John Tillotson: a reappraisal

Facer, Peter

JOHN TILLOTSON: A REAPPRAISAL

by

Peter Facer

A thesis presented in the
Department of Theology
of the Faculty of Arts
in the University of Durham
for the degree of
Master of Letters,
2000

One Volume

Peter Facer, John Tillotson: A Reappraisal
University of Durham, Faculty of Arts, Department of Theology, Master of Letters, 2000

Abstract of Thesis

John Tillotson (1630-94) was fellow of Clare, lecturer at St Lawrence Jewry, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, dean first of Canterbury and briefly of St Paul's, and archbishop of Canterbury (1691-4).

This thesis seeks to review the career of a much-neglected and misrepresented clergyman, who lived and held office during the most turbulent phase of English history. The last attempt at a full-length biography was published in the eighteenth century. The judgements of Tillotson's enemies have often been uncritically repeated, and he has often been depicted as an enemy of the true Church of England and condemned as a Socinian and a rationalist, who preached nothing but morality.

Reworking of old material and introducing new enables a more just appraisal to be made. The thesis describes and explains his rise from a humble background in Yorkshire to the see of Canterbury. The nature and content of his pamphleteering against atheism and Roman Catholicism is summarised. His part in the comprehension schemes of the period is discussed. The professionalism with which he approached his duties is revealed. Tillotson's involvement in political life is explained. Aspects of his pastoral work and personal life are described. From the large corpus of his printed sermons, the theological content of his preaching is examined.

Tillotson emerges as a sincere, generous and tolerant Christian. He was a conscientious and hardworking clergyman. He was a convinced and campaigning, but never bigoted or a strident, protestant. His preaching reveals a concern for Christian commitment to, and growth of maturity in, the faith, which can be justified through reason. He was orthodox in theology and preached on all the main doctrines of the creed as well as stressing the ethical implications of faith.

CONTENTS

NOTES

Abbreviations used throughout the footnotes

Add.MSS.: Additional Manuscripts of the British Library

Birch: Thomas Birch, The Works of Dr John Tillotson, (London 1752) as reprinted in 1820 in ten volumes

DNB: Dictionary of National Biography, (London 1908-9)

EHD: A. Browning (ed.), English Historical Documents, 1660-1714, (London 1953)

PC: Privy Council Papers

SP: State Papers (Domestic)

T: State Papers (Treasury)

HMC: Historical Manuscripts Commission

The place of publication of books and articles is assumed to be London unless otherwise stated.

Dates are given in Old Style, except that the year is taken to begin on 1 January.

INTRODUCTION

When, in 1752, Thomas Birch concluded his biography of John Tillotson, he commented that he had undertaken 'a task too long neglected by others, and now undertaken by me from a just apprehension, that most of the present materials for a life of him, would in all probability have been lost in a course of a few years more.'[1] Unlike other contemporary senior clergy, Tillotson has been neglected by biographers ever since. For example, the nineteenth century saw biographies of William Sancroft, John Sharp and Thomas Ken.[2] In the mid 1930s E.F. Carpenter began his series of books which covered the careers of Sherlock, Tenison and Compton.[3] A. Tindal Hart wrote in the later 1940s and early 1950s on John Sharp and William Lloyd.[4] Later in the second half of the twentieth century G.V. Bennett published a biography of White Kennett, H.A.L. Rice of Thomas Ken and W.M. Marshall of George Hooper.[5] No biography of Tillotson was published, however.

Interest in Tillotson since the 1950s has been focussed on special aspects of his career rather than on biography. John Mackay, who was appealing for material on Tillotson in Notes and Queries as early as 1947, presented his thesis five years later on Tillotson's contribution to the development of English prose. Nevertheless, over half the thesis was biographical.[6] In 1954 L.G. Locke also produced a study of Tillotson's literary significance, though about a quarter of the work was biographical.[7] Irene Simon in the 1960s and 1970s was concerned only with pulpit oratory.[8] Alan C. Clifford, writing in 1990, was interested in evangelical theology in the works of John Owen, Richard Baxter, Tillotson and John Wesley, though he did

---

1. Birch, I, cclxii
2. G.D'Oyly, The Life of Archbishop Sancroft, (1821); T.Sharp, Life of John Sharp, (1825); E.H. Plumtree, Thomas Ken, (1891)
3. E.C. Carpenter, Thomas Sherlock, (1936), Thomas Tenison, (1948), The Protestant Bishop, (1956)
4. A. Tindal Hart, The Life and Times of John Sharp, (1949), William Lloyd, (1952)
5. G.V. Bennett, White Kennett, (1957); H.A.L.Rice, Thomas Ken, (1964); W.M. Marshall, George Hooper, (1976)
6. John Mackay, 'John Tillotson: a Study of his Life and of his Contribution to the Development of English Prose', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1952
7. L.G.Locke, 'Tillotson: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Literature' in Anglistica, vol.IV, (Copenhagen 1954)
8. Irene Simon, Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South and Tillotson, (Paris 1967)

include a biographical summary of each.[1] Isabel Rivers in her work of 1991 used two of Tillotson's sermons in her investigation of the language of religion and ethics between 1660 and 1780.[2] Two years later, Gerard Reedy successfully challenged the view that Tillotson only preached morality.[3]

The reason for the absence of any recent biography of Tillotson and for the emphasis on specialist areas of his work is not because Thomas Birch had said all that could be said but simply because of the lack of any significant number of new primary sources. Birch's gloomy prophecy of 1752 has been fulfilled, and the material for further work has indeed disappeared. Consequently those who have included information on Tillotson in their work, whether as passing references or as biographical sketches, have relied most heavily on Birch and produced nothing that was new. No journals, large collections of correspondence or sets of business papers of Tillotson's have been discovered. Even the manuscripts of his sermons have not been found. It is not surprising, therefore, that biographers have avoided Tillotson as a suitable subject.

Thomas Birch's work of 262 pages provides an invaluable narrative of Tillotson's career. He quoted a considerable number of documents verbatim, re-printed the two dozen pages of John Beardmore's Memorials of Tillotson and the six pages of John Jortin's remarks on some of the sermons. Birch's work was thorough and accurate as comparisons between the printed documents and the manuscripts show.

However, Birch's work cannot now be considered to be adequate. The questions asked today of historical characters are different from those in the middle of the eighteenth century. The antiquarian collection of facts for simple narrative is no longer sufficient. Present-day concerns would include an analysis of how such a clergyman came to power, what was the full range of work attempted by him, how far was he successful in what he attempted, the importance of his political involvement, his theological emphases and his legacy to church and state. Even his personal life would be scrutinised to assess its effect upon his work. Above all, it would be asked how he fitted in to what is now known of the

---

1. Alan C. Clifford, Atonement and Justification,(Oxford 1990)
2. Isabel Rivers, Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780, (Cambridge 1991)
3. Gerard Reedy, 'Interpreting Tillotson' in Harvard Theological Review, 86:1, January 1993, pp. 83-103

contemporary political and religious controversies.

A significant, amount of new material is now available, particularly on the administrative work that Tillotson did. The archives at Lambeth, St Paul's and especially at Canterbury reveal the wide-ranging expertise required of a dean and an archbishop, and the heavy burden of responsibility that lay on his shoulders. The legal, financial and economic management of the estates alone, though beyond the scope of this thesis, could be the subject of a major work.[1]

When this new material is added to a re-working of the old, it is possible to gain a very full picture of the rise to prominence and the work-load of a conscientious senior clergyman of the period.[2] Tillotson was no Trollopean parson collecting butterflies by Lake Como while neglecting his Barchester canonry.

Early in his career Tillotson was known as a hard-working fellow at Cambridge. As dean, first of Canterbury and then of St Paul's, and, finally, as archbishop, he was busy attending meetings, preaching and conducting worship, attending Court and the House of Lords, and travelling regularly to fulfil his responsibilities. His meetings involved the routines of the cathedral and of parliamentary life.[3] He was also involved in political affairs and in the attempts to reconcile nonconformists to the Church of England.[4] Much of his time was spent writing defences of Anglican teaching, challenging popery, enthusiasm and atheism, and providing a convincing apologetic in an age of reason.[5] Deep down , however, he was always an evangelist and pastor with a very human heart.[6] It remains a matter of great wonder that in the days of quill and ink, candles and lamps, and horse power, Tillotson still managed to cope with all this work and to prepare and deliver some 255, approximately hour-long, sermons that fill nine and a half volumes.[7]

In addition, now that the religious controversies of the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century have become less

---

1. See below: Chapter 4
2. See below: Chapters 1 and 4
3. See below: Chapter 4
4. See below: Chapters 3 and 5
5. See below: Chapters 2 and 7
6. See below: Chapters 6, 7 and 8
7. Vol. XII of Birch gives the last sermon as CCLIV but in Vol. IV two sermons are numbered LIX, pp. 89 and 106

emotive, it is possible to investigate again the adverse criticism that Tillotson and his memory have suffered. He was accused of being unbaptised, hypocritical in his attitude to non-resistance and a usurper as archbishop. He was condemned as a Socinian and a rationalist in theology and unfaithful to the liturgy and constitution of the Church of England. The terms of some of the libels against him would bring blushes even to the cheeks of twenty-first century tabloid journalists.[1] From the eighteenth century at least the criticism has been regularly parroted that he preached morality rather than the gospel.[2] All these charges can now be considered and refuted with a much clearer perspective.

The attempt to re-appraise Tillotson's career creates a dilemma as to whether to proceed chronologically or thematically. If the former pattern is followed, the themes can become confusing. If the latter, then the chronology and inter-connection of issues are not easy to appreciate. The approach of this thesis will be thematic, looking in turn at eight different areas of Tillotson's life and work. It is hoped, thereby, to clarify each aspect of his ministry throughout the whole of his life. The first chapter, however, as it deals with the development of his career, seeks to provide also a chronological framework.

Tillotson lived through the most turbulent period in English political and religious life since the Reformation. When only a boy, the Civil War broke out, in his teens the king was beheaded, as a young man he lived through the Commonwealth and Protectorate and into the Restoration. In his late fifties came the Revolution of 1688, soon to be followed by his all-too-brief occupation of the archiepiscopate. In church life he experienced the era of Laud, the ecclesiastical anarchy of the Interregnum, the nonconformist problem of the Restoration, the moral and theological issues raised by the Revolution, the non-juring schism, and all in the background of a growing tendency to rationalism. The fact that Tillotson and the Church of England weathered these storms without shipwreck owes much to the wisdom, sincerity, and the calm and moderate leadership of Tillotson and his likeminded. When he died in 1694, theologically and practically, the Church of England was resting on firm foundations. Nonconformity was weak, the non-jurors were declining, Roman Catholicism to the majority was politically unacceptable. It is not insignificant that it was into the church which Tillotson had left that John and

---

1. See below: Chapters 1 to 3, 5 and 8
2. See below: Chapter 7

and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, Benjamin Ingham and their fellow early Methodists were born and nurtured.

Chapter 1: Progress

Introduction

Without the advantages of great wealth, high social class or even, at first, influential friends, John Tillotson, son of a Yorkshire clothier, became archbishop of Canterbury. He was fortunate that his parents' situation was sufficient to enable him to profit from an education at school and university which qualified him for a career in the church. Without the slightest vestige of aggressive ambition, Tillotson took full advantage of his opportunities. He carefully and safely navigated the troubled ecclesiastical and political waters of his day. He toiled to be an effective minister in the church, eventually became associated with useful patrons and finally embraced the ultimately triumphant political philosophy. The pilgrimage which took him from Old Haugh End to Lambeth Palace lasted sixty years. Within three years of attaining the primacy, however, Tillotson was dead.

Birth and Background

John Tillotson was born on 3 October 1630 at Old Haugh End, Sowerby, in the parish of Halifax.[1] He was brought up in an area already well-known for its successful woollen manufacture, though in times of recession there was considerable poverty. Agriculture, however, was poor because of the mountainous terrain and inhospitable climate.[2]

The parish of Halifax covered 118 square miles and was divided into twenty-six townships. The impressive parish church of St John stood in Halifax itself, but there were also twelve chapels of ease scattered round the parish, including one at Sowerby. From the 1590s the religious atmosphere had been decidedly puritan, though moderate in tone. In the year that Tillotson was born the vicar, Henry Ramsden, two of the

---

1. Birch I, ii; DNB LVI, 392; H.P.Kendall, 'Old Haugh End' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, vol. VII, p.144.
2. J.W. Watson, The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Halifax in Yorkshire, (1775), pp. 4-6 cited Watson; H.Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries, (Oxford 1920), pp. 1-3, 50-3, 78-80, 208-15; D. Defoe, Tour Through the Whole of Great Britain (Everyman,1928), vol.II,pp. 199-200; E.Baines, Yorkshire Past and Present (1871), vol. II, pp. 373-4.

lecturers and seven of his curates, including the one at Sowerby, were all noted puritans.[1]

Tillotson's father Robert was a prosperous clothier, who, two and a half years before Tillotson's birth, had married Mary, the daughter of Thomas Dobson, a local gentleman.[2] Robert and Mary already had one son Robert when John was born. In the 1690s controversy was raised concerning John's earliest days. Not only the date, but even the fact, of his baptism were disputed. To some when he was archbishop he was 'undipped John', and in 1691 an anonymous writer mourned:

> O sorrowing wretched Anglican Church
> Speak not of your Head or Archbishop
> For that schismatic Primate and Hollander King
> Are still in want of christening.

In 1694, shortly after his death, it was commented that 'some became fathers of the Church who never were her true sons'.[3] Tillotson suffered many similar attacks as will be shown in Chapter 8.

The fact of Tillotson's baptism cannot, however, be doubted. On 10 October 1630 the Halifax baptismal register records: 'John Robert Tilletson [sic] Sourb.'.[4] The suggestion sometimes made that the date was the 3rd derives from a misunderstanding of the arrangement of the register.[5]

Tillotson's was a staunchly puritan family. His father was known as a great expert on scripture and as a Calvinist of unshakable convictions.[6] He was later to become anabaptist which explains the controversy surrounding his son's baptism. After John's birth, two younger brothers followed - Joshua and and Israel. The gradual adoption of Old Testament names, especially as the family had no such earlier tradition, could

---

1. R.A. Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642, (1960), pp.9-32,107-113 and 225-88.
2. Birch I,i; E.Horsfall(ed.),The Parish Registers of Heptonstall (Yorkshire Parish Register Society 1925); Watson 293-4.
3. Thomas Wright, The Antiquities of the Town of Halifax in Yorkshire, (Leeds 1738), pp. 153-4 cited Wright; T.B. Macaulay, The History of England from the Accession of James II, (13th edition, 1857), vol. IV, p. 54; Birch I,ii; Birch MS 4244.
4. MS Halifax Parish Church: Baptismal Register.
5. Wright 153-4; Watson 389 and 517-8; Birch I,ii; Notes and Queries, 6th series, vol. VII, 1883, pp. 404-5.
6. Birch I, i-vi.

well suggest a growing puritanism.[1] John was always grateful for the influence for good which the family puritanism had upon him. Before his consecration as archbishop he gave thanks to God that he had been 'born in a time and place where true religion was preached and professed'.[2] Bishop Gilbert Burnet, in his funeral sermon for Tillotson, commented that his 'first Education and Impressions were among those who were called Puritans; but of the best sort'.[3] The Tillotsons were clearly moderate in their views and were not Quakers, Levellers or Ranters. The nonjuror George Hickes, however, disputed Burnet's view and asserted that even when Tillotson went up to Cambridge he had already been infected with ideas of rebellion.[4]

Tillotson's birth and parentage brought him little benefit through family or wealth to launch him upon a distinguished career in public life. As a clothier and husband of one of the local gentry, Tillotson's father must have been comfortably off, though subject to the vicissitudes of life in his trade. Beyond the confines of Halifax, or at the most the West Riding, the Tillotsons were probably unknown to any but their kinsfolk. The most important thing that Tillotson gained from his parents was a respect for the sincere practice of the Christian faith. His own later emphasis upon the importance of teaching the faith to children, which is outlined in Chapter 6, could well be explained by his own experience.[5]

Education

Tillotson's parents' financial situation was sufficient for him to be spared for, and supported during, a lengthy period of formal education. It was this that helped Tillotson to quit Halifax and take his first steps towards Canterbury.

---

1. Watson 293-4; Birch incorrectly attributes these brothers to Tillotson's father, but W.E. Crump, 'Ancient Highways of the Parish of Halifax' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, vol. 85, 1928, pp. 1-42 clearly identifies Israel as John's brother.
2. Birch X, 202.
3. Gilbert Burnet, A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Most Reverend Father in God John by the Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury...., (London 1694), p. 10 cited Funeral Sermon.
4. George Hickes, Some Discourses upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson Occasioned by the Late Funeral Sermon of the Former upon the Latter (London 1695), p. 10 cited Some Discourses.
5. See below: Chapter 6, pp. 149-155.

Tillotson's schooling, as Thomas Wright first recorded in 1712, was at Colne in Lancashire.[1] However, as time passed the legend developed that Tillotson had attended Heath School in Halifax, although the school's nineteenth-century historian rejected the view.[2] In the mid-twentieth century John Mackay asked, "Why go to a school a day's journey from home rather than one three miles away?"[3] Louis J. Locke, despite evincing less geographical accuracy, asserted that Tillotson attended the 'neighbouring grammar school of Colne'.[4]

It does seem, at first, improbable that the boy should be sent so far to school. However, the family had connections in the Colne area. John's great-grandfather Thomas had lived at Carleton in Craven, just over the Yorkshire border from Colne. John's grandfather had married Eleanor Nutter, daughter of Ellis Nutter of Pendle Forest in Lancashire, only a short distance from Colne. The name Tillotson also occurred in nearby Barnoldswick at the period, which might suggest the existence of other branches of the family there.[5] James Carr, the Victorian historian of Colne, wrote that Tillotson had been brought to Colne by his mother 'for the double purpose of change of air and scenery and receiving his first lessons within the walls of its Grammar School. Doubtless, too, as he had relatives in Pendle Forest, she would wish him to be near them, for the lad was liable to fainting fits, and of a somewhat weakly constitution'.[6] The Colne claim is corroborated by an entry dated 19 June 1691 in the diary of Ambrose Barcroft of Noyna Hall, Colne, where Barcroft mentioned that he had written to the new archbishop 'my ancient acquaintance and lesson fellow at Colne School for several years'.[7] The schoolmaster at the time was Thomas Preston.[8]

---

1. Wright 154-5.
2. Thomas Cox, A Popular History of the Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth at Heath, near Halifax,(Halifax 1879),pp.83-4.
3. John Mackay, John Tillotson: A Study of His Life and of his Contribution to the Development of English Prose, (Oxford D.Phil., 1956, p. 6.
4. Louis J. Locke, 'Tillotson: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Literature' in Anglistica, (Copenhagen 1954), vol. IV, p.17.
5. Birch I,i; G.Redmonds, English Surnames Series, vol. I, Yorkshire: the West Riding, (1973), pp. 220-4.
6. James Carr, Annals and Stories of Colne and Neighbourhood, (Manchester 1878), pp. 175-6.
7. Lancashire County Record Office MS DDB 65/2: Barcroft Diary and Accounts, 1689-1732.
8. D.J.Harrison, The History of Colne Grammar School, (Colne 1977), p. 3.

What Tillotson learnt at Colne is impossible to know, but his education there fitted him in 1647 to move on to Clare College, Cambridge, with which he was to maintain a connection for the rest of his life. He was admitted pensioner on 23 April 1647 and matriculated on 1 July.[1] It is difficult to see why Tillotson chose Clare as his college. It had no particular links with Colne or Halifax by way of scholarships, college estates or local benefactions.[2] Clare was, however, a college with a reputation for moderate puritanism and contained a sprinkling of Yorkshiremen. Tillotson's tutor, David Clarkson, a dissenter after 1662, came from Bradford and could well have been known in nearby Halifax.[3] Fellow undergraduates included Thomas Sharp of Little Horton, Bradford, who, though episcopally ordained, was silenced in 1662, and Francis Holcraft, son of Sir Henry of Eastham in Essex, who was Tillotson's 'chamber fellow' and who was later imprisoned for twelve years because of his puritanism.[4]

Cambridge contemporaries of Tillotson included Simon Patrick and Edward Stillingfleet, who had both matriculated between 1647 and 1648 and who, like Tillotson, were to be elevated to the episcopate after 1688.[5] Whether the three ever met in Cambridge is not known but is not impossible.

Tillotson graduated B.A. in 1650 and M.A. four years later.[6] After taking his B.A., and following a mandamus from the Committee for the Reformation of the Universities, he was elected on 14 November 1650 to a probationary fellowship and on 27 November in the following year he was made a Clare fellow in the place of David Clarkson, who had resigned.[7] George

---

1. Wright 154-5; Birch I, iii; J. and J.A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, (Cambridge 1922), Part I, vol. IV, p. 242 cited Venn.
2. V. Morgan, 'Cambridge University and the Country' in L. Stone (ed.), The University in Society, (Oxford 1975), vol. I, pp. 183-245.
3. Venn I, I, 242; A.G. Matthews, Calamy Revised, (Oxford 1934), p. 120.
4. A.G. Matthews, op.cit., pp. 420-1; Venn I,I, 348 and 388; Venn I, IV, 50; Birch I, iii; J.R.Wardale, Clare College: Letters and Documents, (Cambridge 1903), pp. 116-8, cited Wardale.
5. Venn I, III, 163; Venn I, IV, 319.
6. Venn I, IV, 242.
7. W.J. Harrison and A.H. Lloyd, Notes on the Masters, Fellows, Scholars and Exhibitioners of Clare College, Cambridge, (Cambridge 1953), p. 27 cited Harrison and Lloyd; Wardale 114-6.

Hickes complained that Tillotson's fellowship had been gained for loyalty to the Rump and that he had taken Peter Gunning's fellowship.[1] These charges cannot be substantiated. Writing after Tillotson's death, James Montaigne, a senior fellow, could not remember the mandamus, though one of Tillotson's pupils, John Beardmore, did believe the story.[2] There could, however, have been nothing sinister in Tillotson taking Gunning's fellowship as Gunning had been expelled from it six years earlier, while Tillotson was still at school.[3] Moreover, the fellows had, in fact, asked the Committee for the Reformation of the Universities to appoint Tillotson.[4] In 1655 Tillotson performed the exercises according to the Philosophy Act to great congratulation.[5]

Tillotson's first appointment as fellow of Clare was, therefore, obtained because of his acceptability to the fellows and to the Protectorate. It was his personal qualities rather than the intercession of influential patrons which earned him his position. When Tillotson left Cambridge in 1656 or 1657 the same was true. He entered the service of Edmund Prideaux, Cromwell's attorney general. In December 1656 Tillotson is known to have been dealing with Prideaux over college affairs, and this acquaintance may well have led to his appointment. However, since the precise date of Tillotson's departure from Cambridge is not known this cannot be asserted with any certainty.[6] Up to this point, if J.H.Pruett's work on restoration Leicestershire is more generally applicable, Tillotson's career was typical of that of many parish clergy. Thirty per cent came from parents who were yeomen, merchants traders or skilled craftsmen. Two thirds had M.A. degrees and almost two thirds were Cambridge graduates. Many followed a college post by a tutorship or chaplaincy in a gentleman's household.[7]

After Cambridge

Tillotson's duties in the Prideaux household are usually

---

1. Some Discourses 63; Birch I, vi.
2. Birch MS 4236, ff. 84-113; Birch I, ix-x and cclxiv.
3. Birch I, vi-vii; G.Burnet, Reflections Upon a Pamphlet Entitled: Some Discourses upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson, (1696), p. 164, cited Reflections.
4. Wardale 13.
5. DNB LVI, 392.
6. Birch I, x and cclxvii; Some Discourses 63.
7. J.H. Pruett, The Parish Clergy Under the Later Stuarts: the Leicestershire Experience, (Illinois 1978), pp. 35-45, 60-8

described as tutor to Edmund Prideaux's son, also called Edmund, and chaplain to the family. If Tillotson was, indeed, tutor to Edmund the younger, he was in charge of a man who had matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford, six years earlier at the age of eighteen.[1] Edmund was clearly in his twenties when Tillotson entered the Prideaux household and, therefore, whatever his title, Tillotson, only some three years older, must have been more of a companion than a tutor.

This employment in the Prideaux family brought Tillotson into the service of a high-ranking member of the government. Edmund Prideaux senior came from a wealthy West Country family, he was a member of parliament, had been in charge of the post office in the 1650s and was Cromwell's attorney general.[2] Tillotson certainly exploited his position to further the interests of Clare College, as will be seen in Chaper 4. In the course of this work he came into contact with two influential people: he had a private interview with Oliver Cromwell himself and a consultation with Sir Orlando Bridgman, later to be chief baron of the exchequer to Charles II and from 1667-72 lord keeper.[3] Whether Tillotson hoped to benefit his career by these contacts or, indeed, by his intimacy with the Prideaux family is impossible to tell. However, neither Cromwell nor Prideaux were able to do much towards his advancement. Cromwell died in 1658, and within twenty months the monarchy had been restored. Prideaux died in 1659 and left no network of relationships that could be of service to his chaplain. Bridgman was, however, an entirely different matter as a senior adviser to Charles II.

The restoration in 1660 created for Tillotson the problem of his future. He suspected, rightly as events proved, that Gunning would be restored to the Cambridge fellowship which he was enjoying.[4] He also had to consider what place he might find in the church settlement that would emerge. It seemed clear that the Church of England would be re-established, but it was not clear whether the doctrines and liturgy would be the same as in 1640 or what attitude would be taken to dissenters.[5] In 1660 there were both Anglicans and Presbyterians who were eager

---

1. R.M. Prideaux, Prideaux: A West Country Clan, (Chichester 1989), pp.111, 143 and 157.
2. G.E.Aylmer, The State's Servants, (London 1973), pp. 19-20 and 86.
3. Wardale 21-4, 71, Document 21; MS Masters' Letter Book 25.
4. Wardale 39, Documents 29-30; MS Masters' Letter Book 33.
5. J.Miller, James II: A Study in Kingship, (1991 edition), p.49, cited Miller

for a united church and to avoid a proliferation of separatist groups.[1] Charles II's Declaration of Breda encouraged this view, and Tillotson thoroughly agreed. When, in fulfilment of Breda, the king proposed a conference of equal numbers of episcopalians and Presbyterians, Tillotson wrote, "I hope something will be done towards an accommodation."[2] Thus Tillotson's desire for a comprehensive church, which was to be with him for the rest of his life, was clearly articulated. His attempts to achieve this will be discussed in Chapter 3. Moderation such as Tillotson's was not, however, universal. It is true that some Presbyterians like Edward Reynolds and Richard Baxter appeared to be willing to embrace a modified form of episcopacy, and that some Anglicans were ready to concur, but it was also true that Anglicans of a Laudian persuasion and the more extreme puritans were most definitely not.[3] The Worcester House Declaration with its renewed promise of a religious conference was encouraging to those of Tillotson's persuasion.[4] Episcopal appointments, however, created mixed feelings. Baxter, Calamy and Reynolds were offered bishoprics, although only Reynolds accepted. At the same time, determined Anglicans like Morley, Cosin and Henchman were also being elevated to the bench. In addition, threats to the policy of compromise came also from leading politicians like Clarendon, Ormonde and Southampton, who desired a strong episcopal system of church government.[5]

The election in 1661 of the fiercely Anglican Cavalier Parliament, which sought both to outlaw all but Anglican practice and to thwart Charles's liberal policy dashed, for the time being at least, all hopes of a comprehensive church. Therefore when Charles summoned the Savoy Conference it was doomed to failure from the start and served only to produce even more entrenched views. When the representatives of both sides met, Tillotson went in with Baxter as auditor and, across the table, faced Gunning, an official representative from the Anglican side. The conference ended without any decision once

---

1. R.Thomas, 'Comprehension and Indulgence' in G.F.Nuttall and O.Chadwick, From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962, (1962), p. 191, cited Thomas.
2. Wardale 38-9 Document 29; MS Masters' Letter Book 33.
3. I.M.Green, The Re-establishment of the Church in England, 1660-3 (Oxford 1978), pp. 8-9, cited Green.
4. Thomas 192; John Miller, Restoration England: The Reign of Charles II (1985), pp. 28-30.
5. J.R.Jones, Country and Court: England 1658-1714 (London 1978), D.Ogg, England in the Reign of Charles II (Oxford 1956), cited Ogg; Green 10-17 and 113; Thomas 194.

its four-month time limit had elapsed.[1]

Tillotson had clearly allied himself to the cause of moderate Presbyterianism but, at the same time, he was moving towards the acceptance of the establishment and a clerical post within it. It is said that he was destined for a canonry at Lichfield should Calamy have accepted the offer of the bishopric. Calamy, however, declined, and Tillotson had to look elsewhere.[2] His search did not prove protracted. In 1661 he was appointed curate to Dr Thomas Hackett at Cheshunt in Hertfordshire.[3] As with his Cambridge fellowship and his tutorship in the Prideaux household, Tillotson obtained this preferment by his own unaided efforts.

In 1662 Tillotson began to take an interest in affairs in London. Whether because of a genuine scientific interest or from a desire to mix with potentially useful friends, Tillotson became a member of the newly-founded Royal Society and was elected a fellow in 1672. Amongst the other first members was John Wilkins, a clergyman and astronomer, with whom Tillotson was to work in London.[4] On 17 February 1662 Wilkins and Tillotson were appointed lecturers at St Lawrence Jewry in the City of London, where both had to preach each Sunday.[5] In 1662 Tillotson had thus formed connections with a London group of scientists and with a London city church. His preaching duties committed him to regular journeys to London from Cheshunt. This connection with St Lawrence Jewry was to last for almost thirty years. Tillotson's preaching work is outlined in Chapter 7.

Whilst Tillotson was becoming known in London, the Cavalier Parliament was enacting the Clarendon Code and in particular the Act of Uniformity which, from St Bartholemew's Day 24 August 1662, not only imposed the invariable use of the revised Prayer Book upon all clergy, lecturers and school and university officials but also insisted that all clergy should be in episcopal orders.[6] Those who refused to conform were

---

1. R. Baxter, Reliquae Baxterianae, (1696), part II, p. 337, paragraph 194, cited Baxter; E. Cardwell, History of Conferences...., (Oxford, 1849 edition), chapters VI - VIII; G. Burnet, History of His Own Time, (1838 edition), pp. 122-4, cited Burnet.
2. Birch MS 4236 ff. 84-113; Birch I, cclxviii.
3. Birch I, xvi.
4. Thomas Birch, The History of the Royal Society of London, (1756), vol. III, pp. 3-4 and 19.
5. Guildhall London MS 2590/1/551, MS 9531/16/30, cited G.L.
6. EHD 377-82, Document 137.

either ejected or resigned. Tillotson's desire for a comprehensive church was thus thwarted for the first, but not the last, time in his career.

By 1662, at the latest, it was obvious that the traditional episcopal system would be restored, and Tillotson by acceptimg his Cheshunt and London appointments had made it clear that he had thrown in his lot with the episcopalians. There is, however, no primary evidence of his ordination. Birch confessed total ignorance, but John Beardmore recorded that Tillotson had told him that he had received his orders 'from the old Scottish bishop of Galloway' but gave no date.[1] This tradition has been accepted ever since. The bishop must have been Thomas Sydserf, who had been appointed in 1635. By 1660 he was the only surviving bishop in Scotland and was translated by Charles II to Orkney. To the annoyance of the English bishops, he conferred holy orders in England without requiring his ordinands to take the oaths or make the subscriptions.[2] No records of Sydserf's ordinations have survived, even if he kept any, and the registers of the Synod of Galloway do not begin until 1664, after Sydserf's translation and death.[3]

John Hunt believed that Tillotson's acceptance of episcopacy came as a result of conversations with Ralph Browning, bishop of Exeter, 1642-59, John Hackett, bishop of Lichfield, 1661-71, and their friends, though he stayed with the Presbyterians until the passing in 1662 of the Act of Uniformity. Unfortunately Hunt did not reveal his sources.[4] There is, however, a scrap of evidence that suggests that Tillotson was a convinced episcopalian before St Bartholomew's Day. In the summer of 1662 he and Stillingfleet spent a whole afternoon with Edward Bowles, a puritan minister from York who was dying, trying unsuccessfully to win him into the Church of England. Bowles was buried on 23 August 1662, the day before St Bartholemew's.[5]

It is impossible to say whether Tillotson was ordained before or after 24 August, but there can be no doubt, despite the absence of primary evidence, that he did receive

---

1. Birch I, xii, cclxvii-viii.
2. George Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland...., (Edinburgh 1861), vol. II, pp. 187-8 and 214.
3. Information from the Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh.
4. John Hunt, Religious Thought in England, (1870-3), vol. II, p.99.
5 White Kennett, A Register and Chronicle Ecclesiastical and Civil, (1728), p. 747, cited Kennett.

Anglican orders. No one at the time or since has ever challenged the fact. Even his arch-enemy George Hickes, who raised serious questions about his education and career, never raised the validity of his orders. Tillotson's baptism may have been questioned but never his ordination. The date and place must remain a mystery, but the fact cannot be doubted.

Tillotson's conformity can easily be understood in one who was later to work so hard for the comprehension of nonconformists, especially in order to form a protestant bulwark against Roman Catholicism. He may also have been eager to preserve the puritan strand in the restored church. Kennet lists twenty-two other noted puritans who, along with Tillotson, did the same.[1] Their behaviour could, of course, be interpreted as opportunism. However, Tillotson, as with the other puritans who conformed, was able to be an Anglican but hold a low view of episcopacy and to benefit from the toleration of different liturgical practices that, for some time at least, continued to exist.[2] Although he had committed himself to the episcopalian camp, Tillotson, as his subsequent career was to show, never lost his sympathy for his dissenting brethren.[3]

Promotion

Once firmly incorporated into the Anglican Church, Tillotson was soon offered further responsibilities. On 27 October 1662 he was chosen Tuesday Lecturer at St Lawrence Jewry in addition to his Sunday post there. His new duty meant that he had to preach for half an hour from 9.30 a.m.[4] The choice of Tillotson for this post was the result of his ability as a preacher. Wilkins described him as 'the best polemical divine this day in England'.[5] After gaining this apppointment Tillotson resigned from Cheshunt. His reasons are unclear. Perhaps he felt it impossible to combine his curacy with Sunday and Tuesday duties in London. He was, however, later to accept a living much further distant from the capital. He may also have felt that he wanted to be free to accept another living in

---

1. Kennett 920 and 931.
2. Thomas Lathbury, A History of the Book of Common Prayer, (1853), pp. 389-92.
3. See below: Chapter 3.
4. G.L. MSS 2590/1/559 and 2590/2/321-2. Birch and those who relied on him incorrectly date this as 1663: Birch I, xvii.
5. DNB LVI, pp. 392-8.

London, though later when one was offered he turned it down. It is possible that he did not find it easy to work with Thomas Hackett. Thirty years later Tillotson and Hackett certainly clashed.[1] Whatever the reasons, Tillotson's resignation of his curacy at this time must have been the reason for the circulation of the incorrect rumour that he had been expelled for nonconformity.[2]

At St Lawrence's Tillotson worked with two vicars: first with Wilkins until he became bishop of Chester in 1668 and then with Whichcote. Besides preaching, Tillotson conducted marriages. Between 8 November 1662 and 31 August 1666 there were twenty-eight weddings, of which Tillotson conducted twelve and the vicar nine.[3] When the church was destroyed by the Great Fire in 1666 Tillotson's lecture was suspended, and the money given to the poor.[4] In 1671, however, he was re-imbursed for his lost emoluments.[4]

On 16 December 1662, less than two months after Tillotson had been appointed to his Sunday post at St Lawrence's, the parishioners of St Mary Aldermanbury elected him their minister in the place of the ejected Edmund Calamy.[5] Tillotson declined the appointment because he was being seriously considered for the living at Kedington in Suffolk. This appointment was in the gift of Sir Samuel Barnardiston, a former parliamentarian who had now accepted the restoration.[6] It was described as being worth £200 a year, having a pleasant house and glebe, a kind neighbourhood and loving congregation. Even his ejected predecessor Samuel Fairclough approved of his appointment. Tillotson's attraction was that he was of moderate and candid spirit and of a large and generous temper. He was inducted on 18 June 1663.[7] The reason that he accepted a post so far from London, having turned down a London appointment and resigned a curacy at Cheshunt so much nearer the city, can only be explained by his desire for a better income. He showed no signs of wishing to leave St Lawrence's.

However, Tillotson had barely read himself in at

---

1. See below on this page and in Chapter 4.
2. Lambeth Palace: Gibson Papers, vol. 5. 73.
3. H.W.H.Clarke (ed.), Register of St Lawrence Jewry, 1538-1676, (1940), pp. 101-2.
4. John Betjeman, The City of London Churches, (London 1974), p. 20; G.L.MS 2590/2/22.
5. DNB IV, 227-30.
6. DNB III, 246-7.
7. Wright 156; Birch I, xviii and cclxviii; Kennett 769 and 896.

Kedington when another attractive preferment came his way - that of preacher at Lincoln's Inn. Sir Robert Atkins, chairman of a committee of the Inn charged with reviewing the appointments of chaplain and preacher, heard Tillotson one Tuesday and was so impressed that he marched straight into the vestry and offered to support his candidature for the post of preacher.[1] Tillotson was pressed to accept by his friends on the grounds that he could do so much more good there than in the country.[2] On 26 November 1663 he was duly appointed 'Minister and Preacher', a position he held until 1691 when he became archbishop. His income was £100 a year, and he had commons for himself and a servant in term time plus £24 for vacation commons. His duty was to preach twice each Sunday in term, on the Sundays before and after term, and in 'reading time'. He was also to administer the sacrament in term and vacation.[3]

In 1664, once settled in Lincoln's Inn, Tillotson resigned from Kedington. His reasons were probably mixed. He liked to be conscientious about residence and pastoral care but he had also failed to gain acceptance by his parishioners. They rejected his emphasis upon reason and complained that he did not preach Christ.[4] It is true that the monetary income from the Inn was only half that from Kedington and was insufficient, but Tillotson was clearly gaining popularity in London and could hope for further advancement if he concentrated his presence in the capital.[5]

As Tillotson was centring his ministry on London he contracted a marriage which, in the royalist atmosphere of the 1660s, could well have damaged his future prospects. On 23 February 1664 he married Elizabeth French, daughter of Oliver Cromwell's sister Robina. Robina, widow of Dr Peter French of Christchurch, Oxford, had married Tillotson's vicar, John Wilkins.[6] It is interesting to speculate whether Tillotson ever considered that such an alliance with the Cromwell family might

---

1. Birch I, xvii.
2. Add. MS 9828, ff, 125-6.
3. The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn: the Black Books, (London 1899), vol. III, pp. 34 and 179-80, cited Black Books; Birch Ms 4236 f. 207.
4. Biographia Britannica, (1763), vol.VI,part 1,p.3946, cited BB; Birch I, xviii.
5. Funeral Sermon 19.
6. H.W.H. Clarke, op.cit., p. 102; G.L. MS 6975; DNB LXI,pp. 264-7.

hamper his career. Oliver had died only six years previously, at the Restoration his corpse had been exhumed and publicy mutilated, and his son and successor Richard still lived. Tillotson may well have ignored the political implications or felt that the monarchy was so secure that the Cromwells no longer posed any threat. In the event, the marriage did not hamper his career.

In late 1668 or early 1669 Tillotson became a chaplain to Charles II. He had preached before the royal family as early as 1666. However, it was his sermon preached in 1668 at Wilkins's consecration as bishop of Chester that gained him the appointment.[1] Burnet may have been referring to this in Tillotson's funeral sermon when he spoke of 'those great preferments to which his extraordinary worth seemed to have forced some who had no kindness to him to advance him...'.[2] Why Tillotson should seem to have been forced on the king is difficult to say. He had tolerant ideas and supported comprehension as did Charles. He was, however, strongly anti-Catholic, and this could well have given the king some grounds for hesitation. On the other hand, in the anti-Catholic atmosphere of the period, it was to Charles's advantage, if not to his taste, to have chaplains of that persuasion.[3] In any case, Tillotson was developing influential friendships. Hickes asserted that Charles had only promoted Tillotson 'to gratify the heads of a party'.[4] This is a clear reference to the Cabal, which had come to power in 1667 on the fall of Clarendon. Through both Wilkins and the Royal Society Tillotson had connections with Buckingham, a member of the Cabal and royal favourite.[5] In addition, through his friendship with fellow West Riding clergyman John Sharp he was linked to Sir Heneage Finch, in whose household Sharp ministered. Finch had also been a young man at the Inner Temple when Edmund Prideaux, Tillotson's first employer, had been a bencher.[6] Finch was

---

1. Birch IV, 254; Sermon LXVII; BB. VI,i,3947.
2. Funeral Sermon 20; Some Discourses 63
3. J.P. Kenyon, The Popish Plot, (1972), chapter 1.
4. Some Discourses 64.
5. P.A.W. Henderson, Life and Times of John Wilkins, (1910), pp. 38 and 113; Maurice Lee, Junior, The Cabal, (Urbana 1965), pp. 175-8; DNB IV, 347.
6. A.T. Hart, The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York, (1949), pp. 58-9 and 63, cited Hart; Foster III, 212; Venn III, 398; DNB XLVI, 350-1; K.H.D. Haley, The First Earl of Shaftesbury, (Oxford 1968), p. 197, cited Haley; Henry Horwitz, Revolution Politics: The Career of Daniel Finch, Second Earl of Nottingham, (Cambridge 1968), p. 38.

clearly a trusted servant of the king since it was to him as solicitor general that in 1667 Charles had entrusted the task of taking proceedings against his hated former minister Clarendon. Finch was in 1670 to become attorney general, in 1673 lord keeper and in 1674 lord chancellor. Moreover, the Finch family were increasingly known as patrons of a group of younger Anglican clergy such as Sharp, Stillingfleet, Tenison and - Tillotson.[1] In addition, Tillotson had had dealings towards the end of the Interregnum with Sir Orlando Bridgman who from 1667-72 was lord chancellor.[2] It is true that Tillotson was not as clearly and firmly allied to a particular noble family as Sharp to the Finches, Tenison to the earl of Manchester, Ken to Bishop Morley of Dorchester, or Compton who was born with powerful connections, but he did have useful friends and acquaintances who might well enhance his future.[3]

To 1668 or 1669 Tillotson had made his way by his own efforts and undoubted abilities. From this time he had also the support of a network of politicians. Cathedral appointments were soon to follow. On 28 January 1674 he was instituted prebendary at Chichester and on 14 March second prebendary at Canterbury.[4] Ironically at Canterbury he succeeded Gunning whom he had succeeded at Clare and met at the Savoy Conference. It is significant that Tillotson's prebend at Canterbury was one of the nine in the gift of the king.[5] Tillotson had thus benefited a second time from royal patronage.

The year 1672 was to bring Tillotson to his most senior position so far and to one which he was to occupy for nearly twenty years. The deanery of Canterbury fell vacant on 8

---

1. A.T.Hart, The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York, (1949), pp 58-53, cited Hart; Foster III, 212; Venn II, 398; D.N.B. XLVI, 350-1; K.H.D.Haley, The First Earl of Shaftesbury, (Oxford 1968), p. 197; cited Haley; Henry Horwitz, Revolution Politics: The Career of Daniel Finch, Second Earl of Nottingham, (Cambridge 1968), p.38.
2. See above: p.16.
3. H.A.L. Rice, Thomas Ken: Bishop and Non Juror, (1964), pp. 17-18; E. Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, (1948), pp. 10-11 and 115 and The Protestant Bishop, (1956), p. 8.
4. C. Jenkins and E.A. Fry, (eds.), Index to the Act Books of the Archbishops of Canterbury, (1938), pp. 216 and 236; Canterbury MS Dean's Small Book, p. 51 from back; John le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, (1716), vol. I, p. 48.
5. J. Bacon, Liber vel Thesaurus Rerum Ecclesiasticarum, (1786), p. 21; J. Ecton, Thesaurus Rerum, (1763), p.1.

October, and Tillotson was installed on 4 November.[1] The king had been approached to promote Tillotson quite separately by Archbishop Sheldon, the duke of Buckingham and Lord Berkely. At the time of these approaches, however, Charles's immediate priority had been a visit to Newmarket, but on his return he had concurred with their suggestion.[2] Tillotson's patrons had obtained for him this prestigious preferment.

