THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

AUTHORITY'S ADVOCATE: SAMUEL PARKER, RELIGION, AND POLITICS IN RESTORATION ENGLAND

By

JASON JEWELL

A Dissertation submitted to the
Program in the Humanities
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Fall Semester, 2004

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Jason Jewell defended on August 4, 2004.

_____
Paul Strait
Professor Directing Dissertation

_____
Jeffrey Kite-Powell
Outside Committee Member

_____
Leon Golden
Committee Member

_____
David Darst
Committee Member

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

To Vickie and Edward,
without whose love and support this
project would never have been completed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The assistance of many individuals has been essential to the completion of this manuscript. Professor Richard Greaves first suggested Parker to me as a possible topic, and his guidance throughout this project has been indispensable. His passing away, which occurred just days after the manuscript was completed, was a tremendous blow. I must also thank the rest of my dissertation committee at Florida State University: Professor Paul Strait, Professor Leon Golden, Professor David Darst, and Professor Jeffrey Kite-Powell.

In the United Kingdom, I received valuable help from archivists at the Bodleian Library in Oxford, the Canterbury Cathedral Archives, and Lambeth Palace, the Dr. Williams's Library, and the British Library in London. My research in the United Kingdom was made possible by FSU's History department's appointing me to teach at the university's study abroad program in London in the Spring 2001 term, and also by a dissertation research grant from FSU's Office of Graduate Studies.

Stateside, the staff of FSU's Strozier Library, particularly in the Special Collections area, was extremely helpful. My parents, Drs. Fred and Alice Jewell, of Searcy, AR, supplied a great deal of encouragement and some financial assistance during the writing stage, as well as help with proofreading; Alice also spent many hours translating Latin passages from Parker's works for my benefit.

Much of the credit for this manuscript belongs to the above individuals. Any errors within are my own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations vi
Abstract ix

INTRODUCTION 1

1. A LIFE OF CONTROVERSY 3

2. GRACE UNDER PRESSURE: THE TOLERATION CONTROVERSY I 36

3. WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?: THE TOLERATION CONTROVERSY II 77

4. ANGLICAN APOLOGETIC: HISTORY AS POLEMIC I 117

5. ABSOLUTISM AND PASSIVE OBEDIENCE: HISTORY AS POLEMIC II 154

6. BISHOP PARKER 197

EPILOGUE 225

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 228

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 241

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABAC	*Act Books of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, Lambeth Palace, London
AGCC	Samuel Parker, *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the First Six Hundred Years* (London: 1683)
ANEDDG	Samuel Parker, *An Account of the Nature and Extent of the Divine Dominion & Goodnesse* (Oxford: 1666)
ANF	Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325*, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1950-1953)
Arber	Edward Arber, ed., *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709 A.D.*, 3 vols. (London: Professor Edward Arber, 1903)
Ashcraft	Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986)
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BDBR	Richard Greaves and Robert Zaller, eds., *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982-)
Burnet	Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Times*, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833)
CCA	Canterbury Cathedral Archives
CCE	Samuel Parker, *The Case of the Church of England* (London: 1681)
Cherry	Cherry Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford
CSPD	*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1603-1714*

DCEP	Samuel Parker, *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*. (London: 1671)
DDALN	Samuel Parker, *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion in Two Parts* (London: 1681)
DDPD	Samuel Parker, *Disputationes de Deo et Providentia Divina* (London: 1678)
DEP	Samuel Parker, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* (London: 1670)
DKJ	Samuel Parker, *A Discourse Sent to the Late King James* (London: 1690)
DNB	Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, eds., *Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1949-1950)
DVBB	Samuel Parker, *A Discourse in Vindication of Bp Bramhall and the Clergy of the Church of England* (London: 1673)
FICPP	Samuel Parker, *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie*. (Oxford: 1666)
Hasted	*The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 12 vols. (Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1797-1801 [1972])
HHOT	Samuel Parker, *History of His Own Times* (London: 1727)
HMC	*Historical Manuscripts Commission, Reports*
Lambeth	Lambeth Palace, London
Marvell	Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd and The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, ed. D. I. B. Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)
Morrice	Roger Morrice, "Ent'ring Book, Being an Historical Register of Occurrences From April, Anno 1677 to April 1691," Dr. Williams's Library, London
NPNF	Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series*, 14 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954-1956)
Owen	John Owen, *The Works of John Owen*, 16 vols., ed. William H. Goold (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1850-1853 [1965-1968])
Parkin	Jonathan Parkin, *Science, Religion and Politics in Restoration England: Richard Cumberland's De Legibus Naturae* (Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 1999)

Preface	Samuel Parker, Preface to John Bramhall, *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy, from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery* (London: 1672)
RAT	Samuel Parker, *Reasons for Abrogating the Test Imposed Upon All Members of Parliament* (London: 1688)
Rawlinson	Rawlinson Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford
RL	Samuel Parker, *Religion and Loyalty* (London: 1684)
RLII	Samuel Parker, *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part* (London: 1685)
RRT	Samuel Parker, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transprosed* (London: 1673)
Tanner	Tanner Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford
Toon	Peter Toon, *God's Statesman: The Life and Work of John Owen* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1971)
TPTD	Samuel Parker, *Tentamina Physico-Theologica de Deo* (London: 1665)
VCH	William Page, ed., *The Victoria History of the County of Kent*, 3 vols. (London: Constable, 1908-)
Wood	Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 4 vols. (London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1967)
Wood MSS	Wood Papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford

ABSTRACT

Samuel Parker (1640-1688) was one of Restoration England's most significant religious controversialists, the writer of numerous pamphlets and books dealing with subjects on which learned opinion was completely polarized. His works attracted both praise and condemnation from many of England's most prominent figures, and there is little doubt that he helped frame the terms of debate on several religious issues. At the peak of his career, just before his death, he was both bishop of Oxford and president of Magdalen College, Oxford; his appointment to the latter post by King James II occasioned one of the most important episodes in the struggle between that monarch and the Church of England. Parker died about nine months prior to his royal patron's overthrow in the Revolution of 1688.

This dissertation offers an interpretation of the career and writings of Samuel Parker. It concludes that Parker placed the concept of legitimate authority at the center of his political and social philosophy. Parker's concern was rooted in the desire, so prevalent among elites in the early modern period and particularly in Britain after the Interregnum, for a practical policy of ensuring social stability. Over a period of nearly twenty years, he developed a well-thought-out yet almost deceptively simple theoretical model of authority based on scripture, natural law, and historical precedent. This dissertation provides a detailed analysis of that model as found in Parker's writings. It also treats subordinate themes in Parker's works, such as the moralist concept of grace and the use of history as a polemical tool. In so doing, it offers a corrective to contemporary scholarship which frequently views Parker as a superficial thinker and timeserver in the Church of England.

INTRODUCTION

Samuel Parker (1640-1688) was one of Restoration England's most significant religious controversialists, the writer of numerous pamphlets and books dealing with subjects on which learned opinion was completely polarized. His works attracted both praise and condemnation from many of England's most prominent figures, and there is little doubt that he helped frame the terms of debate on several religious issues. At the peak of his career, just before his death, he was both bishop of Oxford and president of Magdalen College, Oxford; his appointment to the latter post by King James II occasioned one of the most important episodes in the struggle between that monarch and the Church of England. Parker died about nine months prior to his royal patron's overthrow in the Revolution of 1688.

This work was originally conceived as a critical biography of Parker. However, my archival research in England in the spring of 2001 revealed the insufficiency of extant sources from which to construct such an account. Parker left behind no collection of papers; his relatively few surviving letters are scattered throughout various manuscript collections. Moreover, relatively few records have survived relating either to his early years or to his activities as an administrator in the Canterbury diocese, where he spent most of his adult life. Most of my research into Parker's career and private life has been incorporated into Chapters One and Six; it paints a picture of a man who is more complex than his critics down the centuries would have us believe.

The lack of biographical sources necessitated a shift in focus to Parker's published works, which total many thousand pages. Although I began with the notion of treating each book in detail, I eventually decided to eschew detailed analysis of the predominantly philosophical works, which number nearly half a dozen. Thorough discussion and contextualization of these writings could potentially constitute a book in itself; in the following pages, therefore, I limit my references to them to situations where they shed additional light on Parker's political, religious, and historical works, which are what drew me to Parker in the first place and which have become my focus here.

The issue of *legitimate authority*–what constitutes it, how it should be exercised, and the appropriate response to it–is the overriding theme of Samuel Parker's writings. I found I could not really escape it in my discussion of any of his works, and even subordinate themes, such as grace in his writings during the toleration controversy (see Chapter Two), ended up tying into the question of authority on some level. Parker's concern was rooted in the desire, so prevalent among elites in the early modern period and particularly in Britain after the Interregnum, for a practical policy of ensuring social stability. Over a period of nearly twenty years, he developed a well-thought-out yet almost deceptively simple theoretical model of authority based on scripture, natural law, and historical precedent. This framework (which, as I show in Chapters Four and Five, was not Erastian, contrary to some recent scholarship) assigned a near-absolute prerogative

in temporal matters to the civil magistrate while reserving to the episcopal church a similar jurisdiction in spiritual affairs. The individual's conscience was to yield to these authorities *in their respective spheres* unless their commands contradicted the express dictates of scripture, and even in disobedience no active resistance could be offered when punishment threatened. This restraint would eliminate the possibility of civil unrest, always a greater potential danger in Parker's mind than that of "despotic" tyranny.

Failure to acknowledge legitimate authority marked one as a likely criminal or, worse, a rebel. Thus Parker advocated a sort of preemptive strike against Protestant nonconformists, who tended to deny the absolute power of the monarch at the same time that they refused to submit to the leadership of the Church of England. He refused to believe that they would ever move beyond the revolutionary attitudes of the 1640s and live peaceably as loyal subjects. That Parker's prescription of thorough persecution was never adopted by the Court was fortunate for Restoration-era dissenters.

One other aspect of Parker's writing that receives frequent mention hereafter was his tendency to use the past, both recent and ancient, as a rhetorical weapon against his enemies. Again, his greatest concern in exploring history was to find examples of good and bad uses of authority and responses to it on the part of subjects. Much of Chapters Three, Four, and Five is devoted to this practice.

CHAPTER ONE
A LIFE OF CONTROVERSY

Samuel Parker was born in Northampton in September 1640.[1] Northamptonshire was at that time one of the most politically and religiously agitated areas in England. Northampton had been a "Puritan hotbed" since at least 1571, when the preacher Percival Wiburn had proposed that the town model itself on Calvin's Geneva.[2] Calvinist doctrine subsequently spread among both the gentry, who were numerous in the county, and the townspeople. The area's strongly Protestant character may have been one reason for Elizabeth I's choice of Fotheringhay Castle as a prison for the Roman Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, from 1585 until the latter's execution in 1587.

This Puritan streak caused Northamptonshire to fall into royal disfavor in the reigns of James I and Charles I. Resistance to the Church of England's movement toward Arminian doctrine, especially under William Laud in the 1630s, was stubborn. Laud commented on the widespread disregard of "rubrics, order and doctrine," and singled out the church of All Saints, Northampton, for special censure after a visitation in 1633.[3] The town also resisted secular elements of Charles I's personal reign, opposing the ship money levies and refusing to contribute to the war effort against the Scots in the late 1630s. Not surprisingly, Northamptonshire's representatives in the Short Parliament and Long Parliament were strongly Puritan, and the county sided with Parliament when hostilities broke out in 1642. The populace remained Parliamentarian throughout the 1640s and witnessed several of the decade's significant events, including the confinement of Charles at Holdenby House near Northampton in 1646, a Digger-inspired movement at Wellingborough, and Leveller agitation.[4] It was in this dynamic social environment that Samuel Parker was born and reared.

Very little is known about Parker's early life, although by his own account he lived in Northampton until 1656 and received an education there.[5] Unfortunately, the source containing the most information regarding this period of Parker's life, along with his ancestry, is Andrew Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (1673), which, because of its satirical and polemic character and its reliance on hearsay, is probably not completely reliable. Marvell claimed to have had trouble researching Parker's lineage, but came to the conclusion that his grandfather had been one Martin Parker, the author of certain ballads noteworthy for their "disgrace of Religion, to the increase of all vice, and withdrawing of people from reading, studying and hearing the Word of God and other good books." So scandalous were these ballads that a petition against them was brought to Parliament by "the City of *London* and several Counties" in 1640, the year of Samuel's birth.[6]

Marvell went on to report that Parker's mother, a yeoman's daughter, had been a servant to Parker's father, John, before their marriage.[7] John was an "ill Sire" who served as a sub-committee man in Northamptonshire during the civil war, gradually gaining wealth and credit in part through the confiscation of royalists' estates. While in this capacity he participated in the sentencing of three royalist nobles: Arthur, Lord Capel; Robert, earl of Holland; and James, duke of Hamilton, all three of whom were subsequently beheaded.[8] He continued to serve as a minor official in various capacities after the establishment of the Commonwealth in 1649. A warrant dated 15 December 1654 recorded the order to pay Parker the sum of £263 19*s*. for services rendered "as Judge Assistant in the Duchy Court for the yeares 1651. 1652. and 1653. And as Judge of the Assize for ye northerne Circuit in the yeares 1652. and 1653."[9] Anthony Wood recorded that in 1655 John had been a commissioner "for the removing obstructions at Worcester House in the Strand near London," and that he had been sworn in as a serjeant-at-law on 22 June of the same year. Furthermore, he was appointed baron of the court of Exchequer by Parliament on 18 January 1659; although he lost this position before or at the Restoration, he shortly thereafter regained his post as serjeant-at-law due to the patronage of Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon.[10] After this point, John disappeared from the records.

Although information pertaining directly to young Samuel's education has not survived, one can get a fair idea of its ideological content from a pamphlet his father published in 1650, entitled *The Government of the People of England Precedent and Present the Same*. According to Marvell, John wrote this "remarkable" work to ingratiate himself with Parliament after having been petitioned against for some reason in his position as serjeant.[11] As its title implies, the tract attempted to demonstrate that England's republican government differed in no fundamental respect from the previous monarchical system. John defined government as "a power to command, or prohibit others, which command or prohibition they ought to obey, or for disobedience be punished." He then asserted that, ultimately, this power had always resided with the people. "The people are first in time, nature, and dignity; before their Magistrate, because the people make the Magistrate, and because the people can be without a Magistrate, but a Magistrate cannot bee without a peo[p]le. . . . Kings and Governours are from the people, and are appointed for the peoples sakes."[12]

John argued that although certain peoples had turned over their sovereign power to a monarch, as the Romans had done to Augustus, this had never occurred in England, which had always been ruled by law. "The power of commanding and forbidding the people of England is in the lawes onely, and none other."[13] Accordingly, any monarch wishing to impose his will on the people of England must first enshrine his will in statute, an action which required the people's consent. Parker went so far as to say that English monarchs had always been subordinate to Parliament and its lawmaking power:

> Commands and prohibitions may be altered, repealed or expounded, or other made by the people only, that is by their Representatives in Parliament. . . . And the truth is, the Kings and Queens that sent forth the Commands or Prohibitions heretofore, were but Deputies to the Lawes, to send, or as Conduit-pipes, to convey the same Commands or Prohibitions that the Lawes directed.[14]

Parker approved of the use of the words "Kingly Office" in the statute abolishing monarchy, arguing that because the monarch–as well as the House of Lords–was the servant of the law, Parliament could remove this "officer" whenever it saw fit.

Parker not only defended Parliament's actions as legitimate but also asserted that the abolition of monarchy and the House of Lords would prove beneficial to England. This was because neither of these two groups had an interest in the people's will; historically, they had obstructed that will in an effort to preserve their privileged positions, and it was therefore time for their removal. John argued that the Commons could now achieve much greater things:

> The people may now freely and fully act for the publique good without any opposition, and that is the principall end of meeting in Parliament: Neither is there any prejudice to the Lords, for what is there acted for the Publique good, must also necessarily extend to them, and they be partakers thereof as well as any others.
> Yea, if there were some prejudice to the private, yet that ought to be endured, to accommodate the Publique.[15]

Parker wrapped up his argument with the assertion that because the law still reigned supreme in England, as it had before January 1649, there was therefore no fundamental difference between the current republican government and that of Elizabeth I.[16] The former was as legitimate as the latter. Parker concluded the pamphlet with a flourish: "Behold then, O *England*, and consider thy Governours, the Lawes of this Nation, free from passion, ambition, and all other exorbitant affections, *yet willing to be reformed by your selves for your good*."[17]

We can reasonably conclude from the stridently republican tone of *The Government of the People of England* that young Samuel Parker was indoctrinated with some very radical political ideas of the 1640s. We can also count religious austerity as one of the key components of his early education; Wood described Samuel's parents as "severe puritans and schismatics" and recorded that Samuel was "puritanically educated in grammar at Northampton."[18] Beyond this, however, little is certain.

Parker left home at the age of fifteen to enter Wadham College, Oxford, enrolling there in the midsummer term.[19] According to Marvell, Parker's parents intended for him to enter the ministry, and Samuel early on distinguished himself by his outward piety. He joined a group of young students who fasted and prayed together every week, who "for their refection fed sometimes on a Broth from whence they were commonly call'd *Grewellers*: only it was observed that he [Samuel] was wont still to put more *Graves* than all threst in his Porrige."[20] Parker also paid weekly visits to the home of Elizabeth Hampton, an elderly Presbyterian laundrywoman, where he listened to sermons and took communion. Eventually, he began speaking at these meetings, and was regarded as "one of the preciousest young men in the university."[21]

If, as seems likely, Parker was indeed preparing himself for a religious career, he would have been ready to embark upon it as a Presbyterian minister when he received his bachelor's degree on 28 February 1660.[22] The restoration of Charles II would therefore have been a blow to him and his plans. Marvell wrote that he engaged in "praying,

caballing, and discoursing" in an effort to obstruct the restoration of episcopal church structure, revenues, and authority. These activities met with the disapproval of Wadham's warden, and later the same year Parker moved to Trinity College. Louis du Moulin, one of Parker's later literary antagonists, alleged that Wadham's warden had expelled Parker, but Wood denied that this was the case.[23]

Parker apparently spent the next seven years at Trinity, although in what capacity is not completely clear. His signature survives in the register of entering students, but the college has almost no other records dating from that period regarding students.[24] It was at Trinity, however, that one of the defining events of Parker's life occurred, *viz*. his decision to conform to the Church of England. Unfortunately, no account survives which explains how this change of heart occurred.

About all that can be said for certain is that Ralph Bathurst (1620-1704), a fellow and future president of Trinity, was instrumental in the process. Bathurst came from a gentry family that was strongly royalist; of his thirteen brothers, six died in the service of Charles I. He became a scholar at Trinity in 1637, a fellow in 1640, and a priest in 1644. The civil war forced him to seek other employment, and he eventually became a prominent physician in the Oxford area, being called on to treat Parliamentarian army and naval officers despite his royalist background. During the Interregnum, Bathurst acted as archdeacon to the ejected bishop of Oxford, Robert Skinner, helping the latter secretly confer holy orders. He abandoned his medical practice at the Restoration and openly resumed his clerical duties, being named chaplain to Charles II in 1663 and president of Trinity in 1664. Although he was a disciplinarian, apparently he was quite popular with students, both conformist and nonconformist.[25]

At some point in the early 1660s, Parker must have come under the influence of Bathurst, who persuaded him that his previous religious beliefs and efforts had been misguided. Parker dedicated his second book, *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophy* (1666), to Bathurst. In the dedicatory epistle, he wrote that he owed Bathurst many things, but one thing stood above all else; "For to your prevailing advice (Sir) do I owe my first Rescue from the Chains and Fetters of an unhappy Education."[26] The following lines implied that Bathurst had introduced Parker to a more rational approach to religion:

> There being no Perfection to be Valued at so high a Rate as a true Freedome and Ingenuity of Mind: *****Tis this, that distinguishes Churches from Heards. And those men that have laid aside the free and impartial use of their Reasons, are just as fit for Religion as Sheep and Oxen, for they differ only in this, that the one are Brutes without Reason, and the other Brutes with it.[27]

The conversion of Parker to a rationalist form of Christianity would go a long way toward explaining the outright hostility towards "enthusiasts" and "fanaticks" which characterized the remainder of his career. It is possible that he carried a lingering resentment towards those responsible for providing his "unhappy education" for the rest of his days. In any event, none of Parker's writings after 1666 made any reference to his Puritan background. He did maintain his relationship with Bathurst, as evidenced by his

dedication of his 1681 work, *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion*, to the latter.

If we are to take Marvell's hearsay testimony at face value, Parker's conversion was less than sincere. According to Marvell, Parker was initially denied his degree at Trinity because he refused to conform to the state church. He then traveled to London, "where he spent a considerable time in creeping into all Corners and Companies, Horoscoping up and down concerning the duration of the Government." He eventually came to the conclusion that episcopal government was there to stay, whereupon he "cast about how to be admitted into the Church of *England*, and find the Highway to her preferments."[28] This account is not corroborated by any other source, and seems suspect for obvious reasons. There is no reason to doubt that Bathurst could have had a genuine impact on young Parker, given his reputation for Anglican apologetic. It also seems likely that Bathurst, with his past experiences in dealing with people who changed religious loyalties for insincere reasons, would have been able to spot a phony conversion in Parker, which would have made a lasting friendship between them seem less likely.

Parker received a master of arts degree from Trinity on 9 July 1663.[29] As noted, he remained at Trinity in some capacity until 1667, although he may have spent a portion of his time in London. A few facts can be verified concerning this period of his life. On 4 December 1665, he was admitted into holy orders and began his career as a clergyman.[30] Because this event occurred well after Parker's conforming to the state church, it seems safe to dismiss as rumor the report by one of his later literary opponents that "at his Induction into Orders, he peremptorily refused the Ceremony of *bowing towards the Altar*."[31]

During this period, Parker began his career as a writer, producing three books between 1665 and 1667, all of which were philosophical in nature. The first was a Latin treatise of 410 octavo pages entitled *Tentamina Physico-Theologica de Deo* (1665). In this work he attempted to harmonize orthodox Christianity with the mechanistic philosophy, which was gaining increasing popularity in England at the time. Much of this effort consisted of rebutting classical authors' arguments for atheism which were based on some form of materialism. Parker dedicated *Tentamina* to both Charles II and Gilbert Sheldon, who had been named archbishop of Canterbury in 1663 on the death of William Juxon. According to Wood, it was this dedicatory epistle that attracted Sheldon's attention to Parker for the first time.[32]

Tentamina was followed in 1666 by *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie*, which expanded on a statement made in passing in *Tentamina*. Although it was dedicated to Bathurst, the book was written in the form of a letter to Nathaniel Bisbie (1635-1695), a fellow Anglican clergyman living in Suffolk. Bisbie appears to have been a kindred spirit to Parker; his published sermons "consist nearly wholly of violent invectives against the nonconformists," and, like Parker, he was a steadfast Tory during the 1680s.[33] Apparently, his request that Parker elaborate on his condemnation in *Tentamina* of Platonism as "an ungrounded and Fanatick Fancy" provided the occasion for the writing of *A Free and Impartial Censure*.[34] At 115 octavo pages, it was a much less ambitious undertaking than *Tentamina*, as was Parker's third book of this period, *An Account of the Nature and Extent of the Divine Dominion & Goodnesse* (1666), which ran to 112 octavo pages. *An Account* was also addressed to Bisbie and was another elaboration on material in *Tentamina*. In addition to defining

God's dominion and goodness, here Parker attempted to refute the Church Father Origen's hypothesis of the preexistence of souls. Parker's attack probably was a response to the employment of the preexistence idea by Henry More, a Cambridge Platonist (see below), in his *An Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness* (1664). *Tentamina*, *A Free and Impartial Censure*, and *An Account* helped establish Parker on the literary scene and in philosophical circles. The latter two works were reprinted in a single volume in 1667.

There can be little doubt that *A Free and Impartial Censure* and *An Account* were intended at least in part as an attack on the revival of Platonic philosophy that had begun in England in the mid-seventeenth century. The foremost proponents of this trend were the so-called Cambridge Platonists, a group of thinkers associated in one way or another with Cambridge University. Benjamin Whichcote (1609-1683), who taught there during the 1640s and 1650s, is considered the "godfather" of the group, but the most important of these philosophers were Henry More (1614-1687) and Ralph Cudworth (1617-1689), both of whom were fellows at Christ's College. In general, the Cambridge Platonists were moralists who wrote extensively on ethical issues. They held that the end of philosophy was the production of moral behavior in the individual.[35] Parker appreciated this emphasis in Plato's system: "As for [its] *Morality*, no *Platonist*, can set an higher estimate on it, then my self. . . . The Rules and Directions it prescribes are Sober and Practicable."[36]

However, Parker deplored the level of abstraction and *a priori* reasoning in Platonic philosophy. Whereas Plato's "discoursings about practical matters are exceeding handsome and pertinent," his treatment of "speculative Notions" was by contrast "wide, lose, [*sic*] and incoherent."[37] His arguments, according to Parker, were marked by circularity and rested on "uncertain and inevident Principles." The concept of the "universal soul" received special ridicule in this context; Parker claimed that Plato's descriptions of it, "which are nothing else but some odd fantastick Schemes of numerical figures and proportions," were evidence that he never intended for anyone to understand the idea.[38]

Parker's remarks were symptomatic of an increasing skepticism in matters of natural philosophy. He stated a few pages later, "I am lately grown such a despairing *Sceptick* in all *Physiological Theories*, that I cannot concern my self in the Truth or Falshood of any *Hypotheses*." Although he preferred the relatively new mechanistic theories, he felt that "their contexture [was] too slight and brittle to have any stress laid upon them."[39] It was with this qualification that he recommended the Baconian empiricism which was gaining strength in English intellectual circles at that time, "not so much because of its greater certainty, but because it puts inquisitive men into a method to attain it" through experimentation.[40]

As Jonathan Parkin has noted, some of Parker's contemporaries viewed with great suspicion his attack on a venerable tradition of Western thought, along with his expressions of skepticism, which had the potential to undermine Christian faith. For example, the well-known Puritan Richard Baxter, who in later years became the target of Parker's invective, attacked him specifically in the appendix of his 1667 work *The Reasons of the Christian Religion*; Baxter believed that Parker and others like him placed undue stress on matter and motion, thereby bringing in "Epicureanism by the back-door."[41] However, the intellectual tide was on Parker's side; Ken Robinson argues that,

to those like Baxter, Parker's ideas "were all the more threatening because they developed in response to the shifting philosophical and scientific climate of his time."[42] He goes on to state, "*A Free and Impartial Censure* is an important document in the history of later seventeenth-century empiricism," which may account for the fact that it, alone of Parker's numerous published works, has been reprinted in recent years.

Parker's newfound status as a spokesman for empiricism undoubtedly contributed to his election to the Royal Society on 13 June 1666, whereby he became the 210th member of that esteemed organization.[43] He had praised the new organization in *A Free and Impartial Censure* as science's greatest hope for the future:

> We may rationally expect a greater Improvement of Natural Philosophie from the *Royal Society*, (if they pursue their design) then it has had in all former ages; for they having discarded all particular *Hypotheses*, and wholly addicted themselves to exact Experiments and Observations, they may not only furnish the World with a compleat *History of Nature*, (which is the most useful part of *Physiologie*) but also laye firm an solid foundations to erect *Hypotheses* upon, (though perhaps that must be the work of future Ages).[44]

Michael Hunter, a historian of the Society, calculates that between 1660 and 1700, only 8% of the 479 members elected were divines, putting Parker in a relatively select group of clergy.[45] Hunter notes that in the 1660s especially, the Royal Society's membership rolls were a sort of Who's Who in London society; Charles II, his brother James, Prince Rupert, and several royal councillors were all members. Because of the organization's prestige, joining the Royal Society did not necessarily indicate any real interest in natural philosophy. "Membership was often proof rather of fashion than of a serious commitment to science, particularly in the 1660s. . . . Natural philosophy evidently became a rather superficial courtly fashion in the 1660s . . . and membership of the Society undoubtedly reflected this mindless craze."[46] Of course, this observation does not apply to Parker, whose interest in the subject was clearly genuine. It is likely, though, that the social standing accompanying membership in the Society gave the ambitious young man an extra incentive to apply.

Parker's application for membership was sponsored by John Wilkins (1614-72), a prominent divine who served as dean of Ripon from 1663 and became bishop of Chester in 1668. Wilkins was a charter member of the Royal Society, serving on its council from 1662 to 1671 and as its secretary from 1663 to 1668. Between 1661 and 1672, Wilkins sponsored forty-one candidates for membership to the Society, 24% of those elected during the period and more than twice as many as any other sponsor.[47] Parker's admission coincided with the climax in recruitment of divines to the Society, in which Wilkins played a significant role, during the late 1660s. In the period 1665-1669, no fewer than twelve clergymen were admitted.[48]

It seems that Parker did not actively participate in the Society after his election in 1666. He paid the admission fee, but never sent in annual dues thereafter, nor did he ever hold office.[49] This may be partially explained by the fact that he resided outside London during many of the years he was a member, particularly during the mid- and late 1670s. However, it is clear that Parker did live in London at certain periods, notably during his

participation in the toleration controversy in the early 1670s. A more likely explanation for his minimal involvement in the Society is the diversion of his interests to politics and theology after 1667, although this cannot be verified. Also, it may be that Parker and Wilkins fell out over the latter's advocacy of broader comprehension in the Church of England in the following years.

Parker's star continued to rise, and in 1667 Gilbert Sheldon selected him to fill the office of "Lorde Chaplayne Domestique." Parker had left Oxford just after Easter of that year and was summoned to Lambeth Palace, the archbishop's London residence, around Michaelmas.[50] He received his first living, the rectory at Chartham, Kent, on 31 October of the same year.[51] These preferments inaugurated a period of nearly twenty years during which Parker maintained a close association with the Canterbury diocese.

The next phase of Parker's career has received the most attention, as he attracted widespread recognition for his role in the public debate over religious toleration which began in 1667 and lasted until 1673. He published several books beginning in 1669, strenuously arguing against toleration of dissenters by the state. A more detailed chronology of Parker's involvement and that of his opponents in the controversy is found in Chapter Two; here it will be sufficient simply to note the titles of Parker's contributions to the debate: *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* (1669); *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie* (1671), which was written in response to John Owen's *Truth and Innocence Vindicated* (1669); a lengthy preface to *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery* (1672), which was later reprinted separately under the title *A Discourse in Vindication of Bp Bramhall and the Clergy of the Church of England* (1673); and *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transprosed* (1673), which was written against Andrew Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672). During this period, Parker was in the center of public debate; unfortunately for him, it was a debate that he ultimately lost in the view of most contemporaries.

Parker continued to accumulate preferments in the church during this period. On 23 May 1670, he was named archdeacon of Canterbury on the resignation of William Sancroft.[52] (In 1678, Parker became Sancroft's subordinate when the latter became archbishop of Canterbury following the death of Sheldon. The differences between the two men became a significant factor in Parker's career during the 1680s.) In 1671, Parker received another living in the diocese: the rectory of Ickham (Ilckham). Sheldon granted a dispensation on 18 July allowing Parker to hold Chartham and Ickham simultaneously, the justification being that the two parishes were only eight miles apart.[53] The actual grant of Ickham occurred a few days later, on 22 July.[54] This honor was followed by Parker's being named a prebendary of the cathedral on 14 November 1672. Here Parker replaced another future archbishop of Canterbury, John Tillotson, who had just been promoted to the deanery of the cathedral.[55] Parker received his final living in the Canterbury diocese on 29 August 1673, when Sheldon appointed him master of Eastbridge Hospital in Canterbury.

It is tempting to view Parker's preferments as rewards for his attacking the nonconformists in print during the 1669-73 period, and this is a plausible (though not ironclad) explanation for his rapid advancement. Parker's appointment as archdeacon of Canterbury came less than six months after the publication of *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, a book which was everywhere regarded as a major exposition of

the anti-toleration position in the established church. A similar length of time elapsed between the publication of *A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Politie* and Parker's collation to the rectory of Ickham. Arber's *Term Catalogues* do not list a licensing date for *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself*, but Marvell claimed that the book was published in June or July, a date which would give us, again, roughly a six-month lag between publication and the appointment as prebendary.[56] Finally, the appointment as master of Eastbridge Hospital occurred about three months after the publication of *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transprosed*.

It is quite possible that there is a one-to-one relationship between Parker's anti-toleration books and his preferments. However, other than noting the timing of Sheldon's bestowing of the archdeaconry on Parker, the latter's enemies did not accuse him or the archbishop of being engaged in any *quid pro quo* exchange. If Marvell, for example, who evidently was privy to Canterbury gossip, had intelligence of any such arrangement, he surely would have made use of it. It may be, therefore, that the timing of the preferments was largely coincidental, although certainly Parker's polemic efforts on behalf of the Church of England were a factor contributing to his increased responsibilities and income.

Parker withdrew from public view after 1673, following the publication of Marvell's second attack on him. As discussed below, records indicate Parker's presence at Canterbury and its environs with greater frequency from this point. It is probable that he was based in Canterbury from 1673 until at least 1684, when he returned to London to perform some service for the king. During this period, his activities were chiefly administrative in nature and are discussed below.

Parker took a hiatus from writing for several years after the publication of *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Tranprosed*. He returned to the press in 1678 with his second Latin treatise, *Disputationes de Deo et Providentia Divina*. Here he revived the philosophical issues that had motivated his early publications. The targets of censure in this work were the Epicurean and Cartesian systems. As it had been in his early philosophical works, Parker's empiricism was clearly on display here, especially in his attack on the Cartesians' deductive system. This book attracted some scholarly attention; Cambridge Platonist Henry More commented on it in his *Philosophical Volume* (1679), and the Cartesian Antonius le Grand criticized it in *Apologia pro Renato Descartes* (1679). Of course, this debate stirred up nowhere near the excitement that the toleration controversy had done in the early 1670s, and by writing in Latin, Parker clearly indicated that such was not his goal.

English books began to flow from Parker's pen again in 1681. The first was *The Case of the Church of England*, an extended argument defending an independent state church with an episcopal government. This book's publication may have been prompted by the succession crisis being debated in Parliament at the time. The failure of Charles II to have any legitimate children meant that the heir apparent was the Roman Catholic James, duke of York. Not wanting to repeat the experience of the 1550s, when Mary I had brought England back under the religious authority of the pope, anti-papal forces in Parliament, particularly nonconformist sympathizers such as the earl of Shaftesbury, introduced legislation on multiple occasions which would have barred James from the throne. These attempts failed, but public debate concerning church and state was intense throughout the period 1679-1681. Parker feared that the Hobbesians at court or the

Presbyterians might gain enough influence to bring about an alteration in the settlement of the established church, either by increasing royal encroachment in internal church matters or by adopting a less hierarchical structure. Parker argued that either of these courses would be contrary to divine law, but he focused more on the latter. He later wrote that Parliament at the time was being asked to consider a "new fangled settlement" of the church and that the book's chief purpose was "to blow up, Dr [Edward] Stillingfleets Irenicum, a man [on] whose principles the whole project was erected."[57]

Later that same year (1681), Parker produced *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion*, which in some respects was an extension of his arguments in *Disputationes de Deo*. The *Demonstration* is in two parts; the first is a rational proof of the existence of natural law, whereas the second is a rational proof of the truth of Christianity. Parker argued that both conclusions were inevitable if the existence of God were presupposed. The work's primary purpose apparently was to popularize the natural law theory expounded in Richard Cumberland's *De Legibus Naturae* (1672). Cumberland (1631-1718), who later became bishop of Peterborough, had produced one of the most important attacks on Thomas Hobbes' version of natural law philosophy in *De Legibus*. Parker's own antipathy to Hobbes and his utilization of Cumberland's work in that context is discussed in Chapters Three and Four. The *Demonstration* was Parker's last work of a chiefly philosophical nature.

His next book was *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the First Six Hundred Years* (1683). Parker regarded this work as the second part of *The Case of the Church of England*, as he made clear in a letter to Anthony Wood the previous year.[58] His purpose in writing was to demonstrate that the presbyterian theory of an absence of bishops in the primitive church was false, and that an episcopal structure of dioceses and metropolitans was rooted in first-century practice. The rise of the papacy was interpreted by Parker as a betrayal of the spirit of the early church, which had relied solely on councils for determining questions of significance to the entire Christian fellowship. Clearly, Parker was using history as a weapon against contemporaries with opposing visions of the church's organization and authority.

This foray into historical polemic continued with Parker's next two publications. *Religion and Loyalty* (1684), released during the Tory Reaction, argued that true Christians never participated in active resistance against an established government. Parker examined the period from the church's founding through the reign of the emperor Julian and concluded that the Christians of that era never tried to take political action against the Roman Empire. This book's sequel, *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part* (1685), followed the same line of argument, this time beginning with the death of Julian and continuing through the reign of Justinian in the sixth century. Again, Parker used his interpretation of the past as a justification for his position in contemporary debate. Unlike his earlier polemical works, these two volumes called forth no literary opponents, and Parker published nothing else until he was at Oxford.

Parker's star was on the rise again, and he was soon in London under Charles II's sponsorship; a letter of his dated 16 April 1684 was written from London and indicated that he had already been there for two weeks. He wrote, "I came hither by the Dukes command and I suppose the Kings about some business, in which they think I can serve them."[59] What business this was he did not indicate, but it apparently occupied him for some time. A warrant dated 13 November 1684 was addressed from the king at

Whitehall to the dean and chapter at Canterbury, "requiring that Samuel Parker, D. D. one of the prebendaries of that church, whom the King is employing in some affairs that will require his attendance in or near London, be dispensed with as to his residence in that cathedral till the King's further pleasure be signified."[60] Two other warrants, dated 3 November and 5 December, instructed the clerks in both houses of Parliament to grant Parker access to "the journals, records, and papers in their respective custodies" and also to allow him to have copies of anything he deemed necessary.[61] The earlier warrant described Parker as "chaplain in ordinary"; the latter did not.

The project Parker was working on for Charles may have been the *History of His Own Times*, which was not published until 1727, nearly four decades after his death. The research for this book likely would have included a study of parliamentary records. Of course, if the history had been sponsored by Charles, a key question is why the work was not published as soon as it was completed. (In fact, as I shall argue in Chapter Five, there is good reason to believe that Parker never completed the manuscript, and this would explain why it was not published before his death.) We can assume that Parker had not begun the history until 1683 at the earliest, as it was not mentioned in his catalogue of works in the letter of August 1682 to Anthony Wood. This increases the likelihood that Parker's research for the book coincided with his stay in London. However, we cannot say with certainty whether this was in fact the case.

One other event which should be noted is Parker's removal from the rolls of the Royal Society's membership in 1685. From 1682 to 1685, numerous members whose dues were in arrears or who were otherwise inactive were stricken from the rolls. This was the first (and only) "purging" of the membership in the society's history.[62] Parker was not one of the members who had been marked as liable for expulsion, but as noted, he had never been active in the society, nor had he paid dues after paying the initial membership fee. His name last appeared on the rolls in 1684.[63]

Parker the Administrator

Although Parker's reputation was made through his published works, most of his waking hours were more likely preoccupied with his administrative duties for the diocese of Canterbury. Many records relating to this aspect of his life have not survived, but it is possible to piece together a fair amount of information about the places he served and his activities during the 1670s and early 1680s.

The parish of Chartham lay about four miles west of Canterbury, along the high road between Canterbury and Ashford, and its church of St. Mary was "part of the antient possessions of the see of Canterbury."[64] Parker's appointment to the living came a mere five days after the death of its previous holder, John Reading, who had occupied it since July 1660.[65] Unfortunately, none of the parish records from Parker's era have been preserved, but the archbishop's act books record that the living was valued at £41 5*s*. 10*d*.[66]

The late eighteenth-century geographer Edward Hasted wrote that Chartham was well situated in fertile pastureland, and that the entire parish was about twelve miles in circumference. In the late eighteenth century, it contained about 100 houses and 500

inhabitants, numbers probably not changed substantially from Parker's day. The village of Chartham itself, where the church was located, lay on the banks of the river Stour. This was the largest settlement in the parish, although a few hamlets lay nearby. Aside from some wooded areas, the major geographical feature of the parish other than pasture was the chalky downs on one side of the Ashford road, and alongside them were many barrows dating from at least the Danish conquest.[67]

The dean and chapter of Canterbury Cathedral owned a manor and deanery in the parish; both were leased by the church to local gentry. Chartham contained several other substantial estates during Parker's tenure. Densted manor, a 400-acre estate, had at one point belonged to the priory, but in Parker's time it was held by the Swan family. Howfield manor had likewise been in ecclesiastical hands before the Reformation, but its owner during the Restoration was Sir William Man. Two other manors, Shalmsford-street and Shalmsford Bridge, were originally part of one estate that was later divided, and during Parker's tenure, Shalmsford-street was held by the George family of Canterbury, whereas Shalmsford Bridge was under divided ownership. Mystole belonged to Sir John Fagge, who was created a baronet in 1660. Finally, Horton manor belonged the Farell family. Hasted recorded that the church itself was a "large, handsome building," and that in the early seventeenth century it directly controlled more than forty acres. By the late eighteenth century this area had been reduced to about thirty acres; its status during the Restoration era is uncertain.[68]

References to Chartham are almost nonexistent in Parker's surviving letters and related sources, making it difficult to ascertain how often he visited the parish. In 1668, shortly after Parker took possession of the rectory, parish residents digging a well made a sensational discovery of "a parcel of strange and monstrous bones, together with four teeth, perfect and sound, but in a manner petrified and turned into stone, each as big as the fist of a man." A debate ensued as to whether these bones were from an ancient marine animal or from one of the elephants Claudius had brought into England during his invasion of the island in the first century A. D.[69] Given Parker's scientific interests, it is likely that the rector played some part in this discussion, although no record of his participation has survived.

In *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part*, Marvell accused Parker of leaving the parish's business to a deputy and never going there himself.[70] Although this may have been true enough during the toleration controversy, when Parker was apparently in London most of the time, things probably changed after 1673. In a letter to Archbishop Sancroft on 5 December 1678, Parker wrote that although he was then in Canterbury, the book he had borrowed from Sancroft was in Chartham, and that he would retrieve it "as soon as ever I can step over."[71] This would seem to indicate that in the late 1670s at least, Parker was making fairly regular visits to his living. Although it is impossible to know just how much time he actually spent at Chartham, it seems likely that the area made a significant impression on his family. Hasted wrote that Parker did reside there, and also that his grandson later built a house and grounds called the 'Fishponds' "at a large expence" in the northwest part of the parish. This estate had already gone to ruin by Hasted's day, however.[72]

The parish of Ickham lies about five miles east of Canterbury, just off the high road leading to Sandwich. Like the church at Chartham, the Ickham church had long been a possession of the see of Canterbury. Parker's appointment to the living came soon

after the death of the previous rector, Meric Casaubon, who died on 14 July 1671.[73] As in the case of Chartham, no parish records of Parker's period have survived; the archbishop's act books record the rectory's value at £29 13*s*. 4*d*., with about 250 communicants, making it a somewhat less valuable living than Chartham.[74]

This parish consisted almost entirely of farmland. The village of Ickham lay on the Lesser Stour, or Littleborne, river, which contained the "best coloured, and the finest flavoured" trout in either of the Stour rivers. The village itself, however, lay "in a low flat country, very wet and unpleasant, the road through it being but little frequented."[75] The land between Ickham and the Canterbury-Sandwich road was the most fertile and was divided into two plots, the Ickham and Treasury fields.[76]

The dean and chapter owned two manors in the parish which, as at Chartham, they leased to gentry, but Hasted did not record who held these church lands in the 1670s. Several manors in Ickham were in secular hands as well. The Bay farm, or the manor of Baa, lay about a quarter of a mile from Ickham; in Parker's day it belonged either to the Austen or Gillow family. Apulton, or Appleton, in the southeast part of the parish, was held by the Forster family in the 1670s, but Sir James Oxenden of Dean purchased half of the estate in 1680. Lee manor in the southwest was owned by Thomas Southland, esq., when Parker arrived in the parish, but Southland sold the estate to Paul Barrett, esq., a sergeant-at-law and recorder in Canterbury, in 1676. Well-Court manor lay in the western tip of the parish; Hasted was unsure of its ownership in the 1670s, but a Francis Jeoffrey acquired it in 1680.[77]

Ickham's church, dedicated to St. John, was typical in that it contained several memorials endowed by the parish's prominent families. Certain features of the church, including the stained-glass windows and a chapel dedicated to St. Thomas, had "long since" been destroyed, according to Hasted. This may have occurred during the Interregnum.[78]

As with Chartham, it is impossible to know how much time Parker spent at Ickham. Marvell's accusations of Parker's neglecting Chartham were repeated with regard to Ickham. He named Parker's deputy at Ickham, a Mr. Lee, who was "so like you [Parker], that if both your heads were cut off and *Transpros'd* on each others shoulders, no man living but would take you one for the other."[79] Marvell may have been referring to Lee at another point in his book when he criticized Parker not only for having spurned his parish duties, but also for having chosen a deputy who scandalized the parish by secretly committing adultery late at night under a pretense of studying for his sermons, and who thereby "in stead of instructing your Parish in the *Fruits of the Spirit* . . . gave them an example of the *Works of the Flesh*."[80] Whether Parker eventually replaced Lee with another deputy is not known. It is plausible to suppose that, as with Chartham, Parker visited Ickham more frequently in the late 1670s and early 1680s than he had during the toleration controversy.

Parker's appointment as the master of Eastbridge Hospital occurred shortly after the death of its previous administrator.[81] This hospital, also called St. Thomas's Hospital, lay within the bounds of Canterbury. In addition to the hospital and its grounds, the master of Eastbridge administered several parcels of land scattered throughout the area. For example, the master nominated and supervised the minister of the nearby church of St. Nicholas and enjoyed a portion of that parish's revenue.[82] Parker may also have been required to follow Archbishop Matthew Parker's 1569 statute, which directed the master

to distribute thirty pence each Friday to thirty poor people in peacetime and four pence daily to passing soldiers in wartime. In 1690, the hospital had an annual income of £80 6*s*. 4*d*., making it a wealthier preferment than either Chartham or Ickham, although it had greater expenses as well.[83]

Whereas virtually no documents survive illustrating how Parker dealt with the two rectories he possessed, several records relating to Eastbridge Hospital have been preserved. Most numerous among these are leases and indentures negotiated between him and residents of Canterbury. As master of the hospital, he was responsible for handling contracts relating to its lands and making an account of them to the archbishop. He negotiated two leases with a John George of Canterbury in 1674, one of forty years duration containing "all the Messuages or Tenem[en]ts with the Outhouses Edifices Building Sellars Waters watercourses wayes casements Backsides yards Garden profitts Emoluments Comodityes advantages & appurtenances" in All Saints parish in exchange for a yearly rent of 62*s*., to be paid in quarterly installments at the major church feasts: St. John's, Michaelmas, Christmas, and Annunciation.[84]

Several other instances of Parker's leases and indentures are recorded in the archbishop's act books, and most of them follow this pattern. Two manors on church property were leased to the Boys family in 1679.[85] An indenture of six tenements in All Saints parish, with their shops and gardens, was made to Michael Kite in 1678.[86] Several indentures of farmland were made to Canterbury families.[87] Some of the contracts obligated the lessee to keep the buildings in good repair, whereas others stipulated that Parker had the right to seize the land if rent was not paid in a timely fashion.[88]

Not surprisingly, the act book entries do not provide a glimpse of Parker's personality. Fortunately, references to the leases appear in several of Parker's letters. In a letter to Archbishop Sancroft dated 23 September 1682, he informed his superior that all of the houses belonging to the hospital were in good repair; two of them had "almost utterly decayed," but he had forced the tenant to repair them, "so that I think this care is over for this age."[89]

Parker then informed Sancroft that he had not charged two of the tenants the full rents and fines to which the church was by law entitled. His defense of his forbearance in these cases is revealing. The first man was given relief because of his poverty, and also because he had done much to increase the value of the property at his own expense, "turning a plowd feild into an hop-garden." In the other man's case, Parker had not yet made a formal agreement with the tenant and could therefore have required the higher fines Sancroft was apparently requesting. However, Parker explained that he intended to be kind to this tenant as well, for he

> is a modest and an honest man & referrs himself wholy to my Courtesy, And I am inclined to use him very kindly because I know he has been as great expertes in repaires, and though he has had the Lease several yeares (which he seized on for a desperate debt) I can compute that as yet he never made any Proffit of the Rent, it being all laied out in Repaires. And for that reason I can not but in Conscience consider his hard case, especially, when the decay of the house was none of his Neglect.

Parker concluded the letter by asking Sancroft to confirm the leases quickly to set the tenants' minds at ease, "especially one of them, that is a very old man."[90]

This letter reveals a side of Parker never acknowledged by his enemies or modern critics.[91] Although he was undoubtedly strict in his dealings with others, he was also capable of charity and compassion when interacting with the deserving poor. This is especially important when it is remembered that Parker, so frequently accused of having pandered to those in positions of authority, was in this situation apparently resisting pressure from the archbishop to maximize revenue from the church lands. The fact that Parker and Sancroft were not always on the best of terms does not lessen the validity of this observation.

Parker defended his tenants in another letter written at some point after Sancroft had become archbishop. In response to an apparent request to alter the duration of the existing leases, Parker replied that to the best of his knowledge and research, land leases had always been for twenty-one years and house leases had always been for forty years, "so that to alter it now, would bee an injury to the Tenant Right." He argued that the presumption of the authority to alter the leases was based upon an incorrect understanding of an Elizabethan statute which gave officials greater discretionary power over new hospitals, but which did not "abridge the righte of the Tenants for ancient hospitals." He further stated that any disruption to the regular payment of rents and fines would be harmful to the current efforts to make repairs to the hospital.[92]

Eastbridge was apparently in poor physical condition when Parker took over. A letter in his hand dated 8 October 1674, a little over a year after his appointment, indicated that he was bothered by "the noise and dirt of building," evidently a reference to repairs that were underway.[93] This is confirmed by a letter years later to Sancroft, in which he asserted that when he became master of Eastbridge, the hospital had been "much neglected." The damage was of such an extent that he soon decided his initial outlay of £10 or £12 yearly from the hospital's regular revenue would not suffice for the necessary renovations. Parker at that time made known to Sheldon "the danger hee had put me in of having an hospital fall upon my own head," and the archbishop quickly provided him with "a very good contribution" toward serious repairs. At the time of the letter to Sancroft, the work was still incomplete, but Parker stated confidently that "I have mastered the greatest difficulty, & doubt not but in some time to put [the building] into a firm & lasting condition."[94]

Parker found some aspects of his job as master of Eastbridge very tedious. The letter of 8 October 1674 illustrates this point. He complained that the system by which petitions of the poor were accepted and considered was in disarray, and as a result, "I am most grievously pester'd with our hospitall Clients." His recommendation was that all the pending petitions be reviewed to assess their legality and propriety, and he also asked that he be given the opportunity to examine each new petition for merit before forwarding it to the archbishop. It is clear that Parker wanted to reduce his workload by more effective screening of petitioners. He wrote:

> But without this Course I can not beare the Burthen of this Preferment. For the Poor people looking upon mee as the hospitall master teare mee a peices with their perpetuall Petitions & Solicitations, in so much that they trouble mee mor than all my other affairs. I can bear a great deal from

> them, because I do not a little delight to do kind Offices to the poore, but I would not bee beseiged with their crys & complaints, as I now daily am. And without entring upon some such Reformation as I propose it will bee impossible to avoid it.

However, Parker also justified these recommendations by stating his concern for the deserving poor. The backlog of petitions was so great, he stressed, that some of the applicants had died before receiving a response. According to him, the mere acceptance of a petition created unreasonable hope in the minds of many, "for upon the Acceptance of their Petition they always suppose it granted, & by living according to their hopes run themselves into such debts as they can not easily & do not usually recover, so that I am told there are as many undone by their expectations as are provided for by succeeding." He requested action on behalf of a petitioner he had previously recommended, "for the man is very honest & sufficiently poor," and assured Robert Thompson, Sheldon's (and later Sancroft's) secretary, that he could provide other deserving objects of charity if the means to relieve them were available.[95] Once again, it is clear that Parker had a charitable side.

A few years later, Parker reiterated his request for an effective screening of petitioners when Sancroft became archbishop. He asked that Sancroft not receive any petition without an accompanying certification from himself that the petitioner was qualified according to statute. In this letter, Parker wrote that this procedure had always been followed up until the tenure of his immediate predecessor at the hospital, "who was a very infirm & unactive man, & so suffered other people to take his business into their hands." He also told Sancroft that Sheldon had promised to fix the problem, but unqualified petitions were "never wholy prevented."[96] The problem of incessant suppliants was expressed in terms similar to that in the previous letter:

> When petitions go by other hands, all my Clients are disappointed, & I might endure the complaints & importunity of so many miserable People, & it is now come to that pass, that there never falls a place but that I am wearied out from morning to night with the crys and Solicitations of at least ten or twelve poor widows from which misery I beseech your Grace to deliver mee.[97]

Parker had other administrative duties by virtue of his status as archdeacon, a position he held from 1670. Anglican archdeacons had several responsibilities; in general, they were their bishops' chief assistants in diocesan administration. The archdeacon had jurisdiction over much of the physical property of the parish churches, such as the fabric and furniture, and he acted as his bishop's representative on visitations. Finally, archdiaconal courts formed ministerial subsections of the episcopal jurisdiction.[98] Judging from the surviving records, these activities took up much of Parker's time.

One of his duties, apparently, was collecting or handling corrody money. A *corrody* was a right of maintenance in a religious house which included room, board, and sometimes clothing. In the Middle Ages, especially, houses were commanded to provide corrodies for the king's nominees. A corrody could also function as an annuity, and many were purchased by widows or others who wished to retire in the care of the

church.[99] That Parker was involved in these transactions is attested by a letter from him to Robert Thompson, Sancroft's secretary, dated 1 February 1681, in which he refers to "the Corrody money" of which he was in charge.[100]

On 19 December 1678, Parker wrote to Archbishop Sancroft, who had not occupied his office long. The first lines referred to a previous communication (now lost) in which Parker had given "a breif account of your Diocess." We can assume that this prior report was submitted in fulfillment of Parker's duties as archdeacon. He then proceeded to describe in detail the state of "another charge that I am intrusted with under your Grace, i.e. your Hospitals." He gave an account not only of Eastbridge Hospital but also of two others, Harbledown (or Marbledown) and St. John's. Both of these latter institutions also lay within the city, Harbledown in the west and St. John's in Northgate. These were considered twin foundations, and the master of one normally took charge of the other. Masters were appointed in 1660 and 1702, but there was evidently a gap in administration into which Parker had stepped during this period.[101] The context and other sources do not make clear whether Parker's responsibilities for Harbledown and St. John's derived from his capacity as archdeacon or if they were attached to his care of Eastbridge, although he did draw a distinction between Eastbridge and the others by explaining that his repairs at Eastbridge were motivated "not by charity but duty." It seems that his authority over Harbledown and St. John's was of an informal nature by arrangement with Sheldon. Later in the letter, Parker noted that since the death of Sheldon, some troublemakers had spread the word that Parker's authority over the two hospitals had ended, "so that I begin to find some of the roughest of them grow somewhat more stubborn & refractory, which in a little time will destroy the peace & quiet of their own lives, for nothing else can preserve it but the awe of their master." He asked that Sancroft inform the hospitals that Parker retained "full power of Government over them according to the Statute."[102]

Like Eastbridge, the other two hospitals were in a dilapidated state upon his taking possession. Harbledown had become "unhabitable & deserted," and had to be rebuilt from the foundations. St. John's had serious debt problems "by the breaking of their cheifest Tenant, & the Ruin of his farm house," but since that time, the debts had been paid and the buildings repaired.[103] In recording these conditions, Parker was undoubtedly trying to present himself in the best light to his new superior, showing that his administration of these church properties had been efficient. While this should be kept in mind, there is no evidence that any of the claims made in this letter were false.

Finally, Parker had responsibilities as a prebendary of the chapter at Christ Church, Canterbury, from 1672.[104] The cathedral at Canterbury had twelve prebends and a stall for each of them; Parker occupied the second.[105] A prebendary supported by a landed prebend, which normally included a parish church, remained on the estate to manage the church's affairs except when "in residence" at the cathedral.[106] Parker's appointment in the archbishop's act book does not specify whether his was a landed or money prebend, nor does the record in the chapter's act book, but it seems likely that given his numerous other positions and responsibilities, he would not have been able to spend a great deal of time in yet another parish, making a money prebend more likely.[107]

Some records of Parker's service at the cathedral survive. An indenture dated 25 November 1674 named him the chapter's treasurer for one year.[108] The Treasurers Book for the year 1674-75 is in his hand and reveals a good deal about the transactions of the

church. He recorded each instance of his having accepted a transfer of funds from Dr. John Bargrave, the chapter's receiver for the year 1674-75. The time between entries ranges from three days to three weeks. For the entire year, Parker recorded receipts from Bargrave of £3,164 8*s*. 9½*d*., a sum including £200 19*s*. of extraordinary income,[109] and he left a balance of £168 17*s*. 10*d*. Beneath this figure are the signatures of several members of the chapter, including that of the dean, John Tillotson.[110] This was the final settling of Parker's accounts which had to be validated by the rest of the chapter.

We have already noted that payments on leases Parker made were due at the four major religious festivals of the year. These were also the dates of many disbursements made by Parker while he was treasurer. The Treasurers Book records numerous payments to various persons on these occasions, including quarterly stipends to the cathedral's prebendaries. The stipend actually increased slightly at each feast, until by the end of the year Parker had paid out £40 2*s*. 11*d*. to each prebendary.[111] In addition to this regular income, the prebendaries received "dividends" periodically; most of these amounted to a few pounds, but on one occasion the dividend was a substantial £43 3*s*. 6*d*.[112] Clearly, the Canterbury prebendaries could afford comfortable lifestyles, and Parker in particular would have received well over £100 per annum after the revenues from his livings were taken into account.

Apparently, the treasurer was also in charge of distributing charitable contributions to the poor of the city. Several pages of the Treasurers Book record small payments to indigents and other needy people. For example, 2*s*. 6*d*. were given to "a poor Gentlewoman whose husband fell sick in Town as they were passing to London." Likewise, "an Irish man & his wife with a pass" received a shilling. Parker also recorded payments to poor scholars, widows, and petitioners. There is no way to know how many, if any, of these gifts were made on his initiative and how many were instigated by other members of the chapter. A few of the records include the note "with Dr. Bell's consent" or some other indication of the involvement of a third party.[113]

Immediately upon the completion of Parker's term as treasurer, the dean and chapter on 25 November 1675 selected him to be the receiver for the following year.[114] The Receivers Book for 1675-76 has survived; like the Treasurers Book of the preceding year, it is in Parker's hand. Judging from the entries, it appears that his main activity as receiver was collecting rents from the various properties owned by the cathedral. Each entry contains simply the name of a property and the rent collected. There is also a list of "Receptiones Extraordinarice" totaling £418 5*s*. 4*d*. In addition, Parker recorded a series of expenditures, probably indicating payments made to that year's treasurer. For the year, he collected £5,911 10*s*. 3*d*. and paid out £5,152 9*s*. 6*d*. As in the Treasurers Book, Tillotson and other members of chapter signed their names on the final page containing the summary figures.[115]

Parker never served as treasurer or receiver after 1676, which is not surprising, given that there were twelve prebendaries and that he surrendered his after thirteen years; if the offices rotated evenly, he would have been gone before his turn came around a second time. It is clear, though, that he was still involved in the business decisions of the chapter. For example, Tillotson sent a letter to him dated 15 May 1677 regarding a forfeiture of land; the letter may have been a response to one from Parker which is no longer extant. Tillotson wrote that a Mr. Evans, who wished to purchase forfeited land from the church, had his permission to do so if the chapter had no objection.[116] In this

case, Parker seems to have been the member of the chapter most responsible for handling the matter.

Furthermore, Parker was probably the prebendary responsible for supervising the chapter's properties in 1681; an Estate Rents book for that year is in his hand. This book contains at least one page for each of the cathedral's properties, listed in alphabetical order. Many of the pages are blank except for the property's name, but most bear entries. Parker recorded such information as the products from the property, the lessee, the rent, and the assessed value of the property.[117]

Parker and Sancroft

After Parker departed Canterbury for London sometime in 1684, his involvement in affairs of the diocese was probably minimal, despite his retaining most of his offices and livings after his translation to Oxford in 1686. The sheer length of the two parts of *Religion and Loyalty* indicate that he spent a great deal of time in research and writing, and there was also the project to which Charles II had assigned him.

The question should be raised as to what prompted Charles to sponsor Parker, given that the king had been angry with him during the toleration controversy.[118] *Religion and Loyalty* had been dedicated to Charles II, and it may well have impressed him, just as *Tentamina Physico-Theologico de Deo* had impressed Sheldon in the 1660s. In this instance, however, other records shed light on the situation. Parker's letters of the early 1680s clearly identify him as a Tory, and his political views seem to have brought him into conflict with Sancroft to such a degree that Parker eventually petitioned Charles for assistance against him. Sancroft had been elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1678 following the death of Sheldon the previous year. He was much more of a moderate than Sheldon on issues such as comprehension of dissenters, and he was more likely to try to accommodate nonconformists when it came to religious ceremony. Parker, who had been a protege of Sheldon and had admired the old archbishop very much, apparently saw his successor as insufficiently committed to upholding the dignity of the Church of England. Parker's correspondence in the years following Sancroft's accession in 1678 reveals a growing frustration with the prelate's administration of the diocese.

The archdeacon's early letters to Sancroft were respectful and displayed a hope that the new archbishop would assist him in maintaining "effectual discipline." In a letter of 5 December 1678, Parker expressed "great joy that your Grace thinks good to employ mee in any thing for the good of the Church." He also complimented Sancroft on the latter's plan of "enforcing every incumbent to do right to his preferment in his life time," saying that this would prevent many abuses.[119]

Parker requested Sancroft's assistance in curtailing appeals from the archdiaconal court. He complained that every time a judgment was rendered against an offender in his court, the defendant immediately appealed to the Court of Arches and was accepted even though Parker had not been consulted, "& when they are lodged there they have the liberty of Appeal to the delegates, & how tedious their proceedings are your Grace very well knows, so that it is not possible for mee to proceed against any person or in any

cause without the charges & trouble of a long law suit." Parker claimed that the dean of the Arches was unwilling to restrict any appeals from Parker's court for fear of a lawsuit being brought against him. He therefore asked Sancroft to take action to remedy this state of affairs; otherwise "it is in vain for us lower courts to pretend to any jurisdiction." Moreover, the costs of continuing suits at the Arches were prohibitive. "From hence, my Lord, comes this great load of dilapidations upon the Clergy, from the great charges of suing for them, which the Attorneys have blown into all mens heads."[120]

The people Parker was prosecuting in his court, or at least the ones with whom he was most concerned, were clergy suspected of insufficient conformity to the Church of England and dissenters accused of stirring up political opposition. In this letter to Sancroft, Parker was chiefly concerned about one Brown, the rector of Sutton Valence, who seems to have been involved in some scandal, according to a letter dated 15 July 1678 from Parker to Robert Thompson. Parker wrote that he had solicited the ministers in the parishes neighboring Brown's for information about the matter; it was difficult to deal with Brown himself because he was "so infirm that hee never appears at Visitations." Parker wanted to prosecute him "upon publique fame," but was warned against it for fear of a lawsuit. Disgusted with procedural requirements, he wrote, "I am sure I find so many scruples & difficultys started not only in this but all other Cases, that I have very little Encouragement to apear in so ineffectuall a Jurisdiction." He concluded by expressing the hope that Sancroft would take action.[121]

Another object of Parker's wrath was an attorney named Hirst, whose name occurred more than once in Parker's letters. Evidently, Sancroft did not limit the appeals from Parker's court, for we find Parker complaining about Hirst's escape from his clutches in a letter to George Thorpe dated 27 January 1682. Hirst, whom Parker later referred to as "the very Good: enough of that Diocesse," had been convicted of being a rebellious fanatic in Parker's court, but he had appealed from there to the Arches.[122] Parker reported to Thorpe that Hirst and his colleague Durrance had made a further appeal from the Arches to the Delegates, and that the dean of the Arches was likely to drop the case, for "he is weary of spending any more money out of his own pocket, upon the publique Account & that for any thing that he sees, to no end, for he is well aware of the slow proceeding of delegates."[123] This would have been detrimental to the cause of discipline in the diocese. "But if it be not gon through with, we are utterly blown up here, for this is a leading case, & Hirst is a leading man, so that if we can but hamper him, People will not be so brisk at appeals, as now they are."[124] As will be shown, Parker eventually came to suspect that the reason Sancroft was not more energetic in the prosecution of nonconforming clergy was that he secretly favored their cause.

Parker experienced other frustrations in his dealings with Sancroft which lowered his estimation of the archbishop. One of these was a controversy in early 1681 over the position of registrar in the diocese. Apparently, the previous occupant of the office, Martin Hirst (not the Hirst mentioned above), had died or become incapacitated, and the office had been given to his son. Parker claimed that the office, or at least the right of choosing its occupant, was his, and when Sancroft denied his claim, he wrote to George Thorpe complaining about the situation. Sancroft had expressed doubt about the legality of Parker's claim, but Parker insisted that the claim was just, and that the archbishop was trying to "to debarr me of my right, & that is doing me wrong."[125] He asked for Sancroft

to reconsider his judgment in the matter, but no records survive which suggest the prelate changed his mind.

Parker did what he could to avoid his superior's open displeasure. On one occasion documentation of some importance pertaining to the rebuilding of St. Paul's cathedral in London was not processed on schedule by Parker's staff, and the commissioner for that church complained to Sancroft. When Thorpe showed Parker a copy of the commissioner's letter, the latter immediately wrote to Sancroft explaining his side of the story. Not wanting to be considered negligent, he assured the archbishop that the matter had not been brought to his attention until it was too late for him to do anything effectual. The briefs, he claimed, had been sent to his office without any indication of their importance. Parker subtly suggested that the error might have been made by someone in Sancroft's office; "I suppose the ground of the miscarriage was that when your Grace commanded them to be sent down, it was done accordingly, but not in the right method."[126] Once Parker had become aware of the papers' significance, he gave instructions for their processing. He explained that both he and the bishop of Peterborough had been assured by the staff that the documents had been dispatched in good order, but that they had been lax in the fulfillment of their duties. Here Parker's uncharitable side shone through in his attempt to deflect criticism: "I find I have to do with such stupid careless People, that unless I would do all the servile work of the Office my self things will be thus neglected, & therefore I must seek out some course to remedy my self against so heavy an inconvenience." He assured Sancroft that the documents would be sent immediately.[127]

It seems that Parker's office was responsible for making copies of statutes and church documents. A letter to Robert Thompson dated 1 February 1680 indicated that Parker thought Sancroft was being unreasonable in some of his requests. "As for the copy of the Act, if his Grace will send me obsolete Laws, I think he ought to pay for them, but it being set upon your account, I shall contend with so good a freind upon no account, much less for so small a matter."[128] Taken as a whole, Parker's surviving correspondence shows much more dissatisfaction than satisfaction with Sancroft's management of the diocese.

Finally, Parker decided to take drastic action by writing to the king about his conflict with Sancroft. A remarkable seventeen-page letter in his hand complaining about Sancroft survives in the Tanner Manuscripts.[129] Unfortunately, it is undated, but it could not have been written before 1684, as Parker mentions one case that dragged on for six years after Sancroft's elevation to the archbishopric.[130] It appears that Parker originally addressed the letter to the king himself, but later changed the addressee to someone in the king's inner circle; this person is not named in the letter, but there had obviously been some previous correspondence between him and Parker. Parker thanked him for his "soe franke & generouse readinesse to serve mee with his Majestye," and he asked him to convey the information in the letter to the king immediately.[131]

Parker was very forthright in explaining the reason for the letter. "I am too well informed that my Lord of Canterbury hath beene pleased to make himselfe my Enemye. The effects of his displeasure I have long felt, & patiently endured, but the grounds & reasons of it I can scarse surmise." He claimed that despite their clear disagreement on occasion, he had always performed his proper duties to Sancroft, implying that any fault must have lain with the archbishop. He then listed six or seven years of accumulated

grievances, seeking to prove that Sancroft was a friend to disloyal subjects, chiefly Whigs and nonconformists.[132]

Parker referred first to the case of Hirst and Durrance, which he claimed to have had prosecuted with the promise of Sancroft's help. Once the proceedings were underway, however, Sancroft had failed to respond to Parker's repeated requests for assistance and had even informed the archdeacon that he was being troublesome. A member of the gentry, Captain Roberts, paid for the suit, and several other gentlemen had been prepared to reimburse him upon the successful completion of the case, but at the last moment Sancroft had stopped the proceedings, claiming that they violated statute; Parker contended that the prelate had clearly been misapplying the law in question. All in all, the suit took six years, and Roberts's estate was "verye much impaired" by his efforts to serve the king.[133]

Sancroft gave credibility to the nonconformists by offering a preferment to the vicar of Ashford, Kent, "the most notorious man for inconformitye in the Diocesse, one that turnes the church it selfe into a Conventicle, that cants & prayes after the manner of the Nonconformists, & sometimes permitts them the use of his pulpitt." Parker noted that the preferment was announced by a letter in Sancroft's own hand, in which was indicated greater rewards in the future for the vicar. This letter was circulated throughout the diocese by the nonconformists, who saw it as a sign of great things to come. Conversely, the whole affair was greatly disheartening to the Tory clergy, and Parker blamed the incident for changing the religious atmosphere in Kent. On another occasion Sancroft angered the Tories by appointing to a six-preachers place a Whig, passing over in the process "one of the most Loyall men in the Diocesse," whom Parker had favored.[134] Sancroft even entertained at Lambeth Palace people who were later imprisoned for seditious activities, while ignoring petitioners from "the honest partye," a situation "which you may easilye apprehend must at that time make great noyse & heates in the Country."[135]

Parker asserted that the archbishop had appointed clergy of suspect loyalties in the diocese. One of the clerks in a parish about three miles from Canterbury had caused a scandal at the most recent visitation when "hee publickelye refused at dinner before all the Clergye, to put of his hatt at drinking his Majesties health." Another of Sancroft's recent appointees had been chased out of office by Parker "upon proofe that hee had never received the Communion in his life." These and other such incidents had a deleterious effect on morale in the diocese; Parker assured his reader that his own zeal for the king and church would be attested to by any gentleman in the region, "but if beside this you will bee pleased to enquire what service has come from another Quarter, you will seeme to aske strange newes endeed, as of something transacted in the East or West Indies."[136]

Sancroft's conduct during the furor over the Popish Plot also left something to be desired, opined Parker. Although no scholarly treatment of Parker has mentioned it, the archdeacon had ties to the notorious Titus Oates, whose allegations of a widespread Roman Catholic conspiracy had England in an uproar in the late 1670s. Before his alleged conversion to the Roman faith, Oates had been a member of the Anglican clergy. In early 1673, he was made vicar of Bobbing, Kent, by Sir George Moore, a member of the local gentry who held the advowson. This action also placed Oates under the indirect supervision of the archdeacon of Canterbury. His parishioners soon began to complain

about his habits, accusing him of drunkenness and theft, and even of disrespect towards the Christian religion. When the complaints reached Parker, he combined forces with Moore to eject Oates from Bobbing. Oates' schoolmaster, William Smith, who later wrote *Intrigues of the Popish Plot Laid Open* (1685), asserted that Oates decided to accuse Parker during the plot's investigation because of this incident.[137]

Oates later returned to Bobbing, coming under Parker's jurisdiction again, although at Moore's death in 1678 his estate was transferred to a Colonel Diggs. Diggs apparently grew dissatisfied with Oates, as his predecessor had done, and Parker's account of what transpired deserves to be quoted in full:

> When (upon the complaint of Collonell Diggs) I summon'd Oates to reside upon his vicaridge of Bobbing in order to his second Expulsion out of it, for I had once before expelled him before hee went to travell, Oates sends mee a threatening letter, I returne answer that it was not in my power to releive him, upon this hee repaires to Lambeth, & makes his Complaint of mee, But his Grace will not concerne himselfe in the businesse, layes it wholelye upon my indescretion & private piques against Oates, soe I was left in the lurch, & complained of in the mad Westminster Parliament for endeavouring to hinder the Evidences attendance upon his greate cure of the Plott: And had beene certainelye Kidnap't into Tophaws pound, had not Sr William Jones, with whom I had beene formerlye acquainted, interposed.[138]

Oates' later discrediting undoubtedly cast Parker in the welcome role of the diligent official who persevered in his duty at risk to his career and was eventually vindicated. It is equally certain that Parker wished to call attention to this fact as well as to draw a distinction between himself and Sancroft, the prelate who had neglected the discipline of his diocese so that an insubordinate cleric could incite a persecution of innocent Roman Catholic subjects.

