

## One

## Enthusiasm and the Restoration Anglican Establishment

Although the institutions and liturgies of the Church of England were formally abolished between 1642 and 1659, the Act of Uniformity in 1662 restored it to complete ascendancy as the national church. The triumph of the Royalist Anglican faction in parliament as well as the Church of England's return to dominance have been documented by historians.<sup>1</sup> John Spurr and Blair Worden have indicated that whilst Cromwell's regime officially endorsed Presbyterian orders and a broad national Church, he exhibited considerable indulgence to Protestant sectarians as well as to Anglicans.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, during the 1650s an older generation of Anglicans, lay and clerical, continued to conduct their religious and social lives according to the traditions of the pre-war Church.<sup>3</sup> A number of bishops who were to gain prominence in later years were ordained in this surreptitious way.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, this current of traditional Anglican practice gained increasing momentum in the country after 1660 despite the uncertain status of the religious settlement in London.<sup>5</sup> In 1660 the Church of England was very far from moribund.

This is only part of the story of the restored Church's institutional success. As early as 1659, when the fall of Richard Cromwell initiated a twelve-month long contest for power in London, Anglican polemicists, apologists, and theologians were developing a case for why the Church of England alone would resolve the nation's political and religious problems. Prior to the spring of 1660 neither the return of the Church of England nor

---

<sup>1</sup> Godfrey Davies, *The Restoration of Charles II* (San Marino, 1955); G. R. Abernathy, *The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration, 1648-1663* (Philadelphia, 1956); Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1985); Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime* (Cambridge, 1989); John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, 1991); Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Age* (London, 1993); Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge, 2004); Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (New York, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 15; Blair Worden, 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate', in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *Persecution and Toleration: Studies in Church History*, 21 (1984), 199-233.

<sup>3</sup> Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 146.

<sup>4</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 36; Harris, *Politics*, p. 43; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 146.

even the return of Charles Stuart were inevitable, and the unsettled circumstances are pertinent to the shape of Anglican apologetics.<sup>6</sup> Arguments about the nature of church government, religious and civil power, and the authority and responsibility of the individual believer were fashioned out of those resources then at hand, specifically, the historical basis of the apostolic church and the then-current body of Anglican doctrinal tradition. Accompanying these urgent matters were the controversies that, to observers of diverse affiliations, seemed to animate the catastrophes of the preceding two decades.

Anglicans were not alone in giving priority to their own system as superior to those of their competitors, nor were they alone in attempting to claim for themselves a solution to the problems enthusiasts were held to present. Although enthusiasts, as they came to be known by their critics in the late 1650s, advanced the apparently simple claim of direct divine communication with, or inspiration from, God or the holy spirit, their holy mandates thus received contained potentially volatile implications. As J. G. A. Pocock has written, enthusiasm was the 'essential characteristic of Puritanism: the claim to personal inspiration by an indwelling spirit, with all its chiliastic and antinomian capacity to turn the social as well as the metaphysical world upside down'.<sup>7</sup> The example of the Quakers who, led by the inner light of God, put the conviction into social and theological practice, is sufficient to illustrate the innovations the enthusiast, defined in this way, might present. The accusation, however, was not limited to Quakers in this period. The epithet indicated a specific kind of religious transgression, at the heart of which was an expressly Protestant dilemma: the critic accused the enthusiast of throwing off scripture, ecclesiastical tradition, and holy council; but the critic may only press the complaint so far before throwing off the Reformation itself in favour of Rome's firm hierarchies of authority.

Generally critics of enthusiasm were satisfied that this tension could be negotiated. The controversy thus developed into a dispute over competing conceptions of enthusiasm. Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, and

---

<sup>6</sup> The political unfolding of the Restoration in London is described in De Krey, *London and the Restoration*.

<sup>7</sup> J. G. A. Pocock, 'The Varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform: A History of Ideology and Discourse', in *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 219.

Quakers who confronted the defenders of the Church of England traded subtle definitions of enthusiasm and finely drawn solutions to the problems it presented. The individuals who led the English Church after the Restoration were generally ministers who, by either conforming to or collaborating with Cromwell's Presbyterian church, were able to maintain possession of their livelihoods.<sup>8</sup> Edward Stillingfleet, later bishop of Worcester and by his death in 1699 'the leading theologian and apologist for the Church of England', as well as John Tillotson and Robert South, were among the ministers who received covert episcopal ordination during the Interregnum.<sup>9</sup> Henry Hammond was personally recommended by Charles II for the bishopric of Worcester, but died in 1660 having left an immense legacy as a 'rebuilder of the Church' and defender of episcopacy.<sup>10</sup> The diocese at Worcester instead went to John Gauden, who had likewise earned a reputation as a trenchant defender of the Church during the Interregnum. Gauden wrote the introductory remarks to Book VII of Richard Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, which defends the office and authority of bishops and was first published in 1662, and additionally became known as a conciliator during the early unsettled years of the Restoration Church.<sup>11</sup> The future bishop of Ely, Peter Gunning, likewise took part in negotiations with Presbyterians in 1660, though proving himself rather more rigid in his defence of episcopacy than some of his Anglican counterparts.<sup>12</sup> These bishops or future bishops were joined in public controversies by a range of preachers and scholars. Jeremy Taylor, Meric Causabon, and Nathaniel Hardy all earned advancement in their respective careers following the Restoration owing to their support of episcopacy and Anglican tradition.<sup>13</sup> The somewhat more eclectic and philosophically-minded George Lawson

<sup>8</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>9</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 95-155, pp. 223-60. For more on Stillingfleet and Tillotson, in particular, see Robert Todd Carroll, *The Common-sense Philosophy of Religion of Bishop Edward Stillingfleet* (The Hague, 1975) and John Marshall, 'The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men, 1660-89: Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and "Hobbism"', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985), 407-27.

<sup>10</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 9. For more on Hammond, see J. W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660, with special reference to Henry Hammond* (Manchester, 1969).

<sup>11</sup> Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, pp. 14-15; Arthur Stephen McGrade, 'Introduction', in Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: Preface, Book I, Book VIII*, ed. Arthur Stephen McGrade (Cambridge, 1989), p. xviii.

<sup>12</sup> Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, p. 75.

<sup>13</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 10-11, 23; Michael Heyd, *'Be Sober and Reasonable': The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (New York, 1995), pp. 72-73.

and Joseph Glanvil, it will be shown, also made notable contributions to debates about enthusiasm and the appropriate responses to it. All of these individuals were conforming members of the Church of England of varying degrees of assent and commitment.

Although there was a range of views on the subject both within and between denominations, there are nevertheless shared judgments that can be discerned along denominational lines. It was the very fact of shared ideas that compelled Anglicans to focus their arguments. Throughout these encounters, two points were consistently submitted. The first was the theological legitimacy of the Anglican episcopate, and the second was the sectarian effort to undermine it. There emerged from these debates an Anglican case against enthusiasm that exhibited a considerable degree of internal consistency. This is not to say that all Anglicans were consummately united or, indeed, that all of their critics were. As the significance of the Anglican conception of episcopal government, its basis, and its utility in theory and practice is made clearer, it will become apparent that each group, on certain points, yielded to those of the other. Anglican grounds for generalizing about the value and authenticity of claims of divine inspiration or enthusiasm will also become clearer. As one commentator has written, the English Church in the early 1660s 'badly needed means of insisting that the Spirit ordinarily acted only through channels consistent with the authority, civil and ecclesiastical, of the Father who brought the law and the Son who brought the Church and its priesthood'.<sup>14</sup> Contemporaries also seem to have realized that more was required of Church theologians than a negative critique of corrosive behaviour. Thus the grounds for knowing when the holy spirit spoke and when it did not were developed concurrently with the critique of enthusiasm.

To argue that new problems were approached in new ways in this period is to invite additional questions about the broader contours of Restoration historiography. The revisionist critique of liberal, whiggish, and marxist analytic frameworks, dismissed as anachronistic and teleological, in favour of those emphasizing short-term, local, and contingent factors is foundational to one recent entry in the controversy, Jonathan Scott's

---

<sup>14</sup> J. G. A. Pocock, 'Enthusiasm: The Antiself of Enlightenment', in Lawrence E. Klein and Anthony J. La Volpa (eds.), *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850* (San Marino, 1998), p. 12.

*England's Troubles*. Like his revisionist predecessors,<sup>15</sup> Scott argued that, at bottom, religious conflict, defined particularly as fear of popery and arbitrary government, animated the great political and religious conflicts of the seventeenth century. One casualty of this argument is an understanding of the Restoration itself as an event or period during which new conflicts, ideas, and perceptions found currency or deliberation.<sup>16</sup> For Scott the Restoration is one stage in a much larger confrontation involving popery and arbitrary government, a scenario that replayed itself repeatedly over the course of the seventeenth century.<sup>17</sup> Even allowing for the creative and generative impulses characteristic of this confrontation, the Restoration neither coincided with nor pointed the way toward meaningful disturbances of England's pre-modern consensual 'unity-in-variety'.<sup>18</sup>

It is not necessary here to quarrel over whether seventeenth-century society can be characterized as a unity-in-variety, for this is surely true, or over whether it is pre-modern or modern, a matter that seems neither fruitful nor very pertinent to the present objective. But this revisionist historiography does have bearing on the problem of religious enthusiasm. The central background for understanding the period after 1660, in Scott's view, is that of 'fear and insecurity, understood in the context of restoration memory'.<sup>19</sup> The attempts at 'ideological containment' between 1660 and 1665 consisted of the Clarendon Code as well as the re-imposition of control over the press.<sup>20</sup> The efforts of Restoration Churchmen are understood as having a primarily negative function. Scott cites, for example, the notoriously austere rule-of-law Anglican Gilbert Sheldon to this effect.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, the individuals responsible for reconstituting the restored Church, animated by fear and insecurity, reacted to the perceived

<sup>15</sup> See especially Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990); John Morrill, *The Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of War, 1630-1648* (New York, 1998); Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000); J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 2000).

<sup>16</sup> One recent edited collection purports to advance this very point in support of the Restoration's novelty. See Steve Pincus and Alan Houston (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001).

<sup>17</sup> Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 6.

<sup>18</sup> Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 7.

<sup>19</sup> Scott, *England's Troubles*, p. 173.

<sup>20</sup> Scott, *England's Troubles*, pp. 408-09.

