The English Historical Review
 https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/ceae106

*Remembering Episcopalian Conformity in Restoration England**

This article examines how the phenomenon of episcopalian conformity in the late 1640s and 1650s was remembered, debated and explained after the Restoration. An important development in the historiography of the English Revolution over the last two decades has been a renewed focus on the fate of the Church of England and its clergy during these years of Puritan ascendancy.[1] In a string of particularly ground-breaking articles, Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor have transformed our understanding of episcopalianism between the mid-1640s, when episcopacy was abolished and the Prayer Book proscribed by parliamentary ordinance, and the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660.[2] They point out that, in contrast to the prevailing tendency to depict the Church of England as an oppressed underground movement in these years, kept alive only by a small group of 'hard-line' nonconformists in exile, the majority of clergymen were *not* ejected from their livings by either the Long Parliament or the Cromwellian authorities.[3] Scholarly focus on individuals such as Henry Hammond and Gilbert Sheldon has therefore helped to conceal the 'protracted process' of conformity in which most episcopalian ministers were engaged during the late 1640s and 1650s.[4]

* I would like to thank Jeremy Fradkin, Ed Legon and audience members at the 'Britain in Revolution' seminar at the University of Oxford for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this article. I am also very grateful to the two anonymous reviewers of this journal and to Alex Beeton, who kindly shared findings from his doctoral research and drew my attention to important material in the Winchester College Archives. The research for this article was funded by the Leverhulme Trust.

1. J. Maltby, 'Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of "Anglicanism", 1642–60', in C. Durston and J. Maltby, eds, *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158–80; A. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007); A. Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in J. Adamson, ed., *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–1649* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 61–81; K. Fincham and S. Taylor, 'Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity, 1646–60', in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith, eds, *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 18–43; F. McCall, *Baal's Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham, 2013); C. Haigh, 'Where Was the Church of England, 1646–1660?', *Historical Journal*, lxii (2019), pp. 127–47.

2. Fincham and Taylor, 'Episcopalian Conformity'; K. Fincham and S. Taylor, 'Vital Statistics: Episcopal Ordination and Ordinands in England, 1646–1660', *English Historical Review*, cxxvi (2011), pp. 319–44; K. Fincham and S. Taylor, 'Episcopalian Identity, 1640–1662', in A. Milton, ed., *The Oxford History of Anglicanism*, I: *Reformation and Identity, c.1520–1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 457–82.

3. See, for example, R.S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662* (London, 1951); A. Whiteman, 'The Restoration Church of England', in G. Nuttall and O. Chadwick, eds, *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662–1962* (London, 1962), pp. 19–88; J.W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643–1660* (Manchester, 1969).

4. Fincham and Taylor, 'Episcopalian Conformity', p. 23.

This work, in turn, has raised a great many new questions and avenues for future research. How, for instance, did these episcopalian conformists rationalise their decision to continue ministering in a Church shorn of its bishops and supreme head, both at the time and after the return of Charles II? How consistent did they regard these choices as being with previous statements of support for the institutions of monarchy and episcopacy? The potential for apparent instances of Interregnum collaboration to cause embarrassment during the Restoration decades was obviously considerable, not just for individual ministers but also for a resurgent Anglican establishment that was always careful to present itself as having suffered with and for the Stuart monarchy in its darkest hour. To what extent were memories of episcopalian conformity thus used as ammunition by nonconformists in their attacks on the Church of England after the Act of Uniformity had been introduced in 1662?

In reconstructing the perspectives and priorities of these clergymen who ministered within the Interregnum Church, it is possible to draw on the insights of a rich body of scholarship on religious conformity in the century prior to the Civil Wars. Andrew Pettegree, Alexandra Walsham and Peter Marshall, among others, have shown the dangers of bifurcating responses to religious persecution under successive Tudor monarchs into the heroic resistance of martyrs and exiles on the one hand and the unprincipled accommodation of cowed timeservers on the other. Peter Lake, meanwhile, has carefully elucidated the theological assumptions of moderate Puritans within the Elizabethan and early Jacobean Church.[5] This literature also enables historians to consider how far episcopalians in the 1650s imitated the habits and arguments of other religious groups—and particularly their Puritan adversaries—who had been forced to grapple with the same dilemmas of conscience and conformity in earlier decades.

Drawing on petitions, pamphlets, funeral sermons and clerical biographies, this article argues that both personal ambition and polemical advantage encouraged episcopalians to suppress evidence of Interregnum conformity from the moment the king returned in May 1660. Motivated by the hope of advancement within the Restoration Church, clergymen rushed to find 'usable pasts', refashioning their complex personal histories into straightforward stories of heroic martyrdom in the service of Church and king. In pamphlets and petitions, the more uncomfortable aspects of Interregnum careers were glossed over or erased, while activities that helped create a picture of

5. A. Pettegree, 'Nicodemism and the English Reformation', in A. Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 86–117; A. Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993); P. Marshall and J. Morgan, 'Clerical Conformity and the Elizabethan Settlement Revisited', *Historical Journal*, lix (2016), pp. 1–22; P. Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982).

unblemished loyalty to these institutions were brought to the fore. Attempts to 'backdate' loyalty through publications was common, with ministers creating print portfolios that they presented as proof of fearless witness in the midst of the storm, as opposed to belated conversion once the clouds had parted.

Evidence of conformity and compromise was also problematic for 'high' Anglicans more generally, given their instinctive tendency to justify the Act of Uniformity and the persecution of dissent partly on the grounds that they themselves had undergone much greater hardship during the 1640s and 1650s. As a result, the exact nature and extent of episcopalian suffering during the Civil Wars and Interregnum became a battleground in the religious polemic of the later Stuart period, with dissenters depicting an Interregnum Church that was a good deal more tolerant and inclusive than the persecutory institution that their Anglican adversaries chose to remember. Restoration accounts of Interregnum episcopalianism were thus from the outset often characterised by simplification and exaggeration; stories of pragmatism, collaboration and inconstancy were now neither personally nor polemically useful to Anglicans.

Crucially, however, this kind of whitewashing was by no means the only—or even the principal—way in which episcopalian conformists retrospectively presented their own careers. Rather than taking for granted that the only legitimate response available to loyalists during the 1640s and 1650s had been martyrdom or lofty retreat, many clergymen were subsequently eager to defend their decision to continue ministering publicly under the English Republic. This, they insisted, had been the product of a careful assessment as to how they could best serve the interests of Church and king, rather than a timorous capitulation to the enemy; their Interregnum ministry had allowed them to influence lay responses to the ongoing crisis, to resist the new powers from within, in a way that withdrawal would not have done.

I argue that this reflects the unstable and contested meaning of loyalty, especially after 1649. What exactly it meant to practise loyalty to a disestablished Church and an exiled monarch was open to very different interpretations. For some, it was essential to avoid any course of action that could be construed as conceding the legitimacy of the new politico-religious order. Others, including the episcopalian conformists discussed here, were more preoccupied with ends than means: how could the royalist and episcopalian causes be furthered in practice? Tied to this was the issue of how and whether episcopalian ministers should engage pastorally with non-episcopalians, a question that would be just as pressing after 1662 as it had been in the 1650s.

On one level, then, this article adds a new dimension to the growing historiographical literature on the significance of memories of the English Revolution in the later seventeenth century, showing how

competing interpretations of the recent past shaped, and were shaped by, the fractious religious politics of the Restoration.[6] It also builds on recent work by scholars such as Andrew Hopper, who has examined the ways in which gentry turncoats during the Civil Wars subsequently justified their actions and sought to fashion a respectable self-image for posterity.[7] However, most importantly, the article sheds significant new light on episcopalian identities during the 1640s and 1650s, helping to explain why clergymen who considered themselves loyal to the pre-war order could embark on such divergent trajectories when confronted with defeat, disestablishment and regicide.

I

The two years between the return of Charles II from exile in May 1660 and the implementation of the Act of Uniformity in August 1662 witnessed a fierce struggle to dictate the character of the Church of England. The king's conciliatory rhetoric in the Declaration of Breda had raised Presbyterian hopes of an inclusive religious settlement, which would accommodate their ongoing objections to aspects of the Prayer Book and episcopacy. Some 'plain and moderate Episcopal men' were willing to make substantial concessions to Presbyterians on these issues, partly as recompense for the role the latter had played in bringing back the king.[8] On the other hand, steadfastly opposed to any kind of compromise was an influential party of strict episcopalians, or 'high' churchmen, who were united by their determination to see a full restoration of the pre-Civil War religious order. This group began to gain the initiative with the election in early 1661 of the Cavalier Parliament, and on 24 August 1662—later known to dissenters as Black Bartholomew's Day—almost one thousand ministers were officially ejected from their livings for refusing to conform to the narrow terms of the Act of Uniformity.[9]

Alongside these fervent debates over the precise form of ecclesiastical government and liturgy the Church would adopt, the months immediately following the king's return were characterised by a frantic

6. M. Neufeld, *The Civil Wars after 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge, 2013); McCall, *Baal's Priests*; E. Peters, *Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658–1667* (Cham, 2017); E. Legon, *Revolution Remembered: Seditious Memories after the British Civil Wars* (Manchester, 2019); E. Vallance, *Loyalty, Memory and Public Opinion in England, 1658–1727* (Manchester, 2019).