Sancroft also singled out Catholics for persecution, according to Parker. During the furor over the plot, the Privy Council, at the instigation of Charles' chief minister, the earl of Danby, had issued a missive to the bishops asking them to enforce the canons against recusants. When Sancroft relayed this information to Parker, the latter asked whether he was to proceed only against Catholics or against "all dissenters as the Cannon seemes to explaine it selfe, by defineing all to bee Recusants that come not to divine service." Sancroft's reply was that only Catholics were to be targeted.[139]

This answer confirmed Parker's suspicions "that his Grace would never take the courage to lift up a finger against the faction." He then argued that the church courts technically did not have jurisdiction to prosecute Catholics because they were tried at the sessions and assizes, after which Parliament forbade the church to take any further action. On one level this appears to have been simply a concern for procedural correctness, but he revealed to his reader another reason for his objection to the prosecutions:

> And to confesse a secret truth to you, I was concern'd to doe them all the Kindnesse I could not onelye because they were then unworthilye harrass't & oppress't by others of the Fanatique faction, but because I know them to

> bee very honest and Loyall men. For as there number is very small in that Diocesse, soe I had familiar acquaintance with the greatest part of them, partlye by my frequent Conversation in my Lord Strngfords Familye, but cheifelye by haveing the greatest & leading men of them subtenants to my Archdeaconry.[140]

Obviously, Parker knew his audience well, or he would not have dared to praise the Catholics of his diocese in such a way. Perhaps he was aware of Charles' leanings toward Catholicism. Even so, he was clearly setting himself apart from the majority of his fellow clergymen in making these statements.[141]

Parker also averred that Sancroft had interfered with the publication of *The Case of the Church of England* in 1681. The earl of Anglesey had learned of Parker's intent to publish a work defending the existing settlement of the church and attacking Edward Stillingfleet's *Irenicum* (1660), and he had complained to Sancroft about the matter. When Sancroft informed Parker of the complaint, the latter acquainted Sancroft with the subject of the book and sent copies of the printed pages to his office. Sancroft "flatlye refused to see them, calld him [Ralph Snow, Sancroft's servant] to witnesse that hee Know nothing what was in them, & if I would bee meddling I must looke to my selfe."[142]

With the bishops of London and St. Asaph, Sancroft blocked the printing of the work. At the time, Parker seemed to accept the situation philosophically; in a letter to his friend Henry Dodwell dated 10 December 1680, he cited his duty to maintain Christian unity in obedience to his superior and informed Dodwell that Sancroft was "pleased to treat me like a friend."[143] However, after a two-month interval, the "greedy bookseller" proceeded with the printing unbeknownst to any of them, Parker included. The archdeacon informed Dodwell in a letter dated 14 April 1681 that "though I owe him [the printer] no thanks for it, I cannot hear that it is like to do any harm."[144] Undoubtedly, Parker preferred for his ideas to circulate on the streets of London, and by the time of his complaint against Sancroft he had chosen to portray the entire incident as an example of the archbishop's lack of dedication to episcopacy. Parker informed his intercessor that he had included a copy of the book to demonstrate "what Torye Champions such men are like to bee for the church in any distresse."[145]

Parker listed several other complaints against Sancroft that will not be dealt with here. The seriousness of his charges, he contended, was that the archbishop's behavior harmed both king and church. He claimed to write on behalf of "all the true Torye Clergye of England" whose careers had been harmed by charges of "intemperate Zeale."[146] From Parker's viewpoint, this charge simply meant that those who were conscientious in their duties would never advance in the church without royal intervention as long as men such as Sancroft were overseeing its affairs. Such a situation could only have demoralized the loyalist clergy, for "you Know very well Sr that the best soldiers will have but litle stomacke to fight when they Know before hand that there officers will give all the prey & plunder to others that onelye stand by and looke on." Parker pointed out in particular one of Sancroft's confidantes, the bishop of Peterborough, who had recently appointed John Patrick of the Charterhouse, "the sowrest Whigg in the Nation," to a vacant prebend in his diocese. The ecclesiastical climate had become so hostile to Tories that Parker warned that if "some such good men as your selfe

doe not put his Majestye in mind of it, his best subjects, & most faithfull servants will not onelye bee unrewarded, but oppressed even for theire fidelitye in the worst of times."[147]

Whether this letter was instrumental in gaining Parker the royal sponsorship in 1684 is impossible to say, but it cannot be doubted that from that year on, he had access to the king either directly or indirectly. His career began an upward trajectory due almost entirely to royal favor which did not end until his death.

In at least one respect, Parker tried to extricate himself from some of his responsibilities in the Canterbury diocese. In the summer of 1685, he abandoned his office of prebendary in favor of his friend Dr. John Bradford, one of the royal chaplains. The incident caused something of a stir. Apparently, Bradford was quite eager to lay his hands on the prebend, and he tried to circumvent the normal procedure for the transfer. Henry Hyde, the second earl of Clarendon and keeper of the privy seal, wrote a letter dated 2 August 1685 to Francis Turner, bishop of Ely, recounting the unusual haste Bradford had been in when trying to get him to seal the document:

> The Clerke of the Privy seale brought me a grant of a Prebend of Canterbury to Dr Bradford upon the voluntary surrender of Dr Parker, he sayd there was hast in it, and desired I would seale it presently, because the Dr understood I was to goe out of Towne the next day; I answer'd that there needed noe such hast, that though I did goe out of Towne, I should be back again on Thursday at farthest, & that I would not seale it till my returne; after this Dr Bradford himselfe came to me & prest me extremely to dispatch him, sayd, he was the King's Chaplain, & many other things, but I replyed, he must excuse me, I would speake wth the King before I seal'd it.[148]

Hyde expressed doubts as to whether Sancroft, whose approval was required for any such grant, was aware of what Parker and Bradford were trying to do. He wrote that he had resolved to make sure all the proper steps had been taken before he sealed the grant.[149]

Hyde's action had the result of stymieing, at least temporarily, Bradford's ambitions. A letter dated 1 October 1685 from Francis Turner to Sancroft bubbled with barely suppressed glee at what had transpired since August:

> My Lord Privy Seale gave me last weeks the Honor & pleasure of receiving an Account from his Lp's owne hand that Dr Bradford's insolent pretensions are stopt, till the King speake's wth yr Grace. If secretarys of State may accept Resignations of Prebends, it will lett in more Simony than all the other back dore's. Besides tis yr Grace's owne Cathedrall. And lastly the man is Worthless but for his prefermt.[150]

Turner seemed to view Parker, not Bradford, as the force behind the mischief, and he went on to attack the archdeacon directly. He hoped that Sancroft would "turne this uppon the Trickers," and recommended, "May wth yr Grace's dextrous managemt you may take the opportunity to show the Archdeacon in his Colours. & for ever perhaps spoil his Aspiring projects. This wd be mightily to our case."[151]

In the end, however, Parker was not discredited, and Bradford succeeded in gaining the prebend. Unfortunately for both, the latter died a mere six weeks after his installment, and Parker's attempt to name a successor with similar views was thwarted. According to Anthony Wood, Dr. John Younger of Magdalen College, Oxford, succeeded Bradford on the recommendation of Mary of Modena, duchess of York. Wood did not note whether Younger was friendly toward Roman Catholics, but it seems likely that he would have had Tory leanings, so Parker's project was not a complete failure.[152]

Certainly Parker's career would have been seen as successful by many even before he acquired a bishopric in 1686.[153] Not only had he secured a generous income through his various livings in the Canterbury diocese, he had made a name for himself in scientific, political, and religious circles through his various writings. It is true that he made numerous enemies in the process, but many others considered him their ally. Unfortunately, not enough information concerning Parker's private life and official duties has survived to form the basis for a full biographical treatment of the ambitious clergyman. What we do have in great supply are the polemical works he composed. The following four chapters examine these in detail, beginning with the ones produced during the famous toleration controversy.

---

[1] Bodl., Wood MSS F 46, fol. 272r.

[2] R. L. Greenall, *A History of Northamptonshire* (London: Phillimore & Co., 1979), 56, 57.

[3] Ibid., 57.

[4] Ibid., 60-63.

[5] Bodl., Wood MSS F 46, fol. 272r.

[6] Marvell, 179. The bulk of Anthony Wood's information on Samuel Parker's ancestry and early life appears to be taken from Marvell (cf. Marvell, 180-82; and Wood, 4:225-26).

[7] Ibid., 180.

[8] Wood, 4:225. Cf. Marvell, 181.

[9] Bodl., Rawlinson MSS A 328, fol. 161r.

[10] Wood, 4:226.

[11] Marvell, 181.

[12] John Parker, *The Government of the People of England Precedent and Present the Same* (London: 1650), 1.

[13] Ibid., 2.

[14] Ibid., 4.

[15] Ibid., 8.

[16] Ibid., 9.

[17] Ibid., 18. Emphasis added.

[18] Wood, 4:226.

[19] Bodl., Wood MSS F 46, fol. 272r.

[20] Marvell, 181.

[21] Wood, 4:226. Cf. Marvell, 181.

[22] Wood, *Fasti*, col. 218.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Signature and information provided by Clare Hopkins, Trinity archivist, in correspondence with the author, May 2001.

[25] *DNB, s.v.*

[26] *FICPP*, sig. A3v.

[27] Ibid., sigs. A3v-A4r.

[28] Marvell, 182.

[29] Wood, *Fasti*, col. 266.

[30] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 1, fol. 166r.

[31] Anon., *Insolence and Impudence Triumphant* (London: 1669), 5.

[32] Wood, 4:227.

[33] *DNB, s.v.*

[34] *FICPP*, 2.

[35] See, for example, Henry More, *Enchiridion Ethicum* (London: 1667); and Ralph Cudworth, *A Treatise Concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality* (London: 1731).

[36] *FICPP*, 4.

[37] Ibid., 36.

[38] Ibid., 40.

[39] Ibid., 44.

[40] Ibid., 45.

[41] Parkin, 123.

[42] Ken Robinson, introduction to *FICPP*, iv.

[43] Michael Hunter, *The Royal Society and Its Fellows 1660-1700: The Morphology of an Early Scientific Institution* (Chalfont St. Giles, Bucks, England: The British Society for the History of Science, 1982), 198-99.

[44] *FICPP*, 45.

[45] Hunter, 24.

[46] Ibid., 10.

[47] Ibid., 59, 61. For more information on Wilkins see Barbara Shapiro, *John Wilkins, 1614-1672: An Intellectual Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

[48] Hunter, 115.

[49] Ibid., 198-99.

[50] Bodl., Wood MSS F 46, fol. 272r.

[51] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 2, fol. 104r.

[52] Ibid., vol. 3, fol. 9r.

[53] Ibid., fol. 92v.

[54] Ibid., fol. 93v.

[55] Ibid., fol. 174r.

[56] Marvell, 74.

[57] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 170r. *Irenicum*, published just after the Restoration, urged a policy of comprehension and a broader freedom of conscience than was adopted in the Act of Uniformity.

[58] Bodl., Wood MSS F 46, fol. 272r.

[59] Bodl., Tanner MS 32, fol. 26r.

[60] *CSPD, 1684-85*, p. 207.

[61] Ibid., 195, 236.

[62] Hunter, 41.

[63] Ibid., 198-99.

[64] Hasted, 7:316.

[65] Ibid., 7:318.

[66] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 3, fol. 92v. The author was informed of the absence of Restoration-era records from Chartham, Ickham, and Eastbridge Hospital by archivists at the Canterbury Cathedral Archives.

[67] Hasted, 7:301.

[68] Ibid., 7:304-16.

[69] Ibid., 7:301-02. See also John Somners, *Chartham News: Or a Brief Relation of Some Strange Bones There Lately Digged Up* (London: 1669).

[70] Marvell, 220.

[71] Bodl., Tanner MS 124, fol. 100r.

[72] Hasted, 7:300.

[73] Ibid., 9:179.

[74] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 3, fol. 92v.

[75] Hasted, 9:168.

[76] Ibid., 9:167-68.

[77] Ibid., 9:169-75.

[78] Ibid., 9:178.

[79] Marvell, 220.

[80] Ibid., 212.

[81] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 3, fol. 201r.

[82] Hasted, 9:17-18.

[83] *VCH*, 2:215.

[84] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 3, fol. 248r.

[85] Ibid., vol. 4, fol. 72r.

[86] Ibid., fol. 91r.

[87] Ibid., fol. 194-98, 210-12.

[88] Ibid., fol. 91r.

[89] Bodl., Tanner MS 123, fol. 177r.

[90] Ibid., fol. 178r.

[91] See, for example, Toon, 136-37; John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 58-59; Ashcraft, 41-54.

[92] Bodl., Tanner MS 123, fol. 188r.

[93] Ibid., fol. 181r.

[94] Ibid., fol. 179r.

[95] Ibid., fol. 181r.

[96] Ibid., fol. 179r.

[97] Ibid.

[98] Edward Cutts, *A Dictionary of the Church of England* (London: 1887), 31.

[99] Cutts, 207-8.

[100] Bodl., Tanner MS 123, fol. 175.

[101] *VCH*, 2:211, 220.

[102] Bodl., Tanner MS 123, fol. 179.

[103] Ibid.

[104] A *prebend* is an endowment in land or money given to a cathedral to support a secular priest. The beneficiary of the endowment is called a *prebendary*. The prebendary was nominated by either the bishop or the cathedral's dean and chapter. Parker also presided

at an archdiaconal court; more information on this aspect of his duties is found in the following section.

[105] J. Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (London: 1712). Cited in Marvell, 377.

[106] Cutts, 476.

[107] Lambeth, *ABAC*, vol. 3, fol. 174r; CCA, *Canterbury Cathedral Chapter Act Books* CA5, fol. 12r.

[108] CCA, Boxes in the Basement, 67/86.

[109] CCA, TB 11, fol. 5r.

[110] Ibid., fol. 50v.

[111] Ibid., fol. 9r.

[112] Ibid., fol. 45v.

[113] Ibid., fol. 41-43.

[114] CCA, Boxes in the Basement, 67/120.

[115] CCA, RB 13, fol. 53r.

[116] CCA, Canterbury Letters 163.

[117] CCA, MB 2/2. The year 1682 appears in at least one entry.

[118] Details of this incident are in Chapter Two.

[119] Bodl., Tanner MS 124, fol. 99r.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid., fol. 65r.

[122] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 180r.

[123] Bodl., Tanner MS 36, fol. 223r.

[124] Ibid.

[125] Bodl., Tanner MS 124, fol. 63r.

[126] Bodl., Tanner MS 35, fol. 122r.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Bodl., Tanner MS 123, fol. 175r.

[129] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 166-175.

[130] I have proceeded on the assumption that the letter is indeed intended for Charles II, but it is possible that it was written to James II after Charles' death, in which case the letter should be dated 1685 and would have had no impact on Parker's summons to London in 1684.

[131] Bodl., Tanner, MS. 31, fol. 173v, 175r.

[132] Ibid., fol. 167r.

[133] Ibid, fol. 167r-v..

[134] Bodl., Tanner, MS. 35, fol. 107r.

[135] Bodl., Tanner, MS. 31, fol. 168v.

[136] Ibid., fol. 169r.

[137] Jane Lane, *Titus Oates* (London: Camelot Press, 1949), 25-26.

[138] Bodl., Tanner, MS. 31, fol. 169v.

[139] Ibid., fol. 170v.

[140] Ibid., fol. 171r.

[141] Of course, if the letter were written after James' reign had begun, the motive for claiming an affection for Catholic subjects would be obvious.

[142] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 170r.

[143] Bodl., Cherry MS 23, fol. 321r.

[144] Ibid., fol. 324v.

[145] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 170r.

[146] Ibid., fol. 171v.

[147] Ibid., fol. 172r.

[148] Ibid., fol. 176r.

[149] Ibid.

[150] Ibid., fol. 206r.

[151] Ibid., fol. 206v.

[152] Wood, 4:227.

[153] This event is discussed in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER TWO
GRACE UNDER PRESSURE: THE TOLERATION CONTROVERSY I

Samuel Parker's active participation in the national debate over religious toleration taking place in England between 1667 and 1673 catapulted him to national recognition. During this critical period, he emerged as one of the chief spokesmen for the anti-toleration position and gained for himself many allies as well as numerous enemies. This chapter provides a basic chronology of the controversy, outlining the various books Parker wrote as well as those written in response to him and concluding that he held his own rhetorically against his adversaries. It also analyzes a relatively ignored aspect of the debate, *viz*., the authors' polemical usage of grace. I argue that Parker's and his opponents' stances on the toleration question were determined to a significant degree by the view of grace each author espoused.

The Toleration Controversy's Context

Public attitudes towards the nonconformists had generally improved in the mid-1660s. Many nonconformist ministers had stayed in London to care for the sick and dying during the outbreak of plague in 1665, while some ministers in the Church of England had fled the city for the relative safety of the countryside. The plague and subsequent Great Fire of 1666 were interpreted by some as divine punishment on England for its strict treatment of the nonconformists after the passage of the Act of Uniformity in 1662; various statutes, such as the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts, had imposed severe limitations on the activities and meetings of dissenters.

Although the year 1667 was clearly a good one for Parker, with his selection as Gilbert Sheldon's chaplain and his appointment to the living at Chartham, the same cannot be said for the leadership of the Church of England and its allies at court. Edward Hyde, first earl of Clarendon, who had been Charles II's chief minister since the Restoration, had fallen from favor for his mismanagement of the war against the Dutch and was finally impeached. He was replaced by the group widely known as "the Cabal": Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. Thomas Clifford (1630-1673), later created baron of Chudleigh by Charles, had held various posts in the government prior to 1667, most notably with the navy; he was present at the major engagements during the Second Dutch War and prepared papers concerning naval operations for Parliament. Henry Bennet, baron (and later earl) of Arlington (1618-1685), had fought on the royalist side in the 1640s and had served the royal family abroad in the 1650s. He achieved great influence after 1660 through an alliance with Lady Castlemaine, Charles' mistress. George Villiers, duke of Buckingham (1628-1687), had fought for the king in the

1640s and shared Charles II's exile until 1657. Despite having had cool relations with Charles between 1657 and 1660, he had his lands restored to him after the Restoration and was reputed to be the king's richest subject. He had sat on the privy council since 1662 and became the most influential member of the Cabal. Anthony Ashley Cooper (1621-1683), the future earl of Shaftesbury, had fought on both sides in the 1640s, served in the Barebones Parliament but later opposed Cromwell, and helped bring about the Restoration through his support of General Monck. He had held posts in the Treasury throughout the 1660s and was an important backer of the Carolina colony in North America. John Maitland, earl (and later duke) of Lauderdale (1616-1682), had been a Scottish commissioner at the Westminster Assembly in 1643, but later supported Charles I. He had been confined in England throughout the 1650s and was made secretary of state at the Restoration, becoming dominant in Scottish affairs thereafter. From the perspective of the "High Church" party, none of these five ministers was a reliable supporter of the Church of England. Clifford was a Roman Catholic; Arlington inclined to lenience toward Catholics and nonconformists when it seemed politically expedient for reasons of foreign policy; Buckingham had been connected to Presbyterian intrigues in the late 1650s and was a known supporter of toleration; Cooper had taken the Solemn League and Covenant in the 1640s, had opposed the Five Mile Act, and consistently supported lenience for Protestant dissenters; and finally, Lauderdale, despite his energetic persecution of conventicles in Scotland, was lukewarm toward the Church of England.[1]

Sheldon rightly suspected that an attack on the state church's monopoly was imminent.[2] He and the other bishops had supported Clarendon that year, but their efforts had been in vain. Now they faced the displeasure of not only the Cabal but also the king. In December, the diarist Samuel Pepys noted how things stood between Charles and the clergy:

> The Archbishop of Canterbury is called no more to the Caball . . . , the Bishops differing from the King in the late business in the House of Lords [Clarendon's impeachment] having caused this and what is like to fallow, for everybody is encouraged nowadays to speak and even to print (as I have one of them) as bad things against them as ever in the year 1640; which is a strange change.[3]

Charles' displeasure stemmed as much from the clergy's ineffectiveness at influencing the public as from their support of Clarendon. In his history of the period, Gilbert Burnet described a conversation he had with the king:

> While we were talking of the ill state the church was in, I was struck to hear a prince of his course of life so much disgusted at the ambition, covetousness, and the scandals of the clergy. He said, if the clergy had done their part, it had been an easy thing to run down the nonconformists: but, he added, they will do nothing, and have me do every thing: and most of them do worse than if they did nothing.[4]

Sympathy for the nonconformists became evident in Parliament in the autumn of 1667 when a brief attempt was made to introduce legislation that would ease or lift completely the restrictions on them.[5] This ignited a stream of pamphlets and books from authors across the religious spectrum that did not abate for several years. Conformists and nonconformists alike were divided among themselves as to what action, if any, should be taken. In the ensuing debate,

some warned against any change in the religious settlement, others argued for a comprehension within the state church of at least some of the conservative and moderate nonconformists, and still others demanded toleration in varying degrees of dissenting groups.

Initially, the nonconformists' prospects looked favorable; on 21 December 1667, Pepys wrote, "The Nonconformists are mighty high and their meetings frequented and connived at; and they do expect to have their day now soon; for my Lord Buckingham is a declared friend of them and even of the Quakers, who had very good words the other day from the King himself."[6] He returned to the theme many times over the next several weeks, speculating that the most likely sticking point in Parliament would be an attempt to include toleration for Roman Catholics, which the "sober party" would not allow.[7] Despite this initial momentum, specific proposals for comprehension went nowhere in 1668. One reason for this was the failure of negotiations between the state church, represented by John Wilkins, and the moderate dissenters, represented by Richard Baxter, to settle the question of reordination for those ministers who had begun to preach during the Interregnum.[8] Another obstacle to comprehension was the active opposition of Sheldon and his allies. Although Sir Matthew Hales had drawn up a bill containing some of the provisions of Wilkins' and Baxter's negotiations, the House of Commons preemptively forbade the introduction of it or any other bill designed to ameliorate the circumstances of nonconformists.[9] Parker later wrote that Sheldon "had so prepared the good members of that House that the very first day of their meeting, they resolved if it [a comprehension bill] was brought into the House, they would not pass it."[10] Meanwhile, the High Church, pro-comprehension, and pro-toleration sides of the question continued to argue their views in print. As the debate moved forward, comprehension was viewed less and less as a viable option, and more energy was expended discussing toleration.

Richard Ashcraft believes that John Locke's mature political thought arose from the controversies of 1667-1673. He views the nonconformist polemicists of these years as working within a single philosophical framework of individual autonomy and a compatibility between reason and revelation that enabled individuals to apprehend the requirements of natural law. Each individual, according to this paradigm, was authorized–indeed, obligated–to make his or her own judgment regarding the legitimacy of religious injunctions issued by the magistrate.[11] In *England's Troubles*, Jonathan Scott focuses attention on a different argument for toleration which Ashcraft overlooked, *viz.* that it was in England's national interest. Major proponents of this view, according to Scott, were Slingsby Bethel, Algernon Sidney, and William Penn. These authors believed that religious persecution retarded trade and economic growth and thus lessened England's standing among the nations.[12]

Gary de Krey, by contrast, has identified four distinct arguments on behalf of toleration that circulated in the years 1667-72.[13] Some authors, as Ashcraft notes, relied on natural law and sought to reconcile the claims of conscience with the ecclesiastical authority of the magistrate. Chief among these were John Owen and John Humfrey, both of whom issued replies to Parker's *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* in 1669 (see below). Others claimed, as Scott notes, that toleration was in the political and economic interest of England. A third group appealed to natural law and historical right to deny completely the ecclesiastical jurisdiction claimed by the magistrate. William Penn and Sir Charles Wolseley (ca. 1630-1714), a Commonwealthman who had urged Cromwell to lay claim to the crown and had been pardoned at the Restoration, were the most important in this group. Finally, some writers employed Hebrew and Christian prophetic imagery, arguing for toleration on the basis of a millennial ideology. (Obviously, individual nonconformists used more than one of these arguments when the situation suited

them.) Thus, the opponents of toleration were faced with an entire array of arguments, some of which were contradictory.

De Krey has also examined radical activity in the London area during the toleration controversy and has concluded that there was sufficient unrest to label the period the "First Restoration Crisis."[14] He describes intense opposition to the Conventicle Act which prompted anti-brothel riots in 1668 (whereas conventicles were harshly persecuted, the equally illegal brothels were allowed to operate freely) as well as the election of three radicals as aldermen in 1669-1670. Dissenters also actively tried to drive a wedge between Charles II and Parliament by offering Charles £40,000 in loans when he was unable to raise the desired sum from the City magistrates.[15] De Krey concludes that this period was a crucial one in the "prehistory" of the Whig party and helped to form much of its ideology.

De Krey's work has prompted a reevaluation of some of the major writings of the period. For example, Richard Greaves has reassessed John Bunyan, one of the most important nonconformist leaders in Restoration England, who spent almost all of the 1660s and early 1670s in prison for his beliefs. It is likely that Bunyan had hoped for release from his imprisonment when discussion of toleration reached a fever pitch in the late 1660s and had been frustrated when no relaxation of the Act of Uniformity was forthcoming.[16] Greaves notes that Bunyan may have been present at the bawdy house riots in 1668 during one of his brief periods of freedom, and that this episode may have been reflected in his masterpiece, *The Pilgrim's Progress*.[17] Elsewhere he postulates that it would have been extremely strange for Bunyan not to have written anything concerning the most burning religious controversy of the time, and concludes that *The Pilgrim's Progress* may have been intended in part as a contribution to the debate over conscience in the late 1660s.[18]

Parker should also be reassessed in light of recent scholarship in this area. Study of his writings during these years shows that he was attempting to answer all of the above pro-toleration arguments except the prophetic/millennial one. It is also clear that he viewed all these positions, even the "Interest" argument, as ultimately stemming from Wolseley's belief that the magistrate had no legitimate authority in religious matters. Thus we see a tension and disjointed quality in his work as he attempted to articulate one position which would silence all the nonconformists. Even so, Parker must be credited with realizing the implications of the natural law theory still in its developmental stage, for its consistent application did eventually lead to the complete rejection of the magistrate's ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the protestations of some of Parker's opponents notwithstanding.

The First Round: The *Discourse* and its Answerers

Parker entered the controversy late in 1669 on the side of the High Church forces with *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie: Wherein the Authority of the Civil Magistrate over the Consciences of Subjects in Matters of Religion Is Asserted; the Mischiefs and Inconveniences of Toleration Are Represented, and All Pretenses Pleaded in Behalf of Liberty of Conscience Are Fully Answered*, which was licensed for publication on 22 November.[19] The book consisted of a preface and 326 octavo pages divided into eight chapters.[20] Its title represented its contents well, and the work quickly became a focal point of the controversy; subsequent printings were licensed on 17 February and 22 November 1670, making it in all likelihood Parker's most widely

read work.[21] Its impact on contemporary debate can be seen in the fact that eighteen years later Robert Ferguson, who penned one of the replies to Parker in 1673, was still berating it.[22]

The *Discourse* was not the first book in which Parker had criticized the nonconformists of his day. Hostile reflections on them occur in his early philosophical works. For example, in *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie*, in the midst of offering praise for the ethical concerns of Platonists, Parker paused to draw a contrast with unnamed nonconformists who "were wont to discourse, that the Saints or People of God (*i.e.* That sort of people who can be Devout and Godly, without being Vertuous) are indeed peevish here, but in Heaven this imperfection shall be removed." These false teachers, he declared, might as well have claimed "that the Saints are *Drunkards* here, but in Heaven they shall be Temperate; the Saints are *Cheats* and *Knaves* here, but in Heaven they shall be Honest; the Saints are *Adulterers* here, but in Heaven they shall be Chast."[23] Elsewhere in the same work he offhandedly declared, "What Pestilential Influences the Genius of *Enthusiasme* or opinionative Zeal has upon the Publick Peace, is so evident from Experience, that it needs not be prov'd from Reason."[24] At that time, Parker believed that the best way to avoid schism was to "silence groundless and dividing Opinions"; in other words, the church's leaders were to refuse to take sides in doctrinal disputes over "undeterminable" things and silence the partisans of both sides.[25] Apparently, the intervening years had persuaded Parker that this approach was not practical in the English context and that the state needed to act against the dissenters. The point is Parker's hostility towards his former coreligionists was on record before the toleration controversy began; in fact, J. G. A. Pocock places Parker at the beginning stages of a trend linking Platonists with nonconformists, noting that "a polemic against Platonism went hand in hand with the polemic against enthusiasm" to a great degree in the eighteenth century.[26]

Although major aspects of the *Discourse* are examined in detail later in this and the following chapters, a general overview is appropriate here. In the preface, Parker gave fair warning that his argument would be harsh in tone, and he optimistically (and incorrectly) asserted that this feature of his writing would be the only one to which the nonconformists would be able to object. He excused his vehemence in advance by swearing that under normal circumstances he was of "a tame and softly humour," but that "to lash these morose and churlish Zealots with smart and twingeing Satyrs is so farr from being a criminal Passion, that 'tis a zeal of Meekness and Charity."[27] He went so far as to compare himself to Christ, who was provoked into "a hot fit of Zeal" by the hypocrisy of the moneychangers in the temple.[28] Parker clearly was trying to create for the reader in these first few pages an image of himself as the heretofore aloof scholar who had finally lost patience with the irresponsibility of toleration advocates and had come out of seclusion to put them in their place.

He stated that his initial plan had been to expose "the lamentable Folly and Silliness of these mens [the nonconformists'] Religion" by rational discourse, but that the publication of Simon Patrick's *A Friendly Debate Between Two Neighbors, the One a Conformist, the Other a Non-Conformist* (1668) had relieved him of this task.[29] He thereupon had decided rather to attempt to prove the authority of the civil magistrate to compel observance of religious ceremonies, and then to urge the exercise of that authority against the nonconformists because of their inherently seditious tendencies. "I never proposed to my self any other aim in this following Discourse, than . . . to awaken Authority to beware of its worst and most dangerous Enemies, and to force them to that Modesty and Obedience by severity of Laws."[30] In the course of his argument, Parker directly or indirectly attacked the first three pro-toleration positions noted above.

Chapter One of the *Discourse* put forward the claim that because religious beliefs and practices have such a critical impact on the peace and stability of states, they must be subject to the authority of the magistrate. This chapter also laid out Parker's views on the nature and origin of authority, a topic I analyze in Chapter Three. Chapter Two of the *Discourse* promoted moral virtue as the goal of religion, and contended that virtue and grace are one and the same; this is another key component of Parker's construct that is discussed below in more detail. In the following chapter, Parker drew a distinction between internal judgments and worship on the one hand and external action on the other, arguing that Christian liberty is not impinged by external restraints on action.

Parker's fourth and fifth chapters focused on Thomas Hobbes's philosophy of authority and the errors Parker ascribed to it. Parker also contended that acceptance of the Hobbesian framework led inevitably to atheism, toleration, and a breakdown of social order. Chapter Six argued against the notion that nothing should take place in worship not expressly authorized by scripture, and claimed that abuse of religious authority by the magistrate is preferable to complete absence of that authority; this chapter was the target of some of the most strident denunciations by the nonconformists. The next chapter expressed the view that nonconformist leaders maintained their separation from the state church under the false pretense of not wanting to cause their followers to stumble, when in fact they were sinning by placing the dubious scruples of third parties ahead of their own duty to obey lawfully established authority. Finally, Chapter Eight denied an exemption for "tender consciences" from obeying the law in matters where scripture has not spoken clearly. Parker maintained that the real reason for nonconformists' disobedience was their pride and unwillingness to submit to God's ordained magistrates.

Answers to the *Discourse* soon appeared. The first was the anonymously authored *Insolence and Impudence Triumphant* (1669), a work of only twenty quarto pages, many of which were taken up with quotations from the *Discourse* arranged under various headings.[31] The author's stated purpose in quoting Parker was to highlight the extreme tone of Parker's polemic. This complaint would be found in virtually everything written by his opponents, and modern historians still take note of it; in fact, John Spurr mentions the *Discourse* in his general treatment of the Church of England solely to point out its "intemperate violence."[32] That Parker's writing offended so many in an age renowned for its inflamed rhetoric and biting satire is noteworthy. This style is probably best explained by a combination of factors: excessive self-confidence, the zeal of a convert attacking the perceived errors of his youth, and a calculated attempt at provocation.

In the same vein, Parker's opponents repeatedly complained about his apparent arrogance in dismissing all those who took a position different from his as schismatical, seditious, or worse. The author of *Insolence and Impudence Triumphant* began this refrain as well. "That a young *Pragmaticus* so magisterially should Sit and Judge, Censure and Sentence the whole Universe, as 'twere; is such a monstrous piece of Arrogance, as I know not how to think on't with any tolerable patience."[33] He went on to write that he had been present at a recent sermon Parker preached at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, the bulk of which Parker spent "decrying an *imputed* Righteousness, railing at *Phanaticks*, jearing them with *lolling* upon Christ, calling them *Lubberly Believers*, &c."[34]

Another reply to the *Discourse*, entitled *A Case of Conscience . . . Together with Animadversions on a New Book Entitled Ecclesiastical Polity* (1669), came from John Humfrey in the weeks immediately following the *Discourse*'s publication. Humfrey, a Presbyterian

minister in London who had previously renounced his post-Restoration ordination in the state church, was a tireless advocate of the unity of all Protestants. Despite its brevity (thirty-one octavo pages), *A Case of Conscience* was an *ad hoc* compilation of musings in three unrelated sections; the middle one dealt with the *Discourse*. The only positive thing Humfrey found to say about Parker's book was that it had been written on "very fine Paper."[35] He offered a paragraph or two in response to each chapter in the *Discourse*, arguing both that the magistrate had nothing to fear from the individual conscience, which is controlled by God, and that he did not rightly have the expansive authority Parker claimed. Humfrey was particularly incensed by Parker's argument in Chapter Eight that the subject should forsake his or her scruples to defer to authority's commands in uncertain cases: "this Author hath bestowed this Chapter to perswade men to damnation."[36]

This analysis was quite perceptive, considering its brevity. After animadverting on each of Parker's chapters, Humfrey complained that Parker had not touched on the central issues of nonconformity. He proceeded to distinguish among various sorts of nonconformists, pointing out that the Congregationalists' definition of the church was very different from the Church of England's, and that Parker had never addressed this root cause of their separation.[37] He further maintained that Presbyterians in general desired reconciliation with the state church and remained outside it because of their consciences or the consciences of those around them, not because of their "peevishness."[38] Humfrey's complaint was that Parker had grossly oversimplified the issues raised by the nonconformists by lumping them all into a collective bogeyman to frighten those in power. It is surprising that others who answered Parker opted not to pursue this line of argument in more detail. It may be that this was the result of the shift in the debate toward toleration after the failure of comprehension proposals in 1668.

Undoubtedly, the most important immediate response to the *Discourse* was John Owen's *Truth and Innocence Vindicated* (1669). Owen (1616-1683) had been one of the most prominent divines in England during the Interregnum; in addition to serving as Oliver Cromwell's chaplain and vice-chancellor of Oxford University, he had been involved in the "Wallingford House" conspiracy to depose Richard Cromwell in 1659. The Restoration had ended Owen's political involvement, but not his role as an apologist for nonconformity.[39] Owen had asked Richard Baxter, the well-known moderate nonconformist leader, to answer Parker in print, but Baxter refused, not thinking that he was one of Parker's targets. Owen then took it upon himself to provide a detailed response to Parker on behalf of the nonconformists.[40] The result was a volume longer than Parker's at 410 octavo pages. The book's outline mirrored the *Discourse*'s, with critiques of Parker's preface and each subsequent chapter. However, Owen did not complete the task, stopping with Chapter Six, "utterly wearied with the frequent occurrence of the same things in various dresses."[41] In so doing he perhaps conveniently avoided the issue of the tender conscience Parker had raised in the last two chapters of his work.

Throughout the work, Owen generally argued the exact opposite of Parker's position. He asserted that the magistrate did not have authority to bind the conscience and that the alleged evils of the unfettered conscience cited by Parker were nonexistent. He argued strenuously that grace and moral virtue were separate things in his critique of the *Discourse*'s second chapter, going on in the treatment of the third chapter to assert that external forms were an essential part of religious worship that could not be controlled by the magistrate. Owen had less to say about Parker's discussion of Hobbes, but he expressed skepticism regarding the specter Parker had raised of atheistic influence in the toleration movement. In the last chapter Owen rejected the doctrine of passive obedience and urged a policy of toleration once more. Baxter later wrote that

"Dr. *Owen*'s esteem was much advanced with the Nonconformists" on account of the book, and that the consensus among them was that Parker would never be able to answer it.[42]

The Second Round: Parker Pursues Owen

However, Parker responded in 1671 with an even longer work entitled *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie: By way of Letter to a Friend in London, Together with a Letter from the Author of the Friendly Debate*. This contribution to the discussion, which ran to 750 octavo pages, was licensed for printing on 22 November 1670.[43] Its hefty price of seven shillings, double that of the *Discourse*, may be one reason why it was not as widely read as its predecessor. In the preface, Parker apologized for having delayed so long before issuing a response to Owen, but defended himself by noting, "I am not able (as my Adversary is) to write Books at *Idle Hours* and *Spare Minutes*, and though I were, I have them not."[44] The polemical tone which incensed his opponents continued unabated; abuse of Owen began in the preface and continued throughout the work: "This man is not at leisure to write Sense, nor takes time to weigh whether what he dictates be pertinent either to his own or to my purpose. His whole Book is nothing but Cavil and vulgar Talk."[45]

A Defence was less well organized than the *Discourse*, a fact which may betray evidence of Parker's state of mind during its composition; he frequently went out of his way to accuse the nonconformists in general and Owen in particular of various sins. It consisted of seven chapters, to which was appended, as indicated in the title, a letter from Simon Patrick. Chapter One expounded on the sin of pride and claimed that its prevalence among nonconformists was the chief reason for division in the church. It also accused the nonconformists of slandering and misrepresenting any author who criticized them, giving alleged examples from Owen's book. The following chapter defended the episcopal clergy from the accusations of ignorance and immorality frequently leveled at them by dissenters, and championed Patrick's *Friendly Debate* in particular.

In Chapter Three, Parker returned to the themes of the *Discourse*, asserting that Owen had misrepresented his argument regarding the magistrate's authority over the individual conscience, and that he had never implied that this authority was absolute. He went on in the subsequent chapter to reiterate and defend his doctrine of grace and virtue's oneness, as well as the argument that the magistrate's jurisdiction over virtue is the same as his jurisdiction over worship ceremonies. Chapter Five expanded upon Parker's idea of "Christian Liberty," and denied that he had ever restricted it purely to inward thoughts, attempting instead to show that the dissenters' notion of liberty was the defective one. In Chapter Six, Parker argued that the logical result of applying nonconformist principles to the church would result in nothing being tolerated but Independency. The final chapter, which was 162 pages long, accused nonconformists of sedition and pointed out the widely diverging views of the nature of the Reformation and causes of the civil wars in England. The assertion that "religion is not onely the best, but a necessary disguise for Rebellion," figured significantly in Parker's argument.[46] Baxter's opinion was that Parker scored a telling blow with this line of attack, despite the *Defence*'s shortcomings, because Owen was indeed vulnerable to charges of rebellion, having been such a major figure during the Commonwealth and Protectorate:

> *Parker* had so many of his [Owen's] Parliament and Army Sermons to cite, in which he urgeth them to Justice, and Prophesyeth of the ruine of the *Western* Kings, and telleth them that their work was to take down Civil and Ecclesiastical Tyranny, with such like, that the Dr. being neither able to repent (hitherto) or to justify all this must be silent, or only plead the Act of Oblivion: And so I fear his unfitness for this Work was a general injury to the Nonconformists.[47]

After the publication of the *Defence*, there was a lull in the toleration debate as far as Parker was concerned. Things seemed to have been going well for his side in the political arena. A new Conventicle Act to replace the one of 1664, which had expired in 1669, was passed in the spring of 1670. Its terms were strict; negligent justices of the peace were to be punished as well as the nonconformist ministers, and informers were encouraged to initiate prosecutions.[48] Enforcement of the act had proceeded apace throughout that summer, with officials occasionally using military force to break up meetings in the counties. Nevertheless, grassroots resistance remained strong, as evidenced by the repeated refusal of a jury in September to convict the Quakers William Penn and William Meade for conspiracy to provoke a riot while speaking out during an Anglican service.[49] The House of Commons continued zealously to pursue the nonconformists, and it passed a bill in April 1671 which gave indemnities to persecuting officials, although the proroguing of Parliament soon thereafter prevented it from becoming law.[50]

Over the course of the following year, the tide began to turn against the anti-toleration party in court circles. Perhaps the chief reason for this was the necessities of foreign policy. Having secretly committed himself to assist Louis XIV in his war against the Dutch, Charles II needed to ensure that the home front was secure; he was concerned that the nonconformists' sympathy for the Reformed Dutch, combined with a repressive religious policy, could lead to revolt once hostilities began. Moreover, Charles had never been enthusiastic about the persecution of dissenters and had acquiesced in it mainly as a concession to Parliament. As noted, the members of the Cabal had their own reasons for wishing to end the repression of dissenters as well. They advised Charles that although he could not repeal the laws against dissenters, he could suspend them via a proclamation. At a series of meetings of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in March 1672, Charles and Clifford worked out an arrangement whereby the penal laws would be suspended and the nonconformists' meetings permitted with certain regulations. Charles implemented this plan by issuing a Declaration of Indulgence on 15 April 1672.[51] This was certainly a severe blow to the hopes of Parker and the rest of the anti-toleration forces, and he resumed his involvement in the pamphlet war shortly thereafter.

Owen did not directly reply to Parker' *Defence*, but he continued his apologetics on behalf of nonconformity. In 1672 he anonymously published *A Discourse Concerning Evangelical Love*, which went into a second edition bearing his name the following year. In this work, he took advantage of the favorable climate afforded by Charles' indulgence to explain his Congregationalist views in a disarming way. In four chapters covering 258 octavo pages, he argued that the Congregationalist separation from the state church was not a repudiation of the latter as a true church of Christ, nor did the separation constitute a schism. He also laid out the case for nonconformity based on the state church's allegedly unscriptural terms of communion and its neglect of certain scriptural duties.

Unwilling to let Owen's work pass without censure, Parker took the opportunity to criticize it in a preface to *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy*,

from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, as It Is Managed by Mr. Baxter in His Treatise of the Grotian Religion (1672).[52] John Bramhall (1594-1663) had been a controversial figure in the preceding era. As bishop of Derry in the 1630s, he assisted Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, in his notorious policy of "Thorough," for which the latter was impeached and executed in the early stages of the Long Parliament. He maintained a close correspondence with William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, writing to him at least once a month and serving as the latter's chief agent in the attempted "harmonization" of the Church of Ireland with the Church of England.[53] Bramhall fled to England in 1641 and to the continent in 1644 and was one of the few clergy (along with Laud) to be exempted from the general amnesty granted by Parliament. The Presbyterians called him "bishop bramble," and Cromwell referred to him as "Irish Canterbury." At the Restoration, he returned to England and was appointed archbishop of Armagh and speaker of the Irish House of Lords in 1661. His *Vindication* was not published during his lifetime, but was resurrected by Parker in the hopes of striking another blow against the nonconformists.[54]

Parker's preface ran to ninety-four octavo pages, making it more than half as long as the text it introduced. In addition to praising Bramhall as a tireless advocate of the reconciliation of all Christendom, he denounced the "fierce and fiery Calvinists" who accused the archbishop of involvement in a murky "Spanish-Popish-Jesuitical-Arminian Plot."[55] Naturally, Baxter, against whom Bramhall had written his *Vindication*, received criticism from Parker; he had been "flusht and perch't in his own conceit . . . to bolt forth such bold and rash censures" against the archbishop. Parker conceded that Baxter had become more sensible in the years since his attack on Bramhall, and stated that the publication of the *Vindication* was not intended to "impair his Esteem."[56] However, he warned that the state church and its officers were still under attack, for

> others that pretend to as great an Interest and Authority with the holy Brotherhood still persevere in the same rudeness and incivility towards the Church of *England*, and upon every slight accident are beating up the Drums against the Pope and Popish Plots; they descry Popery in every common and usual chance, and a Chimney cannot take fire in the City or the Suburbs, but they are immediately crying Jesuites and Fireballs.[57]

Parker held up Owen as the prime example of such persons ("the great scribler of the Party"), taking particular exception to a passage in the *Discourse Concerning Evangelical Love* in which Owen accused the state church of having fallen into Arminian and Socinian error.[58] He attacked Owen's most recent work as a tired reiteration of arguments that had already been refuted by himself and others:

> Whoever will be at the idle pains to peruse his *Discourse on Evangelical Love, Church Peace and Unity*, will never be able to find one syllable to the purpose, beside a perpetual Repetition of the old worn-out Story of *Unscriptural Ceremonies* . . . and innumerable Suggestions that all that are or pretend to be Loyal to the present Setlement of the Church of *England*, are not so upon any Principles of Integrity or Conscience, but purely for their own secular and carnal Ends: *i.e.* in plain English, they are all downright Knaves.[59]

Parker went on to reassert his own contention that any acquiescence to the nonconformists' clamoring would result in more demands of increasing audacity because the dissenters' ultimate aim was to destroy the established church. Again, Owen declined to respond to this salvo, but Parker soon found he had another, equally capable opponent.

Round Three: *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and its Answerers

The next entry in the debate, Andrew Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or, Animadversions upon a Late Book, Intituled, A Preface Shewing What Grounds There Are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery* (1672), which went through several printings, caused a mild sensation in London, and changed entirely the character and tone of the controversy. Marvell (1621-1678) was one of England's most renowned satirists. He had been absent from England during most of the conflicts of the 1640s, but supported the Interregnum regime upon his return, forging ties with the Fairfax and Cromwell families in the early 1650s. He served as a member of Parliament for Hull from 1659 until 1678, the year of his death, transferring his loyalty to the Stuarts at the Restoration. He sympathized with the plight of the nonconformists and opposed the new Conventicle Act of 1670, viewing with distrust what he saw as the growing authority of Charles II. A letter of his dated 1669 or 1670 expressed this concern: "It is . . . my Opinion that the King was never since his coming in, nay, all Things considered, no King since the Conquest, so absolutely Powerful at Home, as he is at present. Nor any Parliament, or Places, so certainly and constantly supplyed with Men of the same Temper. In such a Conjuncture, . . . what Probability is there of my doing any Thing to the Purpose?"[60] Happily for Marvell, Charles' Declaration of Indulgence allowed him to strike a blow for toleration without appearing to oppose the royal prerogative.

Like many other pamphlets of the period, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* was not licensed for publication. When Roger L'Estrange, Charles' licenser of the press, first saw it, he considered suppressing it, but was stymied by the earl of Anglesey, who later objected to the printing of Parker's *The Case of the Church of England*. Anglesey told L'Estrange, "I have spoken to his Majesty about it [the book] and the King says he will not have it supprest, for Parker has done him wrong, and this man has done him right."[61] That Charles II had taken great exception to Parker's role in the toleration debate, singling him out from the many anti-toleration writers, is testimony to the impact which his books, particularly the *Discourse*, had made on the controversy. It is doubtful that Charles objected to Parker's absolutism, but the latter's warnings of the dangers of toleration must have been frustrating to the king who had encountered fierce parliamentary opposition to his indulgence..

Marvell took the title of his book from *The Rehearsal*, a play by George Villiers, duke of Buckingham, which had been published earlier that year after having opened to great success in 1671. *The Rehearsal* was a spoof of the heroic tragedies then in vogue, in which characters, "caught up in extravagant situations and torn by conflicts of love and honor, alternately coo and roar their passions in language heightened far above nature and far beyond sense."[62] Its main character, Bayes, is a caricature of John Dryden, the most prominent contemporary playwright in the genre.[63] Throughout the play, the "straight men" who visit the rehearsal of Bayes' newest work for the stage ridicule its nonsensical dialogue and plot and take great pleasure in listening to Bayes' incompetent explanations and justifications for each device. *The Rehearsal* was a

huge success and became a repertory piece for over a hundred years, although Buckingham did not succeed in driving heroic tragedy off the stage as he had hoped.

In *The Rehearsal*'s first scene, a conversation between Bayes and Johnson provided the rest of Marvell's title:

> BAYES: I do here aver, that no man yet the sun e'er shone upon, has parts sufficient to furnish out a stage, except it were by the help of these my rules.
> JOHNSON: What are those rules, I pray?
> BAYES: Why, Sir, my first rule is the rule of transversion, or *regula duplex*, changing verse into prose, and prose into verse alternative, as you please.
> SMITH: Well, but how is this done by rule, Sir?
> BAYES: Why thus, Sir; nothing so easy, when understood. I take a book in my hand, either at home or elsewhere, for that's all one; if there be any wit in't, as there is no book but has some, I transverse it; that is, if it be prose, put into verse, (but that takes up some time;) and if it be verse put it into prose.
> JOHNSON: Methinks, Mr. Bayes, that putting verse into prose, should be called transprosing.
> BAYES: By my troth, Sir, it is a very good notion, and hereafter it shall be so.[64]

At the outset of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Marvell likened Parker's argument against nonconformists to one of Bayes' plays, and he called Parker "Bayes" throughout the rest of the work. Although its title indicated that it was directed against the preface to Bramhall's *Vindication*, the book in fact addressed the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* and the *Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie* as well. However, Marvell did not so much answer Parker's arguments as ridicule them and their author.

In his study of debate and context in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, W. Andrew Alexander argues that Marvell followed a seventeenth-century convention by searching out an *implicit* argument–Parker's character and integrity–in order to debunk the *explicit* argument against toleration.[65] He believes Marvell's work was animated by two questions: who is Parker, and what kind of works has he written?[66] This fact placed the author in a role different from that of the traditional animadverter. "Marvell's primary concern is with what the text reveals about its author and itself; what it reveals about the debate on toleration is of decidedly secondary importance."[67] Although the book was unusual in this sense, its style was typical of Marvell's writing; Annabel Patterson has noted similarities of metaphor and persona between *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* on the one hand and the author's "Dialogue between the Soul and Body" and *An Account of the Growth of Popery* on the other.[68]

Alexander is correct in noting that Marvell's assessment of Parker "strives for neither rigor nor objectivity."[69] Many of the accusations he hurled were ludicrous on their face. For example, very early in the work he accused Parker, who was soon to be married, of being a womanizer whose indiscreet, hot-tempered writings were the result of his divided attentions. "Thus it must be, and no better, when a man's Phancy is up, and his Breeches are down; when the Mind and the Body make contrary Assignations, and he hath both a Bookseller and a Mistris to satisfie: Like *Archimedes*, into the Street he runs out naked with his Invention."[70] He also alleged that Parker's real target throughout the toleration controversy had been Charles II, who

had dared to offend the church leadership by favoring an indulgence of dissenters. Marvell even implied that Charles II, a notorious lecher, led a more moral lifestyle than the clergy in general.[71]

Another staple of Marvell's strategy, as Alexander notes, was a reliance on literal-minded distortions of Parker's statements.[72] Thus Parker's aside that fanaticism was more common among the mercantile classes was turned into a denunciation of all trade.[73] The assertion that tolerating all religious practices was more dangerous than countenancing vice became a positive encouraging of the latter.[74] Also, the qualifying remarks on the scope of sovereignty in the *Defence* were turned into a mere contradiction of arguments found in the *Discourse*. Marvell undoubtedly knew that this twisting of words would infuriate Parker, who had already complained of similar (though milder) treatment by Owen. Incidentally, Marvell did go out of his way to defend Owen and the *Discourse Concerning Evangelical Love*, claiming that it was timely and on topic, despite Parker's assertions to the contrary.[75]

The Rehearsal Transpros'd ended with a catalogue of Parker's sins which Marvell cited as his motivation to write: his presumption and arrogance, his "Infinite *Tautology*," his ill treatment of merchants, his irreverence towards kings and princes, his profanation of scripture, his attempt to reduce grace to virtue, his alleged speaking out against the Holy Trinity, and his ignorance of all Christians' divine duties.[76] Marvell had clearly outdone Parker in the sheer number and scope of the insults and denunciations which formed the heart of his work. Despite this, he claimed to be merely a neutral observer of the toleration debate, a moderate Anglican who disagreed with the nonconformists, but who, like the king, saw no harm in extending an indulgence to them. This persona he had constructed for himself later came under attack but was for the most part very effective in portraying Parker as an extremist.

Marvell's blistering attack called forth no fewer than six responses, including one from Parker. The first was *Rosemary and Bayes* (1672), a slight work of twenty-two octavo pages. Its author was the physician Henry Stubbe (1632-76), whom Anthony Wood called "the most noted Latinist and Grecian of his age." He had been a protege of the radical leader Henry Vane the Younger in the 1640s and had written numerous anti-monarchical works during the Interregnum. Although he had conformed to the state church at the Restoration, he remained a critic of popery and was arrested in 1673 for criticizing the duke of York's marriage to a Catholic princess.[77] In his 1983 study of Stubbe, James Jacob argues that the controversialist remained a radical at heart after 1660, continuing to advocate subtly a rationalist and proto-deist civil religion in his published works.[78]

Stubbe made it clear that he thought both Marvell and Parker were dangerous innovators. In an apparent attempt at herbal humor, he dubbed Marvell "Rosemary" to correspond with Parker's "Bayes." He noted several factual errors in Marvell's work, asserting, "I do not find that His understanding is proportionate unto his confidence."[79] Concerning *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, he complained, "If you will now examine the New Book, it will appear like a Mountebank's Ball, or a project of the R.S. [Royal Society] Wherein nothing doth answer our Expectation."[80] Most of his criticism consisted of nitpicking over details, but he addressed some larger issues by deriding Marvell's wholesale attacks on the Anglican clergy and his explanations of the civil war.[81] He concurred with Parker's stance that concessions to the nonconformists would not persuade the bulk of them to "acquiesce in Episcopacy."[82]

However, Stubbe reserved more substantive criticism for Parker, claiming that the latter's theology was totally out of step with the rest of the established church. "As to the Church of England few of them approved of the Style of Mr. Bayes, and fewer his Doctrines: He was in the Pulpit declaimed against as the young Leviathan."[83] He asserted that Parker and his friend

Simon Patrick had departed from the Anglican heritage. "Were Bishop Whitgift and Jewel, Whitaker and Perkins alive now, they would be accounted Fanaticks, Hereticks, and Brambles. And a new part of the Friendly Debate would evince them to be the most ridiculous, canting Preachers that ever were." He cited criticism of Calvin and Augustine in the two clergymen's writings as evidence that they had divorced themselves from the Protestant Reformation.[84] These claims were similar to those Owen had made regarding the Church of England's swing toward Arminianism, and there was clearly an element of truth in them. Several scholars have observed this trend away from the moderate Calvinist consensus of the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras towards a greater emphasis on works which became highly visible in the reign of Charles I and resumed after the Restoration.[85] Patrick, Parker, and their allies in the toleration controversy were prominent representatives of this view.

James Jacob views *Rosemary and Bayes* as one of several veiled calls for a civil religion in England. He believes Stubbe was following in the tradition of–but also offering a "drastic revision" of–the mid-seventeenth century radical James Harrington, who also advocated a civil religion.[86] Here Stubbe's criticisms of both Parker and Marvell are seen as motivated by the belief that the calumnies each directed against the nonconformist and Anglican clergy, respectively, were harmful to the civil peace because clergy (of whatever persuasion) help to anchor the social order. To Stubbe, concerns about salvation and the like were to be subordinated to the desire for public order. Therefore, Stubbe was being even more Hobbesian than "the young Leviathan" he was criticizing. Jacob even speculates that *Rosemary and Bayes* may have been commissioned by the court, since the work appears to be directed at Parker more than Marvell.[87]

The second answer to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* was the anonymously authored *A Common-place-Book out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1673).[88] This work's fifty-six octavo pages are largely devoid of serious criticism, the author focusing on the minutiae of Marvell's arguments and correcting various factual errors. His stated purpose was to inject an element of humor into the debate, something he felt the author of *Rosemary and Bayes* had not done.[89] He grouped his musings under seven headings: logic, chronology, wit, geography, anatomy, history, and loyalty. The last section castigated Marvell's treatment of the civil war for its endorsement of many of the parliamentary goals. Only in the last pages did the author acknowledge the conflict between Marvell and Parker, leaving no doubt as to who he thought was in the right. "As to what you have wrote against the Author of the Preface, the most part has either been answered to your Principal *J. O.* or else needs none."[90]

The third response to Marvell, *S'too Him Bayes: Or Some Observations upon the Humour of Writing Rehearsals Transpros'd* (1673), was also anonymous.[91] At 133 octavo pages, this was the longest rebuttal yet, and though its author mired himself in numerous digressions, he was the first to point out that Marvell, for all his satirical wit, had never refuted any of Parker's ideas. "Here you must give us leave to *distinguish* betwixt *Transprosing* and *Answering*. 'Tis plain some Persons [Parker and Bramhall] are presently *Transprosed*, but we can't perceive that any of the *Principal* things they say are *Answered*."[92] To drive the point home, he referred to Marvell as "Trans" throughout the tract.

The author criticized Marvell for lifting Parker's remarks out of context and ignoring his addressing of various issues. For example, in attempting to show Parker's inconsistency, Marvell had placed side by side two quotations from different books, one of which stated that the sovereign's jurisdiction was limited, the other of which asserted that it was unlimited. Regarding the second quote, the author replied, "It [the sovereign's will] is *bounded* by being *subordinate*

to the will of God, and so I believe the *Author* answers too, though you found it not so convenient (I suppose) to continue on your *quotation* till he came to shewing in what manner he explains himself."[93] Parker's other allegedly contradictory statements likewise only appeared so when taken out of context, he argued. This was a relatively accurate indictment of Marvell's style in the *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, although the device was undoubtedly effective in winning over readers. As a final jab at Marvell's perceived lack of substance, *S'too Him Bayes* ended with an epitaph:

Here lies Transprosal
That Writ a Book he could not name,
And Answered the Prefacer *to Bishop* Bramhall
Without Replying *a word*.[94]

The fourth reply to Marvell was arguably the most successful one in its attempt to turn the satirist's wit back on himself. Richard Leigh, an actor in the duke of York's company, produced *The Tranproser Rehears'd: Or the Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes's Play* in 1673. At 149 octavo pages, this work was roughly the same length as *S'too Him Bayes*, but was superior in its execution. At the outset, Leigh highlighted the seeming absurdity of Marvell's having written a 326-page book to answer a ninety-four-page preface, and he likened *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* to "a House wrought out of a Portal. 'Tis pretty I confess, and exceeds the power of common Architects. But what follows is more strange, that 100. pages . . . should be foundation sufficient to support his mighty *Paper-building* of 326."[95] Leigh also accused Marvell of being decidedly unoriginal, informing him that he should have named his book *The Rehearsal Transcrib'd* because he quoted Buckingham's play excessively.[96]

One of the highlights of *The Transproser Rehears'd* is an extended depiction of Marvell consorting with and whipping up the "rabble" with his screeds against bishops and papists, astounding the multitude with a few clever but meaningless plays on words.[97] Leigh expressed doubts as to the literacy of Marvell's fans, and wrote that many of the copies of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* that had been sold were probably being used for "baser" purposes. His epitaph on the work read:

Here lies in Sheets, TRANSPROS'D REHEARSAL
Condemn'd to wipe his, or her A- - -hole.[98]

In response to Marvell's description of Parker as a philanderer, Leigh insinuated that the former had been involved in a homosexual relationship with John Milton.[99] Finally, Leigh questioned the provenance of Calvinism. "The *Pox* and *Presbytery* broke out at the same time in *Europe*. And therefore are the Twin-*Diseases* deservedly associated in a Fatal Chronology."[100] Like the two anonymous respondents to Marvell, Leigh avoided serious examination of the theological and political issues of the toleration debate in favor of ridiculing his opponent. In doing so, he achieved to a large degree the same effectiveness Marvell had by virtue of his mastery of the satiric style, something the previous authors clearly lacked.

Parker penned the fifth response to Marvell, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transprosed, in a Discourse to Its Authour* (1673), another lengthy work of 528 octavo pages; it was licensed on 6 May 1673.[101] Here, for the first time, the archdeacon was truly on the defensive; whereas the *Discourse* and the *Defence* were well organized works divided into topical chapters, and their

style, along with that of the preface to Bramhall's book, indicated a firm command of the situation and context, the *Reproof* was relatively disorganized and reactive, in most places a mere line-for-line response to Marvell's attack. Obviously, Parker had been somewhat flustered by Marvell's rough handling of him and the inflammatory accusations and innuendo which filled the pages of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Despite this, he was able to return fire and strike several blows against his adversary.

From the outset, Parker hammered away at Marvell's failure to provide any rebuttal to his arguments, and averred that it confirmed all his expectations. "It has ever been their [nonconformists'] old Artifice, that when they are baffled out of all their impotent Pretences by dint of Reason and Argument, that then they should hire some Buffoon to recover their Credit and Cause by downright Rudeness and Impudence."[102] Regarding his "Grand Thesis," as Marvell put it, of the sovereign's jurisdiction over the consciences of his subjects, Parker noted, "You are not provided with one syllable of objection against it, and have not spent so much as a Tale or a Jest or a Quibble in its confutation."[103] He expressed bewilderment at Marvell's willingness "to bray forth such a confident heinous censure against it, as if it were notoriously evident without proof that it directly subverts all the Principles of Religion and Government."[104] Repeated challenges to Marvell to answer Parker with something more than name-calling occur throughout the work. One detects in these remarks echoes of Parker's assertion in the previously quoted dedicatory epistle of 1666 to Richard Bathurst that the nonconformist position was inherently irrational and unable to withstand logical scrutiny.[105]

Most of the remainder of the *Reproof* is a restating of the issues running through the *Discourse* and *Defence*, albeit in a more disorganized form. There are also extended digressions answering Marvell's taunting on quibbles such as his frequent classical allusions, particularly with regard to the Roman Empire. The substantive themes of the work, such as grace, authority, and the civil war, are dealt with below.

The sixth and final response to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Edmund Hickeringill's *Gregory, Father-Greybeard, with His Vizard off: Or, News from the Cabal in Some Reflexions upon a Late Pamphlet Entituled, The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, which was licensed on 16 June 1673 and sold for 2*s*. 6*d*., differed qualitatively from the rest of the books written by Parker's "allies."[106] At 332 octavo pages, it was a much more in-depth reply to Marvell, and more importantly, it dealt with the underlying issues of the toleration debate. Hickeringill (1631-1708) had had trouble finding a religious home; during the 1650s, he had been at various times a Baptist, a Quaker, and a deist. He later conformed to the state church and was ordained, spending most of his career in Colchester, advocating a rationalist and Erastian form of Christianity. *Gregory, Father-Greybeard* was his first book, but he went on to write many more over the next few decades.[107]

Hickeringill claimed he had been motivated to write by a conversation he overheard in a coffeehouse in which a group of young men were praising Marvell and his witty treatment of bishops and royal councillors; an older man at the table disagreed, saying such writing reminded him too much of the events of 1642. The old man went on to criticize Marvell for his backhanded condemnations of Charles I and William Laud, and said that such treatment was worse than that of Gregory Father-Greybeard, the headsman who had executed them.[108] Marvell's champions said very little, but what they did say was so rude "that I could scarce contain my self; and I had much ado to forbear kicking the Coxcombs."[109] The incident convinced him to read *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and then to publish a response, referring to Marvell as "Gregory" or "Greg" throughout.

Like Marvell's other answerers, Hickeringill injected as much humor into his work as he thought possible. For example, he referred to Richard Cromwell as "Queen Dick" when recounting the events of the Interregnum,[110] and he poked fun at various millennial interpretations of the book of Revelation put forward by nonconformists.[111] His purpose, he wrote, was to present important truths in a playful style, "that the *wholsom food* thereon contain'd, not *disgusting* the Palate of this *humorsome* and *frothy* Age, might *relish* the better, and go *merrily down*."[112]

Hickeringill's work is of interest because of its arguments, not its jests, which were inferior to Leigh's. He tackled the question of the relationship between grace and moral virtue head on, coming down firmly on Parker's side, but using very different arguments to prove his case (discussed below). Like Parker, he questioned the motives of nonconformist leaders, accusing them of being false prophets and only interested in personal gain. "All is fish that comes to net, whilst these *Hugh Peters*, *Baxters*, *Marshals*, and *Owens* laugh in their sleeves to see how soon the fools and their moneys are parted."[113] Like Parker, he viewed them as wicked men searching for an excuse to be unconcerned with good works. "I have by my own experience found more goodness, more kindness, more truth, more honesty, more sincerity among man-eaters or *Cannibals* in *India*, and *Turks* in *Arabia*; than among the best of these Professors."[114]

Hickeringill also called for restrictions on lay access to the scriptures, an argument which Bramhall had likewise made and which Marvell had criticized. He claimed that the English translations of the previous 150 years had serious flaws; some parts were "erroneous," and others made "scarce sence" or were prone to misinterpretation.[115] He cited the example of the Great Commission in Matthew 28, in which the apostles were commanded to make disciples, teach, and baptize. Baptists argued that because "teach" came before "baptize" in the English translation, paedobaptism was an abomination; Hickeringill pointed out that in the original Greek text, "baptize" came before "teach," a fact that destroyed the Baptist line of argument but that remained largely unknown among the sect because of its members' ignorance of Greek.[116] He further argued that no one in his day could truly understand ancient Hebrew because of its idiosyncracies, and that the Septuagint should be the basis of Old Testament translations.[117] Restricting access to the scriptures would prevent the blind from leading the blind; the laity should focus on the Ten Commandments and let the learned worry about the prophecies in Daniel and Revelation.[118]

Another of Hickeringill's targets was the sermon, a tool which he believed had come to be terribly abused. He contrasted the brevity of the sermons recorded in the New Testament with the length of the nonconformists' "hour-glass discourses," and averred that the dissenters had skewed the proper balance between catechizing and preaching as the means of gospel instruction.[119] He likewise condemned what he considered nonsensical and blasphemous prayers among the dissenters, recalling a Scottish minister in Colchester who had asked God to confound the king's images and idols.[120] He believed a liturgy was essential for the maintenance of order in worship and castigated the nonconformists for rejecting the Book of Common Prayer, most of the contents of which were almost as old as the Lord's Prayer.[121]

Hickeringill also discoursed at length on the civil war, a topic covered in Chapter Three of this dissertation. Of all Parker's allies in the literary struggle, Hickeringill had by far the greatest mastery of the relevant issues and provided an impressive bolstering of the former's position. Presumably recognizing the ability of this contributor to the debate, Marvell jumped to the erroneous conclusion that Hickeringill was in fact Parker writing under an assumed name in an effort to create the illusion of a scholarly consensus against him; this misperception–in

fairness not an unreasonable one since Hickeringill was a relatively unknown author and had only signed his initials to the work–surfaced in several places in Marvell's reply, as when he referred to Hickeringill as Parker's "other self."[122]

Marvell finally responded late in the year to his numerous critics, but chiefly to Parker, with *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part*, which bore the subtitle *Occasioned by Two Letters: The First Printed, by a Nameless Author, Intituled, A Reproof, &c., The Second Letter Left for Me at a Friends House, Dated Nov. 3. 1673. Subscribed J.G. and Concluding with These Words*; *If Thou Darest to Print or Publish Any Lie or Libel Against Doctor Parker, by the Eternal God I Will Cut Thy Throat.* This second offering of Marvell's retained much of the character of the first. The irreverent taunting of Parker persisted and was taken to another level with the mocking of the archdeacon's lineage. However, Marvell responded in part to Parker's demand in the *Reproof* to reorient the debate to the pertinent issues by attempting a substantive refutation of Parker's theses.

