to their Restoration principles and avoid any radical ideas that might have arisen in the aftermath of the Revolution settlement. Under Queen Anne there was a revival of the more extreme political interpretations of Hooker, but this brief Tory domination withered with the accession of the Hanoverians and the arrival of Whig dominance.

The post-1688 importance of the Whigs also severely curtailed the old high Church ideal of the confessional state. The massive exodus of nonjurors and the new parliamentary-sanctioned toleration of the dissenters encouraged the slow growth of an English Erastianism. Most of the newly appointed bishops felt less inclined towards a Hooker-sponsored justification of a divine Church than their predecessors, although there were still plenty of lower clergy who clung vociferously to this opinion until the suppression of convocation deprived them of a voice. Although the Erastianism of moderate latitudinarians such as William Warburton and William Paley heavily influenced the eighteenth century, Nockles has demonstrated in *The Oxford Movement in Context* that the old Restoration Anglican belief in the “organic union of two interrelated divinely-ordained powers” continued to persist.⁸ Not just the non-jurors, but such notables as the political theorist Edmund Burke, and even George

⁸ Nockles, *Oxford Movement*, pp. 29, 53, 54, 61, 63, 185; W. Warburton, *The Alliance between Church and State, or, the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test-Law Demonstrated, from the Essence and End of Civil Society, upon the Fundamental Principles of the Law of Nature and Nations*, (London: Printed for Fletcher Gyles, 1736), pp. 31, 87, 89.

III showed themselves to be conscious of this heritage.⁹ Consequently when the nineteenth century proponents of the Oxford Movement claimed Hooker as a supporter of the via media Church they were not inventing a new claim, but building upon a tradition which had already existed for over two hundred years.

Although Hooker had anticipated that the *Polity* would be read as a Reformed work, his elusive and often idiosyncratic formulations had encouraged each new generation to shape the text to suit their own particular context. These different groups did not necessarily misread Hooker - although there were some obviously biased misunderstandings - so much as emphasize different aspects of the *Polity* whilst ignoring others. Inherent tensions within the *Polity*, such as the confusion surrounding the respective jurisdiction of monarch and Parliament, meant that it could be used to validate a range of opinions. Consequently the creation of Hooker's reputation was dependent on the discreet marginalization of some sections of the *Polity* as well as the explicit citation of other parts. Hooker had, of course, allowed for the continuous evolution of the theology and ecclesiology of the English Church, however, since the "wisdom which is learned by tract of time" may find that "the lawes that have bene in former ages establisht, needfull, in later to be abrogated."¹⁰ Only the proponents of sola scriptura believed in a static, inflexible, and unchanging settlement. Such an insight into the potential evolution of the Church's historic theology is well illustrated by Hooker's own personal transformation from a mainstream Reformed sixteenth-century Protestant into the guardian of an unique seventeenth-century Anglican tradition.

In 1662 Fuller's *History of the Worthies of England* had described how "in our late times" the *Polity* had been viewed as "an old almanack grown out of date, but blessed by God:

⁹ E. Burke, 'Speech on Toleration Bill 17 March 1773,' in *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke, Vol. II, Party, Parliament, and the American Crisis 1766-1774*, P. Langford, (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), (pp. 381-390), p. 385; E. Burke, 'A Vindication of Natural Society: Or, a View of the Miseries and Evils Sharing to Mankind from Every Species of Artificial Society. In a Letter to Lord **** by a Late Noble Writer. (Second Edition, 1757),' in *Pre-Revolutionary Texts*, I. Harris, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), (pp. 8-57), p. 33; A. Cobban, *Edmund Burke and the Revolt against the Eighteenth Century. A Study of the Political and Social Thinking of Burke, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey*, pp. 239-244, 245; J.F.H. New, *Anglican and Puritan. The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964), p. 25; Nockles, *Oxford Movement*, pp. 58, 60, 63, 64, 149.

¹⁰ R. Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Preface Books I-IV*, G. Edelen, (ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol. I, Bk. I, Chpt. 16, p. 142; Bk. III, Chpt. 2, p. 278; Bk. IV, Chpt. 14, p. 336.

there is now a revolution which may bring his works again into reputation.”¹¹ By the start of the eighteenth century Hooker’s enduring Anglican appeal had been so assured, however, that a subsequent reader of this book felt compelled to scribble in the margin that it was hard to believe that “he was speaking of the greatest divine that ever adhered to the Christian Church.”¹²

¹¹ T.Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England*, (London: Printed by F.G.W.L. and W.G., 1662), p. 264.

¹² Early eighteenth-century manuscript annotation in Fuller, *The Worthies of England*. [Durham Dean and Chapter Library, E.V.3.], p. 264.

Bibliography

Primary Printed Sources

A., M., *Sober and Useful Reflections upon a Treatise of Mr Richard Baxter's Stiled [Sacriligious Desertion of the Holy Ministry Rebuked, and Tolerated Preaching of the Gospel Vindicated] with a Most Serious Preface Relating to the Same, out of the Said Mr Baxter,* (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1680).

A., M., *Speculum Baxterianum, Being Sober and Usefull Reflections upon a Treatise of Mr Richard Baxter's, Stiled [Sacriligious Desertion of the Holy Ministry Rebuked, and Tolerated Preaching of the Gospel Vindicated] with a Most Serious Preface to the Same, Out of the Said Mr Baxter,* (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1680).
Advice to Protestants, (London: Published by Henry Hills, 1687).

The Abolishing of the Booke of Common Prayer by Reason of Above Fifty Grosse Corruptions in It, (London: [No Printer], 1641).

Aldrich, H., *A Reply to Two Discourses Lately Printed at Oxford Concerning the Adoration of Our Blessed Saviour in the Holy Euchaist,* (Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1687).

Aldrich, H., *A Vindication of the Oxford Reply to Two Discourses There Printed A.D.1687 Concerning the Adoration of Our Blessed Saviour in the Eucharist from the Exceptions Made to It in the Second Appendix to a Compendious Discourse on the Eucharist Publishd from the Same Press,* (Oxford: Printed at the Theatre, 1688).

Alleine, R., *The Best of Remedies or a Letter to a Friend; Tending to Prove, I. That Valid Ordination Ought Not to Be Repeated, II. That Ordination by Presbyters is Valid,* (London: Printed for J.S. 1661).

Allen, W., *Killing, No Murder with Some Additions Briefly Discourst in Three Questions, Fit for Publick View; To Deter and Prevent Single Persons and Councils, from Usurping Supream Power,* (London: [No Printer], 1659).

Allix, P., *An Examination of the Scruples of those Who Refuse to Take the Oath of Allegiance,* (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1689).

Allix, P., *An Historical Discourse Concerning the Necessity of Ministers Intention in Administring the Sacraments,* (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1688).

Altham, M., *A Vindication of the Church of England from the Foul Aspersions of Schism and Heresie Unjustly Cast upon Her by the Church of Rome. Part II,* (London: Printed by J.H. for Luke Meredith, 1687).

Amy, S., *A Praefatory Discourse to a Late Pamphlet, Entituled, a Memento for English Protestants. Being an Answer to that Part of the Compendium, Which Reflects upon the Bishop of Lincoln's Book,* (London: Printed by Tho. Dawks for the Author, 1681).

Animadversions on a Discourse Entituled, God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms, (London: Printed for W.Rayner, 1691).

The Answer of the New Converts of France, to a Pastoral Letter from a Protestant Minister, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1686).

An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled the Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of England, Concerning One Special Branch of the King's Prerogative; Viz in Dispensing with the Penal Laws, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1687).

An Appology for Roman Catholicks. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament. 1703, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.III, (pp. 430-439).

Ascham, A., *A Reply to a Paper of Dr Sandersons, Containing a Censure of Mr.A.A. His Booke of the Confusions and Revolutions of Government*, (London: Printed by A.J, 1650).

Assheton, W., *Toleration Disapprov'd and Condemnd*, (Oxford: Printed by William Hall, for Francis Oxlad, 1670).

Astell, M., *A Fair Way with the Dissenters and Their Patrons*, (London: Printed by E.P. for R.Wilkin, 1704).

Atkyns, R., *An Enquiry into the Power of Dispensing with Penal Statutes. Together with Some Animadversions upon a Book Writ by Sir Edw. Herbert, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, Entituled, a Short Account of the Authorities in Law, upon Which Judgment Was Given in Sir Edward Hale's Case*, (London: Printed for Timothy Goodwin, 1689).

Atwood, W. *The Fundamental Constituion of the English Government. Proving King William and Queen Mary Our Lawful and Rightful King and Queen*, (London: Printed By J.D., 1690).

Bacon, F., *Certaine Considerations Concerning the Better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England*, (London: [No Printer],1640).

Bacon, F., *Certaine Considerations Touching the Better Pacification, and Edification of the Church of England: Dedicated to His Most Excellent Majestie*, (London: [No Printer], 1640).

Bagshaw, E., *The Great Question Concerning Things Indifferent in Religious Worship*, (London: [No Printer], 1660).

Baillie, R., *Ladesium, the Canterburians Self-Conviction*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1640).

Baillie, R., *A Review of the Seditious Pamphlet Lately Published in Holland by Dr Brambell; Pretended Bishop of London-Derry; Emtituled His Faire Warning against the Scots Discipline*, (Delph: Michael Stait, 1649).

Bainbridge, T., *An Answer to a Book, Entituled, Reason and Authority: Or, the Motives of a Late Protestant's Reconciliation to the Catholick Church. Together with a Brief Account of Augustine the Monk, and Conversion of the English*, (London: Printed by J.H. for Brabazon Aylmer, 1687).

Bainbridge, T., *Seasonable Reflections, on a Late Pamphlet, Entituled a History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation: Wherein the True Notion of Passive Obedience Is Settled and Secured from the Malicious Interpretations of Ill-Designing Men*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavell, 1689/90).

Barbon, J., *Liturgie a Most Divine Service: In Answer to a Late Pamphlet Stiled, Common-Prayer-Book No Divine Service*, (Oxford: Printed by A.& L Lichfield, 1662).

Barclay, P., *A Perswasive to the People of Scotland, in Order to Remove Their Prejudice to*

the Book of Common Prayer. Wherein Are Answered, All Objections Against the Liturgy of the Church of England, (London: Printed for Jonah Bowyer, 1723).

Barksdale, C., *A Remembrancer of Excellent Men*, (London: Printed for John Martyn, 1670).

Barlow, T., *A Few Plain Reasons Why a Protestant of the Church of England Should Not Turn Roman Catholick*, (London: Printed for R.Clavel, 1688).

Barow, I., *Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions*, (London: Printed by E.Flesher, for Brabazon Aylmer, 1678).

Barwick, J., Ryves, B., and Wharton, G., *Angliae Ruina: Or Englands Ruine*, (London: [No Printer], 1647).

Barwick, P., *The Life of the Reverend Dr John Barwick, D.D.*, (London: Printed by J.Bettenham, 1724).

Basset, J., *Reason and Authority: Or the Motives of a Late Protestants Reconciliation to the Catholic Church. Together with Remarks upon Some Late Discourses against Transubstantiation*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687).

Baxter, R., *An Accompt of all the Proceedings of the Commissioners Appointed by His Sacred Majesty, According to Letters Patents, for the Review of the Book of Common Prayer*, (London: Printed for R.H., 1661).

Baxter, R., *An Apology for the Nonconformists Ministry*, (London: Printed for Thomas Parkhurst, 1681).

Baxter, R., *A Christian Directory: Or, a Son of Practical Theologie, and Cases of Conscience*, (London: Printed by Robert White for Nevill Summons, 1673).

Baxter, R., *Church Concord*, (London: Printed for Tho.Parkhurst, 1691).

Baxter, R., *The Church, Told of Mr Ed. Bagshaw's Scandals, and Warned of the Dangerous Snares of Satan, Now Laid for Them, in His Love-Killing Principles*, (London: [No Printer], 1672).

Baxter, R., *Confirmation and Restauration, the Necessary Means of Reformation, and Reconciliation*, (London: Printed by A.M. For Nevil Simmons, 1658).

Baxter, R., *The Cure of Church-Divisions*, (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons, 1670).

Baxter, R., *The Defence of the Nonconformists Plea for Peace, or an Account of the Matter of Their Nonconformity*, (London: Printed for Benjamin Alsop, 1680).

Baxter, R., *The Duty of Heavenly Meditation*, (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons, 1671).

Baxter, R., *Five Disputations of Church Government and Worship*, ([No Place of Publication], Printed by R.W. for Nevil Simmons, 1659).

Baxter, R., *The Grand Debate between the Most Reverend the Bishops, and the Presbyterian Divines*, (London: [No Printer], 1661).

Baxter, R., *The Judgment of Mr Baxter Concerning Ceremonies and Conformity. With a Short Reflection upon a Pamphlet Intitled, a Proposition for the Safety and Happiness of the King and Kingdom*, (London: Printed for R.Jenaway, 1667).

Baxter, R., *The Life of Faith, as It Is the Evidence of Things Unseen. A Sermon Preached (Contractedly) before the King at White-Hall upon July the 22th 1660*, (Kidderminster: Printed by R.W. and A.M. for Francis Tyton and Jane Underhill, 1660).

Baxter, R., *Mr Baxter's Vindication of the Church of England in Her Rites and Ceremonies, Discipline, and Church Orders: As Faithfully Taken out of His Own Writings, Without Either False Citation or Fraudulent Alteration*, (London: Printed for Walter Kettilby, 1682).

Baxter, R., *Naked Popery; Or, the Naked Falshood of a Book Called the Catholick Naked Truth, or the Puritan Convert to Apostolical Christianity; Written by W.H.*, (London: Printed for N.Simmons, 1677).

Baxter, R., *Nonconformity Without Controversie from Rom. Chap.12.Ver.2. Shewing, that It is Every Christian's Duty to Be a Nonconformist to this World*, (London: Printed by A.M. for Tho.Parkhurst, [No Date]).

Baxter, R., *Of National Churches: Their Description, Insttuion, Use, Preservation, Danger, Maladies, and Cure: Partly Applied to England*, (London: Printed by T. Snowden, for Thomas Parkhurst, 1691).

Baxter, R., *A Petition for Peace; With the Reformation of the Liturgy as It was Presented to the Right Reverend Bishops, by the Divines Appointed by His Majesties Commission To Treat With Them About the Alteration of It*, (London, [No Printer], 1661).

Baxter, R., *The Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter, Vols. I-XXIII*, W.Orme, (ed.), (London: James Duncan, 1830).

Baxter, R., *Reliquiae Baxteriae: Or Mr Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*, M.Sylvester, (ed.), (London: Printed for T.Parkhurst, F.Robinson, F.Lawrence, and F.Dunton, 1696).

Baxter, R., *Richard Baxters Answer to Dr Edward Stillingfleet's Charge of Separation*, (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons, 1680).

Baxter, R., *Richard Baxter's Penitent Confession, and His Necessary Vindication, in Answer to a Book Called, the Second Part of the Mischiefs of Separation, Written by a Unnamed Author*, (London: Printed for Tho.Parkhurst, 1691).

Baxter, R., *The Saints Everlasting Rest*, (London: Printed by Rob White for Thomas Underhil and Francis Tyton, 1650).

Baxter, R., *A Treatise of Episcopacy*, (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons and Thomas Simmon, 1681).

Baxter, R., *Two Papers of Proposals Concerning the Discipline and Ceremonies of The Church of England Hunbly Presented to His Majesty, by the Reverend Ministries of the Presbyterian Perswasion*, (London: [No Printer], 1661).

Bayly, R., *A Parallel of the Lirutgy with the Mass-Book, the Breviary, the Ceremonial, and Other Romish Rituals. Wherein Is Clearly and Shortly Demonstrated, Not Only that the Liturgy Is Taken for the Most Part for Word out of these Antichristian Writs*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1661).

Bayly, T., *An End to Controversie between the Roman Catholique, and the Protestant Religions Justified, by All the Severall Manner of Wayes, Whereby, All Kind of*

Controversies, of What Nature So Ever, Are Usually, or Can Possibly Be Determined, (Doway: [No Printer], 1654).

Bayly, T., *A Legacie Left to Protestants, Containing Eighteen Controversies,* (Douai: [No Printer], 1654).

Bayly, T., *The Royal Charter Granted unto Kings, by God Himself; And Collected out of His Holy Word, in Both Testaments,* (London: [No Printer], 1649).

Bayly, T., (ed.), *Witty Apothegms,* (London: Printed by R.W., 1669.)

Bentley, R., *The Life and Character of that Eminent and Learned Prelate the Late Dr Edw. Stillingfleet Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with Some Account of the Works He Has Publish'd, in The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate, Dr Edw Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character,* (London: Printed by J.Hepinstall, for George Mortlock, 1710), Vol. I, pp. 1-46.

Bernard, N., (ed.), *Clavi Trabales; Or, Nails Fastened by Some Great Masters of Assemblies. Confirming the King's Supremacy. The Subject's Duty. Church-Government by Bishops,* (London: Printed by R.Hodgkinson, 1661).

Bernard, N., *The Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Learned Father of Our Church Dr James Usher, Late Arch Bishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland,* (London: Printed by E.Tyler, 1656).

Bernard, R., *A Short View of the Praeleticall Church of England,* (London: [No Printer], 1641).

Beveridge, W., *A Sermon Concerning the Excellency and Usefulness of the Common Prayer. Preached 27th Nov, 1681,* (London: Printed by T.James for Richard Northcott, 1682).

Blackall, O., *The Subjects Duty. A Sermon Preached at the Parish-Church of St Dunstan in the West, on March the 8th 1704/5. Being the Anniversary Day of Her Majesty's Happy Accession to the Throne,* (London: Printed by J.Leake for Walter Kettilby, 1705).

Blount, T., *Calendarium Catholicum or, an Almanck for the Year of Our Lord, 1689. Being the First after the Bissextile or Leap-Year. With an Exposition of All the Principal Holy-Days, Fasts and Feasts of the Year. Also a Useful Chronology of Things since the Reformation. Together with a Catalogue of the Lords Knights and Gentlemen (of the Catholic Religion) that Were Slain in Late War, in Defence of Their King and Country,* (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1689).

Bohun, E., *The History of the Desertion, or an Account of All the Publick Affairs in England, from the Beginning of September 1688 to the Twelfth of February Following. with an Answer to a Piece Call'd the Desertion Discussed: In a Letter to a Country Gentleman,* (London: Printed for Ric. Chiswell, 1689).

Bolde, T., *Rhetorick Restrained, or, Dr John Gauden Lord Bishop Elect of Exeter, His Considerations of the Liturgy of the Church of England Considered and Clouded,* (London: Printed for Thomas Parkhurst, [No Date]).

Book of Common Prayer, (Cambridge: Printed by John Field, 1662).

Book of Common Prayer, (London: R.Royston, 1666-1685).

The Booke of Common Prayer, Now Used in the Church of England, Vindicated from the

- Aspertion of All Schismatics, Brownists and Separatists*, (London: Printed for John Thomas, 1641).
- Bossuet, J.B., *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controversie*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1686).
- Bossuet, J.B., *A Pastoral Letter from the Lord Bishop of Meaux, to the New Catholics of His Diocess, Exhorting Them to Keep Their Easter, and Giving Them Necessary Advertisements against the False Pastoral Letters of Their Ministers. With Refections upon the Pretended Persecution*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1686).
- Boughen, E., *An Account of the Church Catholick: Where It was before the Reformation: And, Whether Rome Were or Bee the Church Catholick*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes, for Richard Royston, 1653).
- Boyle, R., *Reasons Why a Protestant Should Not Turn Papist: Or, Protestant Prejudices against the Roman Catholic Religion; Propos'd, in a Letter to a Romish Priest*, (London: Printed by H.Clark for John Taylor, 1687).
- Boyse, J., *Vindiciae Calvinisticae: Or, Some Impartial Reflexons on the Dean of Londondereys Considerations that Obliged Him to Come over to the Communion of the Church of Rome. And Mr Chancellor King's Answer Thereto. In Which He No Less Unjustly than Impertinently Reflects, on the Protestant Dissenters*, (Dublin: Printed by A.Crook, and S.Helsham, 1688).
- Brabourne, T., *Sundry Particulars Concerning Bishops, Humbly Offered to the Consideration of this Honourable Parliament*, (London: Printed for Theolophius Brabourne, 1661).
- Bramhall, J., *A Fair Warning for England to Take Heed of the Presbyterian Government of Scotland? As Being of All Others Most Injurious to the Civil Magistrate, Most Oppressive to the Subject, Most Pernicious to Both. Also the Sinfulness and Wickedness of the Covenant, to Introduce that Government upon the Church of England*, (London?: [No Printer], 1661).
- Bray, W., *A Plea for the Peoples Fundamentall Liberties and Parliaments. Or, Eighteen Questions Questioned and Answered*, (London: Printed by John Clowes, 1659).
- Brooke, R., *A Discourse Opening the Nature of that Episcopacie, Which is Exercised in England. Wherein with All Humility, are Represented Some Considerations Tending to the Much-Desired Peace, and Long Expected Reformation, of this Our Mother Church*, (London: Printed by R.C. for Samuel Cartwright, 1641).
- Brough, W., *A Preservative against the Plague of Schisme. Or, an Antidote against the Separations of the Time*, (London: Printed for I.Clarke, 1652).
- Brown, I., *Pax Vobis: Or, Gospel and Liberty against Ancient and Modern Papists*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1687).
- Browne, P., *The Sovereign's Authority and the Subject's Duty, Plainly Represented in a Sermon Preached at the Visitation, April the 12th 1681*, (London: Printed by M.Flesher, for Walter Kettilby, 1682).
- Bull, G., *The Protestant's Doom in Popish Times, 1680, in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts, on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects: But Chiefly Such as Relate to the History and Constitution of these Kingdoms*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.IV, (pp. 219-224).