7. A. Hopper, 'The Self-Fashioning of Gentry Turncoats during the English Civil Wars', *Journal of British Studies*, xlix (2010), pp. 236–57.

8. Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), p. 229.

9. D. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007), p. 2. See also I. Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660–1663* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 141–54; P. Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 162–95; N.H. Keeble, ed., *'Settling the Peace of the Church': 1662 Revisited* (Oxford, 2014).

scramble for ecclesiastical patronage.[10] Death had greatly diminished the bishops' ranks during the preceding decades, such that from the mid-1650s Edward Hyde, concerned about a possible lapse in the episcopal succession, tried unsuccessfully from the exiled court to co-ordinate the consecration of new bishops. But as well as these vacant episcopal sees, there were deaneries, prebends and royal chaplaincies to which an ambitious cleric could once again aspire. Meanwhile, one of the first and most pressing questions confronted by the Convention Parliament after it had proclaimed Charles II king on 8 May 1660 was whether those clergymen who had been ejected or sequestered by parliamentarian committees over the course of the preceding two decades should now be automatically reinstated to their livings, at the expense of current incumbents 'intruded' during the Interregnum.[11] As well as having an obvious bearing on the material condition of the ejected clergymen themselves, this was a matter of principle for those staunchest advocates of the pre-war ecclesiastical status quo and a vital first step towards the Church of England's full recovery.

As a result, stories of episcopalian suffering and unshakable loyalty to the Stuart cause throughout the 1640s and 1650s were rehearsed at length in early Restoration pulpits, pamphlets and petitions. This was, of course, just one aspect of a more general trend in these months, which saw different groups leverage their histories of devoted service to the Crown in the hope of redress or compensation.[12] Robert Mossom's *Apology in the Behalf of the Sequestred Clergy*, presented to 'the High Court of Parliament' in June 1660, declared that, 'though sequestered, threatened, and imprisoned', the loyalist clergy had 'earnestly contended for that Liberty, wherein these Nations now stand'. Some just recompense now had to be made as a 'Reward of their services, [and] a Release from their sufferings', beginning with the restitution of livings. 'To tell us of being further Loosers', Mossom explained, 'when for so many years we have lost all, is but the part of miserable Comforters'.[13] Presbyterians, however, retorted that it was not the loyalty of these ministers but rather 'the crimes, scandals, or superstitions of their lives' that had been 'the occasion of their sequestration'.[14] The precise meaning of, and motivation behind, the clerical ejections instigated by parliament during the Civil War period was thus immediately subject to contestation in the months following the king's return. Indeed,

10. Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, pp. 159–61; Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England*, pp. 52–7, 64–70; R. Beddard, 'A Reward for Services Rendered: Charles II and the Restoration Bishopric of Worcester, 1660–1663', *Midland History*, xxix (2004), pp. 61–91.

11. Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England*, pp. 37–52; L.F. Brown, 'The Religious Factors in the Convention Parliament', *English Historical Review*, xxii (1907), pp. 51–63.

12. See, for example, M. Stoyle, '"Memories the Maimed": The Testimony of Charles I's Former Soldiers', *History*, lxxxviii (2003), pp. 204–26.

13. Robert Mossom, *Apology in the Behalf of the Sequestred Clergy* (London, 1660), pp. 4–5, 12.

14. *A Plea for Ministers in Sequestrations* (London, 1660), p. 2.

it was not until 1979 that Ian Green showed that the picture insisted on, first by Restoration Anglicans and then modern historians, of huge numbers of clergymen driven from their livings solely for royalist and/or Laudian sympathies, was a significant simplification.[15]

This particular issue would eventually be settled in September 1660 with an Act 'for the confirming and restoring ministers', which reinstated surviving ejected clergy while allowing Interregnum incumbents whose predecessors had since died to retain their livings.[16] However, given the ecclesiastical patronage once again at the Crown's disposal, the months after May 1660 witnessed scores of petitions directed to Charles II by individual clerics seeking either the restitution of their livings or further advancement within the Church.[17] An individual case could obviously be strengthened if the petitioner was able to demonstrate impeccably royalist credentials. Those of 'my profession', Thomas Washbourne reminded the king, who 'had not bowed their knees to Baal … [but] suffered with and for your Majesty' now deserved 'preferments answerable to their merits'.[18] A great many sermons were accordingly printed in the second half of 1660 celebrating 'His Majesties happy return', frequently accompanied by fawning dedications to the monarch.[19]

Quite understandably, however, these post-Restoration publications could leave a minister open to the charge of strategic and belated bandwagon-jumping—that he was one 'of those, the opening of whose Eyes is just of the same Age with his Majesties Glorious Restauration'.[20] What was needed therefore was corroborating evidence that one had held fast to, and better still publicly expressed, royalist allegiances 'when Rebellion was Rampant, and Schisme Triumphant; when Loyalty was condemned for Treason, and all Order in the Church bawled down for Antichristian'.[21]

This was all the more essential if a minister was to divert attention away from potentially uncomfortable aspects of his recent past, as the example of Christopher Harvey shows. While, after the Restoration, Harvey was quick to declare himself 'a constant sufferer for my loyalty … in all the late troublesome times', his actual career in the years between Civil War and Restoration was far more ambiguous. He made financial contributions to parliament during the First Civil War, was appointed as a trustee of Rugby School, Warwickshire, by

15. I. Green, 'The Persecution of "Scandalous" and "Malignant" Parish Clergy during the English Civil War', *English Historical Review*, xciv (1979), pp. 507–31.

16. *Journals of the House of Commons*, VIII: *1660–1667* (London, 1802), pp. 147–8.

17. See, for example, Kew, The National Archives [hereafter TNA], SP 29/9, fo. 245; SP 29/35, fo. 28; SP 29/6, fo. 35; SP 29/142A, fo. 23.

18. Thomas Washbourne, *The Repairer of the Breach* (London, 1660), sig. A3v.

19. See C. Edie, 'Right Rejoicing: Sermons on the Occasion of the Stuart Restoration', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, lxii (1979), pp. 61–86.

20. Richard Meggot, *A Sermon Preached at St. Martins in the Fields, at the Funeral of the Reverend Doctor Hardy* (London, 1670), p. 23.

21. Ibid., pp. 23–4.

a decree of Chancery in 1653, and kept hold of his living at nearby Clifton-upon-Dunsmore throughout that decade. At the same time, Judith Maltby has shown that Harvey also spent these years composing and circulating 'highly polemical verse in defence of the Church of England'.[22] To assuage any doubts about his royalism, he published in 1661 *Aphēniastēs, or, The Right Rebel*, a treatise that purported to expose 'the true use of the name by the nature of rebellion'. Crucially, Harvey felt the need to alert readers in a preface to the fact that this work had actually been composed in 1645, at the climax of the First Civil War, and only his inability to find a willing publisher had prevented him from printing it at some point during the intervening sixteen years.[23]

In other cases, the same tactic of backdating loyalty through publications was combined with direct petitions to the king for ecclesiastical advancement. In the case of a cleric like Anthony Sadler, presenting oneself as a principled adherent of the royal cause required a distinctly creative interpretation of the recent past. Sadler seems to have been both a grasping and a pugnacious character, with a habit of generating controversy wherever he went. Having become rector of Bishopstoke, Hampshire, after the sequestration of the previous incumbent in 1643, he put himself before the Cromwellian Triers in June 1654, in the hope that they would approve his recent presentation to the rectory of Compton Abbas in Dorset. Their failure to do so led soon after to a bitter pamphlet exchange between Sadler and the son of one of the Triers, Philip Nye.[24] Sadler's *Inquisitio Anglicana*, which catalogued his objections to the process in full, included a direct appeal to both 'His Highness the Lord Protector' and 'the High Court of Parliament'. After the Restoration, he became embroiled in an acrimonious dispute with the patron of his living at Mitcham, Surrey, and was suspended on more than one occasion by his diocesan bishop in the 1670s and 1680s for 'scandalous practices'.[25] The late seventeenth-century Anglican and antiquary Anthony Wood would aptly describe Sadler as having possessed 'a rambling head, and turbulent spirit'.[26]

Sadler's activities during the Interregnum had spawned an incriminating paper trail, which might cast some doubt on the sincerity of his allegiance to the monarchy and thwart his hopes of promotion within the Restoration Church. From the moment of the king's return, he therefore set about trying to refashion his public image through