Three years after Tillotson became dean of Canterbury, new responsibilities were heaped upon him. On 18 December 1675 he was appointed by the king prebendary of Ealdland at St Paul's, a preferment which he held until his resignation in 1677.[3] This appointment was the result of the intercession of John Sharp with Heneage Finch.[4] On 14 February 1678 Tillotson became also prebendary of Oxgate at St Paul's.[5] Both these prebends were in the king's gift and were vouchsafed to Tillotson 'as a special mark of our esteem for his great learning and piety and other exemplary qualifications'.[6] When Stillingfleet left Canterbury for the deanery of St Paul's, Tillotson's gained his residentiaryship 'for his better support'.[7] On 19 September 1679 Tillotson became a stagiary of St Paul's.[8]

Meanwhile in 1677 Tillotson was being actively considered for a bishopric. The death occurred of William Lucy, bishop of St David's, and a rumour spread that Guy Carleton, bishop of Bristol, would be translated.[9] Carleton was considered to possess a 'hot spirit' that did not accord well with 'the fanatics of that city' and was, therefore, to be exiled to Wales. Rumour also said that Finch had a mind that Tillotson should go to Bristol but that he should retain his

---

1. Canterbury MS: General Register, 1667-80, vol. 28. p. 148; SP29/316/214 and SP 44/27/39; J. le Neve, op.cit., vol. I, p.48; C. Jenkins and E.A. Fry, op.cit., vol. III, p.172.
2. Birch MS 4236, ff. 84-113; Birch I, cclxxii.
3. St Paul's MS WC45/144; J.M. Horne, John le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, (rev. ed. 1974), Ser. 3, vol. III, p. 32, cited Horn.
4. Birch I, xxvi-vii; BB 3948.
5. St Paul's MS WC/148-9 and MS F.C. 2, Minute Book A, p. 66; Horn 32 and 49.
6. SP 44/27/109.
7. G.P. Elliott (ed.), Diary of Dr Edward Lake, Camden Society, vol. 39, p. 20, Miscellany, vol. I; W.F. Hooke, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, (1860 -76),p. 337.
8. St Paul's MS: WC45/158.
9. Venn Part I, vol. III, p. 115; Foster vol. I, E.S., p. 238.

Canterbury deanery.[1] Tillotson was approached but was unenthusiastic. He was contented at Canterbury and afraid that the new post would be dangerous. He complained that he could not afford the anticipated expense involved in the promotion: his only income was from the deanery and Lincoln's Inn. He was sure that the latter could not be held in commendam and was doubtful about the former.[2] The revenues of Bristol only amounted to £383 8s. 4d., considerably less than he received as dean.[3] Although financial concerns were uppermost in Tillotson's mind, he may also have been concerned to avoid regular journeys to Bristol, which his conscientious character would have decreed, and thus his being away from the centre of affairs in the capital. The plans went no further. Carleton remained at Bristol until 1679 when he was translated to Chichester, and William Thomas in 1678 became bishop of St David's.[4]

In 1680 when William Lloyd was made bishop of St Asaph, there was a hint that Tillotson might become his successor at St Martin's in the Fields, 'the greatest and best living in England'. Finch thought of Simon Patrick, but among others, if Patrick should refuse, Tillotson's name was mentioned. When the matter was brought to Tillotson he refused to be considered on the grounds that he was of more use elsewhere. Patrick did refuse, and Tenison was appointed.[5]

In the autumn of 1681, Tillotson was again being considered for the episcopate, but this time in Ireland. Ormonde, the lord lieutenant, was concerned about appointments to Derry and Raphoe. He really wanted clergy from Ireland but was willing to consider eminent men from England. After hearing and reading a few of Tillotson's sermons, he felt he might be a good candidate for Derry and suggested his name. The appointment was attractive: it was second only in Ireland to that at Dublin and had an income of at least £1,800 a year. Ormonde's views were heard in London too late, however. Charles had appointed Bishop Hopkins of Raphoe to Derry, in the hope that Dr Marsh could then be translated from Kilmore to

---

1. HMC., 7th Report, Sir Henry Verney, Claydon House, Bucks., p. 465: Letter from John Verney to Sir H. Verney, 9 September 1675 [sic.].
2. HMC, 14th Report, Bath, vol. II, pp. 156-7; letter from Tillotson to Sir William Jones, attorney general.
3. E.H.D. 418; See below Table 6.
4. Foster vol. I, E.S., p. 238.
5. Tanner MS vol. 37, f. 146; Add. MS 9828, ff. 125-6; A. Tindall Hart, op. cit., pp. 37-8; E. Carpenter, op. cit., p. 16.

Raphoe and William Sheridan made bishop of Kilmore.[1]

This was not, however, the end of the possibility of Tillotson becoming a bishop in Ireland. Both the primate of Ireland and the archbishop of Dublin were soon reported to be seriously ill, and it was believed that Tillotson would be glad of either post. Discussions were openend with him. Within three weeks yet another problem threatened: the bishop of Meath was believed to be dying. Ormonde was concerned to prevent Sheridan from urging his brother, the notorious absentee bishop of Cloyne, or the bishop of London, pressing the claims of Dean Murray. Ormonde set his mind on Tillotson for Meath. The bishopric was worth at least £1,000, brought with is a seat on the privy council, and was often seen as a stepping stone either to Dublin or the Irish primacy. If Tillotson refused Meath, Ormonde's second choice was the bishop of Kildare. Charles II was contented with Ormonde's plans.[2] Tillotson was approached and ruined all the scheming by refusing the offer. He felt that he was in such good circumstances that he had no reason to desire a change. He would have declined a similar move, he declared, even if it had been in England. He affirmed that the good of the church should be paramount, but he was conscious that the best years of his life had passed and that the infirmities of age were coming upon him. He could not face so great a change, he said, especially as it meant moving to another country 'and beginning the world again, when I feel myself going out of it'.[3]

However, the main crisis passed as, in the meantime, the bishop of Meath had recovered, though at eighty-four he was still not expected to survive for long. Ormonde informed the secretary of state of this and, not knowing of Tillotson's refusal, expressed the hope that Tillotson would indeed go to Ireland as it would be 'pleasing to all who wish the Church well'. He felt that Tillotson would have been coming 'to a settled and easy station' rather than beginning the world again. However, he was consoled by the knowledge that, despite the prophecies of the physicians, the bishop of Meath and the archbishop of Dublin were both recovering.[4] He was further consoled by the news that, although Tillotson had disqualified himself, when either Meath or Dublin fell vacant the king would

---

1. HMC Ormonde NS, vol. VI, pp. 181, 186 and 205.
2. HMC Ormonde NS, vol. VI, pp. 207-8, 228 and 234.
3. HMC Ormonde NS, vol. VI, pp. 238 and 243; HMC 7th Report, Marquis of Ormonde, Kilkenny Castle, p. 752.
4. SP63/341/81; SP63/342/84.

accept his advice.[1]

In the aftermath of the Popish Plot and the execution of Archbishop Plunkett of Armagh, Tillotson as a staunch and campaigning protestant must have seemed the ideal choice to Ormonde as he agonised about the decaying Irish episcopate.[2] Tillotson, however, was fifty-one in 1681, and was concerned about his health, which had never been robust. Financially the move to Ireland would have been beneficial, but was this worth an upheaval that would remove him from the centre of affairs in London, where he had the patronage of the Finch family, to a backwater in Ireland. If, despite his protestations about his health, he did have a desire to influence political and ecclesiastical events, it was not advisable to leave the south east of England.

The Archiepiscopate

It was the revolution of 1688 and the eventual departure of the non-jurors that created the circumstances which resulted in Tillotson attaining the highest position which the Church of England had to offer. William III did not lack advice on suitable men to fill the vacancies. Early in 1688 Gilbert Burnet, a royal chaplain later to become bishop of Salisbury, had presented him with a list of London clergy who 'desire more particular regard from your Highness'. Tillotson headed the list and was 'the most moderate and prudent clergyman of England, and ... the fittest man of England to be Archbishop of York'.[3] In practice, William relied heavily in ecclesiastical affairs on his secretary of state, Daniel Finch, earl of Nottingham and son of Heneage Finch. This boded well for Tillotson and others who had long enjoyed the encouragement and patronage of the Finch family.[4]

Tillotson was, therefore, destined for promotion from the moment of the accession of the house of Orange. He was known to William and Mary since he had assisted them as a newly-married couple and may well have been in regular contact with them ever after. After their wedding in 1677 William and Mary had found themselves stranded in Canterbury because of heavy seas

---

1. HMC Ormonde NS, vol. VI, p. 272.
2. J.P.Kenyon, op.cit., pp. 196-7 and 204.
3. R.W. Blencoe (ed.). Diary of the Times of Charles II by the Honourable Henry Sidney, (1843), pp. 281-6; T.E.S. Clarke and H.C. Foxcroft, The Life of Gilbert Burnet, (Cambridge 1907), pp. 257-8, cited Clarke and Foxcroft.
4. Horwitz 99.

preventing them from sailing to the United Provinces. Bentinck, William's attendant, had hurriedly found them accommodation at an inn and then sought to borrow money and plate to ensure suitable conditions. The city authorities had been anxious about their property, but Tillotson put his plate, money and the deanery at their disposal. William and Mary had accepted all but the deanery, received Tillotson at the inn and attended worship in the cathedral.

This chance, or providential, meeting between Tillotson and the future mo narchs may have influenced his advancement to the archiepiscopate fourteen years later, especially if, as has been asserted, Tillotson began a correspondence with William and Bentinck. Unfortunately no such correspondence has been traced. Tillotson's behaviour in 1677 cannot, however, have been motivated by hopes of future patronage. The possibiliy of Mary ever becoming queen was very remote. Charles II still lived, her father James might well have sons by his second wife, and there could as yet have been no inkling of the possibility of revolution.[1]

In 1688 Tillotson, besides having influential friends and an acquaintance with William and Mary, had also the right political and religious views. He was hostile to Catholicism, eager for the comprehension of dissenters and a committed whig. He was also an eloquent and popular preacher, as Chapter 7 will show. Cosequently it came as no surprise when in April 1689 he was made clerk to the closet.[2] This gave him a powerful position not only among the other royal chaplains but also as the royal adviser on ecclesiastical affairs. At the same time he was being seriously considered for the see of Canterbury in the event of Sancroft continuing unco-operative.[3]

Sancroft refused to swear allegiance to William and Mary and was, therefore, suspended in August 1689. Much of his work then fell to the dean and chapter of Canterbury thus providing Tillotson with a valuable apprenticeship for the post which two years later he was to occupy.[4]

---

1. Birch I, xxxiii-xxxv; H.W. Chapman, Mary II, Queen of England, (1953), pp.67-72; N.A. Robb, William of Orange, (1966), vol. II, p. 103; Calendar of State Papers (Domestic), 1677-8, PP. 461-2, 467, 475.
2. SP44/57/229.
3. H.C. Foxcroft, The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., (1889), vol. II, p.216.
4. Lathbury 61.

Promotion came as was expected. When Stillin gfleet was appointed bishop of Worcester in October 1689, Tillotson succeeded him as dean of St Paul's and prebendary of Newington.[1] Tillotson informed the king that he 'had set [him] ... at ease for the remainder of ... his life'. William replied, "No such matter, I assure you," and spoke about 'a geat place' which it was necessary for him to hold for the king's service. William's meaning was clear, and Tillotson expressed great reluctance to accept further advancement.[2] Indeed, he sought the help of others to avoid promotion. He approached the royal favourite, the earl of Portland, to remind him that at nearly sixty he was too old, his health was deteriorating and, though he was willing to serve the king, he had no love for 'the ceremony or trouble of a great place'.[3] He raised his concern with Lady Russell, but she felt that he was suitable for a higher appointment.[4]

Tillotson's reluctance to consider further advancement was doubtless fuelled by an awareness of the great difficulties that would be involved in being archbishop in the circumstances, of the hostility which would be heaped upon him by the non-jurors and of the resentment of Compton, the ambitious bishop of London. Tillotson did, however, begin to reduce his responsibilities: he resigned his pulpit at Lincoln's Inn and the prebend of Oxgate at St Paul's.[5] This must have been preparation for the inevitable.

1 February 1690 saw the deprivation of Sancroft and some four hundred clergy. Sancroft refused to recognise the deprivation and remained at Lambeth. For William III it was a matter of urgency that the vacant bishoprics should be filled, and he wanted to do this before his planned visit to the United Provinces.[6] He, therefore renewed his pressure on Tillotson, who warned William of Compton's hostility and the danger of this rebounding on the king. Tillotson reluctantly agreed to consider the king's request. Lady Russell had no doubts: " You must take up your cross and bear it," she wrote, confident that

---

1. SP44/150/31; SO1/12/335; St Paul's MS WC45/217-8; Horne, vol. III, pp. 6 and 47.
2. Birch MS 4236, ff. 21-4; Add MS 17,017, ff. 145-6; Birch cxlv-via.
3. Birch MS 4236, ff, 17-8 and 306-7; Birch ci-ii..
4. T. Selwood (ed.), Letters of Lady Rachel Russell, (7th ed., 1909, 244-5; Birch MS 4236, ff. 19-20; Birch cxlviii-ix.
5. Black Books III, 175; St Paul's MS WC45/148-9.
6. Kennett 641.

this was God's will for Tillotson.[1] Nevertheless, continued to beseech the king to excuse him. William replied that he did not know what he would do if Tillotson finally declined. On that, Tillotson surrendered and unreservedly offered his services. William was delighted. He readily agreed to Tillotson's suggestion that his promotion should not immediately be made public but should be delayed until after parliament had risen.[2] Tillotson clearly feared at least an initially hostile reaction from parliament. The reason for this is not altogether clear. Tillotson's qualifications were excellent. He might, however, have feared opposition because of his puritan upbringing and sympathy for dissenters. He might also have been concerned that his appointment might provide troublesome politicians with another excuse to attack William or his ministers. William was finding parliament extremely difficult to manage.[3]

After the prorogation of parliament on 5 January 1691 and William's return from the Netherlands on 13 April, Tillotson's nomination was announced. He was consecrated on Whit Sunday, 31 May, at St Mary le Bow. He thus became the first archbishop since the sixteenth-century Matthew Parker to be a married man and the last up to the present day not to have been already in episcopal orders.[4]

Predictably, Compton was disappointed and angry. He refused to share in Tillotson's consecration or attend when Tillotson joined the Privy Council. The claims of Compton to the archiepiscopate did seem overwhelming. Politically he was unassailable. He had been an exclusionist, opponent of James II and had been the only clergyman among the 'Immortal Seven' who invited William to come to England. He had acted as religious tutor to both Mary and her sister Anne and had performed their marriage services. In 1688 he had helped Anne desert her father. When William first entered London, Compton had led the clergy and a hundred nonconformist ministers to greet him. He had carried out some of Sancroft's duties during the suspension, including presiding at the coronation. He had supported the comprehension of dissenters. However, Compton had angered the monarch over his opposition to Tillotson as

---

1. Birch MS 4236, ff. 29-30; Add MS 17,017, ff. 143-4; Birch clviii.
2. Lambeth Palace MS Commonplace Book pp. 44-5; Birch MS 4236, ff. 32-5 and 307-11; Birch clx-iii.
3. Jones chapter 13.
4. SP44/150/78, 91 and 103; W.Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, (Oxford) 1887), pp. 200-1.

prolocutor in the convocation of 1689.[1] There were also problems over his personality. Burnet thought him 'weak and wilful'. Mary did not want him. There was fear he would antagonise the non-jurors. Tillotson, on the other hand, was popular with both sovereigns and a friend of influential people at court like Nottingham and Burnet. He was also known as a tolerant, peaceful, moderate, man. He was learned and the most popular preacher of his day. His alliance with the whig cause was unimpeachable. It may, however, be equally significant that William owed less to Tillotson than to Compton and, therefore, felt his dealings with him would not have to be so much influenced by gratitude. Equally, Compton was politically close to Carmarthen, the chief minister, whose influence William constantly sought to curtail.

There can be no doubt that Tillotson's was the more suitable appointment. The Church of England was in turmoil. The questions of the legality of the new political regime and of the suspensions, deprivations and replacements of the non-juring clergy exercised conscientious minds to produce varied answers. Anglican attitudes to the revived concern to help dissenters also aroused strong feelings.[2] In delicate circumstances such as these, an archbishop was needed who was quiet, understanding, even-tempered, sympathetic and diplomatic. Tillotson was all of these. Compton was too aggressive a politician and, therefore, more likely to foment division rather than promote reconciliation.

Conclusion

The son of an insignificant Yorkshire puritan, Tillotson rose to the highest position that the Anglican Church had to offer. This occurred during one of the most turbulent periods in English political and religious history, including as it did the Civil War, the Interregnum, the troubled reigns of Charles II and James II and the Revolution of 1688. Despite all the pitfalls, Tillotson's progress was steadily upwards. Educational provision at the levels both of school and

---

1. See below: Chapter 3, p.83.
2. Carpenter 172-5; E.Carpenter, Cantuar: the Archbishops and their Office, (1971), p. 225; Henry Hart Milman, Annals of St Paul's Cathedral, (1869), pp. 414-21; T.B. Macaulay, The History of England from the Accession of James II, (13th ed. 1857),vol. IV, p. 35, cited Macaulay; A. Browning, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, (Glasgow 1944-51), vol. I, p. 489; Jones 266.

university enabled him to lay the foundations for his subsequent career. His early appointments and promotions were the result of his own unaided efforts and abilities. Eventually, however, without deliberate seeking, he gained the support of patrons, most notably the Finch family, who propelled him first to the deanery and then to the see of Canterbury. None of this would, however, have been possible had Tillotson not accepted episcopacy, won support through his preaching, his moderate theology, his opposition to Catholicism, his otherwise tolerant personality, his loyalty to the Whig cause and his refusal to accept translation to Ireland. There is no evidence to suggest that he was a crude careerist hungry for power. No-one, not even his enemies, accused him of that. He showed great reluctance when pressed to become archbishop, not because he wanted to command a high price after long bargaining, but because he feared the responsibility at his age, in his state of health and in those religious and political circumstances. He may have felt flattered to be so urged by his monarch, but in the end he accepted so that he might the better serve his king and his church. He prayed that the cup might pass from him but nevertheless obeyed the will of his master. The clothier's son from Sowerby reached the most senior preferment available in his church and in that position, as in his lowlier ones, he worked with characteristic vigour and enthusiasm, seeking to fulfil his duties to the best of his ability.

Chapter 2: Pamphlets

Throughout his ministry Tillotson was involved in controversy. The amount of time and effort he expended upon it suggests that he felt it important, challenging and satisfying. By 1693, however, he was beginning to weary of the battle. He wrote of 'more controversy: a thing which I seldom meddle with and do not delight to dwell upon', of 'a contentious argument, in which I take no pleasure' and of his hope that for the rest of his life he might be 'released from that irksome and unpleasant work of controversy and wrangling about religion'.[1] These were rather the sentiments of an exhausted old campaigner within months of his death than a 'pose of aversion' based upon classical models.[2]

Tillotson's career covered the dramatic years in English public life which were dominated by the hostility to Catholic France, the Popish Plot, the Exclusion Contest, several royal indulgence initiatives and the Revolution of 1688. Religion played an inescapable part throughout. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to find Tillotson debating the theology of Roman Catholicism and the ethics of non-resistance. His views on the former remained steadfast up to his death, but those on the latter underwent a revolution. Tillotson also preached against atheism, a philosophical and religious pre-occupation of his age, which stressed the unreasonableness of Christianity, though often attacking the faith on the superficial level of mockery and drollery.[3] In addition, he published refutations of socinianism, of which he was accused by his enemies. His views were expressed mainly in printed sermons and pamphlets, though he did produce one lengthy treatise. His literary output of controversial and less controversial work was prodigious.

Tillotson's First Pamphlet

Tillotson's first published work was a sermon which was not, however, on any of the burning issues of his day. His subject was business ethics. In September 1661 he preached at

---

1. Birch III, 335, 405, 440.
2. Gerard Reedy, 'Interpreting Tillotson' in Harvard Theological Review, 86:1, January 1993, p. 93, cited Reedy.
3. John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689, (Yale 1991), p. 250, cited Spurr.

short notice at St Giles's Cripplegate.[1] His title was 'Of the Rule and Equity to be Observed among Men' and based on Matthew 7,12: "Therefore in all things whatsoever you would that men sh ould do unto you, do even so to them for this is the law and the prophets". Tillotson argued that, since in essentials we are all equal, we should treat others with equality. This is of mutual benefit, and its contrary absurd and inconvenient. We must allow others to make the same profits as we would expect for ourselves, but these must be no more than a fair return for the time and effort involved. It is justifiable to drive a hard bargain with an equal but unacceptable to take advantage of the inexperienced. We must not exploit another's ignorance or sell goods with hidden defects. Openness is essential in all dealings. People who do not behave according to these principles will fall under divine judgment. Prosperity and peace would result if these rules were universally obeyed.

Tillotson's message appealed to scripture, common sense and self-interest. In his sentiments, he was firmly rooted in a tradition stretching back to Aristotle, whom he quoted, through Aquinas, Luther, Calvin and Taylor, whom he did not. Aristotle had declared that the difference in value of goods cannot depend on ignorance or misfortune and that it is wrong to take advantage in such circumstances.[2] Aquinas had strongly insisted on the need for justice in all dealings.[3] Luther had taught that the amount of profit should be governed by conscience.[4] Calvin, in the context of a discussion on usury which could have wider implications, had condemned 'all bargains in which the one party unrighteously strives to make a gain by the loss of the other party'.[5] Jeremy Taylor's rules for bargaining insisted on truth in all transactions, justice towards the other party in the contract and fair prices.[6]

Tillotson's ideas were not, therefore, in any way

---

1. Birch I, xii and cclxviii; X, 160-195, Sermon CCLIV; Samuel Annesley, Morning Exercises at Cripplegate, (1844), vol. I, pp. 194-212, Sermon X.
2. Aristotle, Ethics, V, v, 6 and V, x, 3 and 8.
3. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae: Injustice, 2a, 2ae, Question 77.
4 Walter I. Brandt, Luther's Works: The Christian Society, (Philadelphia 1966), vol. 45, pp. 48-51.
5 J. Anderson (ed.), J. Calvin, Commentary on the Book of Psalms, (Edinburgh 1845), vol. I, Psalm 15, 5, p. 212.
6 Jeremy Taylor, The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living...., (Oxford 1863 edition), pp. 201-3.

original. He was not, however, seeking to articulate new ethical concepts but to encourage Christian behaviour in the London business world. His sentiments may have been familiar, but they were also clear and challenging. The expression was unmistakable and the divinity practical. In these respects this sermon was typical of the whole of Tillotson's pulpit ministry.

Tillotson's Attack on Atheism

In March 1664 Tillotson preached in St Paul's before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the city of London, who then asked him to print the sermon. It was expanded and entitled The Wisdom of Being Religious and thus formed the only lengthy treatise that Tillotson composed.[1] It was a reply in general to the atheism of the age and to the views of Thomas Hobbes in particular. English atheistic attacks on religion dated back for a century, but Hobbes's Leviathan had only been published as recently as 1651.[2] Tillotson objected particularly to four of Hobbes's views: that the notion of spirit implies a contradiction, that fear and fancy are the origins of deity, that ignorance and melancholy are the true causes of devotion, and that religion is the fear of an imaginary power.[3]

Tillotson's text was from Job 28,28: 'And unto man he said, Behold! the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding'. Religion, he said, brings knowledge of God, whom we know from creation and providence but supremely in Christ's work of redemption. This knowledge is most useful and necessary for our happiness. To be religious, therefore, is to be wise.

It is unreasonable to deny the existence of God because without God there can be no tolerable explanation for creation or for the universal consent of mankind that there is a God. To deny God means that either the world is eternal or that it is the product of chance. However, from the most ancient times, the theistic tradition has been accepted. Chance Tillotson rejected on the grounds that according to ordinary human

---

1. Birch I, 317-89, Sermon I.
2. M.Hunter, 'The Problem of Atheism in Early Modern England' in TRHS, 5th series, vol. 35, (London 1985), pp. 135-137.
3. Birch I, xix-xx; M. Oakeshott (ed.), Leviathan or the Matter, Form and Power of Commonwealth Ecclesiastical and Civil by Thomas Hobbes, (Oxford n.d.), Part 1, chapter 6, p. 35, Part 3, chapter 34, p. 264; cited Hobbes.

observation it never produces anything new.[1] Tillotson could not see how belief in God could be the product of fear, since fear could not produce the notion of God's goodness and mercy. He rejected for lack of evidence Hobbes's view that belief in God was an invention of some government to keep people under subjection.[2]

Not only did Tillotson find atheism unreasonable, but he also considered it imprudent because it prejudiced the peace, happiness and order of human society. Religion, unlike atheism, brings comfort in the troubles of life. Atheists are imprudent because they put at risk their eternal interest. If there is no God religious people are no worse off than the atheists, but if there is a God they enjoy eternal happiness rather than misery. Prudence, therefore, counsels belief.[3]

Tillotson concluded with an appeal to atheists to consider seriously and impartially what he had written. He pleaded, with some passion, that his readers should 'fear God and depart from evil' and warned that God has provided no remedy against human obstinacy.[4]

The Wisdom of Being Religious is a bold attempt to refute the arguments of contemporary atheism and is an outstanding piece of apologetic. Tillotson showed that he was aware that the strength of the cosmological argument is clearest when compared with the view that all that exists is the result of chance.[5] His approach was reasonable, scholarly and respectful of those with whom he disagreed. Nevertheless, he did intend that his sermon should convince people of the intellectual validity of belief in God. To him, rejection of God could only lead to misery, and in the last few pages of his work he used all his oratorical powers to persuade people to turn in faith to God. Tillotson was not only a philosopher, theologian and preacher but also a zealous evangelist.

Tillotson's Controversies with Roman Catholics I: John Serjeant

By the opening of the seventeenth century, hostility to Roman Catholicism had become part of the national ideology. Papal power was feared, and Spain was seen as its agent. Roman

---

1. Birch I, 323-348.
2. Birch I, 348-56.
3. Birch I, 362-71.
4. Birch I, 383-9.
5. E.G.Rupp, Religion in England, 1688-1791, (Oxford 1985), p. 246, cited Rupp.

Catholics were, quite wrongly, considered a disciplined army controlled by their priests and especially by the Jesuits. The powers of the faith to seduce protestants by its ancient traditions, ceremonials, powers of absolution and its assurance of heaven to Catholics of good life were all seen as almost irresistible. Protestants dwelt upon Roman Catholic atrocities such as the Marian persecutions, the Massacre of St Bartholemew's Day, the Armada and Gunpowder Plot. By Tillotson's time the fear was of France rather than Spain, but English attitudes were essentially the same. Minds were being increasingly focussed by James, duke of York, the king's brother and heir, who by 1669 had become convinced of Roman Catholic claims.[1]

One fundamental aspect of anti-Catholicism was the serious theological debate in which Tillotson was involved for much of his adult life. Between 1664 and 1672 Tillotson's chief protagonist was John Serjeant, a convert to Catholicism who, Tillotson declared, had left protestantism before he had understood it. Serjeant, a Cambridge graduate and former secretary to Bishop Morton of Durham, had been ordained in 1650 in Lisbon and encouraged to return to England and to write against protestantism.[2]

The chief point at issue in the early days of Tillotson's debate with Serjeant was authority in doctrinal matters. This had been a major issue between Catholic and protestant ever since the Reformation. In 1521 at Worms Luther had declared that he would not retract his views unless 'proved wrong by Scriptures or evident reason'. Calvin had taught that 'the scriptures are the only records which God has been pleased to consign his truth to perpetual remembrance'. In England the Act of Supremacy of 1559 had allowed room for tradition when it decreed that heresy must be judged not only by the canonical scriptures but also by the first four general councils or any other council where the decision was based on scripture.[3]

---

1. C.Z. Wiener, 'The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism' in Past and Present, 51 (1971), pp. 27-62; Miller 58.
2. Birch X, 271; Joseph Gillow, A Literary and Biographical History or Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, (New York n.d.) vol V, pp. 491-2.
3. O.Chadwick, The Reformation,(1964),p.56,cited Chadwick; R.H.Bainton, The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, (1953), pp. 44-5 and 61 and Here I Stand, (Nashville 1950), pp. 140-4; John Calvin, Institutes, Book I, chapter VII, i; G.H.Tavard, Holy Writ or Holy Church, (1959), p. 225; cited Tavard.

However, the Thirty Nine Articles of 1562 betrayed no such equivocation and simply affirmed that the scriptures contain 'all things necessary to salvation', and no article of faith can demand acceptance unless based upon scripture. The church has no power 'to ordain anything contrary to God's word written'.[1] The Anglican position was, therefore, quite clear.

The sixteenth century saw bitter polemics produced all over Europe between those who argued for the scriptures alone and those who argued for scripture and tradition. The reformers and their followers condemned 'ecclesiastical' or 'human tradition' as accretions and distortions of the true gospel preserved in Holy Scripture. Meanwhile from the Catholic side the reformers were accused of breaking the tradition of the church and of producing arbitrary interpretations of scripture. The Council of Trent firmly declared that unwritten traditions and scripture were to be given equal reverence. At the end of the sixteenth century the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine went further and asserted the necessity of an infallible church to interpret scripture. Not unexpectedly he inspired much protestant hostility in the century that followed.

Elizabethan theologians like John Jewel and Richard Hooker emphasised the primacy of scripture. However, by the opening of the seventeenth century the English church had established a balance between scripture and tradition by returning to an idea which pre-dated Trent: the teachings of the church and the word of scripture are always in harmony, but scripture has primacy as the word of God.[2]

In 1638, however, Chillingworth, from whom Tillotson drew so much inspiration in his Cambridge days took a firmer line: 'The Bible, I say, the Bible only is the religion of the protestants', any belief not drawn from scripture is simply a matter of opinion and 'there is no sufficient certainty but of scripture only'.[3] Two years later, John Wilkins, later to be Tillotson's vicar and father-in-law, spoke of scripture as the 'Rule of our Faith and Obedience'. In 1651 Hobbes firmly resisted the view that the pope was supreme judge of faith or morals. Benjamin Whichcote affirmed, "The essentials of belief are contained in the Scriptures, and are so clearly set forth

---

1. Articles VI and XX.
2. H.A. Oberman, The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Mediaeval and Early Reformation Thought, (Edinburgh 1986), p. 270 and 286; Chadwick 304-5; Tavard 235-43.
3. Burnet 10-11; W. Chillingworth, The Religion of the Protestants: A Safe Way to Salvation, (Oxford 1638), chapter 2, 1, p. 51 and chapter 6, 56, pp 375-6.

that anyone using his reason can scarcely miss them."[1]

Tillotson was provoked into the lists in defence of scripture and against tradition by the publication in 1664 by John Serjeant of his Sure Footing in Christianity or a Rational Discourse on the Rule of Faith.[2] Two years later Tillotson published his Rule of Faith, for which he was awarded his doctorate in divinity.[3] His work is thorough and scholarly. The language and tone are moderate. There is none of the invective so often found in anti-Catholic polemic, though irony is not lacking.

In Part I Tillotson questioned Serjeant's understanding of 'rule' and 'faith'. Contrary to Serjeant, Tillotson believed that rule was not an imperative to believe but a standard for testing the truth. Faith was more than belief in God, it was also assent based upon the testimony and authority of God.[4] A 'rule of faith' for Serjeant was the way to arrive at faith but for Tillotson it was the standard by which the authenticity of revelation is judged.[5]

According to Tillotson, the rule is a body of doctrine transmitted through scripture, but to Serjeant it was transmitted by tradition, infallible through the Holy Spirit, in the Roman Catholic Church.[6] Serjeant believed that the prevalence of differing interpretations of scripture proved the weakness of the protestant view, but Tillotson felt that all matters essential for salvation were sufficiently clear. Indeed, earlier Christians had acknowledged scripture rather than tradition.[7]

Nevertheless, Tillotson did acknowledge a place for tradition, but this had been only in the days when the faith had been passed down orally before it had been infallibly committed to writing.[8] Tradition was, however, important as it affirmed that the books of the New Testament were written by the apostles and evangelists.[9]

---

1. Hobbes part 3, chapter 42, pp. 365-72; Jack B. Rogers and Donald K. McKim, The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach, (San Francisco 1979) pp. 225-30.
2. Cited SF.
3. Birch X, 226-446; cited RF.
4. SF 2-4; RF 230-1.
5. RF 231.
6. RF 231-2 and 238-9; SF 47-9, 54, 59-65, 81-94, 115-17.
7. SF 38-9; RF 241 and 245-8.
8. RF 250-4.
9. RF 255.

In Part I, therefore, Tillotson asserted the traditional protestant view in contrast to Serjeant's typical Catholic view. By stating that the infallible Spirit worked in the writers of scripture as they set down the oral rule and that tradition authenticates the authorship of the New Testament books, Tillotson laid himself open to the charge that the infallible Spirit could work through tradition at any time.

In Part II, Tillotson sought to refute Serjeant's criticisms that the scriptures were not satisfactory as a rule.[1] Unlike Serjeant, Tillotson believed that the meaning of scripture is plain and intelligible even to ordinary protestants and that in its transmission and translation there has been no corruption in matters of faith or practice.[2]

Turning to the attack, Tillotson asked why, if the oral tradition is as effective as Serjeant would have people believe, there was so much dispute in the Roman Church about matters such as the efficacy of divine grace, the supremacy of Peter and the infallibility of popes and councils.[3] Tradition, he concluded, can be no more certain than scripture.[4] He admitted that scholars did have differences over the meaning of scripture but asserted that they were agreed on fundamentals.[5] Tillotson rejected the view that tradition is passed accurately down the generations on the grounds that, since the learning may be imperfect, variations can creep in.[6]

By his emphasis that the scriptures are clear and unmistakable in vital matters of faith and that tradition is no more likely to be free from corruption, Tillotson effectively upheld the protestant position. He might have been even more effective had he buttressed the arguments for protestant confidence in the Bible even though it contained obscurities and apparent contradictions.

In Part III Tillotson challenged Serjeant's view that tradition is inerrant. This was proved false by the rise of Arianism, Pelagianism, Islam and the schisms in the church from the Orthodox to the protestant. Scripture shows that the first disciples could misunderstand Jesus and that the first

---

1. SF 1-21; RF 262-325.
2. RF 272-3, 274-82 and 284-5; SF 13-17.
3. RF 286-8.
4. RF 291-4.
5. RF 302-3; SF 22-33.
6. RF 324-5; SF 41-44.

Christians fell into error.[1] In any case, Tillotson argued, even the Roman Church did not see tradition as the sole rule of faith. The Council of Trent had declared that scripture and tradition were to be treated pari pietatis affectu et reverentia. The Roman catechism and Bellarmine said that the word of God was to be found in both. Cardinal Perron had even said that 'scripture is the foundation of Christian doctrine'.[2]

Serjeant's Sure Footing and Tillotson's Rule of Faith sum up the contemporary Catholic and protestant arguments on tradition and scripture. There is nothing original on either side. What is significant for an understanding of Tillotson is the style of his book. It reveals a scholar who respected his opponent and treated him to a courteous, considered and detailed reply. Tillotson's immense erudition is obvious throughout. He never descended to the insulting or the scurrilous. The Rule of Faith was the work of a deeply convinced, highly-industrious, well-read, protestant scholar. Tillotson did not, however, have the final word.

As early as 1666 John Serjeant published in Paris his Letter of Thanks from the Author of Sure Footing to his Answerer Mr John Tillotson.[3] He accused Tillotson of misrepresentation, over-selective use of quotations, perverseness in the meaning of words and of abusing him.[4] He sought to denigrate scripture by emphasising differing interpretations and its contradictions. If God had intended scripture to be the rule of faith, he would surely have made the meaning clearer.[5] Only the oral tradition transmitted through the church can get the true sense from scripture.[6]

Serjeant nowhere took seriously Tillotson's point that in essentials scripture is clear, nor did he discuss their differing definitions of 'rule of faith'. What is obvious from the writings of both combatants is that scripture and tradition played a large part in the theological enquiry of both faiths but that neither was prepared to admit it. At the same time neither was prepared to discuss his evidence for accepting scriptural or ecclesiastical infallibility or, indeed, the more radical issue whether either is necessary.

---

1. SF 58-60 and 78; RF 332-3, 336-49, 351-4, 362-7.
2. RF 425-45.
3. Cited LT.
4. LT 114.
5. LT 15-16, 40, 42-4, 46, 49.
6. LT 16 and 107.

In the year following his Letter, Serjeant published Faith Vindicated from Possibility of Falsehood.[1] He sought to produce an argument from first principles rather than answering Tillotson step by step. He asserted that Tillotson's theology was weak and undermined the solid foundations of Christianity. Latching onto Tillotson's oft-repeated point that in crucial matters scripture was fully reliable, Serjeant argued that there can be no truth until all doubts have gone. Tillotson, he demanded, must explain how one can have faith without complete certainty. The rule of faith cannot admit the possibility of error. Tillotson, therefore, has no true rule.[2]

In Faith Vindicated Serjeant returned to his regular theme of the necessity of infallible belief. Nowhere did he deal with the view implicit in Tillotson that, provided that the basic essentials are known with certainty, other matters can be regarded as indifferent. As in his earlier work, he did not demonstrate how tradition can be infallible. Presumably he assumed that this was the work of the Holy Spirit, but he neither stated nor justified this view.

Preaching at Wilkins's consecration as bishop of Chester in 1668, Tillotson touched on the Roman claims to infallibility. The Roman Church, he said, understood the text: 'And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world' (Matthew 28,20) to mean that the Roman Church was infallible. This, Tillotson claimed, was not the clear meaning of the passage. The first apostles enjoyed miraculous gifts of the Spirit to enable them to plant and propagate the gospel. These gifts confirmed that their teaching was free from error. The pope and general councils provide no such divine testimony and, therefore, cannot lay claim to infallibility.[3]

Tillotson began to prepare a response, but before it was published Serjeant produced his Method. Tradition, he said, as contained in the Catholic Church, was the only rule of faith. It had passed infallibly through the generations from the first apostles. It elucidates scripture and ensures orthodoxy.[4]

Tillotson's reply to Serjeant's latest writings was contained in 1671 in the preface to the first volume of his printed sermons. Tillotson rejected the view that the faith of

---

1. Louvain 1667, cited FV.
2. FV Introduction (no page numbers); FV 1-2, 8, 12, 18, 95, 167-8 and 171.
3. Birch VI, 154-6, Sermon CXXIII.
4. ? 1671, cited M; M 3, 15-18, 33-3.

individuals must be 'absolutely conclusive and impossible to be false'. People who have inadequate intellectual grounds for their faith will still be saved.[1] At last Tillotson had challenged one of the main planks of Serjeant's argument - that salvation is dependent upon an infallibly accurate set of beliefs. He did. however, press the argument further in two respects.Firstly, he showed that neither Catholic theologians nor the Council of Trent had insisted on an infallible tradition as the sole rule of faith. Secondly, he suggested that if true Christians had infallible beliefs through tradition, then there was no need for the infallibility of popes or councils.[2] Here are signs that Tillotson was developing and refining his views as the controversy proceeded and getting to grips with Serjeant's weaker arguments.

Serjeant was swift to reply. In Reason Against Raillery in 1672 he re-asserted his views on the need for infallible belief and that this can only come through oral transmission. An infallible pope or council was necessary, he argued, to teach the authentic faith. In contrast to Tillotson's views of the Council of Trent, Serjeant stressed that the council had said that scripture interpreted by tradition has the full authority as God's word. Serjeant failed, once again, to deal with Tillotson's assertion that oral tradition is as capable of fallibility as scripture. Nor did he make out a case for the necessity of infallibility of doctrine for salvation. Serjeant was wearying of the controversy, and it was to be sixteen years before he took up the cudgels again.[3]

It was this controversy with Serjeant that brought Tillotson to the forefront of the anti-Catholic propagandists of the 1660s and 1670s. The amount of effort expended by both men shows that they considered each other as worthy opponents. By the time of Reason Against Raillery, however, the debate was becoming sterile as both writers were mainly restating familiar opinions and ignoring unpalatable problems. Their efforts had been confined to the fundamental issue of authority. In the future, Tillotson was to make targets of different aspects of Catholic teaching.

Tillotson's Controversies with Roman Catholics II: 1672-88

John Serjeant was not the only Roman Catholic to tackle Tillotson over the Rule of Faith. John Austen, a Norfolk

---

1. Birch I, ccxcv-ccciv.
2. Birch I, cccix-xi.
3. 1672, cited RR; RR 30-3, 55, 97-9, 106; RR 181-3; RR 245.

gentleman, graduate of St John's College, Cambridge, and a convert to the Catholic faith in 1640, wrote A Punctual Answer to the Rule of Faith. The book disappeared, however, at the printers.[1]

During the uproar created by Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence of 15 March 1672, Tillotson was one of many preachers to deliver anti-Catholic sermons. At Whitehall Palace on 21 April he preached the sermon which for publication was entitled The Hazard of Being Saved in the Church of Rome.[2] The Roman Church, Tillotson stated, had added as necessary to salvation doctrines and practices which had never been taught by Christ or the apostles. Indeed, they were either contrary to Christian doctrine or destructive of good life. Among these innovations were the doctrine of infallibility, priestly absolution after auricular confession, purgatory, prayers and masses for the dead, the rightness of deposing kings for heresy, worship in 'an unknown tongue', communion in one kind, the worship of images, the adoration of the eucharistic elements, and the invocation of saints, angels and the Virgin Mary.

In a scarcely veiled reference to James, Duke of York's, reception into the Catholic Church early in 1669, Tillotson argued that there was no justification for converting to the Roman Church simply on the grounds that Anglicans admit that Roman Catholics may be saved. It was vital to examine the doctrines and practices of both churches. In any case, the way to salvation through the Roman Church was hazardous because of its errors. He had, by contrast, full confidence in the Church of England. Anglicans should remain steadfast in their faith. It is hardly surprising that James, who had sat through this sermon, never again attended Whitehall Chapel.[3]

In 1678 as the hysteria over the Popish Plot was gaining momentum, Tillotson preached before the House of Commons on 5 November at the commemoration of the failure of Gunpowder Plot.[4] Tillotson castigated the Catholic Church for perpetrating conspiracies, rebellions, massacres, the

---

1. Birch I, xxiii-xxiv, Rupp 195.
2. Birch II, 37-60, Sermon XI.
3. J. Beardmore, Some Memorials, in Birch I, cclxxi.
4. J.P.Kenyon, op. cit., chapters 3-4; E.S. de Beer (ed.). The Diary of John Evelyn, (1955), vol. IV. pp. 156-7 cited de Beer; Birch II, 212-32 Sermon XIX.

deposition of kings and the betrayal of ones country. Nevertheless, he did not advocate severities against Catholics but 'generous humanity and Christian temper'. For the future, the people must commit their cause to God and, under God the security of their peace and religion to parliament.[1]

In the circumstances of 1678, this sermon was remarkably moderate. Perhaps Tillotson as a royal chaplain had been steered in this direction by the king. Thomas Lamplugh, bishop of Exeter, preached a similarly moderate sermon before the Lords.[2] However, Tillotson's style in his anti-Catholic controversies had never been inflammatory, and this sermon was couched in his usual charitable language. He did not seek to court popularity by exploiting the prevailing emotional atmosphere.

The discovery of the Popish Plot led Charles Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, to question his Catholicism. He asked some prominent Catholics for reasoned statements of their faith and then submitted these to Tillotson for comment. Tillotson wrote him a letter on 22 April 1679 outlining the errors of Rome, as a result of which Shrewsbury embraced the Anglican Church. Tillotson's letter was eventually printed in 1768 as part of A Dissuasive from Popery.[3] Tillotson criticised the Catholic Church for discouraging enquiry and making the scriptures available only in a foreign language. He could find no warrant in scripture for the supremacy and infallibility of the pope, services in an 'unknown tongue', communion in one kind, the worship of images, invocation of the Virgin, saints and angels, and the doctrines of transubstantiation and purgatory. Protestantism, however, was in conformity with scripture.[4]

Six months later, on 23 October, Tillotson wrote again to Shrewsbury about rumours concerning his standards of morality. He was pleased to have had some part in Shrewsbury's conversion, he wrote, but was more concerned that Shrewsbury should be virtuous than a protestant. He believed that God would more easily forgive ignorance and errors of understanding

---

1. Birch II, 224-7 and 231.
2. J.P. Kenyon, op. cit., 90.
3. Birch I, xxxviii; T.C. Nicholson and A.S. Turbeville, Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury (Cambridge 1930), pp. 17-28, 85; Joan Wake, The Brude nells of Dean (1953), pp. 181-2; HMC vol. 52 (1900): Report of the Manuscripts of Mrs Frankland-Russell-Astley of Chequers Court, Buckinghamshire, p. 42; J. Tillotson, A Dissuasive from Popery (1768), Preface, in S.P.C.K. Religious Tracts (1800), cited Dissuasive.
4 Dissuasive 7-24.

more easily than faults of will.[1]

Tillotson's first letter adds nothing to an understanding of his views on Catholicism. His second, however, made a new point which he could well have made to challenge Serjeant: that God does not demand infallible theology for salvation but will forgive doctrinal errors more easily than moral faults. For Tillotson, therefore, salvation was possible within the Church of Rome, a concession which Rome was not prepared to concede to Canterbury. From one so wedded to scripture as the authority on religious matters, it is strange to find Tillotson making unscriptural statements on what could, or could not, be the more easily forgiven.