Burke, E., 'Speech on Toleration Bill 17 March 1773,' in *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke, Vol.II, Party, Parliament, and the American Crisis 1766-1774*, P.Langford. (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), (pp. 381-390).

Burke, E., 'A Vindication of Natural Society: Or, a View of the Miseries and Evils Sharing to Mankind from Every Species of Artificial Society. In a Letter to Lord **** by a Late Noble Writer. (Second Edition, 1757),' in *Pre-Revolutionary Texts*, I.Harris, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), (pp. 8-57).

Burnet, G., *An Answer to the Animadversions on the History of the Rights of Princes, &c.*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1682).

Burnet, G., *An Apology for the Church of England, with Relation to the Spirit of Persecution for Which She is Accused*, (Amsterdam: [No Printer], 1688).

Burnet, G., *Bishop Burnet's Autobiography 1643-1710*, in *A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time from-His Original Memoirs, His Autobiography, His Letters to Admiral Herbert, and His Private Meditations All Hitherto Unpublished*, H.C.Foxcraft, (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), (pp. 451-514).

Burnet, G., *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time. Vol.I. From the Restoration of King Charles II to the Settlement of King William and Queen Mary at the Revolution: to Which is Prefix'd a Summary Recapitulation of Affairs in Church and State from King James I to the Restoration in the Year 1660*, (London: Printed for Thomas Ward, 1724).

Burnet, G., *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time. Vol.II. From the Revolution Tithe Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne. To Which Is Added, the Author's Life by the Editor*, (London: Printed for the Editor by Joseph Downing and Henty Woodfall, 1734).

Burnet, G., *A Collection of Eighteen Papers, Relating to the Affairs of Church & State, During the Reign of King James the Second. (Seventeen Whereof Written in Holland, and First Printed there)*, (London: Printed for John Starkey and Richard Chiswell, 1689).

Burnet, G., *A Discourse Concerning Transubstantiation and Idolatroy Being an Answer to the Bishops of Oxford's Plea Relating to those Two Points*, (London: [No Printer], 1688).

Burnet, G., *An Enquiry into the Reasons for Abrogating the Test Imposed on all Memembers of Parliament*, (London: [No Printer], 1688).

Burnet, G., *The Exhortation to Peace and Union: A Sermon Preached at St. Lawrence-Jury, at the Election of the Lord-Mayor of London, on the 29th of September, 1681*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1681).

Burnet, G., *The Infallibility of the Church of Rome Examined and Confuted*, (London: Printed by M.Clark, 1680).

Burnet, G., *A Letter, Written upon the Discovery of the Late Plot*, (London: Printed for H.Brome and R.Chiswell, 1678).

Burnet, G., *The Life of William Bedell, D.D. Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland*, (London: Printed for John Southby, 1685).

Burnet, G., *A Modest Survey of the Most Considerable Things in a Discourse Lately Published Entitled Naked Truth*, (London: Printed for Moses Pitt, 1676).

Burnet, G., *The Protestant's Companion: Or, an Impartial Survey and Comparison of the Protestant Religion, as by Law Established; With the Main Doctrines of Popery: Wherein is Shewn that Popery is Contrary to Scripture, Primitive Fathers and Councils; and that Proved from Holy Writ, the Writings of the Ancient Fathers for Several Hundred Years, and the Confession of the Most Learned Papists Themselves. Whereby the Papists Vain Pretence to Antiquity, and Their Reproaching the Protestant Doctrines with Novelty, is Wholly Overthrown*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1685).

Burnet, G., *A Rational Method for Proving the Truth of the Christian Truth of the Christian Religion as It is Professed in the Church of England. In Answer to a Rational Compendious Way to Convince Without Dispute all Persons Whatsoever Dissenting from the True Religion*, (London: Printed for Richard Royston, 1675).

Burnet, G., *A Sermon Preached at the Chappel of the Rolls, on the Fifth of November, 1684. Being Gun-Powder-Treason-Day*, (London: Printed for the Author, 1684).

Burnet, G., *A Sermon Preached before the Aldermen of the City of London at St Lawrence-Church, Jan 30.1681. Being the Day of the Martyrdom of K.Charles I.*, (London: Richard Chiswell, 1681).

Burnet, G., *The Unreasonableness and Impiety of Popery: In a Second Letter Written upon the Discovery of a Late Plot*, (London: Printed for R.Chiswell, 1678).

Burnet, G., *A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England. In Which It is Demonstrated that All the Essentials of Ordination, According to the Practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches, Are Still Retained in Our Church. In Answer to a Paper Written by One of the Church of Rome to Prove the Nullity of Our Orders; And Given to a Person of Quality*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1688).

Burton, H., *Christ on His Throne*, ([No Place of Publication]: R.Hearne?, 1640).

Burton, H., *The Lord's Day, the Sabbath Day. Or, a Briefe Answer to Some Materiall Passages in a Late Treatise of the Sabbath-Day: Digested Dialogue-Wise between Two Divines A & B.*, (Amsterdam: J.F.Stam, 1636).

Bury, J., *Advice to the Commons Within All His Majesties Realms and Dominions*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills Jun. for Richard Northcott, 1685).

C., J., *A Net for the Fishers of Men. And the Same Which Christ Gave to His Apostles. Wherein the Points Controverted betwixt Catholics and Sectaries, Are Briefly Vindicated, by Way of Dilemma*, (London: [No Printer], 1687).

Calfine, G., *The Book of Common Prayer Confirmed by Sundry Acts of Parliament, and Briefly Vindicated against Contumelious Slanders of the Fanatique Party, Tearing It Porrage*, (London: Printed by T.M. for William Potter, 1660).

Cambden, W., *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, Late Queen of England*, (London: Printed for Benjamin Fisher, 1630).

Care, H., *A Modest Enquiry Whether St Peter Were Ever at Rome, and Bishop of that Church*, (London: Printed for Randall Taylor, 1687).

Cartwright, T., *The Judgment of M.Cartwright and Mr Baxter Concerning Separation and the Ceremonies*, (London: [No Printer], 1673).

Cartwright, T, *A Sermon Preached upon the Anniversary of the Happy Inauguration of Our Dread Sovereign Lord King James II*, (London: Printed by F. Leake, 1686).

Cary, A., *The Lady Falkland: Her Life*, in *Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland. The Tragedy of Mariam the Fair Queen of Jewry with the Lady Falkland: Her Life by One of Her Daughters*, B. Weller and M. W. Ferguson, (eds), (London: University of California Press, Ltd, 1994).

Casaubon, M., *A Vindication of the Lord's Prayer, as a Formal Prayer, and by Christ's Institution To Be Used by Christians as a Prayer against the Antichristian Practice and Opinion of Some Men*, (London: Printed by T. R. for Thomas Johnson, 1660).

The Catholick Mirrour. Or a Looking-Glasse for Protestants, Wherein They May Plainly See the Errours of Their Church and the Truth of the Roman Catholick, (Paris: [No Printer], 1662).

Certain Considerations Wherein the Prelates Doe Acknowledge that They Stand by the Meer Mercy of the King and Parliament; Not Having Any Foundation in Scripture, (London: [No Printer], 1642?).

Certain Reasons Tending to Prove the Unlawfulness of All Diocesan Episcopacy (Even the Most Moderate), (London: [No Printer], 1641).

Charles I, *Essata Regalia*, Watson, R., (ed.), (London: Printed for Robert Horn, 1661).

Charles I, *His Majesties Declaration in Defence of the True Protestant Religion*, (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1643).

Charles I, *His Majesties Paper Containing Severall Questions Propounded to the Commissioners Divines Touching Episcopacy with an Humble Answer Returned to His Majesty by Mr Marshall, Mr Vines, Mr Carill, and Mr Seaman 4 October 1648*, (London: Printed by Moses Bell, 1648).

Charles I, *His Majesties Proclamation Concerning the Book of Common Prayer, and the Directory for Publike Worship*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1645).

Charles I, *The King's Majesties Answer to the Paper Delivered in by the Reverend Divines Attending the Honourable Commissioners Concerning Church-Government*, (London: Printed by E. Griffin, for T. Hewer, 1648).

Charles I, *A Proclamation against the Oppression of the Clergy by the Intrusion of Factions and Schismaticall Persons into Their Cares, and Inverting and Detaining Their Titles and Possessions by Orders of One or Both Houses of Parliament Contrary to All Law and Justice*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1643).

Cheyne, F., *Chillingworthi Novissima. Or the Sicknesse, Heresy, Death, and Buriall of William Chillingworth*, (London: Printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1644).

Cheyne, F., *The Rise, Growth, and Danger of Socinianisme. Together with a Plaine Discovery of a Desperate Designe of Corrupting the Protestant Religion, Whereby It Appears that the Religion Which Hath Been So Violently Contended for (by the Archbishop of Canterbury and His Adherents) Is Not the True Protestants Religion, but an Hotchpotch of Arminianisme, Socinianisme and Popery*, (London: Printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1643).

Chillingworth, W., *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation. Or an Answer to a Booke Entitled Mercy and Truth, or, Charity Maintain'd by Catholiques, Which Pretends to Prove the Contrary*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1638).

Chisenhale, E., *Catholike History, Collected and Gathered Out of Scripture, Councils, Ancient Fathers, and Modern Authentick Writers, Both Ecclesiastical and Civil; For the Satisfaction of Such as Doubt, and the Confirmation of Such as Believe, the Reformed Church of ENGLAND Occasioned by a Book Written by Dr. Thomas Vane, Intituled the Lost Sheep Returned Home*, (London: Printed by J.C. for Nath Brooks, 1653).

A Christian Letter of Certaine English Protestants, Unfained Favourers of the Present State of Religion, Authorised and Professed in England: Unto that Reverend and Learned Man, M.R. Hoo Requiring Resolution in Certaine Matters of Doctrine (Which Seeme to Overthrow the Foundations of Christian Religion, and of the Church among Us) Expresslie Contained in His Five Books of Ecclesiastical Pollicie, (Middleburg: R.Schilders, 1599).

Clagett, W., *An Answer to the Dissenters Objections against the Common Prayers and Some Other Parts of Divine Service Prescribed in the Liturgie of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for T.Basset, B.Took and F.Gardiner, 1683).

Clagett, W., *An Answer to the Representer's Reflections upon the State and View of the Controversy with a Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer Shewing, that the Vindicator Has Utterly Ruined the New Design of Expounding and Representing Popery*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswill, 1688).

Clagett, W., *The Difference of the Case between the Separation of Protestants, from the Church of Rome, and the Separation of Dissenters from the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Thomas Basset and Fincham Gardiner, 1683).

Clagett, W., *A Paraphrase with Notes, and a Preface, upon the Sixth Chapter of St. John Showing that There Is Neither Good Reason, Nor Sufficient Authority, to Suppose that the Eucharist Is Discoursed of in that Chapter, Much Less to Infer the Doctrine of Transubstantiation from It*, (London: Printed by J.D. for J.Robinson and Thomas Newborough, 1686).

Clagett, W., *The Queries Offered by T.W. to the Protestants Concerning the English Reformation Reprinted and Answered*, (London: Printed by H.Clark for James Adamson, 1688).

Clagett, W., *A Reply to a Pamphlet Called the Mischief of Impositions Which Pretends to Answer the Dean of St.Paul's Sermon Concerning the Mischief of Separation*, (London: Printed for Walter Kettilby, 1681).

Clagett, W., *The State of the Church of Rome When the Reformation Began, as It Appears by the Advices Given to Paul III and Julius III by Creatures of Their Own. with a Preface Leading to the Matter of the Book*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1688).

Clagett, W., *A View of the Whole Controversy between the Representer and the Answerer, with an Answer to the Representer's Last Reply: In Which Are Laid Open Some of the Methods by Which Protestants Are Represented by Papists*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1687).

Clarendon, E., *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, Vol.I, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1702).

Clarendon, E., *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon, Lord High Chancellor of England, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford: In Which Is Included a Continuation of His History of the Grand Rebellion*, Vols. I-III, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1827).

Clarke, S., *A Collection of the Lives of Ten Eminent Divines, Famous in Their Generations for Learning Prudence, Piety, and Painfulness in the Work of the Ministry*, (London: Printed for William Mille, 1662).

Clarke, S., *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Late Age*. ((London: Printed for Thomas Simmons, 1683).

Clutterbuck, J., *A Plain and Rational Vindication of the Liturgy of the Church of England. Collected out of the Discourses of Some of the Reverend Bishops and Doctors of the Same Church, by Way of Question and Answer*, (London: Printed by J.L. for William Keblewhite, 1694).

Collections of Passages Referr'd to by Dr. Henry Sacheverell in His Answer to the Articles of His Impeachment, (London: Printed for H.Clements, 1710).

Collier, J., *Dr Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered. With Some Remarks upon His Vindication*, (London: [No Printer], 1691).

Collins, A., *Priestcraft in Perfection: Or, a Detection of the Fraud of Inserting and Continuing this Clause (the Church Hath Power to Decree Rites and Ceremonies and Authority in Controversies of Faith) in the Twentieth Article of the Articles of the Church of England*, 1710, In *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.II, (pp. 460-482).

Colson, N., *A Modest Account of the Chief Points in Controversie between the Roman Catholics, and the Protestants: Together with Some Considerations upon the Sermons of a Divine of the Church of England*, (Antwerp: [No Printer], 1696).

Comber, T., *A Companion to the Temple or, a Help to Devotion in the Use of the Common Prayer Divided into Four Parts*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavell, 1688).

Comber, T., *The Plausible Arguments of a Romish Priest Answered by an English Protestant*, (London: Printed for R.Clavell, 1686).

Comber, T., *The Plausible Arguments of a Romish Priest from Antiquity, Answered by the Author of the Answer to the Plausible Arguments from Scripture*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavell, 1687).

Comon Prayer-Book Devotions Episcopal Delusions; Or, the Second Death of the Service Book, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1666).

A Compendious Discourse Proving Episcopacy to Be of Apostolicall, and Consequently of Divine Institution, (London: Printed by E.G. for Richard Whittaker, 1641).

A Compleat History of the Whole Proceedings of the Parliament of Great Britain against Dr Henry Sacheverell: (London: Printed by J.Baker, 1710).

Corker, J., *A Remonstrance of Piety and Innocence; Containing, the Last Devotions and Protestations of Several Roman-Catholicks, Condemned and Executed on Account of the Plot. Faithfully Taken from Their Own Mouths as They Spoke Them, or from the Originals Written and Best under Their Own Hands*, (London: [No Printer], 1683).

Corker, J., *Roman Catholick Principles in Reference to God and the King*, 1680, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.IV, (pp. 212-219).

Cosin, J., *A Collection of Private Devotions*, P.G.Stanwood, (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

Cosin, J., *A Sermon at the Consecration of Dr. Francis White, Bishop of Carlisle*, in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham*, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843), Vol.I, (pp. 85-116).

Cotton, J., *Singing of Psalmes, A Gospel Ordinance*, (London: Printed by M.S. for Hannah Allen, 1647).

Cotton, J., *Some Treasure Fetched out of Rubbish: Or Three Short but Seasonable Treatises (Found in an Heap of Scattered Papers), Which Providence Hath Reserved for Their Service Who Desire to Be Instructed, from the Word of God, Concerning the Imposition and Use of Significant Ceremonies in the Worship of God*, (London: [No Printer], 1660).

Cranmer, T., *The Judgment of Archbishop Cranmer Concerning the Peoples Right to and Discreet Use of the H.Scriptures*, (London: Printed for John Taylor, [No Date of Publication]).

Cressy, H.P., *The Church-History of Brittany from the Begining of Christianity to the Norman Conquest*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1668).

Cressy, H.P., *A Collection Of Several Treatises In Answer To Dr.Stillingfleet*, ([No Place Of Publication]: [No Printer], 1672).

Cressy, H.P., *An Epistle Apologetical of S.C. to a Person of Honour: Touching His Vindication of Dr Stillingfleet*, (London: [No Printer], 1674).

Cressy, H.P., *Dr Stillingfleets Principles, Giving an Account of the Faith of Protestants Considered by N.O.*, (Paris: Printed by the Widow of Antoine Christian, and Charles Guillery, 1671).

Cressy, H.P., *Exomologesis: Or a Faithful Narration of the Conversion unto Catholike Unity*, (Paris: Chez Jean Billaine, 1680).

Cressy, H.P., *Fanaticism Fanatically Imputed to the Catholick Church by Doctour Stillingfleet and the Imputation Refuted and Restored by S.C. a Catholick O.S.B.*, (Douai, [No Printer], 1672).

Cressy, H.P., *A Non Est Inventus Return'd to Mr Edward Bagshaw's Enquiry, and Vainly Boasted Discovery of Weakness in the Grounds of the Churches Infallibility*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1662).

Cressy, H.P., *I Question. Why Are You a Catholic? II Question. But Why Are You a Protestant? An Answer Attempted (in Vain)*, (London: [No Printer], 1686).

Cressy, H.P., *Reflexions upon the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Publisher], 1661).

Cressy, H.P., *Roman-Catholick Doctrines No Novelties: Or an Answer to Dr. Pierce's Court-Sermon, Miscal'd the Primitive Rule of Reformation*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1663).

Cressy, H.P., *Why Are You Not a Roman-Catholick? A Discourse Occasioned by the Pamphlet Intituled Why Are You a Catholick?*, (London: Printed for H.Brome, 1679).

Cranmer, G., *Concerning the New Discipline an Excellent Letter Written by Mr George Cranmer to Mr R.H.*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1642).

Creyghton, R., *A Sermon Preached before the King at Windsor, Sept the 10th. 1682.* (London: Printed by F.Wallis, for Benj.Tooke, 1682).

Creyghton, R., *The Vanity of the Dissenters Plea for Their Separation from the Church of England,* (London: Printed by F.Wallis, for Benj.Tooke, 1682).

Croft, H., *A Short Discourse Concerning the Reading His Majesty's Late Declaration in the Churches. Set Forth by the Right Reverend Father in God, Herbert Lord Bishop of Hereford,* in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.II, (pp. 361-363).

Crofton, Z., *Altar Worship or Bowing to the Communion Table Considered,* (London: Printed for J.Rothwell, 1661).

Crofton, Z., *An Appendix unto the Homily against Images in Churches in Altar Worship, or Bowing to the Communion Table Considered,* (London: Printed for J.Rothwell, 1661).

Crofton, Z., *Reformation Not Separation: Or, Mr Crofton's Plea for Communion with the Church under those Corruptions, and by that Disorderly Ministration to Which He Cannot Conform Nor by It Administer,* (London: [No Printer], 1662).

Crofton, Z., *A Serious Review of Presbyters Re-ordination by Bishops: In a Letter Written unto a Minister in Warwickshire, Resolving this Case of Conscience, Whether a Minister Ordained by Prebyters, May with a Good Conscience Be Reordained by a Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon, So that They Will Declare Their Ordination to Be Meerly Accumulative, and the Man Shall Not Renounce His Ordination by It,* (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1661).