Marvell continued to portray himself as a pragmatic moderate whose whimsical jests in his prior work should not have been interpreted as having been meant to give offense. He employed an extended metaphor of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* as a tonic that was simply intended to give its readers, including Parker, a good laugh, and feigned surprise that some might have taken exception at his jokes.[123] He went on to inform Parker that one who writes invective must be prepared to be the target of the same. It was Parker, not the nonconformists, he alleged, who was ruining the clergy's reputation by advancing "so corrupt Doctrines with as ill a conversation."[124] In a particularly vehement passage Marvell denounced the archdeacon for

> the perniciousness of the whole design of his books; tending, in my opinion, to the disturbance of all Government, the misrepresenting of the generous and prudent Counsels of His Majesty, and raising a mis-intelligence betwixt Him and His People; beside his calumniating the whole foreign Protestancy, his stirring up of persecution against those at home, and his mangling even of Religion it self and Christianity. . . . [He] forgot not only all Scripture rules, but even all Scripture expressions; unless where he either distorts them to his own interpretation, or attempts to make them ridiculous to others.[125]

Marvell regarded the plethora of books written against him as a contrivance of Parker; "the more hungry starvelings generally look'd upon it as an immediate Call to a Benefice, and he that could but write an Answer, whatsoever it were, took it for the most dexterous cheap, and legal way of Simony." He also accused Parker of trying to find embarrassing information that could be used against him in print.[126] This last complaint seems in bad form because it is exactly what Marvell did to produce the section on Parker's background and lineage a few pages later.[127]

Marvell finally laid out his own views on some of the key issues Parker had insisted upon, such as the nature and scope of the magistrate's authority and the relationship between grace and moral virtue. These topics, along with Marvell's interpretation of the civil war, are discussed below.

Reactions to the Debate

Apparently, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part* had the effect its author intended: the public silencing of Parker. No further response from the archdeacon was forthcoming, and before long he found himself in Canterbury attending to more mundane administrative duties. Many contemporaries commented on the exchange between the authors.[128] One anonymously authored pamphlet published in 1674 conceded that Marvell was the better satirist, but denied that he had bested Parker through the strength of his argument.[129] Gilbert Burnet provided an admittedly biased summary of the whole affair. Although he admitted that Parker was "considerably learned" and "full of satirical vivacity," he condemned him as a man of "no judgment" and "little virtue" who was also impious, continuing:

> After he [Parker] had for some years entertained the nation with several virulent books, written with much life, he was attacked by the liveliest droll of the age [Marvell], who wrote in a burlesque strain, but with so peculiar and so entertaining a conduct, that, from the king down to the tradesman, his books were read with great pleasure. That not only humbled Parker, but the whole party: for the author of the "Rehearsal Transprosed" had all the men of wit (or, as the French phrase it, all the laughers) on his side.[130]

Anthony Wood gave a more tempered interpretation of the controversy in his biographical sketch of Parker:

> The reader is to note that this pen-combat exercised between our author and Marvell was briskly managed with as much smart, cutting and satyrical wit on both sides, as any other perhaps of late hath been, they endeavouring by all the methods imaginable, and the utmost forces they could by any means rally up, to blacken each others cause, and to set each other out in the most ugly dress: (their pieces in the mean while, wherein was represented a perfect trial of each others skill and parts in a jerking, flirting way of writing, entertaining the reader with a great variety of sport and mirth, in seeing two such right cocks of the game so keenly engaging with sharp and dangerous weapons).

Wood acknowledged the consensus that Marvell had the ultimate victory, but he believed that the episode ultimately strengthened Parker and made him a more effective writer:

> And it was generally thought, nay even by many of those who were otherwise favourers of Parker's cause, that he [Parker] thro' a too loose and unwary handling of the debate (tho' in a brave, flourishing and lofty stile) laid himself too open to the severe strokes of his snearing adversary, and that the odds and victory lay on Marvell's side: Howsoever it was, it wrought this good effect upon our author, that for ever after it took down somewhat of his high spirit, insomuch that tho' Marvell in a second part replied upon our author's reproof, yet he judged it more prudent rather to lay down the cudgels, than to enter the lists again with an untowardly combatant so hugely well vers'd and experienc'd in the then, but newly, refin'd art (tho' much in mode and fashion almost ever since) of sportive and jeering buffoonery. And moreover it put him upon a more serious, sober and

> moderate way of writing in other good treatises, which he since did set forth, and which have proved very useful and beneficial to the public.[131]

William Holden Hutton, the author of the entry on Parker in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, also took a moderate view of the controversy, writing that Parker had "held his own" against the popular Marvell.[132]

More recent assessments of the controversy have come largely from Marvell scholars, who predictably favor their protagonist. A good example is J. D. Hunt, who does not hesitate to use Marvell's own language in denouncing Parker: "Whether in matters of principle or expression, it is Marvell's essential humanity that emerges and triumphs over Parker's 'spight against the Non-conformists' and the 'presumption and arrogance of his stile.'"[133] Hunt admits that Marvell's polemic was "prejudiced," but he takes nearly all of the satirist's statements at face value, giving no indication that he has ever read anything of Parker's other than the out-of-context quotations appearing in the two parts of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Annabel Patterson likewise takes a dim view of Parker's abilities, dismissing him as a "turncoat clergyman" who was clearly outmatched by the much more reasonable Marvell.[134]

A reassessment of the toleration controversy surrounding Parker, focusing on the merits of the two sides' arguments, is overdue. This necessitates shifting some attention away from Marvell and refocusing on Parker and Owen, and possibly Hickeringill and Robert Ferguson (see below). The pragmatist arguments Marvell marshaled were on the whole mediocre, certainly of a lesser quality than Owen's and Ferguson's, and when assessed apart from the masterful rhetorical style in which they were presented, cannot truly stand against Parker's or Hickeringill's. Hutton's opinion is more accurate than those of the more recent authors cited; Parker did hold his own in the exchange. It is perhaps unfortunate that the public debate was resolved in Marvell's favor on the strength of an extended *ad hominem* attack. In any event, the controversy subsided, and religious toleration did not become a burning issue in England again for several years. Despite the repeal of Charles' indulgence in 1673, the dissenters gained a certain freedom of action they had not experienced in the 1660s.

One other author entered the lists against Parker at about the same time Marvell's second book was published. Robert Ferguson (d. 1714) was a Scottish minister who had been ejected from his living in Godmersham, Kent, in 1662. He thereafter aligned himself with the Congregationalists in England. His first book, which was on the topic of justification against the Socinians in 1668, "did much to ingratiate him with Dr. [John] Owen, the patriarch of the Independents."[135] He became Owen's assistant and friend, and preached with him frequently; Owen later left him a small bequest in his will. Ferguson eventually became involved in plots against the Stuart regime and fled to the Netherlands after Monmouth's rebellion, in which he participated, failed in 1685.

In response to Parker, Ferguson published *A Sober Enquiry into the Nature, Measure, and Principle of Moral Virtue, Its Distinction from Gospel-Holiness*, which was licensed on 24 November 1673, to protest Parker's assertions throughout the *Discourse*, *Defence*, and *Reproof* that there was no meaningful distinction between moral virtue and grace.[136] He charged that Parker's works were full of "Satyr and Scurrility," and that according to the archdeacon, "it is not the belief of the Bible and Obedience to the Gospel that doth constitute us Christians, but submission to the Bishops Cannons."[137] Over the course of 327 octavo pages, Ferguson attempted to prove that Parker had subverted the true meaning of grace and to show the limits of reason in ascertaining morality.

He began by giving definitions of "virtue," "moral," and "grace," arguing that the first was chiefly a philosophical construct whereas the last was firmly rooted in scripture, and that the notion of their equivalence was a relatively recent innovation. Then he discussed in detail the notion of law and claimed that the Law of Creation and the Law of Grace are both currently in effect; they are distinct but connected, and humanity is bound by the conditions of both, although individuals cannot keep the Law of Grace without the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Ferguson explored the limitations of reason in apprehending the proper manner in which God is to be worshiped, and argued extensively against Parker's interpretation of Old Testament sacrificial duties. The book's final chapter discussed *power*, by which one acquires virtue. Ferguson averred that the Holy Spirit's subjective working within a Christian is what enables him or her to act virtuously, and he accused Parker of Pelagianism for holding that "Natural Power" was sufficient for keeping God's commandments.

As with *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part*, Parker refrained from replying to *A Sober Enquiry*. It may be that the attention being paid to Marvell's work caused *A Sober Enquiry* to be overlooked by the public, even though Parker must have read it. To the scholar, however, Ferguson's offering deserves at least as much attention for its thorough analysis, and its relationship to Parker's writings is discussed below.

Grace in the Toleration Debate

Of the several issues which surfaced during the toleration controversy, that of grace may be the most overlooked by modern scholars, perhaps because historians tend not to concern themselves with more abstract theological concepts. One of the few treatments of this aspect of the debate is found in Dewey Wallace's study of predestination in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Wallace focuses on the decline of Calvinism and the debate over the nature of grace. He identifies four main controversies over grace in the Restoration period, most of which involved accusations of Socinian moralism against "High Anglicans" by nonconformists; Parker's *Discourse* is placed at the center of the third of these controversies.[138] The debate in which Parker and the nonconformists were engaged, writes Wallace, "dealt mainly with the issues of conformity and toleration, . . . but also raised the same theological issue of Socinian moralism that kept recurring in Restoration religious debates."[139] Interested in such questions as original sin, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and justification, he searches the disputants' writings for views on these issues, even though he believes they were of secondary importance or even tangential in the toleration debate.

Isabel Rivers has also examined the conflict between what she calls the "religion of reason" and the "religion of grace." In her view, both schools held that ethics was central to the Christian life and that grace was important, but their differing emphases and uses of language led to fierce disagreements which appeared irreconcilable.[140] Furthermore, there were disagreements within the nonconformist camp on the precise role of grace; for example, John Bunyan's and Richard Baxter's differences on the subject led Bunyan to label Baxter a legalist and Baxter to call Bunyan an antinomian.[141] Although Rivers' study, like Wallace's, briefly refers to Parker and the controversy surrounding the *Discourse*, it is quite broad in scope and offers no analysis of the impact of grace on the 1667-1673 debate.

Although some strands of the grace debate, such as the one in which Edward Fowler and John Bunyan participated, were not positioned explicitly within the context of an argument over toleration, grace occupied a larger role in the toleration controversy than Wallace and other contemporary historians recognize.[142] Far from being tangential, Parker's concept of grace provided a key underpinning to his contention that the sovereign had authority over the subject's conscience. In addition, an examination of Parker's ideas on grace serves to obscure the distinction often made between him and other High Anglicans on the one hand, and the so-called "latitudinarians," or moderate Anglicans, on the other.

Parker first laid out his doctrine of grace in Chapter Two of the *Discourse*, the stated purpose of which was to prove "that those who would deprive the Supreme Civil Power of its Authority in reference to the Conduct of the Worship of God, are forced to allow it in other more material Parts of Religion."[143] Parker's view was that the essence of religion consisted in discharging the duties it imposed, and he rigorously subdivided Christian obligations into various categories. "The whole Duty of Man refers either to his Creator, or his Neighbour, or himself: All that concerns the two last is confessedly of a Moral Nature; and all that concerns the first consists either in Praising of God, or Praying to him."[144] Good works for or on behalf of others were considered acts of virtue, and Parker saw humanity's duties to God in the same light. In his construct, praising God was classified as "a Branch of the Vertue of Gratitude," and was no different from thankfulness towards others, except in its object and degree; thus, "Gratitude and Devotion are not divers Things, but only different Names of the same Thing; Devotion being nothing else but Vertue of Gratitude towards God."[145] Prayer can also be divided into two categories: prayer on behalf of others, and prayer on behalf of oneself. However, Parker was still able to classify each type of prayer as a form of virtue. Prayer for others is "an Act of the Vertue we call Kindness or Charity." If prayer on one's own behalf is a request for worldly comforts or enjoyments, it is not virtuous and is useless; if one prays for other, godly things, prayer is "instrumental to the Vertues of Morality," whatever the particular virtue may be.[146]

Hence, "all Religion then (I mean the Practical Part) is either Vertue it self, or some of its Instruments; and the whole Duty of Man consists in being Vertuous; and all that is enjoyn'd him beside, is in order to it."[147] Parker's religion is all-encompassing, including every action the Christian takes. Each good work performed for someone else is as much a fulfillment of Christian duty as is praising God in a worship service. In short, religion is something one *does*. Parker claimed this interpretation was evident from scripture, citing Christ's and Paul's numerous exhortations to moral behavior in the New Testament.[148]

Parker was seemingly mystified by nonconformists in the Calvinist tradition who stressed the importance of grace separate and apart from morality. To them, a virtuous life alone was useless, unable to ensure salvation without God's grace. Parker obviously had no patience with this line of reasoning: "But when we have set aside all manner of Vertue, let them tell me what remains to be call'd Grace, and give me any Notion of it distinct from Morality."[149] On this point, Parker and the nonconformists were obviously working from different soteriologies and definitions of grace.

Basing his entire analysis of religion on the idea that it is something one does, Parker logically viewed grace as one aspect of action or, rather, as something that induces one to act; in other words, it is "a vertuous temper of Mind." In attempting to base this interpretation on scripture, he gave an explanation that initially appears inconsistent:

> All that the Scripture intends by the Graces of the Spirit, are only Vertuous Qualities of the Soul, that are therefore styled Graces, because they were derived purely from Gods free Grace and Goodness, in that in the first Ages of Christianity he was pleased, out of his infinite concern for its Propagation, in a miraculous Manner to inspire its Converts with all sorts of Vertue.[150]

Here Parker appears to be using "grace" in two different ways. It is both a virtuous quality of the soul and something God does, or did in past ages.

This second idea of grace is much closer to that held by the nonconformists. In *Truth and Innocence Vindicated*, Owen defined grace in four different ways, all of which consist of action on God's part.[151] According to Owen, virtue and grace must be completely separate things, for many pagans in classical times were virtuous, even though they knew nothing of God and therefore could not have received any measure of grace, which is shown only through God's revealed word. Owen was quick to point out what he perceived as Parker's error when the latter gave "a reason why moral virtue is styled 'grace,' which is peculiar and appropriate to Christian religion alone."[152]

Owen also objected to Parker's entire scheme of religion, claiming it was "the rudest, most imperfect, and weakest" he had ever seen because it ignored many core ingredients of Christianity.[153] Although he conceded that gratitude and prayer sum up the duties of "natural religion," he believed that the concept of sin could not fit into Parker's construct, nor could the ideas of repentance and conversion. In his estimation, the *Discourse* could only accurately describe what religion might have been in the state of innocence, before Adam's fall. Attempting to account for religion since that time, without addressing the issue of sin, was "to build castles in the air."[154] In no other context could Christ's role be assessed.

Parker spelled out more clearly his views of Christ's role and grace in the *Defence*. Although he ignored Owen's point about virtuous pagans, he challenged Owen to produce one early Christian writer who distinguished between grace and virtue, "Evangelical Grace being nothing else in their account but Moral Vertue, heightened by the Motives of the Gospel, and the Assistances of the Spirit; both which are External Considerations to the Essence of the Thing it self."[155] Interestingly, Parker's second usage of "grace" in the above passage from the *Discourse* was rephrased as "assistances of the Spirit" here, a concept that at first seems to conform to Owen's second definition of grace, "*the effectual working of the Spirit of God* in and upon the minds and souls of believers, thereby quickening them, . . . regenerating of them, creating a new heart in them, implanting his image upon them."[156] The difference in the two conceptions lies in the fact that grace as understood by Owen is completely internal, whereas Parker's "assistances" serve only to induce action. Parker's framework had no place for alleged action on God's part that did not have visible results. As for repentance, Parker asserted that it was simply the swapping of a life of vice for one of virtue, an action his religious paradigm assimilated quite well.[157]

Parker's objection to the nonconformist conception of grace was a familiar one in the seventeenth century: it relieved the individual from any moral responsibility. It is inconsistent, he declared, to say there is no relationship between virtue and grace, to argue that "though a man be exact in all the Duties of Moral Goodness, yet if he be a Graceless Person (*i.e.* void of I know not what Imaginary Godliness) he is but in a cleaner way to Hell."[158] The nonconformist view of grace had created "a Godliness without Religion," requiring nothing of grace's object, and it was contrary to the spirit of early Christianity. "The Father and first Preachers of the Christian Faith,

did not teach their Proselytes the Trick how to Spirit themselves into Heaven, and presume themselves into Salvation by a stout Belief; but to purchase their future hopes by living up to the severest and most exalted Doctrines of the Gospel."[159] This rejection of a separation between grace and virtue was at the core of Parker's moralist philosophy; to him, there could be no grace in the absence of virtue.

The *Defence* also gave a clearer picture of Christ's role, which was referred to only in passing in the *Discourse*. Owen was correct, Parker wrote, in claiming that the view of religion in the *Discourse* illustrated the state of innocence, for that is exactly the state to which Christ restored religion. "The Christian Institution is not for the substance of it any new Religion, but only a more perfect digest of the Eternal Rules of Nature and Right Reason."[160] The effect of Adam's fall was to corrupt humanity's ability to discern and discharge its religious duties, which never changed. "Our Saviour came not into the world to give any new Precepts of moral goodness, but only to retrive the old Rules of Nature from the evil Customs of the world, and to reinforce their Obligation by endearing our duty with better Promises, and urging our Obedience upon severer Penalties."[161]

According to this line of reasoning, Christianity is not a new religion, but a restitution and refinement of original, pure religion. Some aspects of it, such as sacraments, are indeed new, but they are useful only insofar as they aid morality and righteousness; they have no intrinsic worth.[162] Parker's philosophy of Christianity thus can be viewed as a form of primitivism, although it is not the primitivism described by Theodore Bozeman and T. L. Underwood in their studies of Puritans, Baptists, and Quakers, a primitivism that strives "without rest for reconnection with the paradigmatic events and utterances of ancient and unspoiled times."[163] For Parker, the reconnection had already been achieved through Christ's actions. Furthermore, this reconnection was not to the "Great Time" of early Christianity but to natural, prelapsarian religion. The importance of this restitution lay not in particular practices or ceremonies but in humanity's enlightenment.

Marvell ridiculed Parker's paradigm without offering a substantive critique in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, complaining without any elaboration that "he overturns the whole fabrick of Christianity, and Power of Religion. For my part, if Grace be resolv'd into Morality, I think a man may almost as well make God too to be only a Notional and Moral Existence."[164] He expressed doubt that Parker would ever be granted a bishopric, but that if he did, "I am resolved instead of *his Grace* to call him alwayes *his Morality*."[165] Elsewhere he tauntingly alluded to Parker's sympathy for the mechanistic philosophy, writing that the archdeacon was one "who having never seen the receptacle of Grace or Conscience at an Anatomical Dissection, may conclude therefore that there is no such matter, or no such obligation among Christians."[166] Richard Leigh's retort to this barb was one of the best of the entire controversy: "The Learn'd in Anatomy are so far from granting him this, that they assure him of the contrary. Maintaining upon dissection of the Presbyterian Carcasses that they have made an undoubted discovery of the Receptacle of Conscience, unanimously agreeing upon their best Observation that it lies very near the *Spleen*."[167]

Parker's response to Marvell, as noted, criticized the latter for not offering any serious analysis: "But Sir, how come you to be concern'd either in Grace or Morality, but that it is the nature of some Vermine to be nibbling though they have no teeth."[168] He deftly turned Marvell's jest over the bishop's title into an opportunity to associate the satirist with Martin Marprelate, the infamous anticlerical pamphleteer of the late sixteenth century. "I thank you Sir, it ["his Morality"] is a much more civil and cleanly Title than *his Belzebubship of Kanterbury*, which yet

was the softest word your meek-spirited Puritans could in the days of your Predecessor *Martin* afford to that pious and humble man Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*."[169] His exasperation with the lack of substance in Marvell's argument was evident: "Do we not write to very great purpose, when such whifling tools as you are able to defeat our most rational discourses by squirting at them with such trifles as these."[170]

Parker went on to claim that his position on grace had incontestably won the day. The "abstracting and subtile Metaphysicians" could not produce anything to be called "grace" when moral virtue was absent. He even claimed that Owen had been compelled to concur with him:

> *J. O.* himself, notwithstanding all his Zeal and Reluctancy, is at length forced over to my side of the Question . . . for as much as all the difference he himself is able to assign between Grace and Vertue, relates not to the nature of the things themselves, but to the Principles from whence they issue . . . so that even in his own account Grace is nothing but infused Vertue, and infused Vertue is Vertue still.[171]

This point was critical for Parker, for he believed that through an incorrect conception of grace, "great Numbers of well-meaning People have . . . been abused both out of the Notion and the Practice of all real goodness" by nonconformist preachers.[172]

Hickeringill bolstered Parker's case in *Gregory, Father-Greybeard*, although he approached the question from a different angle by comparing the Two Tables of the Ten Commandments.[173] He declared that by emphasizing the First Table and ignoring the Second, nonconformists had become pharisaical. The Pharisees had been punctilious in their religious observances, but Christ condemned them and informed his followers that their righteousness had to exceed that of the Pharisees. Hickeringill equated the duties of the First Table with concern for observing proper forms in corporate worship. Although he acknowledged its value, he denied its centrality. "Granting that any man preaches, and prays, keeps Gods holy day, and worships him, how divinely, truly and sincerely soever; yet *all this* exceeds not a *Pharisee*, nor shall ever bring him to the Kingdom of God."[174]

Hickeringill believed that the essence of the gospel message was its emphasis on moral behavior. "So that as food and rayment is for the preservation of the body, *Preaching* Gods holy word, *Prayers*, keeping *days holy*, and all the *worship* of God whatsoever has but one main scope and end, even to make men *good*."[175] The duties of the First Table are thus a means to the end of moral virtue as outlined in the Second Table and summed up in the Golden Rule. Regarding these words of Christ, he opined, "And if no other Text had been preached upon this 30 years, and practised, *England* had seen no warrs nor bloodshed, ruine nor rapine, murder and rebellion, that had almost quite destroyed us."[176] He concluded his section on morality by emphasizing that Parker was correct, even though Marvell had quoted him out of context in an attempt to make him look ridiculous.[177]

Marvell's second reply included criticism of Parker's earlier works, *Tentamina Physico-Theologica de Deo* and *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie*. He defended his assertion that Parker was in danger of rationalizing God's essence away by pointing to Parker's reference to "Gods Moral accomplishments" in *A Free and Impartial Censure*.[178] He also accused Parker of blasphemy for making fun of the nonconformists' frequent emphasis on the believer's spiritual relationship with Christ without any reference to good works.[179] Like Owen, whom he cited as more authoritative on the subject than Parker, Marvell considered

Parker's moralism to be severely deficient as an explanation of Christianity; the archdeacon had a "too high conceit of mens good Works; as if, contrary to the stream of the Scripture, we could be thereby justified." However, he did not dwell long on the subject, for he evidently had been apprised of Ferguson's upcoming work. Regarding Parker's challenge to his opponents to produce ancient authors who contradicted him, Marvell wrote, "If you will but have a little patience, I am told that it will be accepted and complyed with," and then proceeded to another topic.[180]

As noted, Ferguson effectively ended this strand of the debate over grace and virtue by producing a far more exhaustive treatment than any other author in the controversy, and his arguments deserve analysis. He began by acknowledging that it was possible for some to "presume themselves into Salvation" by deluding themselves with a false notion of grace and failing to live a righteous life.[181] Parker, he stated, had erred in the opposite direction by renouncing *all* "infused principles" and replacing them with unassisted moral virtue. Consistent application of Parker's notion would result in the ultimate denial of the Gospel.[182]

Ferguson devoted a good deal of space to defining the terms "virtue," "moral," and "grace." "Virtue," he explained, was a term that rarely occurred in scripture and was used by the ancients to indicate behavior in accordance with right reason. The philosophers believed virtue was inherent in humanity, but that a "darkness" in the soul of unknown origin inhibited it.[183] They believed that one could become like God by training oneself to act virtuously; Ferguson contended that this mistaken notion caused them to reject the Gospel.[184] The term "moral" was even less Biblical, and after rejecting different definitions on account of their narrowness or broadness, he decided the concept included all of one's duties toward God and fellow humans, whether they could be discerned by reason or not.[185] He characterized the idea that morality and grace are equivalent as a "novelty," and claimed he could muster quotations from a hundred ancient authors to disprove Parker's contention; however, for some reason he did not quote any ancients, limiting himself to citing more recent Jesuit and Dominican authors who acknowledged a difference between acquired and infused virtues.[186] Ferguson defined "grace" in several ways, as Owen had before him, keeping the action of God central to all its manifestations.[187]

The second chapter of *A Sober Enquiry* focused on the concept of divine law as the objective and unchanging external standard by which all human actions are judged good or evil. Like Parker, Ferguson rejected the claims of Hobbes and other "wild, Atheistically disposed persons" that there is no law of nature.[188] He identified four pillars of this natural law or "Law of Creation." To begin with, those things consonant with God's nature are good, whereas things dissonant with it are evil. Second, humans have been granted rational capacity with which they can discern good and evil. Furthermore, each person is endowed with a conscience, which is "the soul reflecting on it self and actions, and judging of both according to Law."[189] Without this conscience, the Hobbesian contractarian theory of the state collapses, for any individual's repudiation of the social contract cannot be judged as conclusively evil.[190] Nor could God justly punish humans for disobeying divine revelation because rejecting his authority could not be construed *a priori* as evil.[191] Finally, if nothing were inherently good or evil, laws could be passed to make vice virtue and virtue vice. Ferguson considered this a self-evident absurdity confirming the existence of natural law.[192]

He argued that natural law could not be limited to instinctual urges, which humans share with animals who are not under law; the consensus of nations, because customs differed so radically; or even the dictates of right reason, because our capacities to discern the law correctly have been "darkened by sin" as a result of the Fall. Only the Ten Commandments can be relied

upon as a perfect digest of natural law.[193] The Law of Creation endured beyond the Fall because the obligations resulting from our natures and God's nature must continue. Ferguson acknowledged that one's obligations could change according to the relationships in which one found oneself, but he insisted, contrary to Parker's assertion, that the Law itself could never change.[194] Despite the darkening of our natures and our weakened capacity to perform our duties, we retain some knowledge of our duties to God. When we perform these duties on our own, we exhibit moral virtue.[195]

The foregoing is not radically different from Parker's exposition of the moralist position, although the archdeacon denied that the Decalogue was a flawless rendering of God's law. The difference was that Parker believed Christ's function was to restore humanity's understanding of this natural law, whereas Ferguson (along with Owen and most of the nonconformists) held that it was to institute an entirely new law, the "Law of Faith." Ferguson declared that Christ instituted no new moral obligations, but that the natural law must be approached through the new Law of Faith in order to be kept properly; faith in Christ is now a prerequisite of the acceptability to God of a virtuous act.[196] Furthermore, the terms of the Law of Grace cannot be discerned through the use of reason. They are beyond the comprehension of mortals, who must rely on divine revelation for their incomplete knowledge of them.[197] Finally, humans are too depraved to respond to the Law of Faith on their own and must receive regeneration from the Holy Spirit to fulfill its terms.[198] Ferguson castigated the "specious pretences" of those such as Parker who paid lip service to the idea of grace but emasculated its true meaning by defining it as "our Natural faculties, or at most the *Objective* assistances of the Holy Ghost in the Gospel."[199] He cited numerous scriptures attesting to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.[200] This indwelling brought about virtuous behavior, and Ferguson denied Parker's accusations of moral permissiveness by affirming that he and other advocates of the separation of grace and virtue held to the position that "where there is not Vertue there can be no Grace, and that none can be truly Devout, that is not highly Moral."[201]

This last statement could have come from Parker, and it begs the question of why the distinction between grace and virtue was so critical in the minds of both writers. Ferguson provided part of the answer by asserting that reason can never apprehend the behavior required by revealed truths under the Law of Faith. He disavowed Parker's postulating of "articles of meer belief," contending that each belief enjoined some kind of action.[202] Forms of worship fall into this category, for although reason can determine that God deserves worship, no proper form can be discerned except in response to a divine command. To support this assertion, Ferguson discussed at length the Old Testament practice of animal sacrifice, noting the biblical classification of "clean" and "unclean" animals and inferring that it must have resulted from a divine command not explicitly recorded in scripture.[203] This argument, if correct, would seriously undermine Parker's assertions regarding the nature of Old Testament sacrifices.[204] He also listed other instances of required actions which reason could in no way have discovered, such as Abraham's traveling to Canaan at God's command.[205]

Ferguson further developed the contention that reason could not bring one to correct worship by citing examples from the pagan world showing that it had not led to a correct interpretation of the Law of Nature, either. The entire ancient world aside from the Jews was polytheistic. Prominent thinkers denied or doubted the notion of life after death. Ancient leaders sometimes condoned theft, prostitution, sodomy, the killing of one's wife on a slight pretext, and the killing or torture of debtors. Philosophers viewed pride as virtuous and condoned suicide. Ferguson argued that all who relied on reason mistook the root of virtue, which is respect for

God; virtuous acts are not ends in themselves.[206] Only the Decalogue contained "an *Epitome* of the Dictates of Right Reason," but even it was "not the measure of the whole of Religion."[207] It provided neither mercy nor forgiveness, both of which could come only through the Law of Faith.[208]

A Sober Enquiry's final chapter discussed *power*, the means by which one acquired virtue. Quoting extensively from Parker, Ferguson denied the former's assertion that the Holy Spirit normally acted only *objectively* through miracles, affirming instead that he works *subjectively* within Christians.[209] Parker had in fact used the Lord's Prayer as an example of the subjective working of the Spirit, but Ferguson viewed this statement as disingenuous and contrary to the thrust of Parker's argument.[210] He went on to claim that "Natural Power" could enable one to keep the duties of the Second Table, but that Parker had ascribed too much efficacy to it by claiming that there was no difference between a virtuous act accomplished by a Christian and one performed by a non-Christian; the notion that a virtuous pagan possesses grace was nothing short of Pelagianism, he declared.[211] To fulfill all of God's requirements and gain acceptance, one must have a "superadded infused Principle" of grace. The commandment of "*making to our selves new hearts*" could never be achieved without it. Ferguson drove home this point with a great number of citations from scripture.[212]

Two important points can be drawn from an analysis of how various authors used the idea of grace in the toleration controversy. First, their different conceptions of grace played an important role in shaping their arguments for or against religious toleration. Parker and Hickeringill viewed grace, whatever its source, as performing no other function than assisting virtuous behavior for the purpose of social utility as determined by the use of reason. For them, any appeal to grace to justify dissent–or especially active resistance–in situations where an established authority was not clearly commanding something evil was a proverbial red herring intended to deflect attention from seditious motives.

Above all, they denied the existence of any "inner light" within the individual that might instruct him or her to disobey God's ordained ministers.[213] This view, at least for Parker, was an inevitable result of his concept of restitution and Christ's role, which was more collective than individualistic. Although he made a fleeting reference to Christ's suffering as an atonement for the sins of the world, the idea that his blood expiates the sins of people on an individual basis became unnecessary and superfluous. Christ saves by the knowledge he imparted through his teachings and the example of his life, the knowledge of how to discharge one's religious duties correctly. He did not need to establish a personal relationship with each Christian. An anti-toleration position developed from these anti-individualistic premises quite naturally, at least when the call for toleration was based on the sanctity of the individual conscience. Not surprisingly, Owen and Ferguson accused Parker of adhering to the Socinian heresy.[214]

On the other hand, grace as a primary and independent force occupied a critical place in the theology of Owen and Ferguson (and perhaps Marvell). A person who had received an internal infusion of grace from an external source (the Holy Spirit) had a radically different view of virtuous works, seeing them as an outflowing of grace with the purpose of glorifying God, with social benefits resulting as a mere side effect. If the Spirit's grace, manifesting itself through one's conscience, forbade compliance with the magistrate's directives regarding religious ceremony (which stemmed from an inappropriate reliance on reason), nonconformity was required. Thus, the toleration and anti-toleration writers could not have found common ground from which to resolve their disagreement while they held different conceptions of grace.

Second, Parker's use of grace calls into question the validity of the term "latitudinarian" (as it is currently used), which is often employed to describe a group of moderate Restoration conformist clergymen, including Simon Patrick, Edward Fowler, and John Tillotson, who stressed the importance of practical morality. In a 1988 essay on John Bunyan, Isabel Rivers explains the views of the latitudinarians in this way:

> Their doctrinal positions include the following: natural religion is the foundation of revealed religion; faith is an act of reason; . . . repentance and obedience are the necessary conditions of justification. Terms which are antithetical to traditional Protestants–grace and virtue, faith and works–mean essentially the same thing to the latitude-men.[215]

This passage reads like a description of the theology found in the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, as does Rivers' quotation from Fowler's *Design of Christianity*: "The Promoting of Holiness was *the* Design of our Saviour's *Whole Life, and Conversation among Men*."[216]

Scholars normally describe Parker as an arch-conservative, not a moderate or latitudinarian, but he fits the criteria outlined by Rivers. Rivers attempts to explain this fact away by claiming that Parker's discourses on moral virtue and grace were merely an opportunistic caricature of latitudinarian ideas devoid of any serious reflection.[217] To one familiar with Parker's many writings on the rational basis of religion and its essential moral character both before and after the toleration controversy, this explanation is highly unsatisfactory. In his recent volume on latitudinarianism, William Spellman notes how the "Sheldonians" and latitudinarians joined forces against nonconformists during the toleration debate.[218] Parker's praise in the *Discourse*'s preface for Patrick's *A Friendly Debate* and his inclusion of a letter from Patrick in the *Defence* bear witness to this finding. However, Spellman takes no note of the basic philosophical agreement between Parker and the latitudinarians. If a useful distinction between latitudinarians and high churchmen is to be made, Rivers' definition needs to be revised.

In her 1991 study *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, Rivers does write that the latitudinarians did not believe the particular form of church government was especially important.[219] Connected to this idea is Spellman's assertion that the latitudinarians were disposed "to respect at least the theological sincerity of the moderate Dissenters," many of whom saw episcopacy as the chief obstacle to their conforming to the state church.[220] These observations certainly do not apply to Parker, who throughout his career in the Church of England defended episcopacy as the only divinely-sanctioned governmental form. However, Rivers notes this flexibility of the latitudinarians only in passing and clearly considers it less important than their rationalist approach to religion. To account for Parker's agreement with the latitudinarians on every point save that of church government while maintaining that there was a distinct latitudinarian faction within the state church, we are seemingly forced to one of three conclusions:

> 1. Parker was merely an anomaly and should be ignored when dealing with the larger issue of latitudinarianism.
> 2. Parker was in fact a latitudinarian who happened to place more emphasis on church government than his fellows.
> 3. The question of church government by itself was enough to disqualify one from being considered a latitudinarian.

Viewing Parker as merely an anomaly, although tempting to those who might prefer to see viewpoints in the Restoration church break down neatly into predetermined categories, should be rejected unless further study can demonstrate that Parker's stress on rationality and episcopacy was unique in the state church. The second option strains credulity; Parker was never regarded by contemporaries as a latitudinarian, nor has any subsequent scholar attached that label to him. Jonathan Parkin comes closer than anyone else; in his *Science, Religion and Politics in Restoration England: Richard Cumberland's De Legibus Naturae*, he argues that Parker's influences in the years preceding the publication of the *Discourse* "had been profoundly Latitudinarian in ethos," but even he does not label Parker a latitudinarian.[221] Furthermore, Parker's attacks on latitudinarian Edward Stillingfleet's proposals for church government in *The Case of the Church of England* and elsewhere leave little doubt that he did not consider himself Stillingfleet's ally in any sense. The third option seems the best of the three, but it would require placing a much greater emphasis on the question of church government when discussing latitudinarians than scholars such as Rivers have hitherto done.

There is a fourth conclusion we may draw if we are willing to abandon the notion of the latitudinarians as a distinct faction within the state church. John Spurr has argued that "no specifically 'latitudinarian' party or outlook can be distinguished among the Restoration churchmen."[222] Given that Parker's theology was so similar to that ascribed to the latitudinarians, the Sheldonian/latitudinarian alliance during the toleration controversy to which Spellman refers was probably more than one of convenience against a common enemy. It would be more profitable to see the views of the latitudinarians and high churchmen as points on a spectrum within the state church rather than as different categories. In this way the term "latitudinarian" can be retained and profitably used (as it was during the Restoration period) while taking account of the overlapping of viewpoints exemplified by Parker.

The use of grace in the toleration controversy has hitherto received relatively little attention. Employing different definitions, each side tried to bolster its case and portray its opponents as straying from the historic and universal understanding of the church. Far from being a mere abstraction with no real bearing on the toleration issue, one's interpretation of grace helped determine what one believed was the proper posture of the state toward nonconformity. Concepts of grace also had an impact on views of authority, a topic covered in the next chapter.

---

[1] For more information on the members of the Cabal ministry, see the *DNB, s.vv.*; Maurice Lee, *The Cabal* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965); Kenneth Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

[2] For more on that monopoly and its establishment in the early 1660s, see Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 162-95.

[3] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 11 vols., Robert Latham and William Matthews, eds. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970-1983), 8:585.

[4] Burnet, 2:475.

[5] *CSPD, 1667*, 437. Also Roger Thomas, "Comprehension and Indulgence," in Geoffrey Nuttall and Owen Chadwick, eds., *From Uniformity to Unity* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), 197; Douglas

Lacey, *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661-1689: A Study in the Perpetuation and Tempering of Parliamentarianism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 55-56.

[6] Pepys, 8:584-85.

[7] Pepys, 9:31, 45-46.

[8] Geoffrey Nuttall, *Richard Baxter* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 107; Barbara Shapiro, *John Wilkins, 1614-1672: An Intellectual Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 171-75; Parkin, 31; Seaward, 318-19.

[9] William Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993), 42.

[10] *HHOT*, 40.

[11] Ashcraft, 41, 45.

[12] Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 371-73.

[13] See Gary de Krey, "Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience, 1667-1672," *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 53-83.

[14] Gary de Krey, "The First Restoration Crisis: Conscience and Coercion in London, 1667-73," *Albion* 25 (Winter 1993): 565-80.

[15] Ibid., 575.

[16] Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), 217.

[17] Ibid., 225.

[18] Richard L. Greaves, "'Let Truth Be Free': John Bunyan and the Restoration Crisis of 1667-1673," *Albion* 28 (Winter 1996), 598, 600.

[19] Arber, 1:21.

[20] The preface ends on page lvi, but this is due to an error in pagination; it is actually forty-eight pages long.

[21] Arber, 1:28, 62.

[22] Robert Ferguson, *A Representation of the Threatning Dangers, Impending over Protestants in Great Brittain* (Edinburgh: 1687), 37.

[23] *FICPP*, 23.

[24] Ibid., 73.

[25] Ibid., 90.

[26] J. G. A. Pocock, "Thomas Hobbes: Atheist or Enthusiast? His Place in Restoration Debate," *History of Political Thought* 11 (Winter 1990), 749.

[27] *DEP*, i, x.

[28] Ibid., vii.

[29] Ibid., xiii-xix. Patrick's book was initially published in 1668 and reprinted in 1669. Patrick went on to publish *A Continuation of the Friendly Debate* in 1669, and *A Further Continuation and Defence, or, A Third Part of the Friendly Debate* in 1670.

[30] *DEP*, xii.

[31] Anon., *Insolence and Impudence Triumphant* (London, 1669), 9-17.

[32] John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 58-59, 225.

[33] Anon., *Insolence*, 4.

[34] Ibid., 19.

[35] John Humfrey, *A Case of Conscience . . . Together with Animadversions on a New Book Entitled Ecclesiastical Polity* (London, 1669), 18.

[36] Ibid., 17.

[37] Ibid., 18-19.

[38] Ibid., 20.

[39] For more on Owen, see Toon; *DNB*, *s.v.*; and *BDBR*, *s.v.*

[40] Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ed. Matthew Sylvester (London: 1696), pt. 3, 42.

[41] Owen, 13:462.

[42] Baxter, pt. 3, 42.

[43] Arber, 1:58.

[44] *DCEP*, A6v.

[45] Ibid., A3r.

[46] Ibid., 562.

[47] Baxter, pt. 3, 42.

[48] John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 11.

[49] Ibid., 14.

[50] Ibid., 19.

[51] Ibid., 28-29.

[52] Although Arber does not list a license date for this work, Marvell claimed it was published in June or July (Marvell, 74).

[53] John McCafferty, "John Bramhall and the Church of Ireland in the 1630s," in Alan Ford, James Maguire, and Kenneth Milne, eds., *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1995), 102.

[54] For more on Bramhall, see *DNB*, *s.v.* and McCafferty.

[55] *Preface*, sig. A5r.

[56] Ibid., sig. A8r.

[57] Ibid., sig. A8v. This mentality on the part of the populace to which Parker referred is attested to in other documents of the period: "It is impossible to persuade the people into any other belief than that the Papists have a design to rise and cut their throats, and they impute the late sad conflagration solely to their continuance and propagation" (*CSPD, 1666-1667*, 127). Cf. Pepys, 7:356-57.

[58] Ibid., sig. a1r.

[59] Ibid., sig. a2v, a3r.

[60] Andrew Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, 2 vols., ed. H. M. Margoliouth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 2:314-15.

[61] *HMC* 72, *Finch*, 2, 9.

[62] George, duke of Buckingham, and Richard Sheridan, *The Rehearsal and the Critic* (Great Neck, NY: Barron's Educational Series, 1960), 5.

[63] Ibid., 10.

[64] Ibid., 25-26.

[65] W. Andrew Alexander, *'As In That Stile Usual': Debate and Context in Marvell's The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1987), 4.

[66] Ibid., 156.

[67] Ibid., 182-83.

[68] Annabel Patterson, *Andrew Marvell* (Plymouth, UK: Northcote House, 1994), 21, 58.

[69] Ibid., 193.

[70] Marvell, 7.

[71] Ibid., 52.

[72] Alexander, 245.

[73] Marvell, 56-57.

[74] Ibid., 55.

[75] Ibid., 85.

[76] Ibid., 142-45.

[77] For more information, see *DNB, s.v.*

[78] James R. Jacob, *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-4.

[79] Henry Stubbe, *Rosemary and Bayes: Or, Animadversions upon a Treatise Called, The Rehearsall Trans-prosed* (London, 1672), 6.

[80] Ibid., 2.

[81] Ibid., 18-19.

[82] Ibid., 22.

[83] Ibid., 18.

[84] Ibid., 16.

[85] See, for example, Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 84-92, 158-60; Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780,* 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1:1-4.

[86] Jacob, 118.

[87] Ibid., 119-20.

[88] The title-page bears a publication date of 1672, but this was likely the old dating system. Arber gives a licensing date of 7 February 1673. The tract sold for 6 *d*. (Arber, 1:128).

[89] Anon., *A Common-place-Book out of the Rehearsal Tranpros'd* (London, 1673), sig. A2v.

[90] Ibid., 55.

[91] The chronology of works here is not certain. *S'too Him Bayes* and *The Transproser Rehears'd* probably were published about the same time. *The Transproser Rehears'd* may have come first.

[92] Anon., *S'too Him Bayes* (London, 1673), 7.

[93] Ibid., 68-69.

[94] Ibid., 124.

[95] Richard Leigh, *The Transproser Rehears'd* (London, 1673), 2-3.

[96] Ibid., 27.

[97] Ibid., 31-41.

[98] Ibid., 47-48.

[99] Ibid., 135.

[100] Ibid., 131.

[101] Arber, 1:134.

[102] *RRT*, 1-2.

[103] Ibid., 3.

[104] Ibid., 4.

[105] See Chapter One.

[106] Arber, 1:142.

[107] See *DNB, s.v.*

[108] Edmund Hickeringill, *Gregory, Father-Greybeard, with His Vizard Off* (London, 1673), 9.

[109] Ibid., 27.

[110] Ibid., 157.

[111] Ibid., 74-77.

[112] Ibid., 3.

[113] Ibid., 78.

[114] Ibid., 84.

[115] Ibid., 105.

[116] Ibid., 112-17.

[117] Ibid., 283-94.

[118] Ibid., 118, 125.

[119] Ibid., 237-43.

[120] Ibid., 246-47.

[121] Ibid., 249-50.

[122] Marvell, 157, 201.

[123] Ibid., 156-59.

[124] Ibid., 163.

[125] Ibid., 169.

[126] Ibid., 171.

[127] Ibid., 181-86.

[128] Excerpts from several authors' observations on *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* can be found in Elizabeth Donno, ed., *Andrew Marvell: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 28-63.

[129] Anon., *An Apology and Advice for some of the Clergy* (London: 1674), 1.

[130] Burnet, 2:477-78.

[131] Wood, 4:231.

[132] *DNB*, *s.v.*

[133] John Dixon Hunt, *Andrew Marvell: His Life and Writings* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978), 169.

[134] Patterson, 20, 59.

[135] James Ferguson, *Robert Ferguson the Plotter: or the Secret of the Rye-House Conspiracy and the Story of a Strange Career* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1887), 14.

[136] Arber, 1:147. The work sold for 2*s*. 6*d*.

[137] Robert Ferguson, *A Sober Enquiry into the Nature, Measure, and Principle of Moral Virtue, Its Distinction from Gospel-Holiness* (London, 1673), sigs. A6r, A8r.

[138] The Socinian heresy holds that Christ's importance lies only in the moral example he set.

[139] Wallace, 166.

[140] Rivers, 1:24.

[141] Ibid., 1:132.

[142] See Edward Fowler, *The Design of Christianity* (London: 1671); and John Bunyan, *A Defence of the Doctrine of Justification* (London: 1672).

[143] *DEP*, 67.

[144] Ibid., 69.

[145] Ibid., 70.

[146] Ibid.

[147] Ibid., 71.

[148] Ibid.

[149] Ibid.

[150] Ibid., 72.

[151] Owen, 13:415-16.

[152] Ibid., 422.

[153] Ibid., 418.

[154] Ibid., 422.

[155] *DCEP*, 305.

[156] Owen 13:416.

[157] *DCEP*, 320.

[158] *DEP*, 73.

[159] *DCEP*, 306.

[160] Ibid., 315.

[161] Ibid., 316.

[162] Ibid., 317.

[163] Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 11. See also T. L. Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 4.

[164] Marvell, 53.

[165] Ibid., 62.

[166] Ibid., 23.

[167] Leigh, 131.

[168] *RRT*, 48.

[169] Ibid., 50. Joseph Laurence Black has commented on Parker's role in keeping the memory of the Marprelate tracts alive in seventeenth-century debate. See his *Pamphlet Wars: The Marprelate Tracts and "Martinism," 1588-1688* (University of Toronto, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation).

[170] Ibid., 52.

[171] Ibid., 54-55.

[172] Ibid., 55.

[173] The following analysis supports the contention of Sears McGee that Puritans and Anglicans placed greater emphasis on the First and Second Tables of the Ten Commandments, respectively. See J. Sears McGee, *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglican, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976).

[174] Hickeringill, 64.

[175] Ibid., 65-66.

[176] Ibid., 86.

[177] Ibid., 72.

[178] Marvell, 263.

[179] Ibid., 264.

[180] Ibid., 267-68.

[181] Ferguson, 1-2.

[182] Ibid., 3-4, 6.

[183] Ibid., 19-20.

[184] Ibid., 23.

[185] Ibid., 29-30.

[186] Ibid., 31-32.

[187] Ibid., 36-44.

[188] Ibid., 51.

[189] Ibid., 65.

[190] Ibid., 72-73.

[191] Ibid., 74-75.

[192] Ibid., 75-77.

[193] Ibid., 82.

[194] Ibid., 109.

[195] Ibid., 118.

[196] Ibid., 135.

[197] Ibid., 141-43.

[198] Ibid., 147-48.

[199] Ibid., 154.

[200] Ibid., 158-59.

[201] Ibid., 161.

[202] Ibid., 172-73. Cf. *DCEP*, 326.

[203] Ibid., 198-99.

[204] *DEP*, 100-103.

[205] Ferguson, 211-12.

[206] Ibid., 232-36.

[207] Ibid., 237-39.

[208] Ibid., 243-44.

[209] Ibid., 252-60. Cf. *DCEP*, 329-34.

[210] Ibid., 263.

[211] Ibid., 299-301. Cf. *DCEP*, 335.

[212] Ibid., 317-23.

[213] Parker's view of authority is covered in Chapter Three.

[214] Owen, 13:419; Ferguson, 3, 6.

[215] Isabel Rivers, "Grace, Holiness, and the Pursuit of Happiness: Bunyan and Restoration Latitudinarianism," in N. H. Keeble, ed., *John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 50.

[216] Ibid., 58.

[217] Rivers, *Reason*, 1:124.

[218] Spellman, 43-44.

[219] Rivers, *Reason*, 1:26.

[220] Spellman, 158.

[221] Parkin, 37.

[222] John Spurr, "'Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church," *Historical Journal* 31 (March 1988): 82.

CHAPTER THREE
WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?: THE TOLERATION CONTROVERSY II

The toleration controversy of 1667-1673 touched on a range of issues of considerable importance to religion and civil government. Chapter Two indicated how differing concepts of grace bore on the arguments offered by each side in the dispute. This chapter continues an examination of the polemic used by Parker and his opponents, this time focusing on two different themes: authority and the civil wars of the 1640s. These themes are closely linked because value judgments concerning the civil wars necessarily hinged on whether there was an abuse of royal authority in the years leading up to the outbreak of fighting between Parliament and the royalists, and if so, whether resistance to that authority was legitimate. I argue that neither Parker nor his literary antagonists occupied the extremes of the spectrum of contemporary opinions on the authority of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, although their polemic and that of later historians often implies that this was the case. The civil wars provided Parker and his allies with an obvious opportunity to cast great suspicion on the nonconformists, and they effectively drew connections between the latter and the parliamentarians of the 1640s. The strength of this line of attack may have influenced John Owen to withdraw from this particular literary battle, and it probably forced even Andrew Marvell to pursue different arguments in his replies to Parker. Although Parker's view of royal authority probably was not endorsed by public opinion, his clever usage of the wars proved to be one of his most powerful weapons.

Authority: A Crucial Question

The issue of authority was central to the toleration controversy. In a sense, this was the most critical question to be determined, for on its resolution depended the entire framework of the relationship between church and state. If the civil magistrate had no authority to regulate religious observances, then any restrictions on them were to be viewed as an abomination. On the other hand, if the authority of the magistrate in this area were conceded, its extent and the criteria according to which it should be exercised still provided a great deal of room for disagreement and debate. A wide range of opinions on these questions found its way into print between 1667 and 1673. On one extreme were the advocates of complete state control over all aspects of worship to be exercised in the "national" interest, while on the other end of the spectrum were radicals who denied the legitimacy of state involvement in any area of religion whatsoever.

Often, Parker was accused by contemporaries of being an Erastian, one who believed that the church derived its authority from the will of the monarch. More specifically, he was frequently labeled a disciple of Thomas Hobbes, who had presented one of the most comprehensive cases for state control of all religious activity in *Leviathan* (1651). Henry Stubbe's reference to Parker as "the young Leviathan" has already been noted, but Stubbe was not alone in his assessment of the archdeacon.[1] Owen, for example, asserted that the principles Parker argued for "do seem to *border on*, if not to be *borrowed from*" Hobbes.[2] As Hobbes was regarded by many to be an atheist, the purpose of these attacks was clearly to imply Parker's guilt by association with the controversial philosopher.

Accusations such as these have been echoed by modern historians. A prime example is found in *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Works of Andrew Marvell* by Warren L. Chernaik. Despite acknowledging that Hobbes and Parker have their differences, Chernaik informs us that "their disagreements are family quarrels and their basic position is identical."[3] He writes, "Both Parker and Hobbes are thoroughgoing Erastians," and he quotes Parker and Hobbes interchangeably when summarizing the absolutist argument against the liberal position of Marvell.[4] Similarly, in a 1990 article on Hobbes, J. G. A. Pocock claimed of Parker, "His views on church government were erastian enough to come close to Hobbes' own."[5]

The *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* was not a systematic or thorough defense of absolutism; as noted, its preface informed readers that its purpose was not to convict dissenters of their errors, but to "awaken Authority against them."[6] Nevertheless, a close examination of Parker's writings and those of his adversaries in this debate reveals several things. First, neither Parker nor his literary opponents occupied the extremes of the ideological spectrum on the issue of authority. Parker was not a Hobbesian, despite the accusations of his critics. His works of this period, however, may fairly be described as Erastian because they did not clearly distinguish between the authority of the church and that of the state, a distinction that would not appear fully fledged in his work until the 1680s.

Erastianism: An Historical Argument

Parker's basic view of authority was that it is paternal in nature; he outlined his position in Chapter One of the *Discourse*. The "Wisdom of Providence," knowing what discord would result without the presence of authority, ensured that every person born into the world would be subject to a superior, "every Father being by Nature Vested with a Right to govern his Children."[7] Civil governments evolved as an extension of this basic hierarchy. "He that was at first but Father of a Family, in process of time, as that multiply'd, became Father of a City or Province; and hence it came to pass that in the first ages of the World, Monarchy was its only Government, necessarily arising out of the Constitution of Humane Nature."[8] Parker asserted that this view of the origins of government is borne out by "all . . . the best and most antient Records of the first Ages of the World," but he offered no specific examples other than the division of the Israelites into tribes and clans, a fact which political scientist Richard Ashcraft notes with some

frustration in his brief discussion of Parker.[9] Parker went on to point out that the commonwealth form of government was a relatively recent innovation inherited from the Greeks, and he blamed the absence of monarchy for their "perpetual Confusions, and frequent Changes in Government."[10]

Then came the most important component of Parker's argument, *viz*. that from the earliest times civil and ecclesiastical authority have been vested in the same person. Even in states where the priesthood was a separate order from the secular authority, the latter always had supreme power, able to alter or countermand the dictates of the former. This idea, which Dewey Wallace calls "extreme Erastianism," established the tone of the entire *Discourse* and was the key to Parker's argument for the state's ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[11] The patriarch of the Old Testament held power not only over his family members' conduct in their mutual affairs but also over their duties toward God. He spoke directly with God and offered sacrifices on his own behalf and that of his family.[12] The wielding of secular and religious authority by the same individual was "universally practiced over all Kingdoms of the world for well nigh 2500 years, without any one president to the contrary."[13]

Kings had the option to delegate religious authority to priests, but they always retained ultimate power. The Jewish state was an exception; by divine command, the priesthood was permanently transferred to the tribe of Levi, whereas the kingship settled eventually on the tribe of Judah. However, Parker argued that even in this situation, the king still had the last word in religious matters. He named several Old Testament kings, including David and Solomon, who took an active role in religious affairs, performing both legislative and executive functions. Parker concluded this section by writing that any argument against the jurisdiction of the modern magistrate would apply equally to the Jewish kings, who obviously had divine sanction for their authority.[14]

So far, Parker appeared to be on solid ground scripturally, although he offered no non-biblical examples to support his claims of the universality of the system he outlined. Problems arose with the founding of Christianity, for by that time Israel was part of the Roman empire, which came to frown upon the new religious movement relatively quickly. If early Christians had believed that the state possessed supreme religious authority, Christianity would have been a short-lived phenomenon. Parker's task was to reconcile his theory with the evidence from the first few centuries of the church's existence. The problem was compounded by the absence of any teaching of Christ directly pertaining to the issue.

Parker's solution was simply to assert that the ruler's authority in religion remained, unless it ran counter to Christianity. Christ did not address the ruler's authority in religious matters; he simply left government as it was. "No where he [Christ] takes upon him to settle, much less to limit the Prerogative of Princes; and therefore the Government of Religion being vested in them by an antecedent and natural Right, must without all Controversie belong to them, till it is derogated from them by some Superiour Authority."[15] According to Parker, scripture supposes rather than asserts the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the ruler, and there was no need for Christ, Paul, or any other New Testament figure to deliver a discourse on the subject; indeed, it would have been pointless for them to give the prince a new divine commission in religious matters when he so obviously had one already. The point was not for Christians to deny the ruler's jurisdiction but for them to wait patiently until such time as the ruler became a Christian

and could take up his traditional role as the guardian and defender of true religion again. Parker went so far as to declare that Christ's purpose in instructing his followers to be meek and patient was to prevent them from infringing the magistrate's temporal authority and opening themselves to charges of sedition.[16]

During the early days of the church, its leaders had no civil authority over its members. Christ did not take on civil power, nor did he impart it to the apostles; their authority was purely spiritual. However, this was not sufficient to ensure proper discipline; God therefore imposed miraculous punishments on those who assailed the church or tried to subvert it. Moreover, the apostles could invoke this power when necessary. Here Parker was careful to provide evidence to support his claims regarding these "Miracles of Severity," citing incidents in Acts and quoting from the letters of Paul, where the apostle threatened to discipline severely those who would not accept his authority.[17]

Once the emperors became Christian, these extraordinary measures were no longer necessary, and miracles ceased in the Christian church. The emperors immediately resumed the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[18] In Parker's view, the presence of schism and heresy in the church already in Constantine's time was ample evidence that secular authority in religion was essential for maintaining both unity in the church and civil peace. Examples of this use of authority included Constantine's summoning of councils to bring peace to the church, and Justinian's inclusion of ecclesiastical legislation in his great compilation of Roman civil law. The persistence of error kept rulers busy throughout the life of the empire, but their effective exercise of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction was sufficient to maintain order.

Unfortunately, Parker continued, the popes were able eventually to usurp spiritual authority in the West as the empire weakened. Taking advantage of the empire's division, they "gain'd either by force or fraud the whole of Dominion of Religion to themselves," labeling their opponents heretics and cowing them into submission.[19] Christianity suffered under the popes for centuries and very nearly became pagan as error and corruption spread. The achievement of the Reformation, he declared, lay in the reestablishment of ecclesiastical authority in the secular ruler, where it belonged.

Parker asserted that the work of reformation was not completed in the sixteenth century, for in his day there still were many "pert and pragmatical Divines" who, from the Reformation's beginning, had been making their own rules of piety and orthodoxy.[20] Their confidence and vehemence had frightened princes out of their rightful jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters. Parker cited as an example the document proclaiming England's Wednesday fast, which claimed not to bind the conscience.[21] This policy was self-destructive, he believed, for the prince's authority came from God and, because it was God-given, *did* bind the subject's conscience; if a law has no authority over the conscience, then it is no law at all. The chapter ended with a warning that, because nothing has a greater effect on a nation's peace and stability than its religion (a self-evident truth for Parker), the prince who neglects to exercise his or her ecclesiastical jurisdiction hazards the crown.[22]

Some observations may be made at this point concerning this historical argument. It was Parker's first effort at using the history of the church as a polemical tool. While relatively brief and unsophisticated, in the following years this interpretation of the past evolved (with some significant changes) into a much more elaborate defense of authority

based on natural right (for the magistrate) and apostolic succession (for the episcopally-organized church). These later arguments are examined in Chapters Four and Five.

Obviously, there were some areas where evidence for Parker's assertions was lacking. For example, the contention that miracles ceased at the time of Constantine's conversion had no historical support. However, Parker's inclusion of miracles in his analysis is very important, for to him it showed that discipline–*temporal* discipline–was essential in the early church. This discipline under normal circumstances would have been supplied by the magistrate, but God in His mercy provided extraordinary, miraculous punishments while the emperors remained pagan. The need for discipline did not abate with the passage of time, and in 1669 Parker obviously believed in the necessity of its provision by secular authority.[23] He challenged his opponents to deny that the magistrate had authority to punish "Swearing and Blasphemy, and such other Religious Debaucheries," for these actions had as much to do with religion as any ceremony in a worship service.[24]

Another point of interest is that his view of the Reformation in England was very much in line with that of the Henrician Catholics of the 1530s and 1540s. The operative concept here was that if ecclesiastical authority lay in the proper hands, the church would fare well. Thus the heart of the English Reformation was the recovery of ecclesiastical authority by the monarch from the usurping hands of the bishop of Rome, even though the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church of England underwent little if any changes. This belief was in sharp contrast to the view of most Restoration-era nonconformists, who, when writing of the Reformation, normally referred to the reign of Edward VI, when doctrine and ceremonies *did* undergo significant alteration, coming more into line with those of the Swiss Reformation especially. Overlooking this fact may cause confusion when comparing the *Discourse* and Parker's other writings to those of nonconformists.

Grace and Authority in the Worship Service

We have already noted Parker's view of grace's role as an auxiliary to the performance of good works. In the closing pages of Chapter Two of the *Discourse*, the archdeacon applied this idea to bolster the magistrate's authority. Having argued that "the Duties of Morality are the most weighty and material Concerns of Religion," he noted that the magistrate already enjoyed undisputed jurisdiction in this area, for all civil law is predicated on some moral principle. These principles are given by God and may not be changed; the magistrate cannot decide that justice is no longer a virtue or that murder has ceased to be a vice. However, God has given the secular arm some freedom in the definition and observance of virtues and vices. "The Divine Law restrains *Titius* from invading *Caius*'s Right and Propriety; but what that is, and when it is invaded, only the Laws of the Society they live in can determine."[25] The state must define right and property in this case, and whatever definition it issues is binding on the consciences of Titius and Caius. They may fabricate their own definitions that are different from the state's, but those have no practical value; in their actions they must adhere to the state's rules.

Parker assumed that no one would challenge the above example. The greater principle he was attempting to prove was that the magistrate had the power to bind the conscience. In Parker's usage, "binding the conscience" was not equivalent to thought control, even in the matter of divinely instituted virtues. Conscience is bound only in regard to the actions it precipitates, not to the beliefs it holds or the judgments it makes. In this way, it is possible for a conscience to be free and bound at the same time. Parker was not opposed to liberty of conscience if that liberty were defined as the freedom to judge or believe.[26] Working from this idea, he went on to assert in his third chapter that even within the Church of England, nonconformists would have liberty of conscience because worship takes place in one's mind, and they would never be told what to think. What the nonconformists wanted, he argued, was not liberty of conscience, but liberty of *practice*. As Jonathan Parkin notes, this was a recurring argument utilized by Erastians and conformists in the Restoration era; Thomas Hobbes, Edward Stillingfleet, and John Locke (in his early career) had all made similar statements.[27]

The question remained, why should government have jurisdiction over morality? For Parker, this was the central purpose of government. The proper function of life on earth was to prepare oneself for life eternal, but while on earth, humans had to live together. Without some form of organization, the resulting chaos would impede preparation for the hereafter. In Parker's view, the existence of a supreme power was "absolutely necessary to the decision of all those Quarrels and Controversies, that are naturally consequent upon the Passions and Appetites of men, there being no other way of ending their Differences but by the Decrees of a final and unappealing Judicature."[28] For this reason, God ensured that every human since creation had been under some form of government.

Parker believed that religion was the most important influence on a country's stability; in his view, the conflicts of the 1640s provided ample evidence of that truism.[29] The conclusion he drew was predictable, and can be expressed in a syllogism:

A. The magistrate has jurisdiction in matters of moral virtue.
B. The corporate worship service is an expression of moral virtue.
C. Therefore, the magistrate has jurisdiction over the corporate worship service.

Just as the magistrate has freedom to define instances of virtue and vice in other areas, he has the same prerogative in the worship service. This prerogative has its limits, which Parker was careful to define according to his preceding exposition. The two goals of religion are to honor God and to "advance the interests of moral goodness." Therefore, "no Rites or Ceremonies can be esteemed unlawful in the Worship of God, unless they tend to debauch men either in their Practices, or their Conceptions of the Deity."[30] For example, the magistrate may not enforce worship like the Bacchan rites, with their "Lust and Debauchery," nor may he institute idolatry, which offers worship to an inappropriate object.[31]

Within these parameters, the magistrate can still take seemingly extraordinary steps, such as instituting animal sacrifices as part of worship. Although Parker believed this would not be logical or necessary within the English cultural context, he held that the fact of the magistrate's prerogative remained; as we have seen, Robert Ferguson strenuously objected to this declaration. For Parker, it was important that Christians

submit to the magistrate's authority and take part in the ceremonies he institutes because of worship's public aspect. All desire to honor God; the magistrate only determines how that honor is expressed in the corporate assembly; bowing at the name of Jesus is one example.[32]

Like Hickeringill, Parker considered "meer worship" less important than moral behavior in everyday life. He asked, "And therefore is it not strange, that when the main Ends and Designs of all Religion [i.e. moral behavior] are avowedly subject to the Supreme Power, that yet Men should be so impatient to exempt its Means and subordinate Instruments from the same Authority?"[33] He characterized the focus on the worship service as a misplaced concern: "Is there not vastly greater danger of the Magistrates erring in Matters of Morality, than in Forms and Ceremonies of Worship; in that those are the main, essential, and ultimate Duties of Religion; whereas these are at highest but their Instruments, and can challenge no other place in Religion, than as they are subservient to the purposes of Morality?"[34] Again we see Parker's view of grace coloring his notion of authority.

Despite the lesser importance of the worship service, a misconception of it was just as or more dangerous than a misconception of moral virtue, and the former would usually lead to the latter, in Parker's estimation. Time and again in the *Discourse* he asserted that the masses were prone to falling under the sway of demagogues, and argued that the most dangerous demagogue was a religious one because he removed the fear of divine punishment from his followers. The mob was therefore "more inclined to disturb Government by Superstition than by Licentiousness."[35] To support this claim, he made vague references to nations brought down by internal conflict.[36] To him, this was yet more evidence that the worship service fell naturally under the magistrate's jurisdiction.

Parker and Hobbes

Parker surely realized that he was leaving himself open to accusations that he was endorsing Hobbes' conception of the state, and he attempted to deflect preemptively these charges in Chapters Four and Five of the *Discourse* by denouncing the controversial philosopher. Chapter Four began with the declaration that divine law as revealed in scripture supersedes human law, and that any human law contradicting scriptural commands must be disobeyed by the subject.[37] When the civil power commands something that is in accord with or neutral in regard to divine law, it is likewise the divine law that obligates the subject to obedience. Parker then proceeded to assault Hobbes' "wild Hypothesis" of a natural state of war among humans which was ameliorated by the consensual formation of civil government, in which each individual surrendered the right to all things in order to gain a measure of security. This "Fundamental Falshood" implies that humans have no mutual obligations prior to the creation of the state, that self-preservation is the guiding principle which justifies any individual's actions. However, the "Dictates of Reason" are contrary to this construct; human beings are interdependent and are obliged "to aim at the Common Good of Mankind" in addition to seeking their own personal gain. Such a condition requires government, which was part of God's plan for the world from its inception.[38]

According to Parker, anyone who embraces the Hobbesian hypothesis of a natural state of war must believe one of two things:

> 1) Humans have no Creator and instead "hapned by chance to arise like Mushromes out of the Earth," after which they spent their time "belabouring one another with Snagsticks, and beating out each others brains," until they grew tired of that miserable existence and decided to band together out of self-interest.[39]
> 2) The world's Creator was so inept that He "sent his Creatures into it in such a Condition as should oblige them to seek their own mutual Ruine and Destruction," and humanity owes whatever degree of stability and prosperity it has attained to itself, not to the Creator.[40]

The implications of both scenarios are the same: society will never be secure, because individuals will obey the civil law only as long as they perceive it to be in their own self-interest. Any opportunity to advance one's self-interest at the expense of the common good–rebelling against the monarch, for example–will be taken as long as the malefactor believes escape from punishment is likely. Parker asserted that this leaves human society in as poor a position as it was before government was established in the first place.[41] He concluded the chapter with the observation that since Hobbes' foundational suppositions are ludicrous, whatever accurate conclusions Hobbes made stem "not by vertue of these, but other Principles."[42]

The purpose of this statement was no doubt to forestall accusations of "Hobbism" from those who noticed the similar conclusions Parker and Hobbes drew in certain other areas. However, we should not make the mistake of assuming that the differences between the two were merely cosmetic. We have already noted Parker's adherence to empiricism in scientific enquiry, and his great suspicion towards any *a priori* constructs; this outlook provided much of the foundation for his early philosophical works as well as the later *Disputationes de Deo* and *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion*. In this context, that he found himself firmly opposed to Hobbes in the area of first principles is hardly surprising. In dealing with the remote past, Parker referred to the Biblical record as a reliable historical record and based his analysis on its concrete statements; he would not countenance an imaginary construct of a "state of nature" for which there was no empirical evidence.

In a further effort to avoid the charge of "Hobbism", Parker attempted to turn the tables on the nonconformists in the following chapter by arguing that the atheistic views of Hobbes are in fact more conducive to pro-toleration arguments than to anti-toleration ones. If in fact no religion is binding on people before the civil power makes it so, as Hobbes argued,[43] then absolute truth is not a consideration when the state attempts to legislate on religious matters. As Parker put it, "if the Sovereign Power would declare the *Alcoran* to be Canonical Scripture, it would be as much the Word of God as the Four Gospels."[44] The Hobbesian theory of government thus implies that all religion is merely a useful "Cheat of Policy" which can be used to pacify the populace. As long as a prince encourages *some* sense of religion in his or her subjects, the regime will be strengthened; therefore, a policy of religious toleration is a harmless and perhaps even a desirable thing.[45] This line of reasoning was not as faulty as it might appear at first glance.