<sup>21</sup> Scott, *England's Troubles*, p. 409.

pressures of advancing popery by frustrating its apparent sources of proliferation.

This framework undoubtedly captures a dimension of the period's political and religious conflict. But what else, if anything, did the restored Church offer its adherents? The question is made more pertinent by the enduring popularity of Anglicanism under the late Stuarts for the majority of the English population.<sup>22</sup> John Spurr's detailed study of the Restoration Church illuminates the complexity of Anglican doctrine in theory and in practice from 1646 to 1689 and remains a major contribution to Anglican and Restoration historiography. Indeed, Scott's complaints about an earlier generation of historians who had removed 'religion from centre stage'<sup>23</sup> ring somewhat hollow in his own *England's Troubles*. New textures of Restoration religion, for example, the emphasis on the role of reason in religious discourse,<sup>24</sup> the fortification of the Church and social order with the 'new episcopalianism',<sup>25</sup> or the emergence of a positive Anglican identity<sup>26</sup> are evidently not, for Scott, among the contemporary ideas and developments that historians must take seriously for they in fact have no great bearing on his own analysis.<sup>27</sup> Unlike Scott, Spurr underlined these positive, or constructive, projects undertaken by Anglicans in this period.

At the same time Spurr pointed to a different body of Restoration scholarship that has sought to recover the culture and language of nonconformity, particularly following the ascendancy of a narrowly defined Anglican settlement. Epitomized in the work of Christopher Hill, the most significant recent contributions have been those of N. H. Keeble, Richard Greaves, and Sharon Achinstein.<sup>28</sup> Keeble's *The Literary Culture of*

<sup>22</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. xiii; Harris, *Politics*, p. 43.

<sup>23</sup> Jonathan Scott, 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot', in Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990), p. 110.

<sup>24</sup> See John Spurr, "'Rational Religion" in Restoration England', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49 (1988), 563-85; H. John McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951).

<sup>25</sup> The term is Spurr's; see *Restoration Church*, p. 163.

<sup>26</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, chapters six and seven especially.

<sup>27</sup> Scott, *England's Troubles*, p. 4.

<sup>28</sup> Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London, 1972); N. H. Keeble, *Richard Baxter, Puritan Man of Letters* (Oxford, 1982); N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester, 1987); N. H. Keeble (ed.), *John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus: Tercentenary Essays* (Oxford, 1998); Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge, 2003); Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford, 2003).

*Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* exhibits both sympathy for nonconformist worship as well as mild contempt for that of Anglicans. As Spurr noted, commentators have tended to turn away from the Restoration Church, 'with relief', to focus instead on the seemingly more heroic 'travails of Nonconformity'.<sup>29</sup> Keeble's statement that Restoration Anglican worship was characterized by 'sober moralizing' and 'emotional sterility' earns rebuke from Spurr, who conceded that although there is an element of subjective judgment in such an attitude, it deserves to be balanced against a more comprehensive statement of Anglican devotion.<sup>30</sup> Observing the same trend, Blair Worden remarked that here 'for once, history has been written on behalf more of the losers than of the winners'.<sup>31</sup>

So there is something more to be said of the efforts of Restoration Anglican churchmen. Hugh Trevor-Roper's essay on the Great Tew Circle provides some of the intellectual background useful for understanding the development of Anglican ideas before and after 1660. Trevor-Roper argued that a shared and loosely defined intellectual and philosophical heritage united a cadre of advocates for the 'underground Anglican Church' during the civil wars and Interregnum.<sup>32</sup> Sheldon and Hammond, in particular, were the most industrious in 'securing the survival of the Anglican Church, preparing it to resume its old position, and seeking, by scholarship and controversy, to establish its credentials against both its Catholic and its puritan enemies'.<sup>33</sup> Hammond especially is credited with constructing an intellectual basis for the Church, one Laudian and episcopal and appealing to scripture and reason, rather than to the High Calvinism of the Elizabethan Church.<sup>34</sup> Although Spurr did not consult Trevor-Roper's essay, he independently arrives at what he also describes as a new approach to episcopacy associated with the late Hammond in the years following the Restoration.<sup>35</sup> The unprecedented ecclesiastical confidence of the restored Church was owing to its bishops who, it is said by its representatives, having overcome the destructive impulses of mechanic puritan preachers as

<sup>29</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. xii.

<sup>30</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 373-4.

<sup>31</sup> Blair Worden, 'The Question of Secularization', in Steve Pincus and Alan Houston (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 39.

<sup>32</sup> Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', in *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (Chicago, 1987), 166-231.

<sup>33</sup> Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', p. 218.

<sup>34</sup> Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', pp. 219-22.

<sup>35</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 163.

well as the pitiful fortunes of their own Stuart supreme governors, had long preserved its apostolic structures.<sup>36</sup> In this period, the idea that the authority of the Church derived from its episcopate came into its own.<sup>37</sup>

It is within this framework of constructive innovation that the Anglican critique of enthusiasm can be understood. All of the sources consulted below were designed for public consumption, principally printed treatises and sermons, and are drawn from a range of voices inside and outside the Church. For Anglicans, the effort to justify the Church and its doctrines in light of new circumstances entailed, first, providing a relevant and coherent description of them. Distinguishing Anglican doctrines from those of Roman Catholics, Quakers, Presbyterians, and other nonconforming puritans perceived as enthusiasts was not a wholly negative task of denial. The critique allowed its advocates to consolidate and define the subtle differences it revealed between the Church and its antagonists. Additionally a specifically Anglican piety, its testimony of spirit, and the means by which it provided access to the holy spirit in an 'anti-enthusiastic' manner was resolved, and the spiritual and practical functions of the episcopacy were defined and defended from its enemies.

Secondly, a critical look at the activity of the holy spirit on earth allowed for an Anglican justification of inspiration in the early Church among the apostles and why it ceased in modern times. Explanations for the persistence of contemporary claims to inspiration draw from a diverse range of intellectual resources, including appeals to medicine, demonology, and, most importantly, rational religion. By underlining these differences the Church and its advocates could advance their case for supremacy as the true apostolic Church, uncorrupted by enthusiasts who had foolishly or diabolically destroyed it. These apologists made the case that such enthusiasts could not possibly legitimize their claims and attempting to do so was to undertake an unprofitable struggle against episcopacy, the legacy of Christ's time on earth, as well as scripture, Reformation theology, even reason. In short, the critique of enthusiasm allowed for the focusing and fortification of a particularly Anglican perspective on not only the authority of the Church of England and its institutions, but also the contemporary

---

<sup>36</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 109; Justin Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 64-77.

<sup>37</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 129.



problems it faced as the Interregnum drew to a close. The main problem was enthusiasm and Anglican writers were not slow to meet and vanquish it on every point necessary.

## I

As J. C. D. Clark has written, in the emerging and soon dominant Anglican and royalist historical interpretation of the two decades prior to the Restoration, 'the civil war was laid at the door of Nonconformity'. This was a broad narrative encompassing 'Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism and Separatism, 1640s and 50s sectarianism and enthusiasm, and Scots Covenanting fanaticism'.<sup>38</sup> The narrative was from the beginning supplemented from some quarters by support for the divine right of episcopacy, and then in 1670s and 80s, in part due to the efforts of Andrew Marvell and Gilbert Burnett, by the project of bringing the threat of popery to the foreground of public attention.<sup>39</sup> These idioms did not, however, overtake the recourse to enthusiasm for Anglicans defining the contours of the Church and its place in English as well as ecclesiastical history. One stream of this Anglican history, that of enthusiasm and its function in Anglican piety, will be examined here.

The Anglican answer to enthusiasm begins with the defence of the episcopal system and the historical basis of the Church of England. In 1659, Henry Hammond set the tone of his defence of its liturgy and episcopacy by reminding the reader that the Church's structures, having lately been eradicated on the authority of 'Presbyters without any Bishop', might now be resurrected, but not without struggle and persecution. Hammond was of course writing on the eve of Charles's return to England, but the appearance, indeed, the reality, of the persecution of Anglicans and the destruction of their liturgies during the Interregnum was amenable to making the larger point about carrying the burden of Christ's cross beset 'by asserters of the Papacy on one side, and the consistory on the other, [with] the one accusing it of Schisme, [and] the other of Compliance'.<sup>40</sup> The apostolic succession,

<sup>38</sup> J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology, and Politics During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 46.

<sup>39</sup> Clark, *English Society*, pp. 47-53; Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft*, pp. 27-28, 64.

<sup>40</sup> Henry Hammond, *A Vindication of the Ancient Liturgie of the Church of England* (London, 1660), pp. 2, 3.

as it had been since Richard Hooker,<sup>41</sup> was here employed to partially define the Church's *via media* between Reformed and Catholic traditions, and it formed a necessary backdrop to Hammond's imagery of assailment. The unbroken succession of practice from the apostolic era confirmed its status as the original universal Church and thus supplied its defenders with an historical tradition to which they could attribute its authority. John Collop remarked that it would simply be 'folly to leave the Meridian Light' of the Church to follow the '*ignus fatuus* of every fanatic brain'.<sup>42</sup> Meric Casaubon asked pointedly whether it was likely that God would hide a new light or 'prophetic Jewel' from his people for over 1600 years before revealing it to them.<sup>43</sup> Speaking providentially in 1659, Gauden warned that a country that embraced 'any *Idol of superstition, any meteor of enthusiasm, any glow-worm of fanatic fancy and fury*' might finally end up with '*common woe, a Commonwealth*'.<sup>44</sup> In Gauden's view, in the same way the gentry and peers of England lived more freely under a single sovereign, the clergy flourished under the Church's '*excellent Bishops*'.<sup>45</sup> Though besieged for a generation by the fury, war, and the sedition of enthusiasts, Presbyterians, and other rebels, the Church and its ancient episcopal structure remained apart from, and an answer to, the boisterous field of religious innovators.

The claim that structures of authority were necessary to reign in fanatics was not of course unique to Anglicans. Their views on the subject meet at many points with those of Presbyterian writers. In 1659 the Presbyterian Anthony Burgess agreed that defiance of Godly ministry was '*horribly unthankfull*' to God who, 'knowing our frailty and weaknesse', appointed men to instruct. Such defiance was undertaken by men carrying out Satan's work on earth.<sup>46</sup> However, for Burgess, Samuel Clarke, Thomas Vincent, and Thomas Ford the seat of authority ultimately resided in scripture.<sup>47</sup> Burgess, for example, worried that it was the integrity of Scripture that was threatened on all sides by papists and 'illuminatists'.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', p. 195.