Another ideal opportunity to preach in defence of protestantism presented itself to Tillotson on 2 April 1680 when he was summoned at short notice to supply for a court preacher who was ill. At this time anti-Catholic feeling was very powerful. Alleged popish plots were regularly being discovered, and the battle to exclude James, duke of York, from the succession had been joined: an issue that will be discussed in Chapter 5. The sermon was, however, to cause Tillotson considerable sorrow and embarrassment. It was published under the title The Protestant Religion Vindicated from the Charge of Singularity and Novelty.[2] Tillotson stressed that, as religion is vital to the welfare of society, it is the responsibility of the ruler to prevent the corruption of true religion. It is given to no one to draw people away from their faith and so to show contempt for civil authority unless justified by miracles. Individuals can claim to practise their own religion privately but not to seek converts unless specially commissioned by God or a divinely-inspired magistrate. Miracles are the proof of such a divine commission. Conscience alone is not sufficient.[3]

Tillotson then attacked the Roman Church's claim to antiquity and universality and its condemnation of protestantism as 'novelty and singularity'. He argued that far from being universal, there were more non-Catholic christians than Catholic. This could be shown by adding together christians of reformed faith, ancient churches with the same faith and contemporary churches which rejected papal supremacy. In any case, numerical superiority is no guarantee of the truth. Protestants accept the creeds, which makes their faith

---

1. Add MS 32084 f. 8; Tanner MS xxxiii, ff. 155-6; Birch I, xxxviii.
2. Birch I, xli and xliv; Birch II, 453-73 Sermon XXVII, esp. 457-60.
3. James Moffatt, The Golden Book of Tillotson, (1926) p.19.

as old as the Catholic, and they teach all that the ancient church taught as necessary to salvation. Protestantism is the ancient faith with the Roman Catholic additions removed. The protestant religion is the best since it was revealed by Christ, planted by the apostles, confirmed by miracles, sealed with the blood of the martyrs and rescued from false doctrines and superstition.[1]

The earlier part of the sermon caused a stir. According to George Hickes, a peer standing close to the king said, "Sir, Sir, do you not hear Mr Hobs [sic] in the pulpit?" Another informant said that the king fell asleep during the sermon and that when he awoke a nobleman said it was a pity he had slept 'for we have had the rarest piece of Hobbism that ever you saw in your life'. "Odds fish," replied the king, "he shall print it then."[2] As Hickes pointed out, the sermon implied that there was no way to remove heresy if it had the sanction of the civil authorities. There would thus be no defence against a parliament that introduced Roman Catholicism by statute. Peter Gunning, Tillotson's predecessor at Cambridge and Canterbury and now bishop of Ely, complained in the Lords that the sermon was helpful to popery. Simon Patrick suggested that Archdeacon Parker should admonish Tillotson.[3] Nonconformists were even more disturbed. A minister friend of Tillotson's, John Hoe, reasoned personally with Tillotson that Luther and Calvin had differed from him and that christianity had already been confirmed by miracles and no others were needed to refute a wicked ruler who set up a false religion. Tillotson, when he grasped the folly of his statements, wept freely. He could only excuse himself with the fact that his preparation had perforce to be hurried. Richard Baxter wrote a reply to the sermon. By then, however, Tillotson had regained his equanimity. He regretted being classed with Spinoza and Hobbes but consoled himself with the knowledge that he had been trying to do his best.[4] Eventually a nonconformist reply was printed which rejected Tillotson's views but did not attributed to him any desire to attack dissenters.[5]

Tillotson, through haste and a desire to defend his church against Catholicism, had uncharacteristically blundered. His emphasis on miracles as authenticating God's messengers

---

1. Birch II, 461-8, 472-3
2. Some Discourses 48; Birch I, xliii.
3. Some Discourses 48-9.
4. Dr Williams's Library MS Baxter's Letters: vol. 2,78: 2 June 1680; Birch I, xliv-v.
5. Birch I, xlvi-vii; For Simon Louth's attack on this sermon on political grounds see Chapter 8.

certainly echoed the ideas of Hobbes: "it belongeth to the nature of a miracle, that it be wrought for the procuring of credit to God's messengers, ministers and prophets, that thereby men may know they are called, sent and employed by God, and thereby be the better inclined to obey them" and "the testimony that men can render of divine calling, can be no other, than the operation of miracles; or true prophecy, which also is a miracle; or extraordinary felicity".[1] It was new for Tillotson to attack the Catholic claims of universality and antiquity. Despite his antipathy to Rome, he still did not deny the possibility of salvation in that church and presumably meant to include Catholics amongst those allowed to practise their religion in private. Tillotson was not his usual scholarly self in this discourse, but he omitted none of his customary moderation and evinced his typical tolerance.

In 1684 Tillotson launched a new attack, he expanded his views on transubstantiation in an anonymously-published pamphlet Discourse Against Transubstantiation.[2] Tillotson stood firmly in the Anglican tradition. The Thirty Nine Articles had unequivocally condemned transubstantiation.[3] Seventeenth-century writers who concurred included Simon Patrick in his Mensa Mystica or a Discourse Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. George Bull in his Corruptions of the Church of Rome would only say that divine virtue descended upon the elements and is received by the faithful. Thomas Ken in his Manual of Prayers for the Use of Winchester Scholars and The Practice of Divine Love: and Exposition of the Church Catechism spoke of a 'mysterious presence'. Anthony Horneck, a German divine, asserted simply that Christ is present by power and influence which believers recognise.[4]

Seventeenth-century defences of transubstantiation that were available in England included Robert Fuller's Missale Romanum Vindicatum.... of 1674 and William Collins's Missa Triumphans of the following year. Tillotson's work provoked others.

Tillotson rejected the doctrine on the grounds that it is denied by the senses, and that the words 'this is my body' and 'this is my blood' are, like 'I am the door' and 'I am the vine', to be taken figuratively. Following Zwingli,

---

1 Leviathan, Part 3, Chapter 37 and Part 1, Chapter 12.
2 Birch II, 407-52 Sermon XXVI.
3 Article XXVIII.
4 C.W.Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland (1945), 11-122 cited Dugmore.

Tillotson taught that in the sacrament the bread and wine simply signify the body and blood of Christ. Transubstantiation had not, he said, been the perpetual belief of the church, the idea of eating God is barbarous and it encourages idolatry.[1]

In this Discourse Tillotson did not even raise the contemporary issues discussed by Patrick, Bull and Ken. This was because he was concerned to denounce transubstantiation rather than discuss current protestant thinking or expound his own eucharistic doctrine. However, Tillotson did state that the sacrament "seals to us all those blessings and benefits which are purchased ... for us by his death and passion". The benefit is great because we are confirmed in goodness, our resolution is strengthened "and the grace of God's Holy Spirit to enable us to do his will is hereby conveyed to us".[2]

Tillotson did not contribute to the anti-Catholic literature that poured from the press in the first two years of James II's reign.[3] He had said all that needed to be said. However, in 1687 two anonymous books were written in reply to Tillotson. The first was Transubstantiation Defended and Proved from Scripture in Answer to the First Part of a Treatise Entitled A Discourse Against Transubstantiation.[4] The author rejected Tillotson's argument about the senses by pointing out that it was the substance and not the accidents that changed. The change is, indeed, miraculous and above reason. The fathers knew that the doctrine is not explicit in scripture but that it could be deduced from the New Testament. Christ's statement 'this is my body' is different from 'I am the door'. 'This' indicates something with an outward appearance but does not at once reveal its whole nature. The 'I am' sayings do. In addition, in using metaphors, the subject is superior to the predicate. 'I', Christ, is superior to 'the door'. In the expression 'this [bread] is my body' protestants make the subject inferior to the predicate, and thus the metaphor has no proper relationship. Catholics, however, make them equal.[5] Without the real presence, the sacrifice of Christ cannot be set forth, and the people cannot receive sanctification and

---

1. Birch II, 407-8, 410-13, 416-18; 428-34; 440, 443-6.
2. John Tillotson, A Discourse to his Servants, concerning Receiving the Sacrament, (n.d. or place); Birch X, 211; Dugmore 134-8.
3. Miller 154.
4. N.d. or place, cited TD.
5. TD 4-6, 13-15, 17-18, 24-9 and 32-5.

consecration for a glorious resurrection of soul and body.[1]

The writer of Transubstantiation Defended made a bold attempt to counter Tillotson. He stated the traditional view based on Aristotelian philosophy but he did not meet Tillotson's implicit criticism that a change in substance must lead to a change in accidents and therefore be recognised by the senses. More challenging, however, was his discussion of the form of metaphor in the New Testament. The argument as presented is powerful unless the foundation upon which it is based is questioned. It must be asked what evidence there is that 'this' does indeed have the significance which he attaches to it and whether it is meaningful to talk about superiority and inferiority in reference to the subject and predicate of a metaphor. His comment that sanctification and consecration cannot be achieved without transubstantiation betrays an inadequate view of the power of the Holy Spirit.

The second reply was simply entitled An Answer to a Discourse on Transubstantiation.[2] The answerer, after repeating the usual substance and accidents argument, challenged the validity of always using reason to determine truth. Sense says that the sun is small but reason that it is large. Reason says that the sacramental element is bread but revelation that the substance is changed into Christ's body.[3] He did not say what 'sense' suggested. Dealing with the 'I am' passages, the answerer noted that in scripture these are followed by an explanation whereas the words at the institution of the sacrament are not.[4] Tillotson had misunderstood the teaching of the church from the fathers onwards.[5] Because the flesh and blood were consumed under the species of bread and wine the practice could not be condemned as barbarous.[6] The answerer's main contribution to the debate was a thorough attack on Tillotson's view that the doctrine was a late invention of the Catholic Church. The main issue for protestants was, however, avoided: that of the scriptural basis of the doctrine.

One final Catholic challenge to Tillotson in this period took the form of the Sixth Catholic Letter of 1688. This, though published anonymously, was the work of John Serjeant as is shown by his reference to 'my book' Sure Footing in Christianity. The book was a summary of Serjeant's three

---

1. TD 59-60.
2. N.d. or place, cited Answer.
3. Answer 6-7.
4. Answer 27-8.
5. Answer 20-7 and 38-63.
6. Answer 73-8.

other works, a demand for a full reply and a complaint that Tillotson and others were persecuting him.[1] By 1688 Tillotson had other matters on his mind, and Serjeant therefore provoked no reply.

Tillotson's twenty-two years of controversies with the Roman Catholics consumed a great deal of his time. Nowhere did the debate descend into invective or hysteria as was common in the atmosphere of the Popish Plot. Tillotson revealed his very considerable learning: he had a vast range of sources at his fingertips. The debate focussed mainly on the fundamental difference between Catholics and protestants - that of authority in matters of doctrine, an issue which occupies part of Chapter 7 below.

J.R.Jones has correctly written that much of this literature was 'repetitious and derivative', but it did arouse great interest.[2] Its omission from John P. Kenyon's chapter on 'The Catholic Problem' in The Popish Plot presumably as irrelevant to political history cannot be justified.[3] On the contrary, Tillotson's writing formed a significant part of the general theological controversy of the period which lay at the foundation of the anti-Catholic feeling so prominent in English political life in the reigns of Charles II and James II.

Tillotson and Non-Resistance

In its eagerness to preserve the restored monarchy of the 1660s, Clarendon's administration sought to outlaw resistance to the crown by imposing first on corporation officials and then on clergy and teachers the oath 'that it was unlawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take up arms against the king....'.[4] This measure was not unexpected so soon after the civil war and interregnum, when not only had arms been taken against the king but he had been executed and replaced by unsatisfactory republican systems of government. Added to this, in the sphere of political thought, there were well-established traditions which, in certain circumstances, justified rebellion.

Calvin had taught a high respect for, and obedience

---

1. John Serjeant, Sixth Catholic Letter (No place 1688), pp. 24-7 and 30-6.
2. J.R.Jones, The Revolution of 1688 in England (1972),p. 88.
3. J.P.Kenyon, op.cit., pp. 1-31.
4. Corporation Act of 1661 and the Act of Uniformity of 1662 in EHD Doc. 136, pp.375-6 and Doc. 137, p. 379.

to, rulers but did allow 'popular' magistrates to oppose tyranny in the head of state.[1] He had also said of rulers that 'if they command anything against Him let us not pay the least regard to it, nor be moved by all the dignity which they possess as magistrates'.[2] John Knox, however, was much more forceful and wrote that it was the duty of everyone to uphold the rule of godliness and to punish idolatry and tyranny in the monarch.[3] Philippe du Plessis de Mornay in his Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos justified attacks on the Valois monarchy and, though cautiously, condoned tyranicide.[4] George Buchanan in De Iure Regni apud Scotos also asserted the right to rebel and even to commit tyrannicide.[5]

On the Catholic side, the Jesuits had not dissimilar views. Juan de Mariana taught that the community can control, depose and even execute rulers as a remedy for political oppression.[6] Francisco Suarez declared that no form of political obligation is absolute, and subjects may rebel and depose a tyrannical ruler.[7] Bellarmine stated that the pope can absolve from their allegiance the subjects of a heretical prince.[8]

There were, however, opposing voices. Luther taught that an ungodly ruler must never be obeyed but must not be actively resisted.[9] Jean Bodin exalted absolute monarchy, asserted that princes can only be called to account by God himself, but did admit that magistrates might be justified in disobedience if commanded by the sovereign to act contrary to natural law.[10] In England the writings of St Paul and St Peter were emphasised. In the homily 'Against Wilful Rebellion' it is stated 'a rebel is worse than the worse prince, and rebellion worse than the worst government of the worst prince

---

1. Quentin Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought (Cambridge 1978), vol. II, p. 232, cited Skinner; George H. Sabine, A History of Political Theory (3rd edition 1951, cited Sabine.
2. John Calvin, Institutes, Book 4, Chapter XX, sections 23 and 32.
3. Skinner 237, Sabine 316, John Bowle, Western Political Thought (1947), p.281, cited Bowle.
4. Skinner 305-6, Sabine 235, Bowle 282.
5. Skinner 343-4, Sabine 328, Bowle 282.
6. Skinner 346, Sabine 332, Bowle 284.
7. Skinner 177-8, Sabine 332, Bowle 284.
8. Bowle 284.
9. Skinner 17.
10. Skinner 284, Sabine 347-8, Bowle 289-90.

that hitherto hath been'.[1] The canons of 1606 and 1640 emphasised that God is the author of society and that rebels incur damnation.[2] James I, Buchanan's pupil, embraced divine right and declared it unlawful to dispossess the rightful heir. Thomas Hobbes championed absolutism, condemned resistance but accepted that in practice it might occur if rulers failed in their reponsibilities. Sir Robert Filmer asserted divine right and preached passive obedience.[3]

Tillotson, along with Stillingfleet, Burnet and Locke, stressed obedience as a sacred obligation.[4] Writing in 1683 to Lord William Russell, who had been condemned for complicity in the Rye House Plot against Charles II, Tillotson asserted 'the Christian religion doth plainly forbid resistance of authority'. On the scaffold he prayed with Russell: "Grant that ... we ... may learn our Duty to God and the King."[5] Contrary to Tillotson's wishes and later to his considerable embarrassment, since he was already questioning such an absolutist position, both letter and prayer were published.[6] In 1683 Tillotson could not have forseen that within five years he would be actively resisting James II, supporting the revolution and accepting first the deanery of St Paul's and later the archbishopric of Canterbury from the hands of usurpers. Tillotson was not alone in his change of view, but he was to suffer considerable personal abuse from the enemies of the revolution, and this was to cause him great distress, as Chapter 8 will show.

Socinianism

From the late 1680s controversies developed in England over the doctrine of the trinity which were to be continued into the next century.[7] Tillotson, during his achiepiscopate, was charged by both Catholics and non-jurors with Socinianism. From as early as 1669 Tillotson had been acquainted with Socininan doctrines through the collected works

---

1. Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth.... (4th Edition, London 1766), Homily 21, p. 500.
2. K. Feiling, A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714 (Oxford 1924), p. 486, cited Feiling.
3. Sabine 337, 388,399, 434-5.
4. Feiling 486-8.
5. Birch MS 4236 f. 354.
6. Birch I, lxxvi ; Chapter 8 below.
7. Reedy 88.

of a group of scholars entitled Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum. Along with the earl of Shaftesbury, Isaac Newton and John Locke, Tillotson knew Samuel Crell of the famous continental Socinian family and was on friendly terms with Thomas Firmin, the most notorious Anglican lay Socinian. There can, however, be no suspicion of Tillotson's orthodoxy. Partly to prove his own soundness, partly to respond to Queen Mary's wish that he should refute Firmin and partly, no doubt, as archbishop to challenge heresy, Tillotson in 1693 revised and published his four sermons on the divinity and incarnation of Christ which he had preached in 1679 and 1680 at St Lawrence Jewry.[1] All four were based on John 1, 14.

In the first discourse Tillotson emphasised the incarnation, Christ's residence on earth and the clear signs of divinity which he evinced.[2] He rejected Apollinaris and asserted that Christ had assumed both a human body and a soul.[3] The Word existed before creation and is without beginning.[4] He is not created and, since all things were created by him, he is lord and heir of all creation.[5]

In the second, he specifically attacked Socinianism. The Socinians strain the meaning of St John when they deny that Christ was involved in creation, assert that 'in the beginning' does not refer to creation but to the beginning of the gospel and teach that 'the Word was with God' refers to Christ being taken up to God to receive the truth which he then returned to declare.[6] In any case, other parts of John, I John, Philippians and I Timothy, Hebrews and Colossians all show that Christ was the agent of creation.[7]

Tillotson used his third sermon, a year after the second, to consider the nature and manner of the incarnation.[8] The Son of God was a perfect man consisting of body and soul united. His divinity was not changed into humanity, confused with it or swallowed up by it.[9]

---

1. H. John McLachlan, Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford 1951), pp. 139, 294-5; Burnet 649; Birch I, ccvi; Birch III, 281-381: Sermons XLIII- XLVI; Reedy 88.
2. Birch III, 282.
3. Birch III, 283.
4. Birch III, 289.
5. Birch III, 292-4.
6. Birch III, 306-7.
7. Birch III, 314, 316-20, 324-9.
8. Birch III, 340.
9. Birch III, 341-5 and 347-9.

Tillotson's fourth sermon sought to explain why God used the method of incarnation to redeem humanity.[1] God could have used other means but he accommodated his actions to the people of the time who were interested in mysteries in religion, inclined to worship a visible and tangible deity and seeking a sacrifice to appease an offended god.[2] In Jesus, God provided humanity with a mediator who pleads our cause to the Father and supplies us with the grace we need. Thus our sins are forgiven and our wants supplied. We have 'an expiatory sacrifice for sin upon earth, and ... a prevalent mediator and intercessor with God in heaven'.[3]

These four sermons prove conclusively that Tillotson's views were fully in accordance with those of the Council of Chalcedon that Christ was 'truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body ... the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union....'[4] These sermons did not, however, succeed in their purpose. Thomas Firmin was not convinced of the errors of his Socinianism and he caused an answer to be published in 1694 entitled Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Tillotson encouraged John Williams to write a reply, read the draft and gave it his imprimatur on 7 November 1694, the day before he was taken mortally ill. The work was published in 1695.[5] Tillotson's sermons were, however, to be seen as sufficiently important for them to be translated into French.[6] At the same time another pamphlet was in preparation which also appeared in 1695 entitled The Charge of Socinianism against Dr Tillotson Considered. It was an anonymous, crude and scurrilous piece which made no significant contribution to the academic debate. Hickes, however, recommended it. After Tillotson's death, Alexander Monro, a non-juror, was accused of the authorship, though he denied it. By the next century responsibility was laid at the door of Charles Leslie.[7]

Other Literary Work

Tillotson not only produced writing in the heat of

---

1. Birch III, 358.
2. Birch III, 361-4.
3. Birch III, 366-9.
4. Quoted H. Bettenson (ed.), Documents of the Christian Church (Oxford 1943), p. 73.
5. Birch I, ccviii-ix.
6. Add MS 27,874 ff. 99-173.
7. Birch I, ccix-ccx.

controversy but also sought to write at a more lesiurely pace and to encourage and publish the works of others. In 1691, as he became archbishop, Tillotson was planning a four-volume exposition of Christian theology to be written in Latin, but this was never produced. Nor were his plans for a new Book of Homilies ever realised. He did, however, succeed in completing and publishing Wilkins's Principles and Duties of Natural Religion (1672) and ten years later a volume of Wilkins's sermons. In 1683 he edited Isaac Barrow's works. As archbishop he, with Queen Mary, encouraged Burnet to publish his discourse on pastoral care.[1]

Conclusion

Tillotson's total literary production was considerable, and his controversial writings form a large proportion of that work. His most productive period was between 1661 and 1688. By the 1690s he was showing signs of weariness with the whole exercise. Tillotson's work does not reveal an original thinker who made new contributions to the issues which he discussed. He was, however, a man of great learning, with the ability to synthesise and present complex arguments clearly and comprehensibly. With the exception of the 'Hobbesian' sermon, his work was thoroughly considered and logically expressed. His writings are free from over-elaborate quotations in unfamiliar languages which had once been the fashion. The sermons, while too long to hold the attention of congregations in the twenty-first century, drew large attendances in his own day.

All Tillotson's work reveals a scholarly and courteous man with a sense of humour, and yet one who could defend his firmly-held convictions effectively. In the heat of controversy he wrote without acrimony and with a warm-hearted tolerance of even his most determined adversaries. Although he wrote and published on other matters, it was his anti-Catholic writings that were the most influential at the time. This is not surprising when the current political situation is understood. Tillotson caught the mood of the moment. Without the contemporary fear of Catholicism in England, he might never have been known as anything more than an ordinary conscientious preacher. However, in the circumstances, it was he, with his colleagues, who provided the English protestants of his day with a comprehensible intellectual and theological justification for their religious and political opposition to Catholicism.

---

1. Birch I, lxviii, lxxii, clxxxvii-ix, ccli-ii, cclv-vii.

Chapter 3: Peacemaking

Introduction

The creation of a comprehensive Anglican Church which would unite all protestant groups and thus provide an effective bulwark against Catholicism was one of Tillotson's priorities for most of his ministry. His eventual failure was a bitter disappointment.

Tillotson believed that the differences between Anglicans and dissenters were so trivial as to be unimportant.[1] Because both acknowledged one God, became his children through faith in Christ, were members of one body, partook of the same Spirit and shared in the same hope, surely they should live in unity.[2] With goodwill on both sides the disagreements could be removed.[3] The failure of protestants to be united, he believed, had allowed Catholicism to take advantage.[4] The only sure defence against popery was 'an established national religion, firmly united and compacted in all parts of it'. This was something that 'separate sects and separate congregations' could never provide'.[5]

Though tolerant of views from which he differed and willing to concede that salvation could be achieved even through the Church of Rome, Tillotson did not advocate religious toleration. That would simply have perpetuated the fragmentation of protestantism and thus failed to create an effective challenge to popery. In any case, the concept of toleration was generally far too radical for Tillotson's time. Indeed, in England when it was attempted by Charles II and James II it was viewed with suspicion as simply an attempt to help Catholics. For Tillotson, therefore, the Toleration Act of 1689 was a disaster since it perpetuated and thereby encouraged division. Tillotson persisted nevertheless with his comprehension plans but eventually had to accept that his labours were in vain.

The origins of Tillotson's compromising outlook are to be found in his studies at Cambridge. It was there that his theological views underwent a radical change. He abandoned the strict puritanism of his youth with its emphasis on scripture

---

1. Birch II, 233-54: Sermon XX.
2. Birch II, 247.
3. Birch II, 250-1.
4. Birch II, 248-9
5. Birch II, 250.

alone as the source of truth and predestination alone as the way to salvation. Instead, he accepted that reason had a part to play in theological enquiry, rejected predestination and adopted a tolerant attitude to the convictions of others. This conversion sprang negatively from his personal dissatisfaction with the narrowness of puritan teaching and positively from his own reading and from the intellectual atmosphere of Cambridge. A powerful influence on Tillotson was William Chillingworth's The Religion of the Protestants: A Safe Way to Salvation.[1] Chillingworth had argued that, as there was no infallible way to complete truth, no specific doctrines were necessary for salvation. People must apply their reason. Scripture contains all that is necessary for salvation, but it is the vehicle of divine revelation and not that revelation itself. Differing interpretations were, therefore, tolerable. Predestination was to be rejected because it worked against individual responsibility. The church must incorporate a great breadth of opinion and, at all costs, preserve intellectual freedom.[2]

In addition to the works of Chillingworth, Tillotson's views were affected by his friendship with the Cambridge Platonists like Ralph Cudworth, Benjamin Whichcote, Henry Moore, George Rust and John Worthington.[3] Their search for the roots of Christianity was based on scripture interpreted with reason and commonsense and aimed at a consensus that would enable the protestant churches at least to unite.[4]

Challenges to predestination had begun to appear in Cambridge and elsewhere long before Tillotson's time.[5] Predestination is clear in the Elizabethan Thirty Nine Articles, though the baptismal and communion rites of the Book of Common Prayer imply a less rigid approach. Both before and after the works of Arminius were published,[6] scholars in Cambridge were attacking the doctrine.

---

1. Oxford 1638; Funeral Sermon 10-11; William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, (New York 1951), pp. 238-42.
2. R.R. Orr, Reason and Authority: The Thought of William Chillingworth, (Oxford 1967), pp. 56, 62-4, 69, 79, 82-3, 85, 88, 93, 100, 128, 132.
3. Birch I, iv-v.
4. Rosalie L. Colie, Light and Enlightenment: A Study of the Cambridge Platonists and Dutch Arminians, (Cambridge 1957), pp. 2-5, cited Colie.
5. Colie 22.
6. Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640, (Oxford 1987), pp. 1-6 and 29-39; Colie 22-3 and 38.

The intellectual environment in which Tillotson both studied and taught converted this Yorkshire puritan to what his opponents condemned as 'latitudinarianism'. Because of this change Tillotson, with others of his convictions, was able to discuss comprehension charitably, calmly and respectfully with other protestant groups. Because of his tolerant views never during his lifetime did he lose his sympathy for the puritanism in which he had been nurtured nor for its leaders who were his friends.

The 1660s

At the Restoration there was considerable hope that a united protestant church might emerge. There were both Anglicans and Presbyterians who supported this on the practical grounds that it would avoid the continuation of a host of sects and the likely enervating struggles for ascendancy amongst them.[1] There were, however, less compromising attitudes. Roman Catholics and Independents sought toleration, and even the Presbyterians wanted concessions on 'ceremonies' and episcopal power, which some Anglicans would not concede. Healing the religious wounds did not prove as easy as restoring the monarchy.[2]

Charles II's attitude before the Restoration as expressed in the Declaration of Breda was to support toleration rather than comprehension.[3] After 1660, however, he developed a policy aimed at reconciling the protestant groups.[4] Within three weeks of Charles setting foot on English soil Tillotson showed his approval of what was to become the new royal policy.[5]

Charles's Worcester House Declaration of 25 October 1660 initiated his policy of comprehension. He promised a committee of Anglicans and Presbyterians to review the Prayer Book, a

---

1. R. Thomas, 'Comprehension and Indulgence' in G.F.Nuttall and O. Chadwick, From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962, (London 1962), p. 191, cited Thomas.
2. Spurr 31; John Spurr, 'Religion in Restoration England' in Lionel K.J.Glassey (ed.), The Reigns of Charles II and James VII and II, (1992), p. 90, cited Spurr Restoration.
3. EHD 57-8, Doc. 1.
4. I.M. Green, The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663, (Oxford 1978), pp. 25-6, cited Green; M. Ashley, Charles II: The Man and the Statesman, (St Albans 1973), p. 14, cited Ashley; Spurr 30-5.
5. See above p.17.

national synod to discuss 'ceremonies' and a modified form of episcopacy.[1] However, Charles's anger when attempts were made in parliament to have the declaration enshrined in law and his supporters' success in frustrating them led to speculation that rather than seeking comprehension Charles was biding his time until he could defeat the Presbyterians. Given the generally compromising trend of Charles's policy the speculation was probably unfounded.[2] The Declaration is, therefore, more accurately judged as a serious attempt to achieve comprehension, and Charles's attitude to the bill as simply an attempt at such a delicate stage of negotiations to keep his options open.[3]

Charles's ecclesiastical appointments during this period supported the view that his policy was aimed at compromise. To please staunch Anglicans, ejected ministers were restored and determined episcopalians like Morley, Cosin and Henchman were made bishops. On the other hand, many parish clergy appointed during the interregnum and who had conformed to its ecclesiastical traditions were confirmed in their positions. Bishoprics, deaneries and royal chaplaincies were offered to Presbyterians.[4]

However, Charles's policy of compromise was not to survive. The more extreme puritans were mobilising support in all three kingdoms to resist episcopacy in any form. There were fears that the puritans might indeed attempt to overthrow the restoration. These fears had real foundations. In December 1660 a former Cromwellian soldier revealed a plot to murder Monck and march on Whitehall. In January 1661 Venner and his Fifth Monarchy Men threw London into panic as they sought to set up the reign of King Jesus. Thus developed the view that puritans were politically dangerous.[5] On the other hand, zealous Anglicans and cavaliers were beginning to demand a return to the full Anglican system. The advisers that Charles had inherited from his father like Clarendon, Ormonde and Nicholas, and new ones such as Southampton, were all convinced of the need for a strong episcopal system of church government. At the same time the Church of England was steadily recovering its position in the counties, cathedral

---

1. EHD 365-70: Doc. 134; Green 30; Spurr 34-5.
2. R.S. Bosher, Tha Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, (New York 1951), p. 217; John Miller, Restoration England: The Reign of Charles II, (1985), pp. 28-9, cited Miller; Spurr 35-6.
3. Thomas 192; Miller 29-30.
4. Green 39, 52-3, 59, 83-4; Jones 146.
5. Spurr 38.

cities and parishes.[1] In this atmosphere it is hardly surprising that the elections of January and February 1661 produced a fiercely royalist and Anglican parliament. It was this Cavalier Parliament by the Clarendon Code that was to outlaw all but Anglican practice and thus to ruin Charles's liberal policy.

Nevertheless, true to his word given at Worcester House, Charles summoned the Savoy Conference for 15 April 1661. It was to discuss changes in the Prayer Book and to report within four months. At first consultation was only in writing, during which it emerged that the Anglicans were opposed to any but minor changes, whereas Richard Baxter drafted a completely new liturgy. A conference was convened, and Tillotson went in with Baxter as an auditor.[2] Gunning, Tillotson's predecessor as fellow of Clare, led the Anglican delegation. The conference collapsed with nothing agreed because of the intransigence of Gunning and Baxter.[3] The conference proved to have done more harm than good because opinions subsequently became more entrenched. After his comment of the previous summer Tillotson must have been bitterly disappointed, but at least he had been made brutally aware of the difficulties.

As the Savoy Conference was in session, the coronation took place, the new parliament assembled and convocation gathered.[4] The Cavalier Parliament thwarted the hopes for a united church by enacting the Act of Uniformity, which enforced the use of the revised Prayer Book and so produced on St Bartholomew's Day 1662 an exodus of ministers from the church. Thus "the religious settlement turned the formerly comprehensive English church into a persecuting one and divided the nation in two". Dissent, amounting to between 4 per cent. and 10 per cent. of the population, became a permanent feature of English church life. It did not create two denominations but two categories of Christians. Its effect was mainly felt by ministers. Both parish churches and dissenting meetings were open to all, and both were attended by episcopalians and non-episcopalians. The establishment, for all its internal differences, however, remained united around episcopacy, of

---

1. Green 10-17 and 143; Thomas 194; Spurr 36-8.
2. R. Baxter, Reliquae Baxterianae, (1696), part II, p. 337, para. 194.
3. Burnet 122-4; E. Cardwell, History of Conferences and other Proceedings Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690, (Oxford 1840), chapters VI-VIII; Spurr 38-9.
4. Spurr 39.

which various interpretations were tolerated.[1]

Comprehension, 1662-73

For different reasons, neither Charles nor Tillotson accepted the Act of Uniformity as the final word on the religious issue. Tillotson conformed to the Anglican establishment but he remained concerned both for his former associates who did not and for his ideal of a united church. Richard Baxter was usure and felt there should be discussion about the relative merits of comprehension and indulgence. The Independents feared that comprehension would so reduce nonconformist numbers that they would be excluded and suppressed.[2] Charles had a variety of concerns. On the one hand there was the possibility of the dissenters rebelling but on the other of winning their alliance through a policy of clemency. The latter would bring the added benefit of reducing his dependence on Anglicans for political support. Charles had, therefore, no desire to coerce the dissenters and risk provoking their hostility. His choice lay between comprehension and toleration. Toleration might have seemed preferable as it would also have enabled him to relieve the Catholics.

For eleven years after 1662 Charles took the initiative. On 26 December 1662, he produced a declaration in which he regretted that his promise of 'liberty to tender consciences' given at Breda had not been fulfilled and that the Act of Uniformity had 'added straighter fetters than ever, and new rocks of scandal to the scrupulous'. He therefore announced his intention to seek from parliament an act that would allow him 'to exercise with a more universal satisfaction that power of dispensing which we conceive to be inherent in us' for peaceable dissenters.[3]

Charles urged the matter on parliament in his speech at the opening of the session in February 1663. His wishes were successfully opposed by Clarendon and Sheldon, who feared that such powers might be used for the benefit of Roman Catholics, and who were concerned that toleration of dissenters would remove episcopal control from significant sections of the community. Concern was also expressed that royal dispensing power even in matters of religion was unconstitutional, and

---

1. Joan Thirsk, The Restoration, (1976), p. xvi. 2. Spurr Restoration 92, 104, 110.
3. EHD 371-4: Doc. 135.

that the desire for it might appear to be a symptom of absoutist ambitions on Charles's part. The king's initiative had been too bold. A more moderate suggestion might have won greater parliamentary support and, as a result, agreement to some measure of toleration.[1] Instead of becoming more tolerant, the Cavalier Parliament continued to enact further repressive measures until the Clarendon Code was complete. In vain the Catholic earl of Bristol introduced a bill to allow the king to alleviate nonconformist sufferings and to permit their worship on payment of an annual fee to the crown.[2] The dissenters did, however, gain one concession: there was nothing to prevent them from worshipping together at home provided that, in addition to the family, there were fewer than four people.[3]

Throughout this period, Tillotson was in regular communication with dissenters. He was considered a moderate episcopalian along with Wilkins, Whichcote and Stillingfleet. He had regular private conversations with William Bates, who had been ejected in 1662 from St Dunstan's in the West. He was consulted by Gilbert Burnet, who had not yet made up his mind about episcopacy and was discussing the issue with the moderate episcopalians as well as Presbyterians like Baxter and Manton. Baxter heard Tillotson preach and certainly approved.[4]

The fall of Clarendon in 1667 and the emergence of the Cabal opened the way for a new religious initiative. In the choice of his five senior ministers Charles was clearly seeking to break the Anglican domination of the leading posts in government: Clifford and Arlington were Roman Catholics, Ashley-Cooper and Lauderdale were Presbyterians, and Buckingham may be described as a free-thinker with dissenting sympathies. To emphasise the point Sheldon was banished from court, and Charles renewed contact with dissenters.[5]

---

1. Ashley 127, Jones 206, Miller 45, D.T. Witcombe, Charles II and the Cavalier House of Commons, 1663-1674, (Mancheter 1966), pp. 8-11; B. Coward, The Stuart Age, (1980), pp. 251-2, cied Coward.
2. W.G.Simon, The Restoration Episcopate, (New York 1965), pp. 96-7, cited Simon.
3. EHD 384, Doc. 139: Clause I, Second Conventicle Act, 1670.
4. Kennett 917; Bodleian Add. MS. D4, ff. 198-9; Harleian MS. 6584, ff. 25-6; Burnet's Life 38; Baxter vol. II, 437 f. 433; N.H.Keeble (ed.), The Autobiography of Richard Baxter, (1974), pp. 189-90.
5. R.A.Beddard, 'The Restored Church' in J.R.Jones (ed.), The Restored Monarchy, 1660-1688, (1979), p. 168, cited Beddard.

With the tacit support of the king, in October 1667 Robert Atkyns, lord chief baron of the exchequer and Tillotson's patron at Lincoln's Inn, produced a comprehension bill. Indeed, this was the first time that 'comprehension' had been used in this sense. The hope was that moderate nonconformist clergy, often labelled Presbyterians, who had no objection to the parish church and a national church could be brought into the Anglican establishment. However, while lay nonconformists could have been satisfied with a revision of the liturgy, the ministers were more concerned about the Act of Uniformity with its insistence on the Prayer Book, Articles, episcopal ordination and the renunciation of the Solemn League and Covenant.[1] The Comprehension Bill of 1667 sought to address some of these issues. It was supported by Bishop Nicholson of Gloucester and Bishop Barlow of Lincoln. The plan was that all ministers over the age of twenty-three who were in episcopal or presbyterian orders and could give an account of their faith in Latin and subscribe to thirty-six specified Articles from the Thirty Nine should be allowed to preach in any church where the Prayer Book was used before the sermon. There was to be no compulsion over ceremonies.[2]

There was strong opposition to the measure, but even some conservatives felt that some concessions could be made. A series of meetings was held between Anglicans and dissenters. John Wilkins and Hezekiah Burton representing the former and William Bates and Richard Baxter the latter. There was a genuine spirit of compromise, but the major stumblingblocks were the formula for admitting Presbyterian ministers into the church and the strong desire of the Independents for toleration.[3]

However, the parliamentary session was allowed to expire in December 1667 before the bill had been introduced. In the following year a new bill was drafted by John Wilkins and Thomas Manton and was sponsored by Orlando Bridgeman, Lord Keeper, Matthew Hale, the new Lord Chief Baron, the Earl of Manchester and the Duke of Buckingham. Tillotson and Stillingfleet are known to have supported Bridgeman.[4] Nine bishops pledged their support. On 10 January 1668 Wilkins spent two hours with Charles II and won royal approval. The final

---

1. J. Spurr, 'The Church of England, Comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689', in English Historical Review, CIV, 413, October 1989, pp. 929-930, cited Spurr Comprehension.
2. Thomas 195-7.
3. Thomas 198-200.
4. Birch I, xxviii-ix; Maurice Lee Junior, The Cabal, (Urbana 1965), pp. 175-6.

terms that were agreed involved the imposition of hands by a bishop to give authority to preach and administer the sacrament in Anglican congregations. No renunciation of earlier ordinations was to be implied, no compulsion over ceremonies to be exerted and the Prayer Book was to be reviewed. With the exception of Roman Catholics, toleration would be offered for a maximum of three years to all who found the scheme unacceptable. Sir Matthew Hale drew up the final version of the bill, and all went well until Wilkins accidentally ruined it. He sent a copy to Bishop Seth Ward of Salisbury who, unknown to Wilkins, was hostile to the measure. Ward organised the high church opposition. When parliament opened on 10 February 1668 the king showed his support but, in sharp contrast, the commons voted for the strict application of the Act of Uniformity and warned against the introduction of the bill. The measure was not, therefoe, presented to parliament, but Charles II urged parliament to find ways of composing religious differences. This and the passing of the Second Conventicle Act in 1670 put an end for the time being to all parliamentary attempts to reunite protestant Christians.[1] Even had the comprehension bill been passed there could, of course, be no guarantee that all Anglicans would recognise dissenting ministers brought in under its terms.[2]

The failure of the Comprehension Bill did not, however, put an end to attempts at religious compromise. Despite his defeat, Charles persisted in supporting the moderate men in the Church of England and appointed Wilkins bishop of Chester. The consecration took place in London at Ely House on 15 November 1668, and Tillotson preached. In 1669 James, duke of York, publicly announced his acceptance of Catholic teaching and ceased to receive the sacrament from Anglican hands. Though he was not to be received into the Catholic Church until 1672, his action served to focus protestant minds. In the summer of 1670 Baxter sought new talks to heal the divisions. Baxter, with the knowledge of Lauderdale, suggested that the bishops of Norwich and Chester should meet two dissenters to formulate proposals for peace. When these four had completed their work, others should join them to complete the document, and these should include men like Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Whichcote and More.[3] At the same time in Scotland Robert Leighton was trying

---

1. Simon 160-170; Paul F. Bradshaw, The Anglican Ordinal, (1971), pp. 96-98; G.R. Cragg, Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660-1688, (Cambridge 1957), pp. 15-18, cited Cragg; Thomas 201-3; Spurr Comprehension 933-4.
2. Paul F. Bradshaw, loc. cit.
3. Miller 58-59; Baxter 75-8;

to marry episcopacy to presbyterian synodical government.[1]

Hopes of an amicable settlement of the religious tensions were, therefore, still alive on both sides of the border. However, dissenting views seemed to be hardening, and clear divisions appearing. Manton, Bates and Baxter, nicknamed 'Dons' by Sir Joseph Williamson, Arlington's assistant, wanted comprehension and so to prevent benefits to Roman Catholics. Williamson's 'Ducklimgs', such as Samuel Annesley and the Independents wanted toleration.[2]

It was Charles who was to make the next move, provoked by the domestic and foreign situation. In England there was increasing concern at the growth of Catholicism at court. James's change of faith raised the spectre of a Catholic succession since Charles had no legitimate children. James, with Clifford of the Cabal, even pressed Charles to convert. Clifford knew that Charles had promised Louis XIV in the religious clauses of the Secret Treaty of Dover of 1670 to announce his conversion when the time seemed propitious. Charles, aware of the furore that this would cause, especially as he was wrestling with a parliament that was witholding grants of money, did not respond. However, on 15 March 1672, during the prorogation of 1671-3, Charles, to make some gesture, issued a Declaration of Indulgence, which suspended the penal laws against Roman Catholics and dissenters. The former could only worship in their own homes but the latter in buildings licensed for that purpose.[3] Charles was thus seeking to further the cause of toleration rather than comprehension because only the former could help Roman Catholics. The Dons nevertheless and the Ducklings thanked the king, and nonconformists rushed for licences. All of Charles's ministers approved of the Declaration, though for different reasons. Some 1,500 licences were issued. Uproar resulted, however, since some recognised the declaration as a ploy simply to help Catholics and others questioned Charles's constitutional right to issue such a document. There even seemed a possibility of an alliance between the bishops and the Presbyterians to counter the Roman threat. The clergy preached anti-Catholic sermons and were encouraged to do so by the bishops, who had agreed to do this at a nocturnal conference at Lambeth.[4] Tillotson needed no encouragement and preached on The

---

1. N.Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter, (Cambridge 1957), pp. 135-7.
2. Thomas 208.
3. Beddard 169; Spurr Comprehension 935.
4. Thomas 2-7-310; Simon 180-181; Spurr Restoration 93; Miller 63.

Hazard of Being Saved in the Church of Rome.[1] The Declaration was doomed. The outbreak of the Dutch War in 1672 and Charles's consequent financial problems forced him to acquiesce to parliament's demand when it reassembled, and he withdrew the document on 8 March 1673, angrily tearing off the Great Seal with his own hand. Parliament then completed the king's humiliation by forcing upon him the Test Act, which restricted all office holding to communicant Anglicans. Charles never again sought to modify the restoration church settlement.[2]

The chief difficulty in improving relationships within English protestantism between 1660 and 1673 was the lack of a clear aim. The choice was between the toleration of dissent and its comprehension. At first Charles had favoured toleration but then supported comprehension and finally returned to toleration, on the grounds that it would be the best way to help Catholics, which he was under pressure to do. Independents and Catholics, of course, shared his final view. The Cavalier Parliament rejected such toleration for the same reason that the king supported it but also rejected comprehension if it meant departing from the Act of Uniformity.

Support for comprehension came from moderate Presbyterians like Baxter and a significant number of bishops and clergy. Tillotson was in the outer, rather than the inner, circle of this group. He conversed with dissenters, supported Bridgeman over the comprehension bill and was to have joined the discussions of 1670 once the foundation of the scheme had been laid. There was no reason for Tillotson to have been accorded a more central role. He was a well-known and popular as a fashionable London preacher but held no high office. He was merely lecturer at St Lawrence Jewry, preacher at Lincoln's Inn and eventually a royal chaplain. However, his promotion to the deanery of Canterbury while the uproar over the Declaration of Indulgence was at its height was to bring him in the future closer to the centre of affairs.[3] By 1673 the dangers of a fragmented church in the face of Catholicism and France must have been obvious to him. Alliances amongst churches were likely to be weak and temporary. What was needed was one united comprehensive church, and for that Tillotson was prepared to strive. Unfortunately, for Tillotson, opinion was beginning to move from the idea of comprehension towards indulgence and the legal acceptance of dissent.[4]

---

1. See above p. 45.
2. Beddard 169-70; Thomas 211-12; EHD 387-8 Document 140.
3. See above pp. 20-5.
4. Spurr Comprehension 945.