Jonathan Parkin notes that Hobbes himself defended "primitive Independency" and had made links with Oxford Independents in the 1650s; also, at the time of Parker's writing, nonconformists were publishing promises of support to Charles II in exchange for toleration.[46]

It is clear that Parker went to great lengths to distance himself from Hobbes in the *Discourse* and its sequels. However, his agreement with Hobbes on a key point of contention in the 1667-1673 controversy, *viz*. that the magistrate can force a certain external form of worship on the populace, made his disagreement with Hobbes in other areas seem of little practical importance to the nonconformists. In the second part of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Marvell addressed this point. "Under pretence of confuting Mr. *Hobbs* . . . you have usher'd in whatsoever Principles men lay to his charge, only disguised under another Notion to make them more venerable. Nay, in good earnest, I do not see but your *Behemoth* exceeds his *Leviathan* some foot long, in whatsoever he saith of the Power of the Magistrate in matters of Religion and Civils."[47] This passage shows that Marvell realized Parker's views were even more dangerous to nonconformists than Hobbes', for dissenters could always make the same discrediting arguments against Hobbes' atheism that Parker had; perhaps they could even promote toleration using a Hobbesian "Interest" argument. However, Parker's absolutism, which viewed religious pluralism as inherently dangerous, was founded on the fundamentally–though differently interpreted–Christian notion of divine law shared by the nonconformists and the vast majority of the English populace. This helps to explain why the dissenters went to such great lengths to refute Parker in the early 1670s.

Although Parker's books during the toleration crisis were clearly not Hobbesian, they may fairly be described as Erastian, for there was not yet a clear distinction in Parker's philosophy between the authority of the prince and the authority of the church. He stated that Christians are obligated to disobey the magistrate when commanded to do something clearly contrary to scripture, but he did not assign a role to the church leadership in such a situation, nor did he discuss the relationship between the crown and bishops except in passing.

Owen's Reply

John Owen found plenty to dispute in Parker's case for royal authority in religious matters. His critique of Chapter One of the *Discourse* made up the longest section of *Truth and Innocence Vindicated*. The first complaint is a wonderful example of what Isabel Rivers calls "the conflict of languages" in the mid-seventeenth century.[48] In this case, Owen focused on Parker's careless and sometimes contradictory use of words and phrases such as "conscience" and "ecclesiastical jurisdiction"; the archdeacon had not provided clear definitions for these potentially ambiguous terms, and thus his argument lacked clarity.[49] Owen alleged that this absence of a secure foundation prevented any meaningful discussion on the merits of the debate:

> What conscience is, what liberty of conscience, what it is pleaded for to extend unto, who are concerned in it, whether its plea be resolved

> absolutely into its own nature and constitution, or into that respect which it hath to another common rule of the minds and conceptions of men in and about the worship of God, is not declared; nor is it easily discernible what he allows and approves of in his own discourse, and what he introduceth to reflect upon, and so reject.[50]

This criticism was somewhat justified, for Parker betrayed a lack of consistency when using these important terms. Although this obfuscation, intentional or not, allowed him to make hyperbolic assertions, such as that the magistrate had an "uncontroulable power" over the conscience, it also opened the door for his critics (especially Marvell) to twist his arguments, using his own words, into something he did not intend, as I demonstrated in Chapter Two.

Owen claimed to agree with Parker that the magistrate should have all the power necessary to preserve "public peace and tranquillity in the world," but he denied that jurisdiction over the worship service was necessary to achieve that end. He warned that Parker was opening a proverbial Pandora's box out of which would come endless claims of authority for the magistrate under the pretense of preserving order. "Some will, perhaps, think it necessary . . . that the magistrate should have power to determine . . . whether there be a God or no; whether, if there be, it be necessary he should be worshipped or no; whether any religion be needful in, or useful to, the world."[51] Obviously, these things went beyond what Parker was willing to concede to the magistrate, as his discussion of Hobbes made clear.

Owen tried to depict Parker's position as one which pitted the authority of the magistrate against that of God. Parker had clearly argued that the magistrate's authority was derivative, but he had made the fatal error (in Owen's view) of denying any connection between that authority and Christ. For Owen, the idea that a Christian prince did not receive his authority from Christ was incomprehensible. He asserted that Parker's paradigm gave the magistrate even more power than it did to Christ. After listing several areas where the archdeacon made the two seem equal in authority, Owen pointed out two things that tipped the scales in the magistrate's favor. "Men may do and practise many things in the worship of God which the Lord Christ hath nowhere nor by any means required. . . . But, on the other hand, no man must do or practise any thing in that way but what is prescribed, appointed, and commanded by the magistrate, upon pain of sin, schism, rebellion, and all that follow thereon. To leave this unasserted is all that the Nonconformists would desire in order unto peace." Furthermore, if the magistrate were to command something that Christ forbids "in a man's own apprehension," Parker's construct demanded obedience to the magistrate rather than to Christ.[52] Owen believed that this sort of claim to authority had never been put forward by any but the most tyrannical monarchs of ancient times and the papacy.[53] He also reasoned that if Parker's notions about the inherently disruptive tendencies of unsanctioned worship were correct, "the whole world for three hundred years lived in one continual disturbance and tumult upon the account of Christian religion, whose professors constantly practiced and performed that . . . which was so far from being established or approved by public authority, that it was proscribed and condemned under penalties of all sorts."[54]

Some of Owen's most insightful comments related to Parker's criteria for determining whether the magistrate's directives for worship were improper. If the only

things forbidden to the magistrate were promotion of vice and disgracing God, then most "ordinary men" who did not know scripture thoroughly would be unable to refuse to participate in Roman Catholic or even Jewish worship ceremonies when so commanded. Such a principle cast "a reflection of incredible folly and inexpiable guilt upon all protestant martyrs" and condemned those Protestants living in Catholic countries who refused to attend Mass. Owen held up Daniel as an example of one who refused to submit to the magistrate when he was prohibited from praying in his home.[55]

He also raised the question of who was to judge whether the magistrate's command were to be obeyed. Clearly the magistrate was not to be the judge; to say so would be "the highest foppery imaginable; for no magistrate . . . will enjoin such a religion to observance as he judgeth himself to fall under the [dis]qualifications mentioned."[56] The judgment had to be left to the subjects. Owen apparently agreed that nonconformists should "suffer *quietly*" when refusing to comply with religious commands, and that this fact by definition ensured that they would be no threat to the public peace. Just as Parker argued that it was divine law that must be the final arbiter in the subject's decision to obey or disobey, so Owen insisted that the same law continued to bind the nonconformist in obedience to the magistrate in civil matters even while he or she disobeyed the latter in the area of religious ceremonies.[57]

The notion of the priesthood belonging to the magistrate by natural right also drew Owen's criticism. First, he declared that priests had never claimed to exercise absolute rule over others' consciences, that they merely administered holy rites "which by common consent were admitted and received amongst them." Furthermore, it was inconsistent to claim that Christian priests and bishops were agents of the prince operating under an authority antecedent to and unaffected by Christ's coming. He marveled that Parker could maintain this position even while quoting the passage of scripture naming Christ the "King of Kings," stating, "None is the vicegerent of another in the existence of any power and authority, if he have not received that power and authority from him."[58] Again, Owen's purpose was to expose an alleged tension between the magistrate and Christ in Parker's framework. He denounced Parker's statement that the only reason Christ did not prescribe secular penalties for disobeying the gospel was because he had not been invested with any secular authority: "This in plain English is, that if Christ had had power, he would have ordered the gospel to have been propagated as Mohammed hath done his Alcoran; an assertion . . . contrary to the whole spirit and genius of the gospel."[59] On the contrary, Owen cited Matthew 28:18-20, where Christ told his apostles he had been given *all* authority in heaven and on earth. It is therefore Christ's authority that is antecedent to any earthly prince's and from which the prince's authority must be derived.[60] This was undoubtedly Owen's strongest line of attack against Parker's paradigm.

Owen dismissed Parker's account of the miraculous punishments of the New Testament era being merely a temporary substitute for secular authority over the conscience as a *non sequitur*. He considered it a "weak and feeble" argument to contend that because God had seen fit to punish "stubborn sinners, apostates, blasphemers, and such like heinous offenders" with miraculous penalties, the magistrate had the authority to regulate the worship service.[61] This was not exactly Parker's position, of course, but Owen's disagreement ran deeper in that he also disputed Parker's supposition that spiritual sins–violations of the Ten Commandments' First Table–required temporal

penalties at all, at least ones administered by the state. He believed Parker was building a case for civil authority on conjecture.[62]

Not surprisingly, Owen viewed Parker's discourse against Hobbes as inconsistent with his prior statements regarding the magistrate's authority: "If I understand any thing of his words and expressions, our author in the beginning of his fourth chapter cuts down all those gourds and wild vines that he had been planting in his three preceding; for he not only grants but disputes also for an obligation on the consciences of men antecedent and superior unto all human laws and their obligation!"[63] After quoting Parker to this effect, he replied that the nonconformists were simply applying this very principle, and that any disobedience to the magistrate stemmed from the higher duty of obeying the divine law as they understood it. Another alleged inconsistency was Parker's claim that the conscience was what ensured obedience to the magistrate, despite the fact that in the previous chapters he had described it as "a principle of all confusion."[64]

As for the specific arguments against Hobbes, Owen had less to say. Predictably, he associated Parker with the philosopher: "The hypothesis whose confutation he [Parker] hath undertaken, as it is in itself false, so it is rather suited to promote what he aims at than what he opposeth."[65] He flatly contradicted the assertion of an affinity between Hobbesian and pro-toleration aims, and claimed that he had never heard anyone argue that atheism led one to have pro-toleration views. He went on to write that the very notion was absurd: "If there be no such thing in reality as religion in the world, it is certainly a very foolish thing to have differences perpetuated amongst men upon the account of conscience; which, without a supposition of religion, is nothing but a vain and empty name."[66] Here Parker surely had a better grasp of the reality of the situation than Owen, as subsequent centuries made clear.

In an apparent effort to demonstrate that he was not a radical, Owen conceded "that all principles of the minds of men, pretended to be from apprehensions of religion, that are in themselves inconsistent with any lawful government, in any place whatever, ought to be coerced and restrained."[67] However, later in the same paragraph, in a similar statement, he replaced the phrase "lawful government" with "righteous government." Here again one suspects that Parker and his Calvinist opponents were speaking two different languages. Nonconformists of Owen's persuasion were ready to determine for themselves whether a presently-constituted government conformed sufficiently to Biblical standards (as interpreted by themselves) to qualify as "righteous" or "lawful." Parker was most anxious to deny them any such right.

Parker the "Moderate"

Most of Parker's substantive reply to Owen on the question of authority is found in Chapter Three of the *Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*. He accused Owen of splitting hairs with his insistence on a "Scholastick exactness" of language: "I did not dream it was necessary for avoiding ambiguity, to guard every common Expression with rigorous and Logical Definitions."[68] In Parker's view, quibbling over the meanings of words would have no effect on his argument that the magistrate had the authority to regulate worship services. The only purpose he could see

for Owen's criticism was to insinuate that he was a "crude and unskilful writer."[69] Here one detects an element of insecurity in the young author who had been taken to task by one of the most famous divines in England. It may be that the harsh tone he employed in these works stemmed in part from a desire to overcompensate for his inexperience in such weighty controversies.[70]

Parker went on to claim that his own position was a moderate one which avoided the unhealthy extremes of the magistrate's unlimited power and the subject's "unbounded Licence." If the magistrate were the supreme authority, his laws "cannot possibly have any binding Vertue upon the Minds of Men," who would only obey from fear of punishment. It had to be respect for a superior divine authority which would induce obedience. On the other hand, a complete freedom of religion on the part of subjects would "yield up the Constitution of all Publick Affairs to the Humour and Insolence of every wild Enthusiast."[71] Parker in conjuring this vision no doubt had in mind the numerous radical sects which had flourished during the Interregnum; apparently he thought assertions such as these were immune to challenge, for the *Discourse* and *Defence* are peppered with them without any further elaboration or explanation.

Parker flatly denied the assertion that his paradigm placed the authorities of God and the magistrate in conflict, or that it gave the magistrate more authority than Christ. He declared that obedience to the magistrate was commanded quite clearly in scripture:

> There is no Rule of Life and Manners more express and unavoidable, nor any Duty in the Gospel enjoined in more positive Terms, and under more severe Penalties, than this of Obedience to the Commands of Supreme [earthly] Authority, and God has tied all their just Laws upon our Consciences, by vertue of his own Authority As Men would acquit themselves in their Obedience to his Laws, they are bound under the same Sanctions to acquit themselves in their Obedience to theirs.[72]

He reminded Owen of Paul's command in Romans 13 to submit to the governing authorities, emphasizing verse 5, which states that this subjection is "*not onely for wrath, but also for Conscience sake*." In addition, he quoted 1 Peter 2:13: "Be ye subject to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords sake."[73] Owen's picture of tension between God and the magistrate was therefore false: "It is not the different Obligations of Humane and Divine Laws, that are to be concerned in this Enquiry; for the authority of God is equally concerned in both."[74]

In like manner, he elsewhere denounced as an outright lie Owen's description of his view of the magistrate's authority, in which (according to Owen) whatever the magistrate pronounces concerning religion is immediately binding on the conscience by virtue of his own authority: "Though the Commands of the Civil Magistrate should pass an Universal Obligation upon the Consciences of Men, yet ŧtis an Inference like the rest of our Authors, from thence to conclude that they therefore affect them by their own direct and immediate Sanction."[75] He accused Owen of twisting his words by taking them out of their context; when he had declared the magistrate's authority to be "supreme" and "uncontroulable," "I onely maintain it in defiance to the Claims of any other Humane Power," namely "the Pope or the Presbytery."[76] He reiterated his claim from the *Discourse* that this assertion of the prince's (derivative) ecclesiastical

jurisdiction was "the main and the Fundamental Article of the Reformation, and that which distinguishes the truly Orthodox and Catholick Protestant both from Popish and Presbyterian Recusants."[77] But it was God's ultimate authority, not the magistrate's, which bound the conscience in Parker's view.

He used the same principle to deny Owen's claim that he had placed the magistrate's authority apart from Christ in any respect. The fact that the magistrate's commission was antecedent to Christ's coming did not mean that it was held independently of Christ *after* his coming; on the contrary, they now owe that authority entirely to "his Soveraign will and pleasure." Parker believed Christ had tacitly confirmed the prince's antecedent prerogative by refraining from putting into place any new system for government despite his authority to do so, "so that seeing he has thought good to continue the Government of the World in the same state and posture he found it in, Princes are not now less indebted to him for the Grant of their Imperial Power, than if they had been at first instated in it by his immediate and positive Commission."[78] There was thus no tension between the authorities of Christ and the magistrate.

For Parker, then, the decision of whether to resist the magistrate's command was reduced to a single consideration: whether scripture had forbidden what the magistrate ordered as clearly as it had prescribed obedience to the governing authorities. If the Bible unambiguously prohibited what the magistrate had commanded, the subject was to disobey, but if a clear scriptural command was absent, such as that regarding the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, the duty of obedience overrode whatever scruples on which a subject might otherwise act. In Romans 14:23 ("But he who doubts is condemned if he eats"), the apostle Paul warned Christians that participation in an activity not inherently evil (such as eating meat which had previously been offered ritually to idols) could in fact be a sin if the person involved believed it to be such. This verse was an obvious proof-text for nonconformists who wanted to justify their refusal to conform to the state church. However, Parker claimed that this use of scripture was illegitimate because in the situation Paul described there was no earthly authority commanding the activity:

> Where the danger of Sin lies but upon one side of the Action, ŧtis no doubt a Mans Wisdom to determine his choice on the other that is undoubtedly safe and innocent: but when there lies danger on both sides of the Enquiry, then the Doubt ceases to bind from Action, and onely binds to Enquiry, and ŧtis his Duty to resolve with the weightiest and most important Reasons; and the strongest Obligation always cancels the Doubt, and determines the Judgment. And this is the palpable difference of our case from that of St. *Paul*.[79]

In other words, according to Parker, if the magistrate had commanded the Roman Christians to eat the meat in question, Paul would have urged them to obedience no matter what doubts they might have had.

Parker then turned to Owen's question regarding who was to judge the legitimacy of the magistrate's commands. He confessed that this was a difficult issue to resolve, but maintained that it was a dilemma for "all Hypotheses of Government" and would always be present. Thus he did not feel compelled to give a definitive answer: "Therefore I

never design'd to prevent such Inconveniences as are unavoidable to Humane Affairs, but onely to setle their management upon the best and safest Principles that the Nature of things is capable of."[80] Refusing to let Owen confine the scope of the argument to the religious service, he reiterated that all law is predicated on some religious principle and pointed out that Owen himself had not objected to this point nor denied that in some cases it was appropriate for the magistrate to bring his authority to bear in religious issues; the problem of who was to judge would therefore remain in whatever system Owen proposed. Parker here tacitly acknowledged that Owen did not occupy the extreme end of the nonconformist spectrum, his previous accusations of sedition notwithstanding: "Thus far we are agreed, and only differ in marking out the distinct Bounds, and stating the particular Cases of his Jurisdiction: and here, whatsoever Determinations he may propose, they must fall under the different Opinions of the Prince and the Subject."[81]

Having established this context, Parker asserted that a complete reliance on the subject's judgment would produce anarchy; some balance must therefore be struck. The magistrate was to be careful not to propose any law that was a clear violation of biblical principles, whereas the subject was to submit to the authorities in unclear situations. If the magistrate failed on his part, the subject was to disobey the evil laws and submit to whatever punishment was meted out as a result while waiting for God's deliverance; "against this evil there is no remedy but Patience and Prayers."[82] Rebellion or active resistance was never a valid option for the subject because the threat of anarchy was infinitely worse (to Parker) than that of tyranny. This theory of passive resistance was nothing new in the Church of England, and Parker's own formulation of it would develop further in his later works. His point here, though, was that even passive resistance was not warranted in the current situation since there had been no clear violation of divine law by the magistrate. He noted that he had dealt with this issue in the final chapter of the *Discourse*, but that Owen had refrained from discussing that particular section in *Truth and Innocence Vindicated*, it being "too hazardous an Enterprize" for him.[83]

Parker did make one serious qualification to his argument that had not appeared in the *Discourse*. This had to do with the exercise of priestly duties by the prince, which he had clearly stated was legitimate according to natural right.[84] Owen had pointed out that according to this idea, Elizabeth I would have been justified in administering the sacraments personally.[85] In the *Defence* Parker disavowed this notion, stating that the priestly function from Christ's day forward had been expressly delegated by divine revelation to the apostles and their successors, just as the priesthood had been settled on the tribe of Levi in Old Testament Israel.[86] If Parker had intended to make this point clear in the *Discourse*, he had certainly failed; Marvell later used the same passage from the *Discourse* to suggest that Charles II simply appropriate all church revenue as a legitimate exercise of his priestly function: "It would be the best Subsidy that ever was voluntarily given by the Clergy."[87] Parker later used the doctrine of apostolic succession to develop a case for the autonomous authority of the church in the 1680s; in the early 1670s, only the seeds of this idea were apparent in his writings.

Marvell's Attack

In *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Marvell took full advantage of similar differences in emphasis between the *Discourse* and *Defence* to allege that Parker was simply contradicting himself in the two works. He pretended that Parker had placed no restraints whatsoever on the magistrate in the *Discourse*, but had matured in understanding over the following year and imposed limits on the prince's authority in the *Defence*: "He had, you know, . . . [in the *Discourse*] vested them [princes] with an universal and unlimited Power, and uncontroulable in the Government of Religion (that is, over mens Consciences) but now in his second, . . . he strips and disrobes them again of all those Regal Ornaments that he had superinduced upon them."[88] He expressed mock relief that Charles II had not tried to exercise all the powers Parker allegedly acknowledged him to have in the *Discourse*, for he would have "run himself into a fine *Premunire*, when now after all he comes to be made accountable to God."[89]

Marvell did not offer his own theory of authority in 1672, nor did he submit a serious critique of Parker's. He did take aim in one brief section at Parker's argument that obedience to the magistrate in a doubtful matter absolved the subject of any guilt. According to him, even the most important questions were open to doubt, and importance was a subjective determination. A subject who would be willing to violate his or her conscience for any reason was a hypocrite. Of Parker's assertion he declared, "He is the first Divine that ever taught Christians how another man's sin could confer an *Imputative Righteousness* upon all Mankind that shall follow and comply with it."[90]

Parker made the same complaints against Marvell in *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* that he had made against Owen in the *Defence*. Noting that Marvell's critique was purely negative, he challenged him, "Do you seriously believe, that his Majesty has no Power in matters of Religion? . . . Beside, do you not think it possible for men to create publique disturbances under pretences of Religion?"[91] He was clearly exasperated that Marvell had repeated many of Owen's accusations despite the fact that he had already answered them in the *Defence*. For example, when Marvell dredged up the accusation that Parker had not placed the magistrate under Christ's authority, he replied, "This is very shrewd, but then it is none of your own, *J. O.* had it before you, and in truth you are so given to purloining, that I expect ere long to hear of you among the Advertisements at the bottom of the Gazet, with a description of your Stature, Complexion, and Cloaths."[92] Indeed, the *Reproof* makes for tedious reading in most places; many sections are almost a verbatim repetition of passages in the *Defence*. Marvell had raised few substantive points new to the debate, and Parker repeatedly challenged him to offer a positive alternative to his paradigm.

Marvell gave a response of sorts in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part*, but he obviously did not have a systematic or well-thought-out solution to the problem of authority. He prevaricated, "I do most certainly believe that the Supream Magistrate hath some Power, but not all Power in matters of Religion. . . . I do not believe that Princes have Power to bind their Subjects to that religion that they apprehend most advantageous."[93] He went on to argue that this power Parker had allegedly given the magistrate would allow the outlawing of Christianity. Again, Marvell had taken Parker's idea out of context; Parker's use of "religion" referred to ceremonies prescribed in

Christian worship, not a non-Christian religion such as Islam. His loose use of language had lent itself to distortion once more.

Marvell also quoted Parker's statement that Muslims and Roman Catholics were not to be criticized for their "forms and Postures of Adoration" but for their idolatry and false allegiance, respectively. He asked why they should be allowed their ceremonies when nonconformists in England, who addressed worship to its "due and proper Object," should be barred from theirs.[94] Given his earlier statements on the subject, Parker's reply, had he answered Marvell in print, most likely would have been that Muslims and Catholics would indeed be forbidden their ceremonies *in England*; the emphasis was on the magistrate's authority in any particular country. This was the extent of Marvell's discussion of authority proper, and he thus dodged the issue of the propriety of enforcing conformity in England.

We have seen that Parker, Owen, and Marvell all acknowledged the authority of the magistrate in religious affairs to some degree. Likewise, all of them acknowledged that it had limits; the magistrate was accountable to God and could not be considered a law unto himself. Parker extended his authority to the worship service, Owen denied its reach there, and Marvell declined to define its boundaries. However, to this extent at least, they were on common ground. None of them occupied the extreme ends of the spectrum in the debate over authority, despite their constant attempts to portray their opponents as extremists. This spectrum was occupied at one end by the "Hobbists" who proclaimed the absolute authority of the prince to define religion in all its aspects. Here might also be included those rationalist and proto-deist advocates of a civil religion based on the authority of the existing ecclesiastical structure (Henry Stubbe might be placed here, if James Jacob's interpretation of him is correct).[95] On the other end were those who denied the prince any ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatsoever. As Gary De Krey notes, William Penn and Sir Charles Wolseley occupied this extreme;[96] and we may also include here those rationalists and antinomians whose thought included anarchistic strains. Viewed against these extremes, the disagreements between Parker, Owen, and Marvell do not seem nearly as great as they might if discussion is restricted to the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* and its answers and sequels. This is not to minimize the important differences in the disputants' views on authority; Parker was probably at least as close to the Hobbists at this point in his career as he was to Marvell (perhaps) or Owen (certainly). However, the three shared presuppositions (such as the supremacy of scripture) not necessarily accepted by the occupants of the extreme poles.

The "Late Troubles" in the Toleration Debate

Given that authority was such a vital issue in the toleration controversy, it was perhaps inevitable that Parker and the other participants would also revive and debate the issue of the civil wars of the 1640s. The wars resulted from a sharp conflict over numerous issues between Charles I and Parliament in the years 1640-1642. Charles had refrained from calling any parliaments throughout the 1630s, having experienced resistance to his requests for funding in the parliaments of the 1620s. His hand was forced by the Scottish revolt and invasion of northern English counties in the late 1630s,

which the militia had been unable to put down. The necessity of funds to raise an army against the Scots led the king to summon Parliament in 1640.

Unhappy with the royal policies (and royal ministers) of the 1630s, Parliament demanded constitutional changes that would increase its authority before it would grant any funds. Charles acceded to some of these demands, but refused to compromise on others. The crisis built throughout 1641 and finally erupted into armed conflict in 1642. After years of fighting punctuated by negotiations and truces, Charles I was executed by victorious parliamentary forces in 1649, and an eleven-year interregnum dominated by Oliver Cromwell followed. The experiment in republican government ultimately failed, resulting in the restoration of Charles II in 1660. Charles agreed to an Act of Oblivion that year, under which most of the supporters of the Interregnum regime (including John Owen) were pardoned. However, the memory of the wars remained, flaring up from time to time and influencing public debate.

Parker's Assault

Parker, who firmly believed that nonconformity was inherently seditious, could hardly resist the temptation to "wave the bloody shirt" and remind his readers of the role religion had played in the violent upheavals not yet two decades past. His tarring of the "Good Old Cause" began in the *Discourse* and continued in *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Here again, as in his discourse on the paternal nature of authority in the first chapter of the *Discourse*, Parker employed the past as a polemical tool, a tactic which developed into a full-fledged strategy later in his career.

Although accusations of disloyalty were peppered throughout the pages of the *Discourse*, the first extended discussion of the matter came in Chapter Five, in the context of Parker's argument against the Hobbesian concept of authority. He warned that the beliefs of some sects would not allow their members to live peaceably in any society, and asked a series of rhetorical questions intended to demonstrate his point. Although he did not refer explicitly to the conflicts of the 1640s, he left little doubt that the parliamentarians of that era were his target:

> For what if some men believe, That if Princes refuse to reform Religion themselves, ŧtis lawful for their Godly Subjects to do it, and that by Violence and force of Arms? What if they believe, That Princes are Executioners of the Decrees of the Presbytery; and that in case of Disobedience to their Spiritual Governours, they may be Excommunicated, and by consequence Deposed? What if they believe, That Dominion is founded in Grace; and therefore that all wicked Kings forfeit their Crowns, and that it is in the Power of the People of God to bestow them where they please? And what if others believe, That to pursue their Success in Villany and Rebellion is to follow Providence; and that when the Event of War has deliver'd up Kings into their Power, then not to depose or murther them, were to slight the Guidance of Gods Providential Dispensations?[97]

Trusting that his readers would understand to whom he was referring, Parker added, "+Tis sufficiently known where they [these articles of faith] have been both believed and practised." These beliefs, he wrote, were so destructive to civil peace that a more rebellious faith could not have been formulated even if its founders had set out with that goal in mind.[98]

Another thinly veiled reference to the Interregnum regime came a few pages later, as Parker warned of the dangers of granting toleration. He declared that a "Fundamental Principle" of the sects in England was that they were bound by their principles "to labour their utmost to establish the Worship of God in its greatest Purity and Perfection." Because the state church's rites did not meet their standards, they would be "bound in Conscience to endeavour its utter Ruine and Subversion." After they achieved this goal, the various sects, hitherto united in their war against the Church of England, would inevitably turn on each other because they differed among themselves as to the correct forms of worship, the end result of which would be that England "will be eternally torn with Intestine Quarrels and Commotions, till it grow so wise again as to suppress all Parties but one."[99] The context of this passage implies that this was Parker's view of the 1650s, when religious matters had been a factor behind the numerous changes in the structure of the civil government. In his view, the ending of religious toleration and the Act of Uniformity in 1662 had been a return to "wisdom and prudence."

Parker clearly saw religious beliefs as the root cause of civil wars, not only in England but also elsewhere: "Let men but reflect upon all the late Civil Wars, and Rebellions of Christendom, and then tell me, which way they could either have been commenced or continued, had it not been for different factions of Religion."[100] According to him, a rebellious faction is usually made up to two sorts of people. First there is "the Giddy Multitude" who "judge Weakely, fancy Strongly, and act Passionately."[101] Their natural sinful inclinations, combined with the religious teachings of the sectaries, render them a volatile and dangerous force. The second group in a faction is the elites who seek to increase their power in relation to the prince. They are "a sort of Proud and Haughty men among us (not over-well affected to Monarchick Government)."[102] These men manipulate the masses, whom they scorn, whipping them into a frenzy against legitimate authority; they then use their influence with the masses as political leverage. If their demands are not met, they incite violence and rebellion.

It is not surprising that Parker should take this view of religious differences as the chief cause of civil strife, living as he did at the end of the period historians now identify as an era of religious warfare. From the fighting among the Swiss cantons in the 1520s and nearly three decades of civil war in France to the Thirty Years War in Germany, Parker had plenty of examples which he could cite as evidence for his belief. More recent historians, living in a more secular age, have of course identified other factors which played a part in these and other conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but for Parker, religion–specifically, dissenting religionists–were the chief culprits in all of these episodes. His conclusion was that the only way to avoid civil war while having religious toleration was to employ a standing army, "and by this means +tis not so difficult to prevent the Broils and Contentions of Zeal: but this is only a more Violent way of Governing mens Consciences, and instead of restraining them by Laws

and Penalties, it does the same thing with Forts and Citadels." Parker preferred to avoid this course of action.[103]

Owen's Reply

In *Truth and Innocence Vindicated*, Owen responded indignantly to Parker's insinuations concerning the 1640s and the parliamentarian cause. He labeled the alleged disregard of Presbyterians for royal authority "monstrous fictions" and declared that "all the world knows what it is that hath given him [Parker] the advantage of providing a covering" for his allegations.[104] After quoting Parker's list of rhetorical questions (conspicuously omitting the first one), Owen retorted with a list of questions of his own:

> And what, now, if those intended do not believe these things, nor any one of them? What if they do openly disavow every one of them, as, for aught I ever heard or know, they do, and as I do myself? What if some of them are ridiculously framed into articles of faith, from the supposed practices of some individual persons? And what if men be of never so vile opinions about the pursuit of their successes, so they have none to countenance them in any unlawful enterprises; which, I think, must go before successes? What if only the Papists be concerned in these articles of faith, and they in only one of them, about the excommunication and deposition of princes, and that only some of them; and not one of those has any concern in them whom he intends to reproach? I say, if these things are so, we need look no farther for the principles of that religion which hath furnished him with all this candour, moderation, and ingenuity, and hath wrought him to such a quiet and peaceable temper, by teaching him that humility, charity, and meekness, which here bewray themselves.[105]

Clearly, both Parker and Owen were overstating their respective positions. Parker's portrait of the sectaries was obviously prejudiced; there were few if any in England who believed that the prince was simply the "Executioner of the Decrees of the Presbytery," for example. However, it must be acknowledged that the positions he outlined generally had achieved some currency in the public discourse of the 1640s among the increasingly influential radicals. For his part, Owen undoubtedly was being disingenuous when he disavowed knowledge of any nonconformists who held any of these views, having had such extensive contacts and a prominent role in the Interregnum regime. Even in the 1660s, as Richard Greaves has painstakingly shown in his books on British radicals, there was no shortage of "extremist" nonconformists plotting the overthrow of the Stuarts for religious reasons.[106] It strains credulity to suppose that Owen had no knowledge whatsoever of any of the beliefs or activities of these radicals.

Elsewhere, Owen likewise rejected Parker's contention that religious beliefs, particularly those allowed to flourish in a climate of religious toleration, were the chief cause of civil wars in England, either in the 1640s or earlier; he called the notion a "false and futilous pretence." He asserted that the conflicts of earlier ages had been precipitated by rival claimants to the throne or by baronial factions intent on securing greater freedom

from royal control. Only "the late troubles, disorders, and wars among us" could bear the weight of Parker's charge. However, even here the blame could not rest on a policy of toleration:

> But if any one will take the pains to review the public writings, declarations, treatises, whereby those tumults and wars were begun and carried on, he will easily discern that liberty of conscience in practice, or the exemption of it from the power of the magistrate, . . . had neither place in nor influence into the beginnings of those troubles. . . . It cannot be pretended that *liberty of conscience* gave the least occasion unto any disorders in those days, for indeed there was none but only that of opinion and judgment, which our author places out of the magistrate's cognizance and dispose, and supposeth it is a thing wherein the public peace neither is nor can be concerned.[107]

Owen devoted comparatively little space to the question of "the late troubles," in all likelihood because he was sensitive to his vulnerability on that topic resulting from his own actions during the period. However, what he did write provided sufficient ammunition for Parker, who turned all of his rhetorical guns against his adversary in *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*. Asides concerning the culpability of Owen and his coreligionists occurred in several places throughout the book, as when Parker posed yet another list of rhetorical questions using material drawn from Owen's published sermons.[108] However, the most concentrated criticism occurred in the work's final chapter, which was largely devoted to the civil wars. Here Parker mounted a devastating attack on Owen's credibility in the eyes of loyalist contemporaries, liberally citing his antagonist's writings to prove their anti-monarchical and rebellious character.

Exploiting Owen's Past

To begin with, Parker noted that Owen, in his transcription of the former's rhetorical questions to which he then issued a categorical denial, had omitted the inquiry concerning the legitimacy of armed resistance by godly subjects when the ruler refused to reform religion. Parker surmised that this omission was not accidental: "He cares not to have it observed, because he neither dares justifie it, nor will renounce it. It has, and may again by *Providential Alterations*, do brave service for the separate Churches; but **'**tis so apparently inconsistent with the establish't settlement of things, that it can never safely be owned but when it may safely be used; and therefore **'**tis more politick to let it lie dormant and unregarded, till Opportunity shall call it forth to Action."[109] Because Owen had never renounced the principle of armed resistance, Parker argued that he must be regarded as unrepentant for his activities during the 1640s and 1650s and that he still posed a danger to society.

Parker then went on to justify and expand on his accusations regarding sectaries who placed the presbytery above the crown and who believed both that dominion was founded in grace and that providence could lead godly subjects to rebellion. He declared

that he had never dreamed anyone would challenge the truth of his assertion, because "the matters of fact are so notorious, that upon bare Intimation every man has knowledge and sagacity enough to discover the Offenders," but that since he had been challenged on this score, he would produce evidence.[110] The next thirty pages consist largely of Parker's quoting from Owen's sermons to prove his allegations.

Parker devoted relatively little space to defending his accusation of the sectaries' placing the presbytery above the prince. He "clarified" his position by noting that he had only intended to refer to those of the "*holy Discipline*, who challenge to themselves an original and independent Jurisdiction over all Persons, and in all matters of Ecclesiastical Concernment." These people claimed to be subject to the prince in temporal things but not in any matter concerning the church. On the contrary, they declared that in religious matters, "the temporal Power is subject to the spiritual . . . and therefore in cases of disobedience to their [the presbytery's] Authority, they are as obnoxious as any of their Subjects to the Censure of the Church, and the Sentence of Excommunication."[111] According to Parker, this principle was publicly avowed by all the leaders of Presbyterianism. He singled out the Church of Scotland for censure in this regard:

> All the World knows how bold they made both with the Persons and Prerogatives of Princes, upon all occasions studying to cross with Royal Authority, daring to repeal and annul Acts of Parliament, protesting against Edicts and Proclamations, summoning the Lords of his Majesties Privy Council before their Assemblies for giving the King evil Counsel, and vexing and affronting the King himself upon every trifle, even to the *indicting* of strict and solemn Fasts upon those days in particular, upon which the King had appointed any greater and extraordinary Feast.[112]

Parker also noted that Owen never condemned any action of the Scots until they took up arms on behalf of Charles I, after years of fighting against him. He quoted from Owen's "Thanksgiving Sermon for the Success at Worcester," in which the minister decried the Scottish attempts to "re-enthrone Tyranny, Loyalty." Parker indignantly pointed out that only the "unpardonable miscarriage" of loyalty, not rebellion, was enough to draw Owen's wrath. However, by not citing positive statements from English authors who held this belief, Parker implicitly acknowledged that this position had never been dominant among English dissenters.

Regarding his second accusation, that there were some who claimed that dominion stemmed from grace, Parker wrote that he had chiefly in mind the Anabaptists of sixteenth-century Germany. The leaders of this sect claimed that their status as saints exempted them from obeying the commands of ungodly rulers. Parker declared, "The blessed Pranks that *John* of *Leyden*, *Muncer*, *Knipperdolling*, and the Boors of *Germany* plaid under its Protection, are so vulgarly known, that I need not stand upon its proof."[113] This time Parker did not quote any English author; he considered it sufficient evidence for his claims of the necessity of the civil magistrate's authority in religious matters that the Anabaptists had held this position. Again, this constituted an implicit retreat from his insinuations against the parliamentarians of the 1640s.

In contrast to his cursory treatment of the first two points, Parker dwelt at length on the accusation that sectaries claimed the support of providence for their rebellious

activities. It was the Independents, whom Parker blamed for the worst excesses of the Interregnum, who were most guilty of this activity, even at the time of his writing. He referred to their "ascribing every common Accident of humane life, to some extraordinary design of Providence, and interpreting all mischances that befal their Neighbours, as visible Judgments upon them for particular Actions."[114] To prove his point, Parker claimed that it was sufficient simply to cite Owen's own writings, despite the fact that the Independents' works were rife with such statements. ("**'**Tis not possible when there is such plenty of Game, I should be able to set every Covy."[115])

Parker proceeded to prove from sermons such as the "Thanksgiving Sermon for the Success at Worcester" and several others Owen had preached before Parliament that the nonconformist leader had ascribed more than twenty specific events of the 1640s and 1650s to the workings of providence. Among these were the elimination of episcopacy in England, Oliver Cromwell's destructive campaign in Ireland in 1649, and the parliamentarian victory at Worcester against Charles II in 1651. Owen had frequently compared republican figures to the heroes of the Old Testament and had seen God's hand equally at work in the exploits of both. At one point Parker inserted an extended quotation from Owen's "Thanksgiving Sermon" which attributed the republican victories to "the most effectual design of the Lord to carry on the Interest of Christ and the Gospel, whatever stands in the way."[116] Obviously, Parker considered this coopting of providence abominable, and he was confident his readers would think the same.

He continued his critique of Independency by arguing that its proponents had four ways to "draw in Providence and the Rabble to their Assistance": by applying Old Testament prophecy to themselves; by claiming that they were heirs to all the blessings promised to Old Testament Israel; by asserting that providence always favored them, even when it appeared not to do so; and, if all else failed, by relying simply on "flat presumption, and downright enthusiasm."[117] Again, he restricted himself to citing Owen's published works, but nevertheless was able to produce several pages of examples to support these accusations. The application of Old Testament prophecy to the republican cause could be seen, for example, in Owen's usage of Isaiah 65:17–"Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into my mind"–as part of an argument that it was God's will for Parliament to abolish the monarchy in 1649. Owen also drew parallels between "*Covenant and Prelacy, Popery and Treachery*" and the enemies of Old Testament Judah, declaring that God would deliver the Commonwealth from its enemies just as He had His chosen people thousands of years before. Exasperated, Parker wrote, "If such loose and prophane Accommodations of Prophetic passages to present Affairs be sufficient to support Faith in its expectations of success, . . . it can [never] want grounds and encouragements for Rebellion; as long as the Prophecies against *Gog* and *Magog*, the Whore and the Beast, the Pope and the Man of sin are not blotted out of the Bible."[118]

He likewise demonstrated that Owen had sought to encourage the leaders of the Commonwealth by urging them to lay hold of the Old Testament promises to the nation of Israel. The evidence here was less compelling than with Owen's usage of Old Testament prophecy, but there was enough material in Owen's writings for Parker to make a case. For example, Owen had affirmed that providence "*makes all* Joshuas *victories present to every true Believer*," and that it was legitimate to invoke the "God of Marstone-Moor" and the "God of Naseby" in the same way Old Testament figures called

on the "God of Elijah."[119] Parker compared this practice to Don Quixote's steeping himself in medieval romances, and warned that it produced turbulence among the masses: "If they represented to them any act of Bloud and Cruelty with Allusion to Scripture Language and Story, that alone was enough to pass it for *the work of the Lord*, and the Rabble imagined they were acting over again all the Wars and Battels of the Old Testament . . . and fulfilling all the Prophesies of the New."[120]

To prove his assertion about the Independents' confidence that providence favored them, even when it seemed against them, Parker produced a lengthy quote from one of Owen's sermons in which providence was compared to a "side wind" as opposed to a "full wind"; by sending adversity to the elect, God allegedly propelled them to greater successes than they would achieve if they encountered no difficulties whatsoever, just as a sailing ship could go faster in front of a three-quarters wind than it could when the wind was directly behind it.[121] Finally, Parker argued that the Independents claimed "immediate Impulse and Revelation from Heaven" at times. Again, he quoted Owen: "He that is called to serve Providence in high things, without some especial discovery of God, works in the dark."[122] Owen had claimed that the elect of his generation (the 1640s) had received such revelation. "Plainly the peculiar Light of this Generation, is that Discovery which the Lord hath made to his People, of the mystery of Civil and Ecclesiastical Tyranny."[123]

According to Parker, these tactics combined with the notion that otherwise honorable actions became evil if conducted in opposition to providence, to destructive effect. Again he quoted from the "Thanksgiving Sermon," where Owen had berated the Scots for holding to their oath of loyalty to Charles I, despite the allegedly obvious will of God in granting power to the English radicals. Parker pointed out that bonds of allegiance were worthless if "the Turn of Affairs shall untie all the Bands of Oaths, and Success over-rule all the Obligations of Conscience."[124] He concluded that Owen's doctrine of providence was

> a mixture of Blasphemy and Rebellion; when men shall commit such horrid and emphatical Villanies, and then shall with so steel'd a Confidence warrant not only their Lawfulness, but their Necessity by Vertue of a divine Commission ; and shall break all the Laws of Nature, Society, and Religion, by the Counsel, under the Conduct, and with the Approbation of the Almighty.[125]

In Parker's opinion, this doctrine shared by Owen and his compatriots was responsible for the judicial murder of Charles I and the plunging of England into social disorder throughout the 1650s.

Having demonstrated to his satisfaction that Owen's–and by extension the Independents'–religious views led to civil disruption, Parker turned his attention to the parliamentary records to prove that religion had been the chief cause of the civil wars of the 1640s. He pointed out that the 1637 Scottish revolt, which led to the "Bishops Wars" and ultimately to the calling of the Short and Long Parliaments, had been motivated almost entirely by religious feeling. Archbishop William Laud's attempt to introduce the Book of Common Prayer into the Church of Scotland (with Charles I's approval) sparked massive resistance from the Scottish nobility, church, and common people. Parker

clearly regarded the Scots' actions as unjustified, a rebellious refusal to submit to the king's rightful authority in religious matters. Even worse, in Parker's view, was the support given to the Scots by the English Parliament after it had been called by Charles for the purpose of raising revenue to deal with the Scottish rebels, who at that time were occupying counties in the north of England.[126]

Parker produced a string of citations from Parliament's records throughout the 1640s indicating that religious concerns had loomed large in the lawmakers' minds, beginning with the expressions of support for the Scots in 1640 and continuing through 1648. Allegations that Charles I's advisers had been planning to introduce popery into the English church had provided much of the impetus for Parliament's raising of troops in 1642; likewise, the royalist army had been denounced as having been raised "for the Oppression of the true Religion."[127] Communication exchanged between Parliament and the Scots that same year had identified religion as the chief cause of the civil conflict in England.[128] Parker also cited resolutions of Parliament from 1647 and 1648 in which religion was owned as the primary motivation for that body's actions against Charles. According to him, it was only when the execution of Charles was contemplated that Parliament did not claim religion as its justification:

> These [religious] Pretexts were too low for the greatness of their Attempts and Resolution, and were not sufficient to warrant the Murther of their lawful Sovereign; and therefore it was necessary for them to take up with new Pleas suitable to the wickedness of their new Purposes; and then nothing was big enough to Arreign or Condemn their Prince, but the Charge of Treason and Tyranny. . . . So that though Pretences of secular and Political Interest were necessary to cut off his Head, yet it was purely Zeal and Reformation that brought him to the Block.[129]

Parker's argument seems self-contradictory. He had repeatedly stressed that religion was a pretext used by cynical elites to secure the support of the masses because religious ideas were the most powerful influence on people's minds and could motivate them to the most extreme actions. If this were true, not to appeal to religion to justify Charles' execution would have been foolish, for the political charges of tyranny and treason would have been less severe than that of popery or apostasy. It is probable that Parker was referring here to the English tradition, dating from the reign of Elizabeth I, of executing individuals for treason when the real motivation was religious, in an effort to avoid the appearance of having made a martyr of the accused. Parker was correct at least to the extent that religion almost certainly played a role in the decision to execute the king. In a private letter, Oliver Cromwell, a member of the small group that pushed through the order for the execution, explicitly compared the beheading to the Israelite priest Phinehas' summary killing of an adulterous couple in the book of Numbers, an act which resulted in God's sparing the Israelites from His judgment.[130] A clearer confirmation of Parker's thesis would have been hard to find, and it is likely that Parker would have cited this source had he known of its existence.

Marvell Changes the Subject

It is notable that Andrew Marvell did not attempt to disprove Parker's contention that the civil wars hinged primarily on religion, although he did leave the matter open to question. ("Whether it were a War of Religion, or of Liberty, is not worth the labour to enquire.")[131] Content to argue on Parker's chosen ground, he contended that it was the arrogance and provocations of the High Church party during the 1620s and 1630s that had precipitated the wars of the 1640s, and that Parker was cut from the same proverbial cloth as the men who had brought strife to the realm.

Marvell devoted many pages to these alleged abuses on the part of the clergy, beginning with their support from the pulpit of the Forced Loan of 1626-1628. At war with Spain, Charles I had resorted to coercing loans from the gentry because Parliament, which had called for the war, had refused to appropriate funds for its prosecution. The loan was seen by many as an exercise in tyranny, and the support of many Arminian clergymen–Robert Sibthorpe and Roger Manwaring were two prominent examples–for the loan (at Charles' request) harmed the clergy's reputation in the eyes of the public.[132] Marvell accused "those persons that pretended to be the Church of *England*" at that time of dividing up all the property in England between themselves and the king in theory; "they had not left an inch of propriety for the Subject." The effect of this episode was that "the Kingdom was turned into a Prison."[133]

The clergy further alienated "those who were of understanding" by forcing the people to observe new ceremonies in worship services: "Our Church did even *then* exceed the *Romish* in Ceremonies and Decorations." The goal of the innovators was not to return the Church of England to the Roman fold, but "to set up a new kind of *Papacy* of their own, here in England." Moreover, the clergy incensed the nation by being "so intolerably ambitious, and so desperately proud, that scarce any Gentleman might come near the Tayle of their Mules."[134]

Marvell contended that the situation had deteriorated even further upon the ascension of William Laud to the see of Canterbury. Charles I had erred greatly in relying on Laud, for the clergy "are not so well fitted by Education, as others for Political Affairs . . . [;] it is generally observed that things miscarry under their Government." Laud, although he had "studied to do both God and his Majesty good service," and although he was learned, pious, and wise, "seem'd to know nothing beyond *Ceremonies*, *Arminianism*, and *Manwaring*. With that he begun, and with that ended, and thereby deform'd the whole reign of the best Prince that ever wielded the *English* Scepter."[135] Charles, being pious, had trusted the clergy and had not restrained Laud's indiscretion, which culminated in the disastrous imposition of the Book of Common Prayer on the Church of Scotland and a civil war in England.

Marvell did not defend the rebels explicitly, but he made it clear that he sympathized with their position: "I think the Cause was too good to have been fought for. Men ought to have trusted God; they ought and might have trusted the King with that whole matter. The *Arms of the Church are Prayers and Tears*, the Arms of the Subjects are Patience and Petitions." These were the only lines in his analysis which remotely criticized the parliamentarians. He then claimed that it was ridiculous for men such as Parker to pose as the defenders of the monarchy, when it was their policies which had led

to the civil wars. In an aside, he also noted that the consequences of the wars "can only serve as Sea-marks unto wise Princes to avoid the Causes."[136] He thus implied that the burden of responsibility for the war lay almost wholly on the royalist side, although he was careful to avoid blaming Charles I himself.

Attacks on Marvell

Most of Marvell's answerers homed in on his comments regarding the civil wars and concluded that his loyalty to the Stuart regime was suspect. Henry Stubbe offered the mildest criticism of the group, asserting that the explanations submitted for the wars in *The Rehearsal Transpros'* were overly simplistic.[137] The author of *A Common-place-Book out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd* was more strident. Condemning Marvell's criticism of Laud, the author likened him to "a *Janizary*, who though he be the Son of a Christian, is the worst Enemy to the Profession."[138] He claimed that Marvell was acting purely as an apologist for the parliamentarians, explaining the origins of the wars "with a Declaration of the Causes drawn with as much *tenderness* as if it had been penn'd by a *Committee of the Long Parliament*."[139] Finally, he declared that it was extremely disloyal for Marvell to claim that it had been Charles I's responsibility to pacify the populace by not giving any offense, without assigning any corresponding burden of guilt to the parliamentarians.[140]

Richard Leigh's dissection of Marvell's position was more detailed; almost half of *The Transproser Rehears'd* dealt with the civil wars and their background. Using John Rushworth's (1612-1690) 1659 history of the 1618-1629 period as his principal source, Leigh dismissed Marvell's interpretation of the forced loan as pure fantasy; he also defended Laud's actions as those befitting a loyal servant to the crown, in contrast to then Archbishop George Abbott's rebelliousness.[141] He continued by arguing that Marvell's statement that the clergy were ill-suited for civil government betrayed a more general anti-episcopal and anti-monarchical mindset: "The Sport of *Bishop-hunting* is too well known, and though the Clergy be the Game in view, yet they have the Temporal Lords in Chace."[142] This anti-monarchical thought, according to Leigh, was a natural outgrowth of Calvinism, evidenced by the fact that it was Calvinists who had developed the theories, among others, of the distinction between the prince's personal and political capacities, sovereignty deriving from popular consent, and the accountability of the greater magistrate to the lesser.[143] When put into practice in the 1650s, these notions resulted in religious chaos and high taxes. Leigh found the latter especially repulsive and claimed that one of the most reprehensible features of that era was that the "godly" believed they were entitled to confiscate the earthly possessions of others, particularly the "reprobate," as defined by themselves.[144]

Edmund Hickeringill also accused Marvell of being an apologist for the parliamentarians. Because right-thinking people had rejected the legacy of rebellion, "he gives the *Good Old Cause* a good new name, and because the old one is odious, he calls it sometimes Primitive Simplicity, sometimes modern Orthodoxy, and . . . the Cause too good."[145] It seemed beyond doubt to Hickeringill that Marvell wished the rebels'

religious goals had been permanently achieved, even if he claimed there should have been no rebellion:

> Sure he thinks . . . That *the battle was the Lords*, and that *men should stand still*, (I wish they had,) and see the salvation of God; and *that the stars in their Courses* would *fight against Sisera*, (which they construed,) the King and Cavaliers. . . . Sure this *Greg*. thought . . . that God ought in justice to have taken the cause into his own hand, and destroyed us (as he did *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*) with fire and brimstone, and thereby have sav'd the Rebels a labour, and the Scots a long march into England.

Although Marvell thought the Good Old Cause was too good to be fought for, "yet it seems it is not too good to be writ for, nor too good to be commended again to the world."[146] In response to Marvell's claims that the dissenters were weary of conflict and thus would not pose any further danger to the civil peace, Hickeringill wrote in disbelief, "What they that wearied two *Kings*, and one *Queen*; Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James* and King *Charles*, now *themselves weary*? Are they that would travel as far as *Holland*, *Savoy*, *Piedmont*, nay to *New England*, rather than not have their wills, *now weary*?"[147] Like Parker, his message was that dissenters could not be trusted because of what had transpired earlier in the century.

Parker naturally spent more energy on rebutting Marvell than any of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*'s other respondents. He devoted over 100 pages of *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* to the topic of the civil wars and their causes, but the whole work related to that issue, as he made clear in the book's preface: "The main design of this ensuing Treatise . . . [is] chiefly in shewing that certain and inviolable confederacy that there has always been between Non-conformity and the *Good old Cause*; so that whenever one of them appears at the *Top*, the other is sure to lurk at the *Bottom*; and if I have proved it (as I think I have sufficiently) I may leave it to others to make out the Consequences."[148] Marvell, whether wittingly or not, was abetting the cause of rebellion; his book, its praise of Charles II notwithstanding, provided "good Precedents for Rebellion and King-killing."[149]

According to Parker, Marvell's chief sin in this regard was shifting the blame for the civil wars from the Parliament to the Church of England. Quoting Marvell's statement about the "Animosities and Obstinacy" of clergymen being an obstacle to good government, particularly in the reigns of both Charles I and Charles II, Parker remarked that this was tantamount to claiming "that the Clergy has not only in all Ages (nay and places too) been the bane of Government; but more particularly the Clergy of *England* murther'd His [Charles II's] Royal Father, and are more accomptable for his Majesties and the Kingdoms sufferings than either the Rebels that took the Crown off of his head, or those that afterwards took his head off of his shoulders."[150] He then embarked on a defense of the clergy's conduct during the 1620s and 1630s.

It was natural, Parker asserted, for the clergy to be the first target of disloyal subjects, for they are the most vigilant guard against civil strife; they "have been watchful to nip Sedition in the bud, and by a little severity at first save all those executions that would be necessary to suppress it afterward." As a result, plotters hate the clergy, for they "have alwayes been watchful upon their designs, and kept the innocent out of harm's

way by snapping the contrivers of mischief."[151] The clergy are uniquely qualified for this role for two reasons: they are in a position to be "more watchful upon the artifices of ambitious of discontented Grandees," and they understand the "mischiefs of Enthusiasm" better than the laity. This was the ground of the Long Parliament's opposition to the bishops, "because whilst they stood in the way, they could not come against the King, that is the Crown."[152] The financial support of the state was crucial in this regard, because preachers who were dependent on voluntary contributions from the people were subject to "shrewd temptations" of disloyalty if their consciences were in the least dishonorable. "Of this our late Rebellion offers a very remarkable instance, in which none were more conspicuous for Loyalty than the Dignified Clergy, and none greater Incendiaries than the Mercenary Preachers and Lecturers, who subsisted purely by the Benevolence and arbitrary Pensions of the People."[153]

Marvell's contention that clergy were not meant to participate in civil government was ludicrous, according to Parker. Far from mishandling the affairs of state, the clergy were in large part responsible for the current stability of the Stuart regime. This was the result of their refusing to tolerate a situation where "two powerful Factions" would continue to struggle for control of the state church. Instead, "by resolving to break one to pieces for ever, . . . they might not be embroil'd in Civil Wars upon every slight occasion, whenever the People grew wanton, or any Great Man hapned to be out of favour."[154]

Moreover, Parker declared that Marvell and his allies applied an unfair double standard of conduct to the clergy. Rebellion in defense of alleged liberties on the part of the gentry was understood and excused, but the clergy were never to assert their legal rights. "If they demand their Dues, oh Sirs! Ministers must not be covetous and worldly minded, but it seems themselves [the clergy's critics] may be so and knavish too, for so they are if there be any justice and equity in the world, when they defraud them of their Legal Rights."[155]

After offering this general defense of the clergy, Parker turned to a specific justification of Laud, whom Marvell was allegedly trying to make the scapegoat for all the misfortunes of Charles I's reign. The greatest proof of his innocence, he declared, was that Parliament could not convict Laud in his impeachment trial, and that the Commons had to resort to a bill of attainder in order to execute him for "a new and unheard-of sort of Treason call'd cumulative Treason, that is a great many no Treasons to make up a Treason. . . . By this Impudence they might take away the life of any innocent man, if either they hated him, or he liked not them."[156] According to Parker, this legal fiction unmasked the true nature of the rebellion: "Is not this right Presbyterian Ingenuity, to rebel against the King only for the defence and maintenance of the fundamental Laws, and yet in all their Proceedings violate not only all the fundamental Laws they pretended to fight for, but all the more fundamental Laws of nature and humanity?"[157] It was pure hatred of Laud for his vigilance in thwarting the designs of the "Antimonarchical Faction" in previous years that had led to his judicial murder.

Parker also rebutted Marvell's interpretation of the Forced Loan by arguing that Charles had been forced to it by "Seditious Spirits" in Parliament: "They put him upon expensive wars, and when they had so done, obstructed all Supplies by falling to complaints of Grievances, and disputes of Liberties and Priviledges, and Remonstrances against his Government, and Petitions of Redress."[158] He acknowledged that Sibthorpe and Manwaring may have overstepped their bounds in their sermons by implying that

kings had an absolute right of taxation without the consent of Parliament, rather than merely exhorting the people to contribute out of a sense of patriotism and charity. However, if their preaching had been rash, they should have been in large measure excused because of the extraordinary circumstances: "The King could not in the usual Parliamentary method obtain sufficient supplyes to preserve his Honour and Safety, but by Concessions shamefully contrary to both."[159]

Parker then laid out his own interpretation of the wars in a more systematic way than he had hitherto done, attributing the beginning of hostilities to a convergence of several unfortunate things:

> 1. The "unusual ignorance" of subjects concerning their duties to the government, manifested in each person's unreasonable belief "that the King should be able to maintain the Common Safety without his particular Contribution," which further led to an unwarranted resistance to taxation
> 2. "The seditiousness of Persons of broken and shatter'd Fortunes"
> 3. "The great numbers of well-meaning men" who are easily taken in by "that Party that pretends with most confidence to zeal for the publique good."[160]

However, all these things, even in combination, were not especially dangerous; the necessary catalyst for rebellion, according to Parker, was "the Insolence and Seditiousness of the Presbyterian Preachers," who gained favor with the masses chiefly through "the subject matter of their popular discourses, in which they were always very sparing of their reproofs against the gainful vices of tradesmen . . . and on the contrary very prodigal of their declamations and suggestions against such miscarriages as were proper to the Government: And by inveighing perpetually against oppression, they seem'd to take part with the People against their Superiors."[161]

However, even the preachers were no more than "Tools of Sedition"; the true masterminds of the rebellion were "Members of the Republican Faction . . . in both Houses [of Parliament] a Cabal of such as had from the beginning (as appeared afterwards) a design upon the alteration of the Government."[162] Step by step, these men exploited Charles' difficult position to arrogate power to themselves, convincing the people that evil men had taken control of the government and intended to corrupt religion, and to play the king and his loyal subjects off against one another. Parker pointed out that Marvell was accusing contemporary leaders of the Church of England of doing exactly the same thing: "You may see that you are not the first Authour of your own notions; your whole Book is but a short Rehearsal of the Remonstrances, Speeches, and Declarations of the Rebels."[163] He further declared that Marvell's interpretation of the wars bordered on the treasonous:

> And now consider whether you had not been better advised to let this business of the War alone, when you can no other way bring your Clients off with reputation, unless the King will be content to suffer Himself, his Royal Father, and his Loyal Subjects to be impeach'd of their Rebellion? For the blame of it must lie somewhere; and therefore if the Covenanters Cause were *too good to be fought for*; as little Logick as I understand, I

> understand so much, that then the Kings was too bad to be fought for; and that is enough for one Conclusion.[164]

As for Marvell's assertion that present nonconformists were no danger to the state, Parker remarked, "This methinks is but an odd way of ensuring the good Behaviour of the Nonconformists for the time to come, when you stand upon the Justification of their Innocence for the time past."[165] Again, Parker was careful to make explicit connections between the nonconformists of the 1670s and the rebels of the 1640s.

Marvell did not respond to Parker's points regarding the civil wars at any length in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part.* Most of the tract focused on Parker's claims regarding the civil magistrate's authority. His rebuttal was limited to brief asides, such as his condemnation of Parker's labeling the 1629 Parliament "impudent" and disloyal. Marvell claimed that the adoption of the Petition of Right had been sufficient "to eternize their memory among all men that wear an *English* heart in their bosome."[166] He offered no new thoughts on the Forced Loan, the events of the 1630s, or the Long Parliament. He claimed that he was content to leave judgment on these matters to readers.[167] As a result, Parker had the last substantive word on this issue in the debate.

Clearly, the history of the civil wars was a powerful polemical tool in the hands of Parker and his allies. It was definitely in their interest to link the nonconformists of their own day to the parliamentarians–especially the radicals–of the 1640s. Such connections were not that difficult to find, as Owen's case demonstrated. Parker simply needed to show that Owen self-consciously proceeded to republicanism on the basis of his religious principles, and that those principles had not changed since the Restoration. Parker considered the fact that Owen had not disavowed his earlier beliefs at any time since 1660 as sufficient proof of the latter contention. The obvious conclusion was that there was nothing to restrain Owen from participating in another attempt to overthrow the government if the opportunity presented itself. Ironically, Parker laid out this position most clearly in *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd*:

> You see *J. O.* is a profest enemy to the present Government of the State upon the same Principles that he is a Non-conformist to the present Establishment of the Church. He is bound in Conscience to abhorr and oppose Monarchy in pure Obedience to the Institutions of Christ, as *King of Saints and Nations*, having appointed in his Word a *certain number* of Men to be set apart for the *Office of chief Rule and Government* over these and all other Nations in the World. Now I think it is convenient that men who have openly witnessed such Principles as these, should at least be bound to unwitness them, before they are too confidently trusted by the present Government.[168]

This strategy of dredging up Owen's anti-monarchical writings worked exceedingly well for Parker, and it may have been a significant reason why Owen declined to engage Parker again after the publication of *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*. Richard Baxter (who, it must be noted, was sometimes at odds with Owen and therefore not really an objective observer) later recorded his assessment of the episode, which was quoted in the previous chapter and which bears repeating here:

> *Parker* had so many of his [Owen's] Parliament and Army Sermons to cite, in which he urgeth them to Justice, and Prophesyeth of the ruine of the *Western* Kings, and telleth them that their work was to take down Civil and Ecclesiastical Tyranny, with such like, that the Dr. being neither able to repent (hitherto) or to justify all this must be silent, or only plead the Act of Oblivion: And so I fear his unfitness for this Work was a general injury to the Nonconformists.[169]

It was Parker's success in this regard that made it highly desirable for the toleration advocates to find a literary champion untainted by the events of the 1640s and, to a lesser extent, of the 1650s.

Marvell fit this description, having been absent from England during most of the war years and having had only informal ties to the major figures of the Commonwealth and Protectorate periods. However, his lack of political involvement in those years did not relieve him of having to deal with the charge that the nonconformists of the 1670s were simply the rebels of the 1640s in new guise but with the same goals. Knowing that he could not successfully maintain that the nonconformists were unrelated politically and religiously to the parliamentarians, Marvell adopted two strategies: asserting that the nonconformists were tired of conflict and should not be viewed as dangerous to the civil government, and, more importantly, insisting that the primary blame for the civil wars properly lay on the leaders of the Church of England, not the parliamentarians.

In pursuing this second strategy, Marvell was taking much the same position that the parliamentarians themselves had adopted in the early stages of the Long Parliament– that Charles I had been led astray by his counsellors and that Parliament was acting in the best interests of the king and the country. Beyond this, however, Marvell could not go in print and expect to win public support. He could not publicly justify the taking up of arms against the king or endorse the verdicts of treason eventually rendered against Charles and his ministers. He therefore tried to focus readers' attention on the earlier period of the 1620s and 1630s and to shift the argument away from the *legality* of the king's actions to their *prudence*. However, this clearly was not a winning issue for Marvell, and he perhaps wisely passed over it in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd, the Second Part* with minimal comment, choosing instead to focus on Parker's character and style.

For his part, Parker could not convict Marvell with the latter's past writings; he was forced instead to defend the clergy of the prewar period and attempt to redirect his readers' attention to the 1640s. Although certainly not overwhelming, his defense of Laud and his allies was passable; in hindsight, the 1630s no doubt seemed a benign period compared to the disruptions of the 1640s and 1650s in the minds of many English subjects, and so the pressure on Parker to construct an overpowering argument was much less than it might have been. He was more effective in linking Marvell's arguments to those of the Long Parliament, just as he had tied the nonconformists' religious principles to those of the Presbyterians and Independents who took up arms in the 1640s. This link was not imaginary and thus was not easily dispelled. Marvell therefore pressed his advantage in other areas, tacitly conceding that Parker held the upper ground on the issue of the civil wars, given the state of public opinion in the 1670s.

[1] Henry Stubbe, *Rosemary and Bayes: Or, Animadversions upon a Treatise Called, The Rehearsall Trans-prosed* (London, 1672), 18.

[2] Owen, 13:453.

[3] Warren L. Chernaik, *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Works of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 112.

[4] Ibid., 118.

[5] J. G. A. Pocock, "Thomas Hobbes: Atheist or Enthusiast? His Place in Restoration Debate," *History of Political Thought* 11 (Winter 1990): 737.

[6] *DEP*, xii.

[7] Ibid., 29.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ashcraft, 46.

[10] *DEP*, 30-31.

[11] Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 166.

[12] An example of this can be found in Job 1:5.

[13] *DEP*, 31.

[14] Ibid., 32-33.

[15] Ibid., 34.

[16] Ibid., 37.

[17] Ibid., 45-47.

[18] Ibid., 48-49.

[19] Ibid., 55.

[20] Ibid., 56.

[21] Ibid., 59.

[22] Ibid., 59, 64.

[23] Ibid., 52.

[24] Ibid., 39.

[25] Ibid., 79.

[26] Ibid., 92.

[27] Parkin, 24-25.

[28] Ibid., 28.

[29] Parker's and the other disputants' interpretations of the civil wars are discussed later in this chapter.

[30] *DEP*, 82.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid., 107.

[33] Ibid., 77.

[34] Ibid., 78.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., 151-55.

[37] *DEP*, 112-13.

[38] Ibid., 122-24. For Hobbes' postulation of the state of war, see Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 86-90. See also the discussion of its development in Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 1993), ch. 7.

[39] *DEP*, 125.

[40] Ibid., 126.

[41] Ibid., 128-31.

[42] Ibid., 133.

[43] Hobbes, 260.

[44] *DEP*, 138.

[45] Ibid., 138-39.

[46] Parkin, 41-42.

[47] Marvell, 214.

[48] Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, 1:5-24.

[49] Owen, 13:370-72.

[50] Ibid., 13:371.

[51] Ibid., 13:373.

[52] Ibid., 13:378-79.

[53] Ibid., 13:381, 383.

[54] Ibid., 13:386.

[55] Ibid., 13:388-89.

[56] Ibid., 13:397.

[57] Ibid., 13:398.

[58] Ibid., 13:401-402. Cf. *DEP*, 36.

[59] Ibid., 13:404. Cf. *DEP*, 42.

[60] Ibid., 13:404-405.

[61] Ibid., 13:407.

[62] Ibid., 13:406-407.

[63] Ibid., 13:392.

[64] Ibid., 13:393.

[65] Ibid., 13:453.

[66] Ibid., 13:454.

[67] Ibid., 13:456.

[68] *DCEP*, 218.

[69] Ibid., 219.

[70] Accusations that Owen is trying to make Parker appear incompetent occur elsewhere in the *Defence* as well (e.g. pp. 264-65), arguably providing further evidence of Parker's sensitivity on this issue.

[71] *DCEP*, 238-39.

[72] Ibid., 247.

[73] Ibid., 247-49.

[74] Ibid., 250.

[75] Ibid., 268-69.

[76] Ibid., 270.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid., 276-77.

[79] Ibid., 251.

[80] Ibid., 254-55.

[81] Ibid., 256.

[82] Ibid., 258.

[83] Ibid., 264.

[84] *DEP*, 31-32.

[85] Owen, 13:374-75.

[86] *DCEP*, 273-74.

[87] Marvell, 51.

[88] Ibid., 64.

[89] Ibid., 66.

[90] Ibid., 53.

[91] *RRT*, 7.

[92] Ibid., 28.

[93] Marvell, 193.

[94] Ibid., 193-94.

[95] James R. Jacob, *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-4.

[96] Gary de Krey, "Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience, 1667-1672," *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 53-83.

[97] *DEP*, 147-48.

[98] Ibid., 148.

[99] Ibid., 163.

[100] Ibid., 159.

[101] Ibid., 152.

[102] Ibid., 150.

[103] Ibid., 160-61.

[104] Owen, 13:455.

[105] Ibid., 13:455-56.

[106] Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver Us From Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Richard L. Greaves, *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990); Richard L. Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-1689* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992).

[107] Ibid., 13:396.

[108] *DCEP*, 114-15.

[109] Ibid., 576.

[110] Ibid., 578.

[111] Ibid., 581.

[112] Ibid., 582.

[113] Ibid., 585.

[114] Ibid., 585-86.

[115] Ibid., 586-87.

[116] Ibid., 592.

[117] Ibid., 593, 605.

[118] Ibid., 597.

[119] Ibid., 598-99.

[120] Ibid., 599.

[121] Ibid., 602-603.

[122] Ibid., 606.

[123] Ibid., 607.

[124] Ibid., 609.

[125] Ibid., 610.

[126] Ibid., 615-16.

[127] Ibid., 618.

[128] Ibid., 622.

[129] Ibid., 625.

[130] Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (New York: Longman, 1991), 65.

[131] Marvell, 135.

[132] Richard Cust has examined the Forced Loan in great detail in *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626-1628* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[133] Marvell, 131.

[134] Ibid., 132-33.

[135] Ibid., 134.

[136] Ibid., 135.

[137] Stubbe, 19.

[138] Anon, *A Common-place-Book out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd* (London, 1673), 44-45.

[139] Ibid., 48.

[140] Ibid., 53-54.

[141] Richard Leigh, *The Transproser Rehears'd: Or the Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes's Play* (London, 1673), 56-66.

[142] Ibid., 95.

[143] Ibid., 98-99.

[144] Ibid., 75.

[145] Edmund Hickeringill, *Gregory, Father-Greybeard, with His Vizard Off* (London, 1673), 135.

[146] Ibid., 135-36.

[147] Ibid., 176.

[148] *RRT*, A3 *r-v*.

[149] Ibid., 212.

[150] Ibid., 311-12.

[151] Ibid., 316.

[152] Ibid., 318-19.

[153] Ibid., 342.

[154] Ibid., 331.

[155] Ibid., 339.

[156] Ibid., 217, 353.

[157] Ibid., 356-57.

[158] Ibid., 366.

[159] Ibid., 371.

[160] Ibid., 392.

[161] Ibid., 393-94.

[162] Ibid., 406.