22. Maltby, 'Suffering and Surviving', pp. 102–3.

23. Christopher Harvey, *Aphēniastēs, or, The Right Rebel* (London, 1661), 'A Preface'.

24. Philip Nye, *Mr Sadler Re-examined, or, His Disguise Discovered* (London, 1654).

25. E. Legon, 'Sadler Saddled: Reconciliation and Recrimination in a Restoration Parish', *English Historical Review*, cxxxvi (2021), pp. 1164–92. I am grateful to Dr Legon for allowing me to read this article prior to publication. See also J. McElligott, 'Sadler, Anthony', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

26. Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss (4 vols, London, 1813–20), iii, pp. 1268–9.

a particularly intensive publishing campaign. *Mercy in a Miracle*, a sermon preached on 28 June 1660 at Mitcham, was printed with the obligatory sycophantic dedication to Charles II, as well as a series of questionable claims cataloguing Sadler's own history of 'sufferings' for the royalist cause. He was eager to deny that his 'Pen [was] now only, as the Tongue of a ready Orator', and insisted that 'my known Loyalty will vindicate my integritie'. A marginal note described how he had been 'apprehend[ed] … by a Troope of Horse' in 1643 (the sequestered living he had obtained that year went unremarked) and then persecuted in some unspecified way by Oliver Cromwell himself, now tactfully restyled as 'the (so called) Protector'.[27] This sermon was followed in December by *The Loyall Mourner*, which included an elegy on the death of Charles I that Sadler claimed had been 'presented to the hands of many' (presumably—and conveniently—in manuscript form) in February of 'that fatall year', 1649.[28] Through these publications, Sadler's Interregnum past was retrospectively recast as a story of loyal suffering and bold public protest against the Republican regime. He was not long after made both doctor of divinity and a royal chaplain in extraordinary to the king.[29]

Other clergymen confronted charges of collaboration more directly, and were determined to show that any inconstancy on their part had been seeming rather than actual. John Harris, the warden of Winchester College, survived a parliamentarian visitation during 1649–50, despite a reputation for both Laudianism and royalism. Later, 'some [were] ready to Censure both him and the fellows that they would designe to keep their places in such times'.[30] In 1705, however, John Nicholas, who had been a scholar at Winchester at the time, wrote to John Walker to explain how the warden had managed to avoid ejection without having to 'take the Oathes'. According to Nicholas, Harris had benefited from the intercession of Nicholas Love, a Winchester member in the Rump Parliament and commissioner on the visitation, who used 'the great power he had here, to the protection of this Society'. Aware that this might qualify the traditional picture of a Republican regime merciless in its treatment of loyalists, Nicholas was quick to stress the exceptionality of the Winchester case: 'I believe [this] was a single instance of favour, shewd to Clergymen, that complyed not w[i]th the Oppressors'. Nonetheless, the important fact was that this atypically benevolent Republican insider had enabled Harris to square the circle, neither suffering ejection nor compromising his principles.[31] Very similar

27. Anthony Sadler, *Mercy in a Miracle Shewing* (London, 1660), sig. A2r.

28. Anthony Sadler, *The Loyall Mourner, Shewing the Murdering of King Charles the First* (London, 1660), sig. A2r.

29. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, iii, p. 1268.

30. Winchester College Archives, MS 447, unfoliated. This manuscript contains an anonymous biography of Harris written after the Restoration.

31. Oxford, Bodleian Library [hereafter Bodl.], MS J. Walker C. 2, fo. 138r. I am grateful to Alex Beeton for this reference.

explanations were proffered in the Restoration biographies of other clerics, such as Seth Ward and George Stradling, who had kept hold of posts in educational institutions during the Interregnum.[32] Whether this retrospective rationalisation tells the whole story is another question; contemporary evidence certainly suggests that, in order to satisfy the visitation commissioners, Harris at least had been prepared to renounce his previous attachment to Laudianism and had signalled a willingness to obey the new regime.[33]

Nor was it only the lower clergy who had reputations to repair and uncomfortable personal histories with which to deal after 1660. The surviving episcopate was itself open to charges of passivity or even acquiescence during the Interregnum, with Edward Hyde becoming particularly exasperated in exile by its failure to co-operate with his scheme for the consecration of new bishops during the late 1650s.[34] Hyde told John Barwick in early 1660 that 'concerning the business of the Church, I am always ashamed of mentioning it to his Majesty, who is as much troubled and ashamed that there should be no more care taken of it by those whose part it is'.[35] Hyde reserved special criticism for Ralph Brownrigg of Exeter (who he believed 'suffered in reputation, of not being zealous enough for the Church') and Robert Skinner of Oxford.[36] A contemporary biographical account explains that in 1660 Skinner 'was not translated to a richer see, which he much expected' because of 'a great and potent enemy at court, who maligned him because of his submission in some part to the usurpers'.[37] But in fact, out of the nine surviving bishops, only William Juxon, Accepted Frewen and Brian Duppa found themselves immediately advanced at the Restoration.[38]

Another of those passed over was John Warner, bishop of Rochester. Warner seems to have lived quietly during the 1650s and certainly played no part in Hyde's consecration initiative. In 1660 at the age of 80, feeling 'utterly forgotten in all & no way at all in the least regarded', he composed 'a plaine & true narrative' of his activities since 1640.[39] This

32. See, for example, George Stradling, *Sermons and Discourses upon Several Occasions* (London, 1692), 'The Preface'; Leonard Twells, *The Theological Works of the Learned Dr. Pocock* (2 vols, London, 1740), i, pp. 32–3; Walter Pope, *The Life of … Seth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury* (London, 1697), pp. 20–21.

33. Winchester College Archives, MS 418, unfoliated. This manuscript contains Harris's answers to the charges brought against him by the parliamentary visitation, in which he protests that, while he had bowed at the name of Jesus and 'preach[ed] for ceremonies' in the 1630s, this was only because such things 'stood established by law': 'since [those] canons were declared voyd by the parliament, I never medled w[i]th any thing of the nature'. Harris also denied that he had ever 'affirmed the K[ing]s cause to be good'.

34. See P. King, 'The Episcopate during the Civil Wars, 1642–1649', *English Historical Review*, lxxiii (1968), pp. 523–37.

35. Peter Barwick, *The Life of the Reverend John Barwick* (London, 1724), p. 247.

36. See ibid., pp. 210, 488.

37. London, British Library [hereafter BL], Lansdowne MS 986, fo. 88; Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, iv, pp. 842–3.

38. Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, p. 126 n.

39. Bodl., MS Eng. Hist. b. 205, fo. 25v.

document, which Warner circulated in scribal form, recounted the relentless suffering and courageous acts of defiance he had undertaken on behalf of monarchy and episcopacy, beginning with his defence of both in the Short Parliament ('when not a B[isho]p liveing but myself opened his mouth').[40] Despite being 'despoiled … of all' and threatened with imprisonment during the Civil Wars, he claimed to have continued to 'read the liturgy, [and] preached and administered the Blessed Sacraments' wherever he went. Throughout Warner's account, the temptation to exaggerate the risks he had incurred proved irresistible: while it is certainly true that the bishop had (anonymously) 'published against the most Barbarous murder of the most Glorious King', it is highly unlikely he would have 'suffered also [if] they discovered mee to have beene the author'.[41] Likewise, although Warner does seem to have made generous contributions for the relief of the sequestered clergy and their widows, the claim that there was not a 'Clergie man in England, who hath done and suffered (Putt them both together) more for the King, the Church, & the Poor Clergie, then I have' has more than an air of special pleading to it.[42]

A similar exculpatory narrative was crafted by Robert Skinner, in direct response to the criticism he had attracted from Edward Hyde and his resultant failure to gain a more prestigious diocese. As Fincham and Taylor have shown, Skinner's career epitomises the 'complex and shifting' relationship 'between conformity and nonconformity within episcopalianism' during the Interregnum.[43] On the one hand, Anthony Wood would later accuse Skinner of having 'submitted so much to the men of those times, that he kept [his] rectory at Launton' in Oxfordshire.[44] At the same time, he continued to perform Prayer Book services intermittently and was one of the few bishops who carried out clandestine ordinations during the Interregnum: Thomas Cartwright and George Bull, both future bishops, were among those ordained by Skinner in these years. It was, of course, the latter activities that Skinner was at pains to highlight when he wrote to Gilbert Sheldon, bishop of London, on 17 August 1662. Responding to Hyde's charge that 'the antient Bishops' had refused to 'relieve their Mother the Church', Skinner now calculated that he had ordained between 400 and 500 clergymen, at a time when discovery would have meant having 'my Books and my Bed taken from me, having little else left me'. That

40. For other copies, see ibid., fo. 29r.

41. Ibid., fo. 25r. See [John Warner], *The Devilish Conspiracy … against the Anointed of the Lord, Christ Their King* (London, 1649).

42. Bodl., MS Eng. Hist. b. 205, fo. 25v; S. Ward, 'The Restoration Episcopate and the Interregnum: Autobiography, Suffering and Professions of Faith', in E. Vernon and H. Powell, eds, *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635–66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 242–59, at 251.