D., F., *Reasons and Judgement: Or, Special Remarques on the Life of the Renowned Dr Sanderson,* (London: Printed by F.C.for H.Marsh, 1663).

D.,M., *English Loyalty: Or, the Case of the Oath of Faith and Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary Examined and Resolved: In a Letter from a Father to His Son, to Two Divines of the Church of England,* (London: Printed for R.Baldwin, 1689).

Darrell, W., *A Letter to the Author of the Reply to a Late Paper Called a Full Answer to Dr Tenison's Conferences Concerning the Eucharist,* (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687).

Darrell, W., *A Letter to a Lady from William Darrell of the Society of Jesus. Wherein He Desires a Conference with the Gentleman Who Writ Her a Letter, Furnishing Her with Scripture Testimonies against the Principal Points and Doctrine of Popery,* (London: [No Printer], 1688).

Dawbeny, H., *A Sober and Temperate Discourse, Concerning the Interest of Words in Prayer. The Just Antiquity and Pedigree of Liturgies, or Forms of Prayer in Churches: With a View of the State of the Church, When They Were First Composed, or Imposed,* (London: Printed for W.A., 1661).

Dell. W., *Right Reformation: Or, the Reformation of the Church of the New Testament, Represented in Gospell-Light. In a Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, on Wednesday, November 25, 1646,* (London: Printed by R.White, 1646.)

Denton, W., *Jus Caesaris et Ecclesiae Vere Dictae. Or a Treatise of Independency, Presbytery, the Power of Kings, and of the Church, or of the Brethren in Ecclesiastical Concerns, Government Discipline, &c. Wherein the Use of Liturgies, Toleration, Connivence, Conventicles, or Private Assembles, Excommunication, Election of Popes, Bishops, Priests; What and Whom Are Meant by the Term Church Are Debated. and Wherein Also the Popes Power over Princes, and the Liberty of the Press are Discoursed. And the 18th of Matthew*

- and I. Cor. 14. 32. are Generally Misunderstood, Rightly Expounded*, (London: [Printed for the Author], 1681).
- Denton, W., *Jus Regiminis: Being a Justification of Defensive Arms in General. And Consequently of Our Late Revolutions and Transactions to Be the Just Right of the Kingdom*, (London: [No Printer], 1689).
- Denton, W., *Some Remarks Recommended unto Ecclesiasticks of all Perswasions*, (London: [No Printer], 1690).
- A Dialogue between a New Catholic Convert and a Protestant Shewing the Doctrin of Transubstantiation to Be as Reasonable to Be Believ'd as the Great Mystery of the Trinity by All Good Catholicks*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1686).
- A Dialogue between the Pope and a Phanatick, Concerning Affairs in England*, (London: [No Printer], 1680).
- Dobson, R., *Queries upon Queries: Or Enquiries into Certain Queries upon Dr. Pierce's Sermon at Whitehall, Feb 1*, (London: Printed for R. Royston, 1663).
- The Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Jure Divino Disproved, and Obedience to the Present Government, Proved from Scripture, Law, and Reason*, (London: Printed for Randal Taylor, 1689).
- Dodd, C., *Certamen Utriusque Ecclesiae: Or, a List of All the Eminent Writers of Controversy, Catholics and Protestants, since the Reformation. With an Historical Idea of the Politic Attempts of Both Parties in Every Reign, in Order to Support Their Respectable Interests, 1724*, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F. Cogan, 1748), Vol. III, (pp. 287-304).
- Dodwell, H., *An Answer to Six Queries, Proposed to a Gentlewoman of the Church of England, by an Emissary of the Church of Rome; Fitted to a Gentlewoman's Capacity*, (London: Printed for Benj Took, 1688).
- Dodwell, H., *Two Short Discourses against the Romanists, 1688*, (London: Printed for Benj. Tooke, 1688).
- Dow, C., *A Discourse of the Sabbath and the Lord Day. Wherein the Difference Both in Their Institution and Their Due Observation Is Briefly Handled*, (London: Printed by M. Flesher for John Clark, 1636).
- Downes, T., *A Discourse Concerning the Signification of Allegiance, as It Is to Be Understood in the New Oath of Allegiance*, (London: [No Printer], 1689).
- Dryden, J., *Religio Laici or a Laymans Faith*, (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1682).
- Dugdale, W., *A Short View of the Late Troubles in England*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theater for Moses Pitt, 1681).
- Du Moulin, P., *Ecclesiae Gemitus sub Anabaptistica Tyrannide*, (London: [No Printer], 1649).
- Du Moulin, P., *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion in the Point of Obedience to Sovereigns*, (London: Printed by I. Redmayne for John Creek, 1664).
- Duncon, E., *De Adoratione Dei Versus Altare. Determinatis Cantabrigiae Habita Martij 15. 1633*, (Cambridge (?): [No Printer], 1660).

Duncon, E., *Of Worshipping God towards the Altar: Or that Pious and Devout Ceremonies of Bowing towards the Altar Vindicated from the Notorious Calumny of Our Peevish Puritans*, (London: Printed by Timothy Garthwait, 1661).

Durel, J., *The Liturgy of the Church of England Asserted in a Sermon*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1662).

Durel, J., *A View of the Government and Publick Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas*, (London: Printed by J.G. for R.Royston, 1662).

Earbery, M., *Passive Obedience Prov'd to Be the Doctrine of the Church of England from the Reformation, to these Times*, (London: Printed by J.Morphew, 1717).

Earle, J., *Microcosmography: Or, a Piece of the World Discover'd in Essays and Characters*, (London: Printed by E.Say, 1732).

Edwards, J., *Some Brief Observations and Reflections on Mr Whiston's Late Writings, Falsly Entitul'd Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, (London: Printed for F.Lawrence, F.Wyat and R.Robinson, 1712).

Edwards, J., *Some Thoughts Containing the Several Cause and Occasions of Athism Especially in the Present Age*, (London: Printed for F.Robinson and W.Wyat, 1695).

Edwards, T., *Gangraena: Or a Catalogue and Discovery of Many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this Time, Vented and Acted in England these Four Last Years*, (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1646).

Eikon Basilike Deutera. The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty King Charles II. With His Reasons for Turning Roman Catholick; Published by K.James, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1694).

Englands Reioycing at the Prelats Downfall. Or, Gods Goodnesse and Mercy to England in Delivering Them from the Cruell Tyranny of a Blood-Thirsty Prelats, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1641).

An Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: With Respect to the Popular Pleas of the Late K.James's Remaining Right to the Crown, (London: Printed by Thomas Hodgkin, 1693).

Evans, J., *The Case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament Stated & Resolved, Part II*, (London: Printed for T.Basset, B.Took, and F.Gardiner, 1683).

Evans, R., *The Voice of King Charls the Father, to Charls the Son*, (London: [No Printer], 1655).

Everard, J., *A Winding-Sheet for the Schism of England, Contriv'd to Inform the Ignorant, Resolve the Wavering and Confirm the Well Principles Roman-Catholick*, (Dublin: [No Printer], 1687).

F., D., *The Equality of the Ministry Plainly Described, Both by Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils*, (London: [No Printer], 1641).

Falkner, W., *Libertas Ecclesiastica, or, a Discourse, Vindicating the Lawfulness of those Things, Which Are Chiefly Excepted against in the Church of England, Especially in Its Liturgy and Worship*, (London: Printed by J.M. for Walter Kettilby, 1674).

Falkner, W., *A Vindication of Liturgies, Shewing the Lawfulness, Usefulness, and Antiquity, of Performing the Publick Worship of God, by Set Forms of Prayer. Wherein Several Other Things Also of Considerable Use, are Occasionally Discussed*, (London: Printed for Walter Kettilby, 1680).

Fair Warning: Or XX Prophecies Concerning the Return of Popery, (London: Printed for H.Marsh, 1663).

Falkner, W., *Libertas Ecclesiastica, or, a Discourse, Vindicating the Lawfulness of those Things, Which are Chiefly Excepted against in the Church of England, Especially in Its Liturgy and Worship*, (London: Printed by J.M. for Walter Kettilby, 1674).

Falkner, W., *A Vindication of Liturgies, Shewing the Lawfulness, Usefulness, and Antiquity, of Performing the Publick Worship of God, by Set Forms of Prayer*, (London: Printed for Walter Kettilby, 1680).

Featley, D., *The Gentle Lash*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1644).

Featley, D., *The League Illegal*, (London, Printed for R,Royston, 1660).

Featley, D., *Sacra Nemesis, the Levites Scourge, or, Mercurius Disciplined. Diverse Remarkable Disputes and Resolvs in the Assembly of Divines Related, Episcopacy Asserted, Truth Rightes Innocency Vindicates against Detraction*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1644).

Fell, J., *The Life of the Most Learned and Pious Dr H.Hammond*, (London: Printed by F.Flesher for Fo.Martin, Fa Allestry and Tho.Dicas, 1661).

Fell, J., *Seasonable Advice to Protestants: Shewing the Necessity of Maintaining the Established Religion. In Opposition to Popery*, (London: Printed for Charles Brome, 1688).

Fell, P., *Lex Talionis: Or, the Author of the Naked Truth Stript Naked*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1676).

Fern, H., *Certain Considerations of Present Concernment: Touching this Reformed Church of England*, (London: Printed by F.G. for R.Royston, 1653).

Fern, H., *Episcopacy and Presbytery Considered*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1644).

Fern, H., *Of the Division between the English and Romish Church upon the Reformation*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Richard Royston, 1655).

Fern, H., *The Resolving of Conscience, upon Such a Supposition or Case, as Is Now Usually Made (the King Will Not Discharge His Trust but is Bent or Seduced to Subvert Religion, Laws, and Liberties) Subjects May Take Arms and Resist?*, (London: [No Printer], 1642).

Filmer, R., *Patriarcha and Other Political Works Of Sir Robert Filmer*, P.Laslett, (ed.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949).

Filmer, R., *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, J.P.Sommerville, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Firmin, G., *The Liturgical Considerator Considered: Or a Brief View of Dr Gauden's Considerations Touching the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1661).

Firmin, G., *Presbyterial Ordination Vindicated. In a Brief and Sober Discourse Concerning Episcopacy, as Claiming Greater Power, and More Eminent Offices by Divine Right, then Presbyterie*, (London: Printed for Nathanael Webb, 1660).

Firmin, G., *The Questions between the Conformist and Nonconformist, Truly Stated, and Briefly Discussed*, (London: Printed for Tho.Cockerill, 1681).

Fowler, E., *A Defence of the Resolution of this Case, Viz Whether the Church of England's Symbolizing So Far as It Doth with the Church of Rome, Makes It Unlawfull to Hold Communion with the Church of England. In Answer to a Book Intituled a Modest Examination of that Resolution*, (London: Printed by J.H. for B.Aylmer, 1684).

Fowler, E., *A Resolution of this Case, Viz. Whether It Be Lawful to Separate from the Publick Worship of God in the Parochial Assemblies of England, upon that New Pretence Which Some Men Make, of the Case Being Much Altered Now from What It Was, When the Puritans Wrote Against the Brownists and the Presbyterians against the Independent*, (London: Printed by A.Grover, for Walter Kettilby, 1683).

Fox, G., *Something in Answer to the Old Common-Prayer-Book, and for the Information of Those Who Are For It Which Is Much Of It Taken Out of the Old Mass-Book*, (London: Printed for Robert Wilson, 1660).

Freeman, I., *The Reasonableness of Divine Service: Or Non-Conformity to Common-Prayer. Proved Not Conformable to Common Reason*, (London: Printed by Tho.Basset, 1661).

Fuller, T., *The Church-History of Britain; From the Birth of Jesus Christ, until the Year 1648*, (London: Printed for Iohn Williams, 1655).

Fuller, T., *The Church-History of Britain; From the Birth of Jesus Christ, until the Year 1648*, (London: Printed for Iohn Williams, 1656).

Fuller, T., *The History of the Worthies of England*, (London: Printed by J.G.U.L. and W.G., 1662).

Gailhard, J., *The Controversie between Episcopacy and Presbytery*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1660).

Gailhard, J., *The Rights of the Church Asserted against the Power Usurped over It*, (London: Printed for J.Rothwell, 1660).

Gailhard, J., *Some Observations upon the Keeping the Thirtieth of January and Twenty-Ninth of May, 1694*, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748).

Gatford, L., *A Petition for the Vindication of the Publique Use of the Book of Common-Prayer, from Some Foul, but Undeserved Aspersions Lately Cast Upon It. And for the Asserting of the Publique Use of Set-Forms of Prayer, and Dispensing of the Holy Sacraments*, (London: Printed for John Williams, 1655).

Gauden, J., *Antisacrilegus: Or, a Defensatve against the Plausible Pest, or Guilded Poyson. of that Nameless Paper Which Tempts the Kings Majestie by the Offer of Five Hundred Thousand Pounds to Make Good an Act of Parliament to the Purchasers of Bishops, Deans, and Chapter Lands, Their Illegal Bargain for Ninety Nine Years*, (London: Printed by J.B.for Andrew Crook, 1660).

Gauden, J., *Considerations Touching the Liturgy of the Church of England*, (London: Printed by J.G. for John Playford, 1661).

Gauden, J., *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria. The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England Setting Forth Her Former Constitution, Compared with Her Present Condition*, (London: Printed by J.G. for R.Royston, 1660).

Gauden, J., *Gods Great Demonstrations and Demands of Justice, Mercy and Humility. Set Forth in a Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, at Their Solemn Fast before Their First Sitting, April 30 1660*, (London: Printed by F.Best for Andrew Crook, 1660).

Gauden, J. *The Loosing of St Peters Bands; Setting Forth the True Sense and Solution of the Covenant in Point of Conscience So Far as It Relates to the Government of the Church by Episcopacy*, (London: Printed by J.Best for Andrew Crook, 1660).

Gauden, J., *The Love of Truth and Peace. A Sermon Preached before the Honorable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament, Novemb.29.1640*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1641).

Gauden, J, *Slight Healers of Publick Hurts Set Forth in a Sermon Preached in St. Pauls Church, London...Febr 28 1659*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crook, 1660).

Gauden, J., *The Solemn League and Covenant Discharged. Or St. Peter's Bands Not Only Loosed but Annihilated*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1660).

Gee, E., *An Answer to the Compiler of the Nubes Testium: Wherein Is Shewn that Antiquity (in Relation to the Points of Controversie Set Down by Him) Did Not for the First Five Hundred Years Believe, Teach or Practise. Together with a Vindication of the Veteres Vindicati from the Late Weak and Disingenuous Attempts of the Author of Transubstantiation Defended*,(London: Printed for Henry Mortlock, 1688).

Gee, E., *The Catalogue of All the Discourses Published against Popery, During the Reign of King James II. By the Members of the Church of England, and by the Non-Conformists. With the Names of the Authors of Them*, (London: Printed by R.Baldwin, 1689).

Gee, E., *The Divine Right and Originall of the Civill Magistrate from God, Illustrated and Vindicated*, (London: Printed for George Eversden, 1658).

Gee, E., *The Primitive Fathers No Papists: In Answere to the Vindication of the Nubes Testium to Which Is Added an Historical Discourse Concerning Invocation of Saints; In Answer to the Challenge of F.Sabran the Jesuit*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chirlwell. 1688).

Gee, E., *A Second Letter to Father Lewis Sabran, Jesuite, in Answer to His Reply*, (London: Printed for Henry Mortlock, 1688).

Gee, E., *A Third Letter to F.Lewis Sabran, Jesuit; Wherein the Defence of His Challenge. Concerning Invocation of Saints is Examined and Confuted*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1688).

Gibson, E., *A Preservative against Popery, in Several Select Discourses upon the Principal Heads of Controversy between Protestants and Papists: Written and Published by the Most Eminent Divines of the Church of England, Chiefly in the Reign of King James II*, (London: Printed for H.Knaplock, J.Walthoe, G.Conyers, R.Wilkin, D.Midwinter, A.Bettesworth, C.Hitch, J.and J.Pemberton, W.Innys, R.Manby, R.Robinson, J.Walthoeson, B.Motte, C.Bathhurst, F.Clay, A.Ward, J.and P.Knapton, T.Osborn, D.Browne, J.Clarke, T.Longman, H.Lintot, E.Wickstead, J.And R.Tonson, 1738), Vol.1.

Gillespie, G., *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland. Not Only Our Own arguments against the Same Are Strongly Confirmed, but Likewise the Answers and Defences of Our Opposites, Such as Hooker, Mortoune, Burges, Sprint, Paybody, Andrewes, Saravia, Tilen, Spotswood, Lindsey, Forbesse, &c. Particularly Confuted*, (Edinburgh: [No Printer], 1660).

Gillespie, G., *A Late Dialogue betwixt a Civilian and a Divine, Concerning the Present Condition of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Robert Bostock, 1644).

Glanvill, J., *The Zealous, and Impartial Protestant, Shewing Some Great, but Heeded Dangers of Popery*, (London: Printed by M.C. for Henry Brome, 1681).

Goldsmith, O., *The Vicar of Wakefield*, A Friedman, (ed.), (London: Oxford University Press, 1974).

Gordon, J., *A Request to Roman Catholicks to Answer the Queries upon these Their Following Tenets*, (London: Printed for Brab.Aylmer, 1687).

Gother, J., *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome, Evinced from the Concertation of Some of Her Sons with Their Brethren the Dissenters*, (London: Printed by Henry hills, 1687).

Gother, J., *Good Advice to the Pulpits, Deliver'd in a Few Cautions for the Keeping up the Reputation of those Chairs, and Preserving the Nation in Peace*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687).

Gother, J., *A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented: Or, a Twofold Chracter of Popery*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1685).

Gother, J., *Reflections upon the Answer to the Papist Mis-Represented*, (London: [No Printer], 1688).

Goulde, W., *The Primitive Christian Justified, and Jack Presbyter Reproved; Or, a Scripture Demonstration, that to Be Innocent and Persecuted, Is More Eligible than to Be Prosperously Wicked. Delivered in a Semon in the Abby-Church of Bath*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1682).

Goulde, W., *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral of St. Peter in Exon On Palm Sunday. An.Dom.1672*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1672).

Gregory, F., *The Triall of Religions with Cautions to the Memebers of the Reformed Church against Defection to the Roman*, (London: Printed by E.Flesher for R.Royston, 1674).

Gregory, G., *Teares and Blood, or a Discourse of the Persecution of Ministers, With Motives to Martyrdom and Cautions about It*, (Oxford: Printed by A.and L.Lichfield, 1660).

Griffith, E., *Pax Vobis: Or, Gospell and Liberty: Against Ancient and Modern Papists*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1687).

Grove, R., *A Perswasive to Communion with the Church of England*, (London: Printed by A.J.Redmayne, Jun. for Fincham Gardiner, 1682/3).

Grove, R., *A Short Defence of the Church and Clergy of England*, (London: Printed by J.Macock for Walter Kettilby, 1681).

Grove, R., *A Vindication of the Conforming Clergy from the Unjust Aspersion of Heresie*.

(London: Printed for Walter Kettliby, 1676).

Gunning, P., *The Paschal or Lent-Fast Apostolical and Perpetual. As First Deliver'd in a Sermon Preached before His Majesty in Lent, and Since Enlarged*, (London: Printed by R.Norton for Timothy Garthwait, 1662).

H.,T., *An Earnest Exhortation for the Publike Reading of Common Prayer*, (London: Printed for H.T., 1647).

Hacket, J., *Scrinia Reservata: A Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D.D. Who Some Time Held the Places of Ld Keeper of the Great Seal of England, Ld Bishop of Lincoln, and Ld Archbishop of York. Containing a Series of the Most Remarkable Occurrences and Transactions of His Life, in Relation Both to the Church and State*, (London: Printed by Edw.James, for Sammuel Lowndes, 1693).

Hale, M., *The Judgment of the Late Lord Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale, of the Nature of True Religion, the Causes of Its Corruptions, and the Churches Calamity, by Mens Additions, and Violencies: With the Desired Cure*, (London: Printed by B.Simmons, 1684).

Hales, J., *Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable Mr John Hales of Eton College*, (London: Printed for R.Pawlet, 1673).