[163] Ibid., 413.

[164] Ibid., 390-91.

[165] Ibid., 444.

[166] Marvell, 223.

[167] Ibid., 313.

[168] Ibid., 423.

[169] Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ed. Matthew Sylvester (London: 1696), pt. 3, 42.

CHAPTER FOUR
ANGLICAN APOLOGETIC: HISTORY AS POLEMIC I

We have seen that Parker's works produced during the toleration controversy of 1667-1673, though not Hobbesian, may be fairly described as Erastian. Although there were some glimmers of the notion that the church was an institution with a sphere of authority separate from the state's, particularly in *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*, the archdeacon never provided a systematic explanation of the relationship between the two. The emphasis in all those treatises was the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate in religious matters, and this tended to blur whatever lines Parker believed existed between church and state. Although he obviously favored episcopacy, he offered no extended discussion of the proper form of church polity, nor did he say to what degree church officers should interact with the civil government.

These foggy areas in Parker's doctrine of the church began to clear in the early 1680s when he published a series of works championing the episcopal polity and delineating more clearly his view of the church's authority and its posture toward the civil powers. This chapter and the one following examine these works of "Anglican apologetic," which have been virtually ignored by modern historians,[1] and analyze how Parker's view of authority reached its full maturity. I argue that this mature view cannot be characterized as Erastian. This chapter focuses on Parker's writings of the early 1680s, which deal chiefly with episcopacy. We will see that his growing emphasis on defining a distinct sphere of authority for the church, completely separate from the state, formed a crucial component of what he viewed as a *via media* between Erastianism and Independency.

Diagnosing the Church's Ills

In 1681, Parker returned to the press after a hiatus of eight years, which had been interrupted only by his publication in 1678 of the philosophical treatise *Disputationes de Deo et Providentia Divina*. His new offering, *The Case of the Church of England, Briefly and Truly Stated, in the Three First and Fundamental Principles of a Christian Church*, which was licensed for publication in February 1681 and ran to 271 octavo pages,[2] was a vigorous denunciation of perceived efforts by latitudinarians and nonconformists to alter the settlement of the state church. He later identified Edward Stillingfleet's *Irenicum* as the work's chief target.[3] Stillingfleet was a "latitude-man" and had been one of Parker's fellow prebendaries at Canterbury in the early 1670s; in 1677 he was made archdeacon of

London, and he became dean of St. Paul's the following year. After the Revolution of 1688 he was named bishop of Worcester, and might have become archbishop of Canterbury in the 1690s had it not been for his age and poor health. Throughout his career he enjoyed a reputation as a popular anti-Catholic and anti-Socinian writer, but he remained on good terms with most Protestant dissenters.[4] His *Irenicum, A Weapon-salve for the Churches Wounds: or the Divine Right of the Particular Forms of Church Government Discussed and Examined* (1660) had been published soon after the restoration of Charles II; it urged a policy of comprehension and a broader freedom of conscience than was later adopted in the Act of Uniformity. It further argued that the appropriate form of church government was not clearly prescribed in scripture and therefore to some degree fell under the prerogative of the sovereign.[5] Parker viewed men such as Stillingfleet as a sort of Trojan Horse within the state church who would betray episcopacy, which he viewed as the only form of church government with divine sanction, in the name of comprehension.

Although they make no explicit references to contemporary works on the subject, *The Case of the Church of England* and its quasi-sequel, *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church, for the First Six Hundred Years* (1683), were published in the midst of a surge of works dealing with church polity, almost all of which defended episcopacy on various grounds. Some of these titles, such as *Episcopacy as Established by Law in England not Prejudicial to the Regal Power* (1683) by Robert Sanderson (1587-1663), bishop of Lincoln, had originally been published years earlier and were now appearing in new editions. Others, such as William Cave's (1637-1713) *A Dissertation Concerning the Government of the Ancient Church* (1683), were newly-published works. The express aim of several of these new pro-episcopal works was to refute Daniel Whitby's (1638-1726) *The Protestant Reconciler Humbly Pleading for Condescention to Dissenting Brethren, in Things Indifferent and Unnecessary, for the Sake of Peace* (1683), which had placed episcopacy in the category of *adiaphora*; perhaps the most important of these was *A Vindication of the Rights of Ecclesiastical Authority* (1685) by William Sherlock (1641-1707). Parker's titles on church government thus appeared a bit too early to interact with the works in this controversy; the archdeacon devoted his efforts to rebutting influential works of a previous generation.

At the outset of *The Case of the Church of England*, Parker expressed "wonder and amazement" that the state church, "so unanimously owned, so powerfully protected, so excellently constituted, so approved by all wise and good men, should in all this time [since the Restoration] be so far from obteining any true and effectual settlement, that it should be almost stript naked of all the Rights and Privileges of a Christian Church."[6] His answer to this enigma was that three false ideas dangerous to the health of the state church currently held wide sway in ecclesiastical circles, and that their corrupting influence had hitherto weakened the church severely. First on the list was Thomas Hobbes' theory that the civil government is the only founder of religion in each commonwealth. Second was the argument put forth by John Selden in *De Anno Civili et Calendario Veteris Ecclesiae* (1644), which stated that although the Christian religion is divinely instituted, the church has no authority except what the civil government grants it. The final harmful notion was Stillingfleet's claim (Stillingfleet was not mentioned by name) that although there must be some form of government and authority within the church, the particular form it takes is arbitrary, not divinely instituted. Of these opinions,

Parker wrote, "The first supposes a Church without Religion; the second a Society without Government; the third a Government without Governours."[7] The remainder of the work consisted of Parker's efforts to refute these three propositions.

Parker vs. Hobbes

The section against Hobbes, "*The Obligation of Christianity, by Divine Right*," was the shortest of the three and reiterated some of the arguments from the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*. Hobbes' writings had become a focus of debate in English political discourse again in the late 1670s and early 1680s. Hobbes himself had died in 1679, an event that naturally occasioned renewed discussion of his theories. Unauthorized printings of *Leviathan* and *Behemoth* appeared shortly thereafter.[8] The Succession Crisis occurring at the same time in the English Parliament naturally revived interest in the contract theory of the state, of which Hobbes was a major proponent. Therefore, Parker found it necessary to take up cudgels against the political theorist again.

The archdeacon began the attack by calling Hobbes' strategy of political persuasion ridiculous, for although he claimed that "the serious Belief of Religion" was essential to the state's security, he simultaneously "publishes a Book to all the World to no other purpose (beside Flattering the Tyrant *Cromwel*) than to declare that neither himself nor any wise man ought to regard the Tales of Religion, and that they are only designed to abuse the ignorant and silly."[9] According to Parker, the core of Hobbes' natural philosophy was the affirmation "that there can be no other Cause or Principle in the Universe beside the meer Aggregate of Natural Causes," which reduced any hypothetical God to some material substance and a part of the universe rather than the creator of all things.[10] This theory was tantamount to atheism in the view of orthodox Christians, including Parker.[11]

We also find here a recapitulation (albeit with more elaboration) of the critique first found in the *Discourse* of the Hobbesian state of nature. This natural state of war, in which no one was bound by any sort of law, could only follow from atheistic presuppositions, Parker asserted, "for if there be a Deity, there can be no supposition of any such State of Nature in which Mankind can be exempted from his Government."[12] Moreover, Hobbes' version of right reason impelled people to mutually contradictory behaviors, setting them in opposition to everyone else in a state of war and hostility while simultaneously drawing them together to form the social contract. Parker then reiterated his observations from the *Discourse* regarding the impossibility of security within the Hobbesian social contract, which was entered into out of individuals' self interest and would presumably be violated whenever an individual decided that such would further that interest to a greater degree.

After these broad assertions, Parker turned to the specific question of the church in Hobbes' paradigm:

> And here all his Notions of the Church are resolved into one Fundamental Principle, that the Sovereign Power in every Common-Wealth is the sole

> Founder of all revealed Religion, and that whatever pretences, true or false, may be made to Divine Revelation, they can have no Obligatory Power, unless they can obtain it from the Sovereign Authority, and if they can, then whether true or false, they are of equal Force and Obligation to the Consciences of men.

In Parker's opinion, this was the same as asserting "that all revealed Religion is no Religion." He went on to exclaim, "I can not but charge it as a reproach upon the Church of *England*, that such open Blasphemy should be suffered so long to pass so freely without Censure or Punishment."[13]

Parker pointed out several instances in *Leviathan* where Hobbes offered tortured explanations of scripture in an effort to make the Biblical account fit his conception of the civil sovereign's authority. For example, according to Hobbes, Moses made the Torah canonical for the Israelites by virtue of his authority as their civil magistrate, and the Israelites would have been under no obligation to worship God if they had not agreed to make Him their sovereign at Mount Sinai. Furthermore, the Great Commission in Matthew 28 was only intended to apply to those lands where evangelism was not prohibited by civil law, and the New Testament was not binding on anyone until the emperor Constantine's adoption of it. Also, the civil magistrate has "by vertue of his Sovereign Supremacy a power of ordaining Priests and administring Sacraments."[14] This last example of Hobbes' folly is especially interesting given the clash between Parker and his opponents, John Owen and Andrew Marvell, over the same point a decade earlier. Parker believed that merely to recite these assertions was to confute them, and he insisted that Hobbes' entire framework resolved into "one gross Contradiction: That for the ends of Government, we are obliged to believe and obey the Christian Religion as the Law of God: and for the same ends of Government, we are to understand that we owe no other Obedience to it, than as it is injoyn'd by the Law of man."[15] Were this true, the Christian church would be no more than "an association of Atheistical Hypocrites."[16]

Parker followed a strategy he had utilized to great effect in the toleration controversy by repeatedly associating Hobbes with the events and policies of the Interregnum period. He viewed *Leviathan* as a treacherous rejection of Charles I's memory and a self-serving attempt to curry favor with the Commonwealth regime. He especially detested Hobbes' suggestion that the Anglican clergy should be willing to suffer martyrdom for their faith, a statement which contradicted the principle that no one should oppose whatever religion the civil magistrate prescribes. Given that Hobbes allowed the laity the freedom to deny their faith at the sovereign's command, Parker concluded that this prescription for the clergy could only have been motivated by hatred and malice toward them at the low point of their fortunes.[17] He finished this section of the book with the declaration that "men of these irreligious principles are so far from being fit Members of a Christian Church, that they are not worthy to live in any humane Society, in that they blow up the foundations of all Government, as well as Religion."[18]

We can better understand Parker's philosophical position in relation to Hobbes by noting briefly the arguments of *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion*, a work of 427 octavo pages which the archdeacon published later in 1681. Although this treatise was in some ways a continuation of themes Parker first explored in *Disputationes de Deo*, in which he had attacked

Epicureans and Cartesians primarily, he stated that much of the motivation for its publication had come from the renewed strength of Hobbism in England:

> The Plebeans and Mechanicks have philosophised themselves into Principles of Impiety, and read their Lectures of Atheism in the Streets and the High-ways. And they are able to demonstrate out of the *Leviathan*, that there is no God nor Providence, but that all things come to pass by an eternal Chain of natural Causes: That there are no Principles of Good and Evil but onely every Man's Self-interest, nor any Self-interest but onely of this present Life: That humane Nature is a meer Machine, and that all the contrivances of the minds of Men are nothing but the mechanical Results of Matter and Motion.[19]

As part of the project to confute the Hobbesian viewpoint, Parker intended to popularize the arguments of Richard Cumberland's *De Legibus Naturae* (1672). Parker had licensed this work, which in turn had been influenced by Parker's writings during the toleration controversy, in 1671.[20] It argued for a theory of natural law that was at odds with Hobbes'. Parker referred in glowing terms to "the learned and judicious Treatise of our Country-man Dr. *Cumberland*," claiming that the latter had not only stated clearly what the Law of Nature was, but had also demonstrated its obligation "in a method heretofore proper onely to mathematicks."[21]

Like Parker, Cumberland insisted on an empirical base for his moral epistemology. He believed that the new techniques of the experimental and theoretical sciences would provide certainty as to what the natural law prescribed. The proof lay in "demonstration of the existence of natural rewards and punishments," thus showing that obedience to the natural law was obligatory.[22] This was an important point because Hobbes had claimed that the natural law did not demand "sociable behaviour," which in his construct flowed from the social contract's elimination of the natural state of war. Cumberland and Parker, by contrast, insisted that the natural law carried its own divine, inescapable obligation. Hobbes' view was far too accommodating to atheism for their comfort.

Parker spent roughly the first ninety pages of *A Demonstration* summarizing Cumberland's thesis, which dovetailed so well with his own views. However, unlike Cumberland, who had tried to meet Hobbes on his own ground, the archdeacon also insisted on the afterlife and its sanctions as a part of the apprehensible natural law.[23] Without an afterlife, according to Parker, there could be no true happiness even in this life. The remainder of the book's first half dealt with this issue by focusing mainly on classical philosophers, and in that sense returned to the concerns of *Disputationes de Deo*.

The second half of the work defended scripture as a full revelation of the natural law's contents. Parker managed to insert criticism of Hobbes here as well, denouncing his assertion in Chapter Thirty-Three of *Leviathan* that the writings of the New Testament did not become scripture until the Council of Laodicea in A.D. 364. Hobbes' statement seemed to Parker to place the leadership of the church above the word of God, and the archdeacon would have none of it. He declared, "The Testimony of the Church neither is nor can be any more than a proof or an argument of the Original and Divine

Authority of the canonical Books, as any other Testimony is or may be."[24] Although Parker obviously held a high view of the church's authority in doctrinal matters, he was quick to ferret out and rebut any notion that its authority, any more than the state's, was autonomous. The church could *recognize* scripture, but it could not on its own authority cause a text to *become* scripture. The difference was crucial, and Parker had always stressed the atheistic implications of Hobbes' assigning autonomous authority to any human institution.

The first section of *The Case of the Church of England*, together with the arguments found in *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority*, should put to rest any doubts as to whether Parker was a "closet Hobbist." His attacks on Hobbes during the toleration controversy had been interpreted by his detractors as a smokescreen for achieving Hobbist ends while denouncing Hobbist principles. It seems that no such accusation can be made here. Although Hobbes was not the chief target of *The Case of the Church of England*, the denunciations of him it contains cannot be construed as an attempt to deflect criticism from literary opponents preemptively, as was the case with *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*. The same is true of *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority*. Parker clearly had strong disagreements with Hobbes' foundational principles and presuppositions, and in *The Case of the Church of England* he condemned Hobbes' view of the church itself. The rest of the book, although not targeted directly at Hobbes, laid out a position that went even further in directly contradicting his prescription of absolute state control of the church.

Parker vs. Selden

Parker's second proposition, "*The Jurisdiction of the Church, by Divine Right*," dealt with the alleged errors of John Selden (1584-1654), one of the foremost jurists of the first half of the seventeenth century. Selden had been a member of Parliament during the reigns of James I and Charles I and had been commissioned by both monarchs to write legal treatises. He was one of the nine legislators imprisoned by Charles after the dissolution of the 1629 Parliament, but was soon released. A member of the Long Parliament, he was on the commission which drew up articles of impeachment for William Laud in 1641, although he also signed a declaration of adherence to the Church of England.[25]

In contrast to the complex paradigm of Hobbes, Selden's argument in *De Anno Civili* focused on the narrow question of the church's authority to excommunicate. Selden believed that this practice was a purely human institution that did not originate among the Jews until the Babylonian Captivity, when it served a social function–ostracism–for community leaders without recourse to the civil state's coercive power. The penalty in this context applied only to the guilty party's civil liberties, not the ability to participate in public worship. Once the Jews had been restored to their homeland, excommunication took its place among the repertoire of civil penalties available to the lawful authorities. The custom was inherited by the Christians and practiced by the church in its infancy, during which time its status was analogous to that of the Jews in Babylon. This situation persisted until the conversion of the Roman emperors to

Christianity, at which time the power of excommunication reverted to them. In short, excommunication is at bottom a civil punishment and properly belongs to the magistrate, not the church.[26]

Parker acknowledged that his opponent was strictly arguing only against the church's power of excommunication, but he contended that in doing so Selden had implicitly denied any other exercise of autonomous authority by the church, since all acts of government "are supposed by the Power of inflicting Punishment."[27] One could argue that this was a dubious inference, that Selden's denial of the legitimacy of one particular ecclesiastical action did not necessarily imply a rejection of all autonomous church authority. However, because it involved the withholding of the sacraments, excommunication was probably the greatest disciplinary weapon at the church's disposal. Without it, the church would be reduced to impotence, in Parker's view. The archdeacon devoted considerably more space–about ninety pages–to affirming the church's power of excommunication and by extension its divinely instituted jurisdiction than he had to rebutting Hobbes.

He began his argument by noting that the church had been founded "not only without the Allowance, but against the Edicts and Decrees of all the Powers of the Earth; and subsisted so apart from all Kingdoms and Common-wealths for above 300 years."[28] During this period, Christians had no assistance from the civil government, yet they were obliged to gather together in "a visible Society." Here Parker made one of his strongest statements against Erastianism, which is worth quoting at length:

> In a Christian State men are not Christians by the Law of the Common-wealth, but it is the Law of God that constitutes the Being and Formality of a Christian Church. Now this being granted me, which cannot be denyed without denying the foundations of the Christian Faith, the whole cause of *Erastianism* is run upon a palpable Contradiction. For if the Church be a Society founded upon Divine Right, it must have at least as much Power of Government within it self as is necessary to its own Peace and Preservation; otherwise it is no Society, much less of any Divine Appointment. And if it be indued with a Power of Government, it must have a Power of inflicting penalties upon Offenders, because without that the common sense of mankind will tell us, that all Government is ineffectual. And then as it is a Society, so it is no civil Society, as appears by our Saviours own Declaration, that his Kingdom is not of this World.[29]

Since Christians form a society, which must have a government, which must in turn have some power to inflict penalties, it followed that the church's government's "Penalties are distinct from those that are inflicted by the civil Power," and furthermore, that "Excommunication in the Christian Church, whatever it is, must be something distinct from all civil Inflictions."[30]

Selden's argument, Parker averred, suffered from a kind of intellectual schizophrenia. It attempted to find a middle ground between two paradigms with irreconcilable premises. If the church possessed a direct commission from God, it must have its unique jurisdiction regardless of the state's posture toward it. Only in the Hobbesian "Church of *Leviathan*" could it be appropriate for the civil government to be

the determiner of the church's jurisdiction. Hobbes was thus more consistent than Selden on this question.[31]

Having stated his position in broad terms, Parker proceeded to critique Selden's work in detail, dealing with each of the six eras of human history into which the latter structured his argument. Selden believed that such patriarchal-age events as the expulsion of Adam from Eden and of Cain from human society did not qualify as excommunications. Parker conceded this point, but noted that these episodes did illustrate the necessity, even on God's part, of administering penalties to maintain order in the creation. The universal adoption of some form of legal and judicial system was evidence that "the common sense of mankind" demanded such.[32]

According to Selden, in the Mosaic period before the Babylonian Captivity, there was no excommunication among the Israelites; instead, punishment entailed a loss of civil liberties. During the captivity, excommunication developed to punish an offender "by shame and dishonour" after the Jewish leadership had lost the power of the sword.[33] Again, Parker largely conceded these assertions, having already argued a decade before in the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* that civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been vested in the same persons in the Israelite state. He likewise concurred that excommunication did not arise until the captivity, but insisted that this development only proved his point concerning the necessity of government in any society. The use of excommunication during the captivity was a spiritual sanction as well as a social one, for those under its ban were considered non-Jews and thus outside the covenant, unable to participate in public worship.[34] Just as the Jewish leaders had to wield some disciplinary tool to maintain their spiritual society after they had lost civil authority, so did the Christian church need some means of governing itself. The origins of Jewish excommunication were, in any event, irrelevant for determining the legitimacy of Christian excommunication. Selden's error, according to Parker, lay in his faulty analogy between the Israelite state, which was both a civil and spiritual entity, and the church, which was purely spiritual, "not of this world."

Parker's critique became more robust when he came to the fourth of Selden's six eras, the first century of Christianity. Selden claimed that during this period, Christians had excommunicated *as Jews*, by the same authority and under the same imperial edicts as the latter. Parker declared that this was equivalent to saying that Christian baptism made one a Jew, or that "no man can be banisht out of *England*, because he may be banisht out of *France*"; unless Selden could demonstrate that there was no difference between the Jewish state and the Christian church in the apostolic era, he should have recognized that their respective punishments were different.[35] Parker went on to write that the curses of Galatians 1:8 and 1 Corinthians 16:22 were much too strong to refer to a merely social ostracism (particularly the Galatians passage, which could be applied to "an angel from heaven").[36] Regarding the authority by which Christian excommunication was performed, Parker flatly denied Selden's thesis that it was considered *by the Christians* as authorized by imperial edicts which granted latitude to them as Jews. The fact that the Roman state considered Christianity to be a Jewish sect did not make it so, and Parker found it inconceivable that Paul would not have ordered excommunication of scandalous offenders like the incestuous Corinthian absent an imperial edict granting him permission; the command was given "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," not in Caesar's name.[37]

Selden asserted at the beginning of his discussion of the period between the apostles and Constantine that it was unclear when "the present form" of excommunication, i.e. that which claimed spiritual sanctions, had begun in the church. Parker held this up as an example of all Presbyterians' willful ignorance, for they refused to acknowledge the clear evidence (from Parker's point of view) of Jesus' establishing excommunication and episcopacy in the Gospels, professing to be mystified as to how the practices had become firmly established by the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian in the second century A.D. He noted that Irenaeus had referred to excommunication as a practice that had been handed down from "the foregoing ages," and claimed that there could have been no such age other than the apostolic era.[38] Regardless of church tradition, if authority from Christ were found for excommunication in the Gospels, it had to be a legitimate exercise of independent church authority.

Parker located this grant of authority to the apostles in Matthew 16:19, 18:17-18, and John 20:21-23. In Matthew 16:19, Jesus tells Peter he will receive the "keys of the kingdom" and will have the power of "binding and loosing" in heaven. Matthew 18:17-18 extends this power to all the apostles and also instructs them to treat recalcitrants who reject the church's authority as "heathens and tax collectors." In John 20:21-23, the risen Christ gives them the authority to forgive sins. Parker brushed aside Selden's position that the passages in Matthew–Selden did not deal with John–referred only to preaching and baptism, reiterating his charge of inconsistency: "So plainly does the Power of Baptism infer that of Excommunication . . . that the Gentlemen of the *Erastian* persuasion would have been much more consistent with themselves, when they would not give the Church all the Acts of Power, if they would have given it none at all [*á la* Hobbes], for they are inseparable."[39] He also dismissed the argument that "binding and loosing" implied only an authority to interpret scripture or to make judicial declarations concerning the lawfulness of various actions.[40] Naturally, this argument of Christ's granting substantive authority to the apostles figured largely in Parker's argument on behalf of episcopacy in Part Two of the book.

Parker considered the case against Selden closed at this point, for "if the power of Excommunication be founded upon the Command of God, the contrary practice of all the Princes in *Christendom* is of no weight," but he rebutted Selden's analysis of the period after Constantine anyway.[41] Selden cited numerous examples of kings and emperors (including Henry VIII) who had placed restrictions on the authority of bishops or otherwise issued legislation dealing with the church, and claimed that this was evidence that the power of excommunication lay ultimately in the civil magistrate's hands. Parker acknowledged that church and state had been at odds in the past, but contended that this had occurred only when one violated the other's sphere, something that was inevitable in an imperfect world.[42] He argued that the Christian emperors had only ratified the canons of church councils and made them part of the civil law, an action which did not deny the authority of the church to draw up the canons in the first place.[43] He also made the questionable claim that the Submission of the Clergy in Henry VIII's reign, in which the Church of England had promised not to enact any new canons or ordinances "unless the King's most royal Assent and License may to them be had," did not end the autonomous authority of the church but merely made the promise that that authority would only be exercised under certain conditions.[44] Parker's counter-arguments to Selden in this section were not as robust as those which had come earlier, but as the latter had no clear evidence

(in Parker's mind) that the emperors had ever claimed or delegated the power of excommunication, the archdeacon no doubt believed the burden of proof was on him.

A Changing Tone

Part One of *The Case of the Church of England* marks a significant departure in tone from Parker's earlier polemical works. Perhaps this should not be surprising given the eight-year gap between it and *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd*, but it deserves comment. In his works of the 1680s, we find much less of the "intemperate violence," to use John Spurr's words, which had characterized his contributions to the toleration controversy a decade earlier. This may have been the result simply of the diminishing of the fires of youth or of a maturing of his writing style. However, we should keep in mind Anthony Wood's attribution (noted in Chapter Two) of this change to the lesson in humility Parker received at the hands of Andrew Marvell in the two parts of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*; Wood claimed that the experience "took down somewhat of his high spirit" and "put him upon a more serious, sober and moderate way of writing in other good treatises, which he since did set forth, and which have proved very useful and beneficial to the public."[45]

Regardless of its cause, this "more moderate way of writing" first appeared in *The Case of the Church of England*. Although Parker did not hold back in his denunciations of Hobbes, he took a markedly different tone toward Selden. To be sure, he characterized Selden's argument as a product of "the Impotency of Learning joyn'd with Prejudice and Passion," but he also claimed a measure of respect for his adversary. For example, he expressed doubt over the truth of the story (which he does not repeat) concerning the origins of *De Anno Civili*, musing that the alleged provocation spurring Selden to write "was so very slight, that I cannot but think it beneath the Spirit of so great a man." He also expressed regret at feeling compelled to rebut "a Person of his Parts and Learning," but that *De Anno Civili* did not rise to the level of Selden's other great works and contained errors that had to be refuted.[46] These expressions of respect for a literary opponent were entirely absent from Parker's earlier polemical works, and although the archdeacon inevitably described Selden's notions in deprecating terms, the personal attacks and imputation of foul motives found throughout the earlier writings against the nonconformists did not appear.

Parker vs. Stillingfleet

This more moderate tone continued in Part Two of the book, which aimed to refute the argument of Stillingfleet and others that although the Church of England had to have a government, the precise form it took was arbitrary, not divinely instituted. Parker referred to divines holding this view as "mistaken friends" of the church, as opposed to the "false Pretenders" treated in Part One; he also stated that he wished to deal with them "more amicably" than he had with Hobbes and Selden.[47] After announcing his intention

to prove that the notion of arbitrariness in church government was an error "destructive to the Being and Settlement of all the Christian Churches in the World," he assured his readers that his aim was not to give offense:

> Though here I have many learned worthy men for my Adversaries, yet I hope to manage the Dispute with that Candour and Integrity, that none shall have any reason to complain of any more unkindness, than what is absolutely necessary to my doing right to the Church of *England*. And this I am sure can give no Offence to good men, how much soever I may chance to cross with their particular Sentiments and Opinions.[48]

The contrast between this statement and the salvo which began the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, in which Parker warned in advance of the harsh tone of the work, could hardly be greater.[49] The very notion that a sincere reader of good conscience could disagree with him was notably absent from Parker's earlier works.

He credited the "mistaken Friends" with doing their best to work for the unity of the Church of England by "allaying those Controversies about a *Jus Divinum*, that had been lately and still were managed among us with so much heat and noise."[50] According to Parker, these controversies had been stirred up by followers of John Calvin on the continent, of whom Parker singled out three: Blondel, Salmasius, and Daillé, all three of whom were French. David Blondel (1591-1655), a clergyman, had been a professor of history in Amsterdam and a voluminous writer. Claudius Salmasius, or Claude de Saumaise (1588-1653), a humanist and philologist, spent many years at the University of Leiden, writing eighty books in the process. Although he had been a staunch defender of Charles I and the divine right of kings, his arguments in support of presbyterian government in *De Episcopis et Presbyteris* (1641), written under the pseudonym "Walo Messalinus," made him Parker's target. Jean Daillé, or Dallaeus (1594-1670), had been a prominent clergyman in France and the author of many controversial works, the best known of which was *Du Vrai Emploi de Pères* (1631). This treatise, which argued against the conclusive authority of the church fathers in matters of faith and practice, was translated into English and published under the title *A Treatise Concerning the Correct Use of the Fathers* in 1651 and again in 1675. All three of these authors had attempted to prove that in the period immediately after the apostles' deaths, the church had adopted a presbyterian form of government. Parker regarded their arguments as unconvincing and spent much of the remainder of the book rebutting them. Believing episcopacy to be of divine prescription, he regarded it as a serious error to take the position of the "mistaken Friends" and give up a vigorous defense of episcopacy in the name of unity.

The central question, as put by Parker, was "whether the Church were at first founded in a superiority and subordination of Ecclesiastical Officers to each other, or a parity and equality of all among themselves." Parker believed the former could be shown by Christ's direct commands, apostolic practice, and the tradition of the post-apostolic church.[51] Christ had commissioned two different "classes" of followers: the Twelve and the Seventy.[52] Although both of these had been given authority, the Twelve was obviously a more select group, as evidenced by the ceremony by which a replacement for Judas Iscariot was chosen in Acts 1.[53] Parker asserted that it was pointless to argue that the Twelve simply enjoyed a sort of honorary title without a greater authority to match it:

"Wherein consists this superiority of Order and Dignity, without any superiority of Power: For what do men mean by Power, but a right to Govern? and what by Order but a superiority of some as Rulers and a subordination of others as Ruled?"[54] Nor would it do, wrote Parker, to argue that Christ's commission to the Twelve had expired on their deaths and had not extended to their designated successors. Those holding this position would be powerless to answer the Socinian argument that baptism was only necessary for the first generation of converts to Christianity and not for any children born after their conversion; the logic behind each assertion was the same.[55]

All parties to the dispute over church government agreed that the apostles had exercised authority over the church in its first few decades. Parker believed this in itself was sufficient to prove an inequality in church offices, regardless of whatever argument the Presbyterians could construct concerning the equivalence of the terms *bishop* and *presbyter*.[56] He insisted that unless it could be proved that reasons for establishing an inequality of church offices in the first century had ceased in subsequent ages, the church was required to follow the apostolic example.[57]

The practice of the post-apostolic church was the topic on which Parker expended most of his energy and ink–the remaining 128 pages of *The Case of the Church of England* are devoted to it. He began by asserting that the alleged paucity of documents from the era immediately after the apostles could not provide a "sanctuary" for the Presbyterians to claim that their preferred form of church government was then practiced. Episcopacy was in place so early that "unless it descended from the Apostles times, we can never give any account in the World whence it derived its Original."[58] He warned that any argument against episcopacy based on the lack of contemporary documents would have to apply equally to the canon of scripture itself; the "sceptical grounds and pretences" urged against one could not consistently be withheld from the other. Presbyterians "would do very well to consider the consequences of this rude and licentious way of Arguing."[59]

Parker then began a systematic rebuttal of the Presbyterian position (or at least the position Parker ascribed to them) organized under three headings: places, times, and persons (in fact, Parker uncharacteristically failed to provide clear demarcation between the latter two topics, with the result that his argument lost some of its coherence over the following hundred pages). He only briefly considered the objection that because records from most post-apostolic congregations were lacking, there could be no certainty that episcopacy was practiced everywhere or therefore that it was of divine institution. Parker's response was that the burden of proof lay on those who held this position to find positive evidence of some other form of church government being practiced during that period. If such evidence were lacking, it could only be prudent to follow the example set by those congregations that *did* leave records.[60]

He devoted more space to the objection that because Eusebius, the "father of church history," had lived over 200 years after the last of the apostles died, and had allegedly insufficient records with which to work, his endorsement of episcopacy could not be accepted as authoritative. Here Parker tried to demonstrate the continuity in the testimony of the early church fathers from the New Testament to the fourth century. He focused his attention on the period from Clement of Rome (ca. 30-100) to Irenaeus (ca. 120-202), since the authenticity of some works purportedly from this era had been challenged by Daillé and Blondel. Foremost among these was the epistle to the

Ephesians by Ignatius (d. 107), which unambiguously assumes an episcopal form of church government, as evidenced by statements such as the following: "Wherefore it is fitting that ye should run together in accordance with the will of your bishop, which thing also ye do. For your justly renowned presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the bishop as the strings are to the harp."[61] Because Ignatius, along with Polycarp (ca. 65-155), had been a pupil of the apostle John, his word carried significant weight.

Daillé had alleged that the epistle to the Ephesians was spurious and dated from a much later period. Fortunately for Parker, a comprehensive refutation of Daillé and Blondel, *Vindiciae Epistolarum S. Ignatii* by John Pearson (1612-1686), who had succeeded Parker's former mentor John Wilkins as bishop of Chester, had been published in 1672. Parker therefore was able to provide a mere summary of Pearson's argument. Ignatius' epistles had been attested to by Polycarp and Irenaeus; Daillé in various ways had attempted to prove that their testimonies were either mistaken or later additions by scribes, or alternatively, that the epistles passed off as Ignatius' were not the same ones referred to by these other church fathers, that the true letters had been lost and counterfeit ones substituted for them sometime before Eusebius' day. Pearson's reply in defense of their authenticity had been thorough, and until the nineteenth century it was considered the definitive treatment of the epistle to the Ephesians.[62]

Daillé had also challenged the authenticity of the Apostolical Canons, which likewise assumed an episcopal form of government, clearly distinguishing among the offices of bishop, presbyter, and deacon.[63] Relying largely upon Pope Gelasius' decree in 494 that they were apocryphal, he alleged that the Canons had not been compiled until the fifth century. Here again Parker was the beneficiary of another Anglican's labors, this time William Beveridge (1637-1708), who had published *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Primitivae Vindicatus ad Illustratus* in 1678. Beveridge later became a prebendary at Canterbury in 1684 and bishop of St. Asaph in 1704. He rebutted Daillé, arguing that the Canons had been compiled from the synods of the first two centuries, and his interpretation, like Pearson's, became standard for over a century. Parker praised Beveridge's work as "an incomparable treasure of Ecclesiastical Antiquity," and noted that Gelasius' "barbarous and Gothish Decree" had also declared authentic such spurious works as the Acts of St. Sylvester. Resting his case largely on Pearson and Beveridge, he then asserted that if Ignatius' epistles and the Apostolical Canons were acknowledged to be legitimate, no further inquiry into the third and subsequent centuries was necessary, for "we are there overwhelmed with the croud of Witnesses" attesting to the validity of episcopal government.[64]

Another aspect of the argument concerning the alleged ambiguity of the evidence for episcopacy was that there was no record of the succession of bishops in some of the prominent ancient congregations. Parker considered this a frivolous objection, since there were plenty of records indicating such a succession at important churches, including Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome. He reiterated that the Presbyterians needed to show evidence of a non-episcopal structure somewhere in antiquity if they wanted to be taken seriously. Otherwise,

> because the exact succession of Persons in any Bishoprick has not been preserved with that care and diligence that it ought or might have been, to conclude that therefore there was no certainty of the Episcopal form of

> Government, is the same thing as to conclude, that there never was any ancient Monarchy in the world, because in all their Histories there are some flaws, or defects, or disagreements as to the names of the Persons in the succession.[65]

In response to questions concerning the reliability of the extant succession records, Parker observed that some were far too skeptical of the abilities of their Christian forebears: "It is very hard, that when *Irenaeus* . . . gives us a Catalogue of the Bishops of *Rome* from St. *Peter* down to the time when himself was at *Rome*, and who lived not at a greater distance from St. *Peter* than we do from the first Archbishop in Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, that we should suspect the whole truth of his Relation, because we cannot give an account of all the particular circumstances of the Succession."[66] According to Parker, even if the ancient records were as defective as the Presbyterians alleged, the fact that all the surviving ones indicated episcopacy should have been enough to silence them.

The most serious argument advanced by the Presbyterians, in Parker's view, was based on statements made by Jerome (d. 420) in a letter to Evangelus. The purpose of this letter was to prove that deacons were inferior to presbyters, but in making the argument Jerome also wrote that presbyters were equal to bishops. He believed that in the New Testament era, congregations had been governed by a council of presbyters: "When subsequently one presbyter was chosen to preside over the rest, this was done to remedy schism and to prevent each individual from rending the church of Christ by drawing it to himself."[67] The adoption of episcopacy was thus a matter of expediency and not one of divine prescription; this argument was made by Blondel, Daillé, and Salmasius.

Conceding that Jerome's letter expressed his true sentiment, even though it was a "hasty and over-lavish expression" written in the heat of a dispute,[68] Parker maintained that there were numerous problems with its assertion, and that it could not be relied upon by Presbyterians or latitudinarians. If Jerome's statement were true, it would mean that Christ and the apostles had not had enough foresight to plan for the dissension and schism that prompted the switch to episcopacy soon after the apostles' deaths; it was thus a "dishonourable reflection . . . upon the Wisdom of our Saviour and his Apostles."[69] Furthermore, it conceded the necessity of episcopacy based on "natural Reason," for Jerome's statement implied that without it, there would be "as many Schisms as Priests."[70] Finally, according to Parker, the statement was based entirely on the conjecture that during a "dark interval" after the apostles' deaths, the episcopal government over which they had presided was abolished, a presbyterian form set up and discarded, and episcopacy re-instituted. Parker declared that "these are very hard conceits, especially when they cannot so much as pretend to give us any the least probable account, where, and when, and by whom this was done."[71] For him, the notion that these great changes had occurred throughout the church for "such great and urgent reasons" without being recorded by any Christian authors in the first or second centuries was incredible. The great reliance of the Presbyterians on a letter dating from the fifth century, by which they interpreted all earlier Christian sources, illustrated the weakness of their case, in Parker's view.

Having demonstrated to his satisfaction the divine foundations of episcopacy, Parker proceeded to point out two "enormous inconveniences" resulting from the belief

in the arbitrariness of church government. First, "if the Form of Government in the Christian Church be not setled by the Founder of it, . . . we are at a loss to know by whom it may or ought to be determined."[72] This was an important point, for Stillingfleet had opened his *Irenicum* with the assertion that "*things necessary for the Churches peace, must be clearly revealed*" in scripture.[73] If the dispute over church government were so destructive, this principle would seem to imply that if the form itself had not been prescribed, the person or persons with the authority to determine that form would have been. Parker denied that the civil magistrate had this authority; in addition to the lack of an express warrant in scripture, he pointed to the primitive church, which operated in violation of civil law. He also argued that if church officials derived their authority from the state and not Christ, then they were only "Ministers of State, and not of the Gospel."[74] Parker failed to see how entrusting the form of church government to the whim of the magistrate could provide for peace and stability, and he pointed to the twists and turns of the Long Parliament's legislation concerning the settling of ecclesiastical jurisdiction during the summer of 1641 as evidence that such a system was untrustworthy.

Neither did Parker believe that authority to determine the form of church government could lie with the people. There was no express scriptural warrant for such an idea, and adopting it would result in the same instability as if the power lay with magistrate. Furthermore, Parker insisted, asserting that this authority belonged to the people would result in Independency by definition; "when they have once removed the settlement by Divine Right, they leave it, do what they can, entirely in the Peoples power to set up their own Form of Government. Seeing then, that unless the Christian Church be subject to Government, it can be no more than a Rabble, and a Riot."[75] Clearly, Parker's contempt for the masses had not ebbed in the previous decade.

Secondly, Parker warned that abandoning the divinely-instituted model of episcopacy removed any safeguards against popery. Here Parker showed again that his outlook was basically that of a Henrician Catholic, asserting that "the main design of our endeavoured Reformation was to assert and retrieve the Rights of the Episcopal Order against his [the pope's] illegal encroachments."[76] According to Parker, each bishop was properly the sovereign ecclesiastical authority within his diocese, and a general council of bishops was the only body fit to make decisions concerning the universal church. The pope's usurpation of this authority had caused great harm, and had grown even worse in recent times with the institution of the Jesuit order. Parker made the startling claim that "the whole mystery of Jesuitism resolves it self into Presbytery," for by placing Jesuits throughout Roman Catholic Europe to exercise ecclesiastical authority, the pope had degraded the true bishops, reducing their authority to that of mere presbyters.[77] Parker predicted that if what he believed was the Anglican adherence to primitive episcopacy were abandoned, Catholicism would eventually triumph; the only other options were the Genevan model and Independency, "both being so palpable Innovations in the Christian Church, and withall of so very late a date; it will be no difficult matter for the Church of *Rome* to defend her own title, how bad soever, against such upstart and absurd Competitors."[78] He ended the work with a postscript and a call to dissenters "seriously to consider what it is for which they renounce the Church in which they were baptised into the Communion of the Catholick Church, [and] tear and rend it into numberless pieces and factions."[79]

An interesting aspect of Parker's argument in Part Two of *The Case of the Church of England* is that although it was intended ostensibly to persuade members of the Anglican communion of the divine mandate for episcopacy, it reads in many places as though it were intended to convict dissenters of their errors, particularly in the closing pages. Perhaps the archdeacon was hoping to do both. A better explanation may be that he believed he could best persuade Anglicans by refuting the arguments of the Presbyterians, and that any persuasion of dissenters would be incidental. It seems clear that a major goal of the work was to popularize the scholarship of Pearson and Beveridge, which had been published in Latin a few years before. Parker no doubt believed that the arguments of these men would carry the day in the ecclesiastical debate once they became generally known.

Extending the Argument

However, Parker wanted to make his own original contribution to the debate as well, and to that end he published *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church, for the First Six Hundred Years* in 1683. This work, licensed in May 1683 and containing 359 octavo pages,[80] was intended to serve as the second part of *The Case of the Church of England*. It was motivated in part by the appearance of Richard Baxter's *A Treatise of Episcopacy* in 1681. Baxter claimed not to be opposed to episcopacy *per se*, but he complained that the seventeenth-century incarnation of episcopal government was contrary to scripture and early church practice, in that bishops of the Church of England presided over populations far greater than any bishop of the early church had; for primitive practice to be restored, bishops' areas of jurisdiction would have to be sharply curtailed to one congregation, the result being a presbyterian church structure for all practical purposes.[81] Baxter referred to Blondel's work as "that wonder of the world, for Chronology and History";[82] he had not taken into account Pearson's criticisms of Blondel because *A Theory of Episcopacy* actually had been written in 1671. Parker stated that a more sound history of the church's early centuries and a more thorough refutation of the French Presbyterians was now necessary, given the reliance of one of England's most prominent nonconformists on them.[83]

Parker aimed to demonstrate three things, as indicated on his title-page: first, "The Apostolical Practice of Diocesan and Metropolitical Episcopacy"; second, "The Usurpation of Patriarchal and Papal Authority"; and finally, "The War of Two Hundred Years between Bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople* for Universal Supremacy." Here for the first time Parker offered a full-fledged historical work as a polemical device; in his view, an examination of the history of the primitive church would prove beyond doubt the rightness of the episcopal, anti-papal cause. Antecedents to this technique in Parker's writing can be found in Chapter One of *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* and in *The Case of the Church of England*, although in the latter work the argument was more historiographical in nature. Unlike its predecessor, *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church* developed the argument for episcopacy within a chronological format, not (primarily) as a response to the arguments of other authors (although numerous references to Blondel, Salmasius, and Daillé appear throughout the work). Moreover, it

was structured more like the *Discourse* and *Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*, being subdivided into concise sections (although not chapters); the overall effect of this organization was to make Parker's argument more coherent and systematic, as opposed to the animadversions found in *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* or *The Case of the Church of England*, in which his opponents' format dictated his own.

Appealing to the Apostles

Much of the ground Parker covered in this offering he had already gone over in a slightly different way in *The Case of the Church of England*, and thus our analysis of it need not be quite so detailed. He began by stating that each apostle had acted as overseer of the churches he had planted, and if he had settled in one city, he had become the bishop of that church; the only exception to this rule was James, who had been chosen bishop of Jerusalem by the consensus of all the apostles. Establishing the equivalence of apostles and bishops was key to Parker's argument. In his mind this did not degrade the apostles but rather elevated the status of subsequent bishops: "The Apostolical Office was Episcopal, and the Episcopal Apostolical, both of them consisting in the Supreme Government of the Church; so that an Apostle was a moving Bishop to found Churches, and a Bishop a settled Apostle to govern them."[84] He continued by recapitulating his argument (with some elaboration) against Salmasius and Blondel from *The Case of the Church of England* that the issue of the alleged equivalence of the words *bishop* and *presbyter* in scripture was irrelevant, since at the time these officers, whatever their titles, were undoubtedly subject to the apostles or to their appointed representatives, such as Timothy in Ephesus or Titus in Crete. Allowing that the title "bishop" was not applied to the chief overseer in each congregation until after the deaths of the apostles in no way constituted a sound argument against episcopacy, in Parker's view.[85] There followed a restatement of Parker's position on Jerome's letter which equated first-century bishops and presbyters.

Parker then dealt again with the alleged "unknown interval" in which the Presbyterians claimed the church had been presided over by the whole body of presbyters. He claimed that not only was there no contemporary evidence whatsoever that this situation had ever existed, but that Paul's appointment of Timothy and Titus was clear proof for the principle of episcopal apostolic succession, not to mention the writings of Church Fathers such as Irenaeus.[86] He cited 1 Clement 42-44 as further evidence that the apostles had foreseen the struggles over church authority and had appointed bishops to prevent them from occurring.[87] He then devoted fifteen pages to refuting Blondel's contention that the oldest presbyter had always functioned as a sort of chairman, and that this honorary title was eventually corrupted into episcopal government, a notion that Parker called "meer guess and empty Air" drawn mainly from conjecture in the writings of Jerome and the counterfeit Ambrose.[88]

He proceeded through the writings of the church fathers up to Irenaeus in more or less chronological order, arguing that each one had assumed or explicitly endorsed episcopal government. He referred to Ignatius only briefly, but devoted a little more

space to Polycarp, whose reference to himself as a "presbyter" did not (in Parker's view) change the fact that he was a bishop with authority over not only the church at Smyrna but also the church at Philippi.[89] Others, such as Pope Pius and Irenaeus, occasionally referred to bishops as "presbyters," but Parker argued that in these instances the word merely referred to the age of the bishops; Papias even used the word to refer to the apostles, who certainly had greater authority in the church than the presbyters of the churches they had planted.[90] In his *Apology*, Justin Martyr referred to only two orders of church officials, but the context of the passage was a description of a worship service, not an explication of church government, and Parker believed that this fact nullified whatever use the Presbyterians hoped to gain from the author.[91] The archdeacon held that his opponents were relying almost entirely on semantic quibbling to prove that no bishops had existed in the first two centuries of the church.

Although he believed that he had proved his point sufficiently, Parker continued his demonstration of the existence of episcopacy in the primitive church as a response to Blondel. Over the course of seventeen pages he briefly mentioned each of the prominent church fathers of the third and fourth centuries, pointing to passages from their writings in which they affirmed the three-fold division of church offices. He asserted that the only well-known figure from this era who could be made out to be a Presbyterian with any plausibility was the heretic Arius.[92] All the others, including Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and Eusebius, indicated a distinction between bishops and presbyters.

Having established to his satisfaction that episcopacy was the universal form of the church's government in its early centuries, Parker proceeded to defend the arrangement of diocesan and metropolitical jurisdictions. This marked the point of departure for the substantially new material in the work; the topic of jurisdictional bounds had not been broached in *The Case of the Church of England*. The archdeacon attempted to prove that it had been the goal of the apostles and their successors from the very beginning to organize the church's authority structure in conformity with the civil jurisdictions of the Roman Empire. They did this for a specific reason: "that they might not be any occasion of making Alterations or Disturbances in the State, which could scarce have been avoided, had they not cut them out by the same pattern and model."[93] Parker also used the analogy of a soul being "conveigh'd into the Body" to describe this rationale; the church's goal was to reform and strengthen civil government, and it organized itself in such a way as to achieve this with expediency.

He posited that the basic unit of ecclesiastical jurisdiction from earliest times had been the city. The apostles planted churches in cities, and New Testament epistles sent to specific cities were addressed to the "church" in that city, whereas those sent to Christians in a region were addressed to "the churches" of that area.[94] Within each jurisdiction, which included a city and its surrounding area, "the fundamental Rule of the Government was this, *That nothing was to be done without the Bishop*."[95] In support of this assertion, Parker quoted Ignatius, the Apostolical Canons, and the Council of Antioch. Distinct congregations and parishes in rural areas did not form until a later period, and Parker argued that this indicated these places had always been and remained under the jurisdiction of the urban bishop. He also pointed out instances where questions over areas of jurisdiction were expressed in terms of *cities*.[96] In an extended digression, he argued that the "chorepiscopi," church officers operating in the countryside with the power of ordination from the fourth century to the time of Charlemagne, were true

bishops, despite the Presbyterian claim that they were presbyters and equal to the city bishops.[97]

In further conformity to the Roman model of civil government, the church established metropolitical jurisdictions corresponding to the provinces of the empire, making the "head city" of each province its metropolis. Questions of great difficulty or general concern were referred by individual bishops to a synod of bishops of that province, which could be summoned by the bishop of the metropolis. Parker claimed, as he did with episcopacy, that "the Institution of Metropolitans [is] so antient, that we can discover no beginning of them, unless we derive them from the Apostles own times."[98] He located "intimations" of metropolitical organization in 2 Cor. 1 and Acts 15 and 20, where Paul or the apostles seem to include other churches of the region in their instructions to the churches at Corinth, Antioch, and Ephesus, respectively.[99] That metropolitans had existed from the beginning was allegedly shown by the fact that no subsequent canon or conciliar decision ever established them, but rather assumed their existence. Throughout the discussion Parker avoided the use of the term "archbishop," and he stressed that the bishop of a metropolis could exercise his authority, which included ordaining and censuring bishops and receiving appeals from other dioceses, *only* in conjunction with his synod of bishops. He was thus not a "bishop of bishops," as Cyprian (himself a metropolitan) had warned against,[100] but rather a sort of "first among equals" within his synod. His only power independent of the synod was to summon it to meet; otherwise he exercised authority only within his own diocese. Here Parker rebutted Salmasius, who had used Cyprian's comment to argue that in fact no metropolitical organization had existed in the early church; Parker declared that Salmasius' error stemmed from his "Arbitrary Definition" of the metropolitan's function.[101]

Perfidious Patriarchs

He then set out to prove that the patriarchates which arose in the fourth and fifth centuries were in fact a usurpation of authority and violation of the traditions handed down from apostolical times. This was in sharp contrast to the more traditional view that the reorganization of the empire by Constantine in the early fourth century had motivated the church to set up a higher level of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Parker argued that the sixth canon of the First Council of Nice, which many understood to be the first explicit reference to patriarchates, did not in fact acknowledge patriarchal jurisdiction, but merely confirmed the customary privileges of all metropolitans.[102] He pointed out that the imperial multi-provincial dioceses, to which the patriarchates were understood to correspond, did not exist before Constantine's reorganization, and therefore that the "ancient customs" referred to in the Nicene Canons could not be a reference to them. He dismissed as fanciful the argument of Petrus (or Pierre) de Marca (1594-1662), archbishop of Toulouse, in *De Constantinopolitani Patriarchiatus Institutione* that the church, inspired by the "Spirit of Prophecy," had in fact been organized along these lines previously in anticipation of Constantine's action.[103] Parker issued a perceptive warning to historians against reading their assumptions regarding contemporary situations back into the past; he regarded this "Confounding [of] the State of the Church and Empire after

Constantine with the State of both before" as a common manifestation of this error in judgment.[104] This was true even of the post-Nicene Church Fathers, such as Jerome, Innocent I (whom Parker labels "the first pope"), and Johannes Antiochenus (fl. 610-650), all of whom pointed to the Nicene Canons as validation of patriarchal claims of authority.[105]

Neither did the First Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) institute patriarchates, in Parker's opinion. The second canon of that council stated in part, "The bishops are not to go beyond their dioceses to churches lying outside of their bounds, nor bring confusion on the churches . . . and let not bishops go beyond their dioceses for ordination or any other ecclesiastical ministrations, unless they be invited."[106] Parker argued that the term "diocese" at this stage of church history had a fluctuating meaning which could be applied to any area of jurisdiction, and he cited contemporary sources which used the word to refer to a province.[107] Claiming that this was the most common use of the word, Parker argued that the canon was thus a reaffirmation of metropolitical authority and a positive condemnation of would-be patriarchs attempting to impose their will on areas outside their rightful jurisdiction. He also cited the two well-known provincial synods of Antioch (341) and Sardica (ca. 344) as evidence that there were no patriarchates in the fourth century. The canons of the Antioch synod discussed appeals to the metropolitan (but not to the patriarch), and implied that the only appeal from the metropolitan was to the emperor.[108] The Council of Sardica, on the other hand, did assign a special role to the bishop of Rome, but Parker noted that the canons did not permit that bishop to hear and judge appeals; they only allowed that he might request a retrial from the bishops who had judged the case the first time and send presbyters to participate in the trial alongside them.[109] According to Parker, the authors of the canons "suppos'd that there was no settled Right of Appeal beyond the Metropolitan," and they were instituting a new procedure without any antecedent, "a small kind of privilege to the Bishop of *Rome*."[110] In Parker's view, this expression of "civility" proved to be the thin end of a wedge, in that it became a precedent cited by subsequent bishops of Rome when they pressed their authority over the metropolitans in the western church.

He insisted that it was not until the Council of Chalcedon (451) that patriarchs (or "exarchs") were officially recognized by the church, and he described the origins of this "new order" as the "great Riddle of [the] Ecclesiastical Story, (*viz.*) To find a new order of Priesthood thus sprung up on the suddain in the Christian Church, like *Melchisedek*, from an unknown Birth and Parentage."[111] Parker acknowledged that the ninth canon of Chalcedon ratified the pre-existing status of the patriarchs, and that this presented a problem for his position, since he had construed all earlier councils as having condemned what the patriarchs had done, i.e. asserted their authority over several metropolitical jurisdictions. His explanation was that the bishops of Constantinople, far from being latecomers to the ranks of patriarchs, were actually the first to attempt to usurp authority from the metropolitans. At the First Council of Constantinople (381), that city's bishop had been granted "prerogative of honor after the Bishop of Rome. because Constantinople is [the] New Rome," a status which Parker argued could only be purely symbolic when understood in the context of the preceding canon, which reaffirmed the Nicene canons regarding metropolitical jurisdictions.[112] This honorary status, like the one given to the bishop of Rome, became the basis for future claims of wide-reaching authority: "From the *Constantinopolitan* Council, we perpetually find the Bishops of

Constantinople encroaching upon the Jurisdiction of their Neighbours, openly violating the Ecclesiastical Canons by an exorbitant use of its greatness."[113]

Nectarius, the bishop of Constantinople at the time of the council in 381, was aided in his quest for power by the emperor Theodosius, who established a group of "communicatory bishops" on his own authority soon after the council ended.[114] Theodosius named Nectarius–who at that time was still nominally inferior to the bishop of Heraclea–to this group, which was designated the arbiter of orthodoxy in the church. Parker called this "one of the first open Breaches that was made upon the Original Constitution of the *Christian Church*" and criticized Theodosius, who, despite his sincere faith and good intentions, had meddled in an area where he had no authority. Instead of supporting the church by ratifying its decisions, the emperor had "out of too much Zeal Invaded the Ecclesiastical Authority, by assuming to himself a Power of erecting new Models of Government . . . for if [the church] stand upon divine Right from our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, it is then in no mans Power to alter it."[115] This outburst in the middle of his narrative against someone he evidently held in high esteem reminds the reader unexpectedly that Parker was quite serious in his anti-Erastian sentiments, which had first been articulated in *The Case of the Church of England*, and that he viewed as critical the church's autonomous authority to govern itself.

Parker also criticized as a usurper of authority another man he greatly admired, John Chrysostom (347-407), who was "a very good man" and "one of the greatest Wits of the *Christian Church*."[116] As Nectarius' successor in Constantinople, Chrysostom repeatedly intervened in the affairs of other bishops throughout the eastern empire, ordaining and deposing bishops and attempting to impose reforms. Parker defended the actions of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who had denounced Chrysostom's harboring of Origenian monks after Theophilus had excommunicated them and who had been instrumental in having Chrysostom deposed and sent into exile in 401.[117] According to him, Theophilus' denunciation in Constantinople of Origen's teachings and their adherents was merely a necessary ploy to gain the support of the broader church; the real objective was to safeguard the church's authority structure by removing a man who had attempted to set himself over the entire eastern church. Parker did not place the entire blame on Chrysostom, who had lived in an era of corruption and who had been frequently invited to arbitrate disputes outside his jurisdiction, something the canons of the First Council of Constantinople specifically allowed.[118] However, he believed that the bishop's ready acceptance of so many invitations had risked turning "that Liberty which the Council had left for extraordinary cases into an ordinary Jurisdiction. And the truth of it is, when Laws allow such Reserves, if men are not very tender and cautious in using them, they defeat the Laws themselves."[119] One of Chrysostom's successors at Constantinople, Atticus, succeeded in persuading the emperor to enact a law requiring the bishop of Constantinople's assent for the ordination of other bishops, although the geographical area covered by this law is not certain.[120] Thus, wrote Parker, the bishops of Constantinople had made great strides in extending their authority between the First Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon. Almost as an aside, he asserted that the other (future) patriarchates merely had followed Constantinople's lead in seeking greater authority, but had not been able to achieve much more than an honorary status until Chalcedon.

Parker then examined the Council of Chalcedon itself, pointing out several places in the sessions where obvious tension had been present between the bishops who desired to hold strictly to the Nicene Canons' prescriptions for jurisdictions and ordination, and the supporters of the "Constantinopolitans," who argued in favor of post-Nicene "custom" which gave the bishop of Constantinople an elevated authority in the eastern church.[121] He mistakenly argued that the canons of the council made the bishop of Constantinople's court the final ecclesiastical court of appeals throughout the empire (even from Rome), and that this council thus represented a major coup for that party. (In fact, the ninth and seventeenth canons designating "the throne of Constantinople" as the final appeal beyond the exarch of the diocese were probably intended to apply only to the eastern church.[122]) However, he was correct in noting that the "thirty-year rule" in the seventeenth canon legitimated Constantinople's jurisdiction over the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, representatives of which were not present when the canon was voted on.[123] The twenty-eighth canon explicitly stated that the bishop of Constantinople was to ordain the metropolitans of those dioceses, and it also prescribed that the royal city was to have "equal privileges" with Rome.[124] Therefore, Parker was surely correct in declaring that this council marked a significant shift in the balance of power within the church.

Rome vs. Constantinople

This brought Parker to the third of his major themes, *viz*. the struggle for supremacy between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople. In Parker's view, the rise to dominance of the papacy was a *reaction* to the power-seeking by its eastern rival rather than something it instigated itself. Pope Leo I (440-461) reacted strongly to the Council of Chalcedon's twenty-eighth canon (at the adoption of which the Roman delegation had been absent), upbraiding Anatolius for having violated the Nicene Canons, and also writing to the emperor and empress about his presumption in attempting to elevate the see of Constantinople above that of Alexandria and Antioch; Anatolius had "been inflamed with undue desires beyond the measure of his rank."[125] Parker saw this action as laudable and denied that Leo had asserted any authority of his own in the matter; he had only insisted on the observance of the Nicene Canons, which had been approved by the church as a whole.[126] However, despite an initial curbing in the power of Constantinople, its bishops continued to press their authority with the support of the emperors, and Acacius (472-489) succeeded in securing an edict from the emperor restoring to him all the "Rights, Priviledges and Preeminences that any of his Predecessors had ever enjoy'd."[127]

Papal attempts to excommunicate Acacius finally succeeded, but because the latter's successors refused to expunge his name from their rolls, the popes refused them communion for years. They also wrote to the other exarchs in an effort to persuade them to adopt a similar position, and it was here for the first time (according to Parker) that the claims of Petrine supremacy were developed:

> These finding themselves over power'd by the Court of *Constantinople*, leave the Plea of Primacy from the dignity of their City, and the Vote of the Council of *Nice*, and insist upon nothing but the honour of St. *Peter*,

> and the Authority of the Apostolick See, to bear up against the greatness of *Constantinople*, and the favour of the Emperours to their Imperial City; and by the Confidence of this new Plea bore them down, opposing the name of St. *Peter*, to what ever the Emperours enacted.[128]

Moreover, Pope Gelasius (492-496) maintained that the rulings of the Council of Chalcedon or any other ecumenical council were binding only insofar as they were ratified by the pope. This assertion provided a basis for Gelasius to deny the Chalcedonian Canons granting Constantinople special status while simultaneously affirming those pertaining to doctrinal matters. The key assertion here is that the Petrine supremacy was put forward principally as a tactic to thwart the designs of Constantinople.

Over the following century, the bishops of Rome and Constantinople continued to struggle for preeminence in the church. Pope Hormisdas (511-543) gained the upper hand over his rivals by persuading the emperor Justin, when he was newly on the throne and in a weak position, to renounce the long-dead Acacius. However, the tide turned with the accession of the emperor Justinian (527-563) in the east, who ratified the twenty-eighth Chalcedonian Canon by making it imperial law, and also instituted new patriarchates on his own authority.[129] Parker agreed with the Catholic historian Baronius that successive bishops of Constantinople had probably drawn up this legislation. He pointed to Justinian's reign as the origin of the system of patriarchates which persisted for centuries thereafter, although he confessed ignorance as to how Jerusalem had come to be classified as one "all on a suddain."[130] Noticeably absent from this section of the narrative are the denunciations against imperial interference in church affairs which we observed earlier in the relating of Theodosius' reign. As we shall see in the following chapter, Parker considered Justinian the epitome of a Christian prince, and he may have been unwilling to voice any significant degree of criticism when discussing his reign.

During the mid-sixth century, Parker continued, the bishops of Rome had begun mining their records for evidence that their predecessors had exercised the same authority they were then seeking. He briefly surveyed and dismissed all the alleged evidence dating from the time of Damasus (366-384), arguing that these earlier bishops merely had offered advice to other churches or rested their claims on the authority of the Nicene Canons, although he conceded that the language in the bishops' correspondence grew more and more pretentious throughout the fifth century and that attempts had been made to extend papal authority in the province of Illyricum.[131] A great papal victory came during the tenure of Agapetus I (535-536), who succeeded in forcing Justinian to depose a bishop of Constantinople, Anthimus, who held to the Monophysite heresy. Anthimus' successor acknowledged the preeminence of the pope, but the controversy would not die after the empress Theodora took Anthimus' part, and Pope Vigilius was forced to submit to the Second Council of Constantinople (553) after being banished.[132]

Papal authority languished thereafter until the time of Gregory the Great (590-604), who vigorously pressed the claims of Petrine supremacy. In letters to the emperor Mauricius, he protested against the bishop of Constantinople's claiming the title "Universal Bishop," arguing that this honor had always belonged to the papacy, although Gregory's predecessors had been too modest to use it, even when the Council of Chalcedon specifically offered it to them.[133] Although he was unable to persuade

Mauricius to support him, he enjoyed a better relationship with the next emperor, Phocas, who switched his support from the bishop of Constantinople to Gregory's successor, Boniface III, and transferred the title "Universal Bishop" to the latter. Parker regarded this as the decisive moment in the contest between Rome and Constantinople, after which the see of Constantinople was never again recognized as the most prestigious in the church.

Analysis

Several points should be made regarding Parker's history. First, it was a studied attempt in the appearance of objectivity. Parker asked his readers to observe "that I dispute not in a Destructive and Negative way, nor Interest my self in the Quarrel of this or that particular Party. My only Concernment is for real Truth, which I must and will assert against all sorts of Opposition."[134] This declaration was true to the extent that Parker did not make any specific applications of the principles drawn from his "findings" to the circumstances of his own day, despite his numerous and varied criticisms of Presbyterian and Roman Catholic historians. On the surface, at least, his goal was simply to uncover how the church had actually been governed in its early centuries.

However, to any discerning reader, Parker's veneer of objectivity was a transparent cover to his argument for the superiority of the episcopal structure of the Church of England as it existed in the Restoration era. As noted, Parker labeled *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church* as the second part of *The Case of the Church of England* in private correspondence, although this appellation did not appear on the book's title page–in all probability, an intentional omission intended to lend more credence to the pretense of objectivity. Parker claimed that his uncovering of the true history of the church would set him "in the Opposition of all Extreams," for all parties in his day acknowledged the necessity of modeling church government after "the Original Practice of the *Primitive* and *Apostolick Church*."[135] He dropped hints in the book's final pages that his history would be continued in a future volume (which never materialized), and that by the time his account came up to his own day, the full weight of its implications would become apparent to all. These implications, no doubt, would have turned out to be that both Presbyterians and Roman Catholics in England were in error and needed to conform to the state church.

Another point which is extremely important in understanding Parker's view is that no question relating to the church was of more importance in his estimation than that of lawful authority. This is seen quite clearly in his treatment of the ecumenical councils. Parker seemed completely uninterested in the doctrinal controversies which provided the impetus for these gatherings of bishops from all parts of the empire, even as a means of establishing a context for the councils' effects on church government. His book implied that the key dispute at all these meetings concerned the jurisdictions of bishops and metropolitans. Thus we find no discussion even in passing of the Arian controversy as the reason for the Council of Nicaea, nor of the disputes surrounding Origen's teachings as the impetus of the Second Council of Constantinople. Parker did refer briefly to the Monophysite (or "Eutychean") heresy as a reason for the calling of the Council of

Chalcedon, but couched it almost purely as an incident the main significance of which was its impact on structures of church authority. Likewise, his treatment of John Chrysostom's banishment turned entirely on that bishop's abuses of authority, with the role of Origen's teachings in the affair as a mere sidelight or pretext. Granted, Parker's stated focus of his work was the government of the church; however, his imputation of concern for (or disregard of) proper authority as the primary motive for nearly every action taken by churchmen in the period, particularly in the eastern church, was in contradiction to ancient testimony attesting to the overwhelming importance contemporaries attached to correct doctrine and theological formulations. Consider the following statement by Gregory of Nyssa: "If you ask any one in Constantinople for change, he will start discussing with you whether the Son is begotten or unbegotten. If you ask about the quality of bread, you will get the answer: 'The Father is greater, the Son is less.' If you suggest taking a bath you will be told: 'There was nothing before the Son was created.'"[136] Parker's paradigm did not even attempt to assess the impact such a collective mentality could make on the church and its leaders.

Persuading a Prince

This preoccupation with authority was quite evident in another of Parker's neglected works, published posthumously under the title *A Discourse Sent to the Late King James, to Persuade Him to Embrace the Protestant Religion* (1690).[137] As its title indicates, this book originated as a letter in which Parker tried to persuade the duke of York to abandon Roman Catholicism and conform to the Church of England. Apparently, he did not intend for the work to be published, or if he did, he abandoned the idea at some point after its composition; its resuscitation stemmed in part from someone's desire to refute the popular view in the years after 1688 of Parker as a Catholic sympathizer. I have included an analysis of it here both because it was probably written about the same time as *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church*, and because the themes of the two books are nearly identical.

James is addressed as "Your Royal Highness" throughout the book, indicating that it was written before the death of Charles II. The manuscript was delivered to James by way of Sir Leoline Jenkins (1623-1685), who served as Charles' secretary of state from 1680 to 1684. Jenkins' letter of introduction makes clear that Parker was still at Canterbury at that time, and its language implies that Parker was then unknown to the duke. We know that Parker was summoned to London by either Charles or James in early 1684,[138] so this letter's composition must predate that event. Beyond this, it is impossible to pinpoint the time of writing. Parker may have written *A Discourse Sent to the Late King James* during the Succession Crisis (1679-1681), during which time James' Catholicism was the basis of several attempts in Parliament to bar him from the succession. If so, Parker probably used its arguments as the foundation for *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church*. On the other hand, *A Discourse* might have been a condensation of the arguments in the latter work, in which case it could have been written at the same time, or perhaps soon after *An Account*'s publication in 1683.

A Discourse Sent to the Late King James was relatively brief, only thirty-two quarto pages in its published form. In the opening pages, Parker claimed that the most vexing problem facing Anglicans in trying to reach out to Roman Catholics was that some in the Anglican communion, at the same time that they correctly rejected the jurisdiction of the pope, erred in denying the necessity of episcopacy altogether, "so as to make every private Person the only Judg of his own Faith, without any Defence to the direction of his Spiritual Guides and Governors." Catholics believed that the Church of England claimed no independent authority of its own, that "it either resolves all its Authority into the State, or leaves all its Members at their own entire liberty, to choose their Religion as they please, without being accountable to the Church for it."[139] This posed a stumbling block to Catholics, who were correctly persuaded (in Parker's view) of the divine prescription of episcopacy and autonomous church authority.