<sup>42</sup> John Collop, *Charity Commended* (London, 1667), p. 97.

<sup>43</sup> Meric Casaubon, *To J.S., the Author of Sure-Footing* (London, 1665), p. 9.

<sup>44</sup> John Gauden, *A Sermon Preached in St. Pauls Church London* (London, 1660), p. 6.

<sup>45</sup> Gauden, *Sermon Preached*, pp. 58-65.

<sup>46</sup> Anthony Burgess, *The Scripture Directory for Church-Officers and People* (London, 1659), pp. 61-62.

<sup>47</sup> Samuel Clarke, *Medulla Theologiae* (London, 1659), p.80; Thomas Ford, *Logos Autopistos* (London, 1667), p. 1.

<sup>48</sup> Anthony Burgess, *An Expository Comment* (London, 1661), p. 527.

Thomas Vincent believed that God's light was present in the scripture because God would not permit a forgery to deceive so many people.<sup>49</sup> Accordingly the ill-fated Worcester House Declaration, which failed to become law in the winter of 1660, drew together both Presbyterians and Anglicans willing to compromise on a vision of reduced episcopacy. The utility of a 'grave and learned' body of clergy for counselling and overseeing a lay community was not in dispute at Worcester, but the extent of that body and the nature of its powers complicated the proceedings.<sup>50</sup> The unwillingness on the part of Anglicans to abandon the 'Meridian Light' of the Church and its authorities who oversaw even dispensation of scripture epitomized the nature of the cleft between the two parties.

As Reformed Protestants, however, their views on the Roman Catholic Church exhibited more symmetry. The hard-line approach adopted by Anglicans took its cue from Roman claims to infallibility. 'If it is asked why we must believe', wrote Collop, 'it is replied: it is because the Church is infallibly governed by the Holy Ghost: if we inquire how? They run to revelation guilty of enthusiasm which they object to in others'.<sup>51</sup> Henry More bitterly resented the '*perfect Papists*' who 'swallow down all that Church proposes to them without chewing or distasting anything'.<sup>52</sup> Casaubon considered the Pope himself an enthusiast, owing to his self-appointed status as 'not *simply divine*' but governed by 'immediat[e] miraculous inspiration'.<sup>53</sup> The parallel between the Romanist and the Protestant enthusiast is here made explicit. Throughout the 1640s and 1650s the doctrine of infallibility was carried into controversy in England not by Roman Catholics, but by antinomian sectarians who claimed to speak and act on behalf of the divine light that resided within them. The Quaker James Nayler typified this belief notoriously in 1656 by riding into Bristol on an ass in re-enactment of Christ's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. The spirit of Christ, he claimed, expressed itself through him. For Nayler and his followers he was, in some sense, Christ himself. Although Nayler was denounced as a blasphemer and cruelly punished by parliament, his actions were unusual only because the manner in which they flouted standards of

<sup>49</sup> Thomas Vincent, *Christ's Certain and Sudden Appearance* (London, 1667), pp. 174-75.

<sup>50</sup> Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 34-38; Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, pp. 74-77.

<sup>51</sup> Collop, *Charity*, p. 10.

<sup>52</sup> Henry More, *An Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness* (London, 1660), p. 24.

<sup>53</sup> Meric Casaubon, *Of the Necessity of Reformation* (London, 1664), p. 73.

religious etiquette was so extravagant.<sup>54</sup> In principle, all Quakers allowed the spirit of God to live through them, and thus claimed at least the capacity for infallibility. George Fox, the founder of the sect, admitted as much.<sup>55</sup> Claims of having channelled the divine presence into healing powers were for some Anglicans a particularly offensive extension of this theology. Fox, too, claimed in his earlier days to have been a healer of miraculous powers.<sup>56</sup> Gauden expressed only scorn for those fanatics 'flying to *raptures, inspirations, enthusiasms, holy convulsions, and such like quaking and quacking tricks* as pretend no less to the skill of *healing all the hurts of the daughter of my people*'.<sup>57</sup> For the contemporary royalist Anglican historian David Lloyd, enthusiasm was at the root of both the Roman Church as well as the late disturbances generated by Protestant sectarians. 'The Church of *Rome* challenged the power of doing Miracles', Lloyd wrote 'ever since she would be thought infallible; ever ushering in her strange Doctrines with strange performances; and amusing the people, especially here in *England*' over the last fifty years'. The delusions underpinning these performances were no different in kind to the 'Impulses & Visions' guiding the behaviour of puritan enthusiasts: '*Olivers* impulses, *James Naylor*, and other Quakers visions, and [the] light within ... would have superseded, if allowed, all Religion, Law, Duty, Right, and wrong'.<sup>58</sup>

George Abernathy, the historian of Restoration Presbyterianism, judged that the failed Worcester House Declaration of 1660 and the political defeats experienced thereafter by Presbyterians can both be explained in part by that party's unwillingness to allow for the possibility of gains for Roman Catholics.<sup>59</sup> Accordingly Burgess repeatedly made the connection between papists and enthusiasts, especially with respect to their supposed abuse of scripture. Among Burgess's 'rotten foundations' of religion was papal authority itself: 'Now although we grant, That the Ministry of the true Church is very usefull and necessary, as the instrument of our faith, and the preservation of it: *In which sense it's called the pillar and ground of the*

<sup>54</sup> William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 252; Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London, 1985), p. 54.

<sup>55</sup> George Fox, *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. John L. Nickals (Philadelphia, 1997), pp. 51-52.

<sup>56</sup> See for example George Fox, *George Fox's 'Book of Miracles'*, ed. Henry J. Cadbury (Richmond, 2000).

<sup>57</sup> Gauden, *Sermon Preached*, pp. 66-67.

<sup>58</sup> David Lloyd, *Wonders No Miracles* (London, 1666), pp. 4, 14.

<sup>59</sup> Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, pp. 75, 93.

*truth* ... yet it is onely a Ministry, not a Magistray. It's a political Pillar upon which Edicts use to hang for Declaration of the Magistrate's will, not an Architectonical Pillar, that beares up the house'. Burgess believed that scripture alone is '*to be laid for a foundation*' because it is '*immutable and unmovable*' and cannot be renounced by either the authority of a pope or a church. Nor can it be overthrown by private revelations and enthusiasms: 'As the papists on one side, have cryed down the sufficiency and perfection of the Scripture: so *Illuminatists*, men fancying to themselves Revelations from God, have also decried it, making themselves above the Scripture. A dangerous and damnable delusion'.<sup>60</sup> In making the point that scripture is the rule of faith, not a church body, Ford concurred: 'Papists do not indeed say (as far as I know) that Scripture is not of Divine Inspiration. But they say plainly, that the doctrine of Scripture, cannot be ascertained to us except by Tradition ... they say expres[s]ly, Tradition is a competent Rule, and Scripture is not'.<sup>61</sup>

The role of tradition and the extent to which scripture was communicated to lay Christians by a learned clergy was a point of contention between Anglicans and Presbyterians. But it was also what, in principle, Anglicans and Roman Catholics had in common. In order to place the specifically Anglican interpretation of enthusiasm into clearer focus, it is therefore necessary to begin considering the finer points of disagreement between these two groups. Edward Stillingfleet sought to disabuse Protestant critics of the notion that to believe in the English Church and its traditions, testimonies, and liturgies was to err in the same manner as Catholics who assigned infallibility to the Roman Church. Stillingfleet too took aim at the Roman Church's use of General Council declarations, infallible and fundamental articles of faith, in defining the differences between Catholics and Anglicans. In contrast to what he called the prudent method undertaken by the Church of England in propounding articles of faith for peace and security, Catholics insisted on believing that the General Council produced its articles by '*seeing Visions*' and '*dreaming dreams*'.<sup>62</sup> Are they no different, Stillingfleet asked, from the '*Quaker or Enthusiast*

<sup>60</sup> Burgess, *Scripture Directory*, pp. 127-28.

<sup>61</sup> Ford, *Logos*, p. 57.

<sup>62</sup> Edward Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion* (London, 1665), p. 527.

[who] tells you, That the *Spirit of God within him told him this and that*'.<sup>63</sup> Because of their infallible origins, these new articles must be accepted as necessary for a Catholic to obtain salvation. But here, according to Stillingfleet, is 'the state of the difference between the *Church of Rome* and the *Church of England*'. The latter 'makes no *Articles of Faith*, but such as have the *Testimony* and *Approbation* of the whole Christian world of all ages...and in other things she requires *Subscription* to them not as *Articles of Faith*, but as *Inferior Truths*, which she expects a submission to, in order to her Peace and Tranquillity'.<sup>64</sup> Of the Church's Thirty-Nine Articles, Stillingfleet stated that '[w]e do not suffer any man to reject [them] ... neither do we look upon them as *Essentials of Saving Faith*, or *Legacies of Christ and his Apostles*: but in a mean, as *pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity*; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them'.<sup>65</sup>

By the Restoration the view that the Thirty-Nine Articles were a function of peace and communion within the kingdom rather than fundamental articles of faith was finding increased currency.<sup>66</sup> This distinction received its most thorough analysis by William Chillingworth who, in *The Religion of Protestants* (1638), reconciled his anti-authoritarianism with a church that could satisfy his theological scepticism. Chillingworth's own sense of religious uncertainty compelled his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1629 and then back again to Anglicanism a year later, and consequently sharpened his awareness of the problem's contours. By the late 1620s the conflicts within Reformed religion that had shattered Christian unity added to his growing conviction that the Roman Church alone, with its decisive articles of faith and historical claims to legitimacy, had the authority to unite Christendom. Chillingworth retrospectively wrote of his decision to embrace the Roman faith as fulfilling a wish for 'an infallible Guide in the way to Heaven':

I thought myself to have sufficient reason to believe, that there was and must be always some Church that could not err; and

<sup>63</sup> Stillingfleet, *Rational Account*, p. 66.

<sup>64</sup> Stillingfleet, *Rational Account*, p. 62.

<sup>65</sup> Stillingfleet, *Rational Account*, p. 55.