1673-1675

From 1662 to 1673 Charles had made uncharacteristically strenuous efforts to relieve the burdens laid upon dissenters by the Clarendon Code. The rejection of his Declaration of Indulgence and the passing of the Test Act convinced him that parliamentary intransigence would always frustrate his wishes, and he abandoned his leadership of the struggle. Others were not, however, so faint-hearted. In the midst of all the clamour against the declaration and on behalf of the Test Act, on 27 February 1673 a 'Bill for the Ease of His Majesty's Protestant Subjects, Dissenters from the Church of England' was introduced into the Commons. It passed the lower house, but the Lords' amendments proved unacceptable to the Commons, particularly one which would have enabled the king to grant indulgence to dissenters. Parliament had only recently denied the king this right on constitutional grounds and also feared he might use it to help Catholics. The adjournment of parliament in effect destroyed the measure as it was never revived afterwards.

In the country, confusion reigned. Dissenting ministers and congregations still held licences granted by the king as a result of the declaration, and no decision had been taken about their validity. In some areas the Conventicle Act was being enforced. However, the fact that a bill had been introduced and made some progress suggests that the Commons was becoming more tolerant. Keith Feiling recognised this and attributed it to a number of developments. The older cavaliers who had suffered sequestration during the Interregnum had now gone, there was pressure for toleration from the highest quarter, in the church a broad school had emerged including men like Tillotson and Stillingfleet, there was a growth of scientific detachment of mind, and, in any case, lack of resources made the full execution of the penal laws impossible. He could have added the growing desire to rally the whole of protestantism against the Catholic menace, which seemed to be more serious because of the French alliance.[1]

Despite this very recent failure, there were Anglicans who felt that a new initiative was needed. The Earl of Orrery in 1673 sought from Baxter a list of terms that would satisfy nonconformists and unite all protestants against popery. Baxter complied and expressed the opinion that Tillotson,

---

1. Cardwell chapter IX; J. Stoughton, Ecclesiastical History of England: The Church of the Restoration, (1870), vol. I, pp. 435-6; Thomas 212-3; Cragg 21; Haley 325-6; Feiling 132.

Stillingfleet and similar Anglicans would agree with its contents if they could meet.[1] The terms were returned to Baxter with adverse comments by George Morley, bishop of Worcester. Baxter, however, still persisted that if the proposals were put to ministers like Tillotson, Whichcote and Stillingfleet much could be achieved.[2]

Though hostile to Baxter's proposals, Morley was, nevertheless, eager for protestant unity against Rome. He, therefore, produced a comprehension bill in 1674 entitled 'An Act for Composing Differences in Religion and Inviting Sober and Peaceably Minded Dissenters into the Service of the Church'. This bill was lost after the second reading because of a prorogation. Baxter was not sorry, however, as he saw the measure as a 'cunning snare' and of no benefit.[3]

The struggle to settle the religious issue continued. In October 1674 a group of bishops met the king and agreed to produce their views. In the meantime, James duke of York, under the impression that the dissenters were potentially politically influential, was courting their support. He promised to persuade Charles to dissolve parliament, hoping thereby to obtain a more tolerant one that would prepare the way for a new Declaration of Indulgence. In exchange, the dissenters would cease their anti-popery activities. The Earl of Danby, who was gradually rising as the king's chief adviser as the Cabal declined, counselled caution: Charles, he suggested, should await the bishops' views. The bishops speedily and uncompromisingly responded. They asked for the penal laws to be executed and for dissenters to be told that their licences had been revoked. In February 1675 Charles concurred.[4]

As the new parliamentary session approached, further steps were taken which at last brought Tillotson to the centre of affairs. Morley and Ward, episcopal advisers to the king, asked Tillotson and Stillingfleet to try to come to terms with the Presbyterians. The two deans, therefore, sought a meeting with William Bates, Thomas Manton, Matthew Pool and Richard Baxter. They first met Baxter alone, and discussion centred on Baxter's 'form of an healing Act'. Eventually a modified version, bearing signs of the work of Lord Chief Justice Matthew Hale and possibly of Tillotson, found general agreement with the nonconformist leaders. Ward, however, rejected the

---

1. Thomas 215; Baxter Part III, 110.
2. Baxter Part II, 131.
3. Thomas 216.
4. Thomas 217-9.

document and, had he not have been out of town, Morley would doubtless have done the same.[1]

Undeterred, and with an eye to some form of future agreement, Baxter was then eager to make public such measure of success as had been reached in the recent negotiations. Tillotson, however, was reticent. He had been in conversation with Ward, who wanted to keep the matter private, and, more importantly, he had become convinced that several points were unattainable. He was, therefore, unwilling to be associated with Baxter's measure which, since it lacked both royal and episcopal support, was bound to fail in parliament. Tillotson, however, reaffirmed his commitment to comprehension but concluded that to continue to support the unsuccessful measure would 'be a prejudice to me and signify nothing to effect the thing'.[2]

Tillotson's behaviour here is open to serious criticism. His reluctance to have any further association with Baxter's scheme seems hypocritical. He supported both its aims and its contents but was unwilling to risk the cost to himself of its possible failure. In the event of disaster, his credibility as an Anglican who understood the mood of his church, as a sympathiser with dissenters and as a serious negotiator would, of course, have been compromised. However, perhaps Tillotson was simply being cautiously practical. The scheme had strong opposition, and persisting in a futile struggle could have done nothing to promote the cause. For Tillotson to have persevered with an inevitable failure would have caused him to have been condemned as an incompetent and thus reduced his usefulness to more feasible comprehension schemes in the future. The new dean might, of course, have been simply considering his career prospects.

The failure of the comprehension discussions emphasised Anglican divisions on this issue and drove the Presbyterians into thinking that there was no hope of reconciliation. Therefore, in London, negotiations began to try to achieve unity between Independents and Presbyterians, though in some quarters the emphasis even here was on toleration rather than comprehension.[3] Thus the aim to create a united protestant church was in jeopardy and, even worse, there was now the possibility of a united dissenting church emerging as a

---

1. Birch I, xxix; Kennett III, 302; Thomas 219-20; Spurr Comprehension 936.
2. Baxter Part III, 175-6 and 285-8; Birch I, xxix-xxx; Cardwell 396-7; Kennett III, 302; Thomas 220.
3. Thomas 221.

dangerous rival to the establishment. Only France and popery could benefit.

Not discouraged by the recent failure and following the appearance of renewed calls for toleration, Buckingham later in 1675 promoted an indulgence bill in the Lords. He obtained leave to introduce it, but no more was heard of it. By then royal policy had changed: Charles and Danby would henceforth support the Church of England and ignore the rest. At the same time pressure on dissenters was increasing as a result of episcopal requests that anti-dissenting legislation should be enforced. As long as Danby remained in office, there was no hope either of comprehension or of indulgence.[1]

Royal failure between 1662 and 1673 to produce an accommodation between the establishment and dissent had been followed by a similar failure of individual efforts. Episcopal opinion was generally hostile. Charles under Danby's influence had become unenthusiastic. Tillotson, however, was much more concerned. His behaviour in 1675 was questionable, but his commitment to comprehension was not in doubt. He was now at the centre of the discussion and used by the politicians as an intermediary with the Presbyterians. He had the confidence of all sides throughout, and this enabled him later, when the atmosphere became more auspicious, to shoulder again the burden of reconciliation.

1678-1681

It was not until 1679 that the issue of protestant unity reappeared. Between 1678 and 1681 a wave of anti-Catholic feeling swept the country as a result of the revelation of the so-called Popish Plot.[2] Tillotson's reaction was to redouble his efforts to preach and write against Catholicism.[3] He also renewed his call for the creation of a united protestant church in his sermon of 3 December 1678 at the first general meeting of Yorkshire gentlemen living in the London area. It was here that he advocated most strongly the abandonment of trivial differences and the formation of a united front against Rome.[4] The sermon did not please everyone, and Tillotson was summoned before Archbishop Sancroft for having stated that dissenters

---

1. Thomas 222; Coward 253.
2. J.P. Kenyon, op.,cit.; J.R.Jones, The Revolution of 1688 in England (1972), chapter 14; M. Mullette, James II and English Politics, 1678-1688, (1994), chapters 2 - 3; Ogg VI, 1-2.
3. See above pp. 45-9.
4. Birch II, 253-4, Sermon XX; see above p.58.

might have 'plausible exceptions' to elements within the church. When asked for an example, Tillotson cited the burial service and Sancroft reluctantly agreed.[1]

In the following year an anonymous writer followed up Tillotson's sermon and asserted that in the face of the storm the sheep should return to the fold rather than quarrel with the shepherd.[2] The church imposed nothing that was not derived from scripture. Tillotson had declared, the author claimed, that the Anglican was the best constituted church in the world.[3] However, seeking to adapt the church to please dissenters could 'deform the Church and unhinge the government' and also alienate those Roman Catholics who had become Anglicans. This was worse than temporary toleration.[4] Tillotson, said the author, believed that small things should not be overstressed, but he had also said that it was not for individuals to undertake such matters.[5] This writer, unlike Tillotson, was eager for absorption rather than compromise.

During the First Exclusion Parliament of 1679, the Whigs took up the cause of nonconformity.Some believed in toleration as a matter of principle,others,however,were simply concerned to maintain nonconformist support for exclusion.[6] A bill, which was toleration rather than a comprehension measure, was introduced to grant nonconformists freedom from the penal laws on condition that they declared themselves hostile to Catholicism in the terms laid down in the Test Act of 1678. The bill was lost at the prorogation of 27 May.[7]

Undeterred, Richard Janeway produced a list of terms that he felt Anglicans might grant and dissenters accept 'for peace sake' and to create unity against popery.[8] He felt that the Prayer Book should be used on Sundays but that indifferent ceremonies should be left to the ministers' and people's

---

1. Birch I, ccxxxiii and cclxxviii and II, 251.
2. [?], Late Proposal, ([?] 1679), p. 2, cited Late Proposal.
3. Late Proposal 3 and 9.
4. Late Proposal 11.
5. Late Proposal 12.
6. Geoffrey Holmes, The Making of A Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722, (1993), p. 126; Tim Harris, Politics Under the Later Stuarts, (1993), pp. 93-4, cited Tim Harris.
7. H. Horwitz, 'Protestant Reconciliation in the Exclusion Crisis' in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 14, 1964, p. 203, cited Horwitz.
8. R. Janeway, A Specimen of a Bill for Uniting the Protestants, [? 1680-1], p.1, cited Janeway.

consciences. Ministers not in episcopal orders should have hands laid on them by a bishop to admit them to a new charge. The minister would rule his flock but would have to accept the authority of the bishop. He would also swear the oath of non-resistance. Anyone who entered the church on these terms would be admitted to any preferment. Pluralists would surrender their surplus livings to enable dissenters to find posts. Ministers who could not even then accept the church would be free from persecution for seven years, after which a toleration measure would be enacted.[1]

When the Second Exclusion Parliament assembled on 21 October 1680 both houses were eager for protestant reconciliation. Five bills emerged. Halifax reintroduced the bill of 1673 into the Lords, and it was passed on 10 November. In the meantime the Lords sought to prevent the execution against nonconformists of those statutes which were really only intended to apply to Catholics. The Commons voted against the abuse of the recusancy laws. Sir Edward Dering commended to the Commons the drafting of a bill to unite Charles's protestant subjects, and the work was begun by Daniel Finch, son of Lord Chancellor Finch, one of Tillotson's patrons.[2]

During all this parliamentary activity, William Lloyd, bishop of St Asaph had got in touch with John Howe, a Presbyterian minister, about reconciliation. On 14 November they met at Tillotson's house. There Lloyd asked what terms the nonconformists would want before returning to the church. Howe, speaking only for himself, said that new laws would be needed to allow ministers to reform their parishes. They agreed to meet again at 7 p.m. the following evening at Stillingfleet's. Howe with Bates attended but, although they waited until 10 p.m., Lloyd failed to appear. They learnt later that while they were waiting the Lords had rejected the Second Exclusion Bill.[3]

In the lower house, however, more progress was being made. It was agreed that two bills should be introduced: one to comprehend dissenters and the other to grant toleration to those who remained outside. The bills progressed to the committee stage but were lost when, on 18 January 1681, Charles dissolved parliament. Tillotson felt that the measures pleased neither side: the bishops thought that too many concessions were being made and the dissenters too few. He believed that

---

1. Janeway 2-4.
2. Horwitz 204-6; see above p. 24; Spurr Comprehension 936-7.
3. Horwitz 206-7; Thomas 225-7.

progress would be made until minds were calmer.[1] A bill to distinguish protestant nonconformists from Roman Catholic recusants had, however, completed all its stages in parliament, but when it was presented to Charles for the royal assent it was removed from the table by the clerk, presumably at the king's insistence. It was never heard of again.[2]

During the brief Oxford Parliament of 21 to 28 March 1681 attempts were made to revive the comprehension and toleration issues, but all collapsed when Charles dissolved the assembly. Tillotson was disappointed that nothing had been achieved and felt that differing ideas about what should be done had resulted in nothing being done.[3] The vigorous enforcement of the laws against nonconformists which followed suggested a gloomy future for comprehension.[4]

This attempt to unite all English protestants into one church had, like its predecessors, failed. However, the proposals were revived in 1689 and formed the basis of the Toleration Act and Comprehension Bill. The Popish Plot and the Exclusion Contest provided the conditions that won the support of the politicians for a united force to provide a defence against popery. Tillotson had provided the lead in his sermon to the Yorkshire gentry, he played host to the meeting between Howe and Lloyd and commented on the outcome. He did not, however, play any discoverable part in the proceedings. He did, of course, have plenty of other work as dean, preacher and writer, but a healthy political caution was not out of place in the circumstances. The main lines of argument and the possible ways forward had, in any case, become well known long before.

1685-1690

The accession of James II strengthened in Tillotson, as in many others, the fear of a restoration of Catholicism and of the possibility of the establishment of a Roman Catholic dynasty. James, while promising to maintain the existing church government, soon aroused suspicions. His refusal to

---

1. Birch I, lv-lvi; Birch MS 4236 ff. 227-8.
2. Horwitz 207-14; Edmund Calamy, An Abridgement of Mr Baxter's History of His Life and Times, (1713), pp. 349-52, cited Baxter's History.
3. H.C. Foxcroft, The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., (1898), pp. 245-6, cited Savile.
4. Miller 111.

allow Charles II a public funeral, the omission of the communion at the coronation, his open attendance at mass and attempts to have anti-Catholic preachers silenced, quickly raised tension.[1] In any case James had repeatedly proclaimed his wish to restore Catholicism to England.[2]

James also took various positive steps to promote Catholicism and then on 4 April 1687 he issued his first Declaration of Indulgence. This preserved the clergy of the Church of England in their religion and offices, removed the oaths and test required of government servants and permitted nonconformists to establish places of worship.[3] Reactions varied. The poorer dissenters thanked James, the wealthier ignored the document, and some Anglicans sought to warn dissenters of James's true motives. Halifax wrote his Letter to a Dissenter to encourage nonconformists to make common cause with Anglicans against these Catholicising policies. Tillotson preached before Princess Anne a sermon which was clearly an appeal for loyalty at any price to the Church of England.[4] In 1688 James issued his second declaration which, in essentials, was a repetition of the first, and on 4 May issued an Order in Council requiring it to be read aloud in all churches.[5] This blatant attempt further to benefit Catholics precipitated opposition and the trial of the Seven Bishops, which was followed by the arrival of William of Orange and the Revolution of 1688.[6] Tillotson's political involvement will be discussed in Chapter 5.

James's declarations were opposed by Tillotson. He understood their true purpose. In any case, he was pledged to comprehension rather than toleration, and comprehension was not James's policy, for he had no desire to see protestantism strengthened. The Revolution, however, raised the question of what should be done for dissenters. They had formed a firm alliance with the Anglicans against James and thus helped to effect his removal. At all costs, in their quest for religious freedom, they had to be prevented from even the unlikely possibility of making common cause with Catholics against the

---

1. Paul Seaward, The Restoration: 1660-1688, (1991), pp. 122-3; J.R.Jones, op.cit., p. 51; A.P.Stanley, Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey, (7th edition, 1890), pp. 77-80 and 163-4; Miller 136 and 154.
2. Miller 126.
3. EHD 395-7 Doc. 146.
4. Birch IV, 51-72, Sermon LVII; see below Chapter 5.
5. EHD 83, Doc. 16, 395-7, Doc. 146, 399-400, Doc. 199.
6. See below Chapter 5.

Church of England. Some recognition from the new regime was, therefore, essential but also likely, since William of Orange was a Presbyterian, had promised to try to reconcile Anglicans and dissenters and vowed to eschew the persecution of peaceful citizens.[1] The international situation also necessitated a solid protestant alliance. From 1688 to 1697 the Nine Years War was fought, in which Louis XIV was seen as the aggressor, and into which England was drawn because, firstly, of William's position in the United Provinces and, secondly, of Louis's attempt to strike at William by supporting Jacobitism. On several counts it was, therefore, expedient that the dissenting schism be addressed.

Even before William's arrival discussions had begun. Ten nonconformist ministers had visited the Seven Bishops in the Tower, and preliminary talks had begun. After the acquittal, Sancroft and the London clergy met on several occasions to discuss, yet again, what changes could be made to facilitate the comprehension. On 16 July 1688 Sancroft instructed his bishops to urge their clergy to be civil to dissenters and to seek to persuade them to join the church or, at least, to acknowledge such agreement as existed between them. The clergy, he counselled, should also emphasise their hostility to Rome and call on dissenters to join in prayers for a union of all reformed churches against the common enemy and for the establishment of one communion of perfect peace and unity. Sancroft proceeded to draw up a scheme of reform which bore all the characteristics of a comprehension scheme.[2]

To further this work, a committee was established, in which the archbishop participated, to revise the liturgy. Tillotson was part of this group. Improvements where possible were to be made, and indifferent ceremonies were not to be made binding upon those who had scruples about their use until such time as they should willingly comply. Criticisms of the Prayer Book made by the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference were taken into account. Episcopacy, the committee felt, might not be required of all. Some ceremonies were singled out for omission. Texts were revised, and new services drafted. All this work bore no immediate fruit but proved to be the basis of the changes proposed in 1689.[3]

---

1. Birch 1, cix-xi.
2. T.J. Fawcett, The Liturgy of Comprehension, 1689, (Southend on Sea 1973), p. 18, cited Fawcett; E. Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, (1948), pp. 95-6, cited Tenison; Spurr Comprehension 937-8.
3. Fawcett 20-22.

Once William had arrived at St James's he met a body of dissenting ministers and promised to work for 'a firm union among protestants'. After William and Mary had been made sovereigns, Bates presented a dissenting address urging them to fulfil this promise. They agreed to do their best. Baxter, Bates and Howe met to discuss their terms. Tenison tried to urge Sancroft to action.[1]

In the meantime on 14 January 1689, Tillotson, Lloyd, Patrick, Sharp and Tenison had met at Stillingfleet's deanery to discuss possible Anglican concessions based on a revision of the draft bill of 1680.[2] There followed six meetings of this group with Nottingham, William's secretary of state, who was to introduce the necessary comprehension bill. Ten or eleven headings were produced as a basis.[3] Encouragement came from the dissenters who stated that they accepted the Church of England as a reformed church but were prevented from joining it because parts of the liturgy were contrary to their consciences.[4] Encouragement came also from the House of Lords. The peers in discussing the oaths of allegiance and supremacy rejected the inclusion of the test on the grounds that it would discriminate against protestants rather than Catholics and declared that the best security for church and state would be achieved by a union of protestants.[5] William Sherlock, however, was afraid of the demands that the dissenters would make.[6] Sancroft had also become uneasy fearing that dissension would be caused and the church weakened.[7] Nevertheless, attempts to deal with the dissenters continued.

It was clear, however, that a minority of dissenters could never be reconciled so Nottingham developed a policy which involved comprehension for the majority but toleration for the remainder. He worked with the London clergy, including Tillotson, and on 27 February 1689 introduced two bills into the Lords: one for comprehension and the second for toleration. On 14 March both received the second reading. From this point progress was frustrated. A group of clergy met in the Devil's

---

1. Thomas 244; Howe 142-4; Fawcett 24; Birch I, cxii.
2. Thomas 245; Fawcett 24; Spurr Comprehension 938.
3. Fawcett 24; A.Taylor(ed.), The Works of Simon Patrick, (Oxford 1858), pp. 516-7, cited Taylor; Edward Cardwell, History of Conferences Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690, (3rd ed. Oxford 1849, pp. 402-3, cited Cardwell.
4. Howe 146.
5. Birch I, cxii-iii.
6. W. Sherlock, Letter to a Dissenter, (1689); Thomas 243.
7. Cardwell 404-5.

Tavern in Fleet Street and, fearing that dissenters would dominate the church, pledged themselves to defend the Church of England. William then aroused further alarm by proposing the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. His suggestion was rejected. In committee, the Comprehension Bill was attacked, but it was amended at the report stage and passed the third reading. In the meantime the Commons had been discussing its own comprehension scheme, and a bill came for first reading on 8 April just as the Lords' bill arrived. Neither bill was ever heard of again. Opposition was growing in the Commons to such a measure, and there was a strong desire to leave the matter to a Convocation, which could also take steps to strengthen the church.

Anglican and parliamentary opposition, plus the suspicions of some of the Presbyterians towards the Anglican leaders, had killed the policy of comprehension. Something, however, still needed to be done for dissenters, and toleration was seen as the way forward. At a meeting of one hundred and sixty Tories at the Devil'S Tavern, a possible compromise was evolved. The Whigs would drop the comprehension bills and agree to a session of convocation. The Tories would then support toleration. Following a Commons' petition, William called convocation. Burnet and Halifax were both angry because convocation was likely to wreck all hopes of comprehension as was, probably, the Tory intention.[1] The Anglican Church would thus continue untainted by nonconformity, but the dissenters would be free to practise as they wished. Consequently on 24 May the Toleration Act received the royal assent and gave a considerable measure of freedom to trinitarian protestants.

What had been designed as a measure to deal with a small minority of uncompromising dissenters was now applied to nearly half a million moderates also.[2] The Church of England had thus abandoned any claim to have a monopoly of religion in England, and dissent had been given an unprecedented freedom. The emancipation was by no means total, and the Toleration Act destroyed all possibility of comprehension. Ignoring the wider issues, many dissenters preferred toleration to compromise with the church. Others, however, felt that they could now safely demand even greater concessions if comprehension should ever

---

1. Feiling 264-5; Thomas 245-51; G.V. Bennett, 'Conflict in the Church' in G. Holmes (ed.), Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714, (1969), p. 161. cited Bennett; Tenison 97-8; A. Tindal Hart, William Lloyd, (1952), p. 134, cited Tindal Hart.
2. Bennett 161-2; EHD pp. 400-3 Doc. 151; Birch I, cxiii-iv.

again be suggested. Many Anglicans felt threatened by the licensing of dissenting meeting houses in England and by the recent abolition of episcopacy in Scotland.[1] Tillotson may have played some part in the Scottish affair. It was rumoured that nothing was done there in ecclesiastical matters but by his advice.[2] There is no evidence that he had any similar intentions for England.[3] However, when John Lake, the suspended bishop of Chichester, died on 27 August 1689, he declared that Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Burnet and Lloyd had done more to shake the faith than Hobbes.[4]

Despite the growing hopelessness of the cause, Tillotson was loath to allow comprehension to fail and, finding a ready ally in the king, led yet another attempt but this time using convocation. He believed that a measure might have a chance of success if it was drawn up by a group of clergy and approved by convocation before being presented to parliament. William concurred and on 13 September agreed to establish by letters patent a royal commission of ten bishops and twenty divines to prepare matters for convocation. Five of the chosen bishops had received sees from William. Tillotson was listed among the divines, and his supporters had a slight majority. The commission included fourteen high church members, of whom nine were hostile to any change and five who worked with Tillotson. The dissenters had no voice.[5]

The commissions' task was formidable. It was required to review the liturgy, canons, ecclesiastical courts, and anything that would be conducive 'to the good order, edification, and unity of the Church of England'. The commission was to present its resolutions to convocation for approval, after which parliament would have its say.[6]

In preparation for the commission Tillotson drew up a list of likely concessions. He suggested that ceremonies be left indifferent and that the liturgy should be reformed mainly by omitting lessons from the apocrypha and correcting the translation of the psalms. The only promise to be demanded of ministers should be of loyalty to the doctrines, discipline and

---

1. Fawcett 23 and 25.
2. MS Gibson Papers, vol. 5, p. 73.
3. Thomas Lathbury, A History of the Nonjurors, (1845), pp. 158-9, cited Lathbury.
4. Feiling 302.
5. Clarke and Foxcroft II, 276-7; Fawcett 28-80; Birch I, cxix; John Hunt, Religious Thought in England, (1870-3), vol. II, pp. 281-5.
6. Tenison 98-100; Cardwell 428; Birch I, cxix.

worship of the Church of England. New canons should be made to regulate the behaviour of the clergy and people. The ecclesiastical courts should be reformed, and excommunication reserved to the bishop for exercise only over major issues. Ministers of foreign reformed churches should not need to be re-ordained to serve in the Anglican. All ordinations in England for the Anglican Church should be episcopal. No-one presbyterially ordained need renounce his ordination, but conditional ordination should be available.[1]

Opposition to the commission was voiced by an anonymous pamphleteer, possibly William Jane or William Sherlock. The author was unconvinced of the need for change and feared for the future of the liturgy and of episcopacy. He also felt that any accommodation with dissenters might well lead to further schism. He was suspicious of the commitment to Anglicanism of some members of the commission and was afraid that discussion of the changes would not be allowed in convocation. In that case the commission's quorum of nine would be able to force changes on the whole church.[2]

Tenison produced a reply. The members of the commission were not such as would harm the church, having proved their loyalty during James II's reign. As to the charge that nine would dominate: this was more than had been used to review the liturgy for Elizabeth I, and it was unlikely that only nine, or the same nine, would always be present. The commissioners were determined to improve, not harm, the church. Reform was possible and necessary. High hopes were entertained of winning at least some dissenters.[3]

The commission met between 3 October and 18 November 1689. At the second meeting Bishop Sprat of Rochester, one of the high church party, questioned the legality of the commission. Despite assurances, five of the high churchmen withdrew and

---

1. Birch MS 4236 ff. 19-20 and 317-8; Birch I, cxx; Fawcett 25-6; Paul F. Bradshaw, The Anglican Ordinal, (1971), p. 99.
2. [?], Letter to a Friend Containing some Queries about the New Commission for Making Alterations to the Liturgy, (1689), pp. 1-4; Fawcett 33-4; Thomas Lathbury, A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, (1853), pp. 326-7, cited Convocation.
3. Thomas Tenison,'A Discourse concerning the Ecclesiastical Commission opened in the Jerusalem Chamber, October 1689' included in A Collection of State Tracts Published on Occasion of the Late Revolution in 1688, (1705), vol. I. pp. 657-63, cited State Tracts; Fawcett 34-5.

four never put in an appearance.[1] Out of twenty-two sessions, Tillotson attended fourteen. Ten members had a higher record, but no-one put in a full attendance.[2]

The task of revising the Prayer Book was divided up among the members, whose duty it was to produce a draft for discussion. Some of the work from 1688 was incorporated. In the end sixty per cent of the dissenters' objections of 1661 were remedied. The amendments are mostly in Tenison's writing, but Tillotson's and Patrick's hands, and possibly Burnet's, are recognisable.[3] Lathbury tartly commented: "The commissioners agreed upon so many [alterations] that had they been adopted the Liturgy would have been quite a different thing from what it was previously".[4]

A little is known of Tillotson's part in the proceedings. In the discussion on ordination and the status of those not in episcopal orders, Tillotson simply affirmed that episcopal ordination was necessary when it could be obtained.[5] Tillotson thus held a low view of episcopacy since he clearly believed that orders could in special circumstances be valid without it. He also played a part in work on the collects as it was he who put on them the finishing touches 'by the free and masterly touches of his natural and flowing eloquence'.[6]

The day before the convocation, for which all this preparation had been made, N.L. probably Gilbert Burnet, published a pamphlet in support of change.[7] The author urged that even if dissenters did not respond, the changes would benefit the church, but emphasised the need for protestant unity.[8] A week later another letter was published. This has been ascribed to Tillotson but was most probably the work of Hymphrey Prideaux, archdeacon of Suffolk, and a distant relative of the Prideaux family whom Tillotson had served in the late 1650s.[9] While warning of the danger of too-frequent changes in the services, the author emphasised the need to

---

1. Cardwell 429; Fawcett 30.
2. Fawcett 30.
3. Fawcett 31-2.
4. Lathbury 5.
5. Fawcett 171.
6. Quoted Fawcett 207; Birch I, cxxv.
7. N.L., A Letter from a Minister in the Country to a Member of the Convocation, (20 November 1689), cited N.L.
8. N.L. 16-18 and 28.
9. See above pp. 15-16.

heal protestant divisions.[1]

These views were challenged by Henry Maurice.[2] He was unconvinced that changes would either reconcile the dissenters or improve the liturgy.[3] What the dissenters wanted was toleration, which they had obtained.[4] He poured scorn on the idea that religious differences would prevent people from uniting against a foreign enemy.[5]

Maurice's views proved acceptable to convocation. The election for the prolocutorship revealed this at once. Government policy was for Tillotson to be elected prolocutor for the lower house so that he would be able to steer the commission's changes successfully through. Tillotson was, however, defeated by William Jane, dean of Gloucester, by fifty-five votes to twenty-eight.[6] Tillotson's defeat was, according to Birch, the result of the general temper of the clergy and also of the intrigues of the earls of Clarendon and Rochester, who were taking their revenge on the monarchy for their lack of suitable political promotion. Birch also claimed that Compton, president of the convocation, jealous of Tillotson's possible advancement to the primacy, had used his influence against him. Tillotson certainly believed this to be the case.[7] Jane, on the other hand, was a staunch high churchman who had withdrawn from the commission after only three attendances. The Presbyterian hopes of an accommodation also now seemed dashed.[8] However, Thomas Long, a prebendary of Exeter, was pleased, because, though the clergy he knew were ready for some compromise, they did not want to surrender on major matters and feared that dissenting demands would prove

---

1. [?], A Letter to a Friend Relating to the Present Convocation, (1689), pp. 12-3; Birch I, cxxxviii; Baxter's History 444-60.
2. Henry Maurice, Remarks from the Country upon Two Letters Relating to the Convocation and Alterations to the Liturgy, (London 1689), cited Maurice.
3. Maurice 8-13.
4. Maurice 14.
5. Maurice 15.
6. Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, (Oxford 1857), vol. I, p. 607; A. Tindal Hart, The Life of John Sharp, Archbishop of York, (1949), p. 128; Birch I, cxxxi.
7. Birch I, cxxxi-ii; Carpenter 164-5; Add MS 17,017, ff. 143-4; Birch MS 4236, f. 29.
8. Fawcett 30; SP 32/2/48.

excessive.[1] Following Long's publication, an anonymous pamphlet pleaded moderation.[2] Convocation should talk to dissenters to see if some of them could be reconciled without endangering the church.[3]

On 25 November Jane was presented as prolocutor to Compton and in his speech made clear his belief that the church was in no way in need of improvement. Compton, however, encouraged compromise, pointing out that the dissenters had had promises of indulgence and charity from Anglicans in James's reign.[4] Convocation as time went on proved to be in no mood for comprehension. In the meantime dissenting behaviour seemed provocative: some fifty men were ordained into the Presbyterian ministry, and Baxter was writing in a hostile manner against the church.[5] On 13 December convocation was prorogued and without further debate dissolved with parliament on 6 February.[6] The reforms and liturgical changes were, therefore, abandoned and, according to G.G. Perry, the church was saved from 'the vapid and frothy mannerisms of Patrick and Tillotson' and preserved 'the nervous simplicity of the old English'.[7]

The literary debate, however, continued. It was probably William Payne who wrote in defence of Tillotson and of comprehension.[8] He argued for concessions that would win many of the best and wisest dissenters into the church and thus strengthen it against Rome and atheism.[9] Tillotson, he wrote, had 'done as much good to religion and the church as half Convocation, prolocutor and all' and he had taught more people to live and preach well than perhaps anyone since the

---

1. [Thomas Long], Vox Cleri or the Sense of the Clergy, (London 1690), pp. 1-2; Birch I, cxxxviii.
2. [?], Considerations about Subscription Humbly Submitted to the Convocation on Behalf of the Conformable Clergy,(1690), cited Considerations.
3. Considerations 1-2.
4. Fawcett 45; Carpenter 165-6; Convocation 328; Birch I, cxxxiii-iv.
5. Baxter's History 465.
6. Convocation 329-35; Carpenter 166-7; Birch I, cxxxiv-vii.
7. G.G. Perry, A History of the English Church, 1500-1717, (1900), p. 546.
8. [William Payne], An Answer to Vox Cleri, (1690), cited Payne.
9. Payne 9-13, 17, 22, 30.

the apostles.[1] Vox Populi and Vox Regis et Regni argued for reform.[2] The 'Unprejudiced Laymen' pleaded for a new session of convocation in the hope of greater progress.[3]

Opponents of Tillotson and his friends produced verses:

> Sick o' th'old doctrine, they cry for new
> Through the wanton appetite of but a few;
> Not the Janeite, but Tillotsonian crew.
> Old things must pass away, and new must come,
> And fill (or if you please, disgrace) their room
> New liturgy, new deans and bishops too,
> The old are obsolete and will not do.[4]

> Whole troops of crepe gowns, with their captains in lawn,
> In the pale of the church together were drawn.
> A learned good doctor did fairly propose
> To let in our friends and shut out our foes
> But Rochester stood by
> And refused to comply
> For he scorned all commissions unless they were high
> And rather the Tories would see the Inquisition
> Than part with one tittle of vain repetition.[5]

Further and similar attacks on Tillotson will be discussed in Chapter 8.

During the period after the dissolution and when these pamphlets and verses were being published, Tillotson was beginning to see that for a time at least progress was unlikely. In the autumn of 1690 he discussed with Queen Mary a manuscript on the subject which had been written by Frederick Spanheim, professor of divinity at Leyden, and sent to her from Holland.[6] Tillotson commented that there remained the problem

---

1. Payne 34.
2. [?], Vox Populi, or the Sense of the Sober Laymen of the Church of England, concerning the Heads Proposed in his Majesty's Commission to the Convocation, (1690), State Tracts I, 675-701; [?], Vox Regis et Regni, (1690).
3. [?], The Unprejudiced Laymen's Free Thoughts on the Subject the Convocation are upon, (1690), State Tracts I, 666-75.
4. W.J.Cameron (ed.), Poems on Affairs of State, 1660-1714, (Yale 1971), vol. 5, p. 16, cited Cameron.
5. Cameron 5, 131-2.
6. Birch MS 4236, ff. 32-5, 307-11; Birch I, clxii-v.

of the recognition of dissenting orders and that there were a few, apparently trivial, matters that would be difficult to compose. A flight of Anglicans to Rome had to be avoided. On the whole, he felt, further discussion should await a more propitious moment, and he hoped that Spanheim would not publish his treatise until then.[1]

Tillotson abandoned the cause of comprehension in England after 1690, though he did make an attempt in Scotland. In 1689 the Jacobitism of the Scottish bishops and the Whig sympathies of the Presbyterians had led to the abolition of episcopacy in the northern kingdom. Disagreement followed on the terms that episcopalian clergy should be allowed to serve in the Presbyterian Church. The test was an oath to accept Presbyterian discipline, the confession of faith and the catechism. In 1692 Lord Tarbot suggested that episcopalian clergy who were acceptable to the people, loyal to the monarchy and who accepted the confession should be 'assumed' i.e. allowed to minister without implying any denial of episcopacy. Tillotson supported the idea.[2] In 1693 a comprehension bill was placed before the Scottish parliament. Tillotson himself had been involved in the drafting.[3] However, the episcopalian clergy did not feel able to swear the necessary oaths. They were left in their benefices, though in a precarious position.[4]

Between 1685 and 1690 Tillotson's role in the comprehension efforts was much more central. Between 1688 and 1689, as before, he was simply one person involved in the revision of the Prayer Book and in talks about concessions. However, after the passing of the Toleration Act and the failure of the comprehension bill, Tillotson at last became the leader of the movement. Ironically, by the time he had reached this position, the cause had not only been lost, it had become irrelevant.

Conclusion

For thirty years after the Restoration Tillotson was involved in efforts to reconcile dissenters to the Church of

---

1. Birch MS 4236, ff. 36-7; Lambeth Palace MS 690, Commonplace Book, p. 45; Birch I, clxv-viii.
2. Birch I, cc-ii; Lambeth Palace MS 690, p. 68; Birch MS 4236, f. 63X.
3. Lambeth Palace MS 690, p. 68; Birch MS 4236 f. 63X; Birch I, cci-ii; Clarke and Foxcroft 31809.
4. Burnet 598; Birch I, ccii.

England. He never wavered in his belief that this was both possible and necessary. It was possible because the differences were trivial and necessary in order to provide an effective bulwark against Catholicism. He was wrong on both counts.

Although there were many moderates who agreed with him, there were also many Anglicans as well as dissenters who saw their differences as crucially important, thus rendering compromise impossible and encouraging pressure for toleration. The inconsistency of governmental policy encouraged such views to persist. Charles II first advocated toleration, then comprehension, next toleration and finally he ignored dissent altogether. James II, understandably, only ever worked for toleration. Even fears of popish sympathy in Charles, and the firm commitment to Rome of James, did not convince the intransigent of the need to agree concessions. To them it was not only undesirable but also unnecessary, since both sides were opposed to Catholicism and would unite against it if circumstances so demanded. Protestant co-operation against James at the revolution proved the point, and it was re-inforced after 1688 when protestant divisions did not adversely affect English determination to defeat France. In any case, ten years after the Popish Plot, even anti-Catholic ardour was moderating. With the Calvinist William III on the throne, Catholicism and France, could, it seemed, be successfully confronted if necessary without the different protestant groups compromising their beliefs and forming one church. Tillotson never grasped this. Nor did he recognise that parliamentary support for comprehension was for political rather than religious reasons. Once the political justification had gone, there was little enthusiasm to pursue it further.

In the circumstances after 1688 it was obvious that persecution of dissent was no longer either acceptable or desirable. For many Anglicans, however, bringing dissenters into the church would simply lead to perpetual feuds. Toleration, on the other hand, would establish schism in law.[1] Toleration seemed the lesser of the two evils. Thus the uncompromising on all sides could be satisfied. Moreover, toleration would remove the danger of Catholics and dissenters forming an alliance against the establishment. It would also remove the risk of further departures from the Anglican Church at a time when the non-juring schism was taking place, an issue that will be discussed in Chapter 5. In addition, moderate concessions to Roman Catholics might well prevent them from making common cause with France. Once the Toleration Act had

---

1. Spurr Comprehension 942.

been passed, dissenters were reasonably satisfied with their situation, at least for the time being. Comprehension was, therefore, irrelevant to them. The leaders were committed to churches that concurred with their views, and they no-longer needed to search for this in a reformed Church of England. A united church was not for them a matter of principle. Tillotson misjudged the dissenters when he believed that they were as committed to unity as he was. Many were suspicious of Anglican sincerity and of the creation of a larger persecuting church that would wipe out the sectaries. In any case, nonconformist appeals to individual conscience and scriptural interpretation made reconciliation impossible to achieve.[1]

Tillotson's work for comprehension was done mainly in the background but was none the less important. Until 1689 he was simply one of several struggling with the issues. He was a mediator with the necessary confidence of both sides, and this reveals his essential sincere and tolerant character. He only emerged into leadership when the struggle had been hopelessly lost. Despite the overwhelming obstacles, as a good puritan, Tillotson persevered undeterred and suffered defeat in 1689 with a fortitude that he had not shown in 1675.

Throughout these thirty years, Tillotson showed no signs of pursuing unity for its own sake, or because he felt schism to be unscriptural or sinful, or in order to enable the church to preach reconciliation more convincingly to a divided world. He was simply concerned to create a united church against Catholicism. This he failed to do, and his efforts proved unnecessary. He had, unfortunately, misunderstood both the situation, the fears of the dissenters and the motives of his collaborators.

---

1. Spurr Comprehension 944; Spurr Restoration 123.

Chapter 4: Professionalism

Introduction

In addition to his public role as popular preacher and earnest advocate of church re-union, Tillotson had a considerable burden of work outside the public gaze which has not previously been revealed. From his fellowship at Clare, through the deaneries of Canterbury and St Paul's to the primacy, Tillotson carried out his duties with characteristic conscientiousness. The tasks required of him called for a great variety of expertise and reveal the multiplicity of his talents. As well as author, preacher and ecclesiastical diplomat, he was also required to be a teacher, administrator, estate manager, financier and personnel supervisor. For none of these responsibilities was he specifically trained, but he learnt the work as he fulfilled the office. It can only have been as a result of exceedingly long hours of concentrated toil that he was able to achieve all that he did.

Fellow of Clare

From 1651 to 1656 or 1657 Tillotson was a resident fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. He was known for the seriousness with which he performed his religious duties and as an able scholar and teacher. He was 'an acute logician and philosopher, a quick disputant, of a solid judgment'. He taught in Latin and examined his students at the next tutorial on the work of the previous one. In the evenings he called his students to his room for prayers, put them to study the New Testament in Greek and had them translate it into Latin 'in which he was a very great critic'. During the same sessions he chose one of the group to give a critical account of the day's reading. On Sunday evenings he examined them on the sermons they had heard earlier in the day. "Thus," concluded one of his pupils, " he was a very good tutor, and careful of his pupils' behaviour and manners; had a true love for those of us that he saw deport themselves well, and was respected by them; but was very severe on those that did otherwise." As a scholar Tillotson neither made notes nor kept a common-place book. Instead he marked the pages he wanted in his books with a black pen. He rarely delivered lectures but when he did he performed well.[1]

---

1. John Beardmore 'Some Memorials': Birch MS 4236, ff. 84-113, quoted in Birch I, cclxiv-cclxv.

After Tillotson took up his appointment in the Prideaux household in 1656 or 1657, as a servant of a high-ranking member of the government, he was in a good position to further the interests of his college. Clare had lost a good deal of timber during the Civil War by requisition for the fortification of Cambridge Castle. The fellows claimed over £500 compensation, and in 1656 Cromwell granted them £300 in timber for building work at the college. The college deputed Tillotson to deliver a letter of thanks to Cromwell, and at what was a private interview Tillotson boldly raised the future of a lease of land in Ely which Cromwell held of the college.[1] As a result Cromwell renewed the tenancy.

Tillotson also extracted for the college £1,000 compensation from the exchequer and a legacy of £300 from a former alumnus Joseph Diggons (or Diggins) of Lysse.[2] From the Diggons estate also came lands in Hampshire, Middlesex and Essex.[3] Tillotson was then involved in the various problems of these estates. He haggled with Thomas Cole who offered £54 a year for a tenancy which Tillotson valued at £60. He successfully pressed the claim of Obadiah Lee to the rectory of Kirkthorpe on the Diggons property as 'a very sober man and [one] to deserve that place at least'. He was also busy for nearly a year in trying to unravel another problem on the estates, the details of which have not survived.[4]

During these transactions Tillotson was at least once consulted about new fellows, but there is no evidence to support George Hickes's contention that because of his influence with the Interregnum government, Tillotson 'governed the College; the Senior Fellows not daring to oppose him because of the interest he had with his great Masters'.[5] John Denton who, while agreeing that the other fellows consulted Tillotson but because of his sound advice, asserted that far from being imperious, Tillotson was possessor of a 'sweet temper'.[6] In any case the tone of his letters to the fellows is very cordial.[7] Even the staunch royalist James Mountain, senior

---

1. Wardale 68-71, 21-24 and 71, Doc. 21; Masters' Letter Book 25.
2. Birch MS 4236 ff. 84-113; Birch I, cclxvii.
3. Wardale x-xi.
4. MS Clare Masters' Letter Book 20, 27-31; Wardale 10-11, 31-38.
5. Some Discourses 63, Wardale x-xi.
6. Birch I, ix.
7. Wardale 120.

fellow, mentioned Tillotson with respect.[1]

Throughout this period of mundane, and perhaps at times tedious, work Tillotson was learning the problems of fulfilling professional responsibilities, managing estates and negotiating with sometimes hard-headed and very powerful people. This served as a useful apprenticeship for one who in the future was to become involved in much much more extensive stewardship. For a man not yet thirty Tillotson already revealednotonlybusiness acumen but a promising determination.