43. Fincham and Taylor, 'Episcopalian Conformity', p. 36.

44. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, iv, p. 842.

he seems to have begun alleviating this danger by refusing to issue certificates of ordination was, unsurprisingly, not mentioned.[45]

Importantly, however, Skinner also pointed to more subtle acts of resistance, through which he had tried to mitigate some of the deleterious effects of republican rule and regulate the kinds of messages that the laity heard: 'I took such care for all services that were com[m]anded to be read in C[hur]ch[e]s that constantly every cla[u]se that tended to the dishonour of the King or C[hur]ch was branded aforehand with black lead; And this by my direction many did, whom I durst to trust'.[46] Here we can glimpse the argument that, as will be shown, other episcopalian conformists made with still greater confidence: that an Interregnum living was not necessarily something to be ashamed of or apologetic for, because it had enabled the minister to do some active good on behalf of king, episcopacy or Prayer Book—good that would have been otherwise impossible in passive retreat.

It is worth pointing out here that, however much they may have appealed to High Church bishops such as Gilbert Sheldon, narratives of exemplary Civil War loyalty were not always the best ticket to ecclesiastical patronage after 1660. For one thing, the king himself quickly made clear his preference for a broad-based ecclesiastical settlement and his willingness to advance those whose pasts were less than spotless. He was also committed to a more general policy of national forgetfulness: even before the Restoration and the Act of Oblivion, at least one episcopalian preacher had aroused the displeasure of the exiled court by offering 'a brief historical account of the causes of our unhappy distractions', which laid the blame for the Regicide firmly at the door of the Presbyterians.[47] By 1661, Anglican commentators had begun to grumble that the 'poor hunger-starved Loyalists' went ignored by the king, while others—such as John Gauden or Ralph Brideoake—found themselves advanced to bishoprics in spite of their undeniable collaboration with the Cromwellian regime.[48] 'We may suppose', remarked one ecclesiastical historian in the early eighteenth century, 'the Merit of the Man to be preferred, or the Memory of his Sufferings was not always considered, but a regard had to the Royal Promise of Forgetfulness'.[49]

There were also plenty of lay patrons in the provinces likely to be less receptive to narratives of steadfast loyalty and indeed positively sympathetic towards those episcopalian churchmen who had conformed in the 1650s. The most hard-line clerical supporters of the re-established Church could, after all, prove decidedly divisive at a

45. Robert Nelson, *The Life of Dr. George Bull* (London, 1714), p. 26.

46. Bodl., MS Tanner 47, fo. 25r–v.

47. Matthew Griffith, *The Fear of God and the King* (London, 1660); Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, p. 109.

48. Lionel Gatford, *To the Most Reverend, the Arch-bishops … now Assembled at Westminster* (n.p., 1661), p. 1.

49. Nathaniel Salmon, *The Lives of the English Bishops from the Restauration to the Revolution* (London, 1733), p. 353.

local level, unsuited to the realities of confessional diversity that often characterised parish life in Restoration England. One Kentish clergyman, for instance, was reportedly 'thought by some to be too busily zealous for the Church'.[50] Similarly, the conflict between Anthony Sadler and his parishioners at Mitcham in the 1660s was accentuated by Sadler's determination to rake up the nation's recent troubles, castigating publicly those in his congregation who had shown themselves 'disloyal' to king and Church.[51]

The preference of some lay patrons for ministers who had conformed during the Interregnum was made particularly apparent when it came to filling the vacant livings of the ejected Bartholomean clergy after August 1662. Charles Rich, the fourth earl of Warwick, who had the right to appoint to eleven livings in Essex vacated after Black Batholomew's Day, had been a parliamentarian during the Civil Wars and his wife, Mary, harboured Puritan sympathies. Of the ministers Warwick eventually appointed, three seem to have had livings in the Interregnum Church, while the other eight had been either fellows or students at the Cromwellian universities.[52] Lionel Gatford, who, ironically, had landed himself in trouble by attacking the Laudian reforms at Cambridge in the 1630s, petitioned Charles II in August 1661 for the vicarage of Plymouth, Devon.[53] He complained that, despite his 'very faithfull … service both to your sacred Ma[jes]tie and to your Royall father', he had 'had nothing conferred upon him since your Ma[jes]ties happie returne'.[54] But Gatford's pleas fell on deaf ears and when the nonconformist vicar of Plymouth was ejected the following summer, the corporation at Plymouth chose Roger Ashton, rather than Gatford, to take his place. Ashton had held a living throughout the Civil War period and was later named by Edmund Calamy as one of several 'Episcopal Divines' in and around Exeter who during the 1650s were prepared to join the meetings of Presbyterian ministers in the city and 'lived in great Amity with them'.[55] Meanwhile, Simon Patrick, who had gone before the Cromwellian Triers in 1658, received the rectory of St Paul's in Covent Garden from the former parliamentarian William Russell, earl of Bedford, despite the two never having met. Patrick was replacing the Presbyterian and Bartholomean minister Thomas Manton.[56] Clearly, then, there were certain circumstances in which

50. Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England*, p. 176.

51. Legon, 'Sadler Saddled'.

52. Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England*, pp. 163–4.

53. D. Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity at Cambridge, 1590–1644* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 170.

54. TNA, SP 29/40, fo. 88.

55. Edmund Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account* (2 vols, London, 1727), i, p. 254. For Ashton, see 'Ashton, Roger (1638–1677)', *Clergy of the Church of England Database* (King's College London, 2013–), available at https://theclergydatabase.org.uk/jsp/persons/index.jsp (accessed 1 Mar. 2021).

56. *The Works of Simon Patrick*, ed. Anthony Taylor (9 vols, Oxford, 1858), ix, pp. 438–9.

a recent record of compromise could actually be advantageous for an Anglican clergyman.

II

The value of martyrological rhetoric went well beyond simply advancing the material interests and careerist ambitions of individual clergymen. Still more significant questions relating to the Restoration religious settlement remained up for debate in the months following 1660: what, for instance, would be the precise function and jurisdiction of bishops? How far would the king's authority over the reconstructed Church extend? And what, exactly, would its liturgy look like?[57] Alarmingly for High Church activists, the king's personal inclination towards compromise on these issues was repeatedly signalled during the second half of 1660, culminating in the Worcester House Declaration that he issued in October.[58]

By dredging up the collective suffering of the ejected clergy—which, it was always insisted, had been a direct consequence of their unwavering loyalty to Church and king—the most committed episcopalians hoped to ensure that Charles II would own their cause and distance himself from the treacherous Presbyterian faction. According to these churchmen, the revolutionary decades had confirmed that Church and king were mutually dependent. Their accounts inevitably gave little indication of either the scale of episcopalian conformity in the 1650s or the extent to which even rigid nonconformists, such as Hammond and Sheldon, had begun to harbour doubts about the Stuart monarchy and the royal supremacy more generally. As Jacqueline Rose has shown, Charles II's decision to take the Covenant in 1650 prompted some to wonder whether 'establishment was perhaps the *bene esse* rather than the *esse* of the Church of England, which could be justified as catholic, ancient, and episcopal'.[59] Peter Heylyn had even dedicated his 1657 *Ecclesia Vindicata* to Oliver Cromwell himself, apparently concluding that the quasi-monarchical Protectoral regime now offered a much more viable route to the reinstitution of episcopacy than the House of Stuart.[60]

After 1660, however, the ambivalences that had characterised the relationship between Stuart royalism and episcopalianism during the Interregnum were elided entirely. The 'Episcopal Party', insisted Arthur Bury, had during the 1640s and 1650s proved themselves 'Saints, who

57. Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*; Green, *Re-establishment of the Church of England*; J. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011).

58. B. Till, 'The Worcester House Declaration and the Restoration of the Church of England', *Historical Research*, lxx (1997), pp. 203–30.