<sup>66</sup> According to Spurr, this opinion, or variations of it, was advanced in print by 'Tillotson, Fowler, Bramhall, Sanderson, Stillingfleet, Laney, and Turner'. See "'Latitudinarianism" and the Restoration Church', *Historical Journal*, 31 (1988), p. 78.

consequently, seeing all other Churches disclaimed this privilege of not being subject to err, the Church of Rome must be that Church which cannot err.<sup>67</sup>

Trevor-Roper placed Chillingworth's conversion against the backdrop of the 'crisis of Pyrrhonism', or scepticism, that intensified among Europe's Protestants in the years after 1625.<sup>68</sup> The effective use of 'reason' by Protestant controversialists against their Roman adversaries threatened to overturn even shared fundamental Christian beliefs by the middle of the seventeenth century. The responses to this crisis led to an outpouring of theological and philosophical innovation among Protestants, but it also exposed a weakness in Reformed theologies that could not, as Chillingworth learned, provide its adherents with a 'decisive tribunal in religious controversy'.<sup>69</sup> The solution to the crisis of scepticism extended by the Catholic Church to doubt-ridden divines, and exploited by John Piercy, the Jesuit understood to have overseen Chillingworth's conversion, combined authority, tradition, and unity as alternatives to the ever-widening circle of quarrelling Protestant sects.<sup>70</sup>

It was Chillingworth's assessment of the Catholic Church from the inside that provoked his reassessment of the Church's supposed infallibility and eventually came to underpin his approval of the Thirty-Nine Articles. The neophyte, 'once ensnared', will learn that the '*Roman* Religion is much more exorbitant in the general practice' of its presumed infallibility than it is in its books, 'where it is delivered with much caution and moderation, nay cunning and dissimulation'. Rather than reject or contradict the great array of 'strange and unlookt-for practices', the convert will 'stifle their Conscience, and dash all scruples against the rock of their Church's Infallibility'.<sup>71</sup> Like Restoration churchmen, Chillingworth placed a high value on reason as a guiding principle in evaluating religious claims. Yet his desire for certainty, even infallibility, came at a cost. A 'blind' attachment to infallibility was an offence to the rational faculties and allowed the Roman

---

<sup>67</sup> Quoted in Robert R. Orr, *Reason and Authority: The Thought of William Chillingworth* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 10-11.

<sup>68</sup> For a full treatment of this issue, see Richard Popkin, *The History of Scepticism From Erasmus to Spinoza* (Berkeley, 1979); Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', pp. 199-200.

<sup>69</sup> Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', p. 200; Orr, *Reason and Authority*, p. 13.

<sup>70</sup> Orr, *Reason and Authority*, pp. 1-22.

<sup>71</sup> William Chillingworth, *Additional Discourse of Mr. Chillingworth* (London, 1687), p. 45.

Church to assume tyrannical practices for guaranteeing discipline. For the Viscount Falkland, a Great Tew contemporary whose work was also republished in the early years of the Restoration, the Church's claims to infallibility was poor intellectual form: 'I doe not like my own way so well as to esteem it absolutlie infallible, but though I keep it, because I account it the best, yet I will promise to leave it, when you can shew me a better, which will be hard to do, because you cannot prove it to be better but by reason'.<sup>72</sup> Even worse than a Church that claimed to base its authority on the 'infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost'<sup>73</sup> was the manner by which this authority was imposed on its adherents. Seen in this light, Chillingworth felt that the Roman faith fell short of his conception of a rational church that would allow for a diversity of opinions.<sup>74</sup>

Chillingworth's conviction that a church could not be the final arbiter in such matters was carried over into his judgments on the Thirty-Nine Articles. Both Falkland and Chillingworth were influenced by Richard Hooker, the Elizabethan theorist of church government, who offered a concrete model of an episcopal English Church that carefully avoided the perceived excesses of both Rome and Reformed Protestantism.<sup>75</sup> The immediate impetus behind Hooker's *Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity* was the potentially subversive tendencies of sixteenth-century Presbyterianism.<sup>76</sup> Against the 'rapid derivation of unconditional ecclesiastical imperatives' from 'reading of the Bible', Hooker argued in support of the English Church's historical and apostolic legitimacy.<sup>77</sup> But normative conventions such as the Prayer Book and episcopal authority were not absolute. The English Church, if not divine in origin, had strong historical claims to its authority, but it should also be flexible in its practice. Like Hooker, Chillingworth hoped that unity, or at least the possibility of national unity, should take precedence over 'indifferent' doctrinal matters in religion and their tendency to encourage sectarianism.<sup>78</sup> If a church cannot claim to

<sup>72</sup> Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, *A Discourse of Infallibility* (London, 1660), p. 117.

<sup>73</sup> Falkland, *Discourse*, p. 80.

<sup>74</sup> Orr, *Reason and Authority*, p. 29.

<sup>75</sup> Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', p. 195.

<sup>76</sup> McGrade, 'Introduction', pp. xvii-xviii.

<sup>77</sup> McGrade, 'Introduction', p. xxiv.

<sup>78</sup> In Trevor-Roper's view, the objective of reuniting Christianity following the Reformation can often be revealed to have had roots in the thought of Erasmus, finding a powerful champion in not only Hooker, but also Hugo Grotius. See 'Great Tew', p. 196.



entertain divinely inspired doctrine, its articles of faith are but the products of human effort. Chillingworth objected to the

vain conceit that that we can speak of the things of God better than the words of God; this deifying our own interpretation, and Tyrannous enforcing them upon others ... Take away this *Persecuting, Burning, Cursing, Damning of men* for not subscribing to the *words of men*, as the words of God.<sup>79</sup>

The Thirty-Nine Articles could not be the words of God containing as they did divisive passages, including 'sentences in Saint Athanasius's Creed' that Chillingworth deemed 'presumptuous'.<sup>80</sup> His subscription to the articles, which resembled Stillingfleet's formulation, depended on his situating them within a broader set of concerns about 'peace and quiet' and the internal harmony of the Church and kingdom. The Church itself was a true church, its doctrine 'pure and orthodox', and its adherents 'undoubtedly shall be saved'. But the articles that he or any other Protestant disagreed with were not, for them, errors or disagreements 'destructive of salvation'. Neither is there any 'error in it which may necessitate or warrant any man to disturb the peace, or renounce the communion of it'.<sup>81</sup> Chillingworth believed, optimistically, that a Protestant community might put aside its quarrels over indifferent doctrinal issues and come to accept the Church for its function in protecting Reformed religion, widely defined, and cultivating peace and unity.<sup>82</sup>

The Church's structures of authority and official doctrines, through founded and based upon the apostolic succession, stopped short of divine perfection. Stillingfleet, Casaubon, and More dealt so exhaustively with Rome's self-proclaimed infallibility because by doing so they hived off the English Church from a wide array of apparent similarities between the two. Roman Catholic writers were fond of pointing out that, for example, the

<sup>79</sup> William Chillingworth, *Mr. Chillingworth's Judgment of the Religion of Protestants* (London, 1680), p. 7.

<sup>80</sup> Orr, *Reason and Authority*, p. 42.

<sup>81</sup> Quoted in Orr, *Reason and Authority*, p. 42.

<sup>82</sup> This Latitudinarian approach to the Church and its doctrine seems quaint in light of the Act of Uniformity's stipulations for 'unfeigned assent'. Even after 1662, however, it still did not seem impossible to establishment Anglicans like Stillingfleet and Tillotson, both of whom were closely involved in efforts to achieve comprehension throughout the 1670s, that 'occasional conformity' could be a basis for a unified church. On latitude and comprehension see Martin I. J. Griffin, Jr., *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden, 1992); Marshall, 'Ecclesiology'; Spurr, 'Latitudinarianism'.

Roman Church rejected insurrection and schism as decisively and thoroughly as any Reformed Church. Writing in 1663, Serenus (or Hugh) Cressy made the perceptive point that English Protestants 'find themselves obliged to behave differently to several adversaries. For against *Sects* that went out from them, they use the help of *Catholick* weapons, the *Authority of the Church* [and] *Councils*. But against *Catholicks* they ... will make use of a kind of private spirit or reason'.<sup>83</sup> This was quite true and no advocate of the English Church was then likely to disagree with it; it was after all, in theory, the *via media* between Catholic and Reformed traditions. But the exercise of such private spirit opened the possibility that Anglicans, self-proclaimed enemies of enthusiasm, were themselves enthusiasts. Cressy employed the typical argument that 'pretended Inspirations ... which incite private, uncommission'd persons to reform either Church or State' are in the Catholic religion 'rejected, detested, and sent back to the Infernal Father of them'.<sup>84</sup> Likewise John Sergeant, another Catholic controversialist, built his defence of the Roman Church on the weight of its tradition on the one hand, and against the unwelcome intrusions of private spirit or enthusiasm on the other. As Sergeant argued, the Roman Church no less than the English had an uninterrupted succession of doctrine to which to point for its authority.<sup>85</sup> 'T'is a madness', wrote Sergeant, 'to talk of *seeming* Testimonies against so vast and evident a one as that of the whole foregoing Church'.<sup>86</sup> In contrast, the critics of the Roman Church were dependent on a new rule either from 'some private inspiration, or some waxen-natured words not yet senc'd nor having any certain Interpreter, but fit to be plaid upon diversely by quirks of wit; that is, apt to blunder and confound, but to clear little or nothing'. Such outbursts of inspiration, whether by private spirit or inner light, can only contradict tradition.<sup>87</sup>

No matter how tightly proponents of the Anglican tradition adhered to the legitimacy of their episcopate as authoritative, Cressy and Sergeant demonstrated that it could be vulnerable to charges of enthusiasm. In order for the Anglican case against the enthusiasts to remain tenable, it would require rescuing from the charge that it relied as equally on divine

<sup>83</sup> Serenus Cressy, *Roman-Catholick Doctrines No Novelties* (1663), p. 92.

<sup>84</sup> Cressy, *Roman-Catholick*, pp. 94-6.

<sup>85</sup> John Sergeant, *Sure-Footing in Christianity* (London, 1665), p. 68.

<sup>86</sup> Sergeant, *Sure-Footing*, p. 233.