Parker praised James for the "great Courage and Resolution You have shewn for the Maintenance of Your present Perswasion . . . to Your great Detriment and Disadvantage of Your Affairs in this World." He expressed both regret that some in the state church had pressed James to change his religious allegiance on account of worldly interest, and fear that such a tactic could only reflect poorly on the church. Parker's aim was to resolve James' issue of conscience regarding the Anglican communion without reference to any temporal benefits that would accrue to him if he conformed.[140] In pursuance of this goal, his plan was to "make a faithful Representation of the true State of the Primitive Church, and then compare the present Constitution of the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*; and thereby shew how enormously the Church of *Rome*, notwithstanding all its high Pretences, hath departed from it, and how honestly the Church of *England* endeavors to keep to the original Platform."[141]

Parker's first argument was his old assertion that Christianity assumed the prior power of princes, and that there were of necessity two distinct jurisdictions, the temporal and the spiritual, each with its unique officers and sanctions (positive and negative), in any Christian commonwealth. In a foreshadowing of his position in *Religion and Loyalty*, Parker declared that the civil magistrate had complete sovereignty over the church, but that this power was "purely civil," pertaining only to the affairs of this life. All potential conflicts between church and state could be avoided easily if the governors of each sphere refrained from meddling in the other. If conflict occurred, it was to be resolved by observing the primitive practice of passive submission to the magistrate in all temporal matters. Commands from the magistrate concerning articles of faith or a "Fundamental Rule of Religion" could be disregarded because he had no legitimate authority in these areas. However, if temporal punishment resulted from this disobedience, submission was required.[142] I shall discuss these contentions at more length in my discussion of *Religion and Loyalty* in Chapter Five. Also, in any contest between church and state regarding "a Ritual of Worship, or an emergent Rule of Discipline," the church was to refrain from exercising its authority in the interests of civil peace; here Parker repeated his assessment from *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church* regarding the Act of Submission of the Clergy in Henry VIII's reign.[143] According to these criteria, the Roman Catholic church had been a persistent invader of the prerogative of princes by continually intervening in temporal matters: "It pretends to a [temporal] Power not only equal, but superior to Princes: so that the Popes, as the Vicars of Christ, may not only contend with them by force of Arms, but may in some

Cases depose them from their Thrones; which if truly consider'd, is no less than rank Blasphemy against our blessed Savior, by turning his pure Religion into an Artifice of secular Interest."[144]

Having outlined the proper relationship between church and state, Parker continued with a discussion of the organization of the primitive church, strongly echoing his arguments from *The Case of the Church of England* and *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church*. After affirming the divine prescription of episcopacy without extended discussion, he denied the alleged supremacy of the pope on the basis of several considerations. Although he acknowledged that Jesus had given Peter the power of binding and loosing in Matthew 16, he pointed out (as he had in *The Case of the Church of England*) that this power was also given to the other apostles later in Jesus' ministry. Likewise, the apostles were called the "foundation" of the church in Ephesians and Revelation, just as Peter had been in Matthew 16.[145] Roman Catholics were therefore guilty of twisting scripture in their efforts to portray Peter as the "sovereign Lord of all the other Apostles, and sole Monarch of the Universal Church. This Foundation is too slight for the Weight of so great a Building, and so big a Claim requires somewhat a clearer Evidence of Title."[146]

Even if Peter had been granted "some considerable Precedency," this did not prove that the bishops of Rome were to rule the church, wrote Parker. Peter himself never acted as a monarch over the church in the book of Acts, instead serving as an emissary of the church to Samaria in Acts 8 and deferring to James' leadership at the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15. Furthermore, since Peter, according to church tradition, had planted churches in several cities, including Antioch and Alexandria in addition to Rome, it was logical that the bishops of each of those places had as much right to the title of Peter's successor as the popes did.[147]

Parker alleged that this question of the pope's authority was the only significant barrier preventing a communion between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church; in so doing, he again clearly showed his Henrician Catholic view of the English church. He then asked why, if submission to the pope were such a fundamental article of Christianity, no references or appeals to his overarching authority could be found in the records of the primitive church, given all the controversies that had divided Christians in those days. How was it, he asked, "that yet none of the Apostles or Primitive Doctors of the Christian Church, that labor'd so much against Schisms, Heresies, and Divisions, should ever so much as think of or mention such an effectual nay infallible Remedy against them all?"[148] He then reproduced over several pages a condensed version of his arguments from *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church*, tracing the development of the powers of metropolitans and patriarchs, emphasizing the church's operation within the bounds and on the model of the Roman Empire's political jurisdictions. Again Parker asserted that the patriarch of Constantinople had been the first bishop to lay claim to the title "universal bishop," and that the popes' contrary claims to the same honor were developed in response in the fifth and sixth centuries.

After summarizing his position, Parker concluded that the authority structure of the primitive church and the origins of the pope's claims made it quite clear what English subjects were to do in the 1680s. Each Christian was obligated to join in the visible society of the church, and the most immediate point of contact with the church was the bishop of his or her diocese. It was thus every Christian's duty to join in communion

with the local bishop, "for if our Saviour setled the Government of the Church in the Apostles, and if the Episcopal Order succeeded them in their Office, then hath every Bishop Apostolical Authority. And thus is every Christian Man bound to submit to his Bishop, as to an Apostle."[149] One became part of the universal church by joining the episcopal church and submitting to the bishop, who served as "his ordinary Guide and Governour in the things that concern his Salvation."[150]

Parker then followed his logic through by concluding that English Catholics were guilty of schism because they had forsaken communion with their local bishops in favor of communion with another bishop, the pope, who was far away. This circumvented the authority structure of the primitive church as established by Christ. It also violated apostolic prescription through its disregarding of the system of metropolitans, which, as we have seen, Parker believed to be of first-century origin. Appeal beyond the metropolitan to adjudicate disputes was unnecessary, in Parker's view, because "the Controversies in Christianity, are not so monstrously difficult, but that a competent Number of grave and sober Men, may determine well enough, without calling together all the wise Men in the World."[151] The general councils of the fourth and subsequent centuries were obviously an obstacle to this argument, but Parker sidestepped the problem by noting that the bishops attending these councils had all been subject to the same civil authority, i.e., the Roman Empire. Without this unifying factor, general councils were impracticable due to "the various Interests of Princes" to hinder them. Parker was not opposed in principle to a seventeenth-century general council, but he did not believe one could take place in the contemporary political climate. At any rate, general councils were not necessary, as evidenced by the fact that the primitive church never resorted to one; they were "meetings rather of Grandeur than Necessity."[152]

Thus for Parker the crucial point English Catholics were missing was that Rome's status as a *foreign* church, i.e., one not under the same temporal authority as English subjects, relieved them from any and all obligation to leave the communion of the Church of England in order to fellowship with the pope, the purity of the papal church notwithstanding. He stressed this very strongly to James:

> In this one point I fix the State of this whole Address, and say nothing at present to persuade any Person that lives within the Communion of the Church at *Rome*, to forsake that; my only Concernment is with the Members of the Church of *England*, to keep them to their own Church, according to the Rule from the Beginning. . . . The Communion of the *Catholick Church* [did not] consist in an Union of all Churches, under one Head, but in brotherly Love and Correspondence with one another: and for that the Church of *England* is ready to offer it to the Church of *Rome*, or any other, upon the old Condition, that they will give her leave to admonish them of their Faults and Miscarriages, as Churches did one another of old.[153]

Only the pope's insistence on all Christendom's absolute submission to him stood in the way of this fellowship, according to Parker. Both history and the very nature of Christianity stood against this demand:

> For upon that Supposition, that Christianity makes no Abatement as to the civil Rights of Men, especially of Princes; provincial Churches cannot be justly extended beyond the Dominion of the State; because in that case if Metropolitans or Patriarchs have Power to call their Subject-Bishops to Councils, the King's Subjects may be summoned out of his Dominions without his leave, which is not only to diminish, but to destroy his Power over his own Subjects; for when they are out of his Dominions they are none of his. So that the very State of Christianity naturally implies . . . the Conformity of the Church to the State in its bounds of Jurisdiction.[154]

Parker claimed that the Church of England would not object to acknowledging the pope's patriarchal status and communing with him on that basis, with the understanding that the patriarchate was of human institution (i.e. extra-biblical and post-apostolical in origin) and largely an honorary position: "Whatever Power the Bishop of *Rome* can challenge by virtue of his Patriarchal Dignity, is of an humane Original, and so not necessary to the Constitution of a Christian Church."[155] However, the pope's insistence on the title of "universal bishop" and on "absolute Dominion" could not but scuttle any attempt at reconciliation.

On the book's final page, Parker referred only in passing to another of the pope's alleged abuses: claiming a measure of temporal power over princes. Given Parker's assumptions about the nature of Christian authority, this claim was even more blasphemous and rebellious than the claim to temporal authority over subjects. However, he decided to waive discussion of this issue, noting that "Your Highness is here a Party, and it concerns Your worldly Interest more nearly than Your Conscience, to which alone I have made bold to make this Address."[156] Obviously, Parker's letter contained a certain amount of posturing, but it does appear that he was making a sincere attempt to persuade James of the rightness of the state church's position without relying on the duke's material interest.

A Discourse Sent to the Late King James is a prime example of how Parker sought to use history as an apologetic tool on behalf of the "High Church" wing of the Church of England. What was only implied behind a veneer of neutrality in *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church* became quite explicit in this work, *viz*. that English subjects in the 1680s were to reject nonconformity (whether Protestant or Catholic) because of its dubious origins and because of the Church of England's faithfulness to the model, particularly the authority structure, of the primitive church. This historiographical strategy also formed the core of Parker's subsequent works, *Religion and Loyalty* and *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*, despite the differences in theme. In this instance, the attempt to persuade James failed, but in all likelihood the effort was not a complete waste of Parker's energy. The book's publisher claimed in the introduction that Parker's apologetic was "so very seasonable and honest, that the D___ Himself was forc'd to acknowledge as much, and afterwards thank'd the Dr. for it."[157] It is very probable that this address was one factor in bringing Parker to the attention of the royal court in the early 1680s, leading to his eventual promotions after 1684.

Conclusion

Parker's works of the early 1680s clearly show a maturing of his theories of authority and the respective spheres overseen by church and state. This fact has been overlooked by scholars, who focus almost exclusively on his polemical literature of the late 1660s and early 1670s. An examination of *The Case of the Church of England,* along with *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion,* proves conclusively that Parker was not a Hobbesian. His hostility towards Hobbes' presuppositions and theoretical constructs was real and virtually insurmountable. By siding with Richard Cumberland on the issue of natural law, he reaffirmed his commitment to empiricism tempered by divine revelation in opposition to the Hobbesian framework.

The Case of the Church of England and *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church,* together with *A Discourse Sent to the Late King James,* show that Parker rejected the Erastianism of his earlier works in favor of a paradigm which included a distinct area of autonomy for the church, within which it answered to none but God. His vehement condemnations of the Erastian conception of the church on multiple occasions in these works highlight this conclusion. The church's autonomy was founded by a direct commission from Christ and continued by apostolic succession; its exercise lay in the purely spiritual rewards and punishments it could mete out. By staking out an autonomous authority for the church, Parker was able with a modicum of credibility to portray himself as a moderate who avoided the extremes of popery, Erastianism, and Independency. He also displayed the continuing preoccupation with issues of authority that characterized his writings throughout his career.

Another common theme in these works is Parker's increasing ability to utilize interpretations of the past as a polemical tool. This feature of his writing had been present since the 1660s, but by the 1680s he was approaching and using it in a more systematic manner. The past became a weapon to be wielded against contemporary enemies or episcopacy and royal absolutism. The following chapter examines the works in which Parker's historical polemic reached its full flower.

---

[1] Gordon Schochet, almost alone among modern scholars, has taken some account of these works. See Gordon Schochet, "Samuel Parker, Religious Diversity, and the Ideology of Persecution," in Roger D. Lund, ed., *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 119, 128; Gordon Schochet, "Between Lambeth and Leviathan: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and Political Order," in Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 203-204.

[2] Arber, 1:426.

[3] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 170r.

[4] For more information on Stillingfleet, see *DNB, s.v.*

[5] Edward Stillingfleet, *Irenicum* (London, 1660), 1.

[6] *CCE*, 2.

[7] Ibid., 5.

[8] Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 254-55.

[9] *CCE*, 7-8.

[10] Ibid., 10-11.

[11] For some recent treatments of atheism (real and reputed) in the late seventeenth century, see David Berman, *A History of Atheism in Britain: From Hobbes to Russell* (London: Croom Helm, 1988), 48-67; Christopher Hill, "Freethinking and Libertinism: The Legacy of the English Revolution," in Roger D. Lund, ed., *The Margins of Orthodoxy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 54-67; Michael Hunter, "'Aikenhead the Atheist': The Context and Consequences of Articulate Irreligion in the Late Seventeenth Century," in Michael Hunter and David Wootton, eds., *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 221-54; and Roger D. Lund, "Guilt by Association: The Atheist Cabal and the Rise of the Public Sphere in Augustan England," *Albion* 34 (2002): 391-421.

[12] *CCE*, 12.

[13] Ibid., 15.

[14] Ibid., 17.

[15] Ibid., 20.

[16] Ibid., 23.

[17] Ibid., 23-25.

[18] Ibid., 26-27.

[19] *DDALN*, iii.

[20] Parkin, 126.

[21] *DDALN*, ix.

[22] Parkin, 88.

[23] *DDALN*, 84-88.

[24] Ibid., 211.

[25] For more information on Selden, see *DNB, s.v.*; *BDBR, s.v.*; Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 205-221; and David Berkowitz, *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1988).

[26] John Selden, *De Anno Civili et Calendario Veteris Ecclesiae* (London: 1644), i-xiv. The argument is summarized by Parker in English in *CCE*, 30-34.

[27] *CCE*, 30.

[28] Ibid., 34.

[29] Ibid., 35-36.

[30] Ibid., 36.

[31] Ibid., 36-37.

[32] Ibid., 42.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., 54.

[35] Ibid., 57.

[36] Ibid., 58-59. Parker mistakenly treats the untranslated word *Maranatha* (translated "O Lord, come!" in the New King James Version) in 1 Cor. 16:22 as part of the curse on those who do not love Jesus. He also displays inconsistency by arguing that this curse excommunicated *all* non-Christians, not just apostates; how those who had never been part of the church could be cast out of it, Parker did not explain. These points do not affect his larger argument against Selden but should be noted.

[37] 1 Corinthians 5:1-5 (New King James Version).

[38] *CCE*, 72-74.

[39] Ibid., 78.

[40] Ibid., 89.

[41] Ibid., 92.

[42] Parker later expanded on this idea, which formed the foundation of his two volumes on non-resistance to civil authority, *Religion and Loyalty* and *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*. These two works are examined in the next chapter.

[43] *CCE*, 98.

[44] Ibid., 104.

[45] Wood, 4:231.

[46] *CCE*, 28-29.

[47] Ibid., 117.

[48] Ibid., 120-21.

[49] *DEP*, i, x.

[50] *CCE*, 119.

[51] Ibid., 123.

[52] "The Twelve" refers to the apostles, while "the Seventy" refers to the group Jesus sent into the cities of Judea to preach and heal (Luke 10).

[53] *CCE*, 124.

[54] Ibid., 127.

[55] Ibid., 129-30.

[56] Ibid., 138-39.

[57] Ibid., 142-43.

[58] Ibid., 144.

[59] Ibid., 144, 147.

[60] Ibid., 148-50.

[61] *ANF*, 1:50.

[62] Ibid., 1:47.

[63] *NPNF*, 14:594.

[64] *CCE*, 178, 181-82.

[65] Ibid., 191.

[66] Ibid., 196.

[67] *NPNF*, 6:288.

[68] *CCE*, 220.

[69] Ibid., 223.

[70] Ibid., 224.

[71] Ibid., 227.

[72] Ibid., 243.

[73] Stillingfleet, 1.

[74] *CCE*, 246.

[75] Ibid., 251.

[76] Ibid., 252.

[77] Ibid., 257.

[78] Ibid., 258.

[79] Ibid., 267.

[80] Arber, 2:11.

[81] Richard Baxter, *A Treatise of Episcopacy* (London: 1681), 5-9.

[82] Ibid., 112.

[83] *AGCC*, 107.

[84] Ibid., 10.

[85] Ibid., 23.

[86] Ibid., 50-53.

[87] Ibid., 64-65. It should be noted that the passage from 1 Clement does not distinguish between bishops and presbyters, despite its having been written after the apostolic era, although it does allude to the Old Testament orders of high priest, priest and Levite, which episcopal advocates claimed were analogous to the church's bishop, presbyter, and deacon.

[88] Ibid., 67.

[89] Ibid., 91-93.

[90] Ibid., 100.

[91] Ibid., 98-99.

[92] Ibid., 112.

[93] Ibid., 127.

[94] For examples of the former see 1 Cor 1:2 and 1 Thess. 1:1; for the latter, see Gal. 1:2 and Rev. 1:11.

[95] *AGCC*, 134.

[96] *NPNF*, 14:594.

[97] *AGCC*, 145-60.

[98] Ibid., 163.

[99] Ibid., 168.

[100] *ANF*, 5:565-72.

[101] *AGCC*, 186.

[102] *NPNF*, 14:15; *AGCC*, 93-94.

[103] *AGCC*, 205.

[104] Ibid., 212.

[105] Ibid., 225.

[106] *NPNF*, 14:176.

[107] *AGCC*, 230.

[108] *NPNF*, 14:112, 114.

[109] Ibid., 14:416-17, 419.

[110] *AGCC*, 241.

[111] Ibid., 243.

[112] *NPNF*, 14:176-78.

[113] *AGCC*, 255.

[114] *NPNF*, 2:381-82.

[115] *AGCC*, 256-57.

[116] Ibid., 273.

[117] *NPNF*, 2:407-10.

[118] Ibid., 14:176-77.

[119] *AGCC*, 275.

[120] *NPNF*, 2:168-69.

[121] *AGCC*, 286-89.

[122] *NPNF*, 14:274, 280.

[123] *AGCC*, 292-94.

[124] *NPNF*, 14:287.

[125] Ibid., 12:76-77.

[126] *AGCC*, 300.

[127] Ibid., 301.

[128] Ibid., 306-7.

[129] Ibid., 318.

[130] Ibid., 321.

[131] Ibid., 327.

[132] Ibid., 335.

[133] *NPNF*, 12:169-71. This claim of the Council of Chalcedon offering the pope the title "Universal Bishop" is apparently a fabrication.

[134] *AGCC*, 357.

[135] Ibid., 358.

[136] Quoted in Tim Dowley, ed., *Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of Christianity* (Tring, Hertfordshire, England: Lion Publishing, 1977), 168.

[137] The book was licensed for publication in November 1690 (Arber 2:330).

[138] See Chapter One for details.

[139] *DKJ*, 3-4.

[140] Ibid., 5.

[141] Ibid., 4.

[142] Ibid., 6-8.

[143] Ibid., 9.

[144] Ibid., 8.

[145] Ibid., 10.

[146] Ibid.

[147] Ibid., 11-12.

[148] Ibid., 12.

[149] Ibid., 24.

[150] Ibid., 25.

[151] Ibid., 25-26.

[152] Ibid., 26.

[153] Ibid., 27.

[154] Ibid., 28.

[155] Ibid., 30.

[156] Ibid., 32.

[157] Ibid., sig. *A*1.

CHAPTER FIVE
ABSOLUTISM AND PASSIVE OBEDIENCE: HISTORY AS POLEMIC II

Having defended the episcopal structure of the Church of England in *The Case of the Church of England* and *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church,* Parker focused his next two published works on different but related topics: church-state relations and nonresistance to established civil authority. This chapter examines *Religion and Loyalty* (1684) and *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part* (1685), lengthy works which have attracted virtually no attention from historians. Together, they complete the fleshing out of Parker's view of the proper relationship between church and state and their separate legitimate spheres of authority. A thorough examination of these works reinforces the view that authority was the single most important issue to Parker, and that his concept of authority provided his chief argument against both Protestant nonconformists and Roman Catholics. This chapter also examines Parker's posthumous *History of His Own Times* and concludes that there are vital connections between the ways Parker approached ancient history and contemporary events.

The Case for Passive Obedience

Religion and Loyalty was one of Parker's lengthiest works at 608 octavo pages; it was licensed for publication in November 1683.[1] The occasion of its publication was the surge in public support for the monarchy–often called the "Tory Reaction"–which reached its peak after the failure of the Rye House Plot (a conspiracy to assassinate the king and his brother in the spring of 1683) and the abortive discussions of the Duke of Monmouth (Charles II's illegitimate son) and his allies to mount an insurrection to compel Charles to exclude James, duke of York, from the succession. Parker, conflating the two events, referred to this "late Barbarous Conspiracy" in the work's dedicatory epistle, addressed to Charles II.[2] Capitalizing on the wave of support for the monarchy, Parker presented his thesis in bold terms:

> Treasonable and Rebellious Attempts against all Sovereign Powers whatsoever [are] the rankest contradiction to . . . Christian Faith, and the boldest Blasphemy against [the] Sovereign Lord. So that though Your Majesty were as much an Enemy as You are a Patron and Protector of the Church, whoever shall at any time, or upon any pretence, offer any Resistance to any of Your Royal Commands, must forever renounce his

> Saviour, the four Evangelists, and the Twelve Apostles, . . . and turn a Judas to his Saviour, as well as a Cromwel to his Prince.[3]

He intended to demonstrate the necessity of nonresistance both from scripture and from the example of the early church.[4] *Religion and Loyalty* surveyed the period from the apostolic era to the reign of Julian the Apostate, but Parker announced his willingness to issue further volumes covering the remainder of the church's first millennium.

He began his argument by positing that religion existed for two purposes: to advance peace and welfare among humans on earth, and to ensure their safe conduct to heaven. Whereas the duty of the civil magistrate was to "provide for the settlement and preservation of the Publick Peace," Christianity prescribed obedience to the magistrate in the temporal sphere in order to achieve their mutual goal. On the other hand, a separate order of religious officers–the clergy, who are "void of all Secular Power"–existed to care for the souls of Christians. Although the civil magistrate and clergy properly operated in separate spheres, history recorded numerous examples of conflict between them; Parker attributed this to each side's repeated attempts at self-aggrandizement in violation of the divinely-imposed limits on its authority.

Again, as in *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church*, Parker presented himself as an impartial observer able to avoid the dangers exhibited by the zealots of either party, i.e. the papists and Hobbists: "I know my self to undertake [the question] without being engaged by any prejudice, or biassed by any Interest, or hired by any Reward then purely the discharge of a good Conscience."[5] He thus claimed to be qualified to make pronouncements concerning the proper scope of church and state authority, and promised to do so in such a way that both sides could not help but be satisfied:

> To assign an inherent and independent Power in the Church, distinct from that of the State, and immediately derived, not from the Prince, but our Saviour, and that I am sure is as much as the highest claims to Ecclesiastical Power can, with any modesty, or without rank dishonesty challenge. But then this being granted, I shall demonstrate, That there is as full and unabated Supremacy in Sovereign Powers over all manner of Ecclesiastical Authority, as if it had been entirely derived from their own special Grant and Commission: And that certainly is as high a Prerogative as any Prince can care to demand, to have a Sovereign Power over all the Powers within his own Dominions.[6]

Parker referred the reader to *The Case of the Church of England* for his proof of the divine authority of the church and announced that he would henceforth focus on the rights of the prince. His task was to reconcile these apparently contradictory claims of ecclesiastical autonomy and the civil magistrate's authority over the church.

Parker's argument from scripture was reminiscent of what he had written fifteen years earlier in the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie, viz.* that Christianity assumes the power of earthly rulers and in no way challenges them in temporal affairs. Basing his position in large part upon John 18:36, where Jesus told Pontius Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," Parker asserted that the "Fundamental Article" of Christianity was that

"neither himself [Christ], nor any of those that he has deputed for the Government of it, challenge any Temporal Power to themselves, or any exemption from the Authority of those that have it."[7] He cited instances from the Gospels where Jesus withdrew from or rebuked those who wanted to make him a king on earth, as well as the incident in Matthew 26:53, where Jesus rebuked Simon Peter for using force in his defense against lawful authorities. These passages clearly implied to Parker that the church was never intended to exercise physical force in its affairs.

He also dwelt at some length on the Gospel accounts where Jesus dealt with the question of taxes, particularly Matthew 17:24-27 and Matthew 22:15-22. In the former passage, Jesus claimed exemption from the "two-drachma tax" by virtue of his status as "the son of the king," but paid it anyway to avoid giving offense, producing the money in a miraculous fashion. Parker argued that this was a religious tax used for temple repairs, and that Jesus was not claiming exemption from Roman (secular) taxes. The latter passage contains the well-known command, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," which Jesus uttered in response to a question about the legitimacy of paying taxes to Rome. Parker drew from these verses the principle that Christians should not only pay taxes the state required of them, but also refuse to offer any kind of resistance to a sovereign's command, regardless of his character: "When our Saviour is askt his Opinion concerning submission to so brutal a Prince [Tiberius Caesar], he has no regard to his Personal Qualifications, but to the Rights of Sovereignty: Whatever the Man is, it is enough that he is your Prince, and after that there is no room left to resist his Impositions."[8] Parker qualified this submission a few pages later, writing that it was required to all the magistrate's commands "that were not inconsistent with the Law of God," thus repeating the formulation from the *Discourse* that there were sometimes grounds for disobedience.[9] However, he believed that active resistance to the sovereign on account of religious principles was never justified, for it involved some claim of temporal authority: "And the truth of it is, if he [Christ] had laid claim to any such Power, his Religion had stood upon no better Foundation than that of *Mahomet*, that was at first planted and propagated, and has hitherto been maintain'd by nothing but the power of the Sword."[10]

If the church and its leaders were forbidden from laying claim to temporal authority, then the pope had no right to depose sovereign princes and absolve their subjects from their allegiance, as Parker was quick to point out. In his view, this assertion of authority was tantamount to renouncing the Christian faith, and the Roman church stood condemned for overstepping its proper bounds. The charge of apostasy also rested "upon every Church that maintains a right of resistance to Soveraign Powers upon a pretence of Christian Religion," a not-so-veiled reference to the Presbyterians and assorted other nonconformists.[11] (It should be noted that Parker did not attempt to engage the Calvinist doctrine of resistance by the "lesser magistrates" here.)

Parker repeated his assertion from the toleration controversy that the prince's authority was antecedent to Christ's coming and remained unaffected by it. In language echoing the claims that had so irked John Owen, he declared, "Sovereign Princes cannot be properly said to be vested with any power under our Saviour as such. . . . They are and ever were [supreme governors] under God, but so as to be *superiour* to Christ, as Christ is Head of his Church within their Dominions."[12] On the face of it, this seems to be a clear contradiction of Parker's argument in *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical*

Politie, in which he acknowledged that earthly princes owe their authority entirely to Christ's "Soveraign will and pleasure."[13] Parker was speaking solely of temporal authority here and viewing Christ strictly in his earthly incarnation, when he subjected himself to established authority. In that sense, Christ allowed the earthly powers to be superior to him while he was on earth. Still, the claim was bold and could be easily interpreted as Erastian when viewed apart from Parker's defense of church autonomy.

Perhaps in an effort to stave off such criticism from those who had not read *The Case of the Church of England*, he began his next section with the assertion: "But . . . it must be granted too, that the Power of Princes, how great soever in Church matters, supposes the Spiritual Authority of the Church. . . . So that it is undeniably evident from its original Constitution, that the Church subsists no more upon the State as to its proper Power, then the State upon the Church."[14] Although the prince had "an Imperial Supremacy" over all clergy and all religious disputes, it was "no Ecclesiastical, but a Civil Supremacy." Here, as in his previous works, Parker took the opportunity to distinguish his position from that of Thomas Hobbes and to portray his own view as the most moderate and reasonable one, free from the dangers of both popery and Hobbism:

> So far is the King's Supremacy, as it is stated in the Church of *England*, from entrenching upon the proper Power of the Church, as the *Romanists* cavil, that it only protects it in the due exercise of its Jurisdiction: And so far is the proper power of the Church from disclaiming or abating any thing of the King's Supremacy, as the other Factions clamour, that it first Establishes that upon the most lasting Foundations of Divine Institution, before it makes any claim to its own Power, and when it does, it does upon no other Terms then of entire submission to its Supreme Authority.[15]

In other words, each institution strengthens the other; the prince levies temporal punishments on those who attack the church (or abuse its authority), and the church instills in the populace a sense of proper submission to the prince.

Parker anticipated the objection that nothing remained to the church if the prince had absolute temporal supremacy, and he outlined several areas which he considered the exclusive domain of the church. This was new ground for Parker, for although he had written at length on the autonomous authority of the church in *The Case of the Church of England*, the only areas he had treated were the right of excommunication and the divine requirement of episcopacy. Here he expanded the spiritual domain to include other functions, all of which, he maintained, issued from Christ by direct commission to the apostles and their successors without any sanction from the civil government.

These powers included preaching and teaching the Gospel to all nations and requiring obedience to its commands "under the sanction of the greatest Rewards and Penalties."[16] The fact that these spiritual rewards and punishments were not immediate or visible did not lessen their magnitude in Parker's eyes. The church also possessed the power to admit individuals into God's kingdom by baptizing them (or to bar them from the kingdom by refusing to baptize them), which was of such importance that Parker wrote of it, "If there be any such thing as Power in the World, there cannot be a greater then this."[17] Along with this authority went the power of excommunication, which Parker claimed was the most effective tool the primitive church had to maintain

discipline. The church also possessed the powers of ordination and administering the Eucharist, although he did not devote much space to these.

The purpose of this discussion was to refute Chapter Forty-Two of Hobbes' *Leviathan*, which made a radical distinction between the nature of the foregoing powers in the periods before and after the conversion of the sovereign prince to Christianity in any kingdom. Hobbes had argued, for example, that excommunication was of no real effect without the imposition of temporal penalties by the civil magistrate.[18] He also had claimed that the apostles and their successors had no valid authority to command obedience to the Gospel because they lacked temporal power, and that the power of ordination properly belonged to the prince.[19] Parker saw these assertions as evidence of rank atheism: "The plain *English* of the Assertion, if spoken out, is this, that there are no penalties at all but in this life, and [if this is true] I must confess, that the power of the Church can be no Power till complicated [tangled, folded together] with the Civil Power. But the man that discourses upon such Principles as these, has nothing to do with the Christian Religion, or any thing relating to it."[20]

Parker acknowledged that the sovereign had the lawful power under his grant of civil authority to determine "what Doctrines are fit for Peace" and could therefore be taught without danger of causing social unrest. Again, this seems an unavoidable contradiction of his assertion that preaching lay entirely within the purview of the church, but Parker did not see it as such; indeed, he viewed the issue as not requiring any elaboration at all, passing over it without so much as an aside. The best explanation for this is that because Parker viewed Christian teaching as always commanding submission to the civil magistrate, he thought a sensible sovereign would never have reason to forbid the preaching of Christianity in his domain; in fact, he went so far as to say that Christian teaching "makes the Power of Christian Sovereigns more absolute then all other Powers that are not Christian, and even to these it raises their Soveraignty higher then it was before, over all their Christian Subjects, by binding them to a stricter Allegiance then their own Laws."[21] Any teaching actually destructive to civil peace would, by definition, not be Christian, and therefore it would not be an infringement of the church's prerogative for the sovereign to forbid its propagation. The only time the forbidding of true Christian teaching could be a problem would be during the reign of a deranged or evil ruler. Parker did not explicitly say so, but his condemnation elsewhere of Hobbes' statement that the Great Commission presupposed the legality of Christian preaching suggests that he believed this situation would warrant disobedience to the magistrate's commands, following the example of the apostles Peter and John, who replied, "We must obey God rather than men," when commanded by the Sanhedrin not to preach in Jesus' name in Acts 5.

However, Parker's point in this section of *Religion and Loyalty* was to demonstrate that Hobbesian teaching was by its nature anti-Christian because it "apparently takes away all Authority from our Saviour" by vesting all ecclesiastical authority in the sovereign. By 1684 this must have been a very familiar argument to those who had read Parker's other works. He nevertheless expressed confidence that no prince professing Christianity would be so impudent as to claim the authority Hobbes imputed to all sovereigns, for to do so would be equivalent to "Renouncing his Saviour" and engaging in "open Rebellion against the Soveraignty of God himself."[22] For the archdeacon, the invasion of the church's proper sphere by the civil magistrate was little

more than a hypothetical possibility which rarely if ever occurred in the real world, Hobbes' theories notwithstanding.

In Parker's mind, the more realistic danger came from attempts to subvert the civil government's authority by those claiming to represent the church. He acknowledged that there had been occasions when the commands of the prince and the church conflicted, and sincere Christians had been forced to hazard either their lives or their immortal souls, depending on whose directives they disobeyed. According to him, this problem could be almost entirely circumvented by a correct understanding of what he called "the Doctrine of the Cross," based on Christ's statement in Matthew 10:38: "He who does not take his cross and follow after Me is not worthy of Me." Parker interpreted this passage as meaning that the Christian should expect nothing but suffering in this life and should not resist it when it comes.

Applying this idea in the case of persecution by the authorities, Parker declared that the proper response of Christians was to imitate Christ by meekly submitting to whatever punishment the magistrate saw fit to impose, to "resign up their Lives to the pleasure of the Government," all the while professing their faith and their innocence: "Here is no disputing the Commands of Princes, whether right or wrong, nothing but absolute submission to their most unjust and illegal Proceedings, much less any opposition to their most unwarrantable Commands, nor any weapon of defence but laying down their Lives after their great Masters Example in submission to the Government."[23] He asserted that suffering for one's faith was something to be embraced because it brought eternal rewards in heaven, "and that is compensation enough for all that he can suffer in this world." Parker believed that no one who rejected this "Doctrine of the Cross" could properly be considered a Christian.[24]

According to Parker, acceptance of this doctrine resolved any apparent tension between the authority of the church and the state, allowing both to enjoy their full prerogative. Submission to the state in all things temporal contributed to "the Peace and Quiet of this World" and would inevitably persuade non-Christian authorities that Christianity was no threat to their power. Parker claimed that the primitive church exemplified the stance he recommended, and that its early evangelism proceeded "without creating any the least disturbance" to the civil authorities. Parker would no doubt have attributed responsibility for incidents like the Ephesian riot in Acts 19 to the wickedness of the pagan inhabitants who responded to peaceful Christian proselytizing with violence.

In addition to the "Doctrine of the Cross," Parker supported his theory of non-resistance with other passages from the New Testament. As in *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*, he relied heavily on Romans 13 and 1 Peter 2, arguing that these chapters would remove all doubt from any sincere Christian's mind that active resistance to established authority was sinful. Here he criticized two Presbyterian works, *Lex, Rex: The Law and the Prince* (1644) by Samuel Rutherford (ca. 1600-1661), and *A Holy Commonwealth* (1659) by Richard Baxter. *Lex, Rex* defended the Scottish revolt of the late 1630s and was generally acknowledged to be one of the era's most influential works in favor of limited government and the right of resistance. Its author was a staunch Presbyterian who had served as one of the Scottish commissioners to the Westminster Assembly. He died of an illness shortly after the Restoration and before the victorious royalists could try him for treason, but not before

Lex, Rex was publicly burnt at the cross of Edinburgh and in St. Andrews, where he had been a professor at the university.[25] Baxter, of course, had drawn Parker's fire in the 1670s, and *A Holy Commonwealth*'s defense of resistance against sovereigns who overstepped their proper bounds was sure to attract his criticism as well. Ironically, Baxter had repudiated the work in 1670; Parker was either unaware of this fact or had decided that the book was still dangerous enough to require a rebuttal. It was an easy target in the contemporary political climate, having been part of a large book-burning in 1683.[26]

Rutherford had postulated that God would never assist the wickedness of tyrants, that such rulers necessarily went beyond their divine mandate. Hence a distinction had to be made between the sovereign's person and his office in the abstract; whereas the latter had to be respected, the former could be resisted if he had ceased to be a lawful power through his actions. Parker ruled this formulation ridiculous: "But to what Purpose is it for God to make Laws, if Men may evacuate their force by such Metaphysical Nothings? For how can we submit to the Office of a King, but by submitting to the King himself? . . . Seeing [the Abstract] cannot subsist without the *Concrete*, he that commands to submit to the Office, commands us to submit to the Man in whom it is, or he commands us nothing."[27] Parker considered it "prophane trifling" with scripture to attempt to evade its clear prescription in this manner. He claimed that people like Rutherford should "either . . . lay aside their Metaphysicks or their Religion, because such niceness and subtilty makes it a thing of no Use in the practice of the World."[28] Such enthusiasts treated God as they did their prince, obeying in the abstract and rebelling against Him in reality, submitting to scripture only when it pleased them.

Moreover, Parker warned that Rutherford's reasoning rested on a very dubious principle: "It leaves it to those who are commanded absolute submission, to judge when submission is fit, and when not."[29] This was a reiteration of the argument he had made during the toleration controversy over a decade earlier; if subjects could determine for themselves under what circumstances they were to obey, then in reality they were not bound at all. If this were true, "St. *Paul* would deserve to be laughed at, for being so serious in enforcing a Law that can never bind, whilst he commands Subjection or Non-resistance to higher Powers, when the Subjects after that, have full Power in themselves to determine to what higher Powers they will or will not resist. Such Non-sence lies at the bottom of all Rebellion."[30]

Parker also believed that because human governments were by nature imperfect and errors in administration were inevitable, any sort of civil government would be impossible if the prince ceased to be the prince whenever he acted contrary to "Law." Finally, he rejected entirely the concept of a federal structure or checks and balances between the state and the people; "it takes away the very Being both of Government and Subjection."[31] In his mind there had to be a single sovereign entity acting as the ultimate legislator and judge for all temporal matters in the interests of civil peace. This was one foundational aspect of Parker's thinking which had not changed since the 1660s. Efforts to work out a theory of social contract or "Reciprocal Superiority" unfailingly met with his condemnation. He brushed aside Rutherford's contention that if it were truly unlawful to resist kings in any temporal matter without distinguishing their personal and kingly roles, then Bathsheba could not have (if she had chosen to) physically resisted David's attempt to commit adultery with her, for David could have said to her, "*Because*

I am the Lords Anoynted, it is rebellious in thee a subject to oppose any bodily violence to my act of forcing of thee, it is unlawfull to thee to cry for helpe, for if any shall offer violently to rescue thee from me, he resisteth the ordinance of God."[32] Parker refused to take the bait of this *reductio ad absurdum* argument, simply stating that it was a foolish contention which must have had the purpose of profaning the scripture, "for how else could it ever have come into any Man's head to parallel Rebellious Resistance to the Commands of Sovereign Power, with not yielding to a Rape?"[33]

He then turned to Baxter's *A Holy Commonwealth*, which he considered even more impudent in its championing of the parliamentarian cause of the 1640s. Baxter had claimed that it was incumbent upon the people to defend Parliament "when unjust and unchast Kings would commit Rapes" upon them.[34] Like Rutherford, he held that there was a sort of resistance "not contrary to subjection" which was legitimate and in some cases mandatory. Thesis 340 of his book asserted that a subject who resisted commands which went beyond the limits of the prince's lawful authority was only resisting the will of "private Man," not a God-ordained power.[35] After declaring that this belief could make one a rebel and loyal subject simultaneously, Parker pointed out the similarity of this argument to Rutherford's and claimed that both authors suffered from a "wilful blindness" in that "they cannot see the middle way of subjection that lies between Obedience and Resistance; for when I cannot Obey, I can and ought to Submit, but Resist I cannot without Rebellion."[36] He found Baxter's answer to his position quite dubious; the Puritan had claimed "*the first and chiefest act of Resistance*" was non-obedience, and if that step were justified, active resistance had to be as well.[37] Parker marveled at his opponent's ability "to make no difference between meer Non-obedience and cutting of Throats."[38]

Baxter had gone on in his 352nd thesis to declare that if a nation were to wrong its king, the latter had no recourse to violent action to recover his prerogative; such action would be detrimental to the common good, of which the nation's representatives (i.e., Parliament) were the only competent judge. "It is more injustice to seek the destruction of the common good, for a real injury to a single person, then it was in them to do that injury."[39] The people must always support their representatives unless the latter notoriously and flagrantly betray their trust: "The people must alwayes take part with the Parliament, though they do the wrong, because it is they that are their Trustees and Representatives, and so Kings must ever be at their mercy."[40] In fact, the king's only legitimate course if he could not bear the impositions placed on him by the nation's representatives was to surrender his crown: "When any Man's possession of the Crown does cease to be a means to the Publick Good, and this without the Peoples injury; it is then his Duty to resign it, and no injury to be deprived of it: for the means is no means, when it is against the End."[41] Parker saw clearly that the foundation of Baxter's defense of the parliamentarian cause was the assertion that Parliament, not the king, was the sovereign power in England. It was on this basis that Baxter had claimed that the commands of Romans 13 required him to side with Parliament in the 1640s, and that if he found himself in similar circumstances again, his response would be the same.

Parker declared that Baxter's assertion of Parliament's sovereignty was "a contradiction to the fundamental Constitution of the *English* Government, to all the known Laws of the Kingdom, [and] to . . . many reiterated Acts and Declarations of Parliaments."[42] The fact of the king's sovereignty was "so easily and vulgarly known,

that to search it out requires no deep inspection." As proof, Parker cited the Oath of Supremacy, which contained the clause, "That the King's Highness is the only Supreme Governour of this Realm." He rebutted Baxter's claim that the title "Supreme Governor" could be honorary, with others sharing the power implied by it, with the statement that the Oath's inclusion of the word "only" removed beyond any doubt where sovereignty lay. According to Parker, anyone who took the Oath and later claimed that Parliament was sovereign committed perjury.

His discussion of Romans 13 concluded, Parker also cited 2 Peter 2:13-25 as part of his case for nonresistance, as he had in the 1670s. Rutherford had claimed that this passage had been abused by royalists and that it did not prohibit active resistance; rather, "Patient suffering of wicked men, and violent resisting are not incompatible."[43] He believed that the purpose of Peter's admonition to submissiveness was a narrow one, forbidding only "revengefull resisting of repaying one wrong with another."[44] Resistance against tyrants was another matter altogether. Parker distorted this position somewhat, rendering it thus: "A Man may Resist in his own defence, but if he have the ill-fortune to be overcome, he must then suffer patiently." His characterization of Rutherford's claim was understandable, given the examples the latter employed, such as David's suffering patiently while he was pursued by his rebellious son Absalom in 2 Samuel 15. Of course, David retaliated as soon as he was strong enough, overthrowing his son and reclaiming the throne. Parker thought it was self-evident that this was not the kind of situation to which Paul was referring when he commanded submission: "If this be all that is injoin'd by the Apostle, it is nothing at all, for when we are commanded to suffer patiently, or not to resist, only when we cannot help our selves; it is a very needless command, because so we must do, whether we will or no, and Patience *per force* is no Patience at all." Rutherford's paradigm was "more suited to the Philosophy of a Horse, then the Religion of a Man."[45]

At this point Parker rested his case from scripture and proceeded to construct a parallel argument for non-resistance based on natural law. The essence of this second line of reasoning was that the legitimation of resistance would lead inevitably to a state of war in which every person's security and property would be endangered. Here, more than anywhere else in his writings, Parker came extremely close to adopting a Hobbesian position. He asserted that only the fear of lawful authority prevented society from degenerating into "Anarchy and Confusion," and that any rationale for resistance would be seized upon and alleged to apply in so many circumstances as to provide a ready pretext for any would-be rebels. The result would be civil war, the results of which were invariably worse than even the worst sort of tyranny. Parker pointed to the example of Nero, "that as wanton as he was with the Lives of Men, in a very few Months after his death there was abundantly more blood spilt, then in all his fourteen Years Reign."[46] Applying this principle to his own time, he asked, "What a long Succession of unexampled Tyrants must have Reign'd in *England*, before they could have committed so many inhumanities, as a few years Civil War for the Liberty of the Subject brought upon it? What one mortal Man's Salvageness could ever have spilt half so much Blood, as was shed in any one eminent Battel?"[47] Rebellion was thus not only wrong but also foolish, since the hoped-for liberation from tyranny, even if achieved, would result in the society being worse off than it had been before.

As if to ward off any criticism of adhering to a Hobbesian framework, Parker embarked on a third argument for non-resistance which emphasized the autonomous authority of the church. He cited Matthew 20:25 and 1 Peter 5:3 as evidence that though the apostles had been entrusted with the care of the church, they were to exercise this authority as Jesus had, with meekness and condescension toward those under them. Continuing the argument from inference, Parker inquired, "If the Governors of the Church are so strictly injoin'd this Vertue, where they have Authority, how much more are they, where they have none? If they may not contend with one another for Dominion, though they have equal Power, how much less with Sovereign Princes, of whose Power they have no share."[48] Christ had therefore bound the leaders of the church, and by extension the entire church, to an "entire compliance" with the civil government in all temporal matters.

Passive Obedience Before Constantine

His arguments from scripture and theory concluded, Parker at last turned to the historical record, which he insisted would bear out all his prior assertions. He claimed that by comparing the status and conduct of the church in the periods before and after the conversion of the emperor Constantine, one could determine the "exact description of the Rights of the Church in all estates and conditions whatsoever."[49] The remainder of Part One of *Religion and Loyalty*, some 125 pages, was devoted to the period before Constantine, whereas Part Two, which was over 300 pages long, covered his reign and the following decades, up to the reign of Julian the Apostate. In some respects Parker was covering ground he had already plowed in *An Account of the Government of the Church of England* in this portion of Part One, because he went out of his way to draw attention to the fact that the church had exercised autonomous jurisdiction over itself in the period before Constantine. He also contended that adherence to the model of early church government ruled out the authority structures of contemporary Presbyterianism, Independency, and Roman Catholicism. I have already examined these arguments in Chapter Five, and the following analysis is restricted to the issue of passive obedience.

Parker declared that in the period before Constantine, no Christian "either taught or practised the Doctrine of resistance in any case whatsoever; . . . they unanimously both taught and practised the Duty of Passive Obedience, as one of the greatest and most indispensable Laws of their Religion."[50] He supported this assertion in two ways. First, he noted the absence of any condemnations of resistance in the canons and laws of the primitive church, inferring that the reason for their omission was that "the Crime was so unknown and so unsuspected that no Provision was made against it."[51] The first canons against civil resistance were found in the seventh-century Council of Toledo, and even these were not the result of actual rebellion; rather, a Visigothic ruler with an uncertain claim to the throne insisted on them as a safeguard against any potential unrest.[52] Parker believed the omission of such condemnations in the primitive church indicated that the issue of resistance had simply never been in dispute, that it had been obvious to all Christians that passive obedience was a religious duty.

Secondly, Parker appealed to the historical record to note the absence of reports of resistance and the corresponding prevalence of accounts of "quiet and peaceable Submission." Here he turned to the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to show the posture of early Christians toward secular authority. He quoted Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Origen, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, among others, all of whom stressed the importance of submission to authority. For example, Origen, in *Against Celsus*, quoted Romans 13 specifically and remarked, "We are not so mad as to stir up against us the wrath of kings and princes, which will bring upon us sufferings and tortures, or even death."[53] Irenaeus taught that even tyrants were to be obeyed: "Some of these [rulers] are given for the correction and the benefit of their subjects, and for the preservation of justice; but others, for the purposes of fear and punishment and rebuke: others, as [the subjects] deserve it, are for deception, disgrace, and pride; while the just judgment of God, as I have observed already, passes equally upon all."[54] Writing during a period of persecution, Cyprian described the conduct of the Christians: "None of us, when he is apprehended, makes resistance, nor avenges himself against your unrighteous violence, although our people are numerous and plentiful. Our certainty of a [divine] vengeance to follow makes us patient."[55] Parker claimed that it was evident from writings such as these that passive obedience was fundamental to the Christian faith, not simply an expedient in an era where Christians had no recourse to armed action. This concluded his exposition of the period before Constantine.

Church and State After Constantine

Part Two begins with the dual assertion that after Constantine's conversion to Christianity the church maintained its independent governance and that "the Christians, when the Empire was on their side, own'd the same kind of Subjection, and that upon the same Principles of Duty, to the Civil Government, that they had ever done in the times of Persecution."[56] Whereas Parker's examination of the period between the apostolic era and the early fourth century had taken up around 125 pages, the treatment of the fifty-year period from the Edict of Milan through the reign of Julian the Apostate consumed 341 pages.

Roughly 145 of these were dedicated to events of Constantine's reign. Parker acknowledged at the outset of his discussion that the Christians gladly submitted to the converted emperor, "for all Men are for the Government, when the Government is for them."[57] Their obedience therefore would not strengthen Parker's case for nonresistance, and he focused the subsequent sections–and, in fact, the entire volume of *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*–on ecclesiastical issues, intending to demonstrate "the due Exercise of the Regal Supremacy in the Christian Church from his Example." Without question, Parker believed that the relationship between church and state properly changed once the civil authority converted to Christianity. However, he insisted that Constantine never pretended to an Erastian overlordship of the church: "He was so far from annexing this [legislative] Power in the Church to the Imperial Crown, that he expressly asserted its inherent Right, and Protected it in its Exercise within it self, with all his zeal and ability."[58] This idea was key to Parker's contention that the prince's legitimate temporal

authority extended to religious practice without usurping the autonomous authority of the church. He focused on Constantine's role in the Donatist and Arian controversies, claiming that the emperor's actions were appropriate and necessary to ensure "the Peace of Church and State: Which in all Christian Common-wealths is the same thing, for there all Ecclesiastical Schisms are really so many breaches of the Civil Peace."[59]

Parker outlined the origins of the Donatist heresy, generally following the accounts of Cyprian and Augustine. The election of one Caecilian to the bishopric of Carthage was disputed in the year 311, his opponents claiming that his ordination was invalid because one of the consecrating bishops had allegedly renounced his faith under persecution years earlier. The dissenting bishops of the province eventually chose another man for the office and petitioned Constantine to appoint neutral bishops to adjudicate the matter. Parker noted that they were "the first Christians that ever fled from the Judgement of the Church, to the Civil Government," but also that their request was a reasonable one both in that the controversy did threaten the civil peace and in that they acknowledged that the proper judges of the matter were church officials.[60] Constantine agreed, and the panel of bishops he appointed vindicated Caecilian and excommunicated Donatus, the rival faction's leader, whereupon the latter's supporters declared the process and decision illegitimate.

A second, larger council, also sanctioned by Constantine, took place at Arles shortly thereafter, with similar results. Parker cited a letter recorded by the historian Optatus in which the emperor rebuked the Donatists for their repeated appeals to him, "when they were already Condemn'd by the Judgment of God in the Votes of the Bishops, who in these matters judged in God's stead, and by his appointment."[61] Finally, Constantine (who had not been present at the previous two councils) commanded Caecilian and his accusers to appear before him at Milan and there declared Caecilian innocent and his detractors "incorrigible Knaves." Parker insisted that this episode did not represent a usurpation of the church's autonomous authority; it was appropriate for Constantine to exert his authority because "all *Africa* was in an Uproar, and in danger to be lost by the Sedition," and his previous condemnations of the Donatists indicated that he had never contemplated anything other than ratifying the decision which had already been made by the church's representatives.[62]

The Donatists remained recalcitrant, and Constantine embarked on a policy of coercion with the support of the orthodox bishops. His efforts were abandoned when his war against Licinius, his rival in the eastern empire, and the outbreak of the Arian heresy occupied his attention. Having gained breathing room, the Donatists entrenched themselves in North Africa. Parker digressed from his discussion of Constantine's reign to follow their activities through the early fifth century. In doing so he drew explicit parallels between them and the nonconformists of his own day. Of Donatus "the Great" he wrote, "To say all the ill that can be said of one Man in one word, he was the very *I. O.* [John Owen] of that Rebellious and Schismatical Age."[63] The Circumcellions, an ascetic group forming the militant fringe of the Donatist spectrum, who raided the country villas of Catholic landlords, were "a sort of Levellers or Army Saints" who "made the habitable parts of the Country more salvage then the Deserts themselves."[64] Donatus' famous query, "*Quid est Imperatori cum Ecclesia*?" ["What has the emperor to do with the church?"] along with the faction's violent activities in North Africa was further proof in Parker's mind that the Donatists were clearly apostates. He pointed out

that they were much friendlier with Julian the Apostate, who gave them freedom of action, than with any Christian emperor. "And that is another ill quality of all Schismaticks, that they care not what becomes of the common Christianity, so that Faction thrives."[65]

Around the turn of the fifth century, the Donatists supported local revolts against imperial authority on more than one occasion; emperors (most notably Honorius) responded with repressive edicts against them. Parker credited this punitive legislation with weakening the heretics and, by implication, preserving the true church in North Africa.[66] He also pointed to the convention in Carthage in 411 at which Augustine and other Catholic leaders made impressive arguments against the Donatist bishops and persuaded great numbers of the latter's lay supporters to return to the Catholic fold. Parker concluded his section on the Donatists by arguing that their history was a model of all schisms:

> Thus have I shewn in this one Instance the natural Progress of Schism; *How little Leaven leaveneth the whole Lump*, so that a National Madness may be no more then a Malt-house Conspiracy; thirty or forty ill-natur'd men put all *Africk* into a distruction for above one hundred years, and when they were removed out of the way; those many thousands that were drawn in to follow their Frenzy, were restored to their natural sense and sobriety. So that if as small a number as those few, that were so desperate as to destroy themselves at last, had been banisht at first, all that trouble that this Schism gave the Empire, had been certainly prevented, and that is all that any Prince can gain by his kindness to such men, that if he will not punish them at first, they themselves will force him to do it at last.[67]

The implicit parallel between the Donatists and Restoration-era nonconformists would have been obvious to a reader of Parker's other works; in the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, Parker had alleged that all the religious strife in England was due to the activities of a relatively small number of dissenting preachers who were leading thousands of their adherents astray. His prescription for the situation was the same as the Roman emperors'.

He then turned his attention to the Arian controversy, which, like the Donatist heresy, first reared its head during Constantine's reign. Arius, a presbyter in Alexandria, was excommunicated in 318 by a council of bishops, including his own bishop, Alexander, when he began teaching that Christ was a created being and therefore inferior to the Father. He fled to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia (at that time the imperial headquarters on the eastern side of the Bosporus), who received him into communion. The resulting clamor provided part of the impetus for the Council of Nicaea.

I commented on Parker's interpretation of this council in the previous chapter, but one or two points bear repeating. The archdeacon made it clear that he favored the orthodox formulation of the nature of the Trinity as expressed in the Nicene Creed; he even inserted a digression defending the use of the word *homoousios* ("consubstantial," "of one essence"), which was included in the creed to describe the relationship of the Son to the Father and had caused so much debate at the council. However, Parker's interest in the matter clearly was not primarily doctrinal. Although he did not explicitly say so, he

seemed to agree with Constantine, who thought the question was "nice, and unnecessary, and not of weight enough to deserve a determination."[68] He placed the primary blame for the affair on Eusebius and his allies, who had violated the Apostolical Canons in communing with an excommunicate, thereby subverting the proper authority structure of the church and causing the schism. It was the "Eusebians" who likewise perpetuated the controversy through their "pretended moderation" at the council.[69] Again we see that Parker placed overwhelming emphasis on questions of authority when discussing church controversies.

In the same vein, Parker's praise of Constantine's conduct during the affair hinged not on the emperor's wisdom in discerning the theological issue in question, but on his recognition of the proper authority in the matter. In his letter to the church at Alexandria at the conclusion of the council, Constantine declared, "That which has commended itself to the judgment of three hundred bishops cannot be other than the doctrine of God; seeing that the Holy Spirit dwelling in the minds of so many dignified persons has effectually enlightened them respecting the Divine will."[70] In a subsequent letter distributed to many congregations, the emperor made this statement concerning the council's resolutions on the dating of Easter: "Do you gladly receive this heavenly and truly divine command: for whatever is done in the sacred assemblies of the bishops is referable to the Divine will."[71] Parker interpreted statements such as these as indicative of Constantine's recognition that the leadership of the church had direct authority from God to settle matters of doctrine and practice. In the case of the condemnation of the Arians, the emperor ratified the council's decision by imposing secular penalties on the heretics; he did not do so in the Easter-dating issue. "The Conclusion is evident that the Emperour thought that Laws Ecclesiastick ought to be made by the Ecclesiastick State, and when they were so, that they were Valid and Obligatory by their own Authority, though himself had power to enforce them with Civil Sanctions, as he judged it serviceable to the advancement of Religion and the Peace of Government."[72]

Parker was also eager to vindicate Constantine's conduct in the matter of Athanasius, Alexander's successor as bishop of Alexandria. Athanasius had been one of Arius' most vocal opponents and had refused to accept Arius back into communion upon the latter's return from banishment in the years following the Council of Nicaea, doubting the sincerity of his repentance. Eusebius of Nicomedia and his allies accused Athanasius of disrupting the church and charged him with, among other things, murder and rape. At a council in Tyre convened to investigate the charges, the Eusebians deposed and excommunicated Athanasius in his absence, despite the accusations against him having been proven largely false; in fact, the man he was accused of having murdered appeared, very much alive, and participated in the deposition.[73] Here again Parker argued that refusal to acknowledge proper authority in the church played a much larger part than doctrinal questions in causing the Arian schism: "The Heresie it self could never openly appear after the *Nicene* Council, and . . . all the stirs, that were raised after that, were occasion'd by the folly and malice of the *Eusebians*, who profes't themselves Catholiques; . . . their contest with *Athanasius* was not about points of Faith."[74]

Constantine banished Athanasius in support of the council's decision, and the latter was still in exile when the emperor died in 336. Parker's defense of Constantine was twofold. First, he claimed that he had been misled by the Eusebians. The influential faction had plotted to bring the bishop down with false accusations without the emperor's

knowledge. Second, and more importantly, Athanasius had been placed on trial not for holding heterodox opinions, but for committing civil crimes. Therefore, the case fell firmly under the emperor's jurisdiction, and it was appropriate for him to participate in the proceedings. Persuaded that Athanasius was both a criminal and an obstacle to civil peace, Constantine banished him. In doing so, Parker argued that he had not violated the church's legitimate sphere of authority. In fact, he declared that "the example of this Great Prince was set up as the best Standard of Government" and that subsequent emperors who misused the "Regal Supremacy" in the church strayed from Constantine's example.

Parker drew a sharp contrast between Constantine and his son Constantius, who "childishly . . . spent his whole Reign in Metaphysical wranglings about Religion."[75] Opposed to the use of the word *homoousios* in the Nicene Creed, he worked to have it overturned by summoning various councils at different times in his reign. Parker was very critical of this course of action and viewed it as a usurpation of church authority. "Instead of calling free Councils, and allowing free Conference in them, he takes upon himself the Power of presiding and determining all by his own imperious Commands."[76] Parker's position was that everyone, including the emperor, should have refrained from challenging the Nicene Council's formulation, even if he disagreed with it, "for to what purpose is it to call Councils for the resolving of Doubts and Controversies, if their determinations have not Authority enough to Warrant and Oblige our Obedience? . . . If the Decree of so venerable a Council be not of force enough to over-rule every particular Mans own conceit, it is but folly and non-sense to talk of any such thing as Government in the Church."[77] Here Parker made one of his clearest statements of the nature and necessity of the church's inherent authority:

> So is it in all cases, when once a Controversie is determin'd by the Church, it ought to conclude all Christians within it. Not because the Church is infallible, or any Council how great soever, but because its determinations are Authoritative, and bind by virtue of a divine Commission, in all cases that are not against the clear, express, and immediate Commands of God himself; so that if any Man dare presume to gainsay or disobey any Law of the Church, he ought to have an extraordinary assurance to warrant his dissent: But if he be refractory upon Surmises and remote Inferences, or about matters of no great Weight, or little Evidence, he plainly runs himself into the sin of Schism in this World, and the punishment of it in the World to come.[78]

Parker believed church authorities had broad discretion to lay down doctrinal formulations and guidelines for the administration of the church in the interests of unity and peace, just as the civil magistrate had a great deal of latitude in establishing and enforcing civil law for social peace and stability. In both cases, the only substantive restriction on the legitimate power was the prohibition on actions taken "against the clear, express, and immediate Commands of God himself." As we have seen, Parker considered this prohibition to extend to any attempts to establish a non-episcopal authority structure in the church. However, councils of bishops *were* competent to impose binding creeds dealing with the nature of the Trinity and other "Metaphysical"

issues, and the laity were expected to accept these as part of their due submission to their church officers.

Parker did provide an excuse for disobeying the church whenever a person had "extraordinary assurance to warrant his dissent." He then invoked this vague loophole to vindicate Athanasius and his followers, who had refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of the bishop's excommunication of the Council at Tyre and refrained from communing with his replacement. Athanasius had been recalled from his banishment after Constantine's death, but the council's judgment against him still stood. Parker upheld the correctness of the emperor's inability to restore Athanasius to any sort of episcopal function, but still defended the bishop's actions in rebelling against the council. He also claimed that new canons put into effect by Eusebius and his allies–restricting appeals of ecclesiastical censure to the emperor, for instance–would normally have been praiseworthy in strengthening the discipline and independence of the church, but that because the canons were directed against Athanasius their effect in those circumstances was evil:

> If the Proceedings against *Athanasius* at *Tyre* had been any way fair and legal, though he had been hardly used, yet his Appeal was against the Ecclesiastical Rule, and it would have been more decent and becoming Christian Modesty, to have sate down under an hard Sentence, then to have made a breach upon the Order and Discipline of the Church. But when it was all rank Villany and open Forgery contriv'd on purpose to take away his life, it was then proper for him to take Sanctuary in the justice of his Sovereign Prince for a common Subjects Protection. And indeed wherever injustice is become shameless and enormous, men are not bound to that punctual niceness of Rule, that they are bound to observe in common and ordinary cases.[79]

The tension inherent in this position should be obvious. Who was to be the judge of when circumstances became so extreme that disregard of regular authority was warranted? If the authority of the church was absolute within its own sphere, as Parker repeatedly claimed, one might reasonably argue that there could never be any truly legitimate recourse to the state from its censure. Parker's other writings clearly indicated that there was never any legitimate flight from the prince's authority in temporal matters. The only possible way to salvage the consistency of this position lay in Parker's contention that the Eusebians were plotting against Athanasius' life, a fact which allowed the bishop to appeal to the emperor just as any other subject could if there were a conspiracy against him. Still, one suspects that Parker's eagerness to vindicate Athanasius' actions led him to apply his principles of ecclesiastical authority more laxly than he might otherwise have done.

The Council of Sardica, which was dominated by western bishops, reinstated Athanasius, although the Eusebians (more influential in the east) refused to recognize the legitimacy of the act. At this point, Athanasius had Constantius' support and was able to reclaim his see temporarily. However, a war between the emperor and Magnentius, the usurper of the western empire,[80] led to the former's wrath against the bishop, who had entertained two bishops from Gaul in Alexandria and was thereupon accused of

consorting with the enemy. Constantius commanded the bishops at the Council of Milan to excommunicate Athanasius; when some protested that this action was contrary to the canons of the church, the emperor replied, "That his Will shall be the Canon," and subsequently banished them.[81] A similar fate awaited the African bishops who refused to subscribe to the ban of excommunication.

Parker devoted many pages to councils at Sirmium, Ariminum, and Seleucia, all of which occurred in the late 350s, still during the reign of Constantius, and which evidenced (to Parker) the emperor's improper meddling in the affairs of the church. At Sirmium a group of bishops in Constantius' presence drew up a formulary concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son which was intended to replace the Nicene language. The bishops at Ariminum rejected this attempt to change what they considered to have been settled at Nicaea; Parker contended that "from this time forward [Constantius'] Reign was nothing but Force and Tyranny."[82] At Seleucia, followers of Acacius, who held to an extreme form of Arianism, emboldened by the previous attempts to set aside the Nicene Creed, proposed yet another formulation which even the Eusebians would not accept. Here again the emperor intervened, this time on the side of the Acacians.[83] Parker considered this turn of events an example of "the natural event of all sorts of Sedition, that the first Authors of it are at last devoured by their own spawn."[84] Constantius' preoccupation with church issues did not abate until Julian's revolt, which eventually ended his reign, began in 360.

Parker argued that Constantius' actions were in themselves evidence of the church's autonomous authority in doctrinal matters. He asked, "If he had thought that he might have [altered the Nicene statement of faith] by his own Imperial Authority, to what purpose need he have broke up all the High-ways in *Christendom* by conveying Bishops to and from Councils? He might have proclaimed down the word [*homoousios*] by one Imperial Rescript, if he had supposed that a proper Authority for it."[85] Despite his implicit recognition of the necessity of having a council decide the matter, Constantius nevertheless overstepped his bounds,

> for though he did not challenge the Authority of the Church to himself, yet he endeavoured to overrule it by down-right force and violence, which is in effect to destroy it. And that is the ground of their [Athanasius and his allies'] complaints, that they were not allowed freedom in Council, but that himself and his Prefects took upon them to forestall the Judgement of the Church by Restraints and Threatnings.[86]

In the end, Parker moderated his criticism of Constantius by noting that he exempted the clergy from taxation and granted them other favors and immunities beyond what Constantine had done. Generally, he was "a true lover of the Christian Church"; his abuse of the Nicene faith's defenders, Parker claimed, was the result of his excessive trust in Eusebius.[87] Of the turmoil caused by this reliance, the archdeacon declared, "That may be warning to all Princes, That when a Controversie of Religion is once laid by a fair and legal decision, to beware how they suffer it to rise again, lest it prove too strong and stubborn to submit to a second Exorcism."[88]

For their part, Parker wrote, the Catholic bishops fulfilled their duty of submission and passive obedience to the emperor in this period. Athanasius submitted to his multiple

banishments and refrained from issuing any sort of condemnation of Constantine or Constantius despite his hardships. His defenders also submitted to the actions taken against them during the latter part of Constantius' reign. The lone exception to this pattern was Lucifer Calaritanus, an African bishop who "bestowed his rude Language upon the Emperour liberally," but even he balked at the notion of armed resistance, and his later joining with Donatists was evidence enough for Parker that he was not a true Christian in any event.[89]

Parker concluded *Religion and Loyalty* with a relatively brief discussion of the state of the church in the short reign of Julian the Apostate (361-363). Julian recalled Athanasius and the other banished bishops from their exile, and also relaxed the pressure previously applied to the Donatists and Novatianists. According to the church historian Sozomen, he did this "not out of mercy, but that through contention among themselves, the churches might be involved in fraternal strife, and might fail of her own rights."[90] However, a council in Alexandria at which Athanasius presided effected a reconciliation between the Catholics and many of the Novatian and Eusebian bishops.

Persecution of the church by Julian followed thereafter. Parker focused on accounts of soldiers and army officers who were deceived into making ritual incense offerings to the pagan gods when they received their wages, and who afterwards, upon realizing their sin, returned the money and were dismissed from service.[91] According to one account, Julian initially ordered their beheading but issued a reprieve just before the first execution, disappointing the would-be martyr.[92] Parker exclaimed, "I conceive this is as high an Example of Passive Obedience, as any we have upon Record in all the former Persecutions; . . . here the whole Body [of soldiers] submit themselves one and all to the Ax of the Executioner, without speaking an angry or reproachful word against the Emperor."[93] In other times and places of persecution, the Christians likewise submitted to whatever punishment was meted out and thus were not guilty of resistance, even though Parker conceded that there was some evidence of "young Divines" speaking disrespectfully about Julian and making him the butt of "indiscreet jest."[94]

Continuing the Narrative: *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*

Religion and Loyalty ended rather abruptly on its 607th page, and *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part* began in almost the same way, picking up the narrative in the year 363 with no introduction other than a brief preface "To the Reader." The latter work was licensed for printing in November 1684 and was slightly shorter than its predecessor at 586 octavo pages.[95] It continues the narrative of the relationship between church and state through the reign of Justinian, and on the whole is less interesting than *Religion and Loyalty* because it is constructed more as a compilation of examples rather than a discussion of principles, which Parker evidently thought he had covered sufficiently in the previous volume. All the emperors under consideration in *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*, were Christian; thus the issue of passive resistance is largely absent from its pages. Parker instead chose to focus on the exercise of royal authority in religious matters, as he had in his accounts of Constantine and Constantius.

Parker devoted relatively little space to the reigns of Jovian (363-364) and Valentinian (364-375). Of the former, who only reigned about a year, he simply noted that he ceased the persecution of the church and restored Athanasius. Valentinian was praised for refraining from interfering in church matters: "And that was the Maxime of his Reign to leave Church-Matters to the judgment of Church-men."[96] However, Parker also criticized his decision to issue an "Edict for Liberty of Conscience," on the basis that the resulting factionalism had led to a great deal of trouble in the church. Two Arian bishops, Eudoxius of Constantinople and Auxentius of Milan, were the chief objects of Parker's condemnation. Their parties caused numerous disputes over various bishoprics in their respective parts of the empire. Basil the Great, one of the "Cappadocian Fathers," suffered to the point of banishment for his refusal to commune with Eudoxius, who had a powerful influence over Valens, Valentinian's brother and lieutenant in the eastern empire. Parker clearly believed that the civil sword should have been wielded against the Arians in defense of Catholic Christianity and the Nicene Creed, and he declared that Valentinian's adherence to the "unhappy Principle" of toleration "spoil'd his reign."[97]

In his discussion of Gratian (Valentinian's successor in the western empire, who received more or less positive treatment from Parker), the archdeacon took the opportunity to discuss the nature of the temporal/spiritual distinction when commenting upon an imperial order "that Controversies belonging to Religion, should be judged by the Synod of the Diocess, but all criminal Causes should be reserved to the Audience of the Secular Governors."[98] This passage is important for its further development and clarification of his view of the two spheres' authority. Parker claimed that this way of understanding the respective jurisdictions of church and state, *i.e.* by the placing of an issue within one of the spheres according to its "ecclesiastical" or "political" nature, although widespread in his own day, was erroneous. Moreover, it led to unnecessary squabbling over how to classify any given issue and gave rise to the twin errors of papism and Erastianism. Instead, wrote Parker,

> all Actions are both Secular and Spiritual, the same Action as it relates to the peace of the World, and the Civil Government of Mankind is of a secular Nature, and as it is a moral Vertue, and required by the Law of God as a duty of Religion, so it is of a spiritual Nature. And so on the other side, those things that are esteem'd Spiritual, yet as they have an influence upon the publick Peace (and nothing has a greater) they must come under the cognizance of the civil Government. So that these Jurisdictions are so far from being distinguisht by the Objects about which they are conversant, that they are always both equally extended to the same Objects, so as that if we limit either to one sort of Actions, we destroy both.[99]

The clergy must speak to matters outside the public worship service and internal church government; if they are prevented from doing so, "they are cut off from the chief part of their Office."[100] Likewise, temporal rulers must pay attention to the doctrines being instilled in their subjects, or "they may soon be involved into disturbance or confusion, without any Power to relieve themselves." As he had argued in *The Case of the Church of England*, Parker insisted that "the true distinguishing point between these two

Jurisdictions [is] not in the Matters about which their Power is imployed, but in the Penalties, by which it is inforced."[101] For example, church and state alike were right to condemn both Donatists and political rebels, because each offending group both violated the canons of the church *and* disturbed the civil peace. The difference lay in the *means* of condemnation: excommunication for the church and execution for the state. All crimes therefore lay in the purview of both the church and the state.