Hales, J., *A Tract Concerning Schisme and Schismaticks. Wherein Is Briefly Discovered the Original and Causes of All Schisme*, (London: Printed for R.B., 1642)

Hall, J., *Episcopacy by Divine Right, Asserted*, in *The Works of Joseph Hall, D.D.*, Vol.X, (Oxford: D.A.Talboys, 1837), Vol.X, (pp. 141-271).

Hall, J., *Of Government and Obedience, as They Stand Directed and Determined by Scripture and Reason*, (London: Printed by T.Newcomb for F.Kitchin, A.Roper, G.Bedell, and G.Saubridge, 1654).

Hall, J., *The True Cavalier Examined by His Principles; And Found Not Guilty of Schism or Sedition*, (London: Printed by Tho.Newcomb, 1656).

Hall, J., *The Works*, (London: Printed for Edw.Brewster, 1634), Vols.I-II.

Hammond, H., *An Account of Mr Cawdrey's Triplex Diatribe Concerning Superstition, Wil-Worship, and Christmas Festivall*, (London: Printed by J.Flesher for Richard Royston, 1655).

Hammond, H., *An Answer to the Aninmadversions on the Dissertations Touching Ignatius's Epistles and the Episcopacie in Them Asserted*, (London: Printed by F.G. for Richard Royston, 1654).

Hammond, H., *The Baptizing of Infants Reviewed and Defended from the Exceptions of Mr.Tombes, in His Three Last Chapters of His Book Intituled Antipedobaptisme*, (London: Printed by J.Flesher for Richard Royston, 1655).

Hammond, H., *A Brief Account of One Suggestion of the Romanist against the Dispatcher Dispatched*, in *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D.*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.II, Part I,(pp. 413-416).

Hammond, H., *Considerations of Present Use Concerning the Danger Resulting from the Change of Our Church-Government*, (London: [No Printer], 1644).

Hammond, H., *A Continuation of the Defence of Hugo Grotius in an Answer to the Review of*

His Annotations Whereto Is Subjoined a Reply to Some Passages of the Reviewer in His Late Book of Schism, Concerning His Charge of Corruptions in the Primitive Church, and Some Other Particulars, in The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D., (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.II, Part II, (pp. 83-98).

Hammond, H., *A Copy of Some Papers Past at Oxford, Betwixt the Author of the Practical Catechism and Mr Ch. A Brief Vindication of Three Passages, in the Practical Catechism, from the Censures Affixt on Them by the Ministers of London, in a Book Entitled, [a Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ, &c], In The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D.,* (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.I, (pp.153-198).

Hammond, H., *The Disarmers Dexterity Examined in a Second Defence of the Treatise of Schism, in The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D.,* (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.II, Part I, (pp.61-159).

Hammond, H., *The Dispatcher Dispatched. Or, an Examination of the Romanists Rejoynder to the Replies of D.H. Being a Third Defence of the Treatise of Schisme. Wherein Is Inserted a View of Their Possession and Orall Tradition in the Way of M.White,* (London: Printed for Richard Royston, Oxford: Printed for Richard Davies, 1659).

Hammond, H., *Dissertationes Quatuor Quibus Episcopatus Jura Ex S.Scripturis & Primaeva Antiquitate Adstruntur, Contra Sententiam D.Blondelli Et Aliorum,* (London: Typis F.Flesher, Impensis R.Royston in Vico Vulgo Voc., 1651).

Hammond, H., *Lacrymae Ecclesiae; Or the Mourning of Hadrimmon for Englands Iosiah. Delivered in Two Sermons, Janu.30.1660 at the Solemn Fasting and Humiliation, for the Martyrdom and Horrid Murder of Our Late Gracious King Charles the First of Ever Blessed Memory, in the Church of the Borough of Blechingley in The County Of Surry,* (London: Printed for Wil.Hope, 1661).

Hammond, H., *Large Additions to the Practicall Catechisme,* (London: Printed by M.F. for R.Royston, 1646).

Hammond, H., *Of Conscience, Scandal, Will-Worship and Superstition,* (Oxford: Printed by Henry Hall, 1645).

Hammond, H., *Of Fundamentals in a Notion to Practise. Of Schisme. A Defence of the Church of England, against the Exceptions of the Romanists,* (London: Printed by J.Flesher for Richard Royston, 1654).

Hammond, H., *Of Idolatory,* (Oxford: Printed by Henry Hall, 1646).

Hammond, H., *Of a Late, or a Death-Bed Repentance,* (Oxford: [No Printer], 1646).

Hammond, H., *Of Resisting the Lawfull Magistrate under Colour of Religion,* (Oxford: Printed by H.H.and W.W., 1644).

Hammond, H., *Of Schisme. A Defence of the Church of England against the Exceptions of the Romanists,* (London: Printed by J.Flesher for Richard Royston, 1654).

Hammond, H., *Of the Power of the Keyes: Or of Binding and Loosing,* in *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D.,* 1647, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.I, (pp. 402-458).

Hammond, H., *Of the Reasonableness of Christian Religion,* in *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond,* (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.I, (pp. 133-152).

Hammond, H., *Or, the Grounds of Uniformity from I.Cor.14.40. Vindicated from Mr Jeanes's Exceptions to One Passage in The View of the Directory, in The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond D.D.*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vol.II, Part II, (pp. 240-247).

Hammond, H., *A Pacific Discourse of God's Grace and Decrees; In a Letter of Full Accordance Written to the Reverend and Most Learned Dr Robert Sanderson, in The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson, (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.V, (pp. 289-335).

Hammond, H., *A Practicall Catechisme*, (Oxford, [No Printer], 1646).

Hammond, H., *A Second Defence of the Learned Hugo Grotius, or a Vindication, of the Digression Concerning Him, from Some Fresh Exceptions*, (London: Printed by J.Flesher for Richard Royston, 1655).

Hammond, H., *Six Books of Large Controversie in Defence of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Richard Royston, 1656), Vols.I-II.

Hammond, H., *To the Right Honourable, the Lord Fairfax, and His Councell of Warre: The Humble Adresse of Henry Hammond*, (London: Printed for Richard Royston, 1649).

Hammond, H., *A View of Some Exceptionions Which Have Beene Made by a Romanist to the Lord Viscount Falkland's Discourse of the Infallibilitie of the Church of Rome*, (Oxford: Printed for R.Royston, 1646).

Hammond, H., *A View of the New Directory and a Vindication of the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England; In Answer to Reasons Pretended in the Ordinance and Preface for the Abolishing the One, and Establishing the Other*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1645).

Hammond, H., *A Vindication of the Dissertations Concerning Episcopacie: From the Answrs or Exceptions Offered against Them by the London Ministers, in Their Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici* (London: Printed by F.G. for Richard Royston, 1654).

Hammond, H., *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Henry Hammond, D.D.*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1684), Vols I-IV.

Henderson, A., *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacie, or Perpetual Presidencie in the Church, Briefly Discovered*, (London: [No Printer], 1641).

Hewitt, J., *Prayers of Intercession for Their Use Who Mourn in Secret, for the Publique Calamities of This Nation*, (London, [No Printer], 1659).

Heylyn, P., *An Answer to This Quodlibetical Question. Whether the Bishops Make a Fundamental, and Essential Part of the English Parliament*, (London: Printed for A.Seile, 1661).

Heylyn, P., *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate the L.Archbishop of Canterbury*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1644).

Heylyn, P., *Cyprianus Anglicus: Or the History of the Life and Death, of the Most Renowned Prelate William by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, (London: Printed For A.Seile, 1668).

Heylyn, P., *Cyprianus Anglicus: Or, the History of the Life and Death, of William Laud*,

(London: Printed by J.M. for A.Seile, 1671).

Heylyn, P., *Ecclesia Restaurata; Or, the History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for H.Twyford, F.Place, T.Basset, W.Palmer, 1670).

Heylyn, P., *Ecclesia Vindicata: Or, the Church of England Justified*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes for Henry Seile, 1657).

Heylyn, P., *Ecclesia Vindicata: Or, the Church of England Vindicated. Part Second. Containing the Defence Thereof in Retaining the Episcopal Government. And the Canonical Ordination of Priests and Deacons. Framed and Exhibited in an History of Episcopacy*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes for Henry Seile, 1657).

Heylyn, P., *Examen Historicum; Or a Discovery and Examination of the Mistakes, Falsities and Defects in Some Modern Histories*, (London: Printed for Henry Seile and Richard Royston, 1659).

Heylyn, P., *Extraneus Vapulans: Or the Observator Rescued from the Violent but Vaine Assaults of Hamon L'Estrange, Esq. And the Back-Blows of Dr.Bernard, an Irish-Deane*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Richard Lowndes, 1656).

Heylyn, P., *The History of Episcopacy. The Second Part from the Death of St.John the Apostle, to the Beginning of the Empire of Constantine*, (London: Printed for Henry Seile, 1657).

Heylyn, P., *Observations on the Historie of the Reign of King Charles*, (London: Printed for John Clark. 1656).

Heylyn, P., *Parliaments Power, in Lawes for Religion. Or an Answer to that Old and Groundless Calumny of the Papists, Nick-Naming the Religion of the Church of England, by the Name of England, by the Name of Parliamentary-Religion*, (Oxford: Printed by Henry Hall, 1645).

Heylyn, P., *Respondet Petrus: Or, the Answer of Peter Heylyn D.D. to So Much of Dr. Bernard's Book Entitled, the Judgment of the Late Primate of Ireland, &c.*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1658).

Heylyn, P., *The Stumbling-Block of Disobedience and Rebellion, Cunningly Laid by Calvin in the Subjects Way, Discovered, Censured, and Removed*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes for Henry Seile, 1658).

Heylyn, P., *The Undeceiving of the People in the Point of Tithes*, (London: Printed by F.G. for John Clark, 1657).

Hickeringill, E., *The History of Whiggism, or, the Whiggish-Plots, Principles, and Practices, (Mining and Countermining the Tory-Plots and Principles) in the Reign of King Charles the First, During the Conduct of Affaires, under the Influence of the Three Great Minions and Favourites, Buckingham, Laud, and Strafford; And the Sad Fore-Runners and Prologues to the Fatal-Year (to England and Ireland). Wherein (as is a Mirrour) is Shown the Face of the Late (We Do Not Say the Present) Times*, (London: Printed for E.Smith, 1682).

Hickes, G., *An Apology for the New Separation: In a Letter to Dr. John Sharpe, Archbishop of York; Occasioned by His Farewell-Sermon, Preached on the 28th of June, at St. Giles's in the Fields*, (London: [No Printer], 1691).

Hickes, G., *The Case of Infant-Baptism, in Five Questions*, (London: Printed for Tho.Basset, Benj.Tooke, and F.Gardiner, 1683).

Hickes, G., *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated; In Answer to a Letter Sent to the Author, 1693*, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.III, (pp. 264-286).

Hickes, G., *Two Treatises, One of the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order. Formerly Written, and Now Published to Obviate the Erroneous Opinions, Fallacious Reasonings, and Bold and False Assertions in a Late Book, Entituled, the Rights of the Christian Church. With a Large Prefatory Discourse, Wherein Is Contained an Answer to the Said Book*, (London: Printed by W.B. for Richard Sare, 1707).

Hickes, G., *A Vindication of Some Among Our Selves against the False Principles of Dr Sherlock. In a Letter to the Doctor Occasioned by the Sermon Which He Preached at the Temple-Church, on the 29th of May, 1692. In Which Letter are also Contained Reflexions on Some Other of the Doctor's Sermons, Published Since He Took the Oath*, (London: [No Printer], 1692).

Hickman, H., *Pius Ultra: Or Englands Reformation Needing to Be Reformed. Being an Examination of Doctor Heylins History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for the Authors, 1661).

Hill, S., *The Catholic Balance*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavell, 1687).

Hoadly, B., *The Measure of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Consider'd. In a Defence of the Doctrine, Deliver'd in a Sermon Preach'd before the Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, Sept.29.1705*, (London: Printed by W.B. for James Knapton, 1710).

Holdsworth, R., *Praelectiones Theologicae Habitae In Collegio Greshamensi Apud Londinensis*, (Londini: Typis Jacobi Flesher, 1661).

Holland, H., *Heruologia Anglica: Hoc Est Clarissimorum Et Doctissimorum*, (Arnhem: J.Jansson, 1620).

Hollingworth, R., *A Second Defence of King Charles I. By Way of Reply to an Infamous Libel Called, Ludlow's Letter to Dr. Hollingworth*, (London: Printed for S.Eddows, 1692).

Hooker, R., *The Answer of Mr. Richard Hooker to a Supplication Preferred by Mr Walter Travers to the H.H. Lords of the Privie Counsell*, (Oxford: Printed by Ioseph Barnes, 1612).

Hooker, R., *Colestis Legatus; Or, an Astrological Diarie, for the Year of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, (Cambridge: Printed by John Field, 1668).

Hooker, R., 'A Discourse of the Causes of the Continuance of these Contentions Concerning Church-Government,' in *Certain Briefe Treatises Written by Diverse Learned Men Concerning the Ancient Government of the Church. Wherein, Both the Primitive Institution of Episcopacie Is Maintained, and the Lawfulnessse of the Ordination of the Protestant Ministers beyond the Seas Likewise Defended*, (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1641), (pp. 1-6).

Hooker, R., *The Ecclesiastical Polity and Other Works of Richard Hooker: With His Life by Izaak Walton and Strype's Interpolations*, B.Hoadley, (ed.), (London: Holdsworth and Ball, 1830).

Hooker, R., *A Faithful Abridgment of the Works of that Learned and Judicious Richard Hooker. In Eight Books of Ecclesiastical Polity, and of All the Other the Treatises Which Were Written by the Same Author with an Account of His Life*, (London: Printed by Benjamin

Bragg, 1705).

Hooker, R., *Judicious Hooker's Illustrations of Holy Scripture in His Ecclesiastical Policy*, (London: Printed for the Collector, 1685).

Hooker, R., *The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed by Richard Bishop, 1639).

Hooker, R., *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, Eight Bookes, (London: Printed by Will: Stansby, 1617).

Hooker, R., *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie Eight Bookes by Richard Hooker*, (London: Printed for R.Scot, T.Basset, J.Wright & R.Chiswell, 1676).

Hooker, R., *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed by J.Best, for Andrew Crook, 1662).

Hooker, R., *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie; The Sixth and Eighth Books*, (London: Printed by Richard Bishop, 1648).

Hooker, R., *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Policy, the Sixth and Eighth Books*, (London: Printed by R.B., 1651)

Hooker, R., *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1666).

Hooker, R., *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Books I-IV*, G.Edelen, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol.I.

Hooker, R., *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Book V*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), Vol.II.

Hooker, R., *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, VI, VII, VIII*, P.G.Stanwood, (Ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), Vol.III.

Hooker, R., *A Sermon of Richard Hooker Author of these Learned Books of Ecclesiastical Politie, Found in the Study of the Late Learned Bishop Andrews*, (London: Printed for Richard Marriott, 1678).

Hooker, R., *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker, in Eight Books of Ecclesiastical Polity, Compleated out of His Own Manuscripts*, (London: Printed for Robert Scot, Thomas Basset, John Wright and Richard Chiswel, 1682).

Hooker, R., *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker, in Eight Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity Compleated out of His Own Manuscripts. Dedicated to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, Charles II*, (London: Printed for R.C., S.S., B.W., M.W., G.C., 1705).

Hooker, R., *The Works of the Learned and Judicious Divine Mr Richard Hooker: With an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, J.Keble, (Ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836).

Hooker, R., *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, J.Keble, (ed.), Revised by R.W.Church and F.Paget, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888).

- How *The Members of the Church of England Ought to Behave Themselves under a Roman Catholick King: In a Letter to a Friend*, ([No Place of Publication]: Printed by Randal Taylor, 1687).
- Huddleston, R., *A Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church. Composed Many Years Since by that Eminent Divine Mr. Richard Huddleston of the English Congregation of the Order of St Benedict. And Now Published for the Common Good by His Nephew Mr Jo. Huddleston of the Same Congregation*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1688).
- Hughes, L., *Certain Grievances or the Errors of the Service Book*, (Printed by T.P. and M.S. and Edward Blackmore, 1643).
- Hungerford, A., *The Advise of a Sonne Professing the Religion Established in the Present Church of England to His Deare Mother a Roman Catholike*, (Oxford: Printed by L.Lichfield, for Henry Cripps, 1639).
- Hunton, P., *A Treatise of Monarchy: Containing Two Parts. I. Concerning Monarchy:- General. II. Concerning this Particular Monarchy. Also a Vindication of the Said Treatise*, (London: Printed for E.Smith, 1689).
- Hyde, A., *A Copy of a Paper Written by the Late Dutchess of York, &c*, (London: [No Printer], 1670).
- J., R., *A Defensive Vindication of the Publike Liturgy, Establishd Ceremonies, and Settled Patrimony of the Church of England*, (London: Printed by J.R. for R.Whittaker, and William, 1641).
- Jessop, C., *The Angel of the Church of Ephesus No Bishop of Ephesus Distinguished in Order from, and Superior in Power to a Presbyter*, (London, [No Printer], 1660).
- Jewel, J., *An Apologie or Aunswer in Defence of the Church of England, Concerning the State of Religion Used in the Same. Newly Set Forth in Latine, and Nowe Translated into Englishe*, (Londini: Reginalde Wolfe, 1562).
- Johnston, J., *A Reply to the Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrin of the Church of England*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687).
- Johnston, J., *A Vindication of the Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church: Being a Further Vindication of the Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. With a Second Letter from the Bishop of Meaux*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1686).
- Johnston, N., *The Excellency of Monarchical Government, Especially of the English Monarchy; Wherein as Largely Treated of the Several Benefits of Kingly Government, and the Inconvenience of Commonwealths. Also of the Several Badges of Sovereignty in General, and Particularly According to the Constitutions of Our Laws. Likewise of the Duty of Subjects, and the Mischiefs of Faction, Sedition and Rebellion. In All Which the Principles and Practices of Our Late Commonwealths-Men Are Considered*, (London: Printed by J.B. for Robert Clavel, 1686).
- Kettlewell, J., *A Doctrine of the Cross: Or, Passive Obedience, under Any Pretended Invasion of Legal Rights and Liberties*, (London: Printed for Jos.Hindmarsh and Rob.Kettlewell, 1691).
- Kettlewell, J., *The Duty of Allegiance Settled upon Its True Grounds, According to Scripture, Reason, and the Opinion of the Church: In Answer to a Late Book of Dr. William Sherlock*,

Master of the Temple, Entitled, the Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, Stated and Resolved According to Scripture, &c. With a More Particular Respect to the Oath Lately Injoyn'd, (London: [No Printer], 1691).

Kilburne, R., *A Topographie or Survey of the County of Kent*, (London: Printed by Thomas Mabb for Henry Atkinson, 1659).

King, H., *An Elegy upon the Most Incomparable K. Charles the I. Persecuted by Two Implacable Factions, Imprisoned by the One, and Murthered by the Other, January 30th 1648*, (London: [No Printer], 1648).

King, W., *An Answer to the Considerations Which Obliged Peter Manby, Late Dean of London-Derry in Ireland, (as He Pretends) to Embrace, What He Calls, the Catholick Religion*, (London: Printed for R. Taylor, 1687).

King, W., *A Discourse Concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*, (London: Printed for William Keblewhite, 1694).

Lake, E., *Officium Eucharisticum a Preparatory Service to a Devout and Worthy Reception of the Lords Supper*, (London: Printed for Christopher Wilkinson, 1689).

Lake, E., *Memoranda: Touching the Oath Ex Officio, Pretended Self-Accusation, and Canonical Purgation*, (London: Printed for R. Royston, 1662).

Lake, E., *A Sermon Preached at the Church of S. Mary le Bow, before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen, on the Thirtieth of January, 1683*. [London: Printed by M.C. for C. Wilkinson, 1684).

Laud, W., *A Relation of the Conference between William Laud Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr Fisher the Jesuit*, (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1901).

Leslie, C., *Reflections upon a Late Scandalous and Malicious Pamphlet Entitled, the Shortest Way with the Dissenters; Or Proposals for the Establishment of the Church. To Which the Said Pamphlet is Prefix'd Entire by It Self*, (London: [No Printer], 1703).

L'Estrange, R., *An Account of the Growth of Knavery, under the Pretended Fears of Arbitrary Government and Popery. With a Parallel Betwixt the Reformers of 1677, and Those of 1641, in Their Methods, and Designs*, (London: Printed by H.H. for Henry Brome, 1678).