<sup>87</sup> Sergeant, *Sure-Footing*, pp. 68, 110.

inspiration as the radical Protestant theologies it assailed. Doing so demanded carefully distinguishing between a holy spirit that participated in the lives of believers in a meaningful way and one that had licence to designate particular individuals as receptacles of divine information. Quakers, who affirmed the latter, and Cressy's suggestions of hypocrisy will be considered here in turn, along with the responses they elicited from Anglican theologians.

That the scriptures were written under the influence of divine inspiration, truly and unassailably, was the point at which broad agreement terminated. Quakers, however, equivocated. Edward Burrough conceded that the scriptures were written with the assistance of divine inspiration, but he also insisted that they were fundamentally the products of human effort, and thus not beyond reproach. Christ, not scripture, according to Burrough, 'is the word of God ... and this word is not the Scriptures' which were delivered by holy men 'moved by the holy Ghost, and given by the inspiration of the God'.<sup>88</sup> The spirit, shared equally by all individuals, must be present in contemporary recipients of scripture in the same manner that it was present in the original conveyors of it.<sup>89</sup> The holy men who introduced it were not therefore privy to an enhanced or favoured channel of communication with God. Margaret Fell asked whether the spirit that compelled the writers of scripture 'hath not the same power and efficacy to work in the hearts of people, as it ever had?'<sup>90</sup> A frequently cited basis for the Quaker claim for the immutability and ubiquity of the holy spirit beyond the apostolic age was the Old Testament proclamation that 'there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding' (Job 32.8). This passage was repeatedly summoned by Quakers to substantiate their basic claim.<sup>91</sup> This is a point of divergence that could not be reconciled, and it was pressed persistently by Quakers in shrewd ways. The young George Keith reminded the Protestant critics of Quakers that the Marian martyrs, by then assimilated into the mainstream of English

<sup>88</sup> Edward Burrough, *Some of the Principles of the Quakers* (London, 1659), p. 5.

<sup>89</sup> Fox, *Journal*, pp. 8-13.

<sup>90</sup> Margaret Fell, *A Touch-Stone* (London, 1665), p. 84.

<sup>91</sup> See for example Richard Hubberthorne, *An Account of Several Things* (London, 1660), p. 7; George Fox the Younger, *A Collection of the Several Books of Writings* (London, 1662), p. 144; Samuel Fisher, *The Bishop Busied Beside the Business* (London, 1662), p. 61; George Keith, *Help in Time of Need From the God of Help* (Aberdeen, 1665), p. 25.

Protestant mythology, had claimed defiantly the spirit of God within them. 'I read in the ... Book of Martyrs', Keith writes, 'how when some who were burnt for their testimony to the Truth, in Queen *Maries* dayes, were called before the Popish Clergy, and Bishops who disputed with them ... the Martyrs pleaded for the determination of the Spirit of God: and when it was queried, if such had the Spirit of God, and it was answered, Yea'. Warning readers that the Church of England of the present century had declined into apostasy, Keith continues: '[W]hat a time we are fallen in, that the inspiration of the Spirit of God which is the very breath of life into the souls of the Lords people, should be scorned, and such as witness such a blessed and glorious dispensation, nick-named *Fanaticks* and mad men, even by them who have pretended so highly to be the Reformed Church.'<sup>92</sup> Was it not simply popish to deny the light within?<sup>93</sup> Fell demanded to know why, in an ostensibly Protestant nation, there are ministers 'who do not only deny Revelation, and so deny Jesus Christ, but they also stir up the Magistrates, and those that have the Civil Power, to Persecute' those who possess 'the Revelation of Jesus Christ, and are Inspired by the Almighty, with the same Spirit and Power as the Apostles had'.<sup>94</sup> For Quakers, the spirit of God was truly diffuse and, in a sense, democratic. From the time of the apostolic era, when the scriptures were delivered to humanity and up to the present day, inspiration had remained the same in essence. To deny it, and to punish its hosts and disgrace them with smear words, was egregiously popish.

For Stillingfleet, addressing this problem entailed submitting a sharper definition of what it meant to be 'inspired', and specifically, the fundamental distinction between 'private revelation' and 'testimony of spirit'. Cressy had argued that although Anglicans appealed to the authority of a Church or tradition to defend their practices from Protestant sectarians, when criticizing the Roman Church they still withheld recourse to 'private spirit'. The assertion that private spirit understood in this way was indistinguishable from divine inspiration was, according to Stillingfleet, simply false. In vindicating the Archbishop of Canterbury from imputations of private inspiration, Stillingfleet wrote:

---

<sup>92</sup> Keith, *Time of Need*, p. 24.

<sup>93</sup> William Smith, *The Reign of the Whore Discovered* (London, 1659), p. 9.

<sup>94</sup> Fell, *Touch-Stone*, p. 84.

If by the testimony of the Spirit be meant any special revelation of a new object of Faith, then he [the Archbishop] denies the truth of it at least in an ordinary way, both because God never sends us to look for such a testimony, and because it would expose men to the danger of Enthusiasms: but if by the testimony of the Spirit be meant the habit or the act of Divine infused Faith, by vertue of which they believe credible, then he grants the truth.<sup>95</sup>

Stillingfleet denied the imputation that Whitaker and Calvin claimed to have had private revelations. What precisely Stillingfleet meant by 'habit' or 'act of divine infused faith' is here made clearer. Above all, neither of these individuals implied any '*private revelation* of any *new object*, but only a particular application of the evidence appearing in Scripture to the conscience of every Believer'. Both speak of the 'internal satisfaction of every ones conscience'. Thus Whitaker remarked that 'there is a more certain and noble testimony by which we may be persuaded that these *Books* are sacred, viz. that of the *Holy Ghost*'.<sup>96</sup>

Stillingfleet's case for a divinely infused Anglican faith, so far, resists the danger of enthusiasm, at least, by precluding the discovery of 'new objects' of belief. It does, however, invite the question of exactly how such a testimony of spirit interacted with the individual. To illustrate the role of the holy spirit, Stillingfleet assigned it a passive function in informing faith: '[T]here is no repugnancy at all, in the nature of the thing, but that this *Infinite Being* may, in a certain way, but imperceptible by us, communicate to the *Minds of Men* such notions of things, which are the effects of his own *Wisdom* and *Council*: and this is what we call *Divine Inspiration*.' Similarly, Ralph Cudworth remarked in a 1664 sermon that to seek the demonstration of God's spirit in '*loud Noise*' and '*long Speeches*' was to err: 'For the true Demonstration God's Holy Spirit is no-where to be looked for but in *Life* and *Action*.'<sup>97</sup> Such a testimony of faith is nothing more or less than those imperceptible signs of grace that underpin the sober Protestant's relationship to, and understanding of, scripture and virtuousness: '[T]his is what the *Apostle* means when he sayes, That *Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*.'<sup>98</sup> Nathaniel Hardy lifted an invocation from

<sup>95</sup> Stillingfleet, *Rational Account*, p. 174.

<sup>96</sup> Stillingfleet, *Rational Account*, p. 174.

<sup>97</sup> Ralph Cudworth, *A Sermon Preached to the Honourable Society of Lincolns-Inn* (London, 1664), p. 66-7.

<sup>98</sup> Stillingfleet, *Rational Account*, p. 130.

the 1637 edition of the Book of Common Prayer to appeal to the Lord to 'grant us thy humble servants ... thy holy inspiration [so] we may think (and vow) those things that be good'.<sup>99</sup> Hammond considered the 'assistance of God's *Spirit*' among the 'ordinary means' of understanding scripture, along with 'learning, studying, meditation, [and] rational inference'. He admitted lacking any 'such extraordinary gift of inspiration' of the kind 'which hath of late been somewhat preposterous in this Nation'.<sup>100</sup> In this view, active participation on the part of the holy spirit in developing 'new lights' of faith in the present age was not assumed.<sup>101</sup> In effect, these writers conceded to Fell and other Quakers that the spirit was present. But it did not facilitate the discovery of 'new objects', neither revelation, as Quakers would have it, nor infallible papal pronouncements, as Romanists would. Instead it was a testimony of spirit that remained wedded to the forms, structures, and conventions of the Anglican episcopate.

No longer under siege in 1660 by Presbyterians and other Protestant rebels, advocates of the episcopacy insisted on the preservation of its ordained ministry, and its authority to rein in schismatics and oversee the use and interpretation of scripture. Their engagements with Roman Catholics reveal some of the limits of episcopalian power. Unlike the Roman Church, the English Church did not proclaim new articles of faith, infallible or otherwise. Although Anglicans could not follow Presbyterians in arguing that a hierarchy of the kind characteristic of the English Church was overbearing to the point of being un-Christian, they believed that by discarding the principle of infallibility and assigning the holy spirit a modestly Protestant function, they had identified the correct balance. At each stage the grounds for divine inspiration of the enthusiastic variety had been negotiated out of consideration and the definitive points of Anglican contrast were confidently emphasized. At the same time, a positive role for the holy spirit as an imperceptible accessory of grace began to emerge. Cumulatively, all of these doctrinal choices did the work of reproving enthusiasts, Catholic or Protestant, who appointed themselves holy critics of the Church and its traditions. Defenders of the Church therefore felt secure

---

<sup>99</sup> Nathaniel Hardy, *The Pious Votary and Prudent Traveller Characterized* (London, 1659), p. 9.

<sup>100</sup> Henry Hammond, *A Paraphrase and Annotations Upon all the Books of the New Testament* (London, 1659), pp. 1-2.

<sup>101</sup> Hammond, *Paraphrase*, pp. 1-2.

about bringing their specific configuration of episcopacy to bear on England's uncertain religious situation and the problems that troubled it.