Parker was effusive in his praise of Theodosius, who succeeded Valens in the East and later ruled over the entire empire. He even issued a rare retraction of one of his previously published statements, namely the criticism of that emperor made in *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church.*[102] Here Parker stated that further examination of Theodosius' actions had persuaded him that the emperor had not in fact presumed to set up a new model of church government, but had only issued guidelines for his own officers to use in the disposition of church property.[103] Theodosius renewed the civil penalties against those who denied the Nicene faith, in so doing ratifying the results of the Council of Constantinople. He took action to end schisms in three important bishoprics, in each case siding with the Catholic bishop. (Parker insisted that Arianism was not the cause of these schisms but merely a pretense used by the ambitious and factious to advance their own positions.[104]) He also restricted the right of accused criminals to take sanctuary in churches; this was consistent with Parker's theory of authority, and he considered this law an "observable Act of Reformation."[105] Finally, Theodosius enacted laws on his own imperial authority, *i.e.* without reference to the canons or other decrees of the church, against Manichaeans, apostates, pagans, and Jews; again, Parker endorsed these actions as lying within the emperor's natural right to preserve public order.

However, in an interesting aside, Parker criticized Ambrose, bishop of Milan, for reproving Theodosius when the latter commanded the rebuilding of a Jewish synagogue which Christian rioters had destroyed.[106] Since the Jews had been given the liberty to worship by imperial decree, Parker argued, no one but the emperor could remove that freedom. "And therefore if any of the Christians in a violent and tumultuary way, took to themselves the liberty of demolishing [the synagogue] contrary to the Imperial Charter, they stood guilty of a Scandalous Riot, both against the Laws of the Empire and the Sovereignty of the Emperor."[107] That Ambrose had dared to defend this action reflected poorly on him. Here, as he had done in the toleration controversy, Parker, even though he denied that religious toleration was a wise policy, still acknowledged the authority of the state to grant it. The duty of the subject was to abide by the state's decision.

Parker devoted significant space to a discussion of the Priscillianist heresy, which flared up in the 380s in Gaul and Spain. Priscillian led a strict ascetic movement which was accused by church leaders of immoral practices and heretical teachings (chiefly of the Gnostic/Manichean variety).[108] After the movement was condemned in a synod at Bordeaux in 385, Priscillian appealed to the Western emperor Maximus–who had recently revolted against and overthrown Gratian–and appeared before him at Trier, where he and some of his followers were condemned to death and executed by imperial officials despite the appeals of Martin of Tours to have their lives spared.

Martin had argued that it was unprecedented for a secular official to render judgment in an ecclesiastical matter such as this. Parker claimed this revealed that bishop's "great Ignorance of affairs, and great Weakness of understanding, in that it was

so far from being a novelty or prophaneness, for Princes to enact penal Laws in Ecclesiastical causes, after the Judgment of the Church, that it was ever look't upon as a piece of their duty to abet it, if they approved it, with secular Laws and Penalties."[109] Accepting the charges of debauchery and depravity leveled at the Priscillians, Parker exclaimed, "For my part, I cannot understand how men of such lewd and desperate principles, that destroy the natural modesty and the common faith of mankind, can ever be pursued with too much violence."[110] To him the Priscillians were "debauch't Ranters" guilty of subverting human society, and therefore "if they are executed, it is not for their Heresie against the Faith, but their Treason against the State, and such Traitors all such men are that teach such Doctrins."[111]

Thus the Priscillians were much worse than the Arians; they deserved death apart from any religious considerations, and Maximus would have been justified in having them executed with or without the church's approval. Both Ambrose and Augustine disagreed with Maximus' actions in this case, but Parker argued that "at that distance of place, it is to be supposed that [they] understood not [the Priscillians'] Offences, but only took them for a new sort of Hereticks." If these worthies had understood the depths of the Priscillians' depravities, they "would never have opposed cutting off such unheard of Crimes with the Civil Sword."[112] Parker claimed that this severe action against the sect "struck it dead," in contrast to its cousins, the Gnostics and Manicheans, which survived much longer because of the relative peace afforded them by the state. As in the case of the Donatists, Parker was drawing parallels between these ancient heresies and the Protestant nonconformity of his own day; if England were to pursue nonconformists as Maximus had the Priscillianists, rather than leave them in peace as other emperors did the Gnostics and Manicheans, he implied, the Church of England would be rid of them once and for all.

Parker also praised Theodosius' successors, Arcadius in the East and Honorius in the West, for their support of the Catholic faith. Arcadius enacted several laws imposing civil penalties on those deemed heretics by the church, without regard for their particular heresy. Parker called this policy "truly Imperial"; it abetted the church's condemnation without presuming to judge or arbitrate theological issues which the laity probably would not understand anyway.[113] Honorius, in addition to putting a virtual end to the Donatist heresy, forbade all appeals from church courts to the imperial throne. In sharp contrast to his treatment of a similar edict in the days of Athanasius, Parker lauded this measure for preventing the subversion of ecclesiastical discipline.[114] He listed many more examples of what he considered commendable laws from both of these rulers, always arguing that they were necessary to preserve public order.

Parker dwelt at length on the Council of Ephesus (431), which took place during the reign of Theodosius II (408-450), and the enshrining of its decisions in civil statutes, "another eminent Instance of the right Concurrence of the Powers of Church and State in the determination of Ecclesiastical Controversies, and enacting of Ecclesiastical Laws and Canons."[115] The chief issue at Ephesus was the views of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who rejected the word *theotokos* ("bearer of God") as a description of the Virgin Mary and insisted on a strict separation of the divine and human natures of Jesus into what appeared to be two persons. It did not help Nestorius that he had also incurred the enmity of Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and Celestine, bishop of Rome, by considering the cases of some churchmen deposed by Cyril and Pelagians excommunicated in the

West. The council, which resulted largely from the efforts of Cyril and Celestine, condemned Nestorius' teachings and deposed him.[116] Then, in 435, Theodosius enacted a series of laws against the Nestorians, prohibiting their meetings and commanding the destruction of their writings. According to Parker, these seasonable measures "did the work effectually, for though for a time the Ghost of the Heresie skulkt up and down in other shapes . . ., yet it could never after . . . appear in its own form in publick."[117] Here Parker made no claim that Nestorianism threatened the public peace, but the fact that the punitive laws reinforced the decisions of a church council apparently satisfied him that they were "fair and regular."

Parker then considered the Monophysite (or, in Parker's terminology, the "Eutychean") heresy, which motivated the meetings of councils at Ephesus in 449 and Chalcedon in 451; the latter overturned the former. Eutyches, a monastic superior in Constantinople, was the focus of this controversy. His insistence that the divine nature swallowed up the human nature in Jesus seemed to run to the opposite extreme from Nestorius. Nevertheless, he had firm support from Theodosius II, who considered the "two-natures" adherents to be Nestorians or nearly so; and Dioscorus, bishop of Constantinople, who dominated the Ephesian council, at which about 150 bishops were present. The council banned the "two-nature" doctrine and excommunicated some of its supporters.

Widespread opposition to the council's decrees, particularly from Pope Leo, caused Theodosius' successor, Marcian, to revoke imperial ratification of the Ephesian council's rulings and recall the bishops that had been banished in its aftermath. He then called a general council (over 600 bishops attended) to meet at Chalcedon in 451. For Parker, this council was clearly a high point in the history of the church, not so much for the determinations of the bishops (although he obviously agreed with them), but for their submission to Marcian in their proceedings and Marcian's ratification of the council's canons, which he had not tried to influence in any way. According to Parker, Chalcedon, just across the Bosphorus from Constantinople, was chosen for the council's location because the clergy wanted the emperor to be close at hand to "interpose by his own immediate Authority" in case there was a dispute over the proceedings, and they waited to make definitive pronouncements until he was present at the sixth session.[118] These included the deposition of Dioscorus, the condemnation of Eutyches' position, and the promulgation of a new confessional statement affirming that Jesus was simultaneously fully God and fully man, two natures in one person. For his part, Marcian confirmed the council's findings and gave them the force of civil law, which action was "one of the most remarkable Instances of the right use of the Imperial Power in the Christians Church."[119] According to Parker, the enforcement of civil penalties against the Monophysites broke the back of the heresy within a few years and was thus further evidence of the propriety and efficacy of punitive measures against heretics.[120] (In fact, the Monophysites remained strong in both Egypt and Syria.) Parker gave Marcian's successor, Leo, similar praise for his endorsement of church judgments without forcing his own will in ecclesiastical matters.

The reign of Zeno, Leo's successor, presented Parker with an opportunity to decry the perceived evils of religious comprehension. After being dethroned for a time by his uncle Basiliscus, Zeno, upon reclaiming the crown, enacted the *Henoticon*, which attempted comprehension between Chalcedonians and Monophysites by having the state

treat as orthodox anyone who simply affirmed the Nicene Creed. The effect of this act was to allow both of the contending parties legal standing to continue the controversy over the nature of Christ's deity and humanity. Parker denounced Zeno's action for two reasons: it broke the tradition of emperors' confirming the decrees of the church's general councils, and it failed to bring about the reconciliation that was its *raison d'être*. Moreover, it created a third party of "moderates" who favored the *Henoticon* but were opposed as lukewarm by the other two groups. In fact, Parker pointed to the excommunication of the bishop of Constantinople (a supporter of the *Henoticon*) by the pope (an opponent of it) as evidence that the *Henoticon* sowed the seeds that eventually resulted in the permanent schism between the Eastern and Western churches. The bishops of Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria broke communion with each other and were not reconciled to any degree until the sixth century. Parker drew an explicit parallel between the moderates of the period and the latitudinarians of his own day, equating Edward Stillingfleet's *Irenicum* with the failed imperial program of comprehension.[121]

The zeal for agnosticism concerning Chalcedon came to an extreme with Zeno's successor, Anastasius. Relying on the sixth-century historian Evagrius, Parker described this emperor's reign as a period of "numberless Schisms and Factions"; in an effort to restore unity, Anastasius began deposing bishops who either championed or denounced the council. According to the archdeacon, this action on the part of an emperor who favored comprehension was inevitable: "As for these dire effects of love and meekness no Man need to wonder at them, because the design it self is no better than casting away all manner of Discipline and Government, without which all Societies soon fall into War and Anarchy. Neither do these Mischiefs end in the Church, but they break out into Tumults and Rebellions in the Common-Wealth."[122] This last assertion was a reference to a rebellion led by the general Vitalian in the early sixth century, for which the banishment of bishops was a pretext.

Anastasius' successor, Justin, commanded universal subscription to Chalcedon in the Eastern Empire and restored the banished bishops. These actions were a prelude to the reconciliation of the Eastern and Western churches in 519 and received high praise from Parker. This was despite his assertion in *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church*, repeated here, that the entire episode was key to the popes' usurpation of authority over the universal church. Pope Hormisdas (514-523) was uncompromising in his terms of reconciliation with the East, a stance which Parker defended as "seasonable and necessary at that time" because of the breakdown in church discipline in the preceding years.[123] Parker's defense of the pope, which seemed somewhat reluctant, was based on the latter's championing of Chalcedon, the true authority in Parker's mind. According to him, Justin's apparent submission to the pope in this matter was in fact a return to the proper posture of respect and ratification of the church's will as expressed through its councils. Justin's respect for the pronouncements of councils was also seen in his prosecution of old heresies which had resurfaced in the climate of lax discipline.

For Parker, Justin's reign, praiseworthy though it was, was a mere prelude to that of his successor, Justinian, "one of the greatest Princes in the whole Succession."[124] The final 220 pages of *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*, are devoted to his reign. Parker examined in great detail Justinian's law code and his various actions with regard to the church and heresies. In doing so he attempted to refute both Roman Catholic historians, such as Baronius, who accused Justinian of usurping the church's authority, and Erastians

who held him up as "a Pattern to all Princes to keep the Jurisdiction of the Church in their own hands against all the pretences of Ecclesiasticks."[125]

In essence, Parker's vindication of Justinian rested on the assertions that he did nothing for which there was not precedent, and that all his legislation concerning religion was essentially ratification of church decrees. Listing the contents of the Novels which dealt with religion, Parker noted that most of them were either revivals of old laws that had been nullified or neglected, grants of property or privilege to individual churches, or commands to restore church discipline in areas of the empire Justinian had reconquered. He asked rhetorically, "What is there [in these laws] that is not highly praiseworthy? What is there, that is not warranted by Precedents of his Predecessors, unless it be this, That he exceeded them all in his care and kindness to the Church?"[126] Parker defended these laws despite the fact that Justinian had altered church government on his own authority by creating a new archbishopric and placing it over several provinces previously belonging to a different archbishopric. This possible contradiction aside, Parker declared that the emperor "[did] not take upon himself the Authority of enacting Ecclesiastical Laws, but of abetting them, and putting them in execution by secular Penalties: a fault that would be very commendable in all Princes."[127]

He did admit that Justinian made one inexcusable error by condemning by imperial decree certain teachings as heresy, despite the fact that the Council of Chalcedon had adjudged them not heretical: "This was the blot of *Justinian*'s Reign, that no candor can cover, nor Excuse wipe off."[128] According to Parker, the fallout from this episode lay at the root of the schism between the Eastern and Western churches following the Second Council of Constantinople (553), the decisions of which the Western and African bishops refused to accept; Parker concurred that it was not a general council and should not have been binding on the entire empire. However, these churchmen, including Pope Vigilius, eventually submitted to the council under threats from Justinian. Parker ameliorated the case against Justinian by shifting a portion of the blame to Vigilius, whom he condemned as a sower of strife and one of the worst popes in history.[129] He concluded, "Which side soever was in the right, they were all in the wrong, when they made a Schism in the Church about it."[130]

Apart from this incident, Justinian did no wrong in Parker's eyes. The final 160 pages of the book consisted of extended defenses of the emperor against his various detractors. His wars of reconquest were "the most justifiable and most glorious Wars that were ever waged from the beginning of the World."[131] His support of the Venetae faction after the "Nika rebellion" in 532 was justified, for many of the Venetae had rallied to his defense, whereas most of the rival Prasini faction had worked for his overthrow; Parker dubbed the two groups the "Tories" and "Whigs" of their day, respectively.[132] We need not examine the details of the rest of these animadversions. The point is that Parker considered Justinian in many ways to be the epitome of a Christian ruler, so much so that discussion of subsequent emperors and kings became unnecessary.

Analysis

The two volumes of *Religion and Loyalty* brought Parker's theories of authority and church-state relations to their full maturity. Clearly, Parker had formed the basic outlines of these positions by the time he wrote *The Case of the Church of England,* but *Religion and Loyalty* presented them in more detail and complexity. This is not to say that Parker was completely consistent in his views or that there were no unresolved tensions in the edifice he had constructed. The case of Athanasius, discussed above, is a good example of the intellectual contortions to which Parker sometimes resorted in order to avoid besmirching the name of an acknowledged hero of Christian orthodoxy while still maintaining the imperative of submission to all ecclesiastical and temporal authority.

Parker failed to apply his test of submission strictly in a few other cases in these works. For example, when the usurper Basiliscus condemned the Council of Chalcedon, the bishop of Constantinople and many of the monks in the city voiced their opposition. The conflict persisted "till the People [were] tumultuate in defence of their Bishop against the Tyrant."[133] This seemed to be a clear case of active resistance to civil authority, which Parker had repeatedly condemned elsewhere, yet in this instance he refrained from pronouncing judgment on the rebels. Indeed, his characterization of the civil unrest as "defensive" implied tacit approval. As in the case of Athanasius, one suspects that Parker's conviction that the Council of Chalcedon was authoritative led him to excuse actions taken on its behalf that he would have condemned in other circumstances.

These inconsistencies aside, Parker did develop a largely cogent social theory that could guide individuals seeking to understand their responsibilities as subjects and lay Christians. It was not strikingly original, but it did offer answers to many of the pressing questions of the day. This was most evident in the first 200 pages of *Religion and Loyalty*, where Parker constructed a robust (though not ironclad) theoretical case for passive obedience. As we have seen, this case rested on scripture, natural law theory, and the example of the early church. Parker's denial of the traditional sacred/secular distinction, identifying jurisdiction primarily in the sanctions levied by church and state rather than in the actions each institution was competent to judge, was another contribution to absolutist theory which avoided the stigma of Erastianism.

As we have repeatedly seen, the crucial issue in Parker's mind was that of authority. The questions of where authority lay and what its scope was were ever uppermost in his thoughts, and they continually spilled onto the pages he wrote. He had dealt in some detail with the autonomous authority of the church in his earlier works and here was focused on the state's authority. Having presupposed that religious belief was a most powerful influence on people's actions, Parker concluded that the civil magistrate, who was charged with preserving peace, must have the authority to suppress religious teachings which tended to incite violence or rebellion. The genius of the position was that Christian teachings, by virtue of their insistence on passive obedience (in Parker's interpretation), would never need to be suppressed. As Parker conceived it, Christianity and the state (any state) were natural partners.

After establishing his theory of the (temporal) regal supremacy in religious matters, Parker judged every Roman emperor from Constantine to Justinian according to

whether they stayed within those parameters which he had deduced. Those who respected the church's autonomous authority to settle issues of doctrine and practice, along with their attendant sanctions (excommunication, etc.), he praised. Those who did not, he condemned. Likewise, Parker judged churchmen according to whether they submitted to the emperors in temporal matters, and whether they championed the autonomous authority of the church.

Parker believed that in his treatment of the problem of jurisdiction he had found the key to social harmony and civil peace. "Private persons" were to trust their bishops to instruct them in the truths of Christianity; they were also to submit to whatever laws were enacted by the civil magistrate, peacefully suffering the prescribed punishment if they were forced to disobey a law contradicting the clear teachings of Christianity. Churchmen were to inculcate a sense of submission to authority in their flocks, preach the gospel, and administer the sacraments; violations of the church's teachings were to be met with spiritual penalties only. Civil rulers had an obligation to prevent by force the spread of any opinion, religious or otherwise, which threatened to disturb civil peace. They also were to protect the church and enshrine its decisions into law where appropriate; they alone could levy temporal penalties and was called upon to do so in defense of the church.

Parker acknowledged that his paradigm did not prevent the suffering caused by abuses of authority. However, he insisted throughout his career, especially in the two volumes of *Religion of Loyalty*, that tyranny caused far less suffering than rebellion or civil war. In his view, both the needs of society and the Christian religion dictated quiet suffering under tyranny in order to avoid the greater evil of civil unrest. In this insistence he was hardly alone among political thinkers in the early modern world, nor was he isolated among his fellow Englishmen. A letter in the Tanner Manuscripts records a contemporary's reaction to *Religion and Loyalty* expressed to an unnamed nobleman: "I take much . . . pleasure in Reading Dr Parkers Discourse of Religion and Loyalty. And we have reason to thank God, yt we have so many men of right Principles, & they so able & zealous to publish & maintain them. Such I am sure shall ever finde encouragemt wt Yor Grace."[134]

The *History of His Own Times*

Despite its different subject matter, it seems appropriate to consider Parker's *History of His Own Times* alongside the two parts of *Religion and Loyalty* for two reasons. First, the *History* was written either contemporaneously with or shortly after *Religion and Loyalty*, although it was not published until several decades later and, as I shall argue below, was probably unfinished at the time of Parker's death. More importantly, the discerning reader can note many connections in the treatment of the personalities and groups of the two time periods under consideration. When the three books are examined as a group, we gain a clearer understanding of Parker's methods of historical inquiry. First, his preoccupation with certain subjects of his own day, such as plots against the crown, had a significant influence on his examination of ancient history. Second, his understanding of ancient history helped give him a model of submission and

church-state relations which he thought should be imposed on his own society. His studies of ancient and contemporary history were thus mutually reinforcing, given his presuppositions about authority.

The 424-page book is divided into four parts or "books." The first covers the period from the Restoration of Charles II to the Great Fire of 1666. From the beginning, Parker's Tory concerns were evident, in that he dealt almost exclusively with the two issues of royal authority (and attempts to subvert it) and the Church of England (and its enemies). After briefly mentioning how glorious the Restoration was and how high expectations were for the peace of the realm, he immediately began a discussion of individuals and groups who were opposed to Charles' return and their attempts to undermine his rule. He categorized these recalcitrants into four groups: Cromwell's officers, members of the Rump Parliament, "busy holders-forth of sedition," and "sacrilegious persons."[135]

Much of the remainder of Book One was devoted to various plots against the government in the period 1660-1666. Parker invariably described them in ridiculing terms; for example, Thomas Venner's Fifth Monarchist revolt in 1661 was labeled "a rabble of forty enthusiasts."[136] Nevertheless, he contradictorily asserted that they were extremely dangerous and might have succeeded had not the king and Parliament been on their guard. He included brief accounts of the discoveries of an arms cache in Devon, a plot for an uprising in Chester, a conspiracy among some of Cromwell's former officers, an Irish plot to seize Dublin Castle, and the Northern Rebellion of 1663. All of these were thwarted by royal and parliamentary vigilance.

Elsewhere he made the familiar connection between Protestant nonconformity and the plotters, just as he had blamed heretics and their exploiters for most of the civil unrest in the Roman Empire, and he portrayed resistance to the English crown as a vast conspiracy of six cooperating "factions": Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers, Fifth Monarchists, and Levellers.[137] (It should be noted that in Parker's parlance, the word "faction" referred only to groups with which he disagreed, never to supporters of what he considered legitimate authority.) He praised the various acts of Parliament against nonconformist ministers as a necessary part of stopping the "plague of sedition."[138] Later he expressed his suspicion that the ejected ministers as a group were responsible for the Northern Rebellion.[139] He likewise endorsed the censorship of nonconformist literature, an unsurprising stance for a former censor: "By this law the great liberty of lying was taken away."[140] Here he inserted a reminder of his own involvement with the dissenters in his youth: "I, who was a young man at that time, do very well remember that these books [recording sightings of various prodigies] were consulted and perused with no less diligence than the Scriptures themselves. There was no one of the faction who had not these books, and did not read them with the deepest veneration."[141]

Of all the nonconformist groups, the one for which Parker had the most disdain and which he considered the most dangerous was the Quakers. He wrote that they were the only nonconformists who were not subdued (at least temporarily) in 1664 by the Conventicle Act

> because scarce any thing was so fundamental a piece of Religion with them, as non-submission to human authority : Therefore they met the

> oftner, because they were forbid to do so; nor could they be separated by any force, till a merry fellow thought of this stratagem: He proclaim'd in the King's name, that no one should depart without leave. Which he had scarcely done, when they all went about their business, for fear of obeying man.[142]

An understanding of the tremendous stress Parker laid on submission to authority makes clear why he hated this sect above all others. He expressed confidence that they and the other nonconformists would have risen in open rebellion in 1665 if the English had not defeated the Dutch at the Battle of Lowestoft that June.[143] He recounted the story of one James Turner, an English administrator in Scotland who was kidnaped by sectaries in the winter of 1666-1667 and who overheard a prayer in which a Scottish preacher threatened God with apostasy if the rebel cause did not succeed; Parker claimed he had found this account in Turner's journals, which had been given to him by a mutual friend.[144] A reader taking Parker's account at face value would conclude that little else of significance happened in England in the 1660s besides plots against the government.

As for the Church of England, Parker's account of its fortunes included several observations similar to those found in *Religion and Loyalty*. He pointed to the minor changes in the Church of England's liturgy after the Restoration as an example of the model of cooperation between church and state that he had relied on so heavily in the previous work. First, the Convocation had determined what changes were to be made, and then they presented them to Charles, who endorsed them and made them binding, "that what the Church has enacted by its spiritual power, may be inforc'd by the civil authority."[145] Parker thus implicitly likened Charles II to the best of the Roman emperors.

He likewise praised effusively the actions of Gilbert Sheldon and the high church party for their repression of nonconformist ministers. As noted above, Parker drew an explicit connection in *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*, between Emperor Zeno's efforts at comprehension and the latitudinarians of his own day. This connection was repeated in *History of His Own Times*; in discussing the failed effort to have Parliament pass some kind of comprehension in 1668, Parker declared, "And thus this pernicious design of a Comprehension perish'd; which, if it had not died in the birth, would have brought the same evils and plagues upon the Church of *England*, as were brought into the Catholick Church in *Zeno*'s time by his Henoticon."[146] He likewise noted with approval Parliament's squelching of a proposal for an indulgence, claiming, "It was not Indulgence which the Schismaticks desir'd, but Empire."[147] This was a repetition of Parker's accusations during the toleration controversy that, from the nonconformists' point of view, indulgence was simply a stepping-stone toward the ultimate goal of recapturing the state apparatus and bringing back the Commonwealth.

Parker's description of Sheldon is an important biographical source,[148] and mention should be made of it here, at least as far as it relates to Parker's own career. The archdeacon obviously felt affection and devotion for the man who had given his career in the state church a beginning and who had bestowed several livings upon him. He declared that he "must recommend some character of so great a mind, and so famous an example of virtue, to the imitation of posterity."[149] The portrayal in the following pages

leaves one with the strong impression that the archbishop probably had a significant influence on Parker's own views concerning the purpose and duties of religion.

Although Sheldon was "frequent and assiduous in prayers," he believed, like Parker, that good works were the true test of one's religion. According to Parker, his favorite expression was, "*Do well, and be merry*."[150] Like Parker, Sheldon had no use for those who seemed to focus all their attention on "the ceremonies and offices of worship." He imparted this emphasis on moral living to his proteges: "He often used to admonish young Noblemen and Gentlemen (of whom a great many flock'd to him, by the command of their parents,) 'Take care (said he) to be good and virtuous in the first place. . . . No piety can bring any advantage to you or any one, without probity of life and morals. . . . First lay the foundations of Religion in a good life.'"[151] Statements such as these could have come from the pages of the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* or any of Parker's other works, and it is interesting to speculate to what degree Sheldon shaped Parker's opinions in this area. Sheldon's biographer, Victor Sutch, believes that Parker was simply acting as the archbishop's mouthpiece when he wrote the *Discourse*.[152] This seems unlikely, given that Parker's earliest works, written before his association with Sheldon, already showed strong moralist and rationalist tendencies, as we have seen. However, we can reasonably assume that the archbishop, who by all accounts had a powerful personality, would have had an appreciable influence on a young clergyman such as Parker with whom he spent a great deal of time.

Sheldon, who was probably the single most important force behind the Act of Uniformity in 1662 and who worked to block subsequent efforts at comprehension and toleration, may also have imparted to Parker a portion of the latter's attitude toward Protestant nonconformists, although, again, there is evidence of animosity toward dissenters in Parker's earliest works. Parker described a curious incident (probably in 1668, while he was Sheldon's chaplain) in which the archbishop summoned him and another clergyman into his chambers and accused them both of being conspirators against the Church of England.[153] Both men denied the charge; when the other man left the room, Sheldon assured Parker that he knew he [Parker] was loyal. The purpose of the interview, he said, was to confirm the other clergyman's guilt by observing his reaction to the charge. Parker evidently thought this was a demonstration of great sagacity on Sheldon's part.[154] He also wrote movingly of Sheldon's friendship with Charles I and of the day the churchman spent with the king shortly before his execution.[155] It is possible that Sheldon's loyalty to Charles made an impact on the young Parker, who was ever after reminding his readers of the turmoil of the 1640s and warning against a repetition of them.

Book One concludes with a discussion of the Great Fire of 1666, and Parker made some effort at objectivity in describing the various explanations that had been advanced for it: chance, Dutch treachery, divine vengeance for some national sin, and papist arson, among other things. In the end, Parker refrained from offering his own definitive explanation, stating, "I think it rash to interpret the secret counsels of God."[156] However, he could not resist expressing a suspicion that the episode was a divine punishment for the rebellion against Charles I in the 1640s. The section is revealing for its illumination of a certain inconsistency in Parker's thinking; whereas in previous writings he had condemned nonconformists for seeing the hand of divine providence in what (to him) was mundane, here he did almost precisely the same thing, albeit with some restraint.[157]

Books Two and Three of *History of His Own Times* deal chiefly with secular politics, both domestic and foreign, between 1666 and 1686. These sections continued to highlight Parker's concern for lawful authority, even in a non-religious context. He invariably referred to "legitimate" rulers of foreign nations, whether Protestant or Catholic, with a measure of respect, even if they waged war against England during the period in question. Louis XIV of France, for example, was a "gallant and understanding prince"; elsewhere, Parker used the traditional French appellation "Most Christian King" in reference to Louis.[158]

He spent several pages rhapsodizing about how another Roman Catholic, Jan Sobieski of Poland, was a great hero of Christendom for his wars against the Tartars and Turks. He suggested that Sobieski's feats were manifestations of divine providence: "He was inflam'd with that innate hatred against the Infidels, and that ardent zeal for the Christian faith, that he was as it were sent into the world on purpose to rescue *Europe* from the foul and shameful tyranny of the Infidels."[159] He lamented that the Polish king's efforts to construct a grand alliance of all Christendom against Islam were unsuccessful, commenting, "(by whose ambition and treachery it was chiefly prevented, I shall not say)."[160]

On the Protestant side, writing about the Netherlands, Parker unhesitatingly sided with the House of Orange against the republican "conspirators" led by Jan de Witt. He clearly regarded the stripping of the family's authority during the 1650s (during the minority of William of Orange) and the subsequent Perpetual Edict of 1667, which abolished the office of stadt-holder, as completely illegitimate. According to him, it was de Witt's fault that Louis' armies enjoyed such successes in their attack on the Netherlands in 1672: "Nor indeed was it much to be wondred at; for the raising of forces was delayed by the Conspirators (who at that time had the administration of affairs), lest the chief command of the army should fall to the Prince of *Orange*."[161] When discussing the death of de Witt and his brother Cornelius at the hands of an angry mob, Parker issued a rare qualification to his previously published assessments of the effects of rioting: "It often happens that even tumults bring about a change for the better."[162] The "change for the better" in this case was the repeal of the Perpetual Edict and the restoration of all the honors previously stripped from the House of Orange. Parker ended the section by expressing the wish that William would "long enjoy the Government which he won by so many battles and dangers"; one wonders if Parker's opinion of William might have changed if he had been able to foresee the events of November and December 1688.[163]

As usual, rebels of all stripes received Parker's condemnation. Thus we find a negative treatment of efforts by Sicilians to throw off Spanish rule in the mid-1670s, with a focus on the murder of noblemen and spoliation of churches by the insurgents.[164] Parker praised Charles II's proclamation which forbade all commerce with the rebels: "A Declaration worthy of a King! for it is the common cause of all Kings, that they should keep their subjects in their duty and obedience."[165] He also denounced the Hungarian rebellion of a few years later, arguing that it provided important assistance to Turkish attempts to conquer the region.[166] In all, Parker's view of the international scene in his own day conformed quite closely to the philosophy of authority he had laid out in his previous works.

In his discussion of domestic politics, Parker's portrayal of "the Faction" (his name for the Cabal ministry) in Book Two is instructive. The archdeacon briefly mentioned the fall of the earl of Clarendon and added, "At the same time, all the old Counsellors lost the King's favour, who had shewn the strictest fidelity to him, thro' all the changes of times."[167] Perhaps intentionally, he refrained from discussing the shortcomings and policy failures of these advisers; he explains neither why Charles rejected them nor why the members of the Cabal came to power. In dealing with the Cabal, Parker pursued a definite strategy. First, he constructed a portrait of Anthony Ashley-Cooper (whom Charles created earl of Shaftesbury on 23 April 1672) as the dominant influence within the ministry; in fact, the other four members of the Cabal received almost no attention whatever. Key to this portrayal of Shaftesbury was a focus on the peer's well-known sympathies for Protestant dissenters and his efforts on their behalf (as when he provided important backing for Charles' Declaration of Indulgence in 1672). Secondly, Parker attempted to show that all misfortunes occurring in England during the late 1660s and early 1670s (and in some cases after that) were the fault of the Cabal. In this way, he continued to associate implicitly nonconformity with harmful public policy.

According to Parker, Shaftesbury worked to undermine Charles' authority while pretending to uphold it. This caused the kingdom to divide into two confederacies: "the Faction" on one side and "all good men" on the other.[168] A key issue here (to Parker) was the enforcement of the various penal laws passed against nonconformists during the Clarendon ministry. Whereas the Faction favored lax enforcement, the loyalist Parliament remained vigilant against the perceived threat from the dissenters. Faced with Parliament's intransigence, the Faction sowed dissension between the Commons and Lords over procedural issues related to the case of *Skinner v. East India Company*. The resulting strife led to a proroguing of Parliament in both 1668 and 1669, a development which the Faction hoped would allow nonconformists to operate in a relatively unimpeded manner. Of course, Parker viewed the Faction's maneuvers as reprehensible.

In addition to accusing the Cabal of interfering with Parliament, Parker condemned its conduct of domestic policy. For example, he viewed the sale of fee-farm rents to relieve short-term debt as highly irresponsible, for it led to a long-term erosion of royal income. Even worse was the closing of the Exchequer in January 1672, which reduced confidence in the crown, in addition to causing "widows and orphans" to lose their bank deposits. Parker blamed Shaftesbury for this policy, when in fact Thomas Clifford was the minister chiefly responsible for it.[169] In fact, Shaftesbury had opposed the measure in council; his defense of it in a speech delivered to Parliament in February 1673 was probably what led to Parker's erroneous assumption.[170] Given his presuppositions, Parker no doubt believed these policies represented an intentional undermining of royal authority by Shaftesbury.

In foreign policy, Parker criticized the Cabal for abandoning the "Triple Alliance" with the Swedes and Dutch in favor of an alliance with Louis XIV of France.[171] He elsewhere conceded that there had been ample provocation for terminating the alliance with the Dutch, accusing Jan de Witt of having approached Louis about a proposed alliance against England.[172] However, the Triple Alliance had been an important counterweight to French might on the continent, and Parker believed England's rejection of it had destroyed the European balance of power. In his view, not only the Third Dutch

War (1672-1674) but also most of Christendom's troubles in the 1670s and 1680s, including the Sicilian and Hungarian revolts and the Turkish and Tartar invasions of Eastern Europe, could have been prevented by the maintenance of the Triple Alliance.[173] His reasoning was that these conflicts were part of a ripple effect resulting from France's aggressive wars, which presumably would not have taken place had England remained committed to a policy of deterrence. He pointed to the Sicilian revolt as evidence for this view; Louis had aided the rebels until he learned that Charles had decided to assist Spain in putting down the rebellion.[174] Here at least Parker did not accuse Shaftesbury and the Cabal of intentionally undermining international stability; however, he characterized some of their actions during the period, such as authorizing an attack on the Dutch without a prior declaration of war in 1672, as treacherous.[175] Parker either did not know or thought it not fit to mention that Charles II had wanted an alliance with Louis since 1660, and that in the arena of foreign policy, the Cabal was certainly carrying out the royal will.[176]

Book Four of *History of His Own Times* returned to consideration of religious issues. The focus of much of this section was the controversy surrounding Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, which we have already examined as part of the larger toleration controversy in Chapters Two and Three. Predictably, Parker's treatment of the nonconformists was harsh, but in other respects his tone differed from that of his pronouncements of the early 1670s. Here, he argued that despite religious toleration's being the "nursery of all evils," necessities of war against the Dutch forced Charles' hand, and that the king was not to be faulted for issuing the indulgence. He also claimed that indulgence was not necessarily an evil in wartime if it helped avoid civil disorder.[177] However, he insisted that rebellious subjects repaid evil for good by using the indulgence as a cover for subversive activities; for example, he alleged that the newly-legalized conventicles had been used by nonconformist leaders to recruit soldiers for a possible uprising against the crown. Therefore, according to him, the experiment in toleration was a disaster.

Parker singled out Shaftesbury (again) and Andrew Marvell, both of whom had conveniently died by the mid-1680s, for special condemnation in his discussion of the 1672-1673 period. He claimed that Shaftesbury, who by that time had become Lord Chancellor, had tried to bolster his support among the nonconformists when his position at court had begun to weaken, both by inveighing against a nonexistent threat from English Roman Catholics (including pushing for passage of the 1673 Test Act in the House of Lords) and by raising unjustified fears about excessive royal power. The result of his posing as a martyr for Protestantism at court was an increase in social unrest. It must be said that, in his treatment of Shaftesbury throughout the *History of His Own Times*, Parker in all likelihood was reading the minister's actions as leader of the "Country" opposition after 1673 back into the 1667-1673 period to some degree. There is no reason to favor a conspiracy theory of Shaftesbury's actions during this time; he had shown no signs of disloyalty to Charles, in matters of religion or anything else. Even his advocacy of the Test Act, to which Charles agreed and to which Parker's opposition is discussed in the following chapter, may have been one of simple expedience in order to get the House of Commons to take up what he saw as a more pressing money bill.[178] It was only Shaftesbury's parting of the ways with Charles in 1673 that made him an attractive target to Parker. The bishop, writing at some remove, could now safely

criticize acts such as the Declaration of Indulgence and the breaking of the Triple Alliance (which were Charles' doing as much as anyone's) by assigning the responsibility for them to the minister who was subsequently disgraced. Writing in 1686 or 1687, Parker would have felt confident that his denunciation of one of the people most responsible for trying to have James II excluded from the succession would have found a sympathetic hearing.

Parker's treatment of Marvell leaves the reader with the suspicion that the bishop was still smarting from the satirist's polemic even after fourteen years; he characterized him as a "scoffer" and "buffoon" who distracted national attention from the serious issues at hand in the toleration controversy by "ridiculing God and the King, Religion, the Church, and common Modesty, by comical and lewd buffoonery."[179] He indignantly pointed out the incongruity of Marvell's enthusiastic praise of indulgence in 1672 with his equally strident condemnation of it in *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* a few years later, the difference being that in the latter case an indulgence would have benefitted Roman Catholics more than Protestant nonconformists.

Assessing the importance of the toleration controversy, Parker wrote, "From this fountain [of indulgence] sprang the greatest calamities and misfortunes of the *English* government; for this liberty being once granted, one ruin precipitately tumbled and rolled upon another."[180] Later he even declared that the Church of England had nearly been destroyed because of the episode: "We were so near to destruction, that we can hardly believe that we still live; neither can we look back without horror upon the greatness of the danger. But whatsoever evils we suffer'd, they all proceeded from this unhappy policy."[181] He did not offer specific reasons for why the policy had been potentially so lethal to the established church other than to say that it emboldened the sectaries. However, he hinted that the indulgence led eventually to the "Popish Plot" in the late 1670s.

The *History of His Own Times* ends abruptly with a reference to the proroguing of Parliament until 21 October 1678, "at which time the King acquainted the Parliament with *Oates*'s conspiracy."[182] This tantalizing and apparently transitional statement, combined with a knowledge of Parker's personal history, leads us to the conclusion that, in all likelihood, *History of His Own Times* is an unfinished work. As we saw in Chapter One, Parker was one of Titus Oates' superiors in the Canterbury diocese and thus had personal knowledge of and dealings with him. He had ejected him from his living in Bobbing, Kent, on two different occasions, and he may have been one of the people whom the sham Popish Plot was supposed to implicate. It is inconceivable that a man of Parker's temperament, writing in the reign of the Roman Catholic James II, would have refrained from discussing this episode in his history; the opportunity to vindicate his own actions as an administrator and to denigrate those churchmen (especially Archbishop Sancroft) and nonconformists who were taken in by Oates' machinations would have been irresistible.

In a similar vein, it is extremely unlikely that Parker would have stopped his account before discussing the "Exclusion Crisis" and "Tory Reaction" of the early and mid-1680s. The attempts to exclude James from the succession would have given him another perfect opportunity to criticize his opponents and paint them as disloyal subjects. In all probability, Parker would have seen the subsequent swing in public opinion towards support of the monarchy and, to a lesser extent, the Church of England as a

vindication of all that he had fought for over the previous two decades. Certainly events such as the Rye House Plot would have seemed to him at least as important as contemporary events on the continent, which he covered in Book Three. Their absence indicates that Parker was unable to finish the work before his death in early 1688. The unfinished state of the manuscript would also explain why *History of His Own Times*, alone of Parker's major works, remained unpublished during his lifetime.

Parker's Tory concerns dictated the outline and course of his history. He took every opportunity to disparage nonconformists and proto-Whigs of the 1660s and 1670s while praising their royalist and high church opponents. Charles himself received adulation, with Parker's only negative comment being a reference to his "too liberal" spending habits.[183] One notes the same preoccupations in the two volumes of *Religion and Loyalty*. Parker read his own concerns about civil unrest, religious dissent, and lawful authority back into the ancient past and allowed them to dictate the form and content of his narrative. We find almost nothing in it beyond the doings of emperors and rebels, bishops and heretics. Of course, Parker was forthcoming regarding this approach in his addresses to his readers; after all, the explicit purpose of the book was to examine the historical relationships between rulers and ruled in religious matters. However, the fact remains that Parker went to the past with a polemical and political goal in mind.

For the most part, Parker was able to interpret events and relationships in the pre-Christian and Christian Roman Empire as a confirmation of his theories of lawful authority, passive obedience, and respective jurisdictions of church and state. Armed with this evidence, he proceeded to draw parallels between ancient and contemporary situations and make implicit or explicit recommendations about Restoration-era issues based on the good or bad examples of antiquity. In this way the past became a weapon with which he could assail his political and religious adversaries. History had proved, he insisted, that policies of comprehension and toleration were doomed to failure. He greatly desired Charles II to follow the lead of Constantine or Justin and enact severe civil penalties upon those who would not submit to the Church of England's pronouncements, as determined by its bishops in Convocation, concerning doctrine and practice.

The climate of public opinion in England during the Tory Reaction may explain why responses to *Religion and Loyalty* did not appear, but it is hard to believe that the *History of His Own Times* would have failed to provoke rebuttal had it been published during Parker's lifetime. The sentiments it expressed make clear why Whigs and nonconformists continued to revile the bishop even decades after his death. The editor of *History of His Own Times*' third edition, which was published in 1730, subtitled the work *The Tories Chronicle* and, after noting that Parker was buried in Magdalen College's chapel, declared, "It were to be wished that this *Legendary History* of his *Life* and *Times*, had been *buried* with him."[184]

---

[1] Arber, 2:40.

[2] *RL*, sig. A2r.

[3] Ibid., sig. A2v.

[4] Several other books arguing for the necessity of nonresistance appeared about the same time as *Religion and Loyalty*: William Sherlock, *The Case of Resistance of the Supreme Powers Stated and Resolved According to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures* (London: 1684); William Bates, *The Great Duty of Resignation* (London: 1684); Clement Ellis, *The Right Foundation of Quietness, Obedience, and Concord* (London: 1684).

[5] Ibid., 6.

[6] Ibid., 8.

[7] Ibid., 12.

[8] Ibid., 22.

[9] Ibid., 25. Cf. *DEP*, 112-13.

[10] *RL*, 27.

[11] Ibid., 33.

[12] Ibid., 28-29.

[13] *DCEP*, 276.

[14] *RL*, 34.

[15] Ibid., 38.

[16] Ibid., 43.

[17] Ibid., 47.

[18] *Leviathan*, 541-42.

[19] Ibid., 531, 567-70.

[20] *RL*, 57.

[21] Ibid., 70.

[22] Ibid., 64.

[23] Ibid., 72-73.

[24] In many respects, this discussion of suffering resembled statements by some contemporary nonconformists. For example, John Bunyan had condemned the Rye House Plot and insisted on the necessity of suffering willingly (see Richard Greaves, *John Bunyan and English Nonconformity* (London: Hambledon Press, 1992), 177-83).

Other nonconformists likewise stressed nonviolence, although they were willing to plead their case in the press and occasionally in open confrontation with government officials, tactics which pleased neither Parker nor his allies (see N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987), ch. 2).

[25] For more information, see *DNB*, *s.v.*

[26] William Lamont, Introduction to Richard Baxter, *A Holy Commonwealth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), ix.

[27] *RL*, 82-83.

[28] Ibid., 83.

[29] Ibid., 84.

[30] Ibid., 85.

[31] Ibid., 88.

[32] Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex* (London, 1644), 275.

[33] *RL*, 90.

[34] Ibid., 91.

[35] Baxter, 185-87.

[36] *RL*, 93.

[37] Baxter, 187.

[38] *RL*, 95.

[39] Baxter, 191.

[40] Ibid., 199.

[41] *RL*, 97.

[42] Ibid., 100.

[43] Rutherford, 313.

[44] Ibid., 314.

[45] *RL*, 107.

[46] Ibid., 114.

[47] Ibid., 116.

[48] Ibid., 134.

[49] Ibid., 140.

[50] Ibid., 143-44.

[51] Ibid., 144.

[52] Ibid., 146-47.

[53] *ANF*, 4:664.

[54] *ANF*, 1:552.

[55] *ANF*, 5:462.

[56] *RL*, 265.

[57] Ibid., 266.

[58] Ibid., 268.

[59] Ibid., 270.

[60] Ibid., 283-84.

[61] Ibid., 293. It should be noted that later historians have questioned the authenticity of this letter.

[62] *RL*, 299-300.

[63] Ibid., 308.

[64] Ibid., 308-09.

[65] Ibid., 314.

[66] Ibid., 335 ff.

[67] Ibid., 348.

[68] Ibid., 353.

[69] Ibid., 358.

[70] *NPNF*, 2:14. Cf. *RL*, 358.

[71] *NPNF*, 2:15.

[72] *RL*, 369-70.

[73] *NPNF*, 2:32. Cf. *RL*, 390.

[74] *RL*, 398.

[75] Ibid., 416.

[76] Ibid., 417.

[77] Ibid., 418-19.

[78] Ibid., 419-20.

[79] Ibid., 432-33.

[80] Magnentius seized control of the west by murdering Constantius' brother Constans, an act which, according to Parker, made him "the first man pretending to Christianity, that ever thought of Rebelling against his Sovereign Prince, though it is Evident, that he was at best a counterfeit Christian." *RL*, 457.

[81] *RL*, 465.

[82] *RL*, 514.

[83] Parker's account more or less followed Sozomen's. See *NPNF*, 2:312-21.

[84] *RL*, 526.

[85] Ibid., 534.

[86] Ibid., 535.

[87] Ibid., 553.

[88] Ibid., 554.

[89] Ibid., 560-62.

[90] *NPNF*, 2:330. Parker echoed this sentiment.

[91] *RL*, 587-88. Cf. *NPNF*, 2:339-40.

[92] "What influenced the vile trickster in stopping the execution was his envy: he grudged the champions of the faith their glory." *NPNF*, 3:102.

[93] *RL*, 589.

[94] Ibid., 596.

[95] Arber, 2:91.

[96] *RLII*, 10.

[97] Ibid., 40.

[98] Ibid., 44.

[99] Ibid., 46.

[100] This statement is consistent with Parker's essentially moralist view of the nature of true religion. See Chapter Two for a discussion of this idea.

[101] *RLII*, 50.

[102] See Chapter Four.

[103] *RLII*, 57-58.

[104] Ibid., 118, 123.

[105] Ibid., 88.

[106] *NPNF*, 10:441.

[107] *RLII*, 97.

[108] The Gnostics and Manicheans were dualists who held that the material world was evil. Some showed their disdain for the flesh by engaging in licentious behavior, claiming that physical acts could not contaminate the spirit.

[109] *RLII*, 133.

[110] Ibid., 127.

[111] Ibid., 136, 137.

[112] Ibid., 144.

[113] Ibid., 162.

[114] Ibid., 174.

[115] Ibid., 226.

[116] *NPNF*, 2:172.

[117] *RLII*, 258.

[118] Ibid., 272.

[119] Ibid., 279.

[120] Ibid., 295-96.

[121] Ibid., 315.

[122] Ibid., 340.

[123] Ibid., 360.

[124] Ibid., 366.

[125] Ibid..

[126] Ibid., 388.

[127] Ibid., 389.

[128] Ibid., 403.

[129] Ibid., 413-15.

[130] Ibid., 421.

[131] Ibid., 491.

[132] Ibid., 502. The factions were organized around different sports teams which competed in the Hippodrome in Constantinople; they also were significant in the organized crime in the city. Members of both participated in the revolt, which was occasioned by the arrest of leaders of each group. Justinian almost fled the city, and probably would have lost his throne, but the empress Theodora persuaded him to remain and put down the rebellion.

[133] Ibid., 309.

[134] Bodl., Tanner MS 34, fol. 240r.

[135] *HHOT*, 6.

[136] Ibid., 11.

[137] Ibid., 55.

[138] Ibid., 22.

[139] Ibid., 78-81.

[140] Ibid., 23.

[141] Ibid., 25-26.

[142] Ibid., 88-89.

[143] Ibid., 92. Parker incorrectly dated the battle, writing that it occurred in July.

[144] *HHOT*, 107-10.

[145] Ibid., 26.

[146] Ibid., 40-41. See Chapter Two for more discussion of the proposed 1668 comprehension.

[147] Ibid., 65.

[148] For example, Sheldon's biographer, Victor Sutch, relied on it heavily. See Victor D. Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon, Architect of Anglican Survival, 1640-1675* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).

[149] *HHOT*, 41.

[150] Ibid., 42.

[151] Ibid., 44-45.

[152] See Sutch, 108-09.

[153] In the context of the passage, the "conspiracy" was probably the proposed plan of comprehension for the Church of England.

[154] *HHOT*, 39-40.

[155] Ibid., 51.

[156] Ibid., 119.

[157] See Chapter Three for a discussion of Parker's criticism of the Puritan view of providence.

[158] *HHOT*, 131, 254.

[159] Ibid., 269-70.

[160] Ibid., 270.

[161] Ibid., 250.

[162] Ibid., 258. This is not to imply that Parker approved of the mob's actions; on the contrary, he made his disgust clear. Commenting on reports that the insurrectionists had disemboweled and eaten the flesh of the brothers, he wrote, "Thus they made a savage feast of these brothers, whom they had worship'd as gods for some years; not thro' revenge (for that is a generous vice, and seems to carry somewhat great in it) but for the sake of diversion and mockery."

[163] *HHOT*, 259.

[164] Ibid., 272.

[165] Ibid., 274.

[166] Ibid., 282-287.

[167] Ibid., 129.

[168] Ibid., 130.

[169] Kenneth Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 294-96.

[170] As noted in Chapter One, Parker was granted access to Parliament's records beginning in 1684, and it is likely that these were his principal source when researching his history.

[171] *HHOT*, 131, 148-50.

[172] Ibid., 254-55.

[173] Ibid., 259, 300-301.

[174] Ibid., 278.

[175] Ibid., 145-48.

[176] Haley, 268-69.

[177] *HHOT*, 303, 310.

[178] Haley, 322-24.

[179] *HHOT*, 368-69.

[180] Ibid., 370.

[181] Ibid., 378.

[182] Ibid., 424.

[183] Ibid., 380.

[184] Samuel Parker, *Bishop Parker's History: Or, the Tories Chronicle, from The Restauration of King Charles II. 1660, to the Year 1680* (London, 1730), 7.

CHAPTER SIX
BISHOP PARKER

The last year and a half of Samuel Parker's life was one of its most eventful periods. Not only was the archdeacon made, first, a bishop, and second, the president of a prestigious university college, but he also found himself for a brief time at the center of another national controversy. A proper evaluation of Parker's actions during this crucial period in 1687-1688 demands a familiarity with his writings of the previous two decades. When viewed in the context of these writings, his behavior does not indicate a jettisoning of the principles he previously held in favor of rapid advancement; rather, it can be seen as a natural outgrowth of the philosophy of authority he had gradually developed since the late 1660s.

Parker was made bishop of Oxford in 1686 following the death of the previous incumbent, John Fell (1625-1686), who had also been dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and one of the most important figures of the period. Fell was a stalwart defender of the state church and royal authority; Anthony Wood called him "the most zealous man of his time for the church of England." Gilbert Burnet, historian and later bishop of Salisbury, said he was "a man of great strictness . . . and of much devotion," and one of the most zealous opponents of popery in the church.[1] In 1685 he summoned undergraduates at Oxford to take up arms against the duke of Monmouth's rebellion.[2] His death occurred in mid-July of the following year.[3]

It seems that Parker's candidacy for a bishopric had been voiced in certain circles for some time. As early as January 1684, Edmund Elys wrote to the dean of Durham Cathedral, "So wicked in Print I hear Dr Parker is like to be a Bishop, if such a thing come what It will be the greatest Infamy that ever fell upon the Church of England, besides the Mischief that may come by it[.] I Bless God the Mouthes of Many Learned, & Pious Men are Open agst him."[4] Elys did not mention which bishopric he thought Parker would gain, and he anticipated the event by several years. Writing soon after Fell's death, Roger Morrice expressed the belief that Parker was the most likely candidate to succeed Fell.[5]

Morrice's feeling proved correct, and James II soon nominated Parker to replace Fell. About the same time, the king nominated Thomas Cartwright, dean of Ripon and another Tory stalwart, to fill the vacant bishopric of Chester. These two choices caused a good deal of consternation in some circles within the state church. Burnet called Cartwright "ambitious and servile, cruel and boisterous," and asserted that he had long desired "to raise the king's authority above law."[6] He and Parker "were pitched on, as the fittest instruments that could be found among all the clergy, to betray and ruin the church."[7]

The extent to which some of the bishops disliked Parker and Cartwright manifested itself in an attempt to prevent their consecration. Burnet related the incident:

> Some of the bishops brought to archbishop Sancroft articles against them, which they desired he would offer to the king in council, and pray that the mandate for consecrating them might be delayed, till time were given to examine particulars. And bishop Lloyd told me, that Sancroft promised to him not to consecrate them, till he had examined the truth of the articles; of which some were too scandalous to be repeated. Yet, when Sancroft saw what danger he might incur, if he were sued in a *premunire*, he consented to consecrate them.[8]

Given Parker's previous complaint against the archbishop, the threat of legal action against him may have been substantive. Fears of encroaching popery in the church were widespread and doubtless were part of what motivated the attempt to obstruct the two nominations, but Sancroft's long association with Parker may have convinced him that the archdeacon, at least, had no intention of bowing his knee to Rome.

Parker and Cartwright were consecrated at Lambeth Palace on 17 October 1686.[9] James had issued a warrant on 29 September commanding Sancroft to grant Parker a dispensation allowing him to hold his archdeaconry, the rectory at Ickham, and Eastbridge Hospital *in commendam* with his new bishopric.[10] Thus, although Parker was no longer a member of the chapter at Christchurch in Canterbury, he was able to retain a significant income and other privileges in the Canterbury diocese despite his absentee status. This was no doubt galling to his enemies and in all likelihood created a bad impression among the clergy he was to oversee in his new diocese.

Although Parker was bishop of Oxford for less than a year and a half before his death, several noteworthy events occurred during his brief tenure that deserve mention here. The first was a dispute between him and his subordinate clergy over how to respond to the Declaration of Indulgence issued by James on 4 April 1687, which also included a statement guaranteeing the rights and property of the Church of England. Parker composed an address to James offering "most heartie thanks for those gracious Expressions, of your Kindness & for all your former assurances of your Royall favour to the Church of England," while expressing "our loyalty as becoms the true sons of the Church of England & your Majesties most obedient Subjects & Servants."[11] Set in the context of his previous writings dealing with the supreme temporal sovereignty of the monarch, who had the authority ultimately to decide all issues of property, Parker's composition of an address of this sort is not surprising, although his philosophy would not have made it absolutely necessary.

The dispute arose when Parker commanded the clergy of the Oxford diocese to subscribe their names to this address. The order resulted in widespread resistance and noncompliance. At least two different manuscript copies of Parker's address accompanied by a list of reasons why it should not be subscribed to have survived.[12] The author of this rebuttal, William Jane, dean of Gloucester, alleged that there were only two possible reasons for the address: first, that it might help the clergy retain the king's favor and dissuade the treasury from extracting the full worth of the first-fruits tax; and second,

that it would demonstrate the unity of the Oxford clergy in their submission both to James and to Parker.[13]

On the other hand, Jane argued that there were several good reasons to disavow the address. First, thanking the king for respecting the church's possessions implied that the church's rights of property were more arbitrary than those of other subjects, and expressing gratitude to James for the free exercise of their religion put the Anglican clergy on the same level as the Roman Catholic and dissenting leaders, who were dependent on the king's indulgence. An address representing only the Oxford clergy had the potential to cause a division between that diocese and the rest of the Church of England, and "either begett a new schism or widen the old ones, which are already deplorable." Moreover, the laity would be tempted "not only to disgust us for our rash complyance with suspected artifices, which may rise up here after against us to our own & the Churches prejudice, but to waver in the stedfastness of their own profession when they see us owning the exercise of our established Religion to be so precarious." Finally, if the Church of England's championing of James in the Exclusion Parliaments and Monmouth's rebellion were not enough to persuade him of its loyalty, Parker's address, "which coppyes out fanaticall thanksgiving," certainly would not.[14]

Jane proceeded to recommend that Parker be implored not to require public declarations from the clergy without consulting them first. He expressed doubts as to the propriety of Parker's actions, writing, "This Address is noe instance of Canonicall Obedience that wee know of," and complaining that the bishop had treated his clergy "like children in a very weake & passive Minority when he requires our Subscription to a formed Address wherein he neither has consulted us, nor given us leave to word ouselvs or speak our own Sence."[15] Parker did have defenders outside the church; in fact, Roger Lestrange composed and published a rebuttal to the various points of the protest.[16] However, Parker's clergy remained united against him. One account records that when Parker summoned them together to subscribe to his address, "they all unanimously refused."[17] R. A. Beddard writes that "the argument for solidarity with the lay leaders of their church was conclusive" in bringing about this refusal.[18] Evidently, Parker was not a popular superior after this incident, if he had ever been one before; a newsletter writer noted later in the year, "Our Bishop lives at Cuddesdon, but the Clergy do not very much resort to his house."[19]

Parker the Papist?

The second significant event of Parker's tenure at Oxford was the publication of his final work, *Reasons for Abrogating the Test Imposed upon All Members of Parliament* (1687), which appeared shortly after he had become president of Magdalen College (discussed below). As the title indicated, the book recommended the repeal of the Test Act of 1678, which required all members of Parliament to make a declaration against the doctrine of transubstantiation. This law and its predecessor, the Test Act of 1673, which required a similar oath of civil and military officers, were the product of the climate of anti-popery which had flourished in England in the 1670s. Now in the reign of James II (who had been specifically exempted from them) they were at the center of

controversy. James had commissioned several Roman Catholic officers in violation of the 1673 act, claiming that he had authority to suspend the act in specific cases. The aforementioned Declaration of Indulgence of April 1687 suspended both Test Acts (and some other laws) in their entirety and sparked determined resistance from the Tories, High Church, and even the latitudinarian interests. Several dozen works dealing with some aspect of the transubstantiation question were published in 1687 and 1688; the indulgence was in all likelihood the catalyst for this outpouring from various quarters, and thus Parker, as he had in 1669, was entering a preexisting debate. Having already broken ranks with the Tories concerning the indulgence, in *Reasons* he took the next step and called for outright repeal of the Test.

To those who already believed Parker was a papist, this book could only have strengthened their suspicions, especially when the bishop began admitting Roman Catholics to Magdalen on James' orders. After the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, *Reasons* was probably Parker's most widely read work. Anthony Wood recorded that "this book was licensed by Robert earl of Sunderland secretary of state under king James II, on the 10th of December 1687, and on the 16th of the said month it being published, all or most of the impression of 2000 were sold before the evening of the next day. Several answers, full of girds and severe reflections on the author, were soon after published."[20]

Reasons began with a list of four reasons why members of Parliament should not have been required to abjure transubstantiation. First, "It doth not only diminish, but utterly destroy the natural *Rights* of *Peerage*, and turns the *Birth-right* of the English *Nobility* into a *precarious* Title: So that what was in all former Ages only forfeited by *Treason*, is now at the mercy of every *Faction* or every *Passion* in Parliament."[21] Parker pointed out that the 1673 Test Act had included a proviso protecting all the rights and privileges of the peerage. Also, when a loyalty oath abjuring the taking up of arms against the king under any pretense whatsoever had been proposed in the House of Lords in 1675, it was cast out after a protestation was entered asserting that *any* required oath, the refusal of which enjoined some penalty, was "*the highest* Invasion *of the* Liberties *and* Privileges *of the* Peerage *which possibly may be*."[22]

The second reason Parker offered for the abrogation of the 1678 Test Act was its "poisonous root," specifically that it was "brought forth on purpose to give *Credit* and Reputation to the *Perjury*" of Titus Oates. According to Parker, the discovery of Oates' hoax should have been followed by the destruction of "all the Records of Acts done by the Government to abett it."[23] He predicted that history, not to mention foreign nations, would judge the contemporary nobility harshly for allowing impositions on themselves on such a spurious pretext. He also argued that the least Parliament could do to make amends for the injuries suffered by Roman Catholic peers as a result of the Popish Plot would be "*to restore* *em to their natural Rights."[24]

Parker returned to his model of appropriate church-state relations in his next objection to the Test, arguing that Parliament had exercised an "*incompetent Authority*" in enacting it. Parliament had acted on a doctrinal matter without any prior resolution by the church meeting in Convocation, and therefore it had behaved "contrary to the Practice of the Christian World in all Ages." Only the church had the authority, given by Christ's commission, to make "Decrees concerning Divine Verities," and that power was "the very *Foundation* upon which the whole Fabrick of the Christian Church has hitherto

stood."[25] By its actions, Parliament had violated the jurisdiction of the church and by extension had attacked Christ.

To Parker, the contention that the church had in effect endorsed the Test through the bishops, who sat in the House of Lords and had voted in favor of it, was fatally flawed. As an ecclesiastical measure, the Test "ought to have been antecedently enacted by them, without any *Lay-concurrence*. . . . Then, and not before then, was it lawful for the Parliament to take it into their Consideration." Moreover, bishops sat in the House of Lords *not* "as *Bishops*, but as *Temporal Barons*, and so act not there by virtue of any Power derived from our *Blessed Saviour*, but from the meer *Grace* and *Favour* of the *King*."[26] Thus, bishops could not be the official voice of the church in the House of Lords. Even if this were not true, English law still placed ecclesiastical power with Convocation, and any law of an ecclesiastical nature had to have its consent.

Parker's final argument against the Test focused on the nature of the oath required of the members of Parliament. This included, first, a declaration that transubstantiation did not occur during the Eucharist and, second, an affirmation that invoking or praying to saints or the Virgin Mary was idolatrous. Parker thought it was ridiculous to require the laity to make any sort of declaration concerning such doctrinal matters:

> Now to oblige the whole Nobility of a Nation, to swear to the Truth of such *abstruse* and *uncertain* Propositions, which they neither *do* nor *can*, nor indeed *ought* to understand, and this upon Penalty of forfeiting the Privileges of their *Birth-right*, is such a monstrous and inhumane Piece of Barbarity as could never have enter'd into the Thoughts of any Man, but the *infamous Author* of it, neither into his (as malicious as his Nature was) but in his fierce Pursuit of Princely Blood.[27]

In other words, the campaign to bring about the 1678 Test Act was in reality part of a vendetta against the future James II, leading naturally to the Bills of Exclusions in the following years.

As a transition into the main body of the book, Parker asserted that the meaning of the terms "transubstantiation" and "idolatry" in the oath were highly uncertain, so that most of the people who took the oath had no idea what they were denying or affirming: "I fansie that if every Man were obliged to give his own account of it, whatever Transubstantiation may be, it would certainly be *Babel*."[28] He therefore proposed to outline an historical account of the controversy over transubstantiation and also to examine how Biblical writers used the word "idolatry." He believed that an understanding of these two things would convince the reader of the absurdity of the Test.

Parker stated that it was beyond dispute that the early Church Fathers had unanimously affirmed the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and that "transubstantiation" was one of several terms they had used to refer to this event. According to him, the first dispute concerning the matter occurred in the eleventh century, when Berengar of Tours denied the Real Presence, insisting that the elements were only symbols of Christ's body and blood. Berengar eventually recanted this view, and Pope Gregory VII required him to affirm that the elements "*are changed into the true and* proper Flesh *and* Blood *of Christ*."[29] Parker claimed that this was simply the historic doctrine the church had always embraced.

A new problem arose with the synthesis of Christianity and Aristotelian philosophy attempted by the Scholastics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. These churchmen, whom Parker evidently held in low esteem, insisted on interpreting the Real Presence in an Aristotelian fashion, "by separating the *Form* of the Bread from the *Matter*; but chiefly by separating the *inward Substance* of Bread, from its *outward Quantity*, and its *retinue of Qualities*."[30] This attempted formulation resulted in endless disputes among the Scholastics. According to Parker, the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 which asserted that the eucharistic elements were "transubstantiated" into Christ's body and blood was simply a reaffirmation of the Real Presence without specifying the precise mode of the transformation and thus taking a neutral stance in the Scholastic disputes. The word "transubstantiate" was later "hammer'd into a Thousand *shapes* and *forms*" by the Scholastics, particularly Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, "the very *Caesar* and *Pompey* of the Schools."[31] Crucially for Parker, none of these Scholastic definitions of "transubstantiation"was ever labeled as authoritative by the church as a whole. According to him, both the Fourth Lateran Council's and the sixteenth-century Council of Trent's usages of the word were a simple reference to the Real Presence.

Parker then turned to the history of the dispute over transubstantiation in Protestant churches, "where we shall find the same *Harmony* of *Faith* and *Discord* of *Philosophy*."[32] He noted that the Confession of Augsburg (1530), drawn up by Philip Melanchthon, affirmed the Real Presence. He also quoted other writings of Melanchthon, who he claimed had been a greater influence on the English Reformation (because of his moderation) than had Martin Luther or John Calvin. For good measure, he quoted Luther as well along with a few other German and Polish confessions to prove that Lutherans had always affirmed the Real Presence.[33]

Turning to the Calvinist churches, Parker noted that their record was more inconsistent, but he showed that Calvinist leaders also had frequently affirmed the Real Presence in clear terms. He began with Calvin himself, "the very *Urim* and *Thummim* of the *Calvinian* Churches," who had affirmed the Real Presence in Book IV, Chapter 17 of *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.[34] Parker noted that Calvin, like the leaders of the Roman church, had professed ignorance of the precise mode of the Presence, but affirmed its reality nevertheless. Additionally, Parker quoted Theodore Beza's writings in which the Real Presence was defended.

Having surveyed the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist churches on the continent, Parker summed up his findings:

> All Parties of Christendom agree in the *Substance* of the *Doctrine* [of the Real Presence], even the *Calvinists* themselves, who, tho they sometimes attempted to deny it, had not Confidence enough to be steady to their own Opinion, but were often forced to submit to the consent of Christendom.
>
> From all these Premises it is evident, that no one thing in the World is more unfit to be set up for a Test than *Transubstantiation*, seeing all Parties agree in the *thing*, tho not in the *Word*, and yet tho they do, they again disagree in numberless Speculations about it, and when they have done, all Parties unanimously agree that the *Modus* is a thing utterly

> unknown and incomprehensible. So that take it one way (*i.e.*) As to the thing it self, or the *real Presence*, the Test is a *Defiance* to all *Christendom*; take it the other way, as to the *Modus,* it is nothing at all but only imposing an *unintelligible Thing* upon the Wisdom and Honour of a Nation under the severest Penalties.[35]

Parker asserted that the Church of England had always stood together with both the Roman Catholic and Reformed churches in holding to the Real Presence while disclaiming any knowledge of the precise manner of its process. The only exception was a brief period in the last part of Edward VI's reign and the early part of Elizabeth I's reign, during which the church adopted a new liturgy that altered the wording of the communion service (removing the phrases, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," and, "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ") and included a declaration denying "*any real or essential Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood*."[36] The 1560 Act of Uniformity led to a reinstating of the older form of the communion service. Parker claimed that this was "a clear Declaration of the Sence of this Church for a real and essential Presence, when it was so particularly concern'd to have all Bars against it remov'd."[37]

Parker then cited a number of Anglican divines who had written in support of the Real Presence, including Richard Hooker, John Jewel, John Ponet, Lancelot Andrewes, and William Laud, among others. He also pointed to a more recent work, John Cosin's *The History of Popish Transubstantiation* (1675), which had been written originally in 1657 to defend Charles II and the Anglican church from Roman Catholic accusations of denying the Real Presence. He concluded that the most reliable tradition in the Church of England was in agreement with the magisterial Reformers and Roman Catholics in affirming the Real Presence while professing ignorance of its mode.

However, he noted that there was another strain of thought in the Church of England taking a different stance on the Lord's Supper. This view held that the presence of Christ in the elements was either figurative or purely spiritual in nature. Advocates of this position included the latitudinarians Edward Stillingfleet and John Tillotson. In 1679, Stillingfleet had written that when the Church of England affirmed a real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, "All which the doctrine of our *Church* implyes is only *a real presence of Christs invisible power and Grace so in and with the Elements, as by the faithful receiving of them to convey spiritual and real effects to the souls of men*."[38] Tillotson had argued in 1685 that the doctrine of transubstantiation showed "downright impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all Sense and Reason of all Mankind."[39] According to Parker, rationalists such as Tillotson believed that the bread in communion was self-evidently bread and not the body of Christ, and thus the doctrine of transubstantiation–and, implicitly, the Real Presence–was inherently ludicrous.

Parker's complaint was that the latitudinarians did not allow for a "middle real Presence" between transubstantiation and the purely symbolic view. In taking this position, they had not only belittled "all the Learned Men of the Church of *Rome*," but had also "cast all the Protestant Churches [that affirmed the Real Presence in their creeds] into the same Condemnation of *Sots* and *Fools*."[40] Clearly, Parker believed that the latitudinarians had positioned themselves outside the bounds of acceptable debate on this question and deserved the same condemnation as Huldrych Zwingli, the Swiss reformer who had first formulated the "symbolic" view of the Eucharist in the 16th century.

Parker then moved on to the accusation of idolatry in the Mass, a notion he considered "inhumane and barbarous." Idolatry was a serious crime which demanded the death penalty under the Mosaic law. Thus it was "not lightly to be charged upon any Party of Christians, not only because of the foulness of the Calumny, but the barbarous Consequences that may follow upon it, to invite and warrant the Rabble, when ever Opportunity favours, to destroy the *Roman Catholicks* and their *Images*, as the *Israelites* were commanded to destroy the *Canaanites* and their Idols."[41] Parker argued that a correct understanding of idolatry, as defined and condemned by the Bible, precluded the application of the term to Roman Catholics.