L'Estrange, R., *The Casuist Uncas'd, in a Dialogue Betwixt Richard and Baxter, with a Moderator between Them for Quietnesse Sake*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1681).

L'Estrange, R., *The Dissenter's Sayings, in Requital for L'Estrange's Sayings. Published in Their Own Words, for the Information of the People*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1681).

L'Estrange, R., *Free-Born Subject: Or, the Englishmans Birthright: Asserted against All Tyrannical Usurpations Either in Church or State*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1679).

L'Estrange, R., *The Growth of Knavery and Popery under the Mask of Presbytery*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1678).

L'Estrange, R., *Interest Mistaken: Or, the Holy Cheat: Proving from the Undeniable Practises and Positions of the Presbyterians, that the Design of that Party is to Enslave Both King and People under the Masque of Religion*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1662).

L'Estrange, R., *A Plea for Limited Monarchy, as It was Established in this Nation before the Late War*, (London: Printed by T.M. for William Shears, 1660).

L'Estrange, R., *The Relaps'd Apostate: Or Notes upon a Presbyterian Pamphlet, Entitled, a Petition for Peace Wherein the Faction and Design Are Laid as Open as Heart Can Wish*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1661).

L'Estrange, R., *Remarks on the Growth and Progress of Non-Conformity*, (London: Printed for Walter Kettilby, 1682).

L'Estrange, R., *State-Divinity; Or a Supplement to the Relaps'd Apostate. Wherein Is Prosecuted the Discovery of the Present Designe against the King, the Parliament, and the Publick Peace: In Notes upon Some Late Presbyterian Pamphlets*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1661).

L'Estrange, R., *Theosebia or the Churches Advocate: Endeavouringt he Promotion of Loyalty to Our King and Fidelity to the Episcopal Church*, (London: Printed for Walter Davies, 1683).

L'Estrange, R., *Toleration Discuss'd*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1663).

L'Estrange, R., *Truth and Loyalty Vindicated from the Reproches and Clamours of Mr. Edward Bagshaw. Together with a Further Discovery of the Libeller Himself, and His Seditious Confederates*, (London: Printed for H.Brome, and A.Seile, 1662).

L'Estrange, R., *A Whipp a Whipp, for the Schismaticall Animadverter upon the Bishop of Worcester's Letter*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1662).

L'Estrange, R., *A Whipp For The Animadverte in Return to His Libell*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1662).

A Letter from a Clergy-Man in the Country to a Minister in the City, Concerning Ministers Intermedling with State-affairs in Their Sermons and Discourse, (London: [No Printer], 1689).

A Letter from a Minister to a Person of Quality, Shewing some Reason for his Non-Conformity, (London: [No Printer], 1662?)

A Letter to the Author of the Vindication of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Concerning the Legality of that Court, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1688).

A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Arch-Bishop of York, Occasioned by the Prosecution of Dr. Henry Sacheverell, (London: Printed by the Booksellers of London, and Westminster, 1710).

A Letter Writ by a Clergy-Man to His Neighbour, Concerning the Present Cicumstances of the Kingdom, and the Allegiance that is Due to the King and Queen, (London: Printed for Ric. Chiswell, 1689).

Levassor, M., *The Sighs of France in Slavery after Liberty*, (London: Printed for D.Newman, 1689/90).

Lloyd, W., *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms. Part I*, (London: Printed by H.Hills for Thomas Jones, 1691).

Lloyd, W., *The Late Apology in Behalf of the Papists Re-Printed and Answered in Behalf of the Royalists*, (London: Printed for M.N., 1667).

Locke, J., *Two Treatises of Government*, P.Laslett, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Long, T., *A Full Answer to all the Popular Objection that Have Yet Appear'd, for Not Taking the Oath of Allegiance to Their Present Majesties, Particularly Offer'd to the Consideration of All Such of the Divines of the Church of England (and Others) as are Yet Unsatisfied: Shewing, Both from Scripture and the Laws of the Land, the Reasonableness Thereof, and the Ruining Consequences, Both to the Nation and Themselves, If Not Complied with*, (London: Printed by R.Baldwin, 1689).

Lyford, W., *An Apologie for Our Publick Ministrie, and Infant-Baptism*, (London: Printed by William Du-Gard, 1653).

M., P., *The Church of England and the Continuation of the Ceremonies Thereof, Vindicated from the Calumnies of Several Late Pamphlets; More Particularly that Entitled, the Vanity, Mischief, and Danger of Continuing Ceremonies in the Worship of God*, (London: Printed for S.Cook, 1690).

Mackworth, H., *A Vindication of the Rights of the Commons of England*, (London: Printed by J.Nutt, 1701).

Martin, E., *His Opinion Concerning the Difference between the Church of England and Geneva*, (London: [No Printer], 1662).

Marvell, A *the Rehearsal Transposed: Or Animadversions upon a Late Book, Intituled, a Preface Shewing What Grounds There are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery*, (London: Printed by J.D. for the Assigns of John Calvin and Theodore Beza, 1672).

Marvell, A., *The Rehearsal Transposed: The Second Part*, (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673).

Maxwell, J., *The Burthen of Issacher: The Tyrannical Power and Practises of the Presbyterial Government in Scotland*, (London: [No Printer], 1646).

Mayne, J., *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God, Herbert, Lord Bishop of Hereford*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1662).

Meredith, E., *Some Farther Remarks on the Late Account Given by Dr Tenison of His Conference with Mr Pulton. Wherein the Doctor's Three Exceptions against Edward Merdith Are Examined, Several of his Other Misrepresentations Laid Open, Motives of the Said E.M.'s Conversion Shewed, and Some Other Points Relating to Controversie Occasionally Treated*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1688).

A Method of Gaining the Whole Christian World to be Converts to the Church of England, by Satisfying One Doubt. Occasion'd by a Request Lately Made to Roman-Catholics: And Directed to the Requester, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687).

Milner, J., *A Brief Examination of Some Passages in the Chronological Part of a Letter, Written to Dr. Sherlock in His Vindication*, (London: Printed by Randal Taylor, 1700).

A Modest Apology for the Loyal Protestant Subjects of King James, Who Desire His Restoration Without Prejudice to Our Religion, Laws or Liberties: In Answer to the Pretences of the French Invasion Examined, in a Letter to a Friend, 1692, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748).

Modest Discourse Concerning the Ceremonies Heretofore Used in the Church of England,

Shewing the Unlawfulness of Them in the Worship of God, (London: Printed by T.R. for Nathaniel Webb, 1660).

Montagu, R., *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers*, (London: Printed by H.L. for Matthew Lownes, 1625).

Morley, G., *A Modest Advertisement Concerning the Present Controversie about Church-Government; Wherein the Maine Grounds of that Booke, Intituled the Unlawfulnesse and Danger of Limited Prelacie are Calmly Examined*, (London: Printed for Robert Bostock, 1641).

Morley, G., *A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Coronation of the Most High and Mighty King Charles the IId*, (London: Printed by R.Norton for T.Garthwait, 1661).

Morley, G., *Several Treatises Written upon Several Occasions; By the Right Reverend Father in God George Lord Bishop of Winton, Both before and since the King's Restauration: Wherein His Judgment is Fully Made Known Concerning the Church of Rome and Most of those Doctrines, Which are Controverted betwixt Her and the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Joanna Brome, 1683).

Morton, T., *A Defence of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England. Viz the Surplisse, Crosse after Baptisme, and Kneeling at the Receiving of the Blessed Sacrament*, (London: Imprinted for William Barret, 1618).

Mossom, R., *An Apology in the Behalf of the Sequestred Clergy Presented to the High Court of Parliament*, (London: Printed for William Grantham, 1660).

Mumford, J., *The Question of Questions Which Rightly Resolved, Resolves All Our Questions in Religion. This Question is Who Ought to Be Our Judge in All these Our Differences? This Book Answers this Question and Hence Shews a Most Easie, and Yet a Most Safe Way, How Among So Many Religions the Most Unlearned and Learned May Find the True Religion*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1686).

N., N., *The Catholick Answer to the Seekers Request: In a Letter Directed to the Seeker, Proving the Real Presence, by the Scripture Only*, (London: Printed for John and Thomas Lane, 1687).

N., N., *The Letter Which Was Sent to the Author of the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Jure Divino Disproved, &c*, (London: Printed for Tho. Harrison, 1689).

N., N., *Old Popery as Good as New. Or the Unreasonableness of the Church of England in Some of Her Doctrines and Practices, and the Reasonableness of Liberty of Conscience*, (London: [No Printer], 1688).

N.N., *Reflections upon Mr Baxter's Last Book, Entituled, The English Non-Conformity as under King Charles II and King James II Truly Stated and Argued. In a Letter to a Friend*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavil, 1689).

Nalson, J., *The Countermine: Or a Short but True Discovery of the Dangerous Principles, and Secret Practices of the Dissenting Party, Especially the Presbyterians*, (London: Printed for Jonathan Edwin, 1677).

Nalson, J., *Toleration and Liberty of Conscience Considered, and Proved Impracticable, Impossible, and Even in the Opinion of Dissenters Sinful and Unlawful*, (London: Printed for Thomas Dring, 1685).

Neal, D., *The History of the Puritans or Protestant Non-Conformists, from the Reformation under King Henry VIII to the Act of Toleration under King William and Queen Mary, Vols I-II*, (London: Printed for J.Buckland and J.Waugh and W.Fenner, 1754).

Nedham, M., *The True Character of a Rigid Presbyter*, (London: Printed by the Assignes of J.Calvin, 1661).

The New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty, Examined by the Old Test of Truth and Honesty, (London: Printed by R.G., 1687).

A New Test of the Church of Englands Loyally, (London: Printed for N.T., 1687)

Nicholls, W., *A Comment on the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of The Sacraments, &c. Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David*, (London: Printed for R.Bonwicke, W.Freeman, T.Goodwin, J.Walthoe, M.Wotton, S.Manship, J.Nicholson, R.Parker, B.Tooke, and R.Smith, 1710).

Nicholls, W. *A Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England. In Two Parts*, (London: Printed for J.Batley and H.Parker, 1730).

Nicholls, W., *A Supplement to the Commentary on the Book of Common-Prayer*, (London: Printed for James Holland and Will Taylor, 1711).

Nicholson, F., *The Doctrine of the Church of England Concerning the Substantial Presence, and Adoration, of Our B.Savior in the Eucharist Asserted: With a Vindication of Two Discourses on that Subject, Publish'd at Oxford, from the Exceptions of a Sacramentary Answer, Appendix I to A.Woodhead A Compendious Discourse on the Eucharist*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1688), (pp. 143-188).

Nicholson, W., *An Apology for the Discipline of the Ancient Church Intended for that of Our Mother the Church of England: In Answer to the Admonitory Letter Lately Published*, (London: Printed for William Leake, 1659).

Nicholson, W., *A Plain, but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England Enjoyed to Be Learned of Every Childe, Before He Be Brought to Be Confirmed by the Bishop*, (London: Printed for Nathaniel Webb, 1661).

Nicholson, W., *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral Church of Carlisle on Sunday Feb. 15 1684/5. Being the Next Day after Our Sovereign Lord James the Second Was Proclaimed King in that City*, (London: Printed for John Gellibrand, 1685).

Norris, J., *The Charge of Schism Continued: Being a Justification of Christian Blessedness for His Charging the Separatists with Schism, Notwithstanding the Toleration*, (London: Printed for Samuel Manship, 1691).

North, F., *The Examination of Captain William Bedlow Deceased Relating to the Popish Plot, Taken in His Last Sickness by Sir Francis North, Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas*, (London: Printed by the Assigns of John Bill, Thomas Newcomb, and Henry Hills, 1680).

Nye, S., *Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, by Dr.Wallis, Dr Sherlock, Dr. S-th, Dr Cudworth, and Mr Hooker; As Also on the Account Given by those that Say the Trinity Is an Unconceivable and Inexplicable Mystery*, (London: [No Printer], 1693).

Nye, S., *Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity Occasioned by Four Sermons*, (London: [No Printer], 1674).

Oldisworth, W., *A Dialogue between Timothy and Philatheus. In Which the Principles and Projects of a Late Whimsical Book: Entituled, the Rights of the Christian Church, &c. Are Fairly Stated and Answer'd in Their Kind: And Some Attempts Made Towards the Discovery of a New Way of Reasoning, Intirely Unknown Both to the Ancients and Moderns,* (London: Printed by W.B. for Bernard Lintott, 1709).

Oldisworth, W., *A Dialogue between Timothy and Philatheus: In Which the Principles and Projects of a Late Whimsical Book, Intitul'd (the Rights of the Christian Church) ARE Fairly Stated and Answer'd in Their Kind, &c. To Which are Added Seven Tracts Relating to the Same Subject,* (London: Printed for Bernard Lintott, 1711).

Owne, D., *A Perswasion to Loyalty, or the Subjects Dutie,* (London: [No Printer], 1642),

Oxford, *Judicium & Decretum Universitatis Oxoniensis Latum in Convocatione Habita Jul.21. An 1683. Contra Quosdam Pernicosos Libros & Propositiones Inpias, Quae Capitibus Sacratissimorum Principium, Eorum Statui & Regimini, & Omni Humanae Societati Exitium Intentant,* (Oxford: E.Theatro Sheldoniane, 1683).

Oxford, *To the High and Honourable Court of Parliament, the Humble Petition Of the University of Oxford in Behalfe of Episcopacy and Cathedrals,* (Oxford: Oxford, 1641).

P., M.W., *A Manifest Touching M.W.P. Aversion from the Protestant Congregation, and His Conversion to the Catholique Church,* ([No Place Of Publication]): [No Printer], 1650).

Page, W., *A Treatise or Iustification of Bowing at the Name of Jesus. By Way of Answer to an Appendix [by W.Prynne] against It,* (Oxford: Printed by I.Lichfield, 1631).

Parker, H., *The Question Concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacie,* (London: Printed for Robert Bostock, 1641).

Parker, H., *The Trojan Horse of the Presbyterial Government Unbowelled,* (London: [No Printer], 1646).

Parker, S., *A Discourse Sent to the Late King James, to Perswade Him to Embrace the Protestant Religion, by Dr. Samuel Parker, Late Lord Bishop of Oxford,* (London: Printed by Randal Taylor, 1690).

Parliament, *The Address of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons Assembled in Parliament, to the King's Most Excelent Majesty. Presented by the Right Honourable the Lord Marquess of Hallifax, Lord Privy Seal, and Speaker to the House of Lords. In the Banqueting-House at White-Hall, the Eighth of March, 1688/9. With His Majesty's Most Gracious Answer Thereunto,* (London: Printed by James Partridge, Matthew Gillyflower and Samuel Heyrick, 1688/9).

Parliament, *All the Severall Ordinances Directions and Votes of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament for the Speedy Establishing of the Presbyterial Government,* (London: Printed for John Wright, 1646).

Parliament, *The Bill Entituled an Act for Preventing Occasional Conformity, with the Amendments Made by the Lords, and the Amendments Made by the House of Commons to those Amendments: And the Reports of the Several Conferences Relating Thereunto; As the Proceeding Thereupon. As also the Reports of the Conferences between the Two Houses, Relating to a Message the Fourth of February Last, Touching the Commissiones of Accounts, and the Proceedings Thereupon,* (London: Printed for Edward Jones and Timothy Goodwin, 1702).

Parliament, *The Charge of the Commons of England against Charls Stuart, King of England, of High Treason and Other High Crimes, Exhibited to the High Court of Justice, by John Cook Esquire, Solicitor General, Appointed by the Said Court, for and on the Behalf of the People of England*, (London: Printed for Rapha Harford, 1648).

Parliament, *The Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled at Westminster; Presented to Their Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Orange, at White-Hall the 13th of February, 1688/9*, ([No Place of publication]: [No Printer], 1689).

Parliament, *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament for Keeping of Scandalous Persons from the Sacrament of the Lords-Supper, the Enabling of Elders and Supplying of Defects in Former Ordinances and Directions of Parliament Concerning Church-Government*, (London: Printed for Edward Husband, 1646).

Parliament, *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament for the Ordination of Ministers by the Classicall Presbyters Within Their Respective Bounds for the Severall Congregations in the Kingdom of England*, (London: Printed for John Wright, 1646).

Parliament, *An Ordinannce of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. For the Selling of the Lords of All the Bishops in the Kingdome of England, and Dominions of Wales, for the Service of the Commom-Wealth*, (London: Printed for John Wright, 1646).

Parsons, R., *Several Speeches Delivered Concerning the Power of Parliament, to Proceed against Their King for Misgovernment*, (London: Printed for Robert Ibbitson, 1648).

Pearson, J., *An Answer to Dr. Burges His Word by Way of Postscript. In Vindication of No Necessity of Reformation of the Publick Doctrine of the Church of England*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Nathaniel Brook, 1660).

Pearson, J., *No Necessity of Reformation of the Publick Doctrine of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for J.G for Nathaniel Brook).

Pearson, J., *Promiscuous Ordinations are Destructive to the Honour & Safety of the Church of England: (If They Should Be Allowed in It)*, (London: Printed for James Collins, 1668)

Pelling, E., *The Apostate Protestant*, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Printer], 1685).

Pelling, E., *A Fourth Letter to A Person Of Quality, Being an Historical Account of the Doctrine of the Sacrament, from the Primitive Times, to the Council of Trent; Shewing the Novelty of Transubstantiation*, (London: Printed for Ben.Griffin, 1688).

Pelling, E., *A Sermon Preached at Westminster-Abbey on the 26th of July 1685. Being the Thanksgivng-Day for His Majesties Victory over the Rebels*, (London: Printed for Samuel Keble, 1685).

Pelling, E., *A Sermon Preached upon September the 9th 1683 Being a Thanksgiving-Day for a Late Deliverancie from a Fanatick Conspiracy*, (London: Printed for Will.Abington, 1683).

Penn, W., *Christian Liberty as It Was Soberly Desired in a Letter to Certain Forreign States, upon Occasion of Their Late Severity to Several of Their Inhabitants Meerly for Their Different Perswasion and Practice in Point of Faith and Worship towards God*, (London: [No Printer], 1674).

Perrinchief, R., *The Royal Martyr: Or, the Life and Death of Charles I*, (London: Printed by J.M., for R.Royston, 1676).

A Pertinent Speech Made by an Honourable Member of the House of Commons, Tending to the Establishment of Kingly Government, as the Only Way to the Settling of these Three Distracted Nations in Their Due Rights, Privileges and Immunities, (London: [No Printer], 1660).

Philips, F., *Charles the First No Man of Blood but a Martyr for His People*, (London: [No Printer], 1649).

Pierce, T., *The Christians Rescue from the Grand Error of the Heathen*, (London: Printed by J.G. for Richard Royston, 1658).

Pierce, T., *A Correct Copy of Some Notes Concerning Gods Decrees, Especially of Reprobation*, (London: Printed by E.Cotes for R.Royston, 1655).

Pierce, T., *A Decad of Caveats to the People of England, of General Use in All Times but Most Seasonable in These*, (London: Printed for Richard Davis, 1679).

Pierce, T., *The Divine Philanthropie Defended against the Declamatory Attempts of Certain Late-Printed Papers Intitl'd a Correptory Correction. In Vindication of Some Notes Concerning Gods Decrees, Especially of Reprobation*, 2nd Edn., (London: Printed for Richard Royston, 1658).

Pierce, T., *The Divine Purity Defended. Or a Vindication of Some Notes Concerning God's Decrees, Especially of Reprobation, from the Censure of Dr Reynolds in His Epistolary Preface to Mr.Barlee's Correptory Correction*, (London: Printed by R.Norton, for Richard Royston, 1657).

Pierce, T., *England's Season for Reformation of Life*, (London: Printed for Timothy Garthwait, 1660).

Pierce, T., *Letter to Isaac Walton, March 5, 1678* in *The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.VI, (pp. 351-355).

Pierce, T., *The New Discoverer Discovered by Way of Answer to Mr Baxter His Pretended Discovery of the Grotian Religion with the Several Subjects Therein Contained*, (London: Printed by F.G., for Richard Royston, 1659).

Pierce, T., *Pacificatorium Orthodoxae Theologiae Cor Pusculum*, (London: Typis Milonis Flesher, 1683).