The respective roles of magistrates and ministers, who performed crucial functions in the episcopate, were further focused by defining them as opponents of enthusiasm. The fundamental argument was conveyed by George Lawson in 1662 when he declared that 'God doth not write his Laws in our hea[r]ts by Enthusiasm, Rapture, and Inspiration ... but he makes use of the Word, and the Ministers of the Gospel, and the Instructions of Man, as also of the outward senses, as of Eye and Ear, and also of the inward, and of Reason'.<sup>102</sup> Subjects, therefore, must not allow their impulses to overtake them even if such desires are believed to have a divine mandate. Jeremy Taylor assented to this view, adding that 'Phanaticks, both among us and in the Church of *Rome* ... *belie the Holy Ghost*' which 'never disorders the Beauties of Government, but is a God of Order'.<sup>103</sup> This point was echoed in Presbyterian and Roman Catholic quarters. William Prynne, a political eclectic to be sure but a supporter of a moderate episcopacy by 1660,<sup>104</sup> reiterated that Christians must obey and financially support their ministers.<sup>105</sup> Owing to his Catholicism, Cressy offered a more elaborate justification incorporating four 'partial guides' – reason, God's spirit, General Councils, and present visible governors – as the wisest configuration of religious order. Cressy concluded that 'it is only the Roman Catholic Church whose ... Guidance proceed[s] from all these, and the effect of which guidance is full satisfaction to each mans Soul, and universal peace in Gods Church'.<sup>106</sup> The common theme throughout these arguments is the protection of the Church and the social order from wayward religious zealots. The basis for the Anglican endorsement of the local order was the teaching of the apostles themselves, which required obedience to the magistrate. Henry More stated plainly that it was 'both the *Doctrine* of the Apostles, and the *Practice* of the Church ... *to obey the Magistrate and live peaceably under him.*' It behooves 'Christian Rulers, *Ecclesiastical or Civil* to be so well acquainted with' the teaching of the apostles in order 'that they

<sup>102</sup> George Lawson, *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrewes* (London, 1662), p. 147.

<sup>103</sup> Jeremy Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios* (London, 1667), p. 109.

<sup>104</sup> Abernathy, *English Presbyterians*, p. 73.

<sup>105</sup> William Prynne, *A Gospel Plea (Interwoven with a Rational and Legal) for the Lawfulness & Continuance of the Ancient Set[t]led Maintainence* (London, 1660), p. 23.

<sup>106</sup> Cressy, *Roman-Catholick*, pp. 93-94.

may be able to stop the mouths of these loud *Fanaticks* by those holy Oracles they pervert thus and abuse'.<sup>107</sup> The apostolic tradition, which facilitated the organization and perpetuation of Christ's ministry on earth, was the cornerstone of the Anglican scheme of authority.<sup>108</sup> The apostles along with '*Pastours* and *Teachers* (which functions continue still)' were thus appointed by Christ 'for rightly settling his Truth in the first Ages of the Church'.<sup>109</sup> The structure of Church government was determined by Christ, instituted by the apostles, and carried out by the upholders, both ecclesiastical and civil, into the present day. Stillingfleet, who, it must be said, expressed scepticism about the *ius divinum* of the apostolic form, nevertheless judged that the Church of England must balance both the peace and internal harmony of its realm with 'correspondency to the Primitive Church' as the foremost arbiters of governing forms.<sup>110</sup> Stillingfleet hoped that by constructing the Church in correlation to the primitive model, 'not so much *in using* the same *rites* that were in use then, as in *not imposing them*, but leaving men to be won by the observing the true decency and order of Churches, whereby those who act upon a true Principle of Christian ingenuity may be sooner drawn to a compliance in all lawful things'.<sup>111</sup> The overarching argument in Stillingfleet's major investigation into church government, *Irenicum* (1659), that the apostolic structure of authority was neither divine nor immutable, exhibits the unmistakable influence of Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651), the abiding target for defenders of Christianity throughout the period.<sup>112</sup> But Stillingfleet, no less than More, Lawson, or Taylor wished to protect the integrity of the Anglican Church from what he called the '*croaking Enthusiasts* ... [who] continually

<sup>107</sup> More, *Grand Mystery*, p. 204.

<sup>108</sup> Henry More, *A Modest Inquiry Into the Mystery of Iniquity* (London, 1664), p. 91.

<sup>109</sup> More, *Modest Inquiry*, p. 91.

<sup>110</sup> Edward Stillingfleet, *Irenicum: A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds* (London, 1660), p. 8.

<sup>111</sup> Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, p. 7.

<sup>112</sup> See Marshall, 'Ecclesiology'. John Locke's early writing on matters indifferent in religion and the magistrate's authority in overseeing them, which date from between 1660 and 1662, seems to have been an attempt to balance 'morally neutral' religious practices with the internal order of the kingdom. As Philip Abrams has pointed out, Locke's belief that the magistrate, at his own discretion, ought to have the authority over such matters reflected an 'instinctive commitment' to order and government. Locke was to espouse a different view by 1667. Like Stillingfleet, however, Locke's *Two Tracts on Government* indicate a sympathetic reading of Hobbes. See Jacqueline Rose, 'John Locke, "Matters Indifferent", and the Restoration Church of England', *The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005), 601-21; John Locke, *Two Tracts on Government*, ed. Philip Abrams (Cambridge, 1967), p. 20.



pretending commissions from heaven' set the minds of men in 'continual distraction' from the '*rules* given them'.<sup>113</sup>

As many Anglicans observed, by 1659 England might be said to have spent two decades in continual distraction. But it was not a phenomenon that originated in the early 1640s. As the English Church was in the view of its theologians a genuinely catholic Church of uncorrupted principles, its theologians understood the problem of enthusiasm to be a perennial one, stretching back to at least as early as the second century, that would intermittently burst into rebellion. The ecstatic prophet Montanus and his followers, condemned by the Primitive Fathers of the Church as imposters,<sup>114</sup> were frequently cited in terms similar to those used to denounce contemporary enthusiasts. John Smith, quoting Tertullian, stated that 'every false Prophet' can be expected to fall into 'rage or fury'.<sup>115</sup> Stillingfleet elaborated on this theme and observed that the Montanists '*were always trembling both in body and mind; used no consequence of reason in discourse; their words had no proper sense, but were all dark, intricate, and obscure*'. This, he continued, was '[a]n exact description of a late prevailing Sect among us, who have their names from those consternations they were wont to fall into, and whose language carries as much obscurity with it as any of the followers of Montanus could wrap up theirs into'.<sup>116</sup> Peter Gunning's detailed defence of the Lent-Fast as 'Apostolic and Perpetual' takes as its central antagonist the Montanists. Gunning urged his readers to resist 'all that would impose [new] fasts on you, whether Montanists, or other new Hereticks'.<sup>117</sup> There were other historical examples of this behaviour. Edward Waterhouse drew attention to the fourth-century Dontatists who, overtaken with enthusiastic zealotry, 'would disobey Magistrates, upon pretence, that God was rather to be obeyed than they; which was true, but not in their sense'.<sup>118</sup> According to More even an enthusiast such as Mohamet, though no more than a typical fraud, could be successful in spreading his 'cruel and bloody Precepts'. Mohamet, assumed to be '*impeccable*', was only so 'in that *Fanatick* sense, *that doe what he*

<sup>113</sup> Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacrae* (London, 1662), p. 109.

<sup>114</sup> John Smith, *Select Discourses* (London, 1660), p. 198.

<sup>115</sup> Smith, *Select Discourses*, p. 198.

<sup>116</sup> Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, p. 95.

<sup>117</sup> Peter Gunning, *The Paschal or Lent-Fast, Apostolical & Perpetual* (London, 1662), p. 153.

<sup>118</sup> Edward Waterhouse, *Fortescutus Illustratus* (London, 1663), p. 52.

would, he could not sin...a wilde conceit of some *Enthusiasts* of these days'.<sup>119</sup> Robert South warns of 'attempts upon the Civill Power' with the goal to 'Innovate Gods Worship' as characteristic of Mohamet and like enthusiasts, who raised 'his Empire upon two Pillars, Conquest and Inspiration'.<sup>120</sup>

This pattern of rebelliousness could be identified in much more immediate historical examples. Peter Heylyn's history of the Church of England, which was assuredly published in 1659 for polemical reasons, draws attention to a collection of familiar claimants to power:

Hence the ... Puritan faction, against the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; that of the Presbyterians against the Bishops, of Episcopal government; and finally that also of the Independents, against the superintendency of the Pastors and Elders. The terrible effects, whereof will appear hereafter, if God shall give me means and opportunity to carry on the History of those disturbances which have been raised by the *Puritans* and *Prebyterians*, against the Orders of this Church, and the peace of Christendom.<sup>121</sup>

Memories of the fearsome Anabaptists allowed commentators to make an explicit connection between enthusiasm and violence. Waterhouse remarked that the Church and Canon, despite their embankments and bulwarks, would always be vulnerable to the 'leveling fury' of 'Anabaptistical Treachery'.<sup>122</sup> Such treachery could likewise have as its objective the violent overthrow of the civil sovereign. Walter Charleton's laudatory portrait of Charles II credited him with reducing 'no small number of *Fanatiques*' to near conformity, a necessary task given their scarcely concealed violent intentions: '[T]hey pretend the inspiration of His *Holy Spirit*, to justifie their cruel and execrable actions of taking up Armes against their Sovereign, murdering their fellow Subjects, and attempting to subvert Government.'<sup>123</sup> The ultimate vices of enthusiasm were rebellion, fraud, and violence.<sup>124</sup>

<sup>119</sup> More, *Grand Mystery*, p. 159.

<sup>120</sup> Robert South, *Interest Deposed, and Truth Restored* (Oxford, 1660), p. 1.

<sup>121</sup> Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata* (London, 1660), p. 63. An extended analysis of Heylyn's histories, which are more severe in their treatment of continental Reformed Protestantism than of Roman Catholicism, is in Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft*, chapter three especially.

<sup>122</sup> Waterhouse, *Fortescutus*, p. 52.

<sup>123</sup> Walter Charlton, *A Character of His Most Sacred Majesty* (London, 1661), p. 19.

<sup>124</sup> Joseph Glanvill, *A Loyal Tear Dropt on the Vault of Our Late Martyred Sovereign* (London, 1667), p. 27.

## II

Up to this point, the grounds on which enthusiasm might be judged fraudulent have been only partially considered. The view offered by Stillingfleet, along with those of Hammond and Taylor, laid the foundation for an Anglican relationship with the holy spirit whereby the Godly individual did not experience private inspiration, as Roman Catholics alleged, but rather a sober testimony of spirit or grace. But there were two further points espoused by Anglicans to be made in support of this position, both rooted in the apostolic doctrine. Genuine divine inspiration, of the sort assumed by enthusiasts, ended with the apostolic era, and God was not expected to disclose any more information to his subjects in a similar manner. Even in the unlikely event that God wished to do so, the scriptures and the apostles offer models for how a legitimate prophet or divinely inspired individual would conduct himself. He will, in short, be upright, sober, learned, eloquent, and will protect and work to preserve order. This view precluded from legitimate standing the most enduring of radical sects, the Quakers, who on principle scorned the offices and high-flown learning of bishops. It also had the effect of isolating those enthusiasts, not limited to Quakers, known for their 'fury' and 'ecstasy', as well as psychologically damaged individuals perceived to be insusceptible to reason. It likewise ruled out prophecy, astrology, and other specious practices with divine pretensions. All were linked in a common attack on the possibility of finding true divine inspiration by means other than those sanctioned by the Church and its governing authorities.