Dean of Canterbury

For the seventeen years from 1672 to 1689, Tillotson was head of the chapter responsible for the administration of the senior archiepiscopal cathedral. He had overall jurisdiction therefore over the cathedral finances and estates, the personnel including clergy, choristers and even minor functionaries, the fabric and the worship conducted within it, and some ecclesiastical and educational patronage. Tillotson's duties called for a high order of business efficiency. Ideally, the dean had not only to be a capable theologian and minister but also the effective chairman of the board of a wealthy corporation. Mrs Grantley's assertion that 'nothing can be easier than what a dean has to do' may have been true in the Trollopian days of the mid-nineteenth century but they were not so in Tillotson's in the seventeenth.[2]

Tillotson's record of attendance at chapter meetings emphasises the seriousness with which he performed his duties. Out of the 299 meetings that were held whilst he was dean, he attended 206 (68.9%). The minutes of five meetings omit to list those attending (1.7%). Of the rest he was absent on 88 occasions (29.4%), though on seven of these he communicated either his approvals or some information by letter.[3] The minutes do not record the precise part played in the business by the dean or indeed by any other of the participants.[4] However, Tillotson's attendance at more than two-thirds of the meetings, and his willingness to communicate by letter, prove

---

1. William Whiston, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr William Whiston, (1749), pp. 27-9.
2. A. Trollope, Barchester Towers, (Penguin edition 1983), p. 455.
3. Table 2.
4. Canterbury MS Acta Capituli, 1670-1710, pp. 12-110, cited AC.

that he took a serious interest in guiding the work.

One of the main responsibilities of the dean and chapter was the conduct of worship within the cathedral. This involved the organisation of prebendaries, minor canons, lay clerks and their substitutes, choristers, organists and bell-ringers. The selection, appointment, disciplining and even dismissal of many of these officials consumed a considerable amount of chapter time.

The appointment of the dean and prebendaries was not, however, the responsibility of the chapter. The deanery and nine prebends were in the king's gift, and the first, fourth and sixth prebends in the archbishop's.[1] The chapter simply recorded the appointments. During Tillotson's time twelve were named.[2] In one case Tillotson tried to influence the choice. When the tenth prebend fell vacant in 1678 Nathaniel Cole and John Maximilian de l'Angle believed that they had claims. Cole was a royal chaplain, serving the British Embassy in France. De l'Angle was a French refugee. Tillotson wanted Cole. He argued that the two Frenchmen already in the chapter were sufficient and that de l'Angle's claim was to a future vacancy in the ninth prebend, whereas Cole was English and would be of more help in carrying out the duties. Tillotson was frustrated, however. Cole's patron, the British Ambassador Ralph Montagu, had fallen from royal favour, and de l'Angle was appointed. Tillotson, in a rare expression of anger, commented that the appointment was 'very disgustful [sic] to all people here'. It was omitted from the Acta Capituli.[3]

Although Tillotson had no power over appointing the prebendaries and even his wishes could be flouted, as dean he did have to assert his authority over them and establish effective working relationships with them. At times he did experience difficulties in gathering sufficient canons to execute the work. During the Cole affair he complained that sometimes there were too few canons in residence. Out of the twelve, two were Frenchmen and two others had dispensations to

---

1. J. Bacon, Liber Regis Vel Thesaurus Rerum Ecclesiasticarum, (1786), pp. 19-21.
2. AC 18-109; J.M.Horn, John le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, (1974, revised edition), series 3, vol. III, pp. 18-47, cited Horn.
3. Venn I, I, 367 and II, 29; Bodleian Tanner MSS, vol. 39, f. 63 and vol. 123 f. 67; Foster II, ES 694; Horn 35; Venn I, II, 29.

be elsewhere.[1] In June 1682 he wanted a chapter meeting but doubted whether sufficient members could be gathered. He expected that only six would be there. Nevertheless, five meetings were held that month.[2]

Tillotson's chief problem was not the reluctance of the canons to do their duties but the demands of government for dispensations to enable them to serve in other capacities. On the instructions of the king in 1673, the chapter dispensed Stillingfleet from his duties to enable him to work as a Commons' commissioner for the rebuilding of St Paul's. Eleven years later he was still not fulfilling his residence.[3] In 1676 Thomas Blomer was dispensed by the king to enable him to become chaplain to the embassy in Paris.[4] These two were clearly the canons to which Tillotson referred when he was trying to get Cole appointed. In 1684 Samuel Parker was excused on the demand of Secretary of State Sunderland because he was needed in London.[5] Two years later John Younger was allowed to absent himself to serve as chaplain to Princess Anne.[6] In all these four cases, the appointments were in the king's gift, but the dispensations together with absences for other reasons made it difficult for Tillotson to sustain the work.

Besides dealing with the prebendaries, the dean and chapter were concerned with the minor canons. Seven of these were appointed in Tillotson's time.[7] One proved highly unsatisfactory. John Langham, appointed in 1673, was expelled in 1675 since he had 'become a reproach to his profession by his vicious and debauched manner of life and conversation, thereby dishonouring this Church, whereof he is a member'. Eight weeks later he was readmitted, but within a year had failed again, and in the summer of 1677 was replaced. No other minor canon was disciplined for immorality in Tillotson's time, but in 1679 a fine of half-a-crown was imposed on absentees when two were not present to assist at Holy Communion.[8] Under Tillotson, the chapter stood no nonsense from the junior clergy, though the treatment of Langham suggests that an opportunity for repentance and the possibility of reinstatement

---

1. Bodleian Tanner MSS., vol. 123, f.67.
2. HMC 9th Report, Part 1, p. 223, letter232;AC 68-70;Table 2.
3. SP44/27/33; AC 84.
4. SP44/27/87.
5. SP44/57/96.
6. SP44/57/144.
7. AC 31, 33-4, 42, 44, 60-1, 65.
8. AC 31, 42, 44.

could be afforded.

The chapter supervised the musicians of the cathedral. The lay clerks and their substitutes were a regular cause of discussion. Four new lay clerks were appointed in Tillotson's time, and none was disciplined. The substitutes, however, were a constant problem. Seven new ones were appointed, two were restored after discipline, one was suspended, three dismissed for bad behaviour, and two were promoted to lay clerk. The main cause of discipline was neglect of duties, though one was removed 'for greater and scandalous offences and misdemeanours'.[1] In addition a 'choirman' was suspended for ten days.[2]

Choristers were appointed by the chapter.[3] Education was provided.[4] One was paid to learn to play the organ and was later appointed lay clerk.[5] When, in 1673, the choir petitioned for 'liberty weeks', these were agreed provided that a minimum of sixteen should be present at each service.[6] The chapter appointed and paid the organist, the blower and the repairer.[7] Equally the bell-ringers were its responsibility.[8]

The services of worship, in which all these people took part, were conducted largely according to the Book of Common Prayer as used in cathedrals. The dean and prebendaries officiated at the principal feasts, and Holy Communion was administered monthly in addition to the greater festivals. The minor canons read Morning Prayer on working days in their turn at 6 a.m. in the summer and at 7 a.m. in winter. Six prebendaries preached in their turns on Sundays and special days or provided substitutes.[9]

The administration of Holy Communion was not, however, in accordance with the Prayer Book regulations, which required cathedral and collegiate clergy to communicate weekly on Sundays. In 1683 Archbishop Sancroft requested that each cathedral should indeed provide for the sacrament every Sunday.

---

1. AC 12, 17-19, 21-2, 31, 36, 48, 57-8, 68, 93, 97, 103, 107-8.
2. AC 80.
3. AC 19, 23, 30, 36, 80, 91-2.
4. AC 36 and 82.
5. AC 82.
6. AC 33-4.
7. AC 28, 36, 54.
8. AC 18, 21-2, 60, 97.
9. MS Tanner 123, f. 65.

Tillotson felt that this would set a good example and be the means of promoting piety. He put the matter to the chapter, and in November the practice was introduced. To encourage people to communicate Tillotson distributed a considerable number of relevant printed sermons among the congregation and within the city of Canterbury.[1]

In 1684 it was decided that Morning and Evening Prayer on Sundays and Holy Days should begin at 9 a.m.[2] The only other reference to worship was in 1686, when it was decreed that the choir should meet on Mondays or some other day 'to improve their skill in singing'. Absence would incur a fine of 6d.[3]

That the work of staffing and arranging the cathedral services in Tillotson's time was done effectively cannot be doubted. At the visitation of 1682 he and the chapter reported that all the cathedral posts were full and 'the Minor Canons, competently skilled in song'. All the canons, with the exceptions of those with dispensations, kept their residence.[4] At Canterbury, clearly, divine service was conducted 'decently and in order'. The relevant appointments were made without delay, warnings of unacceptable behaviour given, and the recalcitrant suitably and promptly disciplined.

The conduct of the worship, the maintenance of the ministry, the condition of the cathedral fabric and distribution of charity all depended on the efficient management of the cathedral endowments. Attention to detail was essential if the current and future well-being of the institution was to be safeguarded. This was the most time-consuming and the most commonly-discussed matter in the chapter. Unfortunately no balance sheet exists for any year during Tillotson's time as dean, but limited information does survive for 1679, the year he became a prebendary. The revenue amounted to £2,999 3s. 7d. and the expenditure £2,486 1s. 5d. The set stipends for 'about 140 persons' amounted to £1,997 11s. 2d. The dean and the twelve prebendaries received a total of £781 15s. 0d., leaving £1,215 16s. 2d. for the rest, an average of less than £10 each.[5] The dean's stipend was £300, and the prebendaries received just over £40

---

1. MS Tanner vol. XXXIV, f. 176; MS Rawlinson C739, 5 and D 850, f. 318; AC 76-9.
2. AC 84.
3. AC 93-4.
4. MS Tanner 123, f.65.
5. MS Tanner 123, f.31

each.[1] The prebendaries received, in addition, income from their prebendal estates and dividends - a share of money received when leases were renewed.[2] None of this is included in the accounts of 1670. The only expenditure shown in addition to clergy salaries is for fees, pensions, tenths, alms and the upkeep of highways.

Some idea can be gained of Tillotson's income at Canterbury. As a prebendary in the year before he became dean, Tillotson received £175 12s. 11d. in cash. This does not include income from his prebendal estates which did not pass through the cathedral books, nor for corn rents, for which accounts do not survive.[3]

When Tillotson became dean, his income increased considerably. Over the whole seventeen years his income from cathedral sources amounted to £10,032 2s. 9d., an average of £590 2s. 6d. a year, more than treble the sum he had received as a canon. Over half of this was his stipend. Excluding 1672 and 1689, his first and last and therefore incomplete years, his highest income was £764 16s. 0d. in 1682 and his lowest £481 11s. 0d. in 1688. The fluctuation was largely a result of the dividends paid.[4] Tillotson was therefore better off than the Welsh bishops and the bishops of Bristol and Exeter, who had £300 and £500 respectively. He compared favourably with the bishop of Peterborough who had £630.[5] It is unlikely that the office was worth as much as the £900 a year quoted by J. Bacon in the eighteenth century.[6] However, in addition to his income from the cathedral he did have his emoluments from his prebendal estates and his appointments in London. John Spurr's 'over £600' a year, if on the pessimistic side, is nearer the mark.[7]

The granting and renewal of leases was a major activity of the dean and chapter. While Tillotson was dean at least 559

---

1. Canterbury MS Dean's Small Book p. 57, numbering from back; MS Book of Dr J. Warner, back cover.
2. Table 5.
3. Table 1.
4. Table 6.
5. Spurr 177; D.R. Hirschberg, 'Episcopal Incomes and Expenses, 1660 to c. 1760' in R.O'Day and F.Heal (eds), Princes and Paupers in the English CHurch, 1500-1800, (Leicester 1981) pp. 213-5.
6. J. Bacon, Liber Regis vel Thesaurus Rerum Ecclesiasticarum, (1763), p. 20.
7. Spurr 177.

were granted or renewed.[1] The payments made to the chapter for renewing the leases and sealing the documents amounted to £23,484 17s, 6d. The best year was 1683 with £2,541 3s. 4d. and the worst 1679 with only £373.[2] The average over Tillotson's seventeen years was £1,381 9s. 3d. The differing value of the maturing leases and dates for renewal explain the fluctuation of revenue from this source.

Attempts were occasionally made to influence the dean and chapter in the granting of leases. In 1673, Charles II, eager to preserve a friendship by the exercise of patronage, asked that William Kingsley should have a new lease of a house in the cathedral precincts at a modest fine. The Kingsley family had been self-sacrificing royalists in the Civil War.[3] Three months later Arlington made a similar recommendation for similar reasons concerning two houses in the cathedral precincts held by John Sumner.[4]

The dean and chapter were not simply concerned to renew leases and to collect the maximum fines. They also recognised the need to ensure that the properties were maintained in good order. Consequently grants of timber to enable tenants to repair or improve their properties were regularly made. Between 1672 and 1689 thirty-eight such grants were approved.[5] Similar grants were made to clergy.[6]

Supervision of the manors and the collection of the rents were carefully implemented. Provision was made for the collection of arrears.[7] Richard May, steward of the manors, was dismissed in 1675 for failing to produce satisfactory accounts.[8] Equally, misbehaviour by tenants was not tolerated. Birket was sued for cutting timber contrary to the terms of his lease and Andrews fined £20 for a similar offence.[9] Copp was ordered to do repairs on one of his manors.[10] The infrequency of entries such as these suggests either a general satisfaction with the tenants' stewardship or, perhaps, ineffective supervision.

---

1. Table 4.
2. Table 5.
3. MS SP44/27/48.
4. MS SP44/31/119.
5. Table 4, second column.
6. AC 21-2, 28, 36.
7. AC 21.
8. AC 23, 25, 30.
9. AC 27-8 and 62.
10. AC 79-80.

The time, energy and care devoted to the cathedral endowments were vital if the ministerial incomes and the religious work of the cathedral were to be maintained. Except for 1681 when there were debts owing of £729 6s. 4¾d. 'besides some old arrears', the chapter had no serious financial difficulties or troubles in obtaining dues from its tenants.[1] The property was dealt with in a business-like manner, and it was to the financial interest of the dean and chapter to see that it was.

The income generated by the cathedral endowments was used to care for the fabric as well as for personnel. Very little was spent on repairs and renewals during Tillotson's time. Only minor work was recorded. In 1677 the wainscot in the choir was measured, two doors in the cloisters were blocked up and in 1680 bye-gates and posterns that were proving a nuisance were closed.[2] Also in 1680 some little stir was caused by the removal of 'the Sun' from over the communion table. Several days elapsed before anyone noticed it had gone, but then concern was expressed, doubtless based on a fear that Tillotson's puritanism might lead to the removal of other ornaments.[3] The removal had, however, been necessitated by the work being done in wainscotting the choir. In 1682 the cathedral and houses were said to be all in good repair.[4] In the following year, however, some decay was noted in the south aisle of the choir, windows on the south side had been 'much damnified' by recent gales and three out of the fourteen bells were cracked. Work on the windows at least was soon in hand.[5] A total of £320 was spent repairing the great and small organs.[6] In none of Tillotson's eighteen years as dean was the chapter involved in major building schemes which so occupy its twentieth-century counterparts.

Charitable work was also carried out by the cathedral, and King's School Canterbury was a charity supervised by the chapter. These will be discussed in Chapter 6 as part of a full discussion of the whole of Tillotson's charitable work.

Ecclesiastical patronage was wielded by the dean and chapter. During Tillotson's time as dean, twenty-two parish

---

1. MS Tanner 123, f.65.
2. AC 44, 48, 59.
3. Birch MS 4236 ff. 223 and 275.
4. MS Tanner 123, f.65.
5. AC 83.
6. AC 86.

appointments were made.[1] In 1677 Tillotson was subjected to powerful lobbying for the appointment to the rectory of Exning in Suffolk. Ralph Barker and Drs Castle and Jackson from Caius suggested a candidate, as did Mr Secretary Coventry on the king's behalf. Two other candidates were also suggested.[2] Tillotson insisted that it was the chapter's responsibility to make the appointment, and one of the canons Michael Belke was installed. Tillotson informed Coventry that Belke was a far superior candidate. He was well-known by the canons as the son of a deceased prebendary and the brother of an existing one.[3] Tillotson was obviously prepared jealously to defend the chapter's prerogative even in the face of the royal wish. He and the chapter clearly did not fear the king's displeasure but equally clearly preferred to appoint one of their own. On other occasions, one incumbency was given to a prebendary and two to minor canons. One of Tillotson's relatives, Jonathan Maud, was appointed to Tenterden.[4] With only three exceptions, whenever ecclesiastical patronage was exercised, Tillotson was present at chapter meetings.

The dean and chapter were also required to give formal approval to a number of appointments elsewhere. These ranged from the housekeeper at Lambeth Palace to a number of ecclesiastical lawyers.[5] The election and consecration of bishops for the province were also matters for the chapter. Bishops consecrated at Canterbury in Tillotson's time included Thomas Barlow for Lincoln, James Fleetwood for Worcester, William Thomas for St David's and William Sancroft as primate.[6]

If all that was not enough, regular payments were voted for the highways. A total of some £319 was expended in this way.[7]

The responsibilities of the Canterbury chapter were great both in number and variety. Under Tillotson's residency, appointments were made, staff supervised and disciplined, changes in worship introduced, estates managed, fabric repaired, charity given, patronage exercised and road works subsidised. Tillotson and his chapter exhibited a business-like efficiency in all their endeavours.

---

1. AC 15, 47, 57-8, 60-1, 67, 70, 74, 79, 82, 92, 84-5, 91, 94, 98.
2. Birch MS 4292 f. 148; SP44/27/2205.
3. AC 47; Add. MS 32,095 f. 53.
4. AC 54, 62, 68, 74.
5. AC 17, 28, 31, 44-5, 54, 57, 68, 83.
6. AC 30-1, 48-9.
7. AC 14, 18, 25, 28, 33, 37, 44, 57, 64, 73, 90.

Dean of St Paul's

For seventeen years Tillotson had been dean of Canterbury. For eighteen months he was dean of St Paul's. He had, however, been involved in the affairs of St Paul's since his appointment in 1675 as prebendary of Ealdland.

The chapter at St Paul's did not meet anywhere nearly as often as that of Canterbury. It sat on average six times a year compared with sixteen at Canterbury.[1] Tillotson's attendance record up to his appointment as dean was 70.8%, slightly higher than that at Canterbury. He was able to co-ordinate his responsibilities in both cathedrals because of their different patterns of chapter meetings.[2] He generally spent January to May in London and June in Canterbury. July and August were light months for meetings in both cathedrals. In September he spent some time in London but none in Canterbury. By October he was clearly resident in the capital but returned to Canterbury for November and December. Excluding July to September, he spent six months in London but only three in Canterbury. How often he travelled between the two cities during his residence in one or other cannot be ascertained. During the time that he was dean of St Paul's he attended all seven chapter meetings.[3]

Tillotson had the usual duties of a canon at St Paul's, but for the year 1682-3 he was receiver general.[4] He made payments to the king, the dean, the four residentiaries, the minor canons and choir officers, and to the officers of the dean and chapter. He transmitted small sums to various churches and clergy, to Brasenose College and Middleton Free Grammar School, and to a fund for rebuilding London churches. Some expenses were covered and paving work financed. Tillotson's final account showed expenditure and arrears amounting to £1,585 11s. 6d., an income of £2,644 3s. 5¾d., leaving a surplus of $1,058 11s. 11¾d.[5]

During his eighteen months in the deanery, with all his other work, he achieved little for the estates of St Paul's. He renewed sixteen leases representing an annual income of £799 10s. 9d., £106 of which was to pay vicars and the rest for the

---

1. Table 3.
2. Tables 2 and 3.
3. Table 3.
4. St Paul's MS: WE 91.
5. St Paul's MS: 93, 23-31.

cathedral.[1]

Archbishop

As archbishop of Canterbury Tillotson's administrative work was similar to that for which his tenure of the deaneries of Canterbury and St Paul's had prepared him. He was again concerned with patronage and appointments, the behaviour of the clergy, finance and property. Episcopal visitations were, however, a novelty for him, and his membership of the Lords and Privy Council brought to him for the first time governmental responsibilities.

Characteristically Tillotson was conscientious in his attendances at meetings. He was entitled to attend the Privy Council from 4 June 1691 and the Lords from his taking of the oaths on 5 October.[2] There were 336 sittings of the Lords during his time, and he was present on 226 occasions; an attendance record of 67.26%. He was eligible for 253 meetings of the Council and was there on 170 occasions: an average of 67.26%.[3] In both cases his presence was recorded on over two-thirds of the possible meetings. It is remarkable that his attendances at chapter meetings in Canterbury had been 68.9%, almost exactly the same for the Lords and Council.[4] Tillotson clearly had a strong sense of his responsibilities and a desire to fulfil them to the best of his abilities. Perhaps he enjoyed meetings, though he may deliberately have restricted his attendances to two-thirds in order to do justice to all his commitments.

Attendance at these meetings kept Tillotson much in London. On twenty-nine occasions he attended the Lords and Council on the same day. He was present in the Lords but omitted the Council on twenty occasions. On eight days he attended the Council but not the Lords. On twelve he missed both.[5] Parliamentary demands on him tended to be light from spring to autumn, but the Council met regularly throughout the year and, at times, more frequently during parliamentary recesses. By his regular attendances Tillotson, especially in the Lords, was fulfilling a responsibility expected of all royal nominees: that of supporting the king's policies in parliament.

---

1. St Paul's MS: Chapter Act Book.
2. J. le Neve and T.D. Hardy, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, (1716) vol. I, pp. 28-9; Birch I, clxxi-ii; SP44/150/91, 103.
3. Table 7.
4. See above p. 91.
5. HLJ XIV, 62: XV, 428; PC 74/248-75/5-6; Table 7.

Tillotson was called upon to play an active part in the routine affairs of the upper house. Between 1691 and 1693 he sat three times on a committee of all present to consider the 'Customs and Orders of the House, and the Privileges of Parliament, and of the Peers of this Kingdom and the Lords of Parliament'.[1] On 22 October 1691 he was entrusted with the task of drawing up a letter to thank the king for his speech to parliament and to congratulate him on his safe return from the Netherlands and on his success in the Irish campaign.[2] Five days later, he was one of a committee of ten appointed to thank Queen Mary for governing in William's absence, and it was he who drafted the letter for his colleagues' approval. He performed a similar service on 17 November 1692.[3] On 1 December 1691 Tillotson was made a member of a group of thirteen reporters who were to meet with the Commons to discuss the Lords' amendments to the act to replace the oath of supremacy in Ireland.[4]

Tillotson was involved in committee work on five bills. These were concerning changes in procedure in the courts of equity, to prohibit the importation of foreign hair buttons, for making sea water 'fresh, clear and wholesome', to permit William Gulston to provide piped water in Southwark and for the encouragement of the importation of fine silk from Italy.[5]

In addition to his engagement in committees dealing with constitutional, legal, scientific and economic matters, Tillotson was naturally concerned with ecclesiastical affairs. In December 1691 he was one of thirty-six peers to adjudicate on a quarrel between Lord Hatton and the bishop of Ely over £100 a year from property in Hatton Garden. After two meetings, Tillotson recommended that the bishop should be satisfied with the £100.[6] In January 1692 he was part of a committee of forty-eight to discuss a bill to allow the bishop of London to sell the manor of Bushey in Worcestershire and to purchase new property with the proceeds.[7] Between 1692 and 1694 he was busy with a bill for the recovery of small tithes.[8] Also in the spring of 1694 Tillotson was a member of the

---

1. HLJ XIV, 625; XV, 103 and 296.
2. HLJ XIV, 626-7.
3. HLJ XIV, 629; XV, 114.
4. HLJ XIV, 667.
5. HLJ XIV, 656; XV, 245, 273, 333, 340.
6. HLJ XIV, 669: A. Taylor (ed.), The Works of Symon Patrick, (Oxford 1858), pp. 537-8.
7. HLJ XV, 17.
8. HLJ XV, 29, 417, 419-29; MSS of the House of Lords, vol. I (N.S.), 1693-5, p.370.

committee which discussed the creation of the new parish of St John at Wapping.[1]

By far the greatest amount of work that Tillotson did in the upper house was concerning individuals, their debts and their children, especially where lands were entailed and children minors. He was put on eighteen committees for this purpose, more than twice the number on which he sat for other matters. The affairs of the deceased also occupied him. In November 1691 he was appointed to discuss the future of a petition from George Hitchcock, William Bird and others, creditors of Richard Slaney, against Obadiah Sedgewick and a Lords' judgement of 1690.[2] In December he was placed on a committee to discuss a bill for paying the debts and legacies of the late earl of Salisbury.[3] He was involved in a similar measure to deal with the debts of the late Sir William Halford and his successor of the same name.[4] Tillotson performed a comparable duty for Lord Stawell.[5]

Persons still living sometimes needed parliamentary assistance to satisfy their creditors. Tillotson was concerned with Vincent Grantham's desire to lease part of the manor of Golthow in Lincolnshire to pay his debts, with Ralph Macclesfield's wish to sell lands to satisfy his creditors and provide for his family, and with Richard Walthall and Thomas Edwards in the sale of lands to liquidate their debts.[6]

The settlement of property came before the committees on which Tillotson sat. Barbara Newton and her son sought settlement on them of the manor of King's Bromley.[7] Barnham Powell needed so to settle the manor of Kingsnorth as to provide for his younger children.[8] Provision for his daughters led to a bill to allow Henry Hawley's property to be sold.[9] A bill was considered to allow the sale of William Stevens's estate to pay off the mortgage and to provide for his infant sons.[10] Permission by act was sought to enable the earl of

---

1. HLJ XV, 413.
2. HLJ XIV, 642-3.
3. HLJ XIV, 683.
4. HLJ XIV, 698; XV, 14.
5. HLJ XV, 215 and 376.
6. HLJ XV, 9, 124, 128, 356.
7. HLJ XV, 19.
8. HLJ XV, 149.
9. HLJ XV, 126.
10. HLJ XV, 398.

Winchelsea to make a jointure during his minority,[1] Power to issue leases was requested for Thomas Kennersley.[2] Tillotson sat on a committee to deal with the vesting of several manors and rents in Lincolnshire, Berkshire and Devon so that they could be sold and other properties purchased for the same or similar uses.[3] A disagreement between Alexander Popham and Warwick Bampfield was referred to a committee, on which the archbishop sat.[4]

As if committee work for the House of Lords was not enough, Tillotson had administrative responsibilities for Privy Council work. In 1692 with the bishop of London Tillotson worked for the improvement of the curate's stipend in the rectory of Chirbury.[5] Tillotson is recorded as having sat on two Privy Council commissions: one enquired into the hospitals of the London area and the other into appeals concerning prizes taken in wars.[6]

Tillotson was, clearly, heavily encumbered with committee work, mainly for the Lords but also for the Privy Council. His attendance at, and participation in, the committees to which he was appointed cannot be ascertained. However, his general attendance record of over two thirds at the meetings for which information does exist suggests that he would have been equally conscientious in these affairs.

Secular and ecclesiastical patronage also consumed the archbishop's energies. He was canvassed to support people for specific posts and was prepared to recommend names in the appropriate quarters. Tillotson was eager that his old Yorkshire friend John Sharp who had replaced him as dean of Canterbury should be elevated to the episcopate. With the additional support of Nottingham, Sharp was promised York when the post should fall vacant. He was consecrated on 5 July 1691.[7]

In the summer of 1691 Tillotson recommended Edward Pelling to the provost and fellows of Eton for appointment to the rich rectory of Petworth in Sussex. Despite majority support for another candidate initially, Tillotson's nominee was

---

1. HLJ XIV, 685.
2. HLJ XV, 13.
3. HLJ XV, 25.
4. HLJ XV, 331.
5. PC 2/74/417, 435-7; PC 2/75/511.
6. SP 44/341/28 and 35; SP 44/345/4 and 48-50.
7. Hart 130-1; Birch I, clxxix-xxx.
   Wood II, 364; HMC Finch, vol. III, p. 108.

installed.[1] On 19 June 1691, Tillotson's old school friend Ambrose Barcroft asked him for support for the promotion of James Hargreaves, son of the incumbent of Colne in Lancashire, to the parsonage of Thwing.[2] Also in 1691 William and Mary instructed Tillotson to allow four newly-appointed bishops to retain existing church livings in plurality. These were Richard Cumberland of Peterborough, John Hall of Bristol, Thomas Tenison of Lincoln and Edward Jones of St Asaph.[3]

Pluralism was not confined to bishops. William Wooton was to have the rectory of Llandrills in Denbighshire as well as the vicarage of Laycock in Wiltshire.[4] Queen Mary sought Tillotson's advice when Nicholas Adie was presented to the rectory of Nursted in Sussex but wanted to retain Fairlight in Kent.[5]

In 1692 John Wallis, Savilian Professor of Astronomy at Oxford, had been suggested as the new dean of Hereford but wanted to retain his chair. He planned to consult Tillotson but never did.[6]

In the spring of 1693 Tillotson produced a list of eleven recommendations for church livings for Lord Keeper Somers. The names had been suggested to him by various people including the queen, Sir Cloudesley Shovel, Charles Montague and the bishops of Ely and Gloucester.[7]

Sir William Trumball was eager to be appointed judge at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. Sunderland and Sir Charles Hedges pleaded his cause. Tillotson felt that as the post was not vacant, though the current incumbent Sir Richard Raines was seriously ill, the request was impertinent. Raines recovered, but Tillotson agreed to keep Trumball in mind.[8]

Between 1693 and 1694 concern was being expressed over the archbishopric of Dublin. Francis Marsh had died and Tenison

---

1. Hart 130-1; Birch I, clxxix-xxx.
2. Lancashire County Record Office: MS DDB 65/2: Barcroft Diary and Accounts 1689-1732; James Carr op.cit., p. 148; see above p. 13.
3. SP 44/150/83, 101, 108, 118 and 132; HLJ XV, 438; MSS of the House of Lords, vol. I (N.S.), 1693-5, p. 399.
4. SP 44/150/119.
5. SP 44//236/339-40.
6. BM Add MS 32,499 f.327.
7. Surrey County Record Office, MS Acc. 775, D/1.
8. HMC Downshire, vol. I, part 1, p. 421; N.J.Japikse, Correspondentie van William II en van Hans William Bentinck, (The Hague 1927-37), Eerste Gedelte, vol. II, pp. 33-40.

was suggested as successor. Tenison, it was felt, would have improved the Irish episcopate and so assisted governmental policy. Tenison was reluctant to go. When Tillotson informed the administration in Ireland there was consternation, especially as it was rumoured that the bishop of Kildare, a 'rank Jacobite', was to have the position. Narcissus Marsh, archbishop of Caseh, was however, translated.[1]

Other requests for Tillotson's support for a piece of ecclesiastical patronage came on 12 May 1694. The Commons, supported by the queen, wanted a preferment for their chaplain, Maurice Vaughan.[2] Just over three months later the marquis of Normanby sought a bishopric in Ireland for his chaplain Wasely. Tillotson laid the matter before the queen who, wisely in Tillotson's opinion, refused the request.[3] Dr Knightley Chetwood complained to Tillotson that he had been promised the see of Bristol by James II but that after the revolution the position had been given to another. Tillotson acknowledged that he had been wronged but expressed the hope that he would live long enough to do him justice.[4]

Requests for Tillotson to use his influence came not only for ecclesiastical but also for secular appointments. Lady Russell asked Tillotson to take a letter to the queen asking for the position of auditor for Wales worth £600 a year for a protege. The post had, however, been promised to another.[5] Dr John Wallis approached Tillotson for positions. In 1691 and 1692 he sought for his son-in-law, Blencowe, a position that was vacant in the Court of Common Pleas, but failed. He also recommended Dr Bernard for the chair of Hebrew at Oxford but agreed that Dr Huntingdon was also suitable.[6]

University appointments were also brought before the archbishop. Jonas Proast was dismissed as chaplain of All Souls for debt. He appealed to Tillotson as visitor, who agreed that his dismissal had been unlawful, restored him but extracted a promise that he would meet his arrears before returning.[7] In

---

1. Tenison 364-8 and 371; HMC 144th Report: Buccleuch, vol. II, part I, p.63.
2. SP 44/100/14.
3. Birch MS 4236 ff. 69-70 and 251; Birch I, ccxvii.
4. HMC Downshire, vol. I, part 2, p. 696.
5. T.Selwood, (ed.), Lady Rachel Russell's Letters, (7th edition 1909), pp. 282-3; BM Add MS 17,017, ff. 148-9; Birch MS 4236, f. 47.
6. BM Add MS 32,499, ff. 291 and 297.
7. Wood III, pp. 403-4.

one case Tillotson stepped in to prevent an appointment. Dr Oxenden, his chaplain, was being considered for vice-chancellor of Cambridge. Tillotson felt that such an appointment would conflict with his work as chaplain and, therefore, asked Dr Blythe of Clare to prevent Oxenden from having the embarrassment of declining the post.[1] Tillotson nominated Dr Lydall to become warden of Merton, but the college objected on the grounds that he was old, lacking in generous spirit and learning, and had seven or eight children, whose maintenance would exclude a similar number of poor scholars.[2]

Despite all his acquaintance with people in high places, Tillotson did not seek patronage for his own family, though he did it for others. He recommended Abraham Hill as a commissioner of transport, but the secretary at war declared the post unnecessary.[3] He urged Clare College to admit the son of his neighbour, Major Cason.[4] However, his son-in-law, James Chadwick, had no place at court, and Tillotson sought none from him save the right to attend William in Holland. Tillotson asserted moreover:

> I never ask anything of the king, unless upon account of persons in distress, and whom he had reason to consider; as the poor French and Irish protestants: or for some widows, whose husbands have died in his service, and for whom nobody else will speak: or else to do some good office for a friend, which costs the king nothing; and this but very rarely.[5]

During his relatively short tenure of the archiepiscopate, Tillotson was concerned with both a great number and great variety of appointments both religious and secular. His influence may have been even more widespread than the records show. Unrecorded conversations may have played a greater part in patronage than paper transactions. There is, however, no observable pattern about his exercise of influence except to cement friendships. The exercise of patronage was a normal and unexceptionable feature of political and religious life at Tillotson's time. It was manipulated to make and consolidate friendships and alliances, to form pressure groups and to find useful employment for suitable people.

---

1. MS Clare Masters' Letter Book, p. 64.
2. Wood II, p.444.
3. HMC A.G. Finch, vol. IV, pp. 202 and 214.
4. Clare Masters' Letter Book, p. 44.
5. Lambeth MS 690, p.50; Birch MS 4236, ff.313-4.

Just as Tillotson took his governmental and patronage responsibilities seriously, he did not shirk his ecclesiastical work. He was concerned to ensure that posts were filled and that the clergy exercised their ministries effectively.

On 5 July 1691, less than five weeks after his own consecration there, Tillotson consecrated four new bishops at St Mary le Bow: John Moore for Norwich, Richard Cumberland for Peterborough, Edward Fowler for Gloucester and John Sharp for York. On 30 August, also at Bow, he consecrated Richard Grove for Chichester, Richard Kidder for Bath and Wells and John Hale for Bristol. On 10 January 1692 at Lambeth he made Tenison bishop of Lincoln.1

Of these new bishops, Moore like Tillotson was part of the circle round Nottingham, having been his chaplain.[2] Sharp, Kidder, Hall, Tenison, Fowler and Grove had all been divines on the Ecclesiastical Commission. Kidder and Tension had been involved with Tillotson in the abortive revision of the liturgy.[3] Thus men of Tillotson's views were brought onto the bench.

That Tillotson was concerned about the character of the clergy, and especially the bishops, cannot be doubted, though in one prominent case personal feelings may well have intruded. Tillotson found himself dealing with Thomas Hackett, to whom he had been curate between 1661 and 1662.[4] From 1672 Hackett had been bishop of Down and was notorious for the neglect of his duties, having spent most of his time in England. The diocese was said to be full of dissenters, the churches in disrepair, the discontented from Scotland settling there, and discipline lacking.[5] It was suggested that Hackett should have a coadjutor, but Tillotson preferred that he should be deprived.[6] A special commission was despatched to investigate not only the bishop but also some of his clergy. Hackett was deprived in 1694 for making simoniacal pacts, allowing papists into the church by false subscription certificates and for great mismanagement in general.[7]

---

1. W. Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, (Oxford 1897), pp 130-1; Add MS 6,~~103, ff. 6-7.~~
2. Birch I, clxxix-xxx.
3. Birch I, cxix-xx and cxxv.
4. See above p.20.
5. SP Ireland: William and Mary: SP63/356/29.
6. Birch MS 4236, ff.40 and 312.
7. Birch I, clxxiv; SP63/356/29 and 42 ii.

When in 1694 Thomas Watson of St David's was accused of simony, Tillotson gave him a month to answer the charge. Tillotson died before the affair was completed, but Tenison deprived him.[1]

As early as 1692 Tillotson considered steps to ensure that the bishops and clergy fulfilled their obligations. He was concerned that bishops should carefully examine candidates for ordination, hold frequent confirmations rather than confirm many at one service, grant archdeaconries only to residents, set an example of residence themselves when not hindered by parliamentary or other urgent duties, preach as often as possible, and discipline immoral clergy. The bishops were to be urged to emphasise to their clergy the need to reside, to pay their curates properly, to catechise the young, to observe feasts and thanksgivings, to provide in towns monthly sacraments and public prayers on Wednesdays, Fridays and Holy Days, to visit the sick, enforce the canons concerning marriage, to insist on penances, and to preach against 'profaneness and vice'. A record should be made of the glebe and an inventory of chcurch untensils.[2] Tillotson expected the same devotion to duty as he practised himself.

In the summer of 1694 Tillotson called a meeting of bishops at Lambeth, where a number of regulations were drawn up to improve the discipline of the clergy. At first the bishops thought to enforce the new rules by their own authority. Tillotson, however, felt that his would not be sufficiently effective. He, therefore, took Burnet's advice that royal injunctions should be issued. Consultation, William's absence abroad and Tillotson's death all delayed the work, but in 1695 the injunctions were issued.[3]

Tillotson's concern for the good government of the church is illustrated by a parochial visitation that he conducted in 1693 in the city of London. He had the co-operation of Bishop Compton and of Sherlock, dean of St Paul's. The parishes were asked if the minister's house had been let, whether the revenues were properly assessed and recorded, if in the rebuilding of the city there had been encroachments on church property, what plate, books, bells and furniture belonged to

---

1. Wood II, 462 and 466; Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of the State of Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, (Oxford 1857), vol. III, p.541.
2. Tanner MS vol. XXV, ff. 15-16.
3. Birch MS 4236, ff. 69-73, 251, 261; Birch I, ccxvii-ix; Dr Williams's Library MSS 24.53 (1a), 201.39 f.39.

the church, was the minister a pluralist and, if so, how were his responsibilities fulfilled, if there was a curate was he licensed and what was his salary, similar enquiry was made of lecturers, were youth taught the catechism on Sunday afternoons and holy days, were the canons observed with regard to public and private baptism of infants, at communion were the alms given as charity, what legacies had the church received, were the registers properly kept, did the minster observe the laws concerning the conduct of marriages and, finally, the parishes were asked for details of free schools in the locality.[1] Surprisingly no questions were asked about the regular performance of the Prayer Book services, the frequency of Holy Communion, the character of the clergy, the attendances at worship, the moral and spiritual condition of the parishes, the existence of dissenting meetings, or the condition of the church fabric. The main concern was with material things. Perhaps Tillotson was reluctant to turn over too many unnecessary stones.

Despite a genial and tolerant personality, Tillotson had no room for the lax or the incompetent. He could be a firm disciplinarian when occasion demanded and had a zeal to try to ensure that the church was fulfilling the needs of the people.

The disentangling of individuals' problems also occupied Tillotson's energies. In 1693 or 1694 Burnet became concerned about the validity of his appointment in 1689 to the bishopric of Salisbury. Burnet had been properly elected, but Archbishop Sancroft had refused the royal command to consecrate him. Nottingham and several bishops had put pressure on him but he had been adamant. To avoid legal proceedings against him, Sancroft had signed and sealed two commissions: one was to the archbishop of York and all the other bishops of England and the second to all the bishops of his province. These required them to execute his metropolitical authority during his pleasure. As a result Burnet was duly consecrated. However, the non-jurors complained to Sancroft who withdrew the relevant commission from the records, thus removing the legal basis for Burnet's position from the files. It was only after Sancroft's death in 1693 that Burnet learnt of the situation and therefore sought Tillotson's advice. Tillotson recommended that the Court of Chancery should enquire into the matter, and if the commission could not be found Burnet should have witnesses to attest the existence of the commission and then register the details. Burnet prepared to follow Tillotson's advice.

---

1. Guildhall MS 9538, pp. 3-7.

However, the commission re-appeared and was restored to the archives, and legal proceedings were thus avoided.[1]

A variety of other cases came before Tillotson. He received a complaint about the incumbent of Richmond, arbitrated on the validity of a marriage where the bridegroom was a minor and had married without parental permission, and advised on the divorce of the duke and duchess of Norfolk.[2] Tillotson's support for the divorce led to versifying against him, the irrelevant description of him as 'unsprinkled John' and as a follower of Socinus.[3] These and other attacks on Tillotson will be considered in Chapter 8. He considered the matter of Richard Frankland, a Yorkshire dissenting minister, who had been teaching unlicensed, and upheld the law.[4]

Tillotson also dealt with issues concerning institutions or the lack of them. Shortly before becoming archbishop he was placed on a commission to investigate the running of hospitals.[5] He successfully championed the foundation of a college in Virginia.[6] He gave £200 for building work at Clare.[7] As visitor at University College, Oxford, he solved a dispute over scholarships.[8] In 1691 with Compton, he consecrated a new chapel in Chelsea.[9] From 1692 he sat on a commission for the completion of St Paul's.[10] With the bishop of London he appointed Edmund Bohun to license books and approved the building of a Danish church in London.[11]

As archbishop Tillotson dealt with a great number of administrative matters ranging from duties in the House of Lords and Privy Council to matters of concern to individual people and institutions. Tillotson coped patiently, thoroughly, wisely and efficiently with even the most trivial of matters and treated them with the same seriousness with which h e approached high matters of ecclesiastical policy.

---

1. Birch MS 4236, ff. 68 and 255; Birch I, ccxiii-xv.
2. SP 44/100/67; Birch MS 4236, ff. 332-3 and 334-5.
3. Cameron 5, 318-22.
4. Archbishop Sharp MSS, Box 3, Bundle H, Piece 4; Birch MS 4236, ff. 57-8; Birch I, cxci-ii; Sharp 136-8.
5. SP 44/341/28.
6. Harleian MS 6584, f. 478.
7. Clare Masters' Letter Book, p. 43.
8. Ballard, vol. 27, ff. 18 and 209.
9. Wood III, p.370.
10. SP44/341/318.
11. HMC Finch vol. IV, pp 445 and 451; SP 44/98/507 and 539

Tillotson recognised that what must have seemed unimportant to others was of vital significance to the people concerned.

Besides governmental and ecclesiastical administration that came to Tillotson as archbishop, he was also responsible for the stewardship of a considerable amount of property, which provided his income and paid his expenses. As dean of Canterbury his average income had been over £590 a year.[1] As archbishop this increased to over £6,753.[2]

To help him with the expenses of taking up his position, the queen granted him all the revenues of his office from 30 November 1690, six and a half months before he had been appointed. This amounted to £3,240 7s. 9¾d., though out of this he had to pay expenses of £289 12s. 8¼d. in stipends to clergy and salaries of officials.[3] This left him with £2,950 15s. 1½d., over £450 more than he had anticipated when the grant was first ordered. However, Tillotson had the burden of paying his first fruits to the crown which were assessed at £2,682 12s. 2d.[4] This payment was never made.[5]

From taking up his appointment in 1691 to the end of 1694, the year in which he died, Tillotson's income in cash amounted to £23,189 4s. 7¾d.[6] During his actual life time, he received £21,947 13s. 5½d. He was archbishop for three years and three months which means that his average income was £6,753 2s. 7¼d.