59. Rose, *Godly Kingship*, p. 88.

60. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, pp. 162–73.

hazarded their lives, and afterward took chearfully the spoiling of their Goods, and imprisonment of their Persons, to save their consciences, without any hope of recompense'. Presbyterians, by contrast, had amply demonstrated their belief that a king 'must not exercise any power until he has submitted to such conditions as they think good to prescribe'—first in 1650, when Charles II was compelled to take the Covenant, and then again in 1660.[61] Only the episcopalian clergy could therefore be counted on to offer and promote unconditional obedience to the Restoration monarchy: 'that Religion onely, among all Christian Religions, doth promise safety and security to Kings'.[62]

Long after their cause had ostensibly triumphed with the Act of Uniformity in 1662, staunch Anglicans continued to draw on this narrative of suffering as a way of protecting the established Church's hegemony and exposing the 'hypocrisy' of those who now protested against the persecution of dissent. Demonstrating the Church of England's martyrological credentials was also essential given the pervasive assumption, which owed much to the influence of John Foxe, that persecution was a sign of the true Church.[63] The most obvious example of this Anglican martyrology was, of course, John Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, published in 1714 in response to the abridged edition of Richard Baxter's *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696) that Edmund Calamy had produced twelve years earlier. Calamy had incensed High Church opinion by inserting a notorious ninth chapter, in which he relayed the 'numbers, sufferings, and characters of the ministers … ejected by the Act of Uniformity'. To counter these accusations of Anglican persecution and reclaim the mantle of martyrdom from dissenters, Walker engaged in his own numbers game, totting up as many instances as possible of mid-century clerical tribulation brought about by spiteful Puritans. Having done so, he was able to declare that 'the Loyal and Episcopal Clergy did then suffer … in far greater numbers, and in much greater Degree' than those 'who now complain so much of Persecution'.[64]

Walker's work had itself been pre-empted by Robert Chestlin's *Persecutio Undecima*, a more succinct account of 'the puritan persecution of the Protestant Clergy of the Church of England' published in 1648. *Persecutio* was later reissued, first during the Exclusion Crisis and then again in 1682, as 'a necessary Looking-glass, very fit for these times, and … a Warning-piece for the Seed of Dissenters, when they behold the cruel uncharitable dealings their Fore-fathers used'.[65] Readers of this

61. Arthur Bury, *The Bow, or, The Lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan* (London, 1662), pp. 32, 45.

62. Henry Leslie, *The Martyrdome of King Charles* (2nd edn, London, 1660), p. 2.

63. Neufeld, *Civil Wars*, pp. 175–6.

64. John Walker, *An Attempt towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England* (3 vols, London, 1714), i, pp. 1–2. See also McCall, *Baal's Priests*.

65. [Robert Chestlin], *Persecutio Undecima* (3rd edn, London, 1682), title-page.

latter edition would learn how the Puritans had instigated a 'bloody persecution [that] out-stript Nero's' and 'rip[ped] up the Bowels of their Mother the Church', such that there were 'scarce any Parsons or Vicars' in London 'left unsequestered'.[66] In a lengthy diatribe against the nonconformist Richard Baxter published in 1682, Richard Hooke was similarly insistent that the ejection of loyalist clergy had been near universal, dwarfing anything dissenters themselves might have undergone since 1662. 'Are all the Presbyterians', he asked, 'ejected and sequestered? All the Bishops and Loyal Clergy were generally cast out [in the Civil War period]'.[67] Accounts recapitulating the systematic degradation of the loyalist clergy in the recent past were in this respect integral to legitimising the ongoing persecution of dissent and the privileged position of the Anglican Church in the present.

It fell to champions of nonconformity to point out that the situation for episcopalians in the late 1640s and 1650s had, in reality, been much less clear-cut. Writing in 1669, the anonymous author of *An Humble Apology for Non-Conformists* was especially affronted by Simon Patrick's recent contention that nonconformists could not 'reasonably expect any alterations and condescentions now for their sakes' when they had denied 'a toleration to the Episcopal Clergy but lately'.[68] This, the apologist declared, was a flagrant distortion of the historical record. In fact, the government of the day had:

> suffered many of the Episcopal perswasion without ever taking the Covenant to enjoy places in Churches, Colledges, and Schools. And 'tis notoriously known, That Dr. Wild, afterward Bishop Wild, Dr. Gunning, and others, had numerous Meetings for Common Prayer and Preaching, at London; and Dr. Hyde, Dr. Fell, and others, at Oxford, in those days. Give me leave to add too, that the Parliament by their Ordinance allowed the Bishops 200 l. per annum for their Lives … And a fifth part of Livings, where the Minister was ejected, for maintenance of Wife and Children: And scarce any man in those days, that was able, sober, and peaceable, but might, if he had pleased, have Employment and a Livelyhood.[69]

Here, again, we see the idea that the clerical ejections of the 1640s and 1650s had not been ideologically motivated or vindictive, but rather aimed solely at creating an 'able, sober, and peaceable' ministry. More importantly, these ejections were not nearly as widespread as Anglicans like Hooke and Patrick now tried to insist, and, in any case, parliament

66. Ibid., 'To the Reader', p. 22.

67. Richard Hooke, *The Non-Conformists Champion, His Challenge Accepted* (London, 1682), p. 92.

68. *An Humble Apology for Non-Conformists* (London, 1669), p. 22. See Simon Patrick, *A Friendly Debate betwixt Two Neighbors, the One a Conformist, the Other a Non-Conformist* (London, 1668).

69. *An Humble Apology*, p. 23. While it may be true that parliament theoretically granted this money to the bishops, it is not clear that they actually ever received it.

had always been comparatively generous in its treatment of those it removed from livings.

This revisionist challenge to the dominant Anglican history of Civil War ejections would recur in nonconformist polemic throughout the reign of Charles II. In a postscript to his *Fourth Plea for the Nonconformists*, published in 1683, Edward Pearse admitted that he had now come to expect, by way of riposte to his work, 'to be told of the Sufferings of the Loyal Clergy in the Time of War'. However, many of those ejected, he claimed, had actually been able throughout the 1650s to 'take their ease or enjoy a studious Retirement' unmolested. It was also possible to 'reckon up many' loyalists 'that had Livings in the City, and preached in Churches without any Let'—among them George Wild (later bishop of Derry), John Pearson (later bishop of Chester) and Robert Mossom, Wild's successor at Derry and author of the June 1660 petition on behalf of ejected clergymen discussed above.[70]

Clerics could also have their personal history of compromise and collaboration raked up after the Restoration by nonconformists in an attempt to embarrass them and create divisions within the Anglican establishment. This was a strategy that had been regularly deployed in polemical exchanges between Independents and Presbyterians during the 1640s. In his 1646 *Truth, Still Truth*, for example, Henry Burton had accused the Presbyterian Edmund Calamy of having 'prostitute[d] his Ministry to all those superstitious and idolatrous Innovations of the Prelates' during the 1630s. In response, Thomas Edwards claimed that it was in fact 'the great Sectaries themselves' who had been the 'great Innovators and forward Episcopall men, the Innovators of Altars, bowing at the name of Jesus, reading the book of Sports, [and] causing the people to come and kneel at the Rail'.[71] Similarly, when John Gauden entered into print in 1660 to declare that Presbyterians had been released from their obligation to uphold the Solemn League and Covenant, he was quickly reminded by Zachary Crofton that he himself had taken the Covenant in the 1640s. Gauden's pre-Restoration career had done little to endear him to the Restoration Church hierarchy either, and Gilbert Sheldon, who opposed Gauden's promotion to the bishopric of Worcester, would surely have recognised Crofton's description of that 'inconstant, uncertain, ambiguous, obscure, and luke-warm Bishop Gauden'.[72]

Elected master of Balliol College, Oxford, in 1672, Thomas Good had been ejected from his Shrewsbury living during the Civil Wars, but managed to find another in Shropshire and minister quietly there during the 1650s. Although, or perhaps because, Good was a moderate

70. Edward Pearse, *The Conformist's Fourth Plea for the Nonconformists* (London, 1683), pp. 109–10.

71. Henry Burton, *Truth, Still Truth* (London, 1646), p. 7; Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena* (London, 1646), p. 75.

72. Zachary Crofton, *Berith Anti-Baal* (London, 1661), 'To the Reader'; John Gauden, *Anti Baal-Berith* (London, 1661), p. 275; Beddard, 'Reward for Services Rendered'.

Anglican, his *Dubitantius and Firmianus* (1674), in which he claimed that all nonconformists without exception 'had their hands stain'd with that Royal blood', infuriated Richard Baxter.[73] Baxter subsequently revealed that, during the 1650s:

> this Dr. Good was one of the most peaceable, moderate and honest Conformists of my acquaintance; and subscribed our Worcestershire Agreement (published) for Concord; and joyned with us in our Association and Meetings at Kidderminster, and was the man that drew up the Catalogue of Questions for our Disputations at those Meetings; and never then talkt to us of what he here writeth.[74]

It was true, acknowledged Baxter, now addressing Good directly, that many Presbyterians 'were not ejected but enjoyed their places; And did not you as well as they?'[75]

III

So far, I have tried to show the ways in which episcopalians either deliberately suppressed or distorted evidence of Interregnum conformity under the new political and ecclesiastical conditions of the Restoration. However, it is a central contention of this article that by no means all conformists were eager to bury their recent past. Some chose to present their conduct in the 1650s as an expression, rather than a betrayal, of their loyalist allegiances. This is made clear by looking in more detail at the Restoration biographies of those Anglican clergymen who had continued to minister in parish churches between 1646 and 1660. While the preceding sections have established why narratives of loyalty were so important, this one shows that loyalty was itself an unstable, contested concept that people could lay claim to in very different ways.

Both the clerical biography and the funeral sermon were becoming increasingly established genres by the late seventeenth century.[76] Perhaps the most famous instances of this trend are the voluminous collections of godly lives published by the Presbyterian minister Samuel Clarke between 1651 and his death in 1683.[77] But while contemporary biographies have proved indispensable sources of information about the seventeenth-century clergy, they tended to adhere closely to a set of generic conventions and were in many respects extremely formulaic.[78]

73. Thomas Good, *Firmianus and Dubitantius* (Oxford, 1674), pp. 160–61.

74. Richard Baxter, *An Apology for the Nonconformists Ministry* (London, 1681), p. 146.

75. Ibid., p. 145.

76. G. Reedy, *Robert South, 1634–1716: An Introduction to his Life and Sermons* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 11; J. Martin, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography* (Oxford, 2011), p. 24.