Although Anglicans might applaud Thomas Hobbes as he demolished Romanist and sectarian claims of divine inspiration, his next step, dismantling the Aristotelian philosophy of real essences, the spirit made flesh, undercut fundamental Christian doctrines.<sup>125</sup> This was another fine boundary that could not be crossed. Stillingfleet, though somewhat of a Hobbesian in his ideas on the purpose and nature of civil and ecclesiastical government, did not cross it. Like other Anglicans, Stillingfleet believed that the movement of the spirit, limited and operating within the protocols of

---

<sup>125</sup> J. G. A. Pocock, 'Enthusiasm: Antiself of Enlightenment', pp. 12-14.

church hierarchy, was not itself an enthusiasm.

But there remained the questions of how the spirit manifested the flesh of the apostles and why that era could be understood to have drawn to a close. The mission of the apostles was widely agreed to have been elevated by the immediate divine guidance of Christ. Stillingfleet determined that it would be unlikely for God to have commissioned the writers of the gospels and the apostles and in one age, only to allow for continual performances of prophecy to confound and conflict all subsequent ages. 'For supposing that *God* had left *matters of Divine revelation* unrecorded at all', Stillingfleet wrote, 'but left them to be discovered in every age by a *spirit of prophecy*, by such a multitude as might be sufficient to inform the world of the truth of the things; we cannot but conceive that an innumerable company' of enthusiasts would produce no end of 'distracting' inspirations and communications from Heaven.<sup>126</sup> The apostles, having been entrusted with a mission to settle Godly teachings in the early age of the Church, thus had Christ breathe 'into them the Spirit of Truth'.<sup>127</sup> The spirit current during the apostolic age was peerless and could not be replicated. Though philosophically simple, this view has blunt force. John Spencer made the point in an even more straightforward manner: 'Let but any wise man read over the prophecies of Scripture, and then those of *Merlin* or *Nostradame*, and I believe he will scarce need an Argument to perswade him that they were never both inspired by the same Spirit.'<sup>128</sup> There were additional practical reasons why this should be so. The vocation of teaching and spreading the gospels, as it had been handed down through the ages in church government, required a degree of formal education to be carried out competently and the original apostles alone could rightly claim divine inspiration as their source of insight. William Prynne made this point by noting that the apostles were granted divine guidance for their insights, but contemporary ministers must instead make careful preparation before preaching: 'For though they receive their Ministry and Orders freely without purchase ... their preparation for the Ministry costs them many years of study, pains, to themselves or their Friends, Parents many a pound ... whereas the Apostles received the miraculous gift of healing, preaching,

---

<sup>126</sup> Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacrae*, p. 109.

<sup>127</sup> More, *Modest Inquiry*, p. 91.

<sup>128</sup> John Spencer, *A Discourse Concerning Vulgar Prophecies* (London, 1665), pp. 51-52.

immediately by divine inspiration, without study or cost.<sup>129</sup> Whom the holy spirit calls, Richard Allestree declared in a 1660 sermon, will be empowered by Christ's offices.<sup>130</sup> Roger L'Estrange went further in denouncing those preaching without a true calling as spreading '*Delusions of Satan*, for the *Inspirations of the Holy Ghost*'.<sup>131</sup>

Quakers such as Katherine Evans and George Keith, of course, scoffed at the idea that one must be formally educated to speak with authority on Godly matters.<sup>132</sup> Keith even suggested that were the apostles alive today they would be 'hissed at' just as the Quakers and other nonconformists were.<sup>133</sup> But the notion that matters of such urgent importance ought to be left to only those endorsed and ordained by episcopacy did the work of limiting the calling to one era and to a very select few individuals. Proponents of this view could be Anglicans or even moderate Presbyterians such as Prynne, but they would not in any case reject episcopalian church government. By extension, it also served the dual purpose of supporting Stillingfleet's testimony of grace as well as privileging only those already predisposed to the English Church. The spirit thus moves within all sober Protestants in its subtle manner, but only one's appointment or election to a formal office of the Church can be taken as evidence of suitability to preach the gospel.

This last point had the effect of casting off the unlearned mechanics and 'meaner sort' of their divine claims, even those that might otherwise be, or claim to be, 'sober' by contemporary standards, as well as enthusiasts of a more idiosyncratic variety. The unruly and even violent tendencies of enthusiasts, as noted, have often been linked by Anglicans to frenzied or furious behaviour.<sup>134</sup> Again, the model of conduct was the apostles and their obvious differences from the enthusiasts of subsequent ages. It appeared to Anglican critics that the Montanists, for instance, were models for contemporary enthusiasts. Both Smith and Stillingfleet, as noted, emphasized the furious and ecstatic mode of Montanus, apparently imitated

<sup>129</sup> Prynne, *Gospel Plea*, pp. 36-37.

<sup>130</sup> Richard Allestree, *A Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Westminster* (London, 1660), p. 10.

<sup>131</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *A Short View of Some Remarkable Transactions* (London, 1660), p. 100.

<sup>132</sup> Katharine Evans, *A Brief Discovery of God's Eternal Truth* (London, 1663), p. 27; Keith, *Time of Need*, p. 24.

<sup>133</sup> Keith, *Time of Need*, p. 24.

<sup>134</sup> Gauden, *Sermon Preached*, p. 66; Thomas Wilson, *A Complete Christian Dictionary* (London, 1661), p. 496.

by Quakers, as contrary to the manner of discourse characteristic of the true prophets. The 'Pseudo-Prophetical Spirit is seated only in the Imaginative Powers and Faculties inferior to Reason' whereas the 'True Prophetical Spirit seats its self as well in the Rational Powers as in the Sensitive, and that it never alienates Mind, but informs and enlightens it'. Reinforcing the argument that the unlearned will fail to achieve such engagement with the spirit, Smith added that the Pseudo-Prophet can be expected to '*fall into great confusions in many Theoretical matters of no small moment, and do so mix true notions with such as are meerly seeming, and imaginary, as if Heaven and Earth were jumbled together*'.<sup>135</sup> Stillingfleet presumed false prophets were simply weak individuals of poor conversation.<sup>136</sup> The true prophet's message would be accompanied by 'reason' not 'tremblings' and communicated in 'an unforced order of words' employing neither cant nor verse which, conversely, communicated a 'coolness and curiousness' which rendered it greatly unsuitable to the seriousness of the prophetic spirit.<sup>137</sup> They will additionally have a firm grasp on logic and will demonstrate improvement by education.<sup>138</sup> John Spencer, who took to psychological analysis and diagnosis, explicitly defines the rebellious prophet out of the Church and social order: 'Are they not persons generally discontented with the state of things ... and disguise the wishes of encouragements *unto* some sudden change, in the sacred livery of prophecy? ... Are they not persons commonly of a very morose and sower humor, especially where they perceive themselves neglected?'<sup>139</sup> Spencer here makes that sweeping and unequivocal claim that enthusiasts and false prophets, if they have not yet been identified by the myriad symptoms thus far described, might finally be unveiled if their inspirations tend toward the criticism of the Church and the general 'state of things'. The extraordinary gift of inspiration extended to the apostles cannot be claimed by bishop, deacon, or priest, nor certainly one who occupies the Church's '*room of the unlearned*'.<sup>140</sup> By upholding the ministry, its standards of education and ordination, and the circumscribed functions it accorded to the holy spirit, the method for perpetuating Christ's

---

<sup>135</sup> Smith, *Select Discourses*, pp. 190-2.

<sup>136</sup> Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacrae*, p. 159.

<sup>137</sup> Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, p. 94; Spencer, *Vulgar Prophecies*, p. 53.

<sup>138</sup> Spencer, *Vulgar Prophecies*, p. 44.

<sup>139</sup> Spencer, *Vulgar Prophecies*, p. 46.

<sup>140</sup> Spencer, *Vulgar Prophecies*, p. 132.

teachings on earth will be preserved. This structure also accounted for the unlikelihood, indeed perhaps the impossibility, of genuine inspiration arising from within, and certainly from beyond, its ranks.

Spencer's analysis of 'vulgar prophecies' engaged vigorously with what has come to be identified by historians as the naturalist, or modernist, critique of enthusiasm.<sup>141</sup> The certainty with which Anglican writers dismissed claims to inspiration prompted new questions about its causes. If inspirations were not sent by God, what compelled individuals to make such claims, and what explained the often anti-social behaviour that accompanied them? Spencer's characterization of them as morose individuals of 'sowr' temperament is indicative of the attempts to generalize about psychological or physiological causes. A comprehensive medical critique that was initiated in England in the mid 1650s by Casaubon and More advanced the theory that the enthusiast was delusional and could benefit from medical attention.<sup>142</sup> Glanvill believed false inspirations were 'conjur'd up into the *Imagination* by the heat of the *melancholized* brain'.<sup>143</sup> Even Jeremy Taylor, not typically given to philosophical or medical writing, considered that the delusional enthusiastic must be treated and 'cured by physick'.<sup>144</sup> There was occasional recourse to demonological explanations for furious convulsions, pseudo-prophecy, and the spread of false information. Spencer himself believed that unlike the clear, coherent mode of communication characteristic of the true prophets, the Devil's preferred mode, verse, was a more effective means of enchanting the people.<sup>145</sup> In his extraordinarily vehement 'unmasking' of Quakers as agents of the Pope, Prynne quoted the findings of 'learned Physitians' to the effect that shaking or trembling can be symptomatic of 'coldness or weakness of the Brain or Nerves'. Nevertheless, he agreed also with the opinion that it derived 'sometimes from *Sorcery* and the *Devil himself*'.<sup>146</sup> Even More speculated about Satan's

<sup>141</sup> The secularization narrative forms the basis of Heyd, *'Be Sober and Reasonable'*. It is also evident in Jonathan Israel's comprehensive work on the radical Enlightenment: Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity* (Oxford, 2002); Jonathan I. Israel, *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man* (Oxford, 2006); Jonathan Israel, *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy* (Princeton, 2009).