Just over three-quarters of this money came from rents and miscellaneous payments and the rest from fines.[7] The miscellaneous payments included provision rents, rents of assize, pension rents, profits of courts, and tithes of timber.[8] The expenses deducted from his income ranged from £54 10s. 0d. in 1694 to £582 2s. 2½d. in 1693. The total expenses for 1691-4 were £1,839 15s. 1½d., about £613 5s. 0d. a year.[9] A clue to the nature of these expenses can be gleaned from an undated list totalling £535 18s. 7d. This

---

1. See above p. 96.
2. See below Table 8.
3. See Table 9.
4. SPT 52/15/444-5.
5. SPT 29/8/5; SPT 52/18/128-9; Rawlinson MS A 241, f. 68; SPT 53/12/529, 13/408, 14/366, 15/80; Birch I, ccxxxix.
6. See Table 8.
7. Table 8.
8. Table 9; Lambeth MSS TF 10, p. 1 and TF 52/11/38-46.
9. Lambeth MS TF11, pp. 1-4 and 60-4.

reveals payments of rents, tenths to the king and queen, support of hospitals, and stipends of clergy and officials.[1] Another undated document lists Tillotson's domestic staff, which included his steward, treasurer, two chaplains, secretary, librarian, usher, four gentlemen servants, two cooks, four butlers, two brewers, a porter, a gardener, two coachmen, two grooms, two footmen, Mrs Tillotson's personal maids, laundrymaids, housemaids, clerks, six garden helpers and four weeders, a dairywoman and a bargemaster. In all, seventy-three staff are listed with payments ranging from the steward's £40 a year to 'a very useful servant' at 3d. a week. Not all the wages are noted, but the document is endorsed £609 0s. 11d. and 'Laus Deo'. This was clearly the total annual bill for wages.[2] God was perhaps to be praised because it was not higher. Sancroft, a bachelor, had listed thirty-two staff to whom he paid £209 10s. 0d.[3] Tenison's wage bill at midsummer 1695 was for varying periods of service for his forty listed staff and came to £116 10s. 4d.[4] Although he was a married man, Tenison did not list his wife's servants and, like Sancroft, omitted the garden workers. Even if allowance is made for these omissions from Sancroft's and Tenison's lists, Tillotson certainly had a larger household and, therefore, greater expenses than either his predecessor or his successor. Besides the expenses of his own household, Tillotson had to make New Year gifts to the king's servants. Sancroft had given £18 19s. 1d., Tillotson followed suit and after his first full year Tenison contributed the same.[5]

The most considerable drain on Tillotson's income was the work that he did at Lambeth Palace to make it habitable for a married man. Before moving in he had a large apartment built for his wife, organised much repair work, altered the windows of his own accommodation, wainscotted many rooms and effected other improvements. He is also said to have had a new study made with glazed peepholes to enable him to observe the comings and goings in the hall and courtyard. By the time of his death, he was believed to have spent in the region of £700,000 or £800,000.[6]

It was, naturally, in the interests of the archbishop to ensure that the income could be maintained and if possible

---

1. Lambeth MS TF 10, pp. 5-6.
2. Lambeth MS TG 1, p. 68-9.
3. Lambeth MS TG 1, p.67.
4. Lambeth MS TG 1, p. 72.
5. Lambeth MS TG 2, 18, 20, 22 and 24.
6. A.C. Ducarel, History and Antiquities of the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, (1785), pp. 19 and 32.

increased. The management of the endowments had, therefore, to be conducted efficiently. There were 174 estates belonging to the see of Canterbury.[1] Between 20 September 1691 and 24 April 1694, eighty-five leases were signed concerning these properties. Though Tillotson was nominally responsible for the oversight of all this property, the administration he delegated to Ralph Snowe, his treasurer and receiver, who was assisted by a clerk, Roger Wancklen.[2] Careful records were kept of the names of tenants, the property they held, their payments, arrears and the dates of their current leases.[3]

Timber was a valuable asset on the archbishop's estates. When the steward visited the properties he reported on the state of the timber. During Tillotson's short tenure of the archiepiscopate there were no visitations, but a comparison between the records of the of 1687 and 1696 suggests no evidence of maladministration. Between these dates the reeves simply reported to Lambeth Palace, and their word was accepted.[4] As with the management of the estates in general, Tillotson took no part in the management of woods and timber. He was, happily, blessed with officials who could be left to deal honestly and efficiently with that responsibility.

As archbishop Tillotson's income was considerable by contemporary standards. He had a discoverable income of on average of just over £6,753 a year and discoverable expenses of £613, leaving him £6,140. This is considerably more than the £2,683 of Ecton's valuation, or the £4,233 which the position was said to be worth in 1680 and with which D.R. Hirschberg agrees.[5] However, if Felicity Heal's work on Laud can be applied to half a century later, Tillotson's total expenses could have been in the region of £4,000, which would make his personal profit nearer to the Ecton than to the Hirschberg or the 1680 figure.[6] The absence of complete accounts renders the problem insoluble.

Tillotson's income was considerable, but so were his

---

1. Lambeth MS TG 10 View of Estates, pp. 1-327.
2. Lambeth MS TB 3, 1-100, Ind. i to lxxxv.
3. Lambeth MS TE 8 Rental: 1692-1703, pp. 1-7.
4. Lambeth MS TS 2, pp. 81-6, 93-101, 103-6.
5. D.R.Hirschberg, 'Episcopal Incomes and Expenses, 1660 to c. 1760' in R.O'Day and F.Heal (eds), Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800, (Leicester 1981), p. 215; John Ecton, Liber Valorum and Decimarum, (London 1711); A Book of the Valuation of all Ecclesiastical Preferments in England and Wales, (1681), p. 138.
6. R. O'Day and F. Heal (eds), op. cit., p. 139.

expenses. Unknown amounts were added to his expenditure by the cost of food and possibly of clothing for his servants, the furnishing and upkeep of his residences, the cost of entertaining guests, and taxes, fees and charitable donations. All these outgoings and the cost of building work at Lambeth explain the penury of which his widow complained after his death.[1]

Conclusion

Tillotson's career provides a rare glimpse into the routine professional and administrative work carried out by a seventeenth-century clergyman who eventually reached the highest preferment that was available in his church. The volume and complexity of these duties grew as he was promoted, but his experience in lower positions steadily prepared him for the higher. Finance and the management of property occupied him throughout his career. The appointment and supervision of functionaries became a major part of his work from his appointment to the deanery of Canterbury onwards. Increasingly, patronage occupied him, and becoming archbishop thrust onto him the additional burdens of governmental responsibilities.

Tillotson thrived on hard work. He was conscientious in attending meetings, dealing with individuals, making appointments, intervening in disputes, delivering judgments and stewarding finance. His professional and administrative duties would in themselves have been an adequate occupation for many a hardworking man of his time. Tillotson, however, was not content to be a desk-bound bureaucrat. He was also heavily involved in preaching, writing, theological controversy and schemes for protestant reunion. In addition, the momentous developments in national politics in the 1670s and 1680s occupied him. Tillotson certainly took to heart the advice of the Old Testament preacher, upon whose words he based a sermon: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."[2]

---

1. See below Chapter 8.
2. Ecclesiastes 9,10; Birch IX, 60, Sermon CCXI.

Chapter 5: Politics

Introduction

In the seventeenth century politics could not be ignored, even if he wished to do so, by a senior clergyman of the Church of England. The highest appointments were in the king's gift, and promotions were dependent not only on political reliability before selection but also on anticipated loyalty afterwards. Because of the political turmoil of the century, choices on all sides had to be made with particular sensitivity.

Tillotson's life was spent in one of the most tumultuous periods in English history, spanning as it did the 'Eleven Years Tyranny', Civil War, Interregnum, Restoration and the Revolution of 1688. Very real were the dangers of alignment with the wrong cause or the loss of integrity as a Vicar of Bray. Tillotson began by following a cautious path until either self-interest or conviction, almost certainly the latter, firmly allied him to the Whig cause, from which thereafter he never strayed.

Youthful Caution

Tillotson's upbringing in the puritan atmosphere of Halifax and the choice of the moderately puritan Clare College for his university studies influenced more than his religious development. When Tillotson arrived in Cambridge as a youth of sixteen in the spring of 1647, Charles I was in the hands of parliament following his defeat in the First Civil War. The future of the constitution was under discussion, and this discussion was complicated by the conflicts between parliament and Cromwell's army on religious policy and army pay as well as on governmental issues. The execution of Charles I sharpened the constitutional problem and presented Tillotson with his first serious political choice.

In 1649 Tillotson had to decide whether or not to take the Engagement, the oath of loyalty to the Commonwealth required of all who would hold office in church or state. Tillotson hesitated. He could find no reason to refuse the oath but was unsure of his own judgment, especially as he saw that serious consequences might ensue.[1] Tillotson could be condemned as

---

1. Watson 518-9.

indecisive and uncommitted, but in a year which had seen the beheading of the king and the establishment of a republic, neither of which was universally popular, the caution of a nineteen-year-old undergraduate is understandable. Whether he took the Engagement is not known.

Evidence for Tillotson's espousal of the parliamentary cause comes over forty years later from George Hickes, who published after Tillotson's death. According to Hickes, soon after Tillotson's arrival in Cambridge, Charles I passed through the city, and scholars went to kiss his hand, but Tillotson was forbidden because of his reputation as a Roundhead. After its publication this story was investigated by the fellows of Clare, who condemned it as 'absolutely false'. Tillotson was probably excluded because he was too junior. In addition, William Whiston, who was a contemporary of Tillotson's at Clare, had never heard the story.[1]

Hickes also declared that, after Charles II's defeat at Worcester in 1651, Tillotson, by then a fellow, had added to the college grace: 'praesertim pro nupera victoria contra Carolum Secundum Stuartum in Agro Wigorniense reportata'. James Montaigne, a senior fellow, condemned this as 'a most false and impudent lie'. John Denton, a contemporary at Clare, and two other fellows declared that they knew nothing of it. Burnet felt that a junior fellow would not have so presumed, nor the seniors and master tolerated such behaviour.[2]

Yet another accusation was that the corner of the college where Tillotson and his pupils resided was nicknamed 'the Roundhead Corner'. Montaigne could not remember this, but commented that Tillotson could not have dominated that part of the buildings because three or four other fellows had rooms there. Another tradition said that Roundhead Corner was so named because Francis Holcraft, Tillotson's undergraduate 'chamber fellow', was in the habit of haranguing people in King's from his window in that part of the buildings.[3]

Hickes also proclaimed that Tillotson's appointment as Clare Fellow in 1651 was 'as a Reward for his good affection to the Cause' since it was by mandamus from the Rump. Though Montaigne could not remember the mandamus, John Beardmore, one

---

1. Some Discourses 62-3; Birch I, vi; William Whiston, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr William Whiston, (1749), pp. 27-9.
2. Some Discourses 63; Birch MS 4236 f.335; Birch I, ix; Reflections 7.
3. Some Discourses 63; Birch I, ix; Wardale 119.

of Tillotson's pupils, believed the story. There is, however, evidence that Tillotson's appointment was requested by the fellows.[1]

According to Hickes, once in office, Tillotson 'governed the College: the Senior Fellows not daring to oppose him because of the interest he had with his great Masters'. Denton condemned this assertion as malicious and false.[2]

All of Hickes's accusations were refuted in his own day and have to be seen in the context in which they were levelled. As a non-juror, Hickes was deprived of the deanery of Worcester and at the same time of his aspirations to the episcopate. In his anger and disappointment he launched a violent attack upon Tillotson and his supporters. He blamed them for the schism and even denied the validity of the priestly ministrations of the conforming clergy.[3] Although Hickes's stories can be dismissed as the outpourings of an outraged and bitter man, his central theme was correct. As a convinced puritan, as a man seeking to make his way in the contemporary situation, after some initial hesitation, Tillotson's sympathies for the interregnum regimes must have been clear. His appointment in 1657 to the household of Edmund Prideaux, Cromwell's attorney general, confirms his political orthodoxy.[4]

The Restoration

The death of Prideaux in 1659, the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 and the subsequent religious settlement proved critical for Tillotson. Like so many he had to decide upon his future political as well as his religious allegiance. The problem was acute because in the 1660s there could be no guarantee that the restoration would be any more permanent than the interregnum republics had been. Tillotson's decisions would determine whether he returned to his native obscurity or advanced in public life. Commitment to the wrong cause could lead to disaster, whereas dedication to another might compromise his conscience. Tillotson, however, acted cautiously, chose wisely and within twelve years had advanced sufficiently in royal favour to become dean of Canterbury.

---

1. See above pp. 14-15; Some Discourses 63; Birch I, vi and cclxiv; Birch MS 4236 ff. 84-113, 335; Wardale 13.
2. Birch i, ix; Wardale 120.
3. Rupp 14-15.
4. See above, p.15.

In company with many of his contemporaries, Tillotson's activities during the First Restoration remain mysterious. The only certainties are that, since he was Baxter's auditor at the Savoy Conference, he still considered himself a moderate Presbyterian. However, his acceptance of a curacy at Cheshunt in 1661, his involvement in the foundation of the Royal Society, his appointment in 1662 as lecturer at St Lawrence Jewry and his advocacy of the Church of England before St Bartholemew's Day, all show that he had accepted the new regime in church and state. His ordination must have occurred at some time between 1661 and 1662.[1]

Tillotson's progress in church appointments after 1662 reveal that his religious and political credentials were unimpeachable. However, his standing with Charles II is not certain. His appointment as royal chaplain in 1668 or 1669 may have been the result of political pressure from Tillotson's friends. His appointments to royal preferments at Canterbury in 1670 and 1672 and at St Paul's in 1675, 1678 and 1679 certainly were. Tillotson was a client of influential politicians even if he was not in harmony with the king's personal views.

In the first twenty years after the Restoration Tillotson, like many others, had adapted himself to the changing circumstances. The Cambridge Roundhead had become a pillar of the Caroline establishment. Still, however, Tillotson retained much of his puritan faith.[2] In the 1680s his political radicalism was to surface.

Exclusion

The three years from 1678 to 1681 saw a state of religious and political hysteria in England unprecedented in the reign of Charles II. The Popish Plot revived anti-Catholic feeling, which in turn revived fears about the succession and provoked a series of revolutionary attempts to exclude James, duke of York, from the succession to the throne.[3] This produced the end of the Cavalier Parliament and, for the time being, of Danby's political career. Political opinions polarised, and anti-Catholic and anti-French hostility intensified.

The matter of the succession to the throne had been a

---

1. See above pp. 17-19.
2. See above pp. 19-25.
3. Holmes 124: see above pp. 71-2.

concern from the mid 1660s. Charles II had a 'barren queen', leaving his brother James as heir. Tensions mounted as James announced his conversion to Catholicism in 1669 and three years later married a Catholic for his second wife. A son born to this marriage would inevitably be brought up Catholic and would succeed in preference to Mary and Anne, James's daughters by his first and protestant marriage. The idea of a Catholic succession was abhorrent to many.

Various solutions were suggested. Shaftesbury, while a member of the Cabal, suggested that Charles should divorce Queen Catherine and remarry. For some, Charles's illegitimate son Monmouth had attractions as heir. He was protestant, an able soldier, and because of his illegitimacy would be a pawn of the politicians who brought him to power. Others turned their attention to William of Orange. He was Charles's nephew, eventually to become Mary's husband and a sworn enemy of both Catholicism and France.

The Popish Plot, which aimed to remove Charles and establish James as king, gave the issue some urgency. James was believed to have been involved in the plot, and the fears of Catholicism, French domination and the subversion of parliamentary government, all of which were associated with Rome and Versailles, came to the surface. Vigorous attempts were made to prove that Monmouth was, after all, legitimate. Equally vigorous attempts were made to exclude James from the succession. As the exclusion movement gained momentum, the Exclusionists, or Whigs, emerged with Shaftesbury in the lead. Their opponents the Abhorrers, or Tories, appeared in support of the strict hereditary succession.[1]

Throughout these developments, Tillotson was allied to Shaftesbury. He upheld Monmouth's claim to legitimacy and stressed the reality of the Popish Plot. Tillotson visited Shaftesbury privately three or four times a week. Indeed, the Test Act of 1678 which excluded Catholics from parliament was seen as 'a contrivance of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Dr Tillotson and others'.[2] Danby, incarcerated in the tower by Charles II to

---

1. J.R.Jones, The First Whigs, (Oxford 1961), chapters 1-2, cited First Whigs; Feiling chapter VII; P.Seaward, The Restoration, 1660-1688, (1991), chapter 5, cited Seaward; J.R.Jones, Country and Court, (1978), pp. 204-16, cited J.R.Jones; Coward chapters 3-6, cited Coward; Holmes 124-131.
2. HMC Portland, vol. V, p. 642; Birch II, 228-30; Some Discourses 42; see above pp. 45-6.

protect him from impeachment, knew of Tillotson's involvement and asked him to intercede with his powerful friends on his behalf.[1]

In 1679 the first Exclusion Parliament assembled after an energetically-fought election campaign. The first Exclusion Bill, which proposed that James should be passed over in favour of Mary, was introduced. Despite the efforts of Tillotson and Burnet to win him for exclusion, Halifax 'the Trimmer' opposed the bill in the Lords.[2] In July 1679 Charles dissolved parliament, thus destroying the bill and giving the politicians a new opportunity to rally support and the electorate to express its view.

During the summer came the campaigning for the new election. Some discussed the imposition of limitations on James, while others wanted complete exclusion. Tillotson, with Essex, Capel, Sunderland, Godolphin, the duchess of Portsmouth, Temple and Burnet, were among the latter.[3] Tillotson successfully canvassed the vote of Dr Blythe of Clare College for Sir William Temple to represent the university.[4]

The second exclusion bill passed the Commons but was rejected by the Lords. Shaftesbury and Essex pressed for exclusion, but Halifax simply for limitations. Charles again dissolved parliament. Tillotson correctly summed up the situation: 'His Majesty and His House of Commons still differ about the point of Exclusion; they will give anything for that and His Majesty anything but that'.[5] However, when the clergy of London made an address to the king for exclusion, Tillotson refused to sign.[6]

During the election campaign in preparation for the third Exclusion Parliament, Tillotson was again to be found canvassing support. He urged Blythe to vote for Sir Robert Sawyer as M.P. for the university.[7] Tillotson's comment on the election was that it had been conducted 'almost without any drinking or expense, which is great news, and generally the same persons are chosen again'.[8] Charles's sudden and

---

1. Some Discourses 41.
2. Halifax I, 152.
3. Feiling 182.
4. Clare College MS: Masters' Letter Book pp. 37-8; Wardale 58- 9.
5. Birch MS 4236 ff. 225-6.
6. Birch I, lvi.
7. Clare College MS: Master's Letter Book p.38.
8. Birch MS 4236, ff. 227-8.

unexpected dissolution of the Oxford Parliament took everyone by surprise. Tillotson concluded that differing ideas about what should be done had led to nothing being done.[1]

For seven years after 1681 exclusion was no longer practicable. During the contest Tillotson had shown himself a true Whig. He had had no faith in the effectiveness of merely putting limitations on James. Whom Tillotson would have liked on the throne after Charles's demise is not clear. Shaftesbury supported Monmouth, and Tillotson's acceptance of Monmouth's legitimacy and his regular meetings with Shaftesbury might seem to suggest that he did the same. However, he did support the bill that aimed to put Mary on the throne. The failure of exclusion certainly worried Tillotson: in 1681 he gloomily prophesied that religion and liberty might expire with Charles II.[2]

Rye House

After the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament Charles never called another. His priority in the years that followed was the destruction of the already debilitated Whigs. In 1683 the discovery of the Rye House Plot enabled him to complete the rout of the Whigs.

As with the Popish Plot, a good deal of uncertainty surrounds this affair, but the aim was to assassinate Charles as he passed Rye House on his way to Newmarket. Others to die included James, Halifax and Rochester. James's Anglican daughter Anne was then to be made queen. When the plot was discovered the Earl of Essex, Lord William Russell, Algernon Sidney and John Hampden were all arrested. Tillotson was pastorally involved with Russell at a time when he, along with others of the London clergy, was falling under increasing royal displeasure. This association with Russell, alleged conspirator, well-known supporter of Shaftesbury, enemy of James and committed exclusionist, was to give Charles even more reason to dislike Tillotson.[3]

Russell was committed to the Tower and put on trial. During the hearing Tillotson appeared as a character witness

---

1. Halifax I, 245-6.
2. Thomas 232.
3. Coward 291-2; J.R.Jones, 18, 26, 77; Haley 381, 472, 580, 590, 597, 600-1; Seaward 116-20; Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, (Oxford 1857), vol. I, p. 246, cited Luttrell.

and swore that Russell was 'a person very far from any such wicked design he stands charged with'.[1] Russell was, nevertheless, convicted and condemned.

During the last week of Russell's life, Tillotson and Burnet spent much time with him in Newgate hoping that he might agree that resistance to the monarch was unlawful, thus, perhaps, earning him a pardon from the king. When Russell seemed to be moving towards a non-resistance position,Tillotson persuaded Halifax to intercede with the king on this basis. Charles was moved, but Russell then affirmed that he was not yet fully convinced and went to the block in the same mind.[2]

Accompanied by Tillotson and Burnet, Russell made a speech from the scaffold in which he proclaimed his innocence, prayed for the preservation of the protestant religion and government, and hoped that protestant divisions would not open the way for popery.[3] The speech was printed and sold well. It was seen as a party manifesto and popularly believed to have been composed by Tillotson and Burnet.[4] Charles was displeased, and on the same day as the execution Tillotson and Burnet were summoned to appear before the king on the following day. They duly appeared and denied that they had been the authors of Russell's speech. Tillotson confessed that he had seen the speech and had discussed it with Russell, but Russell had not been disposed to alter it. Charles questioned Tillotson about Russell's refusal to endorse non-resistance, and Tillotson replied that Russell had believed that there might by occasions when rebellion was justified and that he, Tillotson, felt bound to agree. James, who was also present, angrily asked for an example, but Tillotson wisely did not hazard a reply. Charles interrupted with, "Brother, the dean speaks like an honest man; press him no further." Tillotson then informed the king that Russell had declared that Charles had never behaved in any way so as to justify rebellion and that Russell had only kept

---

1. A Complete Collection of State Trials upon High Treason and other Misdemeanours from the Reign of King Richard II to the End of the Reign of King George I, (1730), vol. III, p.647, cited State Trials.
2. Lord John Russell, The Life of William Lord Russell, (1819), vol. II, pp. 80-3, 86, 95, cited Russell; Halifax I, 322-5; Birch I, lxxvi-lxxxi.
3. Luttrell I, 270-1; Russell I, 104-5; Laurence Echard, The History of England, (1718), vol. III, pp. 691-4, cited Echard; E.M.Thompson (ed.), Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, Camden Society 23 (NS), vol. II,, p.32.
4. Halifax I, 322-5.

company with the rebels to prevent Monmouth being led into anything rash. Tillotson was then asked why Russell had not revealed the plot to the king, and he replied that Russell had believed the king to be in no danger but that had he thought so he would have taken up arms in his defence. Charles commented that Monmouth had told him the same.[1] Thus the matter was concluded.

Tillotson's involvement with Russell illustrates the strength of his Whig allegiance. He was intimate with one of the leading Whig families and remained so afterwards. Irrevocably identified with the Whig cause as he was, Tillotson was prepared, however, to urge on Russell in Tory tones the virtues of passive obedience. Rather than an inconsistency, this was an attempt to save Russell's life and, in any case, illustrates that Whig and Tory ideologies were not always sharply defined. Tillotson did, however, believe that there might be good and weighty reasons in an extreme case for abandoning this principle. In that, he agreed with Russell, bravely informed the king and incurred James's wrath. Having reached this position in 1683, the way was clear for him five years later to oppose James and support William of Orange.

The Reign of James II

The accession of James II in 1685 strengthened in Tillotson, as in many others, the fear of a restoration of Catholicism and the possibility of a Roman Catholic dynasty. The theological and ethical problem for Tillotson and other Anglicans was how to respond to these dangers. He was a staunch believer in non-resistance but had already begun to wrestle with his conscience about how far he could go in opposition to the the king without compromising his convictions. As one of the leading protestant propagandists, he received attention from James as well as from James's enemies. Tillotson was, therefore, under considerable pressure during these three momentous years.

Some six years before James's accession, Lauderdale had prophesied of James: 'he is as very papist as the pope himself, which will be his ruin....'[2] Nevertheless, James's accession

---

1. SP29/428/60 pp. 46 and 49; SP29/429/100; Luttrell I, 271; Halifax I, 335; Burnet 366; Birch I, lxxxi-lxxxii; Echard IV, 22-3; Clarke and Foxcroft 194-6; see above p. 54.
2 Quoted in J.P.Kenyon, The Stuarts, (1970 edition), p. 144.

with all the royal powers intact was peaceful. Internal divisions, the defeat of exclusion, and Charles's work between 1681 and 1685 had combined to ensure, for the time being, the impotence of the Whigs. Attitudes to James were equivocal. He vowed to preserve the existing system of government in church and state, affirmed his support for the Church of England and summoned the first parliament since 1681. However, his zeal to restore Catholicism and his overtly Catholic behaviour increased protestant anxiety.[1]

Tillotson's name soon came to the fore. After the defeat of the Monmouth Rebellion in 1685, James ordered him with the bishop of Ely and the other royal chaplains to assist Monmouth on the scaffold. The divines worked hard to remind Monmouth of the seriousness of his crime and of the approach of eternity, but Monmouth did not respond in the way that they had hoped.[2] Tillotson and the other chaplains had thus publicly condemned rebellion. James must have found considerable satisfaction from this, especially after his clash with Tillotson on the same subject almost exactly two years previously.

Nevertheless, James was concerned about Tillotson and Stillingfleet because of their influence on the other clergy. This is revealed in two incidents. When James was urging Rochester to receive religious instruction from Catholic priests, Rochester agreed provided that some Anglican clergy were also present. James assented but specifically excluded the names of Tillotson and Stillingfleet.[3] In his renewed campaign against anti-Catholic preaching James accused Simon Patrick, dean of Peterborough and sub-dean of Westminster, of being influenced by Tillotson and Stillingfleet.[4] James cannot have been pleased when Tillotson , presumably to give moral support, was present when Compton, bishop of London, was summoned before the newly-established Ecclesiastical Commission for refusing to

---

1. See above p. 75; Miller 120-8, 135-6; A.P.Stanley, Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey, (7th edition, 1890), pp. 77-80 and 163-4.
2. Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury, Memoirs of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury, (1890), vol. I, p. 120; Burnet 412-4; Tenison 79-82.
3. Burnet 435-6; Samuel Webster (ed.), The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and of his brother Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, (1828) vol. II, p. 89; cited Webster; Macaulay vol. II p. 89.
4. Simon Patrick, Autobiography, (Oxford 1839), p. 501; Burnet 430.

silence Tillotson's old friend John Sharp for his no-popery sermons.[1] Nevertheless, Tillotson officiated regularly at court: twice in 1685 and four times in 1686.[2] Tillotson did not, however, get involved in the publication of more anti-Catholic literature.[3]

In 1686 James took his first step against Tillotson in the course of his attack on local government. In October he purged some 257 magistrates from the Commission of the Peace, and almost two-thirds of the replacements were Catholics. In December Tillotson's was one of the names removed from the list for Kent. Sharp was also removed.[4] During these events Tillotson preached 'cautiously' at Lincoln's Inn on 5 November.[5]

Tillotson may have been cautious in the autumn of 1686, but in April 1687 his message was clear. On 4 April James, seeking dissenting support, issued his first Declaration of Indulgence which, whilst preserving the clergy of the Church of England in their religion and their livings, permitted the establishment of nonconformist places of worship and removed the oaths and tests required of government servants.[6] Reactions varied. The poorer dissenters thanked the king but the wealthier ignored the document. Most Anglican clergy disapproved, and some tried to warn the dissenters of James's true aim. The suspicion was that the Declaration could be just as impermanent as the Edict of Nantes had been.[7] Halifax wrote Letter to a Dissenter to encourage dissenters to make common cause with the Anglicans against James's Catholicising policies. Less than a week after the appearance of the Declaration, Tillotson preached before Princess Anne at Whitehall on Moses refusing to be called a son of pharaoh's daughter and preferring to suffer with God's people. The sermon was a rallying call to loyalty at any price to the Church of England, and that is how it was understood by Bishop Cartwright of Chester, who was present.[8] Near the end, Tillotson said:

---

1. Sharp 92-7; Carpenter 88-97; Add MS 9828 ff. 123-4.
2. Birch IV, Sermon LX; VIII, Sermon CXC; IX, Sermon CCXI; X, Sermon CCXLVII; E.S. de Beer, The Diary of John Evelyn, (1955), vol. IV, pp. 434-5 and 505, cited de Beer.
3. See above p. 50.
4. PC 2/71 p. 368; Revolution 103-4;Miller 164; Seaward 129-30
5. De Beer IV, 529.
6. EHD 395-7, Doc. 146; Miller 128.
7. Thomas 232-7; Miller 169 and 171-2.
8. Hebrews 11, 24-5; J. Hunter (ed.), The Diary of Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, (Camden Society vol. 22), p. 44.

> And we have a great cause to thank God, to see so many in this day of trial, and hour of temptation, to adhere with so much resolution and constancy to their holy religion, and to prefer the keeping of faith, and a good conscience, to all earthly consideration and advantages.[1]

Tillotson's call was for loyalty to the church whatever that might bring. He did not yet advocate resistance.

Despite the momentous developments that occurred during the year that followed, Tillotson played no obvious part in national events. What he was doing from April to November 1687 and from January to April 1688 remains a mystery. None of his major writings dates from these periods.[2] Between June and September 1687 he missed the eight chapter meetings at Canterbury, though he put in full attendances at the seven in November and December.[3] He was absent from St Paul's chapter in April 1687, but attended one of the two in October.[4] Meanwhile James had attacked the universities, dissolved parliament and purged local government. In November the queen's pregnancy was announced, and confident predictions were made, contrary to earlier experience, that a son would not only be born but would also survive. The discontented in England were already in touch with William, who had dispatched Dijkvelt to investigate.[5] Up to November 1687 Tillotson may well have been watching the situation carefully, pondering his own delicate position or engaged in understandably unrecorded machinations with James's opponents.

From November 1687 personal problems consumed his attention. In that month his elder daughter Mary, wife of James Chadwick, died and on or about 30 December 1687 Tillotson himself fell ill.[6] Both events made a deep impression upon him.[7] Whatever Tillotson was doing or not doing in the autumn of 1687 and the early months of 1688 he did not

---

1. Birch IV, Sermon LVII, p. 71.
2. See above, chapter 2.
3. Table 2.
4. Table 3.
5. Seaward 129-136; Revolution chapters 4-6, Ashley chapters 14-16; Miller 147, 169-70, 177-80.
6. Birch MS 4236 ff. 242 and 288; Birch I, xc-xci; see below Chapter 8.
7. Add MSS 45,511 ff. 29-31, 45,359 f. 17; Birch MS 4236 f. 289; Birch I, xci.

lose his credibility with his political allies as the later events of 1688 reveal.

In April 1688, however, Tillotson was again in the centre of affairs. On the 27th James issued his second Declaration of Indulgence, which was largely a repetition of the first, but on 4 May he issued an Order in Council requiring the document to be read publicly in service times in London on 20 and 27 May and in the provinces on 3 and 10 June. The bishops were required to distribute the necessary copies.[1] Thus the clergy would be forced to reveal their sympathies.[2] Tillotson amongst a small group of London clergy, including Patrick and Stillingfleet, were hostile to reading the declaration. They were concerned about the legality of the royal use of dispensing power and the way that it would be used to benefit popery. They hoped to win dissenting support. Other London clergy, however, were hostile to the declaration because of their hatred of dissent.[3] Tillotson's group approached Clarendon, who counselled that the document should not be read. Rochester said the opposite. Nottingham, Tillotson's patron, and Halifax were concerned to avoid a divided reaction.[4] The London clergy pressed Archbishop Sancroft to raise the matter with the king. However, on 12 May at a dinner at Lambeth Palace, Sancroft and a number of bishops decided to defy the king and to call a meeting of bishops to draft a petition to James. The meeting was fixed for 18 May, and Tillotson, though not a bishop, was invited. Tillotson replied to the invitation somewhat obsequiously that he was 'very sensible how unfit I am to advise in difficult cases' but asserted that he would never forgive himself if he 'should be wanting to our religion and church'.[5]

On the 18th thirteen clergy were present in the morning and another bishop arrived in the afternoon. There were eight bishops and six representatives of the London clergy, including Tillotson. The resulting petition asked that they should not be required to distribute and read the declaration because it was based upon dispensing power, which had breen declared illegal

---

1. EHD 395-7 Document 146, 399-400 Document 149, 83 Document 16; Miller 182.
2. Thomas 238.
3. Thomas 238-9.
4. Horwitz 50.
5. MS Tanner vol. 28 f. 37; J.Gutch, Collectania Curiosa, vol. I, pp. 330-1.

in parliament.[1] Seven of the bishops signed: Compton did not because he was under suspension.[2]

As Sancroft was forbidden the court, only six of the bishops presented the petition to James, who rejected it angrily. On the following Sunday the declaration was mumbled in Westminster Abbey and read in a few other churches. Some of the London clergy, including Tillotson, diplomatically spent the weekend at their country houses.[3]

Publication of the declaration, probably by Compton, meant that James could proceed against the seven bishops for seditious libel, gaoling them in the Tower. They were, however, acquitted, and the crowds of Anglicans and dissenters, who by then had formed a firm alliance, greeted the verdict with rejoicing.[4] On the next day the 'Immortal Seven', including Compton, invited William of Orange to come to England.[5]

The seven bishops had been the leading figures in the drama, but Tillotson had been considered important enough to have been summoned to meet with them at such a critical time. Whatever hesitations he may have had earlier, he was by 1688 ready to refuse to obey the king and to question royal authority. It was now but a small step for him to abandon non-resistance altogether, to give his wholehearted support to the Revolution and to swear allegiance to William and Mary. When he visited London again in September 1688 he found that there was so much expectation of invasion that he wondered whether to remain or to return with his family to Canterbury. He stayed in the capital, however, and prayed that 'this poor Church and nation' might soon see an end to 'these distractions'.[6]

James II had come to the throne wary of Tillotson, his uncompromising protestant views and his willingness to consider exceptions to the doctrine of non-resistance. Tillotson's

---

1. EHD 84 Document 17; A. Taylor (ed.), The Works of Symon Patrick, (Oxford 1858), vol. IX, p. 511; Webster II, 478-80; MS Tanner vol. 28, f. 38; Miller 185.
2. Carpenter 116-8; Tenison 84-6; Lloyd 94-7.
3. Carpenter 117; Tenison 86-7; Lloyd 98-101; S. Webster (ed.), The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and of his Brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester with the Diary of Lord Clarendon from 1687 to 1690 ... and the Diary of Lord Rochester, (1828), vol. II, pp. 173-3, cited Webster.
4. Thomas 240-1.
5. Miller 187; Carpenter 121-3; Nesca A. Robb, William of Orange, (1966), vol. II, p.262.
6. MS Birch 4292 f. 150.

behaviour at Monmouth's execution may well have allayed his fears, but this did not prevent James from being suspicious of his influence. It was, however, James's behaviour over the Declaration of Indulgence which steadily forced Tillotson into opposition. By 18 May 1688 and the meeting at Lambeth, there can be no doubt where Tillotson's sympathies lay. However, it is not clear that he was at that time prepared to reject James completely and to throw in his lot with William. It might have been one thing to have excluded James from the succession but quite another to remove him once he had been crowned, anointed and had received so many oaths of allegiance. Other reactions to James's unsatisfactory behaviour were possible. Indeed, a number of those who opposed James over the declaration became non-jurors after the Revolution rather than compromise their oaths to James. There was nothing to prevent Tillotson from having been among them.

The Revolution

The departure of James in 1688 and the acceptance of William and Mary as joint sovereigns in 1689 created problems of conscience for office holders in both church and state. They had to decide whether, having sworn allegiance to James II who still lived, they could now swear the same to their new rulers. The Anglican clergy had the added problem that traditionally they had preached non-resistance. For some William might be acceptable as regent but not as king.[1] Sharply differing opinions caused schism in the Church of England and produced the non-juring church, which showed considerable animosity towards the parent body.

Tillotson had begun to question non-resistance during Charles II's reign and in James's had been numbered among the king's opponents. Through what mental and spiritual turmoil Tillotson went cannot be chronicled, but by 31 January 1689 he had irrevocably accepted the Revolution. On that day he preached at Lincoln's Inn at a service to return thanks to God 'for our Deliverance by the Prince of Orange'.[2] It was forty years to the day since the execution of Charles I.

God, said Tillotson, had sent great judgements on England for its sin, had punished the country but had provided 'a very

---

1. Bennett 159, Lathbury 44-5; Rupp 5.
2. Birch III, 2-28, Sermon XXXIII.

great and wonderful deliverance'. In the past, God's judgement on England had been shown by the invasions that had occurred from Roman to Norman times and by several civil wars. The last civil war had led to 'the murder of an excellent king' and the banishment of his children to a foreign country, where 'they were exposed to the arts and practices of those of another religion; the mischievous consequences whereof we have ever since sadly laboured under'.[1] God's restoration of the monarchy in 1660 had soon been overshadowed by the designs of the Church of Rome. God's punishment had been the Great Plague and, in the absence of repentance following that visitation, the Great Fire. The latter had been the work of Rome. After the fire the Catholics had still continued to plot against the country and especially following the accession of James II. England had been patient with James and, had it not been for William of Orange, only a miracle could have saved the country.[2]

Among the causes of judgement on England were the contempt of religion by hypocrites, the dissensions among protestants and England's marriage alliances with Catholic countries. The law should in future forbid such liasons.[3] Nevertheless, God had rescued his people. This had been done just a century after the defeat of the Armada and on the anniversary of the failure of Gunpowder Plot. This date might be celebrated for ever as the one on which God delivered the country from popery and arbitrary power.[4] England must beware of ever again falling into the evil of consorting with Rome. Tillotson concluded, however, by counselling 'moderation and clemency' towards England's enemies, calling for unity in the face of the Catholic threat, encouraging thanksgiving to God, and under God to William, and by stressing the need to pray that God would perfect the work that he had begun.[5]

Tillotson saw William as the instrument of divine deliverance of God's protestant people from the threat of Rome, just as James II had seen the defeat of the Monmouth Rebellion as a sign of divine approval of his regime and his Catholic policies.[6] Equally Tillotson recognised that God had used Rome to punish England. Malign Catholic influence on Charles I was not mentioned, but French Catholicism was to blame for corrupting his two sons. The reference to dissensions amongst

---

1. Birch III, 14-15.
2. Birch III, 16-17.
3. Birch III, 18-19.
4. Birch III, 20 and 23-4.
5. Birch III, 24-8.
6. Miller 142.

protestants reflects Tillotson's continued concern to establish an acceptable comprehension scheme. Nowhere in this sermon did Tillotson explicitly discuss his justification for resisting the rightful monarch. The 'Immortal Seven' and all who were rallying to the Revolution were guilty of rebellion, whereas the Anglican tradition eschewed such behaviour. Tillotson had said as much to Lord William Russell and in a sermon as early as 1681 had stressed the inviolability of oaths.[1] A determined attempt to deal with his apparent inconsistency might well have pre-empted some of the attacks that were to be mounted against him later.

Tillotson was never explicit about his reasons for his change of view. Presumably, in addition to his ideas expressed to Charles II, he accepted some version of the 'contract theory', but also believed that, since the Revolution was an act of divine intervention, he could consider his old oaths and doctrines superseded. In any case, it was commonly argued at the time that allegiance must be to the de facto, rather than simply to the de iure, monarch and that the authority of parliament was a sufficient justification for taking the new oaths.[2]

Tillotson's concern raised in his sermon to avoid royal marriage alliances with Catholics was reflected in the Declaration of Rights which was being drafted at the same time. This excluded from the succession all Catholics and those married to Catholics. The Declaration also spoke of William who had been 'made the glorious instrument of delivering this kingdom from popery and arbitrary power'. The theology and the phraseology are the same as Tillotson's when, in his sermon, he had referred to 'all the great deliverances from popery, and its inseparable companion, arbitrary power'.[3] This formulation was not, of course, new.

Tillotson published this sermon to support Patrick who had suffered attack from printing a similar one.[4] George Hickes triumphantly accused Tillotson of inconsistency: 'Behold the preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and the confessor in Lincoln's Inn Fields contradicting one another.[5]

Tillotson's loyalty to the new regime did not go

---

1. Birch II, 305, Sermon XXII; L.M.Hawkins, Allegiance in Church and State, (1928), pp. 107-11, cited Hawkins.
2. Hawkins 44, 107-11.3
3. EHD 127, Document 40; Birch III, 23-4.
4. Patrick IX, 518-9.
5. Some Discourses 35-6.

unrewarded. He was appointed clerk to the closet in April 1689, and even then the possibility of promotion to the primacy was a very real.[1] By the end of the summer of 1689 at least, William was consulting Tillotson about episcopal appointments. When John Lake, the non-juring bishop of Chichester, died during his suspension, Tillotson recommended Bishop Walker of Londonderry, though his suggestion was declined.[2]

It was in 1691 that Tillotson received the final and highest accolade from the new monarchy when he was made archbishop. As a member of the House of Lords and the Privy Council he was then brought into contact with every aspect of political life. There were dangers from abroad and political conflicts at home. The Revolution had occurred during the Nine Years War of 1688 to 1697, into which England was drawn when William became king. The aim of William and his allies was to humiliate Louis XIV, who therefore supported the Jacobites in Scotland and Ireland. Domestic politics were certainly not peaceful either. William's ministries suffered from internal conflict, and the Officers Parliament of 1690 to 1695 proved difficult to manage. Nevertheless, by 1691 there was no longer any serious threat from within the country to the new regime, and the schism in the church had passed its worst. In addition, Scotland and Ireland had been subdued, and in 1692 victory at La Hogue prevented further danger from the sea. Tillotson must have been fully aware of all these developments, but his views on them have gone unrecorded. His natural modesty, apparently restrained him from speaking in the Lords.[3] Tillotson did, however, make one surviving comment on foreign affairs and this was shortly before he became archbishop. On hearing of the death of Pope Innocent XII he remarked, "We could spare the king of France if God thought fit to dispose of him in the same way."[4] It was nearly a quarter of a century, and over twenty years after Tillotson's demise, that Louis died.

Ecclesiastical affairs were largely in the hands of the Queen Mary, who took a personal interest in appointments. She ignored men who pushed themselves forward and took note of clergy who were not well-known at court. She frequently

---

1. See above p. 28.
2. HMC 9th Report, Part II, Alfred Morrison, Fonthill House, Hindon, Wiltshire, and Carlton House Terrace, London, p. 462; Birch MS 4236 F. 292; Add MS 17,017, f. 142.
3. Memoirs of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury, written by Himself, (1890), vol. I, pp. 156-7.
4. Birch MS 4236, ff. 247 and 299.

supported Tillotson and defended him against his critics.[1]

One issue of ecclesiastical politics brought Tillotson reluctantly into the limelight between 1692 and 1693. His alleged involvement in 1689 in the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland was revived.[2] The abolition had come about because of the Jacobitism of the bishops and the presbyterianism of the Scottish Whigs. It was followed by strong disagreements on the terms upon which episcopalians were to be permitted to serve in the presbyterian church. The test was an oath to submit to presbyterian discipline and to accept the confession of faith and the catechism. In 1692 Lord Tarbot suggested that episcopalian clergy who were acceptable to the people, loyal to the monarchy and the confession should be 'assumed', that is accepted by the church without implying the abjuration of episcopacy. Tillotson supported this idea.[3]

In 1693 a comprehension bill was placed before the Scottish parliament to enact Tarbot's suggestion. This was the work of the secretary of state, Sir John Dalrymple. According to this bill, the episcopalians would have had to swear that the presbyterian system of church government was the only true form of government. Tillotson, concerned about the Anglican Church south of the border, asked if there was no qualification such as 'as the only government of this church' or 'established by law'. Dalrymple replied in the negative and pointed out that the bill had already been agreed by a committee of the house. Tillotson prophesied that in that case the bill would either fail in parliament or at the royal assent since it was about exclusion rather than comprehension. Tillotson later obtained an accurate copy of the bill and discovered that it did not say that presbyterianism was the only government for the Scottish church. When challenged, Dalrymple tried to deny what he had said but eventually conceded the point. To make matters worse between the two men Dalrymple had quoted Tillotson to William out of context. He had reported that Tillotson had declared the bill to be 'one of exclusion'. William, knowing Tillotson to be careful with words, had accepted Dalrymple's story. Tillotson, therefore, set out his own account of the conversation in a letter to the earl of Portland, persuaded Burnet to explain the truth to the queen, made a personal complaint to the queen and announced his readiness to write to the king in Flanders. Tillotson forbade

---

1. Burnet 595.
2. See above p. 69.
3. Lambeth Palace MS 690, p. 68; Birch MS 4236 f. 63X; Birch I, cc-ii.

Dalrymple his house.[1] Tillotson was deeply affronted by Dalrymple's misrepresentation. Despite all Tillotson's trouble on their behalf, the episcopalian clergy refused to swear the oaths but remained, albeit precariously, in their positions.[2]

Outside the narrow confines of ecclesiastical politics, Tillotson was concerned about the safety of the monarchy. By the autumn of 1691 William's forces had defeated the Jacobite attempts in both Scotland and Ireland, but this had not put an end to Jacobite activity. In 1690 there had been rumours of plots to murder William and so to prepare for James's restoration. James sent Barclay and Sackville to sound out English opinion, but they found little enthusiasm. Louis XIV, however, prepared for an invasion in 1692. William Fuller, who had carried Jacobite intelligence to and from France went to Tillotson to seek his aid to gain access to Lord Portland to reveal a Jacobite plot. However, whenever a meeting was arranged 'he always shuffled and could never be brought to anything'. Fuller may have known of a plot but not in as much detail as he pretended.[3]

Tillotson's attachment to the Revolution meant that he was specifically exempted by James II from pardon when, after a successful French invasion, he had been restored to the throne. Tillotson and Burnet shared the distinction of being the only two clergymen on this list. The planned invasion came to nothing when the English victory at La Hogue in 1692 deprived the French of the necessary naval power and compelled Louis to concentrate henceforth on the continental land war.[4]

Tillotson's worries did not end there, however. Louis's successful attack on Namur in May and June 1692 created in him such fears for William's safety that he lay awake from midnight to 5 a.m. on 7 June.[5] The defeats of the Anglo-Dutch army at Steenkirk and Neerwinden in the summer of 1692 can only have increased Tillotson's apprehensions.