77. See P. Lake, 'Reading Clarke's *Lives* in Political and Polemical Context', in K. Sharpe and S. Zwicker, eds, *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 293–318.

78. A. Pritchard, *English Biography in the Seventeenth Century: A Critical Survey* (Toronto, ON, 2005), pp. 53–77.

More importantly, it needs to be remembered that both biographies and funeral sermons were intended, first and foremost, to be *exemplary*, to provide a model of the virtuous, pious life that readers or auditors would be inspired to emulate.[79] 'St. Paul', explained Thomas Plume in the foreword to his 1675 account of John Hackett's life, had 'given us a Precept, to remember our Governors, or Guides in the Christian Faith, holy Bishops and Martyrs after their death'.[80] There was also an obvious polemical dimension to clerical biography, with both Anglicans and nonconformists keen to publicise the holy lives of those who had adhered to their own religious tradition. As a result, the clerical subjects of these different biographical narratives come across as uniformly—almost tediously—saint-like. If faults or shortcomings are ever acknowledged, it is only as part of a staple conversion narrative that sees the cleric, like Saint Augustine, overcome his youthful folly and embark on a new life of outstanding piety. These hagiographic conventions meant that apparent instances of pragmatism or inconsistency, let alone material self-interest, were unlikely to figure prominently. As Robert South's early eighteenth-century biographer put it, 'it would be an act of the highest Injustice, not to set [the deceased] in their fairest Light'.[81]

It is particularly interesting, then, to observe how the biographers of those episcopalians who had to a greater or lesser extent conformed during the Interregnum handled this potentially awkward episode in their subject's career. It would have been possible to offer an explanation in terms of a duty to continue discharging the clerical vocation that God had set out for the minister, the waxing and waning of earthly regimes notwithstanding. Certainly, this was how some clergymen at the time had construed their actions. Writing shortly before the Regicide, Thomas Warmestry declared that 'I shall alwaies hold it my duty to be exercised in that worke, and so much my duty, that I shall take no humane prohibitions to bee my discharge, though Kings, or Parliaments, or both joyne together therein'.[82] Likewise, in response to criticism from Peter Heylyn in the late 1650s, Thomas Fuller defended his Interregnum career with reference to the Parable of the Talents.[83]

Post-Restoration biographers of episcopalian clerics, however, tended to frame Interregnum ministry in much more partisan terms. This presentation was predicated on a practical conception of loyalty, which placed emphasis on ends rather than means. That there were different approaches to the question of how best to practise loyalty in the 1640s and beyond is seen in the debates over compounding that

79. See, for example, Thomas Plume, *An Account of the Life and Death of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Hacket*, ed. Edward Mackenzie Walcott (London, 1865), p. 5.

80. Ibid., p. 1.

81. Robert South, *Posthumous Works of the Late Robert South* (London, 1717), p. 1.

82. Thomas Warmstry, *Suspiria Ecclesiae et Reipublicae Anglicanae* (London, 1648), p. 185.

83. Thomas Fuller, *The Appeal of Iniured Innocence* (London, 1659), p. 13.

raged in royalist circles after the establishment of the English Republic. For some, such as Edward Hyde, it was never permissible for royalists to compound in order to save their estates. Hyde warned that the king should not expect 'future activity or assistance from those who by their very compounding have soe much changed their condicon, that they cannot with the same hazard bee honest againe as other men'.[84] Hyde was here responding to another school of thought: that the important thing was for royalists to retain their wealth, even if this meant compounding, so that it could be put towards the king's cause later and would not simply fall into the hands of the new regime. This argument was invoked by the cleric Thomas Washbourne while agonising over whether to take the Engagement in 1650. If removed from his living, he would be 'made utterly unable, in a civil capacity, to serve the rightful Prince, if he should come in place to demand my assistance'. As Washbourne noted, Charles II himself had that year 'given leave to his subjects rather to subscribe than suffer the loss of their estates', so that they could 'preserve themselves for the King's service'.[85]

A similar rationale was invoked in Restoration clerical biographies when discussing Interregnum conformity, with writers insisting that their subjects had been motivated by a determination to achieve some greater, longer-term good for king or Church. They stressed that parish ministry had offered opportunities to remedy the most unhappy effects of the English Revolution: through persuasion and education, active clergy had been able to bring the errant laity to acknowledge once again the need for the political and religious institutions that had pertained prior to 1642. There is a parallel to be drawn here with the defences of conformity that moderate Puritans, such as William Bedell and Samuel Ward, had made in the early seventeenth century. As Margo Todd has shown, in choosing reluctantly to conform, these churchmen were following 'a single guiding principle – the evangelical mandate to preach the gospel whatever the cost'. They believed that by abstaining from the kinds of disobedience that might cost them their pulpits, they could focus their energies on combatting the insidious creep of popery, while continuing to agitate for further reform of the Church from within.[86] Meanwhile, when Samuel Clarke came to record the lives of early Stuart churchmen whose careers did not quite fit the preferred mould of heroic nonconformity, he was careful to place additional emphasis on their achievements in defending orthodoxy and advancing the godly cause. Barnaby Potter, for instance, may have taken up a bishopric in 1629 but in this capacity he proved both 'a constant preacher'

84. Bodl., MS Clarendon 29, fo. 61r.

85. *The Works of Robert Sanderson*, ed. William Jacobson (6 vols, Oxford, 1854), vi, p. 19; Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. N. Malcolm (3 vols, Oxford, 2014), i, p. 76.

86. M. Todd, '"An Act of Discretion": Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons', *Albion*, xviii (1986), pp. 581–99, at 583–4. See also Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, pp. 47–8.

who personally 'inveighed against the corruptions that were crept into the Church' and 'a great favourer of zealous Professors, and Lecturers'.[87] Indeed, given the diligence with which episcopalian clerics studied the printed works of their opponents, conformists were doubtless very conscious that they were in an analogous situation, and employing similar arguments, to moderate Puritans.[88]

Having proceeded Master of Arts from Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1651, Simon Patrick underwent examination by the Triers for the vicarage of St Mary's, Battersea, in 1658. In his early eighteenth-century autobiography, Patrick, the Restoration bishop of Ely, defended this apparent act of collaboration on the grounds that the Triers had 'asked me no hard questions'.[89] He also admitted that he had not read the Book of Common Prayer to his congregation at Battersea until it was officially permitted by Charles II. However, he explained that he had thought it 'most prudent to prepare my people for it, by preaching about forms of prayer, the lawfulness and usefulness of them'. Indeed, these sermons met with such 'good success and satisfaction' that when Patrick eventually did 'read the Common Prayer publicly in the church … I do not remember that any abstained from joining in it'.[90] Patrick believed he had won over the hearts and minds of the laity through diligent pastoral ministry *within* the Interregnum Church, and thereby laid the groundwork for a seamless transition to the Restoration religious order at parish level.

Joseph Glanville was likewise convinced that his own experiences of conformity in the Interregnum had ultimately worked to the benefit of the Anglican cause after the Restoration. Glanville studied at Lincoln College, Oxford, in the mid 1650s and after graduating Master of Arts in 1658 became chaplain to Francis Rous, the provost of Eton College. Rous had been a parliamentarian and Presbyterian during the Civil Wars and proved a loyal supporter of Oliver Cromwell throughout the Protectorate.[91] Glanville later claimed that, having been exposed to 'the Sects' in this way, he and his fellow Interregnum conformists were better able to understand 'the Genius, Humour, and Principles of the Parties, which, those that stood always at distance from them, could not so thorowly and inwardly know'. This gave episcopalian conformists such as Glanville the 'great advantage for providing, and applying the Remedies, and Confutations that were proper and effectual'. Furthermore, far from making them sympathetic to Puritans, these experiences had actually 'setled in their Minds a dislike of those

87. Samuel Clarke, *A General Martyrologie* (1677), p. 156.

88. On episcopalians responding to and learning from Puritan publications, see W. White, *The Lord's Battle: Preaching, Print and Royalism during the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2023), chs 1, 2 and 8; G. Tapsell, 'Pastors, Preachers and Politicians: The Clergy of the Later Stuart Church', in id., ed., *The Later Stuart Church, 1660–1714* (Manchester, 2012), pp. 71–100, at 74.

89. *Works of Simon Patrick*, ed. Taylor, ix, p. 428.