Pierce, T., *The Primitive Rule of Reformation: Delivered in a Sermon before His Majesty at Whitehall, Febr I. 1662. In Vindication of Our Church against the Novelities of Rome*, (London: Printed for Timothy Garthwait, 1663).

Pierce, T., *Self-Condempnation, Exemplified in Mr Whitfield, Mr Barlee, and Mr Hickman. With Occasional Reflexions on Mr Calvin, Mr Beza, Mr Zuinglias, Mr Piscator, Mr Rivet, and Mr Rolloch: But More Especially on Doctor Twisse, and Master Hobbs*, (London: Printed by F.G. for R.Royston, 1658).

Pierce, T., *The Self-Revenger Exemplified in Mr. William Barlee. By Way of Rejoynder to the First Part of His Reply, Viz the Unparallel'd Variety of Discourse in the Two First Chapters of His Pretended Vindicaton*, (London: Printed by R.Daniel, for Richard Royston, 1658).

Pierce, T., *Two Letters Containing a Further Justification of the Church of England, Against the Dissenters*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavell, 1682).

A Plain Account of The Persecution Now Laid to the Charge of the Church of England, in Somers Tracts, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748) Vol.II, (pp. 525-531).

The Plain-Man's Answer to His Country Parson's Admonition. Together with the Missioner's Answer, to the Plainman's Reply, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1686).

Political Aphorisms: Or, the True Maxims of Government Displayed, (London: Printed for Tho. Harrison, 1690).

The Primitive Doctrine of the Church of England Vindicated, According to the Apostolick Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, (London: Printed by J.Baker, 1711).

Prince, J., *Danmonii Orietales Illustres: Or, the Worthies of Devon. A Work Wherein the Lives and Fortunes of the Most Famous Divines, Statesmen, Swordsmen, Physicians, Writers, and Other Eminent Persons, Natives of that Most Noble Province, from before the Norman Conquest down to the Present Age, Are Memoriz'd in an Alphabetical Order, out of the Most Approved Authores, Both in Print and Manuscript*, (Exeter: Printed by Sam Farley, for Awnsam and John Churchill, 1701).

Proast, J., *The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration Briefly Consider'd and Answer'd*, (Oxford, Printed for George West and Henry Clements, 1690).

Prynne, W., *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud*, (London: Printed by F.L. for Michael Sparke Senior, 1644).

Prynne, W., *Canterburies Doome. Or the First Part of a Compleat Histroy of the Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Laud Late Archbishop of Canterbury*, (London: Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark, 1646).

Prynne, W., *Conscientious, Serious Theological and Legal Quaeres, Propounded to the Twice-Dissipated, Self Created Anti-Parliamentary Westminster Junto, and Its Members*, (London: Printed by Edward Thomas, 1660).

Prynne, W., *Histrion-Mastix. The Players Scourge, or Actors Tragedie, Divided into Two Parts*, (London: Printed by E.A. and W.I. for Michael Sparke, 1633).

Prynne, W., *Lord Bishops None of the Lord Bishops. Or a Short Discourse Wherein Is Proved that Prelaticall Jurisdiction, Is Not of Divine Institution, but Forbidden by Christ Himselfe, as Heathenish, and Branded by His Apostles for Antichristian; Wherein also Sundry Notable Passages of the Arch-Prelate of Canterbury in His Late Book, Intituled a Relation of a Conference, &c Are by the Way Met Withall*, (Amsterdam: Cloppenburg Press, 1640).

Prynne, W., *A Moderate Seasonable Apology for Indulging Just Christian Liberty to Truly Tender Consciencs, Conforming to the Liturgy*, (London: Printed for the Author by J.C. and L.P., 1662).

Prynne, W., *A Short Pacific Examination of Some Exuberances in, and Ceremonial Appurtenances to the Common Prayer*, (London: Printed by T.C. and L.P., 1661).

Prynne, W., *The Signal Loyalty and Devotion of Gods True Saints and Pious Christians towards Their Kings*, (London: Printed by T.C.and L.P., 1660).

Publick Devotion, and the Common Service of the Church of England Justified, and

Recommended to All Honest and Well Meaning, [However Prejudiced] Dissenters, (London: Printed for Ben.Took, 1675).

Puller, T., *The Moderation of the Church of England, Considered as Useful for Allaying the Present Distempers Which the Indisposition of the Time Contracted*, (London: Printed by J.M. for Richard Chiswell, 1679).

Pulton, A., *Remarks of A.Pulton Master in the Savoy, upon Dr Tho.Tenison's Late Narrative with a Confutation of the Doctors Rule of Faith and a Reply to a Chresners Pretended Vindication*, (London: Printed by Nathniel Thompson, 1687).

Pulton, A., *Some Reflections upon the Author and Licenser of a Scandalous Pamphlet; Called the Misioners Arts Discover'd with the Reply of a Pulton to a Challenge Made Him in a Letter Prefix'd to the Said Pamphlet*, (London: Printed by Mary Thompson for the Author, 1688).

Quartermayn, R., *Quartermayns Conquest over Canterburies Court. Or a Brief Declaration of Severall Passages between Him and the Archbishop of Canterbury, with Other Commissioners of the High Commission Court, at Six Severall Appearances before Them, and by Them Directed to Doctor Featley; With Their Severall Conferences; And the Doctors Reports to the Court*, (London: Printed by Tho.Paine, for Roger Quatermayne, 1642).

Reasons Why the Church of England, as Well as Dissenters, Should Make Their Address of Thanks to the King's Majesty, for His Late Gracious Declaration for Liberty of Conscience, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1687).

Reeves, J., *Thoughts on the English Government*, (London: Printed for J.Owen, 1795).

A Reply to the New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty, (London: Printed for J.D. Assiynce of N.T., 1687).

Resbury, N., *The Case of the Cross in Baptism Considered. Wherein is Shewed, that There Is Nothing in It, as It Is Used in the Church of England, that Can Be Any Just Reasons of Separation from It*, (London: Printed for Fincham Gardiner, 1684).

Reynolds, E., *Divine Efficacy Without Humane Power. Opened in a Sermon Preached at St. Margarets Church in Westminster before the Right Honourable the House of Commons, June 28, 1660, Being the Day of Solemne Thanksgiving for the Happy Return of the Kings Majesty*, (London: Printed by Tho.Ratcliffe, for George Thomason, 1660).

Ridley, N., *The Way to Peace amongst All Protestants Being a Letter of Reconciliation Sent by Bp.Ridley to Bp.Hooper, with Some Observations upon It*, (London: Printed for Richard Baldwin, 1688).

Robinson, H., *Certaine Briefe Observations and Antiquaries on Master Prin His Twelve Questions about Church-Government*, ([No Place of Publication], [No Printer], 1644).

Ryves, B., *Mercurius Rusticus: Or the Countries Complaint of the Barbarous Outrages Committed by the Sectaries of this Late Flourishing Kingdom. Together with a Brief Chronology of the Battels, Sieges, Conflicts, and Othermost Remarkable Passages, for the Beginning of this Unnatural War, to the 25th of March, 1646*, (London: Printed for Richard Green, 1685).

Sabran, L., *A Letter to Dr William Needham in Answer to the Third Letter by Him Licensed Written to Father Lewis Sabran of the Society of Jesus Wherein the Said Letter is Examined and Confuted*, (London: Printed by Henry hills, 1688).

Sacheverell, H., *D.Sacheverel's True Character of a Low-Church-Man Drawn to the Life*, (London: [No Printer], 1710).

Sacheverell, H., *The Perils of False Brethren, Both in Church and State: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach'd Before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral-Church of St.Paul. On the 5th of November, 1709*, (London: Printed for H.King, 1709).

Sabran, L., *The Challenge of R.F.Lewis Sabran of the Society of Jesus, Made out against the Historical Discourse Concerning Invocation of Saints*, (London: Printed for Henry Hills, 1688).

Sabran, L., *A Letter to Dr William Needham in Answer to the Third Letter by Him Licensed Written to Father Lewis Sabran of the Society of Jesus Wherein the Said Letter Is Examined and Confuted*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1688).

Saint Leger, J., *The Managers pro and con: Or, an Account of What Is Said at Child's and Tom's Coffee-Houses for and against Dr. Sacheverell*, (London: Printed by A.Baldwin, 1710).

The Salisbury Quarrel Ended: Or, the Last Letter of the Citizen of New Sarum to Mr. Hoadly. In Which the True Notions of Passive Obedience and Hereditary Right are More Fully Explained, (London: Printed for W.Taylor, 1710). (London: Printed for W.Taylor, 1710).

Sanderson, R., *At a Metropolitan Visitation at Grantham Lincoln, 22 August, 1634*, in *The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson, (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.II, (pp. 107-140).

Sanderson, R., *Bishop Sanderson's Judgment Concerning Submission to Usurpers*, (London: Printed for Richard Marriott, 1678).

Sanderson, R., *De Obligatione Legum Humanum Ex Parte Causae Materialis*, 1650, in *The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson, (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.IV, (pp. 121-146).

Sanderson, R., *A Discourse Concerning the Church*, (London: Printed by T.B. for R.Taylor, 1688).

Sanderson, R., *Episcopacy (as Established by Law in England) Not Prejudiced to Regal Power*, (London: Printed by R.Norton, for Timothy Garthwait, 1661).

Sanderson, R., *Pax Ecclesiae*, in *The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson, (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.V, (pp. 253-277).

Sanderson, R., *The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Sometime Bishop of Lincoln*, W.Jacobson, (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1854), Vol.I-VI.

Scot, P., *A Treatise of the Schism Of England. Wherein Particularly Mr. Hales and Mr.Hobbs Are Modestly Accosted*, (Amsterdam: [No Printer], 1650).

Scott, J., *Certain Cases of Conscience Resolved, Concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worship: Part I*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, Jun. for Fincham Gardiner, 1683).

Scrivener, M., *A Course of Divinity: Or an Introduction to the Knowledge of the True*

Catholick Religion; Especially as Professed by the Church of England: In Two Parts: The One Containing, the Doctrine of Faith; The Other, the Form of Worship, (London: Printed by Tho.Roycroft for Robert Clavil, 1674).

A Second Seasonable Speech Made by an Honourable Member of the House of Commons Demonstrating the Necessity of the Kings Restauration by this Present Parliament, (London: [No Printer], 1660).

A Seekers Request to Catholick Priests, and Protestant Ministers, for Satisfying His Conscience in the Truth of What He Ought to Believe of the Lords Supper, (London: Printed for J.F., 1687).

Seller, A., *A Defence of Dr. Sacheverell. Or, Passive Obedience Prov'd to Be the Doctrine of the Church of England, from the Reformation, to these Times,* (London: [No Printer], 1710).

Seller, A., *The History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation,* (Amsterdam: Printed For Theodore Johnson, 1689).

A Serious Answer to the Ld Bishop of Oxford's Speech in the House of Lords, on the First Article of the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell, (London: [No Printer], 1710).

Sharp, J., *A Discourse Concerning Conscience; Wherein an Account Is Given of the Nature, and Rule, and Publication of It. The Case of Those Who Separate from the Comunion of the Church of England as by Law Established, upon this Pretence that It Is against Their Conscience to Joyn in It, is Stated and Discussed,* (London: Printed for Walter Kettilby, 1684).

Sheldon, G., *David's Deliverance and Thanksgiving, A Sermon Preached before the King at Whitehall upon June 28. 1660 Being the Day of Solemn Thanksgiving to the Happy Return of His Majesty,* (London: Printed for Timothy Garthwait, 1660).

Sherlock, W., *The Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, Stated and Resolved, According to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England, with a More Particular Respect to the Oath, Lately Enjoyed, of Allegiance to Their Present Majesties, K.William and Q.Mary,* (London: Printed for W.Rogers, 1691).

Sherlock, W., *A Papist Not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [a Papist Misrepresented and Represented],* (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswel, 1686).

Sherlock, W., *A Preservative against Popery: Being Some Plain Directions to Unlearned Protestants How to Dispute with Romish Priests, the First Part,* (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1688).

Sherlock, W., *The Protestant Resolution of Faith Being an Answer to Three Questions,* (London: Printed for F.G., 1685).

Sherlock, W., *A Resolution of Some Cases of Conscience, Which Respect Church-Communion,* (London: Printed by Henry Hills, Jun. for Fincham Gardiner, 1682/3).

The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, [Taken from Dr. Sach-ll's Sermon for the Establishment of the Church, (London: [No Printer], 1703).

Shower, B., *Reasons for a New Bill of Rights: Humbly Submitted to the Consideration of the Ensuing Session of Parliament,* (London: [No Printer], 1692).

Sidney, A., *Discourses Concerning Government*, (London: Printed by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1698).

Smalridge, G., *Animadversions on the Eight Theses Laid Down, and the Inferences, Deduced from Them, in a Discourse Entitl'd Church-Government*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1687).

Smalridge, G., *Animadversions on the Eight Theses Laid Down, and the Inferences, Deduced from Them, in a Discourse Entitl'd Church-Government. Part V*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1687).

Smalridge, G., *Reflections on the Historical Part of Church-Government. Part V*, (Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1687).

Smedley, J., *The Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and Non-Resistance Stated; And Its Consistence with Theology, Reason, Justice, the Revolution, Our Laws and Policy, Impartially Consider'd*, (London: Printed for John Morphew, 1710).

Smith, R., *Of the Al-sufficient External Proposer of Matters of Faith. Divided into Two Bookes. In the First. Is Proposed, that the True Church of God, is the Al-Sufficient External Proposer of Matters of Faith. In the Second. Is Shewed the Manifold Uncertainties of Protestants Concerning the Scripture: And How Scripture is, or is Not, an Entire Rule of Faith*, (Paris: [No Printer], 1653).

Sparrow, A., (ed.), *A Collection of Articles Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions Ecclesiastical: With Other Publick Records of the Church of England Chiefly in the Times of K.EdwardVI. Q.Elizabeth K.James K.Charles I. Published to Vindicate the Church of England and to Promote Uniformity and Peace in the Same*, (London, Printed for Robert Pawlett, 1675).

A Speech to His Highness the Prince of Orange: By a True Protestant of the Church of England, as Established by Law, 1689, in Somers Tracts, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.I, (pp. 346-347).

Spinkes, R., *A Sermon Preached in Oxford before the Kings Majesty, April 19.1643. Wherein Is Handled the Unlawfulness of Non-Preaching Bishops, Non-Residents, Plurality of Benefices, &c. With the Utter Destruction of Images. According to the Votes of Both the Houses of Parliament, Scripture, Antient Writers, and Reason It Selfe*, (London, [No Printer], 1643).

Steward, R., *A Brief but Full Vindication of the Church of England from the Romanist Charge of Schism*, (London: Printed by Randal Taylor, 1688).

Steward, R., *The Old Puritan Defected and Defeated: Or, a Brief Treatise Shewing How by the Artifice of Pulpit-Prayers or Dissenters, at All Times Have Endeavour'd to Undermine the Liturgy, of the Reformed Church of England*, (London: Printed for W.Davis, 1682).

Stillingfleet, E., *An Answer to Mr. Cressy's Epistle Apologetical to a Person of Honour, Touching His Vindication of Dr Stillingfleet, in The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character*, (London: Printed for Henry and George Mortlock, 1709), Vol.V. (pp. 577-756).

Stillingfleet, E., *The Council of Trent Examin'd and Disprov'd by Catholick Tradition, in the Main Points in Controversie between Us and the Church of Rome; With a Particular Account of the Times and Occasions of Introducing Them; Part I*, (London: Printed for Henry Mortlock, 1688).

Stillingfleet, E., *A Discourse Concerning the Unreasonableness of a New Separation, on Account of the Oaths. With an Answer to the History of Passive Obedience, So Far as Relates to Them*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1689).

Stillingfleet, E., *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome Truly Represented*, (London: Printed for W.Rogers, 1686).

Stillingfleet, E., *Irenicum. A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds, or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church-Government Discussed and Examined According to the Principles of the Law of Nature, the Positive Laws of God, the Practice of the Apostles, and the Primitive Church, and the Judgment of Reformed Divines*, in *The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester, together with His life and Character*, (London: Printed by J.Hepinstall, for Henry and George Mortlock, 1709), Vol.II, (pp. 147-418).

Stillingfleet, E., *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion: Being a Vindication of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's Relation of a Conference, &c*, in *The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character*, (London: Printed for Henry and George Mortlock, 1709), Vol.IV, (pp. 1-658).

Stillingfleet, E., *Several Conferences between a Romish Priest, Fanatick-Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England, Concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome: Being a Full Answer to the Late Dialogues of T.G.*, in *The Works of that Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character*, (London: Printed for Henry and George Mortlock, 1709), Vol.VI, (pp. 1-182).

Stillingfleet, E., *A Vindication of the Answer to Some Late Papers Concerning the Unity and Authority of the Catholick Church, and the Reformation of the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1687).

Stillingfleet, E., *The Works of that Learned Eminent and Most Learned Prelate Dr Edw. Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester. Together with His Life and Character. Vols. I-VI*, (London: Printed for J.Hepinstall, for Henry and George Mortlock, 1710).

Stuart, W., *Presbyteries Triall: Or the Occasion, and Motives of Conversion to the Catholique Faith, of a Person of Quality, in Scotland. To Which Is Subioyned, a Little Touch-Stone of the Presbyterian Covenant*, (Paris: [No Printer], 1657).

Sudbury, J., *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Fathers in God, Gilbert Lord Bishop of London, Humphry Lord Bishop of Sarum, George Lord Bishop of Worcester, Robert Lord Bishop of Lincolne, George Lord Bishop of St.Asaph. On Sunday 28.Oct, 1660 at S.Peter's Westminster*, (London, Printed for R.Royston, 1660).

Talbot, P., *A Treatise of Religion and Government with Reflexions upon the Cause and Care of Englands Late Distempers and Present Dangers. The Argument. Whether Protestancy Be Less Dangerous to the Soul, or More Advantagious to the State, Then the Roman Catholick Religion? The Conclusion. That Piety and Policy Are Mistaken in Promoting Protestancy and Persecuting Popery by Penal and Sanguinary Statuts*, (London: [No Printer], 1670).

Talbot, P., *A Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith, and Heresie, with Reflexion upon the Nullitie of the English Protestant Church, and Clergy*, (Rouen: [No Printer], 1657).

Taylor, J., *An Answer to the Eighth Chapter of the Representer's Second Part. In the First Dialogue between Him and His Lay-Friend*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1687).

Taylor, J., *An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgie against the Pretence of the Spirit*, (London: Printed for R.Royston, 1649).

Taylor, J., *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of Two Archbishops and Ten Bishops, in the Cathedral Church of S.Patrick in Dublin, January 27.1660*, (Dublin: Printed by W.Bladen for John North, 1661).

Ten Seasonable Queries Proposed by a Protestant that Is for Liberty of Conscience to All Perswasions, (London: [No Printer], 1688).

Tenison, T., *An Answer to the Letter of the Roman Catholick Souldier, [as He Calls Himself] in a Letter from C.D. to A.B. the Examiner of His Speculum*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1688).

Tenison, T., *An Argument for Union Taken from the True Interest, of those Dissenters in England, Who Profess, and Call Themselves Protestants*, (London: Printed for Tho.Basset, Benj.Tooke, and F.Gardiner, 1683).

Tenison, T., *A Discourse Concerning the Ecclesiastical Commission, Open'd in the Jerusalem-Chamber, October the 10th, 1689*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1689).

Tenison, T., *A Discourse Concerning a Guide in Matters of Faith; With Respect, Especially to the Romish Pretence of the Necessity of Such a One as is Infallible*, (London: Printed for BenTooke, 1683).

Thirty Plain, but Sound Reasons Why Protestants Dissent from Popery. To Which is Added, Thirty Four Points, Held by Many Papists Which were Never Yet Rationally Proved by Any One of Them. Therefore Protestants Except a Reasonable Proof of Them, before They Can Be Satisfied of the Truth of Them, So as to Become Their Converts, (London: [No Popery], 1688).

Thorndike, H., *A Discourse of the Right of the Church in a Christian State*, (London: Printed by M.F. for Octavian Pullen, 1649).

Thorndike, H., *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England Being a Necessary Consideration and Brief Resolution of the Chief Controversies in Religion that Divide the Western Church: Occasioned by the Present Calamity of the Church of England; In Three Books: Viz. of I.The Principles of Christian Truth. II.The Covenant of Grace. III.The Lawes of the Church*, (London: Printed by J.M. and T.R. for J.Martin, J.Allestry, and T.Dicas, 1659).