In October 1692 when William returned safe and sound to

---

1. HMC Johnstone, p. 60; Birch MS 4236, ff. 60-2, 63X, 318-9; Lambeth Palace MS 690, p. 68; Clarke and Foxcroft 318-9; Birch I, cxcviii-ix and cci-ii.
2. Burnet 598; Birch I, ccii.
3. Horwitz 67-8.
4. Birch MS 4236 ff. 55-6 and 316-7; Lambeth Palace MS 690 unnumbered page at end; Birch I, clxxxix-xc; Clarke and Foxcroft 308; Wood II, 387-8.
5. Birch MS 4236, ff. 55-6 and 316-7; Lambeth Palace MS 690, unnumbered page at end; Birch I, cxc.

England Tillotson was asked to preach on the 27th at the public thanksgiving for the victory at sea. This celebration was a way of emphasizing William's services to England and so encouraging continued loyalty, especially after the defeats in he Netherlands and complaints from parliament at the cost of the war.

Tillotson rose to the occasion. He preached on Jeremiah 9, 23-4: people do not glory in their wisdom but in their knowledge of God.[1] Humans cannot glory in wisdom, said Tillotson, because human knowledge and wisdom are imperfect and easily lost by disease, a blow on the head or violent passion.[2] Human might is lost by illness, accident and age, and it can be overcome by superior forces.[3] Riches are easily lost.[4] The matter of true glory is the understanding of God and his ways.[5] God had wonderfully brought victory at sea, delivered England from invasion, preserved the king from assassination and from the dangers of the campaigns in which he had fought.[6] God, therefore, expects of his people praise, thanksgiving and amendment of life.[7] Louis XIV, though unnamed, was then condemned as a prince who did not know God, had attacked others and so been rebuked by God through this defeat.[8] William III, also unnamed, was one who did know God and was the instrument of the former's downfall.[9]

Tillotson reinforced his message on 29 May 1693 when he preached at the commemoration of the restoration of 1660.[10] His subject based on I Timothy 2,1-2 was 'the Duty and Reason for Praying for Governors'. Government, Tillotson asserted, was necessary to human welfare because it binds society together, guards its peace, and secures individual property. Without government there would be confusion.[11] Government needed prayers because it secures our civil rights, interests and property and protects us in the free practice of our religion.[12] At the current time of national emergency

---

1. Birch III, Sermon XLI, 224-48.
2. Birch III, 225 and 228-9.
3. Birch III, 229.
4. Birch III, 232-3.
5. Birch III, 233.
6. Birch III, 240-1.
7. Birch III, 241.
8. Birch III, 243-4.
9. Birch III, 247.
10. Birch IV, Sermon LXXXIII, 532-50.
11. Birch IV, 535.
12. Birch IV, 536.

it was necessary for fervent prayer to be offered.[1]

In the meantime Tillotson was becoming increasingly concerned about the parliamentary situation. Hostile attitudes continued to emanate from the Commons. The king's ministers led by the marquis of Carmarthen had great difficulty in managing parliament, and William was not always co-operative. His conduct of the war was criticised, and there were fears that he nurtured absolutist desires. Parliament, therefore, sought to control supply, and from 1692 Robert Harley and his Country Party sought to curb William's powers by triennial and place bills. In 1693 and 1694 respectively, William refused the royal assent to both which served to increase fears of his ambitions. The much-maligned James II had never vetoed a bill, and Charles II had only done so twice.[2] When the parliamentary session ended on 14 March 1693, Tillotson made a rare comment on purely secular politics, when he condemned the parliament as 'the most troublesome I hope I shall ever see', though he did express pleasure that the supply situation was better than expected. He regretted that William had been forced to reject the triennial bill because it had been impossible to stop it earlier in either house. The king's enemies were rejoicing, and his friends resented his action. Tillotson was convinced that the king had his reasons for opposing the bill and hoped that these would soon be obvious.[3]

Tillotson's concern for the stability of the king's government is clear, though he gives no indication of understanding the erosion of royal power which the triennial bill implied and, therefore, the reasons for William's hostility to it. The bill became law shortly after Tillotson's death. Parliamentary troubles continued and when Savoy, England's ally was defeated, William had to return to England in October 1693 personally to explain his policies.

Tillotson unequivocally supported the new regime, proclaiming its establishment as an act of God and William as the agent of divine deliverance. He was anxious about threats to the new regime whether these came from enemies abroad or from politicians in parliament. He used the pulpit to advocate his opinions and to buttress support for the monarchy. His views on policy, however, have not survived.

---

1. Birch IV, 548.
2. Jones 266-7; Coward 333-4; T. Harris, Politics Under the Later Stuarts, (1993), p. 164.
3 Dr Williams's Library MS 24.53 (1a) and 201.39 f. 29.

Conclusion

In political matters, Tillotson for most of his career was a supporter rather than a leader. However, once he had obtained the primacy in the situation created by 1688 he was compelled to use all his powers of pulpit oratory to bolster the new monarchy.

Tillotson was slow, even reluctant, to commit himself politically. His reticence is understandable in the confusion of the times, but his political commitments once made follow a logical development. In the late 1640s he was a parliamentarian, in the late 1670s a Whig and in the late 1680s a pillar of the Revolution. He believed consistently and unshakably throughout in protestantism and parliament. Equally consistently he opposed popery and arbitrary government. He was theologically persuaded, moreover, that the revolution and William's victories afterwards were the result of divine intervention and, inevitably therefore, the will of God. These were Tillotson's overriding convictions.

Tillotson, nevertheless, had a high respect for monarchy. Even his parliamentarianism did not in Charles II's reign permit him to teach anything but non-resistance. Yet in 1683 he was beginning to tolerate the possibility of exceptions. His support five years later for the replacement of James by William and Mary provoked the accusation of inconsistency. Tillotson never published any justification for his change of view, but he could easily have done so. His main commitment was to parliamentary government and the protestant faith, both seemed in danger from James, and so he was prepared to connive at a bloodless revolution as the lesser evil. Theologically he could have quoted Gamaliel.[1]

In any case, as John Miller has written, judged by seventeenth-century standards, a strict fundamentalist consistency was neither possible nor expected.

> The changes which happened in 1640-60 or in 1689 happened in spite of, not as a result of, the prevailing constitutional theory. Men were forced by immediate political circumstances to take actions which directly contradicted their fundamental constitutional beliefs. New ideas were then developed, often hastily and

---

1. Acts 5, 33-9.

> inadequately to justify what had been done as the result of the logic of events or of sheer chance.[1]

Little is known of Tillotson's views on matters of policy. He seemed content to be part of the machinery which implemented the views of the king and his ministers. He could, however, be relied upon to exploit the media of his day - the pulpit and the press - to endow the Revolution and its struggles against its enemies with the seal of divine approval.

---

1. Miller 31.

Chapter 6: Pastor

Introduction

Tillotson's experience of day-to-day parish ministry was brief and undistinguished. For three years at the most he was a parish priest, first as curate at Cheshunt fom 1661 to 1662 and then as rector of Kedington from 1663 to 1664. What else he did besides preaching as lecturer at St Lawrence Jewry is not known, though he did perform wedding ceremonies.[1] In all his other appointments, pastoral work was incidental to his main responsibilities as preacher, teacher, administrator and government servant. Among those who became bishops in Tillotson's life-time, Wilkins, Lloyd, Lake, Patrick and Sharp all had much greater parish experience, as had Tenison his successor as archbishop. Nevertheless, Tillotson was a pastor at heart as is evidenced by his known dealings with certain individuals and by his preaching on pastoral subjects.

Individuals

Tillotson's pastoral concerns were obvious as early as the 1650s whilst he was still a fellow of Clare. One of his students, John Beardmore, wrote not only of Tillotson's efficiency as a teacher but also of his concern for the moral and spiritual development of his pupils.[2] Tillotson's work with with a number of individuals later reveals that he remained the same throughout his ministry.

Tillotson was quite prepared to give unsolicited advice to those whom he felt to be morally vulnerable in a licentious age. In 1681 he expressed concern about the moral life of Sir Thomas Colpepper of Kent, a young man whom Tillotson had known from birth. Tillotson warned him that the age was a licentious one, and the choice had to be made between the temporary pleasure of sin and everlasting misery. If Thomas had succumbed to vice, Tillotson counselled, he should repent of it. Tillotson believed him to be at a dangerous age and wished to see him married and settled in Canterbury.[3] It was clearly 'better to marry than burn'.[4]

---

1. See above pp. 18, 20-21.
2. See above p. 89.
3. Birch MSS 4236, ff 12-13 and 326-7; Lambeth Palace MS 690, p. 35; Birch I, lxi-lxii.
4. I Corinthians 7, 9.

Lady Henrietta Berkeley, the eighteen-year-old daughter of George, Earl of Berkeley, also aroused Tillotson's concern. He felt her behaviour might both cause her misery and imperil her soul. For four years Henrietta had been involved in an affair with Ford, Lord Grey of Werke, her sister's husband. Henrietta had been found writing a compromising letter, and her mother had forbidden Grey the house. However, in August 1682 Grey appeared at the Berkeley's residence and carried her off.[1]

Tillotson sought to make plain to Henrietta the heinousness of her fault. She had sinned against God, dishonoured herself, besmirched her family and shown ingratitude to her parents. He urged her to consider the coming judgment and to think of saving her soul. She would, in any case, suffer distress in this world as she thought about her behaviour and when, after a while, Grey doubtless abandoned her. She should reconcile herself to God, to her best friends and her parents.[2]

Tillotson's admonitions were, however, of no avail. Grey arranged for her to marry a Mr Turner, a dependent of his, whom some claimed was a bigamist. The marriage was arranged so as to enable Grey to keep Henrietta by preventing her father from taking her home. Grey was tried in 1682 for seduction, but Henrietta declared that she had gone of her own accord and was now a married woman. She and Turner were gaoled until the end of the term. Grey was found guilty but not sentenced because by the opening of the new term the situation had changed. Henrietta, Turner and Grey all fled to Holland because of Grey's implication in the Rye House plot. Henrietta retired from public life.[3]

In 1692 Tillotson reconciled to the Anglican faith Charles Lennox, duke of Richmond, the twenty-year-old illegitimate son of Charles II. Concerned as much to impress the re-conversion on the young man's mind as to renew his own battle with Catholicism, Tillotson formulated an elaborate liturgy to mark the reconciliation. Before the congregation Richmond declared his 'hearty contrition and repentance for having publicly abjured the reformed religion preferred in the Church of England', acknowledged that he had 'grievously offended Almighty God', renounced 'all the errors and corruption of the Church of Rome' and sought confirmation in the Church of England. Richmond then signed a document witnessed by six men

---

1. State Trials III, 515-41.
2. Birch MS 4236, ff. 14-15; Birch I, lxvi-lxvii.
3. State Trials III, 515-41.

to affirm his re-conversion.[1]

Tillotson expressed equal concern for William and Mary, for their physical, spiritual as well as their political well-being. In 1694 he wrote a prayer for their safety. William was campaigning in the Netherlands. He was also in political difficulty at home. There were complaints at the cost of the war, which was seen as being fought purely for William's personal benefit. He was criticised for his rejection of the Place Bill and for his lack of enthusiasm for the Triennial Bill. Mary felt depressed and unable to work.[2] To make matters worse, Tillotson had also heard rumours that William was being unfaithful either with Elizabeth Villiers or possibly with Joost Van Keppel. Tillotson prayed, therefore, for the preservation of both monarchs and for the prosperity of their undertakings. He asked that if William was in a state of sin he might repent and that his armies would be victorious. He also interceded for the security of the royal marriage, asked that if the king had gone astray he might repent and that Mary might find spiritual strength. He concluded with the petition that he might know best what to say to direct and comfort the queen on his next visit.[3] The content of the prayer makes it clear that it cannot have been intended for public use, but it serves to emphasise Tillotson's deep personal concern for the new monarchy and especially for the queen.

Of these four surviving examples of Tillotson's pastoral care, three are on sexual morality and only one on narrowly spiritual matters. In all cases, Tillotson was concerned that the individuals involved should repent and so avoid both unhappiness in this world and divine condemnation in the next. Tillotson had a deep concern for wrongdoers but also a clear and uncompromising attitude to their behaviour. A fuller picture of Tillotson as a pastor can, however, be obtained from his dealings with the Russell family.

The Russell Family

For over ten years at least, Tillotson was involved with the Russells. His sustained relationship over a long period with this family reveals a breadth and warmth of concern that

---

1. Lambeth MS Gibson Papers, vol. V, 933.63; A.C.Ducarel op. cit., Appendix, p.60.
2. Henri and Barbara van der Zee, William and Mary, (1975), p.379.
3. Birch MS 4236, f. 330-1.

is not evident in his briefer encounters.

When Tillotson first knew the Russells is not clear. Lord William was at Cambridge in Tillotson's time, and they two may indeed have met there. As a staunch Whig Tillotson probably met the family during the Exclusion Contest, but it was not until 1683 at the time of the Rye House plot that Tillotson is known to have helped the family.[1]

Russell was arrested, tried and condemned for complicity in the plot.[2] During the last week before his execution, Tillotson and Burnet spent much time with him in Newgate Prison, seeking unsuccessfully to persuade him to affirm belief in non-resistance and so, perhaps, obtain a royal pardon.[3] On 20 July 1683, the day before the execution, Tillotson gave Russell the sacrament and received his assurance that he believed in the Thirty Nine Articles, had forgiven his enemies and had made a full and free confession.[4] When Russell was awakened at 4 a.m. on the 21st, Tillotson and Burnet joined him and prayed with him.[5] They also accompanied him from Newgate to Lincoln's Inn Fields. In his farewell speech, Russell acknowledged that 'some eminent divines' had tried unsuccessfully to persuade of non-resistance. After his speech, he asked Tillotson to pray, spoke to him and gave him his ring. He also gave his watch to Burnet and asked him to carry out certain commissions. He was then beheaded.[6] Tillotson as a caring pastor had done all that was possible to preserve Russell's life as well as to ensure his spiritual welfare.

Tillotson kept in contact with Lady Rachel, Russell's widow for the rest of his life, and their letters demonstrate Tillotson's continuing concern for her and for her children. In October 1685 Lady Russell informed Tillotson of the death of her cousin from smallpox. Tillotson in reply reminded her of the joys of heaven but rejoiced that she and her children had avoided the disease. He assured her that God loved her no less for having given her so bitter a cup. Indeed, Christ had drunk

---

1. Russell I, 15-20; First Whigs 18, 26, 77; Haley 381, 472, 580, 590, 597, 600-1.
2. See above pp. 122-3.
3. Burnet 363; see above p. 123.
4. Russell II, 98; Halifax I, 322-35.
5. Russell II, 102.
6. Russell II, 82-3, 104-5; Luttrell I, 270-1; Echard III, 691-4; E.M. Thompson (ed.), Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, Camden Society, 23 N.S., vol. II, p.32.

of it more deeply.[1]

Three years later, on 6 September 1688, Tillotson reveals the closeness of his relationship with Lady Russell by relating the very personal story of his concern for his Chadwick granddaughter who had been expected to die until water poured from her nose expelling 'a pretty big piece of cork'. In the same letter he hoped that Lady Russell and her daughters would find comfort and satisfaction in their lives but reminded them that 'all our hopes but those of another world are built on uncertainty and vanity'.[2]

Advice did not, however, always travel in the same direction. When, between 1689 and 1690, Tillotson was resisting William III's attempts to promote him to the archiepiscopate, Lady Russell insisted that it was his divinely-appointed vocation.[3]

After Tillotson became archbishop, discussion of his involvement with Lord Russell was revived, and he was criticised for changing his views on non-resistance. Tillotson was concerned throughout that people should not be punished simply for libelling him, but he was troubled at the treatment of Russell's memory. For attacks on her late husband, he assured Lady Russell, he supported condign punishment.[4]

It was to Lady Russell that Tillotson confided his ambition to baptise a prince of Wales.[5] The marriage of Lady Russell's second daughter to John, Lord Ross, later duke of Rutland, was a matter for Tillotson's congratulation. He interpreted it as a divine reward to Lady Rachel for all her patience under suffering. He also shared with her his concern for his own wife's health, which was worrying him, but prayed that all would prepare themselves for a better life.[6] Less than two months later Tillotson was concerned about Lady Russell's eyes, which were causing her anxiety, and the fever which she had contracted. He rejoiced when she recovered but urged her not to weaken her eyes by writing to him. He told her how much

---

1. Add MS 17,017, f.141; Birch MS 4,236, f.16; Birch I, lxxxviii-ix.
2. Russell Letters 169-72.
3. See above p. 30.
4. Lambeth MS 690, p. 50; Birch MS 4,236, ff. 41-2 and 315-6; Birch I, clxxvi-vii.
5. Birch MS 4,236, f.39; Birch I, cxcii-iii.
6. Add MS 17,017, ff. 150-1; Birch MS 4,236, f.64; Birch I, cciii.

he valued his old friendships but confessed he could no longer make new ones because he could no longer be sure of people's sincerity. "I could not at a distance believe," he wrote, "that the upper end of the world was so hollow as I find it. I except a very few, of whom I can believe no ill till I plainly see it."[1]

In the summer of 1694 Lady Russell had an operation to deal with a cataract. Tillotson wrote a prayer of thanksgiving for its success and added, remarkably after three years, thanks for the divine comfort that had been felt at the time of her late husband's execution.[2] Within five months Tillotson himself was dead.

Tillotson's care for, and interest in, the Russell family was profound. Even though he disagreed with him on non-resistance, he tried to get Lord William pardoned and supported him in his last days and hours, and even on the scaffold. After Russell's death his concern to support Lady Rachel continued for the rest of his life. They shared each others private concerns. This friendship can have been of little political advantage to Tillotson, even though the Russells were an influential Whig family. Indeed, Tillotson's involvement with Lord William was a clear disadvantage in his relationship to the monarchy in what remained of Charles II's reign and for the whole of James II's. By the time of the Revolution Settlement others saw to it that Tillotson's future advancement was clear, even though he was reluctant to contemplate it himself. Tillotson's contacts with the Russells were, therefore, motivated by friendship and a desire to afford pastoral care rather than for personal advantage.

Charities

Tillotson's pastoral concerns are revealed not only through his dealings with various individuals and the Russell family but also in his work for various charities. He was eager to enable the Welsh to have religious literature in their own language, to use the charity available at Canterbury to help a number of causes and to assist the Huguenots fleeing the persecutions of Louis XIV.

In the mid-1670s, Tillotson led a movement to provide the Bible and theological and liturgical works in Welsh and to set

---

1. Add MS 17,017, f.152; Birch MS 4,236, ff. 65 and 303; Birch I, cciv-v.
2. Birch MS 4,236, ff. 65-7; Birch I, ccxiii.

up schools in Wales to teach English to poor children. Boys were also to learn to write and do accounts but girls only reading. Tillotson himself donated £50 and was supported financially by nineteen other clergymen, including Baxter, Patrick, Stillinglfeet and Whichcote. Baxter's participation shows that this was not purely an Anglican venture. Welsh versions of the Bible and Prayer Book were prepared. Between 1674 and 1675, the organisation distributed thirty-two Welsh Bibles and 479 New Testaments, which were, apparently, all that could be obtained at the time. Five hundred copies of The Whole Duty of Man were given out and 2,000 copies of The Practice of Piety. The printers found it hard to keep up with demand. By 1675 in 86 towns some 1,162 poor children were attending schools. In addition, local people had financed places for another 863. Within two years the lord mayor and aldermen of the city of London as well as other charitable individuals were supporting the work. To ensure that the money and books reached their appointed destinations, the whole exercise was carefully monitored: ministers and church wardens receiving the charity were required to return receipts to London.[1]

Richard Allestree's
Lewis Bayly's
two of the most influential devotional books of the century.

As dean of Canterbury Tillotson presided over a chapter which disbursed sums of money to charitable causes. In his time £298 7s. 6d. was paid out in specific single payments.[2] In addition, unspecified single and regular payments were also made for which totals cannot be calculated. All the payments were made to needy individuals or churches in difficulty.

The chapter was sympathetic to members of its own staff and to other clergy. Sums granted ranged from £20 to the daughter of a former minor canon called Sargenson to 7s. 6d. to the widow of Edmund Burges, a minor canon.[3] Money was provided to help young people secure apprenticeships. Abraham Pratt, a former chorister, was given a quarter's wages. Johnson, a lay clerk, got 40s. for his son. Drayton got £3 for his. An unnamed apprentice was given 30s. to enable him to find a new place.[4] Grants were made to people simply on the grounds of poverty. A widow was given 10s., a poor scholar £5 to help him at university, and £50 was granted to poor Irish protestants.[5]

---

1. An Appeal for Funds ... Pious Treatises in the Welsh Language (1675); D. Neal, The History of the Puritans, (1822), vol. IV, p.429 note.
2. See above p.98-9.
3. Canterbury MS AC 23-29, 31, 36, 80-2.
4. Canterbury MS AC 18, 31, 64-5, 68.
5. Canterbury MS AC 31, 74-6, 107-8.

Contributions were made to Huguenots.[1] Donations were given to rescue people from imprisonment for debt and to redeem slaves.[2] Money was given to people whose houses had been destroyed by fire.[3] Churches which had suffered from the fall of the steeple, or from being struck by lightning and those in need of repair also benefited.[4]

King's School Canterbury was part of the cathedral's charitable work. It appointed examiners, masters and ushers. In 1689 after a year's patient admonition, including one delivered by Tillotson in person, Richard Johnson was deprived of his mastership for neglecting his duties. Pupils were given scholarships to enable them to study at Oxford or Cambridge.[5]

Under Tillotson's guidance, the chapter was not deaf to appeal, and a wide variety of needs was met. What is not known is the number and nature of unsuccessful appeals that were made.

Louis XIV's persecution, led many Huguenots to flee from France to sympathetic countries such as England. Requests for help for these refugees led in 1681 to the privy council urging a collection to be taken for their relief. The first appeal lasted for two years during which £12,788 was received and £12,425 disbursed.[6]

Tillotson was concerned in this work both as dean of Canterbury and in his personal capacity. In 1681 the Canterbury chapter gave 20s. to the fund, two years later it agreed an annual contribution and in 1685, pressed by a letter from the absent Tillotson, £70 was voted.[7]

Following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, the French Church in the Savoy petitioned the privy council for a new collection to help the refugees. James II, who had only succeeded to the throne earlier that year and seemed eager to prevent the Huguenots strengthening English dissent, agreed to

---

1. See below p. 148.
2. Canterbury MS AC 70, 23 and 57-9.
3. Canterbury MS AC 54, 23, 36, 62.
4. Canterbury MS AC 13-14, 39, 40, 71.
5. Canterbury MS AC 13, 16, 38, 70, 86, 106, 109.
6. PC2/69/327, 338, 382; A.P. Hands and I. Scouloudi, French Protestant Refugees Relieved Through Threadneedle Street Church, London, 1681-7, (1971), preface and pp. 1-3, 6-11, cited Hands and Scouloudi.
7. Canterbury MS AC 64-5; Bodleian MS Tanner, vol. xxxiv, f. 176; Bodleian MS Rawlinson, C739,5.

the petition but with the proviso that those to be helped should be conformable to the Church of England.[1] The collection was announced in the London churches on 29 March 1686, and James gave £500.[2] Beveridge refused to read the appeal at the service in Canterbury Cathedral because it was contrary to the rubrics. From Tillotson this drew the riposte, "Doctor, Doctor, charity is above the Rubrics."[3]

From 1686 at least, Tillotson was working for this charity. With others, he signed documents authorising Sir Peter Rich, Sir John Chardin and Peter du Gua to make payments.[4] In the summer he made a special plea to the archbishop for a licence for Monsieur Cougnot, who was eager to be ordained but could not afford the fees. He also raised the needs of Monsieur Le Mot.[5] In October Tillotson was granted £350 to dispense at Canterbury.[6] In November he and three others were entrusted with £500 for the Huguenot poor in London. Also in November Tillotson signed disbursements totalling £2,532.[7] In January 1687 he was sixth signatory out of eight on a grant of £4,796 17s. 0d. and in February he himself was granted £200 for Huguenots arriving in Canterbury.[8] Later in 1687 he helped authorise grants of £1,044 2s. 0d. and £6,250 10s. 6d.[9] After the Revolution, at the request of the privy council, a declaration was issued in 1689 inviting all French protestants to settle in England and promising aid and protection.[10] Tillotson, now dean of St Paul's, was appointed to join the bishop of London, the attorney general and the solicitor general to meet the aldermen of the city and the magistrates of Middlesex and Westminster to consider some means of relieving French protestants.[11] The accounts of the old fund were wound up on 14 May 1689, but nothing is known of Tillotson's work for the new one.[12]

Tillotson's work for charity reveals a wider pastoral concern than purely for individuals and people whom he knew

---

1. PC2/71/50.
2. F.C. Turner, James II, (1948), pp. 313-4.
3. Mary Berry, Some Account of the Life of Rachel Wriothesley, Lady Russell, (1819), p. xxii; Birch I, lxxxviii.
4. City of London MSS 347/58-9 and 61.
5. Bodleian MS Tanner, vol. XXX, f.99.
6. City of London MS 347/25.
7. City of London MS 347/22-7.
8. City of London MS 347/30-1.
9. City of London MS 347/10-12 and 51.
10. PC2/73/74 and 80.
11. PC2/74/82.
12. Hands and Scouloudi 6-11.

socially. The payments made by the dean and chapter at Canterbury can only have been motivated by a desire to help people in difficulty. Equally there can be no doubt that purely charitable motives influenced him concerning the needs of the Welsh and of the Huguenots. However, help to both served to further his other religious and political aims. The strengthening of Anglicanism in Wales enhanced that faith as a whole and, therefore, fortified still further the defences against Rome and even, perhaps, protestant nonconformity. Equally the Huguenots, whether or not they conformed to the Church of England, as a minority of protestants persecuted by the Roman Catholic French, strengthened the forces of English protestantism against James II. It is impossible to tell whether Tillotson rejoiced that the Huguenot emigration weakened the French numerically, economically and militarily. Whatever his views of the benefits of the arrival of the refugees, Tillotson was instrumental in helping them financially and facilitating their permanent settlement.

Children and Servants

Tillotson also manifested his pastoral concern by his preaching and publishing. In these areas he revealed his concern for the personal faith of his hearers and readers, for their treatment of their servants and the upbringing of their children.

In 1694, shortly before his death, Tillotson published a set of six sermons preached between 1662 and 1684 under the title: Of Resolution and Steadfastness in Religion.[1] In the preface Tillotson expressed the hope that he had been released for the rest of his life 'from that irksome and unpleasant work of controversy and wrangling about religion' in order to turn his thoughts to something of greater benefit to true religion. He was eager to publish quickly because the time of his life was short. He hoped that these sermons might make amends for his weaknesses as archbishop by encouraging piety and virtue.[2]

The first sermon, preached at St Lawrence Jewry on 3 June 1684, gave its title to the whole collection.[3] Tillotson set up Joshua as an example of a man who would stand alone if necessary in order to serve God.[4] Throughout the Old Testament

---

1. Birch I, ccxi; Birch III, 439-576: Sermons XLIX-LIV.
2. Birch III, 440-2; Birch I, ccxi.
3. Birch III, 443-63: Sermon XLIX.
4. Birch Birch III, 446.

and in the history of the church up to Luther there had been examples of people who followed Joshua's example.[1] There are, however, limits. One would not stand alone to defend something which had not been divinely commended or something which had been condemned, such as many of the ceremonies in worship. In such matters it was usually right to conform to common custom,but one would stand boldly against things contrary to reason, to sense, or the word of God.[2] He listed a number of Roman Catholic practices and beliefs as examples.[3] In the second part of the sermon he dealt with objections to this view. It could be objected that a man cannot set up his private judgment against a general view. This is true unless the man is supported by scripture or reason.[4] It may be said that it is more prudent for individuals to err with the church than to hold their own views. It can never be prudent to err in matters of great importance. However, people may be excused for following the church rather than a particular person or sect. If the error is gross, no excuse is possible.[5] The final objection is that there is as much danger in forsaking the church because of its pretended errors as in following it blindly. However, the guilt of schism lies not with those who leave a corrupt church but with those who corrupt it.[6] Like Joshua, at times Christians may have to stand alone to serve God.[7]

Ten days later Tillotson continued his sermon in the same church.[8] It is a duty, he said, of a master and father of a family to train those in his care to serve God.[9] This should be done by holding regular worship in the family, giving thanks at meal times, teaching the duties of religion to children and servants, especially on Sundays after attendance at public worship, encouraging private prayer, and by personal example.[10] The obligation to do this results from responsibility for our households and from the desire to further our own interests by having God-fearing, and therefore, reliable, people in the home.[11] These practices have decayed because of the civil disturbances and religious differences of the period which have

---

1. Birch III, 448-9.
2. Birch III, 450-1.
3. Birch III, 451-2.
4. Birch III, 455-6.
5. Birch III, 457.
6. Birch III, 459.
7. Birch III, 463.
8. Birch III, 464-82: Sermon L.
9. Birch III, 464.
10. Birch III, 466-72.
11. Birch III, 473-7.

disrupted and divided families amongst each other.[1] The result of this neglect is that if children are not prepared for profiting from publicly-given teaching, such teaching will have little effect. They will thus become disruptive and ruinous in society. We shall also suffer personally for the problems that they cause. What a paradise this world would be if children and servants were carefully educated in their religious duties.[2]

Tillotson took up a pre-occupation of his day when he included in this volume three sermons 'Of the Education of Children' based on Proverbs 22,6: 'Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it'.[3] The sermons form a continuous discussion of the theme. Tillotson's declared aim was to revive 'that so shamefully neglected, and yet most useful and necessary, duty of catechising children and young persons' and to reflect on education in general.[4] The work of education requires great insight into children's personalities, Tillotson insisted, and much careful hard work. It is the duty of parents and teachers to 'train up a child' and to hope for the fruit of their labours in the child's constancy later in life.[5] Children should be carefully nursed, taken to church for baptism, instructed in their duty to God and their neighbour, taught to form their lives according to religion and virtue, have a good example set, be restrained from evil by reproof and correction, be brought for public instruction in the catechism and then for confirmation.[6] For a mother to pass the nursing of her child to others can expose the child to strange milk which contains the nurse's weaknesses, diseases and 'irregular passions'.[7] It can lead to neglect not only of the foster child but also of the nurse's own child. Using a nurse estranges and weakens the affection of mother and child.[8] Mothers should be caring for their children rather than spending time in dressing elaborately, paying pointless visits, watching plays, gambling and revelling.[9] Baptism must be in public unless the child is in danger of death and not, as current custom was, at home.[10] In teaching children their duties to God and their neighbours, parents are to tell them of rewards and punishments that await

---

1. Birch III, 477-9.
2. Birch III, 479-81.
3. Birch III, 483-551: Sermons LI-LIII.
4. Birch III, 483.
5. Birch III, 484-5.
6. Birch III, 487.
7. Birch III, 489.
8. Birch III, 489-90.
9. Birch III, 491-2
10. Birch III, 493.

them after death. They are to teach obedience, modesty, diligence, sincerity, tenderness and pity, the control of their passions and their tongues, and, especially, to be truthful.[1] Children are to be brought up to be sober and temperate in their appetites, to have a serious and unaffected piety and devotion towards God,[2] and to be just honest and charitable in their dealing.

In the second sermon on this subject, Tillotson stressed the need to set good examples before children.[3] Good education, he said, also involves restraining children from evil by reproof and correction. The severity must be in proportion to the crime so that the error will not be repeated.[4] Children should be brought to the minister to be properly catechised as preparation for confirmation. The catechism is best fitted for teaching children the principles of religion as it is easily remembered. Parents and masters should do some of this work at home with their children and servants.[5] Children, once prepared, should then be brought to the bishop for confirmation. Tillotson believed that confirmation services should be more frequent and for smaller numbers so that the significance for the individual would seem greater. He urged that ministers should prevent people from being confirmed more than once: some presented themselves at every confirmation 'which is very disorderly and unreasonable, there being every whit as little reason for a second confirmation, as there is for a second baptism'.[6]

The second part of this discourse was concerned with the good management of education so that it would be effective. The teacher must understand the pupil's 'particular temper and disposition' so that the good may be fostered and the bad rectified.[7] Children should be taught the most substantial principles of religion and virtue which will be of lasting use to them. Children should be discouraged from sin and vice, which should be plucked out before they get a firm hold.[8] Children should be brought to public worship as soon as they are able and then questioned about what they have learnt there. At home they should be taught prayers for use morning and

---

1. Birch III, 495-502.
2. Birch III, 502-6.
3. Birch III, 507-9.
4. Birch III, 510-12.
5. Birch III, 513-15.
6. Birch III, 516-7.
7. Birch III, 517-8.
8. Birch III, 519-22.

evening in private.[1] The whole business of education must be carried out with care and diligence a little at a time: 'children are narrow-mouthed vessels, and a great deal cannot be poured into them at once'. In all that is done in this matter, we must make it a matter of earnest prayer to God.[2]

In his final sermon Tillotson spoke of what so often went wrong in education. Parents are often mistaken in what they teach, especially when treating as sins things which are not. When the children grow up and discover the error, they question everything they have learnt. Many parents are too free in front of their children and, while not being sinful, give a false impression of what is suitable or bring them to the borders of sin.[3] Parents are also guilty in matters of reproof and correction. Some are too severe and harden their offspring against punishment and instil hatred of religion. Instead, children should be induced by praise and reward and sometimes shame or disgrace, but if these fail reasonable correction may succeed, though not if administered in passion.[4]

The good education of children has a lasting influence on their lives. There are few who are not susceptible to education in what is good. If good education is given when a child is young, it will prevent evil being sown. It also creates good habits and becomes second nature so that conscience is troubled when evil appears.[5]

Tillotson concluded the sermon with an exhortation to persuade parents to educate their children effectively. They will free their children from their corrupt natures, give them the very best inheritance which cannot be taken from them, give their parents the comfort and happiness of a duty properly discharged. The surest foundation of the public welfare is based on the education of children, great evils stem from its neglect, and parental neglect will bring guilt upon the parents for the children's evil.[6]

The last sermon to be included in this collection had been preached at St Lawrence Jewry as early as 1662 and was 'Of the Advantages of an Early Piety'.[7] It was based on Ecclesiastes

---

1. Birch III, 522.
2. Birch III, 524-5.
3. Birch III, 528-32.
4. Birch III, 532-5.
5. Birch III, 535-9.
6. Birch III, 539-51.
7. Birch III, 552-76: Sermon LIV.

12,1: 'Remember now thy creator in the days of thy youth; while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them'.[1] After having published sermons about the education of children, Tillotson was concerned about youth - the stage when people became responsible for fulfilling the vows made on their behalf at baptism. What he had to say was intended to be of benefit, however, to people of all ages.[2] We are to remember our creator to have him in our minds and to take him into consideration in contrast to the wicked who forget him. To remember God means to honour, fear, love, obey and serve him. Remembering God as creator speaks to us of his being, power and goodness. This remembering is done in youth because then the blessing of life is new, we are inquisitive about God, full of wonder at our position and at our capacity for understanding, conversing, friendship and our enjoyment of God. In later life as age begins to bring decay we may forget him.[3] It is also important to remember God in our youth because we are them the more susceptible to the temptations of sensual pleasures but also because youth is equally susceptible to the sowing of religion and virtue. Younger lives are easy to influence, but it is difficult to make impressions upon older people in whom evil has been deeply imprinted.[4] Youth is also the time of our greatest strength and this should be dedicated to God's service.[5] Indeed, if we neglect God in our youth we may not live long enough to consider him later.[6] From all this Tillotson inferred that the young should be persuaded to turn to God and not to be seduced into evil. He also urged those who had failed to turn to God in their youth to repent quickly before it was too late. If we would be accepted by God in our dying hour, now is the time to turn to him.[7]

Tillotson's views on the upbringing of children and young people were not uncommon in his day. From the sixteenth century there had been a concern among both puritans and Anglicans on this issue which continued throughout Tillotson's lifetime. Roger Ascham, for example, in 1598 had recognised that unjust or unreasonably severe punishment hardened rebellion and that shame, although a potent force, if over-used ceased to be effective. Brutality was to be avoided, a view

---

1. Birch III, 552.
2. Birch III, 552-3.
3. Birch III, 554-62.
4. Birch III, 562-4.
5. Birch III, 566-7.
6. Birch III, 569.
7. Birch III, 573-5.

with which Joseph White concurred in 1681. Richard Allestree had argued in 1677 that correction should be proportional to the child's fault and 'tenderness' and never given in rage. Ascham also put stress on free obedience rather than force. John Locke, writing in 1693, believed that children should learn to follow reason rather than appetite and should seek self-control. In addition,Ascham felt that education was beneficial for promoting social peace and avoidance of the sins and follies of youth. Robert Cleaver in 1598 and William Gouge in 1622 had both deplored the use of wet-nurses as threatening the physical and mental health of children.[1]

In this last collection of Tillotson's sermons to be published in his life time, his pastoral concerns, puritanism and humanity are all visible. He emphasised the responsibility of parents and employers for the religious upbringing of those in their care. He counselled family prayers, grace before meals, training in private prayer and attendance at Sunday worship. Children should be baptised, catechised, instructed in their duties to God and their neighbours and then confirmed. In all religious education the example of parents and employers was vital. Youth was urged to turn to God in its prime. It is, perhaps, surprising to find Tillotson speaking about the duties of mothers. He had no room for wilfully neglectful mothers who imperilled their children's health and the mother-child relationship by neglecting to breast feed their own offspring. He showed remarkable psychological sensitivity when he insisted that education requires insight into children's personalities, that over-severity can be counter-productive and that praise and reward, shame and disgrace were preferable to corporal punishment. Tillotson's strictures on private baptisms and repeated confirmations illustrate something of the ecclesiastical practice of the period. His suggestion that children should be questioned about what they had learnt in church services betrays a belief that these were an aspect of religious education rather than purely acts of divine worship.

Conclusion

From the little that is known of Tillotson as a pastor, he was a man with a sincere Christian sympathy for people in need.His concern for the poor and for people's moral and spiritual health led him to seek to provide money, warnings and

---

1. C.John Sommerville, The Discovery of Childhood in Puritan England, (1992), chapters 1 and 3.

advice. His interest in servants, children and youth was a reminder to employers and parents of the responsibilities towards those in their care as understood in the seventeenth century. The paucity of information on these aspects of Tillotson's work comes as no surprise. He was only briefly a parish minister, and his later appointments called for duties of a different order. In any case, because of its very personal nature, most pastoral work occurs in private encounters between minister and people and is never documented for reasons of confidentiality. Indeed, because Tillotson did on occasion communicate his views and advice on paper, more is known of this aspect of his work than might otherwise have been the case.

Chapter 7: Preaching

Introduction

According to George Whitefield and John Wesley, Tillotson 'knew no more of Christianity that did Mahomet'. Thus they dismissed one of the seventeenth-century's most popular preachers, whose sermons were still privately read and publicly preached in the eighteenth. Aquila Smith retorted that Whitefield knew less of Christianity than Tillotson and prayed, "If this be the Spirit of Methodism, my soul come not thou into their secret."[1] Later, however, both divines repented of their view. Whitefield publicly regretted the remark, and Wesley, who had read Tillotson at Oxford, published some of his works in his series, the Christian Library.[2] Tillotson, no stranger to theological controversy during his life time, was, therefore, subjected to more after his death.

Tillotson's abilities as a preacher had been recognised very early in his career. People who heard him on Sundays at Lincoln's Inn often went to St Lawrence Jewry on Tuesdays hoping to hear the same sermon again.[3] James Arderne is believed to have been advocating Tillotson's style when in 1671, like others before him, he advocated a directness and clarity in preaching.[4] Tillotson's sermons were, by standards of his day, short, expressed in simple language, convincing in argument, 'solid and yet lively, and grave as well as fine'.[5] Richard Baxter declared him one of the best Conformist preachers.[6] In 1694 Sir Robert Howard praised Tillotson's sermons in which:

---

1. H.M.C. Polworth, vol. V, p. 167, Doc. 224; Aquila Smith, A Curious Letter from a Gentleman to Mr Whitefield, (1740), pp. 5-6; H.D.Rack, Reasonable Enthusiast: John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism, (1989), pp. 29, 174, 178, cited Rack; Rupp 378; Spurr 393.
2. V.H.H.Green, The Young Mr Wesley, (1961), p. 297; Rupp 378; Rack 347.
3. Birch I, cclxxxiii.
4. James Mackay (ed.), James Arderne, Directions Concerning the Matter and Stile of Sermons, (Oxford 1952), pp. ix, xii, 1-30.
5 Funeral Sermon 2,12-14; Irene Simon, Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South, Tillotson, (Paris 1967), chapter 1; Louis G. Locke, 'Tillotson: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Literature' in Anglistica, vol. IV (Copenhagen 1954), pp. 113-4, 125, 128, cited L.G.Locke.
6. Clifford 33.