90. Ibid., p. 433.

91. J.S. McGee, 'A "Carkass" of "Mere Dead Paper": The Polemical Career of Francis Rous, Puritan MP', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxxii (2009), pp. 347–71, at 350–51.

ways, that was greater and juster than the Antipathy of some others who saw only their out-sides'.[92] It was those, agreed Patrick, who 'accommodate[ed] themselves to the people' that were 'most likely to win upon the minds of dissenters … bring them over to the Church, and prevent her becoming a society of Shepherds without any Sheep'.[93]

These Restoration clerics also pointed out that their Interregnum positions had given them a public platform from which to criticise the new status quo. Glanville claimed that those at the Cromwellian universities during the 1650s had, when given the opportunity to preach, 'much serv'd the Interest of the Church of Bensalem, by undermining the Ataxites, (so the Sectaries are here call'd) and propagating the Anti-fanatical Doctrines, which they had entertain'd and improved'.[94] Similarly, recalling in his autobiography how in 1657 he had been 'appointed before I left Cambridge to preach a fast sermon at St. Mary's', Patrick claimed that he

> was so stirred against the hypocrisy of the faction, who had lately decimated those loyal persons who were admitted before to compound for their delinquency (as they called it) that I made a vehement discourse against the hypocrisy of fasting and prayer, when we continue to be unjust, and oppress our neighbours.[95]

Patrick and Glanville were both young men in the 1650s and have been included among the ranks of those 'Latitudinarian' churchmen who were willing to tolerate a broad spectrum of theological opinion within the Church of England.[96] However, many of those episcopalians who had received their education before the Civil Wars and had actively sided with Charles I in the 1640s were similarly bullish about the achievements of their Interregnum ministry after the Restoration. Originally 'insnared with the fair pretences of the presbyterian party', Nathaniel Hardy later claimed to have been converted to both episcopalianism and royalism by Henry Hammond at Uxbridge in 1645, delivering a sermon of recantation upon his return to London.[97] Despite this about-turn in his allegiances, he remained the permanent minister at St Dionis Backchurch until 1660, and could be heard preaching set-piece sermons from a number of pulpits around the city throughout the 1650s.[98] After Charles II's return he was appointed

92. Joseph Glanville, *Essays on Several Important Subjects in Philosophy and Religion* (London, 1676), p. 16.

93. S.P., *A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitude-Men* (London, 1662), p. 12.

94. Glanville, *Essays*, p. 16.

95. *Works of Simon Patrick*, ed. Taylor, ix, p. 431.

96. J. Spurr, '"Latitudinarianism" and the Restoration Church', *Historical Journal*, xxxi (1988), pp. 61–82.

97. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, iii, p. 896; Meggot, *A Sermon Preached*, p. 24.

98. See, for example, Nathaniel Hardy, *Divinity in Mortality … a Sermon Preached at the Funerals of Mr Richard Goddard Late Minister of the Parish of St Gregories by Pauls* (London, 1653); id., *A Divine Prospective … In a Funerall Sermon Preached at Katharine Creechurch* (London, 1649).

first a royal chaplain-in-ordinary and then dean of Rochester. To some Restoration Anglicans, Hardy's ministry in the 1650s would always be a black mark against his name and precluded unqualified commendation after his death. While acknowledging that 'even in the worst of times', Hardy had 'attested his loyalty to the king, and conformity to church', Anthony Wood felt compelled to add the caveat: 'but this must be known, that in all, or most of, the times of usurpation he was a minister of S. Dionyse Back-Church in London, and tho' frequented by some loyalists, yet by more presbyterians'.[99] To Wood, it was lamentable not only that Hardy had kept hold of a living after the Civil Wars but also that his congregation had included non-loyalists.

When Hardy died in 1670, Richard Meggot was appointed to give his funeral sermon at St Martin-in-the-Fields. Meggot's own career mirrored that of Hardy in many respects. He had been personally appointed to two Sussex livings by Oliver Cromwell in the mid 1650s, occasionally travelling to London to preach at Hardy's church, but after the Restoration was made a royal chaplain and proved 'a staunch defender of the Anglican church' during the political turbulence of the 1680s.[100] His sermon at Hardy's funeral can therefore be read as an exercise in self-justification, as well as eulogy. Meggot could not entirely avoid the subject of Hardy's early Presbyterianism: instead, he opted to blame it on youthful naivety and the deceptive proselytising techniques employed by Puritans. He also insisted that 'it were both Unchristian and disingenuous for any to reproach his Memory with this, when every one knoweth he made such early and sincere amends for it'.[101] According to Meggot, it was Henry Hammond, 'that hammer of all innovation Ecclesiastical and Civill', who had been entirely responsible for Hardy's Damascene conversion to loyalism: 'to his Solid Arguments, and Awful Advices, I have heard our deceased Brother say, he owed his first awakenings and reducing'.[102] As well as linking Hardy to a prominent figure of impeccably Anglican and royalist credentials, this story helped to demonstrate that the former's transition to loyalism had been principled and permanent, rather than pragmatic.

More importantly, Meggot was quick to claim that, far from casting doubt on the authenticity of his commitment to the loyalist cause, Hardy's Interregnum ministry was actually the clearest manifestation of it. By continuing to preach and officiate in those dark times, Hardy had ensured that dispirited adherents of the king and the Church of England remained steadfast in their allegiances, thereby keeping the flame of loyalism alight. 'He shewed that he was converted himself',

99. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, iii, p. 896.

100. E. Vallance, 'Meggott [Meggot], Richard', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. See also Richard Meggot, *The New-Cured Criple's Caveat, or, England's Duty for the Miraculous Mercy of the King's and Kingdomes Restauration* (London, 1662).

101. Meggot, *A Sermon Preached*, p. 23.

102. Ibid., p. 24.

observed Meggot, 'by improving all Opportunities for the strengthening of his Brethren'. According to Meggot, Hardy had provided an oasis of spiritual sustenance to the 'orthodox' laity in a city otherwise overrun by ranting, schismatic, heretical preachers: 'when the generality of the Pulpits there, powred out little but Noyse or angry Nonsense, War or Enthusiastick Humour, His was a well of Water, where many an honest Jacob drank, himself, and his Children and his Servants, and were refreshed; Some being undeceived, and many confirmed by him'.[103]

All this, moreover, took great 'Courage and Faithfulness'. In a possible sideswipe at those who had conducted Prayer Book services only in the safety of their patron's houses, Meggot noted that Hardy had proclaimed his opposition to 'the Murther of our Late Soveraign' 'not only in Private but in Publick'. 'I need not insist upon these Things', he continued, since 'they were not done in a Corner, but in the Heart of Englands chiefest City'.[104] When petitioning the king in 1660 for a prebend at Westminster, Hardy himself had depicted his Interregnum ministry in precisely the same way: it had been about 'endeavour[ing] both publiquely and privately to sowe the Interest of y[ou]r Ma[jes]tie & the church w[i]th ye hazard of [my] life liberty & estate'.[105]

Nonetheless, Hardy was clearly a controversial figure at his death, particularly for the Presbyterians he had abandoned in the mid 1640s, and his posthumous legacy remained subject to fierce contestation. Meggot felt compelled to defend some of the claims he had made in the funeral sermon in a foreword to the printed edition. Acknowledging that there were 'some who are very industrious to represent Him very differently', he asked these 'most Venomous Enemies, whether any thing I did say was false?'[106] It appears that critics had continued to charge Hardy with insincerity and time-serving, refusing to accept Meggot's account of an authentic, principled rejection of Presbyterianism occasioned by conversations with Hammond. Now Meggot shot back:

> That Passage concerning his Conference with Doctor Hammond, which some I hear have much questioned, I had from his own Mouth: as to that Objection against it, that he Preached before the Lords that sat at Westminster afterwards, if the Design of that Sermon, and the Temper of those Times, be well considered of, it is rather an Argument to confirm it.[107]

This passage gets to the crux of disagreements over how the Interregnum ministry of episcopalians was to be interpreted after the Restoration. For Anthony Wood, the mere fact of Presbyterians having been among Hardy's congregation was a sign of apostasy, on the assumption that hearers in these decades could only have tolerated a minister who was

103. Ibid., p. 25.
104. Ibid., p. 24.
105. TNA, SP 29/33, fo. 120.
106. Meggot, *A Sermon Preached*, 'To the nobility … of St. Martins in the Fields'.
107. Ibid.

to some extent preaching to their sensibilities. For Hardy and Meggot, by contrast, preaching to the non-episcopalian laity offered a chance to persuade—to 'undeceive'. Hence Meggot's insistence that, if careful attention had been paid to what Hardy actually *said* when addressing the Lords at Westminster in 1645 or his congregation at St Dionis Backchurch in the 1650s, nobody would have doubted the sincerity of his commitment to the king and the Church of England.