Thorndike, H., *Two Discourses. The One of the Pimitive Government of Churches, the Other of the Service of God and the Assemblies of the Church*, (Cambridge: Printed by Roger Daniel, 1650).

Thorold, T., *Labyrinthus Cantuarensis: Or Doctor Lawds Labyrinth. Being an Answer to the Late Archbishop of Canterburies Relation of a Conference between Himselfe and Mr.Fisher, Etc. Wherein the True Grounds of the Roman Catholique Religion Are Asserted, the Principall Controversies betwixt Catholiques and Protestants Thoroughly Examined, and the Bishops Meandrick Windings Throughout His Whole Worke Layd Open to Publique Veiw*, (Paris: Printed by John Billaine, 1658).

Tillotson, J., *A Discourse against Transubstantiation*, (London: Printed by M.Flesher, for Brabazon Aylmer, 1684).

Tillotson, J., *A Persuasive to Frequent Communion in the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's*

Supper. In a Sermon upon I Corinth.XI.26, 27,28, (London: Printed by M.Flesher, for Brabazon Aylmer, 1683).

Tindal, M., *An Essay Concerning Obedience to the Supreme Powers, and the Duty of Subjects in All Revolutions. With Some Considerations Touching the Present Juncture of Affairs.* (London: Printed for Richard Baldwin, 1694).

Tindal, M., *The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted, against the Romish, and All Other Priests Who Claim an Independent Power over It. With a Preface Concerning the Government of the Church of England, as by Law Established,* (London: [No Printer], 1706).

To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty. The Due Account, and Humble Petition of the Ministers of the Gospel, Lately Commissioned for the Review and Alteration of the Liturgy, (London: [No Printer, 1661]).

Toland, J., *Amyntor: Or a Defence of Milton's Life,* (London: Printed by the Book-Sellers of London, 1699).

Tong, W., *A Defence of Mr.M.H.'s Brief Enquiry into the Nature of Schism and the Vindication of It. With Reflections of It. With Reflections upon A Pamphlet Called the Review, &c. And a Brief Historical Account of Nonconformity from the Reformation to this Present Time,* (London: Printed by T.S. for Tho.Parkhurst, 1693).

A Triall of the English Lyturgie, (London: Printed for Ben, 1643).

Turner, F., *Animadversions upon a Late Pamphlet Entituled the Naked Truth; Or, the True State of the Primitive Church,* (London: Printed by T.R., 1676).

Tutchin, J., *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty: Or Whiggish Loyalty and Church Loyalty Compar'd, in Somers Tracts,* (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), (pp. 557-571).

Two Discourses Relating to His Majesties Justices of Peace, Touching Their Putting the Lawes in Execution, (London: Printed for Robert Hayhurst, 1685).

Two Leters in Defence of the English Liturgy and Reformation; Being Remarks in Four Sermons Lately Preach'd by Dr Thomas Bisse at the Rolls Chappel; And on His Sermon before the Sons of the Clergy, (London: Printed for T.Varnam and J.Osborn, 1717).

Tyrrell, J., *Patriarcha Non Monarcha, The Patriarch Unmonarch'd: Being Observations on a Late Treatise and Divers Other Miscellances, Published under the Name of Sir Robert Filmer Baronet. In Which the Falsness of those Opinions that Would Make Monarchy Jure Divino are Laid Open: And the True Principles of Government and Property (Especially in Our Kingdom) Asserted,* (London: Printed for Richard Janeway, 1681).

Udall, E., *Directions Propounded and Humbly Presented to the High Court of Parliament, Concerning the Booke of Common Prayer and Episcopall Government,* (London: Printed for John Thomas, 1641).

University Loyalty: Or, the Genuine Explanation of the Principles and Practices of the English Clergy, as Established and Directed by the Decree of the University of Oxford, Past in Their Convocation 21 July 1683 and Republish'd at the Trying of Dr H.Sacheverell for High Crimes and Misdemeanours, (London: Printed for A.Baldwin, 1710).

Ussher, J., *The Judgment of Doctor Rainoldes Touching the Originall of Episcopacy,* (London: Printed by G.M. for Thomas Downes, London, 1641).

Ussher, J., *Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and Whether It May Be Deduc'd from the Apostolical Times by Vertue of those Testimonies Which Are Alledg'd to that Purpose in Some Late Treatises*, (London: Printed by R.D. and G.D. for Thomas Underhill, 1641).

Ussher, J., *The Reduction of Episcopacie unto the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Ancient Church*, (London: Published by Nicholas Bernard, 1656).

Utrum Horum; Or, God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms: And Some Clergy-Men's Ways of disposing of Them, (London: Printed for Richard Baldwin, 1691).

Vane, T., *A Lost Sheep Returned Home: Or, the Motives of the Conversion to the Catholike Faith*, (Paris: [No Printer], 1649).

The Vanity of All Pretences for Tolleration Wherein the Late Pleas for Tolleration Are Fully Answered, (London: Printed for Sam.Smith, 1685).

A Very Lively Portrayture of the Most Reverend Archbishops, the Right Reverend Bs. of the Church of England: Set Forth in XX. Irrefragable Positions, Concerning Their Authority, Power, and Practice, as They Onely Are Our Diocesan Lord Bishops, So Grounded upon Scripture, Reason, and Experience, by Evident Demonstrative Practises, as Their Troublesome Opposites, May Clearly See, How Greatly They Are Deceived in All These, (London: [No Printer], 1640).

A Vindication of Episcopacy: Or Animadversions upon a Late Pamphlet Intituled, [Unparallel'd Reasons for the Abolishing of Episcopacy], (Oxford: Printed by H.Hall, 1644).

A Vindication of Their Majesties Wisdom, in the Late Nomination of Some Reverend Persons to the Vacant Arch-Bishopricks and Bishopricks: Occasioned by the Scandalous Reflections of Unreasonable Men, (London: Printed by Randal Taylor, 1691).

A Vindication of Those Who Have Taken the New Oath of Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary; Upon Principles Agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of England, (London: Printed for Randal Taylor, 1689).

Vox Cleri Pro Rege: Or the Rights of the Imperial Sovereignty of the Crown of England Vindicated. In Reply to a Late Pamphlet Pretending to Answer a Book, Entituled the Judgment and Doctrine of the Church of England Concerning the King's Prerogative in Dispensing with Penal Laws, (London: [No Printer, 1688).

W, I., *Certaine Reasons Why the Booke of Common-Prayer Being Corrected Should Continue*, (London: Printed by A.N., for Richard Lownds, 1641).

Wake, W., *A Continuation of the Present State of the Controversy, between the Church of England, and the Church of Rome. Being a Full Account of the Books that Have Been of Late Written on Both Sides*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1688).

Wake, W., *A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the Exceptions of Monsieur De Meaux, Late Bishop of Condom, and His Vindicator*. (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1686).

Wake, W. *A Defence of the Missionaries Arts: Wherein the Charge of Disloyalty, Rebellions, Plots, and Treasons, Asserted Page 76 of that Book, are Fully Proved Against the Members of the Church of Rome, in a Brief Account of the Several Plots Contrived, and Rebellions Raised by the Papists against the Lives and Dignities of Sovereign Princes since the Reformation*. (London: Printed for Richard Wilde, 1689).

Wake, W., *A Discourse Concerning the Nature of Idolatry: In Which a Late Author's True and Onely Notion of Idolatry Is Considered and Confuted*, (London: Printed for William Rogers, 1688).

Wake, W., *A Discourse of the Holy Eucharist, in the Two Great Points of the Real Presence and the Adoration of the Host*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1687).

Wake, W., *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England. In the Several Articles Proposed by Monsieur De Meaux, Late Bishop of Condom, in His Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1687).

Wake, W., *The State of the Church and Clergy of England, in Their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conversions, and Other Publick Assemblies; Historically Deduced from the Conversion of the Saxons to the Present Times*, (London: Printed for R.Sare, 1703).

Walker, J., *An Attempt towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England, Heads of Colleges, Fellows, Scholars, &c. Who Were Sequester'd, Harass'd &c in the Late Times of the Grand Rebellion*, (London: Printed by W.S., for F.Nicholson, R.Knaplock, R.Wilkin, B.Tooke, D.Midwinter, and B.Cowse, 1714).

Walker, O., *Animadversions upon the Reply to the Two Discourses Concerning the Adoration of Our B.Saviour in the Holy Eucharist, Appendix II to A.Woodhead, A Compendious Discourse on the Eucharist*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1688), (pp. 191-217).

Walsh, P., *The Controversial Letters, or the Grand Controversie, Concerning the Pretended Temporal Authority of Popes over the Whole Earth, and the True Sovereign of Kings Within Their Own Respective Kingdoms, in Four and Twenty Letters, between Two English Gentlemen, the One of the Church of England: The Other of the Church of Rome. The First Two Letters*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome and Benjamin Tooke, 1673).

Walsh, P., *The Third and Fourth of the Controversial Letters: Or the Grand Controversie Concerning the Pretended Temporal Authority of Popes over the Whole Earth, and the True Sovereign of Kings Within Their Own Respective Kingdoms, between Two English Gentlemen, the One of the Church of England, the Other of the Church of Rome*, (London: Printed for Henry Brome and Benjamin Tooke, 1673).

Walton, I., *The Life of Dr Sanderson Late Bishop of Lincoln*, (London: Printed for Richard Marriott, 1678).

Walton, I., *The Life of Mr Rich.Hooker, the Author of those Learned Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by J.G for Rich. Marriott, 1665).

Walton, I., *The Life of Mr Rich Hooker, The Author of those Learned Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb for Rich Marriott, 1670).

Warburton, W., *The Alliance between Church and State, or, the Necessity and Equity Of an Established Religion and a Test-Law Demonstrated, from the Essence and End Of Civil Society, upon the Fundamental Principles of the Law of Nature and Nations*, (London: Printed for Fletcher Gyles, 1736).

Ward, T., *Some Queries to the Protestants Concerning the English Reformation*, (London: Printed by Nathaniel Thompson, 1681).

Warner, J., *A Vindication of the English Catholiks from the Pretended Conspiracy against the*

Life, and Government of His Sacred Majesty Discovering the Chief Lyes and Contradictions Contained in the Narrative of Titus Oates, ([No Place of Publication]: [No Publisher], 1681).

Welshman, E., *A Defence of the Church of England from the Charge of Schism and Heresie, as Laid against It by the Vindicator of the Deprived Bishops*, (London: Printed by Randal Taylor, 1693).

Welshman, E., *A Second Defence of the Church of England from the Charge of Schism and Heresy, as Laid against It by the Vindicator of the Deprived Bishops. In Answer to Two Discourses, Entitul'd, a Defence of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops, and, the Doctrine of the Church of England Concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the Lay-Power*, (London: Printed for Will Rogers, 1698).

Wesley, S., *A Reply to Mr. Palmer's Vindication of the Learning, Loyalty, Morals, and Most Christian Behaviour of the Dissenters towards the Church of England*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavel, 1707).

Wheatley, C., *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: Being the Substance of Every Thing Liturgical in Bishop Sparrow, Mr L'Estrange, Dr. Comber, Dr Nichols, and All Former Ritualists, Commentators, or Others, upon the Same Subject; Collected and Reduced into One Convinced and Regular Method, and Interpersed All Along with New Observations*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1819).

Whitby, D., *The Fallibility of the Roman Church, Demonstrated from the Manifest Error of the 2d Nicene & Trent Councils, Which Assert, that the Veneration and Honary Worship of Images, is a Tradition Primitive and Apostolical*, (London: Printed by J.D. for Randal Taylor, 1687).

Whitby, D., *Romish Doctrines not from the Beginning, or a Reply to What S.C. (or Serenus Cressy) a Roman Catholick Hath Returned to Dr Pierces Sermon Preached before His Majesty at Whitehall, Feb.1.1662. In Vindication of Our Church against the Novelties of Rome*, (London: Printed by R.W., for Tho.Basset, 1664).

White, F., *An Examination and Confutation of a Lawfulness Pamphlet Intituled, a Briefe Answer to a Late Treatise of the Sabbath-Day: Digested Dialogue-Wise between Two Divines, A and B*, (London: Printed by R.B., 1637).

White, J., *The Present Constitution, and the Protestant Succession Vindicated: In Answer to a Late Book Entituled, the Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted, &c*, (London: Printed for J.Baker, 1714).

William, J., *The Case of Lay-Communion with the Church of England Considered; And the Lawfulness of It Shew'd, from the Testimony of above an Hundred Eminent Non-Conformists of Several Perswasions*, (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1684).

William, J., *The Difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome in Opposition to a Late Book, Intituled, an Agreement between the Church of England, and Church of Rome*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1687).

William, J., *Pulpit-Popery, True Popery: Being an Answer to a Book Intituled, Pulpit-Sayings: And in Vindication of the Apology for the Pulpits, and the Stater of the Controversie against the Representer*, (London: Printed by Randall Taylor, 1688).

Williams, J., *The Case of Indifferent Things Used in the Worship of God*, (London: Printed by J.Redmayne, Jun. for Fincham Gardiner, 1682/3).

Williams, J., *A Short Discourse Concerning the Churches Authority in Matters of Faith Shewing that the Pretenses of the Church of Rome Are Weak and Precarious in the Resolution of It*, (London: Printed for Randal Taylor, 1687).

Williams, J., *A Vindication of the Answer to the Popish Address Presented to the Ministers of the Church of England. In Reply to a Pamphlet Abusively Intituled, a Clear Proof of the Certainty and Usefulness of the Protestant Rule of Faith*, (London: Printed for Ric.Chiswell, 1688)

Williams, J., *A Vindication of the Case of Indifferent Things, Used in the Worship of God*, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, for Fincham Gardner, 1684).

Wilson, M., *Protestancy Condemned by the Expresse Verdict and Sentence of Protestants*, (Doway: [No Printer], 1654).

Withers, J., *The History of Resistance, as Practis'd by the Church of England: In Which 'Tis Proved from Most Authentick Records, that Is Every Reign since the Reformation of Religion, the Said Church Hath Aided and Assisted, Justified and Approved of, Such Subjects as Have Defended Themselves against the Oppressions of Their Tyrannical, Tho' Natural Princes. Written upon Occasion of Mr. Agate's Sermon at Exeter on the 30th of January; And in Defence of the Late Revolution, the Present Establishment, and the Protestant Succession*, 1710, in *Somers Tracts*, (London: Printed for F.Cogan, 1748), Vol.III, (pp. 572-594).

Womock, L., *Conformity Re-asserted in an Echo to R.S. Or, a Return of His Word to Doctor Womock Asserting, 1.That Modification of Public Worship by Personal Abilities Is Not the Formal Act of the Ministerial Office. 2.That the Ministers of the Church of England Ought to Submit to the Use of an Imposed Liturgy*, (London: Printed by F.G. for Thomas Clark, 1664).

Womock, L., *Pulpit-Conceptions, Popular Deceptions: Or, the Grand Debate Resumed, in the Point of Prayer: Wherein It Appears that those Free Prayers So Earnestly Contended For Have No Advantage above the Prescribed Liturgie in Publick Administrations Being an Answer to the Presbyterian Papers Presented to the Most Reverend the Ls.Bishops at the Savoy upon that Subject*, (London: Printed for Richard Royston, 1663).

Womock, L., *Suffragium Protestantium Wherein Our Governours Are Justified in Their Impositions and Proceedings against Dissenters*, (London: Printed for Robert Clavel, 1683).

Wood, A., *Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford, from the Fifteenth Year of King Henry the Seventh Dom.1500, to the End of the Year 1690*, (London: Printed for Tho.Bennet, 1691).

Wood, A., *Historia Et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis Duobus Voluminibus Comprehensae*, (Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1674).

Woodhead, A., *Church-Government Part V. A Relation of the English Reformation, and the Lawfulness thereof Examined by the Theses Deliver'd in the Four Former Parts*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1687).

Woodhead, A., *A Compendious Discourse on the Eucharist. With Two Appendixes*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1688).

Woodhead, A., *A Discourse of the Necessity of Church-Guides for Directing Christians in Necessary Faith*, (London: [No Printer], 1675).

Woodhead, A., *A Rational Account of Roman-Catholicks Concerning the Ecclesiastical Guide*

in Controversies of Religion, (London: [No Printer], 1673).

Woodhead, A., *The Roman-Church's Devotions Vindicated from Doctour Stillingfleet's Mis-Representation*, (London: [No Printer], 1672).

Woodhead, A., *Two Discourses Concerning the Adoration of Our B.Saviour in the Eucharist*, (Oxford: [No Printer], 1687).

Woodward, J., *The Duty of Compassion to the Souls of Others, in Endeavouring Their Reformation, Being the Subject of a Sermon Preached December the 28th 1696 at St. Mary-Le-Bow, before the Societies for Reformation of Manners in the City of London*, (London: Printed for Ra.Simpson and A.Bell, 1698).

Wren, M., *Monarchy Asserted or the State of Monarchicall and Popular Government in Vindication of the Considerations upon Mr Harrington's Oceana*, (Oxford: Printed by W.Hall, for F.Bowman, 1659).

Wright, W., *A Letter to a Member of Parliament; Occasioned by a Letter to a Convocation-Man, Concerning the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of that Body. Together with an Inquiry into the Ecclesiastical Power of the University of Oxford, Particularly to Decree and Declare Heresy, Occasioned by that Letter*, (London: Printed for W.Rogers, 1697).

Secondary Sources

Aaron, R., *John Locke*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

Abbott, W.M., 'James Ussher and "Ussherian" Episcopacy, 1640-1656: The Primate and His Reduction Manuscript,' in *Albion*, Vol.22, 1990, (pp. 237-259).

Adamson, J.H., and Folland, H.F., *Sir Harry Vane. His Life and Times, 1613-1662*, (London: The Bodley Head Ltd, 1974).

Addleshaw, G.W.O., *The High Church Tradition a Study in the Liturgical Thought of the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1941).

Almasy, R., 'Richard Hooker's Book VI: A Reconstruction,' in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, No.42, 1979, (pp. 117-139).

Almasy, R., 'They are and are not Elymas: The 1641 "Causes" Notes as Postscript to Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 183-201).

Anderdon, J.L., *The Life of Thomas Ken*, (London: John Murray, 1854), Vol.I.

Anselment, R.A., 'Clarendon and the Caroline Myth of Peace,' in *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol.23, 1984, (pp. 37-54).

Archer, S., 'Hooker an Apostolic Succession: The Two Voices,' in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.XXIV, No.1, 1993, (pp. 67-74).

Ashcroft, R., *Revolutionary Politics. Lockes's Two Treatises of Government*, (Princeton:

Princeton University Press, 1986).

Ashley, M., *England in the Seventeenth Century, (1603-1714)*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd, 1962).

Ashley, M., *James II*, (London: J.M.Dent and Sons Limited, 1977).

Ashton, R., *The English Civil War, Conservatism and Revolution, 1603-1649*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978).

Atkinson, N. *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason, Reformed Theologian of the Church of England?*, (St Ives: Paternoster Press, 1997).

Aylmer, G.E., *The Struggle for the Constitution. England in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Blandford Press, 1975).

Barry, J., 'The Politics of Religion in Restoration Bristol,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990).

Bauckham, R., 'Hooker, Travers and the Church of Rome in the 1580s,' in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol.29, 1978, (pp. 37-50).

Beddard, R., 'Sheldon and Anglican Recovery,' in *The Historical Journal*, Vol.19, 1976, (pp. 1005-1017).

Beddard, R.A., 'Wren's Mausoleum for Charles I and the Cult of the Royal Martyr,' in *Architectural History*, Vol.27, 1984, (pp. 36-49).

Beeching, H.C., *Religio Laici. A Series of Studies Addressed to Laymen*, (London: Smith, Elder and Co, 1902).

Bellenger, D.A., *English and Welsh Priests 1558-1800*, (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1984).

Bennett, G.V. 'Conflict in the Church,' in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, G.Holmes, (ed.), (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd, 1969), (pp. 155-175).

Bennett, G.V., *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730. The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

Bennett, G.V., *White Kennett 1660-1728 Bishop of Peterborough*, (London: S.P.C.K, 1957).