<sup>142</sup> Heyd, *'Be Sober and Reasonable'*, chapter three especially.

<sup>143</sup> Joseph Glanvill, *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (London, 1661), pp. 105, 99.

<sup>144</sup> Taylor, *Dekas*, p. 84.

<sup>145</sup> Spencer, *Vulgar Prophecies*, p. 50.

<sup>146</sup> William Prynne, *The Quakers Unmasked, and Clearly Detected to be But the Spawn of*

involvement in enthusiastic practices and behaviours that undermined the Church.<sup>147</sup> The prominence of medical or demonological explanations for enthusiasm, however, should not be overstated, and they did not, in this period, dominate the Anglican approach to the subject. The broadly Anglican analysis of the problem depended instead heavily on well-entrenched religious foundations, and although many added to or borrowed from this body of thought, most preferred to contain the matter of enthusiasm within a more widely shared idiom of Anglican authority and piety.

Related to the medical critique was the appeal to reason or rational religion. As Spurr has demonstrated, the struggle to distance the Church from the perceived irrationalism of puritans was a major preoccupation of Restoration Anglicans.<sup>148</sup> The story of the long-term dynamic between Christianity and reason over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is a wide-reaching issue and cannot receive treatment here.<sup>149</sup> But one significant extension of Restoration Anglicanism, not limited to but loosely consisting of Cudworth, More, and Smith, whose writings were posthumously republished after 1660, was known as Cambridge Platonism, and it consisted in the vindication of particular theological points in elaborate and forceful ways. More was particularly idiosyncratic in this respect. In some ways his ideas converged with conservative Anglican opinion. His Platonism uncontroversially entailed strident rejection of mechanical philosophy, signally Hobbesian ideas, on the grounds that it drove the spirit entirely out of human affairs.<sup>150</sup> More's spirit existed in the universe as a causal agent and as an extension of God, and operated in a manner consistent with reason. For More, spiritual presence in general is ubiquitous and he reports of apparitions intervening in human affairs regularly. In, for example, 'speakings, knockings, opening of doores when they were fast shut, sudden lights in the midst of a room floating in the aire,

---

*Romish Frogs, Jesuites, and Franciscan Fryers* (London, 1664), pp. 23-24.

<sup>147</sup> More, *Modest Inquiry*, p. 7.

<sup>148</sup> Spurr, "'Rational Religion'", p. 564.

<sup>149</sup> Some cornerstones of this historiography are Paul Hazard, *The European Mind, the Critical Years, 1680-1715* (Cleveland, 1964); Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Religious Origins of the Enlightenment', in *Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change* (London, 1967), 193-237; Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft*; David Wootton and Michael Hunter (eds.), *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1992).

<sup>150</sup> C. A. Patrides, 'Introduction', in C. A. Patrides (ed.), *The Cambridge Platonists* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 27-8.



and then passing and vanishing'.<sup>151</sup> More himself admitted a 'natural touch' of enthusiasm that he was able to overcome.<sup>152</sup> For More as for the other Platonists, reason was a universal feature of man's spiritual and intellectual condition and it alone, in principle, could guide an individual to union with God. This consequently led to a Latitudinarian approach to conciliation in 1659-60 as well as to suspicions of Socinianism from more austere advocates of a unified Church.<sup>153</sup> Though defenders of episcopacy and subscribers to the Act of Uniformity, More and Cudworth are indicative of an uneasy consensus that existed within the Church, and this will be examined closely in the following chapter.

But despite the perception among certain churchmen that the Cambridge Platonists and other Latitude-men had fallen short of unequivocal endorsement of the Church and its episcopate in their respective critiques of enthusiasm, the normative possibilities of reason provided some common ground. Throughout these encounters, apparently secular though not necessarily anti-religious or even irreligious, variations are evident. Thomas Sprat, the historian of the Royal Society, linked enthusiasm with an assault on the 'price of the True' which risked collapsing if not defended.<sup>154</sup> Sprat embraced the Anglican critique and argues that at no point did the practices and products of experimental science contradict it. Comparing enthusiasts to alchemists and other 'holy cheats', Sprat insisted that 'it cannot be an ungodly purpose to strive to abolish them'.<sup>155</sup> Spencer likewise expressed concern about the subversion of truth and reason, and linked enthusiasm with a series of intellectually spurious and anti-Christian activities: 'Now we shall ever finde, that all persons which take up opinions from their own ... busie phancie, are impregnable to all the assaults of reason: the *Rosy-Crucians* ... *Chimists* in *Medicks* ... *Enthusiasts* in Religion, *Figure-Casters* in Astrology.'<sup>156</sup> 'Nor are we to give any greater regard to our *Prognosticating Astrologers*', Hardy explained, 'who presumed

<sup>151</sup> Henry More, *The Immortality of the Soul* (London, 1659), p. 90.

<sup>152</sup> Henry More, *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings* (London, 1662), p. x.

<sup>153</sup> For an overview on the Cambridge Platonists, see Mark Goldie, 'Cambridge Platonists (act. 1630s-1680s)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), online edn. (23 August 2010). On the role of reason, including that of 'pure reason', in Platonism and Socinianism, see McLachlan, *Socinianism*, pp. 97, 252.

<sup>154</sup> Thomas Sprat, *The History of the Royal-Society of London for the Improving of Natural Knowledge* (London, 1667), p. 362.

<sup>155</sup> Sprat, *Royal-Society*, p. 361.

<sup>156</sup> John Spencer, *A Discourse Concerning Prodigies* (Cambridge, 1663), p. 18.

to *read* that in the *Stars*, which God never *wrote* there'.<sup>157</sup> The concern taken by Anglicans to isolate a holy age in which the holy spirit circulated freely among his chosen messengers is echoed by Sprat, who dissociated legitimate miracles, performed in the apostolic era, from later fraudulent imitators:

Let us suppose that he [a philosopher] is most unwilling to grant that anything exceeds the forces of *Nature*, but where a full evidence convinces him. Let it be allow'd that he is always alarm'd and ready on his guard, at the noise of any *Miraculous Event*; lest his judgment should be surpriz'd by the disguise of *Faith*. But does he by this diminish the *Authority of Ancient Miracles*? Or does he not rather confirm them the more, by confining their number, and taking care that every falsehood should not mingle with them? Can he by this undermine *Christianity*, which does not now stand in need of such extraordinary Testimonies from *He[a]ven*? Or do not they rather indanger it, who still venture all its Truths on so hazardous a chance? Who require a continuance of *Signs and Wonders*, as if the works of our *Savior* and his *Apostles* had not bin sufficient.<sup>158</sup>

Sprat shrewdly brought scientific reason and near total scepticism about contemporary claims to divinity in line with the foregoing Anglican case against enthusiasm. Reason or naturalistic inquiries can be no threat to the theological foundations of the Church, the original works of Christ and his prophets, their miracles, and their efforts of constructing the episcopate for all subsequent ages. Only the holy cheats, especially abundant throughout the seventeenth century, who attempted to improve or even overthrow what was beyond reproach to begin with.

These three threads of argumentation - reason, medicine, and science - draw explicit attention to the problem of innovation or, more controversially, secularization and modernization in Restoration religion. Scott and his fellow revisionists would dismiss this concern as teleological and unhistorical. The teleological observer becomes 'imprisoned by the anachronistic perimeters' of whiggish historiography and pursues 'future-centred' objectives by projecting modern assumptions and categories into the past.<sup>159</sup> Attempts to describe a process of secularization are thus dismissed as expressions of the poverty of the modern imagination to grasp the fundamental otherness of the pre-modern mentality. But as helpful,

<sup>157</sup> Nathaniel Hardy, *Lamentation, Warning, and Woe* (London, 1666), p. 7.

<sup>158</sup> Sprat, *Royal-Society*, pp. 360-61.

<sup>159</sup> Scott, *England's Troubles*, p. 4.

indeed necessary, as these warnings are, it is possible to appreciate a long-term change in religion in England, one that may broadly be characterized as secularizing but is more accurately expressed in qualitative rather than quantitative terms.<sup>160</sup> In the work of Stillingfleet, Spencer, and Sprat, for example, there are dynamic religious tensions between old ideas and new; religion is both defended and besieged by those armed with claims to authority, tradition, reason, or the holy spirit. Though the Anglican churchmen reached into the history of primitive Christianity to fortify their views of or against enthusiasm, the cumulative force of their arguments resulted in a sturdier theological footing for a Church rebuilt on both old and new ideals, as well as a sharper sense of a Restoration Anglicanism distinct from its Protestant and Romanist critics and in some ways from its own pre-Restoration constitution.

By 1667, the fortunes of the Church of England had again fluctuated. The 1662 Act of Uniformity had defined it as a coercive institution, ejecting thousands of learned ministers from their posts by the end of that year. This newly ejected collection of mostly London-based ministers, many of whom were quite prominent, helped forge a durable culture of nonconformity which developed its own diverse means of antagonizing the Church and establishment.<sup>161</sup> After 1667, when the Church's campaign for supremacy faltered in the wake of the failed Dutch War, this dynamic was well in progress. The religious and political divisions that stimulated the conflicts of the 1640s and 1650s were undoubtedly not eradicated at or during the Restoration. They were modified, however, in meaningful ways. As Steve Pincus and Alan Houston argued, the sheer availability of the events of the 1640s and 1650s as rhetorical resources to Restoration writers should alert us to changes in how political and religious conflicts were understood.<sup>162</sup> The Anglican critique of enthusiasm was fortified in this context. The anarchy of those years emphasized the dramatic breach that had occurred between the solemn, historically justified customs and practices of the Anglican Church and the catastrophic effects of having abandoned them. From this point, it was a short step to identifying those responsible for the abdication. Roman Catholics or sectarian Protestants, both useful targets in

<sup>160</sup> Worden, 'Secularization', 20-40.

<sup>161</sup> De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, p. 87.

<sup>162</sup> Steve Pincus and Alan Houston, 'Introduction', in Steve Pincus and Alan Houston (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 19.

their own way – one the great inveterate enemy of the Church of Christ, the other the usurpers of authority in England – were, in the final Anglican analysis, guilty of the same desertion of established religious conventions. No rhetorical resource at hand helped advanced this case better than enthusiasm.