An emphasis on the positive accomplishments of those episcopalians who had continued to discharge their vocation publicly throughout the late troubles is found in other posthumous accounts. Having been sequestered from his living and ejected from his Oxford fellowship in 1648, George Wild, the Restoration bishop of Derry, continued to officiate wherever he could, both in London and in the countryside.[108] At Wild's funeral in 1665, Robert Mossom (who himself had ministered at St Peter, Paul's Wharf during the Interregnum) praised the deceased for having striven 'to promote Piety, and perswade Loyalty' through his public ministry. Far from being a careerist or timeserver, Wild was 'the Shepherd which kept this Flock, even in the midst of Wolves; that Priest that then served at the Altar, amidst all the variety of State Confusions'. Moreover, he never departed from 'his Principles, of being actively zealous, and patiently resolute in the Kings Cause, and in the Churches Service', always continuing to hope that Charles II would be 'restored to His Throne ... [with] both Churches and Kingdoms'.[109] According to Mossom, therefore, Wild's episcopalianism and his loyalty to the Stuarts had been both unfaltering and mutually reinforcing throughout the revolutionary decades.

John Hacket had managed to keep hold of his living at Cheam, Surrey, in the 1650s partly because he was willing to comply with the ban on using the Prayer Book. Nonetheless, his biographer Thomas Plume insisted that Hackett had done 'much good in the Countrey, by keeping many Gentlemen firm to the Protestant Religion'.[110] Meanwhile, in his early eighteenth-century life of George Bull, the late bishop of St David's, Robert Nelson vigorously denied that the 'Prospect of Riches and Grandeur' had in any way influenced Bull's decision to find a living in the Interregnum Church. He had in fact been moved to enter into 'the service of the Church when the Arguments from Flesh and Blood were least inviting', in order to counteract the insidious effects of Puritan rule: 'he gained very much upon the Affections of his Parishioners, and was very instrumental in preserving some and *reclaiming* others, from those pernicious Errors which then were common among them'.[111] Nelson, who had himself refused to swear the Oath of Allegiance to William III

108. Robert Mossom, *A Narrative Panegyrical of the Life … of George … Lord Bishop of Derry* (London, 1666), p. 6; BL, Additional MS 78364, fo. 34v.

109. Mossom, *A Narrative*, pp. 5–9.

110. Plume, *An Account*, p. 70.

111. Nelson, *Life*, pp. 28, 29–30 (my emphasis).

after the Glorious Revolution, depicted his subject as similarly steadfast in his loyalty to the Stuarts: Bull's possession of a living in the 1650s in no way detracted from his determination 'to be constant in his Duty towards the Church and the King'.[112]

Finally, in an especially revealing extract written in 1660, Matthew Griffith explained why he had chosen to re-enter active ministry in the 1650s, after his initial sequestration the previous decade. The nation, he explained, had 'begun to gangrene' without the sequestered clergy:

> And when some of us became sensible thereof, we took the confidence (being partly embolden'd by the connivance of the higher Powers that then were) to fall on the exercise of our Ministerial Function again, in such poor Parishes, as would admit us. Then I saw that it was high time … to prescribe strong purgative medicines in the Pulpit … fit and necessary to help carry away, and by degrees, the incredible confluence of ill humours and all such malignant matter as offended.[113]

IV

This article has explored the contrasting ways in which episcopalian conformity in the late 1640s and 1650s was interpreted and represented after the Restoration. Once the possibility of restoring the pre-Civil War ecclesiastical order became increasingly conceivable in 1660, both polemic and personal ambition dictated that martyrological narratives, rehearsing the unprecedented suffering and distress inflicted on the Church of England's loyal sons over the preceding two decades, were brought to the fore. Stories of episcopalian compromise and collaboration, by contrast, had little value in this context, other than for dissenters, who were some of the first to present a more nuanced history of episcopalianism between regicide and restoration.

This interpretation of the Church of England during the revolutionary period would remain an integral part of Anglican identity for hundreds of years, long after the publication of John Walker's *Attempt*. Hence, in his mid nineteenth-century biography of John Pearson, the canon of York Edward Churton was eager to dispel the notion that Pearson—who by his own admission often preached around London in the 1650s—had 'complied in any way with the times'.[114] Churton pointed out by way of mitigation that Pearson had only been a lecturer at St Clement's and not held a living. The point here is not whether this should preclude Pearson from the charge of collaboration but the fact that an Anglican clergyman in Victorian England found it so important to preserve the 'purity' of his mid seventeenth-century predecessor's

112. Ibid., p. 36.

113. Griffith, *Fear of God*, sig. A3r.

114. *The Minor Theological Works of John Pearson*, ed. Edward Churton (2 vols, Oxford, 1844), i, p. xxx.

reputation. Meanwhile, a poem eulogising Henry Hammond by John Keble, one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement, epitomises the veneration of the ascetic, passive Anglican in quiet country retreat. The poet invites 'meek, pastoral, quiet souls, whoe'er you may be' to 'come take your rest … by Holy Hammond's side'.[115]

But this emphasis on martyrdom, ejection and exile has obscured the extent to which prominent episcopalian conformists were subsequently prepared to defend their Interregnum careers, presenting their ministries in these years as evidence of steadfast commitment to both the Church of England and the king. By staying within the Church, ministers had acted as a bulwark against heresy and error, the last bastions of 'true Protestantism', and thereby worked to protect and to 'undeceive' the distracted laity—(re)shaping attitudes towards liturgy, episcopacy and even monarchy. Such arguments, it has been shown, echoed the legitimations of moderate Puritanism that were advanced both prior to the Civil Wars and in later hagiographies. This reminds us that while polemicists were only too happy to lambast their religious opponents for timeserving, there were also opportunities for Puritans, episcopalians and Catholics to learn from each other, as they took turns inhabiting the role of persecuted minority over the course of the seventeenth century.[116]

The proselytising aspects of Interregnum conformity remained particularly relevant after 1660, given the growing conviction within Restoration Anglicanism about the importance of pastoral mission in relation to dissenters. As both Mark Goldie and William Bulman have shown, Anglican clergy after 1662 were conscious that the Church of England could not rely solely, or even primarily, on coercion if they were to bring dissenters back within the fold. There was an additional need to bring them 'conscientiously to believe in the orthodox truths of the Church of England', which meant dwelling 'less upon the desirability of order and decency in public worship, and more upon the nature of persuasion and conviction'.[117] Engaging with and winning over those in error, rather than shunning and punishing them, was now the order of the day. Indeed, memories of the Civil Wars and Interregnum, argues Bulman, gave these Anglican clergymen 'strong convictions about how the media of the pastorate—preaching, catechesis, and public disputation—might help them reinvent and defend the church'.[118] Accounts of Interregnum conformists who had won back the

115. John Keble, *Miscellaneous Poems* (2nd edn, Oxford, 1869), p. 216.

116. See also White, *Lord's Battle*, ch. 6.

117. M. Goldie, 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England', in O.P. Grell, J.I. Israel and N. Tyacke, eds, *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 331–68, at 331–4.

118. W. Bulman, *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and its Empire, 1648–1715* (Cambridge, 2015), p. 150.

errant laity could in this respect offer a didactic model of pastoral conduct for their Restoration successors.

Nor, crucially, were these claims about the proselytising achievements of conformists simply *post facto* rationalisations proffered in posthumous hagiographies for actions that had, in reality, been motivated by self-interest. In 1652, Robert Sanderson, the Restoration bishop of Lincoln, had explained his reasons for complying with official injunctions against use of the Book of Common Prayer. He was not, he declared, prepared to deliver

> over the sheep of Christ, that lately were under the hands of faithful shepherds, into the custody of ravening wolves, when such guides shall be set over the several Congregations as will be sure to misteach them one way or other, *viz*. by instilling into them Puritanical and Superstitious Principles, that they may the more securely exercise their Presbyterian tyranny over their judgements, consciences, persons, and estates; or else, by setting up new lights before them, to lead them into a maze of Anabaptistical confusion and frenzy.[119]

Here, then, was a different response to the dilemmas of loyalty that the traumatic experiences of the late 1640s had thrown up, and the question—particular to the episcopalian clergy—of how loyalty and pastoral mission might intersect. This was a debate about the relative importance of ends and means, in which both sides could claim scriptural warrant. From exile in Paris in 1651, John Cosin pointed to Romans 3:8 and St Paul's condemnation of those who were prepared to say 'let us do evil, that good may come'.[120] Cosin's targets were those who compounded, took the Engagement or advocated a Scottish alliance, all of which were defended by sections of the king's supporters on the grounds that they would better advance the royalist cause in the long run. But his words could just as easily have been applied to a clergyman like Sanderson, who complied with the ban on Prayer Book use in the hope of safeguarding his flock. On the other hand, 'when horrid impieties are reigning', asked Nathaniel Hardy from a London pulpit in 1653, 'who but an Ezekiel should warn the people? And when heresies are raging, who but a John should defend the truth?'[121]

University of Hertfordshire, UK WILLIAM WHITE

119. *Works of Robert Sanderson*, ed. Jacobson, v, p. 47–8. For the context, see ibid., p. 37n.
120. *The Works of… John Cosin*, ed. J. Samson (5 vols, Oxford, 1843–55), i, p. 245.
121. Nathaniel Hardy, *Divinity in Mortality* (London, 1653), p. 1.