Blair, Worden, "English Republicanism," in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 443-475).

Bliss, R.M., *Restoration England 1660-1688*, (London: Menhuen and Co. Ltd., 1985).

Booty, J.E., 'Book V,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Medieval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 183-231).

Booty, J.E., 'Hooker and Anglicanism' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 207-239).

Booty, J.E., 'The Importance of Richard Hooker,' in *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, W.J.Wolf, (ed.), (Edinburgh: T.and T.Clark Limited, 1982).

Booty, J.E., 'Richard Hooker,' in *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, W.J.Wolf, (ed.), (Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Co.1979).

Bosher, R.S., *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, (London: Dacre Press, 1951).

Bouwsma, W.J., 'Hooker in the Context of European Cultural History,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 41-57).

Brinkley, R.F., (ed.), *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955).

British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books to 1955. Compact Edition Vols.1-27, (New York: Readex Microprint Corporation, 1967).

Burgess, G., *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution*, (London: Yale University Press, 1996).

Bussby, F., 'An Anglican in Exile,' in *The Church Quarterly Review*, No.166, 1966, (pp. 426-438).

Bussby, F., 'George Morley: Bishop of Winchester, 1662-1684,' in *The Church Quarterly Review*, No.165, 1964, (pp. 185-197).

Bussby, F., 'George Morely: Caroline Divine,' in *The Church Quarterly Review*, No.168, (pp. 433-442).

Calamy, E., *The Nonconformists Memorial; Being an Account of the Lives Sufferings, and Printed Works, of the Two Thousand Ministers Ejected from the Church of England Chiefly by the Act of Uniformity Aug. 24, 1666*, Vols I-II, (London: Printed by J.Cundee for Button and Son, and J.Hurst, 1802).

Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library, O.Ogle, W.H.Bliss, (eds.), Vol.I-V, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872).

The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Cargill Thompson, W.D.J., 'The Philosopher of the "Politic Society": Richard Hooker as a Political Thinker,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western University, 1972), (pp. 3-76).

Carlton, C., *Charles I. The Personal Monarch*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983).

Carpenter, S.C., *Eighteenth Century Church and People*, (London: John Murray, 1959).

Carswell, J., *The Porcupine: The Life of Algernon Sidney*, (London: Butler and Tanner Ltd. 1989).

Carter, J., 'The Revolution and the Constitution,' in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, G.Holmes, (ed.), (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1969).

Carter, C.Sydney, *The Anglican Via Media. Being Studies in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and in the Teaching of the Caroline Divines*, (London: J.Thynne and Jarvis Ltd, 1927).

Champion, J.A.I., *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken. The Church of England and Its Enemies 1660-1730*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Claydon, T., *William III and the Godly Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Cobban, A., *Edmund Burke and the Revolt against the Eighteenth Century. A Study of the Political and Social Thinking of Burke, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Socillely*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1929).

Colie, R.L., *Light and Enlightenment. A Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957).

Collinson, P., 'Hooker and the Elizabethan Establishment,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 149-181).

Collinson, P., 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference,' In *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), (pp. 27-51).

Condren, C., 'The Creation of Richard Hooker's Public Authority : Rhetoric Reputation and Reassessment,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 35-59).

Cope, J.I., *Joseph Glanvill, Anglican Apologist*, (St Louis: Washington University Studies, 1956).

Crowley, W.S., 'Erastianism in England to 1640,' in *The Journal of Church and State*, Vol.32, No.3, 1990, (pp. 549-566).

Daly, J., *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*, (London: University of Toronto Press, 1979).

Davies, E.T., *The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1946).

Davies, G., *The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1955).

Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625-1641*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

De Krey, G.S., 'London Radicals and Revolutionary Politics, 1675-1683,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990).

Dow, F.D., *Radicalism in the English Revolution, 1640-1660*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985).

Dowden, E., *Puritan and Anglican*, (New York: Books for Libraries Freeport, Essay Index Reprint Series, 1969).

Downie, J.A., *To Settle the Succession of the State. Literature and Politics, 1678-1750*, (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd, 1994).

Dugmore, C.W., *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1942).

Eccleshall, R., *Order and Reason in Politics. Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

Eccleshall, R., 'Richard Hooker and the Peculiarities of the English: The Reception of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,' in *The History of Political Thought*, Vol.2, 1981, (pp. 64-117).

Edelen, G., 'Publishing History, the First Five Books of the Lawes,' in R.Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Preface Books I-IV*, G.Edelen, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), (pp. xiii-xxvii).

Every, G., *The High Church Party 1688-1718*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1956).

Finlayson, M., 'Clarendon, Providence and the Historical Revolution,' in *Albion* Vol.22, 1990, (pp. 607-632).

Franklin, J.H., *John Locke and the Theory of Sovereignty. Mixed Monarchy and the Right of Resistance in the Political Thought of the English Revolution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

Fullerton, G., *The Life of Elizabeth Falkland 1585-1639*, (London: Burns and Oates, 1883).

Gascoigne, J., 'Church and State Unified: Hooker's Rationale for the English Post-Reformation Order,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 23-34).

Gascoigne, J., 'The Unity of Church and State Challenged: Responses to the Nineteenth-Century Age of Reform,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 60-79).

Gibbs, L.W., 'Book I,' In *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 81-124).

Gibbs, L.W., 'Book VI,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 249-308).

Gibbs, L.W., 'The Source of the Most Famous Quotation from Richard Hooker's *Law of Ecclesiastical Polity*,' in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.XXI, No.1, 1990, (pp. 77-86).

Glasse, L.K.J., (ed.), *The Reigns of Charles II and James VII and II*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc, 1997).

Goldie, M., 'Restoration Political Thought,' In *The Reign of Charles II and James VII And II*, L.K.J.Glasse, (ed.), (New York: St Martin's Press Inc, 1997), (pp. 12-35).

Grace, D., 'Natural Law in Hooker's of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*,' in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 10-22).

Green, I.M., *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*. (Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 1978).

Gregg, E., *Queen Anne*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980).

Grislis, E., 'The Hermeutical Problem in Richard Hooker,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of his Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 159-206).

Grislis, E., and Hill, W.Speed, 'Richard Hooker an Annotated Bibliography,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972).

Halkett, S., and Laing, J., (eds.), *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature*, Vols.I-VIII, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1926).

Harris, R.W., *Clarendon and the English Revolution*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983).

Harris, T., 'Introduction: Revising the Restoration,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990).

Harris, T., '“Lives, Liberties and Estates”: Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990), (pp. 217-241).

Harris, T., Seaward, P., and Goldie, M., (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990).

Haugaard, W.P., "Books II, III, & IV," In *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), Vol.VI, Part I, (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), (pp. 125-181).

Haugaard, W.P., 'The Preface,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, Vol.VI, Part I, (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), (pp. 1-80).

Haugaard, W.P., 'The Scriptural Hermeneutics of Richard Hooker: Historical Contextualization and Teleology,' in *This Sacred History*, D.S.Armentrout, (ed.), (Cambridge: Cowley Publications, 1990), (pp.161-174).

Hill, C., *The World Turned upside Down. Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*, (London: Temple Smith, 1973).

Hill, W.Speed, 'Doctrine and Polity in Hooker's Laws,' in *English Literary Renaissance*, Vol.2, 1972, (pp. 173-193).

Hill, W.Speed, 'The Evolution of Hooker's Laws Of Ecclesiastical Polity,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 117-158).

Hill, W.Speed, 'Richard Hooker in the Folger Edition: An Historical Perspective,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 3-20).

Holmes, G., (ed.), *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, (London: Macmillan and Co.Ltd, 1969).

- Holmes, G., *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, (London: Manmillan, 1967).
- Hughes, S.F., ‘“The Problem of “Calvinism” : English Theologies of Predestination (1580-1630),’ in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England. A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, C.Litzenberger and S.Wabuda, (eds.), (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), (pp.229-249).
- Hutton, R., *The British Republic, 1649-1660*, (London: Macmillan Education Ltd, 1990).
- Hutton, R., *Charles the Second King of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).
- Hutton, R., *The Restoration. A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Jacobson, W. (Ed.), *Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer [Bishop Sanderson and Bishop Wren]*, (London: John Murray, 1874).
- James, F.G., ‘The Bishops in Politics, 1688-1714,’ in *Conflict in Stuart England. Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, W.A.Appleton and B.D.Henning, (eds.), (London: Jonathan Cape, 1960), (pp. 229-257).
- Jones, J.R., *The Revolution of 1688 in England*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972).
- Jordan, W.K., *The Development of Religious Toleration in England; From the Accession of James I to the Convention of the Long Parliament (1603-1640)*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1936).
- Kaye, B., ‘Authority and the Interpretation of Scripture in Hooker’s of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*,’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp.80-109).
- Kaye, B., ‘Authority and the Shaping of Tradition: New Essays on Richard Hooker,’ in *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol.21, No.1, 1997, (pp. 3-9).
- Keble, J., (ed.), *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr Richard Hooker with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836).
- Keble, J., (ed.), *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, Revised R.W.Church and F.Paget, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888).
- Keele, N.H., *Richard Baxter. Puritan Man of Letters*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
- Kendall, R.T., *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
- Key, N.E., ‘Comprehension and the Breakdown of Consensus in Restoration Herefordshire,’ in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990).
- Kirby, W.J.Torrance, ‘Richard Hooker as an Apologist of the Magisterial Reformation in England,’ in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 219-233).
- Kirby, W.J.Torrance, *Richard Hooker’s Doctrine of the Royal Supremacy*, (Leiden: E.J.Brill,

1990).

Knights, M., *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, (Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Knox, R.Buick, *James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967).

Lake, P., *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988).

Lake, P., 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I,' in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, (Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 113-133).

Lake, P.G., 'Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson,' in *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol.27, 1988, (pp. 81-116).

Lamont, W.M., *Marginal Prynne 1600-1669*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963).

Lamont, W.M., *Puritanism and the English Revolution, Vol.II. Godly Rule: Politics and Religion 1603-1660*, (Aldershot, Gregg Revivals, 1991).

Lamont, W.M., *Puritanism and the English Revolution, Vol.III. Richard Baxter and the Millenium*, (London: Crook Helm, 1979).

Lathbury, T., *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1859).

Lathbury, T., *A History of the Convocation of the Church of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1742*, (London: J.Leslie, 1853).

Litzenberger, C., 'Defining the Church of England: Religious Changes in the 1570s,' in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England. A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from His Students*, C.Litzenberger and S.Wabuda, (eds.), (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), (pp. 137-153).

Lloyd, H.A., 'Constitutionalism,' in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), (pp. 254-297).

Luckock, H.M., *Studies in the History of the Book of Common Prayer*, (London: Rivingtons, 1882).

Macaulay, T.B., *The History of England from the Acession of James the Second*, Vols. I-VI, (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864).

Marshall, J.S., *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition. An Historical and Theological Study of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963).

Marston, E., *Thomas Ken and Izaak Walton*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908).

Mason, A.J., *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).

Matthew, D., *The Age of Charles I*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswode, 1951).

Matthews, A.G., *Calamy Revised Being a Revision of Edmund Calmay's Account of the*

- Ministers and Others Ejected and Silenced, 1660-2*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934).
- McAdoo, H., 'Richard Hooker,' in *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, (Wantage: Ikon Productions, 1992), (pp. 105-125).
- McAdoo, H., *The Spirit of Anglicanism. A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1965).
- McGrade, A.S., 'Book VII,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 309-336).
- McGrade, A.S., 'Book VIII,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 337-383).
- McGrade, A.S., 'The Coherence of Hooker's Polity: The Books on Power,' in *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol.XXIV, No.2, 1963, (pp. 163-182).
- McGrade, A.S., 'Foreward,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp.xi-xxii).
- McGrade, A.S., 'The Last Three Books and Hooker's Autograph Notes,' in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993), Vol.VI, Part I, (pp. 232-247).
- McGrade, A.S., 'Repentance and Spiritual Power: Book VI of Richard Hooker's of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,' in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol.29, 1978, (pp.163-176).
- McGrade, A.S., (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997).
- Mendle, M., *Henry Parker and the English Civil War. The Political Thought of the Public's "Privado,"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955).
- Middleton, A., *The Peculiar Character of Anglicanism*, (Louth: The Prayer Book Society Ltd, 1998).
- Miller, J., *Charles II*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991).
- Miller, J., *The Glorious Revolution*, (London: Longman, 1983).
- Miller, J., *The Life and Times of William and Mary*, (Golborne: George Weidenfield and Nicolson Limited, 1974).
- Miller, J., *Restoration England: The Reign of Charles II*, (London: Longman, 1985).
- Milton, A., *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Morrill, J., *The Nature of the English Revolution*, (Harlow: Longman Group U.K. Limited, 1993).
- Moss, A., *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Munz, P., *The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952).

Neelands, W.D., 'Hooker on Scripture, Reason, and "Tradition," ' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 75-94).

New, J.F.H., *Anglican and Puritan. The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964).

Nockles, P.B., *The Oxford Movement in Context. Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Novarr, D., *The Making of Walton's Lives*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958).

Nuttall, G.F., *Richard Baxter*, (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965).

Ogg, D., *England in the Reign of Charles II*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967).

Orr, R., *Reason and Authority: The Thought of William Chillingworth*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

Packer, J.W., *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660. With Special Reference to Henry Hammond*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969).

Paget, F., *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899).

Parry, C.H., (ed.), *The English Civil War and after, 1642-1658*, (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1970).

Percy, M., *Introducing Richard Hooker and the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (London: Affirming Catholicism, 1999).

Pinkham, L., *William III and the Respectable Revolution. The Part Played by William of Orange in the Revolution of 1688*, (Hamden: Archon Books, 1969).

Porter, H.C., 'Hooker, the Tudor Constitution, and the Via Media,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (ed.), (London: The Press of Cape Western Reserve University, 1972), (pp. 77-116).

Porter, H.C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958).

Powicke, F.J., *The Reverend Richard Baxter under the Cross (1662-1691)*, (London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1928).

Questier, M.C., *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Quinton, A., *The Politics of Imperfection. The Religious and Secular Traditions of Conservative Thought in England from Hooker to Oakeshott*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1976).

Rice, H.A.L., *Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non-Juror*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1964).

Ronalds, F.S., *The Attempted Whig Revolution of 1678-1681*, (Urbana: The University of Illinois, 1937).

Rupp, G., *Religion in England, 1688-1791*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Russell, C., *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

Salmon, J.H.M., 'Catholic Resistance Theory, Ultramontanism, and the Royalist Response, 1580-1620,' in *The Cambridge History of Modern Political Thought 1450-1700*, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Schochet, G.J., 'John Locke and Religious Toleration,' in *The Revolution of 1688-1689. Changing Perspectives*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), (pp. 147-164).

Schochet, G.J., *Patriarchalism in Political Thought. The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975).

Schoeck, R.J., 'From Erasmus to Hooker: An Overview,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 59-73).

Schwoerer, L.G., 'The Coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689,' in *The Revolution of 1688-1689. Changing Perspectives*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), (pp. 107-130).

Schwoerer, L.G., *The Revolution of 1688-169. Changing Perspectives*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Seaward, P., 'Gilbert Sheldon and the London Vestries,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990).

Secor, P.B., 'In Search of Richard Hooker: Constructing a New Biography,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997, 1997), (pp. 20-37).

Scott, J., *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623-1677*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Scott, J., 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990), (pp. 107-131).

Sharp, A., *Political Ideas of the English Civil Wars, 1641-1649*, (London: Longman, 1983).

Sharpe, K., *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, (London: Yale University Press, 1992).

Sharpe, K., 'The Personal Rule of Charles I,' in *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), (pp. 53-78).

Shirley, F.J., *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1949).

Simmons, A.J., *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

- Sisson, C.J., *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940).
- Skinner, Q., *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Volume Two: The Age of Reformation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Skinner, Q., 'The Idea of Negative Liberty Philosophical and Historical Perspectives,' in *Philosophy in History. Essays on The Historiography of Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), (pp.193-219).
- Skinner, Q., *Liberty before Liberalism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Sommerville, M.R., 'Richard Hooker and His Contemporaries on Episcopacy: An Elizabethan Consensus,' in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol.35, No.2, 1984, (pp. 177-187).
- Speck, W.A., *Reluctant Revolutionaries. Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- Speck, W.A., *Tory and Whig the Struggle in the Constituencies 1701-1715*, (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1970).
- Spellman, W.M., *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England 1660-1700*, (London: University of Georgia Press, 1993).
- Spurr, J., 'Religion in Restoration England,' in *The Reign of Charles II and James VII and II*, L.K.J.Glassey, (ed.), (New York: St Martin's Press, Inc, 1997), (pp. 90-124).
- Spurr, J., *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, (London: Yale University Press, 1991).
- Spurr, J., '“Virtue, Religion and Government”: The Anglican Uses of Providence,' in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, T.Harris, P.Seaward, and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990), (pp. 29-47).
- Stanwood, P.G., 'Textual Introduction. The Last Three Books,' in R.Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Books VI, VII, VIII*, P.G.Stanwood, (ed.), W.Speed Hill, (general ed.), (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), Vol.III, (pp. xiii-lxxv).
- Stone, Darwell, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1909), Vol.II.
- Sydney, C, *The Anglican Via Media*, (Tyne and Jarvis Ltd, 1927).
- Sykes, N., *William Wake Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), Vols I-II.
- Szechi, D.D., *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-14*, (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1984).
- Targoff, R., 'Performing Prayer in Hooker's Lawes: The Efficacy of Set Forms,' in *Richard Hooker and the Construction of the Christian Community*, A.S.McGrade, (ed.), (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997), (pp. 275-282).
- Thisleton, A.C., *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, (London: Harper Collins, 1992).

- Thompson, W.D.J.Cargill, 'The Philosopher of the "Politick Society." Richard Hooker as a Political Thinker,' in *Studies in Richard Hooker. Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*, W.Speed Hill, (Ed.), (London: The Press of the Cape Western Reserve University, 1972).
- Thornton, L.S., *Richard Hooker. A Study of His Theology*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1924).
- Tomlinson, H., *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1983).
- Tomlinson, H., 'The Causes of War: A Historiographical Survey,' in *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), (pp. 7-26).
- Trevor-Roper, H., *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*, (London: Macmillan and Co, Ltd, 1940).
- Trevor-Roper, H., *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans. Seventeenth Century Essays*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1987).
- Trevor-Roper, H., 'The Good and Great Works of Richard Hooker,' in *The New York Review of Books*, Vol.24, 24/11/1977, (pp. 48-55).
- Tuck, R., *Natural Rights Theories. Their Origin and Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Tulloch, J., *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol.I-II, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1872).
- Turner, F.C., *James II*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswode, 1948).
- Van Der Zee, H. and B., *William and Mary*, (London: Macmillan, 1973).
- Wall, J.N., 'Jeremy Taylor and Richard Hooker's Contemporary Reputation' in *Seventeenth-Century News*, Vol.35, 1977, (p. 112).
- Wallace, J.M., *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- Wallace, D.D., *Puritans and Predestination. Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).
- Watts, M.R., *The Dissenters*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), Vol.I.
- Wedgwood, C.V., 'The Trial of Charles,' in *The English Civil War and after, 1642-1658*, R.H.Parry, (ed.), (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1970).
- Weller, B., and Ferguson, M.W., (eds.), *Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland. The Tragedy of Mariam the Fair Queen of Jewry. With Lady Falkland: Her Life by One of Her Daughters*, (London: University of California Press, Ltd, 1994).
- Weston, C.C., *English: Ancient Constitution and Common Law, in the Cambridge History of Political Thought 1455-1700*, J.H.Burns and M.Goldie, (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- White, P.O.G., *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

1992).

Wing, D., *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries*, Vols.I-III, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).

Witcombe, W.T., *Charles I and the Cavalier House of Commons 1663-1674*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966).

Wormald, B.H.G., *Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion*, (Cambridge University Press, 1951).

Unpublished Secondary Sources

Greig, M., 'Thought and Polemic of Gilbert Burnet, Ca 1673-1705,' Cambridge Ph.D. 1991.

Hayward, J.C., 'The Mores of Great Tew. Literary, Philosophical and Political Idealism in Falkland's Circle,' Cambridge Ph.D., 1982.

Martin, J.M., 'Izaak Walton and His Precursors: A Literary Study of the Emergence of the Ecclesiastical Life,' Cambridge Ph.D. 1993.