He began by offering a definition, which he claimed was supported by scripture: "*The Worship of the Heavenly Bodies, the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, or any other visible and corporeal Deity, as the Supreme God, so as to exclude all Sense and Apprehension of a spiritual and invisible Godhead*." As he so often had before, he then embarked on a historical survey intended to illuminate the practice. He inferred by the lack of references to idolatry in the first few chapters of Genesis that this was not a failing of humanity until after the Flood, and that Abraham was called out of his homeland in Chaldea because of the idolatry that had begun to be practiced there.[42] By contrast, the presence of Melchizedek, a "priest of God Most High,"[43] in Canaan, and the lack of references to idolatry until the time of Jacob led Parker to infer that in that region the worship of God had not yet been so corrupted; he thought this might have been the reason that God sent Abraham there.

However, by the time of the Exodus, circumstances had apparently changed: "At, and after their [the Israelites'] Deliverance, we hear of nothing else but Cautions against *Idolatry* or Worship of Strange Gods, as if in that long Tract of Time and Misery, they had lost the Tradition of the God of their Ancestors."[44] According to Parker, the entire First Table of the Ten Commandments was primarily directed against idolatry. He pointed to the Septuagint's translation of the Third Commandment–"Thou shalt not give the Name of the Lord thy God to a Vanity or Idol"–as evidence for this. He also argued that keeping the Sabbath, the subject of the Fourth Commandment, "is the very Sacrament of the Worship of the True God . . . in opposition to *Idolatry*," but deferred elaboration of this idea until later in the work.[45]

The following pages take the reader on a brief tour through ancient Israel's idolatrous history, beginning with the Golden Calf at Mount Sinai, which Parker argued symbolized the Egyptian sun god. He likewise asserted that Baal and Moloch, which appear frequently in later parts of the Old Testament, were also representations of a sun deity. Parker called the book of Judges "nothing else but a Narrative of [the Israelites'] Sin by Idolatry."[46] Although the people avoided the sin through most of the reigns of David and Solomon, Jeroboam revived the practice by making two golden calves for the northern ten tribes to worship after they renounced allegiance to Solomon's son Rehoboam. The southern tribes apostatized soon after, "and from this time Idolatry, or the Worship of *Baal*, was the prevailing Religion in both Kingdoms, tho sometimes check'd by the Piety of reforming Princes."[47] The prophets repeatedly tried to persuade the Hebrews to discard their false gods and return to the worship of Yahweh, "yet all in vain," and eventually both northern and southern kingdoms were destroyed.

Parker insisted that these false gods whom the Israelites worshiped "were nothing but the Heavenly Bodies, or the Sun, as the Supreme Deity."[48] In support of this

assertion, he quoted several passages from Deuteronomy, 2 Kings, and the prophets, all of which juxtapose idolatry with worship of the sun, moon, and stars. He also pointed out that the Hebrew word *chamman*, translated "image" or "idol" by the Authorized Version, means "sun-pillar."[49] He claimed that this definition of idolatry was also the understanding of Jewish authorities such as Maimonides. According to Parker, the worship of anthropomorphic gods was a later invention of "the vain and lying *Greeks*"; no such activity was to be found in scripture.

As an aside, it is worth pointing out here that this argument concerning the role of the sun in ancient pagan cultures was in large part a resuscitation of a chapter from Parker's earliest published work, *Tentamina Physico-Theologica de Deo* (1665), specifically Chapter One of Book Two.[50] There Parker had emphasized the idea of the sun as the Supreme Deity as well as the alleged connection between the sun and the various pagan gods mentioned in the Old Testament. The significance of this is that it shows a continuity and consistency of thought between the beginning and end of Parker's career. No one had (or has) ever accused Parker of being pro-Roman in the early part of his career, but this was the period that furnished part of his argument in 1687. The fact that he was falling back on his ideas of two decades earlier in calling for the abrogation of the Test Act argues against any interpretation of naked opportunism and sacrificing of principles on his part. Instead, as I argue below, Parker's 1687 position was consistent with the principles he had espoused all along.

Returning to the *Reasons*, Parker believed that circumcision and observing the Sabbath served primarily as guards against idolatry. Circumcision was the sign of the Abrahamic covenant and served as a constant reminder to the Israelites of their allegiance. When they performed a mass circumcision ceremony upon entering Canaan, God told Joshua, "This day I have rolled away the reproach of Egypt from you." (Josh. 5:9) Parker interpreted "the reproach of Egypt" as the practice of idolatry; circumcision had removed its guilt.[51]

According to him, the observation of the Sabbath was an even more important bar against idolatry. The reason for this was that it was founded on the belief in God's creation of the universe in six days, and the constant reminder provided by the Sabbath would presumably discourage idolatry. Parker pointed out several passages where the command to keep the Sabbath is juxtaposed with the prohibition of idolatry. Likewise, Sabbath-breaking and idolatry appear together as twin sins in the writings of the prophets. Parker believed this was why the penalty for Sabbath-breaking, like the penalty for idolatry, was death.

He also pointed to the laws concerning the Passover feast and those against sacrificing in high places, claiming that these were likewise focused on the prevention of idolatry. The Passover as prescribed in Exodus 12 was "an express defiance to the Egyptian Follies" because of its treatment of rams and bullocks, which the Egyptians held sacred.[52] Parker interpreted nearly every detail of the rite, including the way in which the meal was eaten, as a rebuke to Egyptian idolatry. The prohibition against sacrificing in high places, which Parker interpreted as towers or pyramidal structures, was also a preventive measure, because the pagans wanted to be as close to the objects of their worship (the heavenly bodies) as possible.

However, Parker insisted that God could not have been completely opposed to the use of all images in worship for the simple fact that the Israelites were commanded to put

carvings of cherubim atop the Ark of the Covenant, towards which worship was directed. Parker quoted Hezekiah's prayer in 2 Kings 19:15, which states that God "dwells between the cherubim"; these images were thus a symbol of the divine presence. He professed ignorance as to what exactly these carvings looked like, "but what ever they were, they were sacred, Images set up by God himself in the place of his own Worship; and he was so far from forbidding the use of Images in it, that he would not be worshiped without them."[53] Thus, Parker concluded, the Biblical prohibition against idolatry could not have been intended to abolish all images in worship, but rather to "restore the Worship of the true invisible God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, in opposition to the Idols, or created Deities of the Heathen World. . . . This gives us the true *Rationale* of the *Mosaick* Law, in which every particular Rite had some regard to *Idolatry*."[54]

Having completed his analysis, Parker returned to the contemporary charge of idolatry against Roman Catholics. He asserted that their use of images, adoration of the host, and invocation of saints were all "represented to the People as Crimes of the same Nature with the old Egyptian Idolatry." In the case of the use of images, Parker insisted again that the charge could not be maintained against the example of the Old Testament. He brushed aside Stillingfleet's contentions that because the Israelites only directed worship *towards* the cherubim and not *to* them, and that because the cherubim were actually seen only by the high priest, and that only once each year, Old Testament worship was not idolatry, whereas the Roman Catholic use of images was. Parker thought these arguments preposterous. Directing worship toward the cherubim as the symbols of God's presence was "to Worship God by *Images*, or to give the same Signs of Reverence to his *Representations* as to *Himself*."[55] To Parker, there was nothing to prevent Roman Catholics from making the same argument defending their use of images in worship. Moreover,

> God was not so nice and metaphysical in enacting his Laws, by distinguishing between bowing *to*, and *towards*; or if these Gentlemen say, he was, they must shew us where: But what Authority do these Men assume to themselves, when by the precarious use of these two little Particles, they think to make the same Act the Whitest, and the Blackest thing in the World, *towards* an Image, *****tis innocent; *to it*, Idolatry?[56]

As for the fact that only the high priest saw the cherubim and but once a year, Parker complained, "Here then we distinguish between the Idolatry of the *Sight* and the *Mind*; an Image *seen* is *Idolatry*, but if *covered*, *****tis *none*. So that to adore the Host exposed, is *Idolatry*; but in a Pix, *****tis *none*. What Rubbish is here to stuff out so weighty an Argument!"[57] He also pointed out that if the use of images in worship were idolatry, "it was unlawful once a year, as if done every day."[58]

Therefore, according to Parker, the Roman Catholic use of images could not be condemned unless the images were of false gods or attempts to create a similitude of the uncreated divine nature, and they were neither in Parker's view. The adoration of the host also failed to cross the threshold of idolatry according to this definition. One might suppose that Parker would need to present a detailed discussion of why the invocation of saints was not idolatry, but he disposed of the issue in one sentence: "Unless they worship them as the *Supreme God*, the Charge of *Idolatry* is an idle Word, and the

Adoration of it self that is given to them as Saints, is a direct *Protestation against Idolatry*, because it supposes a *Superiour Deity*, and that Supposition cuts off the very being of *Idolatry*."[59] Although he did not make it explicit, Parker apparently was assuming that because the First Commandment stated in part, "Thou shalt have no other gods *before me*," it was not an absolute bar against appeals to other spirits, as long as they were assigned an inferior position to God. Thus he concluded that Roman Catholic worship in any of its particulars could not be considered idolatry according to the Bible's definition.

Parker concluded the book by asserting that it was "a Barbarous Thing . . . to make the *Lives*, *Fortunes* and *Liberties* of the English *Nobility* and *Gentry* to depend upon such Trifles and Crudities."[60] He listed the punishments prescribed by the Test Act for those who refused to abjure transubstantiation, noting that they went beyond the penalties for recusancy enacted in the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I. He thought they were a stiff penalty to pay "for no higher Act of *Recusancy*, than not swearing to the Truth of Dr. *St*'s *Unlearned* and *Fanatique Notion* of *Idolatry*; for that in reality is the bottom of all this Mischief and Madness."[61] He then closed with an accusation that the Test Act had sprung from the same people who had fabricated the Popish Plot, and that it had the same purpose.

Answers to *Reasons*

As Wood noted, answers to *Reasons*, most of which were published anonymously, were soon in coming. As in the toleration controversy almost two decades earlier, the rebuttals to Parker's arguments were of varying quality and length. One of the poorer responses was the anonymously-authored *Sam. Ld. Bp. Of Oxon, His Celebrated Reasons for Abrogating the Test, and Notions of Idolatry, Answered by Samuel Arch-Deacon of Canterbury*.[62] This tract, which was printed in 1688 in editions of twelve quarto pages and twenty-two octavo pages, produced a variety of quotations out of Parker's works from the toleration controversy which allegedly contradicted his assertions in *Reasons*. In fact, the author did not engage Parker's arguments concerning the Test, transubstantiation, or idolatry at all. Instead, he attempted to show that Parker's earlier works stood in opposition to James II's Declaration of Indulgence of April 1687. His operating assumption was that repeal of the Test would have been equivalent to complete religious toleration for Roman Catholics, and therefore that Parker must have jettisoned his beliefs of the 1670s in order make a case for abrogating the Test Act. The result was a confusing tract which failed to distinguish Parker's great concern for issues of authority from his disregard for "metaphysical nothings."

Different critics focused on different aspects of Parker's argument. The author of *An Answer to the Bishop of Oxford's Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, a work of forty-six octavo pages, concentrated on the issues which Parker had raised in the first few pages of his work. The claim that the Test Act destroyed the rights of the peerage was to this author "the onely Argument . . . that is of true Strength, and Merit in the whole Contexture; it deserves the more Attent Consideration."[63] He insisted that the Test inflicted no real injury upon the peerage because "even those *Noble Lords*, who do

refuse, or do not actually submit taking the *Test*, have yet their Right of Birth, Blood, or other Title preserv'd undisputed, and inviolate . . . and therefore whenever they please to accept it on that Condition, there is no demur upon their Right. But until they so accept, their Right is in a kind of *Abeyance*, and *Custody of Law* for them; and never dyes, or is extinguisht."[64] He claimed that this was analogous to the case of a peer who had not yet reached the age of majority and who was therefore barred from voting in Parliament until that time. In other words, all peers still possessed privilege of Parliament; they simply were not allowed to exercise it without taking the Test. Obviously, this line of reasoning would have struck Parker as disingenuous.

The author answered Parker's "poisonous root" argument by contending that "laws . . . are to be weigh'd by the serviceableness, and use they are of to the main Ends of Vertue, Righteousness, and Peace, and not by the foulness of their occasional Originals."[65] According to this view, a law should be considered appropriate if, upon reflection, it serves to safeguard the national interest, even if the immediate motivation for its passage were base or wicked. The author clearly considered the Test Act to fall in this category. Moreover, he denied that the law was inextricably connected to the Popish Plot in any way: "However it might receive occasion from it, yet the Essentials of it are such Sentiments, as the Nation hath had for above the last hundred of years, and that it hath upon greatest Judgment, Reason and Experience confirm'd itself in."[66]

In response to Parker's complaint that Parliament had initiated legislation on an ecclesiastical issue and thereby usurped Convocation's role, the author issued a rebuttal of several points. To begin with, he denied that the church had any legislative authority whatever in matters of faith, and claimed that arguments to the contrary smacked of popery. The history of the church was not normative in this matter; reliance had to be upon the Bible and the conscience alone. Furthermore, he argued that the Test Act was not ecclesiastical in nature, that it was "onely an Exploration, and Touch upon Persons, whether they are *Romanists* or not. . . . It binds no *Decree* with a *Spiritual*, or *Ecclesiastick Anathema*, or *Excommunication*; which are the Essence of *Ecclesiastick Laws*."[67] The law had a purely civil motivation, namely that the nation did not want Roman Catholics entrusted with the making of its laws. The only function of the Test was to identify who the Roman Catholics were and remove this authority from them.

Furthermore, he argued, the Church of England had made numerous pronouncements on the matter of transubstantiation and invocation of the saints, so that it was not credible to argue that the Test Act was "any *Invasion* upon *Christ's Kingdom*, or the *Rights* of the *Officers* of it."[68] Contrary to Parker's claims, he insisted that the bishops' assent to the law in the House of Lords was validation enough that it was in accord with the will of the Church of England. Finally, he reasoned that if the state had the authority to prevent and correct abuses of church power (as Parker acknowledged), it must also have the authority to judge what those abuses are and how best to prevent them. Viewed in this light, the Test Act was presumably a healthy preventative measure against popery in the church (a curious assertion, since the author had just denied there was anything ecclesiastical about the law).

Finally, the author contended that the "abstruseness" of transubstantiation did not make the Test unreasonable; on the contrary, it made the abjuration of the doctrine the most reasonable requirement in the effort to prevent popery. Here he used a form of the latitudinarian "common sense" argument, writing that because the bread and wine in

communion so obviously remain bread and wine to the senses, and because the doctrine itself was such that the laity could not be expected to understand it, no one could believe in transubstantiation except "with such a blind *Faith* as all Religion and Reason abhors."[69] In other words, those holding to transubstantiation had abandoned reason *and* religion, and it was quite proper for a Protestant nation to bar them from the legislative power.

One writer who dwelt at length on the issue of transubstantiation, taking exception to Parker's framing of the question, was the anonymous author of *Transubstantiation a Peculiar Article of the Roman Catholick Faith, Which Was Never Own'd by the Ancient Church or Any of the Reform'd Churches* (1688). As its title indicates, this book of forty-eight quarto pages aimed to disprove Parker's contention that "transubstantiation" was synonymous with the doctrine of the Real Presence. After noting that most literature on the subject affirmed the Real Presence, the author complained that "where ever our Author has met with this Real Presence, whether in the *Augustan*, or *Bohemian* Confessions; or in *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Beza*, or *Calvin*, he fancy'd he saw the Body and Blood of our Blessed *Saviour* in its full and true Proportion."[70] He set out to prove that the "substantial presence" of Christ in the elements was an innovation unique to the Roman church originating many centuries after the birth of Christianity.

The argument began with an exposition of what the author considered the Protestant (and true) doctrine of the Real Presence, that Christ's presence in the sacrament, although real, was spiritual and not physical. His body and blood "are as really present to our Faith contemplating them, as any thing can be present to the acts of our Minds."[71] They are received by the communicant with the bread and wine "to all the intents and purposes wherein they can do us good," that is, spiritually.[72] The result is that all sorts of "gracious Influences" are imparted to the believer. However, the substance of the bread and wine are not changed.

The author then took great pains to explode Parker's unsubstantiated assertion that the Church Fathers had unanimously affirmed transubstantiation in the Roman Catholic sense. He produced quotations from Tertullian, Eusebius, and Basil in which the elements were referred to as "figures," "images," and "antitypes" of Christ's body and blood, language which presumably excluded transubstantiation. Even Pope Gelasius was quoted in this regard: "*We by them* [the elements] *are made partakers of a Divine Nature, and yet it ceaseth not to be the Substance or Nature of Bread and Wine.*"[73] The author also quoted statements from Cyprian, Ambrose, and John Chrysostom, all of whom affirmed that the partaking of Christ's body and blood was in a purely spiritual sense. Moreover, he denied that the various Greek and Latin words used by the Fathers to indicate the Real Presence implied transubstantiation at all. He claimed that the first intimations of a "substantial presence" in the elements were found in the writings of Anastasius, a seventh-century Sinaitic monk. The doctrine was unknown in the West until the writings of Paschasius Radbertus, the abbot of Corbie, in the early ninth century.[74] Thereafter, it slowly gained acceptance until it was made an article of faith at the Fourth Lateran Council.

The third point of the argument was that the Roman church had indeed defined the manner of the transformation of the elements, contrary to Parker's assertions. Berengar of Tours had been forced to affirm a substantial change in the elements, and the

author produced a citation from the canon lawyer Gratian which required a belief that "Christs Body is Sensually, and not merely as in a Sacrament, handled by the Priest broken into parts, and grinded *by the teeth of the faithful*." He went on to state in the next paragraph, "If this does not very grosly determine the *Modus* of the Real Presence, I know not what can," going on to show that the abjurations Berengar was required to sign were quite specific as to the nature of the transformation.[75] The Fourth Lateran Council and the Council of Trent further refined the doctrine, with the latter stating that the "whole substance" of the elements was changed.

Finally, the author denied the congruity Parker claimed to find between the Roman doctrine and the affirmations of the Real Presence in the Protestant creeds. His proof consisted mainly in the absence in the latter of any language regarding a change in the substance of the elements. References to a "substantial presence" in several of the creeds were interpreted according to Bucer's explanation, that "substantially" meant "no more than that there is a true Exhibition of Christ himself in the Sacrament."[76] The Church of England's affirmation of the Real Presence was to be understood in the Reformed sense, not in the Roman Catholic sense of transubstantiation, and therefore Parker's attempts to cloud the issue of terminology were to be rejected.

Another of Parker's opponents focused his attention on the issue of idolatry, publishing his rebuttal of the bishop's arguments in *A Discourse Concerning the Nature of Idolatry: In which a Late Author's True and Onely Notion of Idolatry is Considered and Confuted*. This book, also anonymously published, has been attributed by the compilers of the Wing index to William Wake (1657-1737), a minister who had earlier worked for Parker's predecessor at Oxford, John Fell, and who would later become bishop of Lincoln in 1705 and archbishop of Canterbury in 1715. The work's title-page sported a translated quotation from *Tentamina* which declared there was a "vast difference" between Christianity and the "Trifles of Popery." Apparently Wake had decided to use the same tactic as the author of *Sam. Ld. Bp. Of Oxon, His Celebrated Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, implying that Parker's argument for doing away with the Test Act entailed a repudiation of his earlier writings. This was an odd position to take, since Parker was reviving *Tentamina*'s arguments in *Reasons*.

A Discourse Concerning the Nature of Idolatry was divided into a preface and several chapters totaling ninety-one octavo pages. Wake claimed in the preface that the author of *Transubstantiation a Peculiar Article of the Roman Catholick Faith* had completely debunked Parker's claims regarding that doctrine, and that he intended to do the same with Parker's arguments on idolatry.[77] However, first he found it necessary to devote the opening chapter to a defense of the motives of those accusing Roman Catholics of idolatry. In answer to Parker's indignant rebuke, he asked, "What if *Idolatry* be a damnable Sin, may we not therefore say, without uncharitableness, that those are guilty of it, whom we effectually prove to be so?"[78] He denied that the charge would lead to pogroms against Roman Catholics, since his party had never claimed the Old Testament penalties for idolatry were still in force, and also because Roman Catholic idolatry was not of the same nature which required the death penalty under the Old Covenant, being instead a corruption of the true religion.

Wake then proceeded to Parker's definition of idolatry, arguing that it was ultimately preposterous. According to it, worship of the heavenly bodies was not idolatry as long as the heathen believed in a Supreme Being beyond them. Moreover, the apostle

Paul clearly did not view idolatry in Parker's sense, based on the many references to the sin in 1 Corinthians, which in their context are not dealing with the situations described by the bishop. Wake stated, "The sum of what he [Parker] offers for [the definition of idolatry], is an *Historical Deduction* of the State of *Idolatry* in the *Old Testament*, compar'd with the Accounts that are given of the *Idolatry* of the *Ancient*, especially the *Eastern Nations*."[79] He then constructed an argument which contended that every part of Parker's analysis of the question was in error.

First, he declared that Parker had misunderstood the nature of the ancient heathens' idolatry. They had not worshiped the heavenly bodies as corporeal deities; rather, "they believed these *very Bodies themselves* to be animated by *Celestial Spirits* who resided in them, and rendred them thereby proper *Objects* of their Adoration."[80] Although they had worshiped the sun, moon, and stars, they always had retained a belief in an invisible spirit superior to those, and thus Parker's contention that the visible bodies had been worshiped as the "supreme god" was false. Moreover, the worship of deified mortals was not a later invention of the Greeks but had existed in Egypt and other civilizations at the time of Abraham and Moses.[81] Wake supported these assertions with a variety of citations of contemporary scholars. If they were correct, Parker's narrow definition of idolatry deduced from a supposed misreading of the Old Testament record could not hold. Wake offered a broader definition: "To Worship the *Supreme God* in any Corporeal Representation or *Image* whatsoever; or to pay *Divine Worship* to any *Created Being*, whether *Spirit* or *separate Soul*; either as having the Power over this *inferior World* to Administer things in it, or as *Mediators* between the *Supreme God* and *Us*; this is, of not the *only*, yet at least a *true Notion* of *Idolatry*."[82]

He contended that the Old Testament firmly supported this definition of idolatry. According to him, the golden calf at Mount Sinai (Exodus 32) and the golden calves made by Jeroboam (1 Kings 12) were intended as a visual representation of Yahweh, not foreign or lesser gods. His reasoning was that, in the former case, it was ridiculous to assume that the Israelites would have immediately abandoned the god who had just shown them miraculous signs a few days before. In the latter case, Wake noted that Jeroboam made no arguments advancing other gods, but only told the people that it was better to worship the calves than to make the long journey to Jerusalem to worship.[83]

To support the second part of his definition, Wake pointed to Solomon's worship of foreign gods at the encouragement of his wives in his later years (1 Kings 11), an action condemned in scripture. He wrote that it was ludicrous to think that Solomon actually rejected all sense of Yahweh–who had miraculously appeared to him twice before–as the supreme god in favor of his wives' idols. Instead, his condemnation was the result of his worshiping *any* being beside Yahweh.[84] Of course, the outright rejection of Yahweh in favor of a pagan god, as in the case of Ahab (1 Kings 18), also constituted idolatry. Wake's final example in this chapter was the bronze serpent made by Moses at God's command in the wilderness, which in later centuries came to be worshiped by the citizens of Judah, although it was clearly not a representation of the sun, moon, or stars. The fact that King Hezekiah found it necessary to destroy the serpent (2 Kings 18) testified to the idolatrous nature of the worship offered it.[85]

Wake also had an answer to Parker's discussion of the cherubim atop the Ark of the Covenant, toward which the Israelites directed their worship. Citing Exodus 25:22, where God tells Moses that He will speak to him from "above the mercy seat," he stated,

"Now here we may plainly see what the *Object* of *Divine Worship* was, not the *Cherubim* but the *Invisible Majesty* which spake from between them."[86] In other words, the cherubim merely indicated to the Israelites where God's presence was, and that was why worship was directed toward them. Neither the Israelite assembly nor the high priest "adored" the cherubim or offered them worship, and thus the presence of those images did not imply idolatry.

The conclusion of Wake's argument was obvious:

> *As the Jews retaining both the Apprehension and worship* of the truely Supreme God, *were nevertheless guilty of Idolatry, for worshiping him after a* Gentile manner, *so may* Christians *be now, and therefore that the* Church of Rome *may justly be charged by us as* Idolatrous, *though we do not pretend in any wise to say either that she worships the* Sun, Moon, *and* Stars, *or* any *other* visible *and* Corporeal Deity *as the* Supreme God, *or that she has lost all* Apprehension *of a* Spiritual and invisible Godhead.[87]

It was this broader understanding of idolatry–any worship of the creature rather than the creator (Rom. 1:20-22)–which motivated early Christians to suffer death rather than to burn incense to the emperor. It also lay behind the accusation of idolatry leveled by the orthodox against the Arians in the fourth century.[88]

Other, briefer answers to Parker were published in 1688, including a short tract attributed to Gilbert Burnet.[89] However, the authors discussed above presented the most thorough responses to Parker's various arguments. The bishop's premature death prevented his answering these critics, and it is of course impossible to determine how he would have responded; it is reasonable to assume that he would not have remained silent, given the security of his position in the church and the surety of royal support on the issue. It seems likely that he would have faced an uphill battle defending his views on transubstantiation and idolatry, as his opponents appeared to have a superior grasp of the historical sources and contemporary scholarship concerning these issues.

However, we can say with some confidence that Parker's calls for the abrogation of the Test Act did not imply that he was secretly a Roman Catholic or that he favored full religious toleration for the members of that communion. As we have repeatedly seen in this study, the central issue for Parker in religious and political matters was that of authority; as noted in Chapter Three, he considered the focus of the English Reformation to be the restoration of proper authority in the Church of England. For him, the chief danger posed by papists was their allegiance to a "foreign power," i.e. the papacy, which in turn made their loyalty to the English crown suspect. Therefore, he probably would have supported any oath of loyalty to the king as England's temporal sovereign power as a legitimate precondition of voting rights in Parliament.

On the other hand, doctrinal matters, particularly such "metaphysical nothings" as the precise mode of the Real Presence, were of a decidedly secondary nature to Parker, if they were worthy of consideration at all. Belief in transubstantiation did not in itself imply any threat of disloyalty to the English state, and so Parker would not have seen any reason to require its denial from the members of Parliament, particularly if he truly believed (as he indicated in *Reasons*) that "transubstantiation" and "Real Presence" could be interpreted as synonymous terms. If the Church of England, meeting in Convocation,

had explicitly condemned transubstantiation, Parker may have changed his stance towards Parliament's actions, according to his philosophy of the proper method of cooperation between church and state. However, he still could have argued consistently that even though transubstantiation had been condemned by the church, there was no reason for the state to make any pronouncement on the matter because belief in the doctrine did not lead to seditious behavior.

This is not to suggest that Parker had no ulterior motives in arguing for the abrogation of the Test Act. Certainly his perceived defense of the Roman Catholic peers could only ingratiate him further with James II, and although he had already profited greatly from the king's patronage, Parker probably had his eyes set on other preferments as well. Viewing his actions in this light was no doubt what prompted his opponents' accusations of his having betrayed the Church of England, to which he owed his career. Nevertheless, Parker's stance was not inconsistent with the philosophy he had developed over the previous two decades, and it is highly unlikely that he would have considered *Reasons* a repudiation of any of his previously published works.

Parker and Magdalen College

The third important event of Parker's tenure as bishop was the Magdalen College incident, when, for the second and final time in his life, he was at the center of a controversy which attracted national attention. Because this episode was a key event in the struggle between James II and the state church, much has been written about it.[90] However, the accounts generally concentrate on the conflict between James and the fellows of Magdalen; Parker himself is not the focus.

On 24 March 1687, Henry Clerke, the president of Magdalen College, died. One of Magdalen's senior fellows, Dr. Thomas Smith, entertained hopes that he might be chosen to replace Clerke, and he consulted Parker, with whom he claimed "an intimate acquaintance," about the matter on 28 March. Parker agreed to write to the king on his behalf. Rumors began to circulate in Oxford that James would select Parker for the position, but the bishop informed Smith a few days later that he was not Smith's competitor for the post. However, he told Smith that "the King expected that the person he recommended should be favourable to his religion," and asked him how accommodating he was willing to be towards Catholics. Smith decided to withdraw his candidacy at this point.[91] It is possible that Parker was seeking the presidency at this early date, but there is no clear evidence that his declaration to Smith that he was not a candidate should not be taken at face value.

On 31 March, Charles Aldworth, Magdalen's vice-president, gave notice to the fellows, who agreed to elect a new president on 13 April.[92] *College in Oxon . . . in 1687* (London: 1688), 1. On 5 April, James issued a mandate, which was read to the fellows on 11 April, recommending Anthony Farmer for the presidency.[93] Farmer was a reputed Roman Catholic, and there resulted a flurry of protests from the fellows, who pointed out that, having never been a fellow of Magdalen, he was not qualified for the post according to the college's statutes. The fellows addressed a petition to James explaining why they could not elect Farmer and deferred the election pending his reply. On 15 April, the last

day their statutes allowed for the election, the fellows received word that James maintained his nomination of Farmer. The fellows agreed that Farmer was unqualified and proceeded to elect Dr. John Hough, a senior fellow, to the presidency.[94]

Displeased with this turn of events, James instituted proceedings against the fellows on 28 May.[95] He appointed commissioners, of whom Thomas Cartwright (the recently-ordained bishop of Chester) was the leader, to investigate the matter, but the fellows put together such a convincing case against Farmer, taking into account his past indiscretions and pronouncements as well as his lack of qualifications under the college statutes, that the commissioners ultimately agreed that he was unfit for the presidency. While the case was pending, the commissioners issued an order on 22 June removing Hough from the presidency and another one suspending Aldworth from the vice-presidency for his disregard of royal wishes in the previous election.[96] On 18 July James issued another mandate prohibiting a second election "till We shall signifie Our further Pleasure, any Statute, Custom, or Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding."[97]

No record of Parker's activities during this crucial period has survived, but it seems likely that he was maneuvering in an attempt to have his name put forward at least from the time the commissioners disqualified Farmer in early July. Magdalen was one of the wealthiest religious houses in England and surely would have been a tempting target for someone of Parker's ambition. As Smith's account stated, Parker had earlier been seen as a likely candidate for the presidency, probably because his lofty view of royal authority was well known. Even so, his beliefs were not out of step with the university, which had always been a royalist stronghold and in 1683 had proclaimed "its official support for divine right monarchy and the subject's duty of 'passive obedience' to any ruler, even an unjust one."[98] This was the same position Parker had articulated in the two volumes of *Religion and Loyalty*. It is also possible that he hoped to preserve the Anglican character of the college to the greatest extent possible in the face of James' prior and subsequent attempts to appoint Catholics to its fellowships; his impeccable Tory credentials made James trust him, and he may have intended to make use of his favored position to minimize the changes at the college. Later events suggest that a promise of no radical changes at Magdalen on James' part may even have been a condition of Parker's acceptance of the post.

Whatever Parker's motivations, he received James' nomination to the presidency in a mandate dated 14 August.[99] Parker himself wrote to Dr. Alexander Pudsey, who in Aldworth's absence was the senior fellow of the college, about the same time, informing him that he was unfit to travel due to illness and asking to be admitted by proxy.[100] Pudsey replied on 28 August that he and the other fellows still considered Hough to be the legitimate president and therefore could not admit Parker.[101] This response precipitated the well-known confrontation between the fellows and James on 4 September, in which James appeared in person in Oxford and castigated the Magdalen fellows in his chambers at Christchurch, saying Magdalen was "a stubborn, turbulent College," and ordering them to "get you gone, and immediately repair to your Chapel, and elect the Bishop of Oxford, or else you must expect to feel the weight of my hand."[102] The fellows returned to Magdalen to deliberate; one fellow, Robert Charnock, was willing to elect Parker without reservation, but the rest agreed that Parker, like Farmer, was not qualified according to the college's statutes, and therefore could not be elected. This answer was given to James that same day, but on 6 September the fellows

sent a second letter, obsequious in tone, begging the king to provide them some way to comply with his wishes without violating their oaths to the statutes.[103] Robert Spencer, earl of Sunderland and secretary of state, who had served as James' chief representative throughout the affair, wrote to Parker on 9 September, enclosing copies of both of the fellows' letters and saying he believed the fellows would submit to Parker if the king constituted him president on his own authority without requiring them to elect him.[104]

Parker's actions during this period are still unclear. He replied to Sunderland, for the latter wrote again on 19 September acknowledging receipt of a letter, the subject of which was "a matter of very great importance," and informing Parker that the king would consult with some lawyers "that he may proceed upon sure grounds being resolved to do right both to himself and your Lordship."[105] Parker may have had concerns about the legality of his appointment, wanting to ensure that it could withstand any scrutiny. Perhaps he had doubts that James could simply declare him president without an election, or the question may have pertained to a potential *quo warranto* proceeding against Magdalen, which James apparently considered in the latter part of September.[106]

Clearly, Parker's health was a factor in both sides' calculations. William Sherwin, an Oxford newsletter writer, wrote on 25 September, "It is the opinion of most that my Lord of Oxford's pretensions will not long continue, he being under such circumstances that he is not likely to live but a very short time. He has never been well since he came into this country."[107] In fact, Parker's poor health had begun well before October 1686; his letter to Anthony Wood of 20 August 1682 complained that "for these two last yeares it has been very broken & infirm," and other letters from 1680 on expressed similar sentiments.[108] Now that his chronic ailments seemed to be getting the better of him, others were planning what to do in the event of his death. Hough recounted a conversation he had conducted on 9 October with William Penn, who had made occasional efforts to mediate the dispute between James and the fellows, in which Penn, smiling, insinuated that Hough had a chance of being made bishop of Oxford should Parker die. Hough replied that he had no ambition beyond retaining the presidency of Magdalen, which he still believed to be rightfully his.[109]

By mid-October, the situation was still unresolved, and James ordered the commissioners he had formerly appointed to conduct a formal visitation of Magdalen. Cartwright and the other commissioners began their investigation on 21 October. The next day, the fellows appeared before the commissioners and, contrary to Sunderland's expectations, refused to obey the king's mandate for Parker to be made president.[110] Cartwright wrote to Parker the following day, explaining that the delay was due to a technicality. James' mandate had been directed to the fellows, who refused to obey because of their prior oaths, but if a second mandate addressed to the *commissioners* were obtained, the fellows would likely submit. Though still bed-ridden, Parker was obviously interested in the proceedings; Cartwright apologized for not answering the two letters prior to the third one he had just received.[111]

James issued a mandate to the commissioners the same day (23 October), and the fellows made a last-ditch effort to save Hough's presidency by arguing in a letter to the commissioners on 25 October that James' prior mandate for electing Farmer had not legally inhibited them from electing Hough once Farmer had been found to be unqualified, and that therefore Hough's election should stand.[112] This ploy failed to sway the commissioners, and that same day Parker was installed as president of Magdalen, one

of his chaplains standing proxy for him.[113] There followed another symbolic moment when the commissioners escorted the chaplain to the president's lodgings, which they found locked, Hough and his servants (who held the only keys) having vanished. Cartwright then ordered the doors to be forced open, and the chaplain was installed in the lodgings.[114] The fellows signed a statement saying that they would submit to Parker's presidency "so far as is lawful and agreeable to the Statutes."[115]

Parker, "being then in a sickly condition," finally took possession of the president's lodgings on 2 November.[116] The fellows' worst fears soon came to pass. Two weeks later, on 16 November, the commissioners deprived Aldworth and most of the fellows of their fellowships and expelled them from the college.[117] Another round of dismissals came in mid-January, when Parker expelled most of the college's demies.[118] Around the same time, James was sending mandates to the new president to fill the vacant positions with Roman Catholics; the first order came on 31 December and was followed by others on 7 January and 14 March.[119]

A crucial question for any evaluation of Parker during this period is his attitude toward the filling of Magdalen with Roman Catholics. Parker's detractors have traditionally pointed to a pair of letters written by Jesuits in February 1688 which name him as a Roman sympathizer. The first letter, written by "a Jesuit of *Liege*," contains the statement, "The Bishop of *Oxford* seems very much to favour the Catholick Cause: He proposed in Counsel, When it was not expedient, that at least one Colledg in *Oxford* should be allowed Catholicks, that they might not be forced to be at so much Charges, by going beyond Seas to study?" The author also alleged that on one occasion Parker, after drinking the king's health, added, "That the Faith of Protestants in *England*, seemed to him to be little better than that of *Buda* was before it was taken; and that they were for the most part mere Atheists who defended it."[120]

The second letter, allegedly from James' almoner to Louis XIV's confessor, is even more damning, naming Parker as a closet papist waiting for the proper moment to convert openly.

> The Bishop of *Oxon* has not yet declar'd himself openly; the great Obstacle is his Wife, whom he cannot rid himself of: His design being to continue Bishop, and only change Communion; as it is not doubted but the King will permit, and our Holy Father confirm: tho' I do not see how he can be farther useful to us in the Religion in which he is, because he is suspected, and of no esteem among the Hereticks of the *English* Church.[121]

Some skepticism is in order here. These two letters were published in a short collection in 1689, when every effort, including that of propagandizing, was being made to consolidate the revolution of the previous December. How the publisher of this tract acquired confidential correspondence between Jesuits on the Continent was not explained. The first letter, especially, was short on detail; Parker was described as interacting with several noblemen, but no names were given (the author and recipient both remained nameless as well). It is possible that one or both of these letters were fabrications.

Assuming that the letters are genuine, we are faced with two possibilities. First, Parker was ready to forsake the Church of England for Roman Catholicism. Despite his numerous writings on behalf of the state church, the notion is not far-fetched. In his mid-1680s letter against Archbishop Sancroft, he complained that he had been very ill-used by the leaders of the institution he had defended so vigorously for many years:

> And I can not but reflect upon it with some litle indignation, that when for these twentye yeares together, I have upon all occasions lead on the forlorne hope in the service of the crowne & church, when I have been particularlye aim'd at by all the worst men in the Kingdome, when I have had noe other open enemyes then such as Owen, Baxter, Ferguson, Marvell, Lewis du Moulin, Bethell & Burnett, When these wicked men have made it there business to pursue mee with all the Keenesse of revenge & malice, and when at this very time all the trimming partye are as outrageouse against mee, as those wretches ever were, & use mee with noe lesse barbaritye.
>
> After all this I can not but thinke it strange that I should meete with as hard usage from the cause I defend, as from the worst of Enemyes.
>
> This I Know has ever beene the practise of all Commonwealths to ruine those men that have preserved them, but the reason is plaine, in that all Commonwealths are noe better then a Rabble. But it is a new sort of Martyrdome in the Xtian church to perish by freinds as well as enemyes; and to an ingenuouse man it is much harder to endure, especiallye when the persecution comes upon men that have been true & faithfull, from those that never appeared in any service.[122]

Parker had tried to convert James to the Church of England at one time, but his poor relationship with Sancroft and other bishops may have made him a target of Roman evangelism. If this were the case, however, and Parker had seriously considered conversion, he apparently repented of the notion before his death, as explained below.

A second possibility is that Parker was being disingenuous in his offer to convert to Catholicism. His ambition may have motivated him to mislead James and the Catholic notables at court in order to gain preferment, such as the bishopric of Oxford. As noted above, it is possible that Parker viewed himself as a "stealth" operative whose goal was to minimize the risk that Anglican institutions would fall under the influence of a foreign power. Of the two scenarios, the first is more likely, but the question of the two letters' authenticity must remain open, making it impossible to ascertain his attitude during this period.

Other evidence indicates that Parker was not happy with the influx of Roman Catholics into Magdalen. Thomas Smith, who had expressed doubts as to Parker's loyalty to the church on 31 December, later stated that both Parker and Cartwright had recommended Anglican degree-holders from Oxford to fill the vacant fellowships, but they could not prevail upon the king, who was set on installing papists.[123] A letter from one of Parker's longtime servants to the bishop's son, which described an event shortly

before his death and was not made public until 1729, provides even stronger evidence of his displeasure with the way events had transpired, and indicates that he felt James had betrayed him:

> These were his (the Bishop's) own Words, when News came to him first, that the King had sent Twenty-Four Fellows to the College. I am sure I never saw him in such a Passion in the Sixteen Years I lived with him. They were all Roman Catholicks. He walked up and down the Room, and smote his Breast, and said, There is no Truth in Man; There is no Trust in Princes. Is this the Kindness the King promis'd me? To set me here to make me his Tool and his Prop, to place me with a Company of Men, which he knows I hate the Conversation of; so sat down in his Chair, and fell into a Convulsion Fit, and never went down Stairs more till he was carried down. I am sure he was no Roman.[124]

One detects a palpable irony in the last months of Parker's life. Despite his apparent misgivings about James' project for Magdalen College, his paradigm demanded compliance with James' mandates, and comply he did, even on his deathbed. His exalted view of royal authority, which he had defended against all opponents for years, had, in a way, claimed him as a victim in the end.

---

[1] Burnet, 3:142-43.

[2] For more information on Fell see *DNB, s.v.*

[3] Morrice, vol. P, p. 567.

[4] Bodl., Rawlinson D, MS. 851, fols. 270-71.

[5] Morrice, vol. P, p. 567

[6] Burnet, 3:144.

[7] Ibid., 3:146.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Morrice, vol. P, p. 636.

[10] Bodl., Tanner MS 147, fol. 66r. For some reason, the rectory of Chartham was not included in the dispensation; Parker was succeeded there by James Jeffreys on 12 November 1686 (Hasted, 7:318).

[11] Bodl., Rawlinson D 843, fol. 113r.

[12] Ibid., 113-14. See also Bodl., Rawlinson D 1345, fols. 330-32.

[13] Ibid., 113r-v.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., 114r.

[16] Roger L'Estrange, *A Reply to the Reasons of the Oxford-Clergy Against Addressing* (London: 1687).

[17] *DNB, s.v.*

[18] R. A. Beddard, "James II and the Catholic Challenge," in T. H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford*, 8 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-), 4:939.

[19] J. R. Bloxam, ed., *Magdalen College and King James II, 1686-1688* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886), 80.

[20] Wood, 4:234. A second edition was licensed in February 1688 (Arber, 2:218).

[21] *RAT*, 1.

[22] Ibid., 4. Cf. Commons Journals for 21 April 1675.

[23] Ibid., 5.

[24] Ibid., 6.

[25] Ibid., 7.

[26] Ibid., 8.

[27] Ibid., 9-10.

[28] Ibid., 11.

[29] Ibid., 15.

[30] Ibid., 17.

[31] Ibid., 22-23.

[32] Ibid., 28.

[33] Ibid., 36-37.

[34] Ibid., 38.

[35] Ibid., 46-47.

[36] Ibid., 53-54.

[37] Ibid., 60.

[38] Edward Stillingfleet, *Several Conferences Between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England Concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome* (London: 1679), 66.

[39] John Tillotson, *A Discourse Against Transubstantiation* (London: 1685), 1.

[40] *RAT*, 70-71 (mspa. 80-81).

[41] Ibid., 72.

[42] In support of this assertion, Parker cited Joshua 24:2, where Joshua told the Israelites that their forefathers, including Terah (Abraham's father), "dwelt on the other side of the River in old times; and they served other gods." (New King James Version) Cf. *RAT*, 77.

[43] Genesis 14:18. (NKJV)

[44] *RAT*, 78.

[45] Ibid., 82.

[46] Ibid., 91.

[47] Ibid., 94.

[48] Ibid., 99.

[49] Strong's Hebrew Dictionary 2553. Cf. *RAT*, 99.

[50] *TPTD*, 181-233.

[51] *RAT*, 104.

[52] Ibid., 114.

[53] Ibid., 127.

[54] Ibid., 128.

[55] Ibid., 130.

[56] Ibid., 131.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid., 132.

[59] Ibid., 133.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid., 135.

[62] Anon., *Sam. Ld. Bp. of Oxon, His Celebrated Reasons for Abrogating the Test, and Notions of Idolatry, Answered by Samuel Arch-Deacon of Canterbury* (London: 1688).

[63] Anon., *An Answer to the Bishop of Oxford's Reasons for Abrogating the Test* (London: 1688), 3.

[64] Ibid., 4

[65] Ibid., 10.

[66] Ibid., 11.

[67] Ibid., 19.

[68] Ibid., 20.

[69] Ibid., 38. The book contains serious pagination errors; after page 38 (misnumbered 28), the next page is numbered 31, and numbering proceeds again from that point.

[70] Anon., *Transubstantiation a Peculiar Article of the Roman Catholick Faith, Which Was Never Own'd by the Ancient Church or Any of the Reform'd Churches* (London: 1688), 4-5.

[71] Ibid., 7.

[72] Ibid., 8.

[73] Ibid., 11.

[74] Ibid., 18, 21.

[75] Ibid., 37.

[76] Ibid., 46.

[77] William Wake, *A Discourse Concerning the Nature of Idolatry: In which a Late Author's True and Onely Notion of Idolatry Is Considered and Confuted* (London: 1688), iii.

[78] Ibid., 3.

[79] Ibid., 22.

[80] Ibid., 31.

[81] Ibid., 48-49.

[82] Ibid., 56.

[83] Ibid., 64.

[84] Ibid., 68-69.

[85] Ibid., 72-73.

[86] Ibid., 86.

[87] Ibid., 83.

[88] Ibid., 89. The Arians believed that Christ was a created being, yet they worshiped him as divine.

[89] Gilbert Burnet, *A Discourse Concerning Transubstantiation and Idolatry, Being an Answer to the Bishop of Oxford's Plea Relating to those Two Points* (London: 1688).

[90] See, for instance, J. R. Bloxam, ed., *Magdalen College and King James II, 1686-1688* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886), which is a collection of primary documents related to the controversy; Laurence Brockliss, ed., *Magdalen College and the Crown: Essays for the Tercentenary of the Restoration of the College, 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); and, most recently, R. A. Beddard, "James II and the Catholic Challenge," in T. H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford*, 8 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-), 4:907-54.

[91] Bloxam, 3-4.

[92] Henry Fairfax, *An Impartial Relation of the Whole Proceedings Against St. Mary Magdalen*

[93] Bloxam, 14.

[94] Fairfax, 2.

[95] Bloxam, 49.

[96] Ibid., 67.

[97] Fairfax, 13.

[98] Angus Macintyre, "The College, King James II, and the Revolution, 1687-1688," in Brockliss, 33.

[99] Fairfax, 14.

[100] Ibid., 15.

[101] Bloxam, 83-84.

[102] Ibid., 85.

[103] Ibid., 90, 92.

[104] Ibid., 94-95.

[105] Ibid., 96.

[106] Fairfax, 17-19.

[107] Bloxam, 101.

[108] Bodl., Wood MSS F 46, fol. 272r.

[109] Bloxam, 105.

[110] Ibid., 132-33.

[111] Ibid., 142-43.

[112] Ibid., 145-47.

[113] Ibid., 148.

[114] Ibid., 148-49.

[115] Ibid., 153-54.

[116] Ibid., 178.

[117] Ibid., 204-05.

[118] Ibid., 223-24.

[119] Ibid., 225-31, 239-40.

[120] Anon., *A Third Collection of Papers Relating to the Present Juncture of Affairs in England* (London: 1689), 11-12.

[121] Ibid., 17-18.

[122] Bodl., Tanner MS 31, fol. 173-74.

[123] Bloxam, 230, 235.

[124] *Fog's Weekly Journal*, 25 October 1729.

EPILOGUE

History, we are told, is written by the winners, and Samuel Parker had the misfortune of being on what was ultimately the losing side. Less than a year after his death, his royal patron, James II, fled England during what came to be called the "Glorious Revolution." James' daughter Mary and her husband, William of Orange, became joint rulers at Parliament's invitation in February 1689. The Declaration of Right issued by William after his coronation indicated that the absolutism of the earlier Stuart monarchs would not be seen again. Later that year, a new Toleration Act ended persecution of all dissenting Protestant ministers who affirmed the doctrine of the Trinity and who agreed to obtain licenses for their congregations. The Tory Party, of which Parker had been such an outspoken member, was relegated to a minority status from which it would not escape for many decades.

Given these events, as well as further shifts away from royal absolutism and toward religious toleration in subsequent centuries, we should not be surprised that Parker's reputation has languished since his death. Indeed, it seems that an effort was made to forget him as soon as possible, even before the revolution; although the fellows at Magdalen had him buried in the college's outer chapel, they erected no marker nor anything else to indicate his presence or preserve his memory.[1] Most commentators in subsequent years, when they chose to mention Parker, did so in deprecating terms. Gilbert Burnet, noting his death, paused to state that *Reasons for Abrogating the Test* had been "full of petulant scurrility."[2] Roger Morrice, commenting on events of the week of 24 March, stated drily, "This weeke also dyed Samuel Parker Bp of Oxford, his own writing give such a character of him that he needs no other."[3] The editor of the third edition of Parker's *History of His Own Times* claimed that the bishop was "cut and dried for a *Papist*" and that the work was a "*Monument* of *Infamy*."[4] Even Anthony Wood, who was to some degree sympathetic toward Parker and his works, closed his biographical entry with the statement, "See too much of this bishop's character and of his tergiversation, in Burnet, who I fear is in the present (though not in every) instance, to be relied on."[5] Generations of Whig historians in later centuries likewise found little to applaud in Parker's writings. A good example is A. A. Seaton, who found the *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*'s reasoning "ingenious rather than capable," and who called attention to this or that "specious analogy," "vicious identification," or "unjustifiable generalization" in the volume.[6]

More recently, some historians have begun to treat Parker in a significantly different manner. To be sure, their personal assessments of him are overwhelmingly negative. Jonathan Parkin calls the *Discourse*'s language "almost hysterically abusive" and its arguments "distasteful."[7] Gordon Schochet, who has probably published more on

Parker than anyone to this point, finds his position "unredeemably objectionable."[8] R. A. Beddard calls him "a notorious erastian timeserver."[9] Even more hostility is seen in J. G. A. Pocock's description of him as "a brass-knuckled ecclesiastical thug" who made a "sudden and savage flank attack" on the Cambridge Platonists in the 1660s.[10]

However, these denunciations increasingly are accompanied by statements indicating a measure of respect for Parker's intellectual abilities and verbal acuity, along with a recognition that he was a capable opponent of Restoration-era "progressives." Parkin recognizes him as an important influence on his own protagonist, Richard Cumberland. Pocock concedes that the case for persecution of dissenters found in the *Discourse* and elsewhere was "not unsophisticated."[11] Ken Robinson insists, ""No matter how much Parker benefitted from his thinking, he was an acute and serious intellectual."[12] Schochet declares that Parker had "a deep and profound understanding of the intimate relationship between the civil and religious institutions that defined Stuart England."[13] At long last, current scholarship is moving beyond the "widely held picture of Parker as a time-server" and acknowledging his considerable contributions to the politico-religious debates of the Restoration period.[14] By way of analogy, historians, rather than playing the role of Andrew Marvell and relying primarily on *ad hominem* attacks, are beginning to approach Parker as John Owen did, by focusing on his arguments and their merits.

This is a positive sign. The evidence examined in this study supports the view that Parker truly believed the arguments he offered the English public in his various writings, his personal ambition and evident character flaws notwithstanding. Those arguments, moreover, although not flawless, were no house of cards that would collapse at the first sign of scrutiny or criticism. On the contrary, Parker spent almost two decades developing a sophisticated view of authority which rested on solid theoretical foundations and which offered the English monarch the absolute authority of a Louis XIV or even a Caesar. At certain times in his career, Parker's ideas helped set the terms of debate in English public discourse, although they never incontestably won the day. The fact that the positions he advocated are repugnant to modern sensibilities should not prevent us from coming to an appreciation of the significant role he played in the intellectual climate of Restoration England.

---

[1] On my visit to Magdalen in April 2001, I was informed by the college's archivist, Dr. Robin Darwell-Smith, of the grave's general location, which had been ascertained some years earlier when a pinhole camera had been inserted under the chapel floor to reveal a number of lead coffins along one side of the room. Several markers and monuments from the period commemorate others buried there.

[2] Burnet, 3:229.

[3] Morrice, vol. Q, p. 248.

[4] Samuel Parker, *Bishop Parker's History: Or, the Tories Chronicle, from The Restauration of King Charles II. 1660, to the Year 1680* (London, 1730), 6, 8.

[5] Wood, 4:235.

[6] A. A. Seaton, *The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 156-57, 159, 161.

[7] Parkin, 38, 45.

[8] Gordon Schochet, "Samuel Parker, Religious Diversity, and the Ideology of Persecution," in Roger D. Lund, ed., *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 127.

[9] R. A. Beddard, "James II and the Catholic Challenge," in T. H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford*, 8 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-), 4:934.

[10] J. G. A. Pocock, "Thomas Hobbes: Atheist or Enthusiast? His Place in Restoration Debate," *History of Political Thought* 11 (Winter 1990), 738, 742.

[11] Pocock, 740.

[12] Ken Robinson, Introduction to *FICPP*, iv.

[13] Schochet, "Samuel Parker," 119.

[14] Robinson, iii.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts:
Act Books of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Lambeth Palace, London.

Canterbury Diocese records, Canterbury Cathedral Archives.

Cherry Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

English History Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Lambeth Palace Manuscripts, Lambeth Palace, London.

Oxford Diocese records, Oxford.

Rawlinson Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Roger Morrice's Entr'ing Book, Dr. Williams's Library, London.

Tanner Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Wood Papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Other Primary Sources:
Aldworth, Charles. *An impartial relation of the whole proceedings against St. Mary Magdalen College in Oxon in . . . in 1687*. London: 1688.

Anon. *An Answer to the Bishop of Oxford's Reasons for Abrogating the Test*. London: 1688.

_____. *An Apology and Advice for some of the Clergy*. London: 1674.

_____. *A common-place Book out of The Rehearsal transpos'd, digested under these several Heads*. London: 1673.

_____. *Deus justificatus: or, the divine Goodness vindicated*. Oxford: 1667; London: 1668.

_____. *A free and impartial Enquiry into the Causes of that very great Esteem and Honour the Nonconformist Ministers are in with their Followers*. London: 1673.

_____. *Insolence and Impudence Triumphant*. London: 1669.

_____. *A letter to the author of the Vindication of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, concerning the legality of that Court*. London: 1688.

_____. *A modest Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet's Irenicum*. London: 1680.

_____. *S'too him Bayes; Or Some Animadversions Upon the Humour of Writing Rehearsals Transpros'd*. Oxford: 1673.

_____. *Samuel Lord Bishop of Oxon his Celebrated Reasons for Abrogating the Test, and Notions of Idolatry, Answered by Samuel Archdeacon of Canterbury*. London: 1688.

_____. *Third Collection of Papers relating to the present Juncture of Affairs in England*. London: 1688.

_____. *Toleration, discussed in two Dialogues*. London: 1670.

_____. *Transubstantiation a Peculiar Article of the Roman Catholick Faith, Which Was Never Own'd by the Ancient Church or Any of the Reform'd Churches*. London: 1688.

Arber, Edward, ed. *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709 A.D.* 3 vols. London: Professor Edward Arber, 1903.

Bates, William. *The Great Duty of Resignation*. London: 1684.

Baxter, Benjamin. *Mr. Baxter baptiz'd in bloud*. London, 1673.

Baxter, Richard. *Grotian Religion discovered*.

_____. *The English Nonconformity as under King Charles II and King James II Truly Stated and Argued*. London: 1689.

_____. *A Holy Commonwealth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. *The Judgment of Non-conformists about the Difference Between Grace and Morality*. London: 1676.

_____. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*. Matthew Sylvester, ed. London: 1696.

_____. *Second Defence of the Nonconformists*. London: 1681.

_____. *A Treatise of Episcopacy*. London: 1681.

Bramhall, John. *Bishop Bramhall's vindication of himself and the episcopal clergy*. London, 1672.

Buckingham, George Villiers, duke of, and Sheridan, Richard. *The Rehearsal and the Critic*. Great Neck, NY: Barron's Educational Series, 1960.

Bunyan, John. *A Defence of the Doctrine of Justification*. London: 1672.

Burnet, Gilbert. *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833.

_____. *A Discourse Concerning Transubstantiation and Idolatry, Being an Answer to the Bishop of Oxford's Plea Relating to those Two Points*. London: 1688.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1603-1714.

Cartwright, Thomas. Diaries. Camden Society, 1843.

Cave, William. *A Dissertation Concerning the Government of the Ancient Church*. London: 1683.

Cox, Nicholas. *An account of the late Visitation at St. Mary Magdal. College in Oxon by the . . . Bish. of Winton., . . . 24 October 1688*. London: 1688.

Cudworth, Ralph. *A Treatise Concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality*. London: 1731.

du Moulin, Lewis (Louis). *Patronus bonae Fidei*. London: 1672.

Ellis, Clement. *The Right Foundation of Quietness, Obedience, and Concord*. London: 1684.

Fairfax, Henry. *An Impartial Relation of the Whole Proceedings Against St. Mary Magdalen College in Oxon . . . in 1687*. London: 1688.

Fairfax, Nat. *Of the Bulk and Selvedge of the World*. London: 1674.

Ferguson, Robert. *A Representation of the Threatning Dangers, Impending over Protestants in Great Brittain*. Edinburgh: 1687.

_____. *A Sober Enquiry into the Nature, Measure, and Principle of Moral Virtue*. London: 1673.

_____. *The Role of Reason in Religion*. London: 1675.

Fog's Weekly Journal.

Fowler, Edward. *The Design of Christianity*. London: 1671.

Glanvill, Joseph. *Lux Orientalis*. London: 1682.

G. W. A. M. *No Praeexistence, or a Brief Dissertation against the Hypothesis of Human Souls, Living in a State Antecedaneous to this*. London: 1667.

Hedges, Charles. *A Vindication of the proceedings of His Majesties Ecclesiastical Commissioners against the Bishop of London and the Fellows of Magdalen College*. London: 1688.

Hickeringhill, Edmund. *Gregory Father-Greybeard with his Vizard off*. London: 1673.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Richard Tuck, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hooker, Richard. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Politie*. London: 1593.

Humphrey, John. *A Case of Conscience. . . Together with Animadversions on a New Book Entitled Ecclesiastical Polity*. London: 1669.

_____. *Free Thoughts*. London, 1710. (P. 56)

_____. *The Authority of the Magistrate about Religion Discussed*. London: 1672.

James II. "His Majesty's Gracious Declaration to All His Loving Subjects for Liberty of Conscience." (1687) In Andrew Browning, ed., *English Historical Documents, 1660-1714*. Oxford: 1953. Doc. 146, pp. 395-396.

Johnston, Nathaniel. *The King's Visitatorial Power Asserted, Being an Impartial Relation of the Late Visitation Of St. Mary Magdalen College in Oxford*. London: 1688.

L'Estrange, Roger. *Reply to the Reasons of the Oxford clergy*. London: 1687.

Leigh, Richard. *The Transposer Rehears'd; or the Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes Play*. Oxford: 1673.

le Grand, Antonius. *Apologia pro Renato Descartes*. London: 1679.

Marvell, Andrew. *Poems and Letters*. 2 vols. H. M. Margoliouth, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Rehearsal Transpos'd, and The Rehearsal Transpos'd, the Second Part*. D. I. B. Smith, ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

More, Henry. *Enchiridion Ethicum*. London: 1667.

_____. *Philosophical Volume*. London: 1679.

Oldenburg, Henry. *Correspondence*. Edited by A. Rupert Hall and Marie Boas Hall. Madison: 1966.

Owen, John. *Correspondence*. Edited by Peter Toon. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970.

_____. *The Works of John Owen*. Edited by William H. Goold. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1850-1853 [1965-68].

Parker, John. *Government of the People of England, Precedent and Present the Same*. London: 1650.

Parker, Samuel. *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the First Six Hundred Years*. London: 1683.

_____. *An Account of the Nature and Extent of the Divine Dominion & Goodnesse.* Oxford: 1666.

_____. *The Case of the Church of England.* London: 1681.

_____. *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie*. London: 1671.

_____. *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion in Two Parts*. London: 1681.

_____. *A Discourse in Vindication of Bp Bramhall and the Clergy of the Church of England*. London: 1673.

_____. *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*. London: 1670.

_____. *A Discourse Sent to the Late King James*. London: 1690.

_____. *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie*. Oxford: 1666.

_____. *Disputationes de Deo et Providentia Divina*. London: 1678.

_____. *History of His Own Times*. London: 1727.

_____. *Reasons for Abrogating the Test Imposed upon All Members of Parliament*. London: 1688.

_____. *Religion and Loyalty*. London: 1684.

_____. *Religion and Loyalty, the Second Part*. London: 1685.

_____. *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transprosed*. London: 1673.

_____. *Tentamina Physico-Theologica de Deo*. London: 1665.

Patrick, Simon. *A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitude-Men*. London: 1662.

_____. *A Continuation of the Friendly Debate*. London: 1669.

_____. *A Friendly Debate Between a Conformist and a Non-conformist*. London: 1669.

_____. *A Further Continuation and Defence, or, A Third Part of the Friendly Debate*. London: 1670.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. 11 vols. Robert Latham and William Matthews, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970-1983.

Roberts, Alexander and Donaldson, James, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1950-1953.

Rutherford, Samuel. *Lex, Rex*. London, 1644.

Sanderson, Robert. *Episcopacy as Established by Law in England not Prejudicial to the Regal Power*. London: 1683.

Schaff, Philip and Wace, Henry, eds. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series*. 14 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954-1956.

Selden, John. *De Anno Civili et Calendario Veteris Ecclesiae*. London: 1644.

Sherlock, William. *The Case of Resistance of the Supreme Powers Stated and Resolved According to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures*. London: 1684.

_____. *A Vindication of the Rights of Ecclesiastical Authority*. London: 1685.

Somners, John. *Chartham News: Or a Brief Relation of Some Strange Bones There Lately Digged Up*. London: 1669.

Stillingfleet, Edward. *Irenicum, A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds*. London: 1660.

_____. *Several Conferences Between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England Concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome*. London: 1679.

Stubbe, Henry. *Rosemary and Bayes: Or, Animadversions upon a Treatise called, The Rehearsall Trans-prosed*. London: 1672.

Tillotson, John. *A Discourse Against Transubstantiation*. London: 1685.

Wake, William. *A Discourse Concerning the Nature of Idolatry: In which a Late Author's True and Onely Notion of Idolatry Is Considered and Confuted*. London: 1688.

Whitby, Daniel. *The Protestant Reconciler Humbly Pleading for Condescention to Dissenting Brethren, in Things Indifferent and Unnecessary, for the Sake of Peace*. London: 1683.

Wood, Anthony À. *Athenae Oxonienses*. London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1967.

Secondary Sources:

Alexander, W. Andrew. *'As In That Stile Usual': Debate and Context in Marvell's The Rehearsal Transpros'd.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1987.

Ashcraft, Richard. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Beddard, R. A. "James II and the Catholic Challenge." In T. H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford*. 8 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-. 4:907-54.

Berkowitz, David. *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1988.

Berman, David. *A History of Atheism in Britain: From Hobbes to Russell*. London: Croom Helm, 1988.

Birch, T. *The History of the Royal Society of London*. New York: 1968.

Black, Joseph Laurence. *Pamphlet Wars: The Marprelate Tracts and "Martinism," 1588-1688*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.

Bloxam, J. R., ed. *Magdalen College and King James II, 1686-1688*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Brockliss, Laurence, ed. *Magdalen College and the Crown: Essays for the Tercentenary of the Restoration of the College, 1688*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Chernaick, Warren L. *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Works of Andrew Marvell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Coward, Barry. *Oliver Cromwell*. New York: Longman, 1991.

Cragg, G. R. *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660-1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Cust, Richard. *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626-1628*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Cutts, Edward. *A Dictionary of the Church of England*. London: 1887.

D'Oyly, George. *Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 2 vols. Oxford: 1821.

de Krey, Gary. "The First Restoration Crisis: Conscience and Coercion in London, 1667-73." *Albion* 25 (Winter 1993): 565-80.

_____. "Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience, 1667-1672." *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 53-83.

Donno, Elizabeth, ed. *Andrew Marvell: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Dowley, Tim, ed. *Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Tring, Hertfordshire, England: Lion Publishing, 1977.

Ferguson, James. *Robert Ferguson the Plotter: or the Secret of the Rye-House Conspiracy and the Story of a Strange Career*. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1887.

Ford, Alan, James Maguire, and Kenneth Milne, eds. *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1995.

Foss, Edward. *The Judges of England*. 9 vols. London: Longman, 1857. [Reprinted 1966 by AMS Press, NY]

Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver Us From Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

_____. *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

_____. *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.

_____. *John Bunyan and English Nonconformity*. London: Hambledon Press, 1992.

_____. "'Let Truth Be Free': John Bunyan and the Restoration Crisis of 1667-1673." *Albion* 28 Winter 1996:??.

_____. *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-1689*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Greaves, Richard and Zaller, Robert, eds. *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*. 3 vols. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982-.

Greenall, R. L. *A History of Northamptonshire*. London: Phillimore & Co., 1979.

Haley, Kenneth. *The First Earl of Shaftesbury*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Harris, Tim, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie, eds. *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Hasted, Edward. *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*. 12 vols. Canterbury: 1797-1801.

Hill, Derek Ingram. *Eastbridge Hospital and the Ancient Almshouses of Canterbury*. Canterbury: 1969.

Hunt, John. *Religious Thoughts in England from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century*. 3 vols. London: Gibbings, 1896. (1971 edition)

Hunt, John Dixon. *Andrew Marvell: His Life and Writings*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Hunt, Michael. *The Royal Society and its Fellows, 1660-1700*. Chalfont St. Giles, Bucks, England: British Society for the History of Science, 1982.

Hunter, Michael and Wootton, David, eds. *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Hutton, William H. *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Queen Anne (1625-1714)*. London: Macmillan, 1903, 1934.

Jacob, James R. *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Jessup, Frank W. *A History of Kent*. Shopwyke Manor Barn, West Sussex: Phillimore & Co., 1995.

Keeble, N. H. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.

_____., ed. *John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Lacey, Douglas. *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661-1689: A Study in the Perpetuation and Tempering of Parliamentarianism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.

Lane, Jane. *Titus Oates*. London: Camelot Press, 1949.

Lee, Maurice. *The Cabal*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965.

Lichtenstein, Aharon. *Henry More: The Rational Theology of a Cambridge Platonist*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Lund, Roger D. "Guilt by Association: The Atheist Cabal and the Rise of the Public Sphere in Augustan England." *Albion* 34 (2002): 391-421.

_____., ed. *The Margins of Orthodoxy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

McGee, J. Sears. *The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglican, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976.

Mintz, Samuel I. *The Hunting of Leviathan: Seventeenth-century Reactions to the Materialism and Moral Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Nuttall, Geoffrey. *Richard Baxter*. London: Thomas Nelson, 1965.

Nuttall, Geoffrey and Owen Chadwick, eds. *From Uniformity to Unity*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.

Ormsby-Lennon, Hugh. "Rosicrucian Linguistics: Twilight of a Renaissance Tradition." In Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus, eds., *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*. Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988.

Page, William, ed. *The Victoria History of the County of Kent*. 3 vols. London: Constable, 1908-.

Parkin, Jonathan. *Science, Religion, and Politics in Restoration England: Richard Cumberland's De Legibus Naturae*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 1999.

Patterson, Annabel. *Andrew Marvell*. Plymouth, UK: Northcote House, 1994.

_____. *Marvell and the Civic Crown*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Pocock, J. G. A. "Thomas Hobbes, Atheist or Enthusiast? His Place in Restoration Debate." *History of Political Thought* 11 (Winter 1990), 737-49.

Rivers, Isabel. *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Schochet, Gordon J. "Between Lambeth and Leviathan: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and Political Order." In Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

_____. "Samuel Parker, Religious Diversity, and the Ideology of Persecution." In Roger D. Lund, ed., *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Seaton, A. A. *The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts*. New York: Octagon Books, 1972. (1911)

Seaward, Paul. *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Shapiro, Barbara. *John Wilkins, 1614-1672: An Intellectual Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Smith, H. F. Russell. *The Theory of Religious Liberty in the Reigns of Charles II and James II*. Cambridge: 1911.

Spellman, William. *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.

Spurr, John. *England in the 1670s: 'This Masquerading Age'*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

_____. "'Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church." *Historical Journal* 31 (1988): ??.

_____. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.

Stephen, Sir Leslie and Lee, Sir Sidney, eds. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 22 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1949-1950.

Sutch, Victor D. *Gilbert Sheldon, Architect of Anglican Survival, 1640-1675*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975.

Sykes, Norman. *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768*. Cambridge: 1959.

Toon, Peter. *God's Statesman: The Life and Work of John Owen, Pastor, Educator, Theologian*. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1971.

Tuck, Richard. *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Underwood, T. L. *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Wallace, Dewey D. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Wallace, John M. *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Whiting, C. E. *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution, 1660-1688*. New York: Macmillan, 1931.

Wilmot, John. *The life of the Rev. John Hough, D. D. . . . containing many of his letters.* London, 1812.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jason Jewell received a Bachelor of Arts degree with majors in history and music from Harding University in 1995 and a Master of Arts degree with a major in history from Pepperdine University in 1997. After spending a year in Wuhan, China, teaching English at the Hankou branch of Beijing Geosciences University, he began doctoral work in the Florida State University's Program in the Humanities on a University Fellowship in August 1998.

While at Florida State, he was professionally active, presenting papers at the regional Phi Alpha Theta Conference in Miami, FL, in March 2000, and the meeting of the Western Conference on British Studies in Little Rock, AR, in October 2002. He served as the Department of History's student coordinator in the Preparing Future Faculty program in 2000. His master's thesis, *Harding University's Department of Music: A History*, was published by Harding University Press in 1998. He also was an Honors Graduate of the Ludwig von Mises Institute's seminar on the History of Liberty in May 2002.

His teaching experience at the college and university level has been extensive, including courses in world civilization, Western civilization, non-Western civilization, Early Modern Europe, American history, British literature, composition, and film. In August 2002 he received the Thomas Campbell Award for Excellence in Teaching from Florida State's Department of History. He is currently Assistant Professor of English and Fine Arts at Faulkner University in Montgomery, AL, where he teaches history and the liberal arts. Additionally, he is Adjunct Instructor of History at Pulaski Technical College in North Little Rock, AR, a position he has held since January 2003.