> all are taught a plain and certain way to salvation, and with all the charms of a calm and blessed temper, and of pure reason, are excited to the uncontroverted indubitable duties of religion, where all are plainly shown, that the means to obtain the eternal peace of a happy rest, are those (and no other) which also give peace in this present life....[1]

Burnet in his eulogy at Tillotson's funeral in the same year agreed with Howard's sentiments and hoped, moreover, that Tillotson's style would be much copied.[2] Characteristically, George Hickes hoped that it would not.[2] Younger clergy were encouraged to take Tillotson as their example.[3] Joseph Addison, writing in 1711, reported giving his parson a set of Tillotson's sermons and as a result hearing a Tillotson one Sunday and a Callamy the other.[4] Others, including Parson Woodforde and Anthony Hastwell working as far apart as Somerset, East Anglia and the North Riding of Yorkshire, regularly adapted Tillotson's sermons for their own congregations.[5]

Early eighteenth-century writers were mainly in favour of Tillotson. Samuel Wesley wrote of 'the immortal Tillotson', and The Tatler considered him the 'most eminent and useful author of the age in which we live'.[6] John Edwards, despite deploring Tillotson's stress on reason and claiming he reduced of Christianity to morality, nevertheless recognised the contemporary need for preaching on morality, which Tillotson had so well done.[7] Robert Lightfoot, however, opined in 1710 that Tillotson was no 'ethic lecturer' but taught that moral

---

1. R.Howard, 'The History of Religion As it Has Been Managed by Priestcraft', 1694, in The Growth of Deism and Other Tracts, (1709), p. 278.
2. Funeral Sermon 14; Some Discourses 51.
3. L.G.Locke 122 and 130.
4 J.H.Pruett, The Parish Clergy Under the Later Stuarts: the Leicestershire Experience, (Illinois 1978), pp. 123-4.
5. Norman Sykes, 'The Sermons of Archbishop Tillotson' in Theology, Vol. LVIII, January 1955, no. 415, p. 298.
6. Spurr 393.
7. John Edwards, The Preacher, (1705-7), Part I, pp. 45-6, 64-5, 78. Cited: John Edwards

virtues are fruits of the Spirit.[1] Christiane Eberhardine, Queen of Poland, accepted a French translation of Tillotson's sermons in the same year recognising that celebrated English preachers were 'very learned and worthy of admiration'.[2] Henry Felton in 1713 commented: "His course of reasoning and style is like a gentle and even current and is deep, calm and strong. Language is pure like purest water, flowest so free and uninterrupted that it never stops the reader.[3] William Wishart, writing ten years later, admired Tillotson's noble sentiments, elegance of expression and opposition to popery but felt his views on certain dogmas too narrow and that his teaching on the bases of moral virtue superficial.[4]

The beginning of Methodism in the later 1730s brought savage criticism from Wesley and Whitefield. During a visit to America, Whitefield rejoiced in 1740 to find that a woman who, previous to coming to faith, had admired Tillotson could now 'no longer take up with such books'. He was, however, displeased to learn that 'bad books', including Tillotson's works were read at Cambridge College, New England.[5] Philip Doddridge (1705-51), a dissenter, praised Tillotson's sermons more for their style, simplicity of expression and quality of argument than for their content. The poet William Cowper (1731-1800) indicates that, despite Tillotson's fine language, he did not proclaim the gospel.[6]

The early nineteenth century finds opinion still as varied. The eminent Baptist preacher Robert Hall congratulated Tillotson and Barrow for handing down excellent moral instruction though criticising them for insufficient stress on the gospel, especially the fruit of the Spirit.[7] John Hunt saw Tillotson as typical of the eighteenth century: miracles had ceased, witches were dead and the sacraments no longer channels

---

1. Robert Lightfoot, Dr Edwards's Vindication Considered in a Letter to a Friend wherein the Late Archbishop Tillotson and Others are more fully Vindicated from his Unjust Reflections,(1710), pp. 44-6.
2. H.M.C. 14th Report, Part II, Vol. IV, Portland, p. 555.
3. Henry Felton, A Dissertation on Reading the Classics, (1713), pp. 154-5.
4. H.M.C. Various Collections, Vol. VIII, p. 366, M.L.S. Clements MSS, Codehill, Co. Cavan.
5. George Whitefield, Journals, (1960), pp. 438 and 462.
6. George M.Ella, William Cowper: Poet of Paradise, (Darlington 1993), pp. 227-8
7. Robert Hall, Works, (1845), Vol. IV, pp. 133-5.

of supernatural grace.[1]

However, the growth of Methodism and Anglo-Catholicism in the later nineteenth century focussed attention on the Hanoverian church, from which both had sprung, and upon the responsibility of Tillotson and his colleagues for its condition. Under the influence of Mark Pattison and Leslie Stephen, the view became widespread that the seventeenth-century divines had difficulty with doctrinal Christianity and turned to a moral religion beased on nature rather than scripture. Stephen saw them as moving towards deism.[2] Tillotson's alleged moralism and rationalism were claimed to have produced a cold, unattractive and uninspiring Christianity in contrast to the religion of the 'warmed heart' of the Wesleys. Tillotson's alleged encouragement of deism together with David Hume's rejection of miracles had the effect, it was claimed, of reducing the faith to no more than worldly wisdom.[3] Tillotson's encouragement of a rapprochement with dissenters and lack of concern for 'ceremonies' made him anathema to the followers of Pusey and Newman.[4]

The severest indictment in the early twentieth century has been that Tillotson was simply a rationalist. His was 'a type of faith which stressed practice, minimised theology, and leant heavily upon reason'.[5] Tillotson and Tenison 'held that reason by itself could provide all that was needed in the way of genuine truth, though its findings were confirmed by scripture'. The result was that there had been less emphasis on distinctively scriptural doctrines and more on natural religion and on the ethics that sprang from obedience to conscience. All this led to revelation having to give way to reason and then to the horrors of Deism. In the early eighteenth century, therefore, 'the theological climate was exceedingly bleak, and religiously there was almost a vacuum'.[6]

A closer and more comprehensive study of Tillotson's sermons reveals this as a distorted picture. James Moffatt in the mid-1920s was nearer the mark when he stressed that Tillotson was not a rationalist in the commonly-understood sense of the term: "He never held that Christianity was a moral

---

1. John Hunt, Religious Thought in England, (1870-3), vol. II, p.100
2. Reedy 150.
3. N.Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, (Cambridge 1959), p.150.
4. Louis G. Locke 78-80; Spurr 394.
5. G.R.Cragg, The Church in the Age of Reason, 1648-1749, (1960), p. 77, cited Cragg.
6. R.E.Davies, Methodism, (1963), pp. 32-4.

philosophy; it was for him a power of life...." God's grace, he had taught, shows people how to live a good life, and redemption produces a zeal for ethical obedience. Christianity is a reasonable religion. Reason can discover the moral law and verify it in scripture. It can understand both the truths of natural religion and the specifically Christian truths in the Bible. There is a divine inspiration in the soul. Deliberate and conscious arguments are, however, to be preferred to passions and affections. Tillotson opposed 'enthusiasm' because it denied reason, claimed direct inspiration from God, ignored mind and conscience and made light of moral standards. Leslie Stephen called Tillotson's 'the golden period of English theology' because theology and reason were in alliance. The fact that the eighteenth-century free-thinkers saw Tillotson as their head resulted from an over-selective study of his works, and therefore he cannot be held responsible.[1]

In 1953 Norman Sykes accused Tillotson of reducing the Divine Benevolence to easy good nature.[2] J. Downey and D.H.M.Davies, writing in 1969 and 1975 respectively, could not understand the popularity of Tillotson's preaching. Davies condemned Tillotson as preaching a 'Christianity without tears', diluting the faith by reducing it to rationalism and abandoning grace by his stress on moralism. A.C. Clifford in 1990, however, successfully challenged both, pointing out that these views were based upon a misunderstanding of the sermon The Precepts of Christianity Not Grievous, where Tillotson's argument was that the undoubted difficulty of Christian practice is eased by the reasonableness of divine law, the availability of divine grace to overcome human weakness in obeying the commandments, and the joy in this world and the next resulting from faithful Christian living.[3]

George M. Ella in 1993 quoted the traditional criticisms of Tillotson as a moralist but congratulates him for reforming the language of preaching and so making it more accessible to ordinary people.[4] However, in the same year, Gerard Reedy mounted a firm defence of Tillotson as a theologian: "I believe that he is one of the great, yet much misunderstood, writers of late seventeenth-century England." Reedy argued that the condemnation of Tillotson as a moralist arose from a study

---

1. J.Moffatt,. 30-36; Simon 17 and 78
2. Norman Sykes, The English Religious Tradition: Sketches of its Influence on Church, State and Society, (1953), pp. 55-6.
3. Clifford 33-4 and 40; Birch I, 466-87, Sermon VI.
4. George M. Ella, op.cit., p. 227.

often restricted to the first six sermons of the first folio and the neglect of the rest of his work. This 'interpreting canon', he declared, was too limited, and he proposed instead that judgement on Tillotson should be based on his four sermons on the divinity and incarnation of the Word with his sermons on the sacrifice of Christ and on the Trinity. Thus a twenty-first century member of the Society of Jesus has defended the seventeenth-century anti-Catholic Tillotson as a preacher firmly based on scripture, tradition and sound learning.[1] Why a judgement should be based on a selection of sermons, rather than the whole corpus, is not clarified.

What Tillotson's enemies and supporters have often failed to recognise is that he was essentially a preacher addressing the issues of his day in sermons which had to be clear enough to be understood in church at the moment of delivery. He was not producing theological treatises for leisured reflection in a library. Equally, in an age when moral standards were felt by some to be below those required of a Christian, it is understandable that one of the main thrusts of his preaching should be to encourage an improvement. It is not surprising, therefore, that the content of his sermons was 'not ... immensely profound, but it was full of sound ethic and high moral tone. Though the note of prophecy is absent, the appeal to common sense is clearly sounded'.[2]

Tillotson's doctrinal preaching was also reflecting the concerns of his age: the second half of the seventeenth century was seeing, in some quarters, a decline in doctrinal teaching and a greater stress on ethics.[3] Also, at a time when observation and reason were enabling such great strides to be made in scientific discovery and when there was so much suspicion of the extravagances of Commonwealth preachers, it was to be expected that Tillotson would seek to clarify the place of reason in theological reflection.

Even though Tillotson is best remembered for his moralism his range of preaching themes is very much wider. Indeed, 'his work as a theologian has been underrated' and 'his services as a defender of the faith have been generally underestimated, or perhaps obscured by his fame as a moralist'. Tillotson did, indeed, preach on all the great themes of the faith: God, Trinity, creation, incarnation, salvation, heaven and hell, judgement, the church and spiritual life. Tillotson was

---

1. Reedy 83-103.
2. J.R.H.Moorman, A History of the Church of England, (1953), pp. 259-60; Cragg 72-3; Rupp 37; Clifford 39-40
3. C.F.Allison, The Rise of Moralism, (1966), pp. 192-6.

essentially a preacher seeking to impress upon his hearers the rationality of the central truths of the faith and their implications for everyday living. Dr Johnson was right when commenting on a friend's reading of Sherlock, Beveridge and Tillotson: "Ay sir, there you drink the cup of salvation to the bottom."[1]

Authority

The question of religious authority in Tillotson's day lay at the heart of most of the theological controversies of the period. Tillotson's debates with Roman Catholics were based upon the repective emphasis to be given to scripture and tradition, as has been shown in Chapter 2. The seventeenth-century dissenters, however, while fiercely loyal to scripture, recognised individual liberty in its interpretation. There was, therefore, the danger of enthusiasm, which Tillotson and others sought to counter with an emphasis on scripture and reason.

During the Interregnum independent sects had proliferated. Most of their members rejected organised religion, claimed fellowship in the true church specifically established by act of God, and the receipt of special revelations. Their worship, they believed, was a more pure and spiritual worship than the Anglican, and they had greater experience in their souls of divine fear, love and joy.[2] Such enthusiasm produced a confusion hard to tolerate in Restoration England. There Anglicans, Presbyterians and politicians were all eager to foster unity in church and state to enable stability to be restored after the anarchy of the 1650s and to ensure that the threats from Catholicism both religious and political could be countered successfully.

Tillotson argued that scripture and reason were the true foundations of the faith. Other teachings, whether advanced by a self-styled infallible church or 'the confident dictates and assertions of any enthusiast' were to be rejected. The enthusiast's confidence, he believed, sprang from 'a kind of passion in the understanding' and was used 'like fury and force for the weakness and want of argument'. A sound argument needed no such support. In the eyes of wise people an unsound argument would get none from such a source.

---

1 Rupp 37, 246, 514-6.
2 J.R.H.Moorman, op.cit., 281; Rack 276; Spurr 264-5.

Enthusiasm was pernicious. It dazzled the ignorant because it was strange and extraordinary, and they did not know what to make of it. "This form of religion," he warned, "is calculated only to impose upon the ignorant, but signifies little amongst the steady and considerate sort of people." It was to be avoided because it was only based on 'what every man that has confidence enough may pretend to' and is an inspiration for which 'we have nothing but their own word...'. Instead, there is the 'great and standing revelation of the gospel'. Fortunately, he concluded, the Church of England exists to preserve us from 'the wild freaks of enthusiasm'.[1]

For Tillotson, scripture was the infallible rule of faith, given by inspiration and sufficiently clear in all essentials. For him, therefore, 'holy scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation', and all Christians should be ready to 'hear ..., read, mark, learn and inwardly digest' it.[2] Pauline references to the Old Testament, readily extended to apply to the New, served to provide Tillotson with his view of scripture's origins in divine inspiration and its value for salvation.[3] In short, scripture is the 'excellent and necessary means of Divine knowledge' which brings us to faith, repentance and eternal salvation.[4] As a result, Christians treat the scriptures as the oracles of God, reverence and submit to them.[5] The Bible did, Tillotson admitted, contain difficulties and obscurities, but these do not pose a serious problem because the essentials are clear.[6]

The purpose of scripture, Tillotson understood, was to lead people to salvation by directing them to turn from sin in repentance and faith. Thus they will be preserved from eternal misery and directed to heaven. The Bible, therefore, is 'the great instrument of our salvation' and must be obeyed if our situation is not to become desperate.[7] Because scripture had divine authority it is to be believed even when it contains matters for which we cannot account. However, to use scripture to encourage error, heresy or for any other evil purpose will cause us to be answerable to God.[8]

---

1. Birch II, 58-9; IV 95-6; VIII 509-10.
2. Thirty Nine Articles: Article VI; Book of Common Prayer: collect for Second Sunday in Advent.4
3. II Timothy 3,16; Romans 15, 4; Birch V, 39-40.
4. Birch II, 521; V, 9; VI 231-22; III, 337.
5. Birch III, 336.
6. Birch II, 523; X, 297; V, 9 and 39-40; VI, 232.
7. Birch IV, 100; VI, 253-5
8. Birch VI, 512; V, 476

Scripture, according to Tillotson, is superior to tradition. He readily admitted that in the earliest days the Christian faith had been passed down by oral tradition before it had been committed to writing and that it was ecclesiastical tradition that affirmed its canonicity.[1] However, once written down scripture had no equal. Controversies in the Roman Catholic Church and the heresies that had arisen proved that tradition is no guarantee of certainty.[2] Scripture avoids the problems of conveying revelation orally where mistakes, forgetfulness, wilful falsification and weakening can occur in transmission. Through scripture the revelation is conveyed more lastingly, uniformly, accurately and publicly. It does not require further supernatural intervention. Nothing can come with greater authority.[3] Scripture is the rule of faith. None of the early councils or fathers said otherwise. It was Roman Catholics who added tradition, and even the Council of Trent said scripture and tradition had to be treated with equal reverence.[4]

Because scripture is crucial to our salvation, contrary to contemporary Roman Catholic custom it must be available to all in their own language.[5] Equally its claims must be impressed upon the people. They must consider whether any other book so claims to be of God, reveals the way to eternal happiness, teaches so usefully and reasonably, argues so powerfully, and contains truth confirmed by unquestionable miracles and recorded by eye- and ear-witnesses. If there is none, then they should follow the Bible. If followed, scripture would make people pious, more holy, sober, just and fair.[6]

Tillotson's Anglican orthodoxy on the crucial significance of the Bible to Christian faith is clear. It was the rule of faith because it was divinely inspired and translated and was comprehensive in its teachings. Tillotson recognised the difficulties created by obscure passages but felt that in essentials all was clear and comprehensible, if properly understood. He eschewed a wooden literalism by recognising the need to distinguish between figures of speech and reality and stressing the necessity of interpretation. As a pastor and preacher he was concerned for the salvation of souls and for moral improvement and was, therefore, eager for everyone to

---

1. See above 38-42.
2. See above p. 41
3. Birch VI, 232-6
4. See above p. 42; Birch IV, 112, 159-60, 165
5. Birch II, 523; VI, 311
6. Birch II, 520; IX, 277; I, 462-3

study scripture, follow its precepts, and so obtain eternal life.

Surprisingly for one who so much asserted the supremacy of scripture for the discovery and understanding of Christian truth, Tillotson also admitted an important contribution from natural religion. Whereas Augustine had taught that there was no 'unaided' knowledge of God, Aquinas had asserted that reason can assure of the existence of God and infer some of his attributes, though doctrines such as the trinity, incarnation and atonement could only be known by revelation. Tillotson went further and argued that natural religion could define ethical behaviour also.

According to Tillotson, natural religion has a vital role in theology as it is the foundation of instituted and revealed religion.[1] Humanity, he declared, generally consents to the truths of natural religion because either the notion of deity has been stamped on it or an understanding granted that will enable a god to be discovered.[2] Natural religion assures of the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and a future state of rewards and punishments in the life to come.[3] It also emphasises God's sovereign authority and faithfulness.[4] Therefore the surest way of reasoning about God begins with the 'natural notions' of him.[5]

Natural religion also has guidelines for the Christian life. It demands obedience to the natural law and the performance of such duties as 'natural light' without supernatural revelation dictates. These duties are love and respect for God, belief in his revelation, acknowledgement of obligations to him and moderation of our appetites for pleasure and enjoyments. They also include attitudes to other people such as just and upright dealings, mercy, compassion, charitableness, doing good to all and the relieving of misery. These, Tillotson said, were duties of eternal and perpetual obligation but had no particular or express revelation from God.[6]

Persons who are aware of natural religion will, according to Tillotson, consider themselves at God's disposal, governed

---

1. Birch V, 305-6; VI, 310
2. Birch IX, 274
3. Birch IX, 190-2
4. Birch VI, 310
5. Birch V, 530
6. Birch V, 305-6

by his will and ready to submit to his pleasure. Their belief in another life will encourage them to piety and virtue. In so far as such principles affect heathens and make them virtuous their condition in another world will be more tolerable.[1]

All doctrines which contradict natural religion are to be rejected no matter upon what authority they are based. All reasoning about divine revelation is to be governed by 'natural notions'. Whatever derogates from the goodness, justice or the other perfections of God known through natural religion must not be heeded even though it claims to be based on scripture.

Nothing can be recognised as divine revelation which plainly contradicts the common notions we have of God. Attempts to contradict 'natural notions' based on scripture strike at the very authority of those books. If the books are from God they cannot contain any such thing. Indeed, difficulties and obscurities in scripture can be resolved by natural religion.[2] Even if proponents of teachings repugnant to 'natural notions' of God perform miracles such ideas cannot be accepted as from God.[3] In all matters of religious controversy, Tillotson concluded, judgment must be based upon the main scope and tenor of the Bible and natural religion.[4]

Tillotson placed unexpectedly high emphasis upon the significance of natural religion. It not only enabled people to conceive of the existence of God and suggest some of his attributes, but it also set out guidelines for human behaviour both towards God and towards other people. With reference to virtuous heathens who followed natural religion, Tillotson astonishingly stated that because of their good works their condition in the next world would be easier. This was hardly sound protestant scriptural teaching but sprang from Tillotson's concern for the fate of the morally upright pagans whom he could not consign to hell with the certainty of many of his fellows. Tillotson's emphasis upon natural religion, as also indeed upon reason, was clearly intended as a challenge to the claims of the wilder protestant elements who produced extreme views based upon highly-individual interpretations of isolated verses of scripture often wrenched from their context.

For Tillotson Christianity was reasonable. By that he did not mean that its tenets could be deduced by unaided reason. He did declare, however, that its truths were reasonable and

---

1. Birch IX, 197-8.
2. Birch V, 530-1; VI, 310.
3. Birch IX, 433-4
4. Birch V, 232

the revelation discoverable from natural religion, scripture and tradition.

Revelation, said Tillotson, is judged by reason and when found to be authentic results in faith.[1] The only way to win unbelievers is to show them the scripture, insist it is the word of God and to produce rational answers to their questions.[2] It is sufficient reason to assert than an article of faith has been revealed by God, but we must be ready to prove the revelation.[3]

Tillotson deplored the contemporary 'rude clamour' against the application of reason to theology. To reject reason, he declared, leads only to the wildest and most absurd enthusiasm.[4] For people to deny and renounce reason is to deny their humanity and to believe without reason, which no one can do without being unreasonable.[5] Some people seemed to think that they were obliging God by rejecting reason and believing contradictions, but God has made us rational beings and cannot take kindly to having his creatures debased by unreason. Only reasonable faith is acceptable to God.[6] Faith is an assent of the mind to divine revelation grounded on evidence approved by reason.[7] God uses reason to show us what is good. It teaches us what is of benefit to us, how natural it is to honour God, respect power and perfection, love goodness and to be grateful and just. Reason emphasises how these things bring human happiness and how God in turn expects good from us.[8]

For Tillotson, however, reason was not all-powerful. The understanding might not be bright enough or the spirit sufficiently pure or fine for people to have free use of their reason.[9] Human reason is 'but very short and imperfect' but we must make the best use of it we can, though there are matters of faith that are beyond reason.[10]

Tillotson's views on the limitations of reason show that John Edwards was wrong in suggesting that Tillotson believed

---

1. Birch IV, 2-3
2. Birch IV, 42-33
3. Birch IV, 45
4. Birch IV, 45
5. Birch IV, 226-7
6. Birch IV, 46-7
7. Birch IV, 42
8. Birch V, 284-6
9. Birch I, 426
10. Birch IV,45

'reason must be the rule of all religion, reason is the standard of all truth, nothing is to be admitted to Christianity but what is founded upon and resolved into natural argument and reason'. He was equally wrong in including Tillotson among those who had reasoned themselves and others out of Christianity.[1] Lightfoot commented that far from destroying religion by setting reason above revelation Tillotson had established and explained Christian doctrine.[2]

Twentieth-century writers have recognised that for Tillotson reason was a tool or a faculty for testing evidence and discovering agreements between truths. Then it compels acceptance. Tillotson did not see reason as bringing mathematical clarity and certainty as did the seventeenth-century rationalist philosophers like Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz. He saw it as a tool which could provide sufficient assurance to encourage faith.[3] Tillotson did, however, ignore that human perversity prevents some people from responding even to reason. His stress upon this faculty has been held responsible for the reaction in the eighteenth century, particularly of Methodism, towards a more mystical and subjective faith.[4] This conclusion is simplistic. The religion of 'the warmed heart' sprang not only from a conscious reaction against reason but also from the religious experience of the Wesley brothers, their friends and Moravian associates. Tillotson's vital contribution was to undertake, in an age when reason was exalted as rarely before and was even seen as a threat to religion, the apologetic task of clarifying for his congregations exactly its uses, strengths and weaknesses when applied to Christian theology. In stressing the limits of reason he proved himself not to be a rationalist.

In the crucial matter of authority in religion Tillotson stood firmly in the Protestant reformation tradition. For him scripture was central. Tradition had its value but was secondary, and natural religion could lay the foundations of faith and morals. All religious thinking, however, was to be conducted according to the dictates of reason, though there were areas of theology beyond reason. Reason and revelation were interdependent as had been the tradition for the previous one thousand years. Tillotson steered a middle course between the Socinian, who subjected every individual doctrine to reason, and the Schoolmen, who over complicated the mysteries

---

1. John Edwards I, 45-6
2. Lightfoot 19-21; Clifford 43
3. Simon 77, Louis G. Locke 105-8, Reedy 89-90.
4. Louis G. Locke, 111

God by using philosophical terms.[1] The basis of faith must be scripture, tradition, natural religion and reason, but the greatest of these is scripture.

God

For Tillotson, atheism was both unreasonable and imprudent. It often arose from the wishful thinking of evil people, who developed arguments to justify their views.[2] People cannot be persuaded of the existence of God by the usual arguments, but only by aspects of the world which cannot be explained except as the work of a 'Being'.[3] The obvious design of creation makes it unreasonable to believe that all was the result of chance. Creation points to a creator. Belief in God, he also argued, was reasonable because people in all ages and places had taken his existence for granted.[4] In any case unbelief is imprudent. Humans need a greater power than themselves to supply their needs, deal with evil and so obtain happiness. How, he asked, will the atheist face God?[5]

Tillotson therefore embraced the familiar cosmological, teleological, rational and ontological arguments for the existence of God. He thus allied himself with Francis Bacon and Robert Sanderson. Bacon had argued that 'atheism is rather in the lip than in the heart of man'. God's works convince of his existence, and notions of him are universal. Sanderson spoke of the 'steps and footings' of God's goodness in his creation, whereby we glean his perfections.[6] Tillotson was not, however, only a theologian and a philosopher, he was also a pastor concerned about the eternal destiny of the unbeliever.

Tillotson's pastoral concern was also revealed in his discussion of the attributes of God. He affirmed the omnipotence of God, by which he meant that God has the ability to do anything that is not repugnant either to his own nature or to the nature of things. People can rely upon the

---

1. Reedy 91.
2. Birch I, 362; VII, 36-7.
3. Birch IX, 36-7.
4. Birch I, 346-8, 396; II, 83; III, 412; IX, 273-5
5. Birch I, 362-4, 369, 371; VII, 37
6. P.E. More and F.L.Cross (eds), The Thought and Practice of the Church of England illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century, (1935), pp. 225-8. Cited More and Cross

omnipotence of God for all their temporal and spiritual needs. Consideration of his omnipotence causes terror to the wicked, provides a check on human pride but also encourages confidence and trust in the faithful.[1]

As with omnipotence, Tillotson took an equally orthodox and pastorally sensitive line with omnipresence and omniscience. God is 'a spirit infinitely diffusing himself, present in all places, so that wherever I go, God is there'. The consciousness of the divine presence awakens reverence for God and fear of offending him. It serves as a deterrent from sin, quickens and animates our sense of duty and encourages faith and confidence.[2]

Omniscience was briefly dismissed. Tillotson was at a loss to explain this philosophically, but he did assert that scripture shows that God has fore-knowledge of the activities of even free agents, and he suggested that God may have ways of knowing that are beyond the grasp of finite minds.3

With greater confidence Tillotson stressed the unchangeable nature of God. Reason as well as scripture affirms this. Where in scripture God seems to change his mind, this is because we seek to explain things in human terms to accommodate to our weaknesses and capacity. God's unchangeability properly strikes terror in the wicked and encourages repentance, but it also brings great comfort and consolation to the good.[4]

God is also infinite. There is no limit to his being or bounds to his duration.[5] He is incomprehensible. Perfect knowledge of God is beyond the understanding of finite creatures.[6] God is holy, separated at an infinite distance from moral imperfections but possessed of all the contrary perfections.[7] God's greatness and holiness are causes of terror to sinners and an encouragement to holiness so that people might know happiness, peace and tranquility in this existence as well as in the life to come.[8]

---

1. Birch VII, 153, 158-9, 168-170; X, 86.
2. Birch VII, 171, 188, 195-200; III, 315.
3. Birch III, 426-7
4. Birch VI, 346-359
5. Birch VII, 188-91
6. Birch VII, 213-221
7. Birch VI, 519-20 and 523-4
8. Birch VI, 529-36

God is invisible. Because he is a pure spirit he cannot be the object of human senses. He is immortal since spirit has no property subject to decay or death.[1]

God is also provident. He governs the world, controls what happens to humanity and provides for human needs both material and spiritual. His gifts are liberally showered on good and bad alike. He has given free will which allows people to abuse their liberty. Sometimes the good suffer and the wicked flourish, but God is patient and his judgement will come.[2]

Equally important for Tillotson is God's goodness, which comprises justice and truth. His goodness extends to all his creatures, each of which he has endowed with a purpose. He preserves and sustains them to enable them to fulfil their roles. To human beings he has given a high rank in creation. He has given reason, the potential for happiness, knowledge and love of himself, bodies to house reasonable souls and immortal spirits, creatures below to serve and angels above to protect. God's goodness continues even though the majority of people are evil. Innocence and wickedness, however, receive their reward in this world or the next.[3] God's most glorious provision for humanity is his grace to help us attain eternal life. He accepts our faith and repentance, and our attempts at holiness and obedience, as perfect and complete righteousness for the sake of Christ, who fulfilled all righteousness.[4]

Tillotson was not unaware that some objected to God's goodness on the grounds of the existence of imperfection, affliction and sin. Tillotson felt that natural imperfection was simply a lesser degree of goodness and that the greatest afflictions were the result of human behaviour either on the part of the sufferer or of other people. Human suffering could be a proper punishment for sin, a deterrent to further wickedness, the means of making us wiser, and even contributing to our happiness since patient suffering contributes to joy. The existence of human sin is not inconsistent with divine goodness because it is the consequence of the granting of free will with the possibility, therefore, of being tested and rewarded.[5]

---

1. Birch VII, 178-9 and 202-7; VIII, 156.
2. Birch VI, 441-6; VII, 10-16, 112-14; 544-7; VIII, 94-5; IX, 52-3 and 133-4.
3. Birch VI, 560-2, 567-8; VII, 2-15
4. Birch VII,15
5. Birch VII, 18-27

Tillotson was also conscious of the objection that it is impossible to reconcile the concept of divine justice and goodness with eternal punishment. Tillotson replied that punishment is aimed at deterrence and that God can choose whether or not, and to what extent, he should inflict it in order to fulfil his purpose. God is not obliged to carry out his threats any further than good government requires.[1]

Tillotson was at pains to stress that God is gracious. His grace is available to fulfil the requirements of the gospel. It brings us to faith, repentance, obedience and holy life. Grace is derived from union with Christ and is sought through prayer. Humans may, however, receive divine grace in vain if they rebel and disobey God. His grace is not irresistible, and he will withdraw it from the obstinate and malicious. Grace assumes human co-operation, and it is our fault, therefore, if we fall short of eternal salvation.[2]

God is loving. He is concerned for our happiness and our life and sent his son to procure its benefits for us. God's love for us requires that we love one another, respond to him with repentance and faith, seek to obey his teaching and so find eternal salvation.[3]

Above all, God is merciful. He works to divert evils and miseries, defers or moderates the punishments we deserve, comforts the afflicted, relieves those in trouble and pardons sin. God's mercy moves us to gratitude and to sorrow for our sin. It brings comfort in despair, warning against abusing his love and encouragement to be merciful ourselves.[4]

For Tillotson there are proper Christian responses to God's existence, nature and attributes. God calls us to worship, thanksgiving, repentance, contentment, renunciation of all evil and the pursuit of holiness of life.[5]

Trinity

Tillotson was not simply concerned with the existence and

---

1. Birch III, 77-89.
2. Birch II, 181-2;VI, 116-22; VII, 443-4; VIII, 456, 462-3, 485-98, 574; X, 106-7
3. Birch IV, 551-557
4. Birch V, 279, 299-30; VII 51-74, 258-60
5. Birch II, 110, VI 447-50, 529-36; VII, 101, 221-4, 230-2; VIII, 113

attributes of God but also with orthodox Trinitarian theology and its challenge to contemporary unitarianism. God is 'three differences or distinct persons in one and the same divine nature'.[1] For Christians, however, the problem is not divine unity but the three persons. Why should there not be three Gods, Tillotson asked. However, Tillotson did feel that the speculations of the Schoolmen were unprofitable, and that Christian modesty leads us to accept what is revealed, however imperfectly, in scripture. 'In this and the like cases', he said, 'I take an implicit faith to be very commendable.' We can believe even though we do not fully understand.[2] Because we cannot comprehend the Trinity is not sufficient reason to disbelieve.

> I desire it may be concluded, that it is not repugnant to reason to believe some things which are incomprehensible by our reason; provided that we have sufficient ground and reason for the belief of them: especially if they be concerning God, who is in his own nature incomprehensible; and we are well assured that he hath revealed them.[3]

There are, after all, many things in the natural world and human life, of which we are conscious, but which we cannot understand.[4]

Tillotson fearlessly defended the doctrine of the Trinity but admitted the difficulty of justifying it through reason. Reason certainly played a central part in theological understanding for Tillotson, but he recognised its limitations. He would have understood Isaac Watts, who, writing on the Trinity a generation later, concluded:

> Where reason fails with all her powers,
> There faith prevails and love adores.

Father

The different persons of the Trinity have different attributes. For Tillotson the central and greatest attribute of the Father is his eternity. He is a present help to all and

---

1. Birch III, 411-19 and 422-3.
2. Birch III, 419-33.
3. Birch III, 425
4. Birch III, 425-6

will be for ever because his goodness and power are also eternal. The Father also possesses self-existence and immensity. He is the original cause of everything and sovereign over all. His clearest perfections are his power, wisdom and goodness.[1] The Father shows goodness, mercy and patience to his people. He judges, punishes and rewards. He is faithful, and his word is sure. The Father knows everything in time or eternity but gives his people liberty of action. All this is a great encouragement to veneration, humility, comfort and a warning to seek righteous living.[2]

God the Father may be awesome in his being, eternity, knowledge and judgement. Yet he is no 'frowning providence'. He gives liberty to his creatures and seeks to encourage them to repentance and faith.

Son

Tillotson's Christology was also orthodox. Christ came to earth because the Father sought to provide a universal remedy for human weakness and degeneracy. Jesus was the pre-existent Divine Word, who fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies about the Messiah, and was God's final dispensation for the salvation of his people.[3] Christ healed, gave instruction and set a good example. He sought out the needy, was ready to deny himself and face opposition. However, Christ came supremely to die for human sin, to suffer the punishment sin deserves, and thus to satisfy divine justice and to save humanity from death and misery.

Tillotson argued that human guilt and the dominance of sin made human beings obnoxious to the wrath of God and incapable of heaven and eternal life. To remedy these problems, forgiveness of past sins and reformation of hearts and lives were necessary. God could have effected this by his abundant mercy and powerful grace without sending his son, but God chose otherwise. It was essential that God vindicate the honour of his laws by punishing sin. However, in his love he laid the punishment on his son rather than on sinners. Christ's sacrifice was, therefore, expiatory - one living being suffered

---

1. Birch III, 234-40; VI, 284-5 and 291-4.
2. Birch III, 105, 115-6, 234-40; VI, 384-6, 392-400, 499-505, 511-18.
3. Birch III, 284-5 and 287; IV, 301; V, 558-65; VIII, 293-9; for Tillotson's exposition of the divinity of Christ see above chapter 2, pp. 54-56

in the place of the one who deserved to die.

Also it was necessary to God to forgive in such a way as to create a horror and hatred of sin and thus to discourage it. The sacrifice of Christ demonstrates what sin deserves and warns of what sinners may expect from God's severity. In addition, Tillotson believed that God had used the system of expiatory sacrifice because it was the general belief of human beings that this was the only way to appease an offended deity.

God was pleased to make a general atonement by the voluntary sacrifice of his beloved son, killed unjustly and classed as a criminal. Because Christ's sacrifice was a propitiation of the sins of the whole world, Jewish and heathen sacrifices were no longer necessary. For Christ's sacrifice to be effective, Christ's innocence and obedience had to be perfect and his sufferings great.[1] His sufferings were not a sign of God's anger with his son, on the contrary he was never better pleased with him. Because of them, God entered a covenant of grace and mercy wherein he engaged himself to forgive the sins of those who believe and repent and to enable them to share eternal life.[2]

Tillotson countered the common objections to his formulation of atonement theology. God's method of expiation did not reveal some defect or want of goodness in God, rather it was a way to avoid a too-easy forgiveness, and thus an encouragement to sin, by substituting his own son. This was the height of goodness and mercy. To the criticism that sins cannot be said to be forgiven freely if Christ's death was needed, he replied that the pardon was costly to win, but it was the free act of God's goodness who paid the price himself. Aspersions on the goodness of God in punishing Jesus were countered by the argument that God did not command the sacrifice but in his providence permitted human evil to have its way. Then, however, God's wisdom and goodness overruled and used the situation to achieve human salvation. There is no injustice here, he claimed, in the innocent suffering for the guilty because the suffering was volutary.[3] For the faithful, therefore, Christ bought pardon for sin, perfect peace, reconciliation with the Father and the right to eternal life. The death of Christ reveals to us the great evil and suffering it produced for Jesus and so encourages us to crucify sin in ourselves. Through sanctifying grace and the work of the

---

1. Birch III, 382-9 and 397.
2. Birch III, 396.
3. Birch III, 400-3.

Spirit, people are delivered from the power and dominion of sin.[1]

Tillotson also stressed the reality of the bodily resurrection of Jesus who then ascended to heaven, sent his Holy Spirit, intercedes for us and reminds of his return in judgement. When this gospel is generally and effectively preached, Christians know they are in the care of a victorious Christ and have a future life.[2]

Tillotson's theology of Christ's atoning work was juridical, substitutional and sacrificial. Its whole purpose was for humanity to turn to the Father in repentance and faith and therefore to receive salvation and eternal life. Tillotson showed signs of the influence of Grotius, who had argued that God demanded satisfaction for sin because he was concerned with public rather than simply retributive justice. God was concerned to reveal his abhorrence of sin. Once the lawgiver was satisfied, the law's threatenings to the penitent could be relaxed. This was a matter of divine grace and not a commercial transaction.[3]

Holy Spirit

Tillotson dealt thoroughly with the doctrines concerning the Holy Spirit. The prophets of the pre-Christian era had received the Spirit, but at Pentecost the apostles were baptised in the Spirit and received the extraordinary gifts of speaking in foreign languages and of healing. Such were given only to certain of the believers, in differing degrees and for the proclamation of the gospel around the world. They were only given temporarily and were withdrawn once the church had become firmly established. Tillotson felt that such gifts might well be renewed in his own day for the conversion of the infidels.[4]

The Spirit was guide and teacher to instruct the apostles in the faith that had not so far been revealed.[5] The Spirit's revelation was not renewed in succeeding generations since all things necessary had been revealed through the first apostles.[6]

---

1. Birch III, 403; VI, 133 and 459-71; IX, 333
2. Birch IV, 358; VIII, 40-42 and 359-76; IX, 471-6
3. Clifford 128-32.
4. Birch VIII, 377-415 and 432-7.
5. John 16, 12-13
6. Birch VIII, 416-31

The Spirit also disposes people to respond to the gospel and persuades of the truth both of the scriptures and of Christ's divinity. The Spirit inspires our regeneration, new birth and re-creation. He empowers our obedience, sanctification and the growth of the fruit of the Spirit. He brings hope and comfort in trouble, assists our prayers and assures us we are God's children by adoption.

Tillotson challenged those of his own day who laid claim to extraordinary spiritual gifts that led them to claim infallibility and to condemn all who did not agree. Such people failed in love - the first of the virtues engendered by the Spirit. Despite their claims to be totally guided by the Spirit, their public prayers and utterances were often confusing and 'unbecoming', and some had fallen into sinful behaviour and then blamed this on the Spirit. People manifested the Spirit's work by the fruit as defined by Paul.[1]

Tillotson's preaching on the Holy Spirit did not deal with the controversy with the Orthodox over the procession of the Spirit nor with his work in the sacraments. He emphasised the significance of the Spirit in the early church and in the lives of believers ever after. Not for him was charismatic enthusiasm. His concern was for the Spirit to produce Christ-like character. His stress upon sanctification, holiness and a sense of adoption was to anticipate Wesley's in the eighteenth century, as was his suspicion of 'enthusiasm'.

The Gospel

Human beings have full and clear evidence of the truth of the gospel from the written gospels. The gospel is the power of God to salvation. It reveals God's justification of sinners and his severity against them. The former serves to encourage obedience and the latter to act as a deterrent to sin. The incarnation was designed to save people from their sin and to reveal new life. Through Christ we are forgiven, delivered from divine wrath, accepted by the Father, vouchsafed the gifts of salvation and eternal life i.e. we are justified. God's grace both prevents and encourages us. On our part, faith is needed, though not simply bare assent, but effectual belief that leads on from justification to sanctification and holiness of life. Great guilt lies upon those who, having heard the gospel, reject it. Equally, Tillotson challenged

---

1. Galatians 5,22; Birch VIII, 397-415 and 448-84; IX, 243-57.

those who showed the form of religion without its power.[1] Not only are religious duties required of believers but so too is reformation of life. Tillotson thus firmly refuted the Roman accusation of solfidianism.[2]

Since the whole of the gospel is recorded in the scriptures, Tillotson warned against adding to the faith by promulgating new doctrines as essential. The Creed of Pope Pius IV, Tillotson claimed, added twelve or thirteen articles which are unscriptural.[3] Tillotson, therefore, followed Arminius rather than Beza, Owen or Baxter. For him salvation was available to all. In line with the reformed tradition generally he saw justification as an event and sanctification as a process, both of which are necessarily connected, as Calvin had argued. Obedience and Christ-like living were elements of saving faith, without which there can be no true faith. Tillotson rejected, however, that Christian living was in any way meritorious. It is though faith in the merits of Christ that people are saved.[4]

Church

The church, said Tillotson, has been visibly in existence since Christ's time. He promised his presence to the apostles, gave them his commission to preach and baptise and promised the Holy Spirit to empower their work. Such promises are also for those who succeed to the apostles. In the church every member is under the patronage and protection of the ascended Christ. Thus Christians have no fear of this world. The gates of hell will not prevail against the church.

Since apostolic times, some parts of the church have fallen into error, especially the Roman.[5] The English church has happily been rescued by reformation. It is, however, not necessary for a church to be free from all error to be part of the visible church. This was was the case with first-century Corinth, but when an unreformed church refuses communion with a reformed one it is guilty of schism.[6]

---

1. II Timothy 3,5
2. Birch V, 187-93, 205 and 356-8; VI, 472-4; VIII, 501-23 and 567-8; IX, 306, 328-333, 430-566 and 620-1; X, 22-30; Clifford 232-3
3. Birch V, 4-18
4. Clifford 43, 59-60, 172-5, 194-213.
5. For Tillotson's views on Roman Catholicism see above Chapter 2, pp. 37-52.
6. Birch IV, 156-7; VI, 147-60; VIII,372-3; IX, 163.

In reply to the question as to why the church was so divided, Tillotson replied, somewhat obliquely, that the differences were insignificant in comparison with the shared doctrines, articles, sacraments and much of the worship. Small scruples, which he described as 'unhappy and childish differences', should not destroy the peace of the church and so endanger religion. When Christians encounter division they can ask with Paul: 'Is Christ divided?'.[1]

Jesus appointed apostles and a succession of teachers to teach the faith. It is everyone's duty to warn those liable to perish, but it is the especial duty of ministers of God's holy word who are set apart for this work. Ministers are specially commissioned and appointed to promote the salvation of others, which is the most honourable and happy work possible. Christ promised to be with them.[2] They must be serious in their instruction and exemplary in their lives. They must take care to preach sound doctrine and show themselves as patterns of good works.[3]

Tillotson clearly accepted the concept of an ordained ministry distinct from that of the laity, but he never expressed any views on episcopacy. This was not, at the time, an issue in the Church of England. The Elizabethan bishops had not been concerned about theoretical definitions of office nor had they seen themselves as a separate order within the church. Laud had, however, believed that bishops ruled by divine appointment though under royal control. After the Restoration the new bishops were less committed to Erastianism and displayed a churchmanship higher than Laud's, which led to conflict with the court. But as the Laudian generation passed, and the Latitudinarians rose to power Erastianism returned.[4] By Tillotson's time, with the Revolution and the non-juring schism in the background, monarch and archbishop needed each other for survival, and so any discussion that might seem to assert episcopal power at the expense of monarchical was not expedient. Tillotson, as most of his contemporaries in the Church of England, seems to have accepted his functions to superintend, consecrate, ordain and confirm without scriptural or theological argument or justification.

---

1. I Corinthians 1,13; Birch II, 247-8; III, 437 and 479
2. Matthew 28, 18-20
3. Birch II, 27 and 194; V, 261-4; VI 159-60; IX 26
4. Jeffery R. Collins, 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy' in Church History, vol. 68, September 1999, no. 3, pp. 549-80.

People are admitted to membership of the church by baptism. They thus take on the profession of Christianity and engage themselves to renounce the devil and obey God's commandments. The water of baptism by divine blessing may be effectual in washing away sin and encouraging spiritual regeneration. The water of the sacrament is the outward symbol and the Holy Spirit the inward grace. Being regenerated and born again by baptism mean that people are enabled to receive all the blessings of the gospel, provided that they do not neglect what the covenant requires. Our baptismal promises are renewed whenever we receive the Lord's Supper.[1]

Confirmation marks the taking up by the candidates of the vows made on their behalf at their baptism, and thus their childhood comes to an end. Tillotson felt that, in practice, bishops should confirm more often and in smaller numbers so that the rite would make a deeper impression.[2]

Tillotson was concerned to encourage frequent participation in the Lord's Supper. It was a command of Christ to be obeyed until he comes again. It brings forgiveness of sins, the grace of the Holy Spirit to enable us to fulfil our part of the covenant, encouragement in well doing, support in suffering and the reward of eternal life. We give thanks for Christ's saving work which is commemorated. Some people, Tillotson found, had scruples about attendance because of St Paul's warnings about the dangers of receiving unworthily. Tillotson's reply was that it is a great danger to disobey Christ's command to partake. Evil people are likely to remain so if they absent themselves, as it is hard to attend without some sense of awe and a desire to change. Indeed, God may use these means to achieve their reform. In any case, all sin is forgivable except blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Constant reception of the sacrament is, through God's grace, a preventative to sin.

Some people failed to attend because they never felt they had prepared themselves sufficiently. Tillotson argued that no-one is in every way worthy to receive and that sincere repentance qualifies us. Indeed, our want of preparation does not excuse our neglect but simply adds a further evil because it signifies that we wish to continue in sin. The necessary preparation need not be excessive in time spent. What is needed is to repent of any irreverance or disorder in our

---

1. Birch I, 493-5; II, 438; III, 92-3; VIII, 436-7.
2. Birch III, 516

lives.[1]

Tillotson's preaching on the church sought to emphasise its purpose in making and sustaining Christians in the faith. He recognised the validity of other churches besides the Church of England and minimised the differences where these were not, in his judgement, central to the faith. He accepted an order of ministry distinct from that of the laity but expressed no views on episcopacy or the apostolic succession. His teaching on baptism carefully avoided any suggestion that the baptised are thereby saved eternally and stressed the need for meaningful confirmation later. In his discussion of the Lord's Supper he was concerned mainly to encourage participation and reception of the grace which it imparts but not to delve into the manner of Christ's presence. He rejected transubstantiation but provided no alternative point of view.[2] Tillotson's views on the power of the sacrament to change people anticipate the Wesleyan view of the 'converting and confirming' sacrament.

Last Things

Tillotson stressed the certainty of a future and general judgement. This reveals God's wrath against impenitent sinners. God has ordained Christ as judge. This is a reward for his patience and suffering and, as a result, humans are judged by one of their own nature. No date has been fixed by Christ, for this is known only to the Father. He will come as suddenly as the bridegroom came to the wise and foolish virgins. All will be judged according to their inward as well as their outward behaviour, their civil as well as their religious dealings, things done in secret as well as in public, what has been done by us or by others under our deliberate influence, our words and deeds of lesser as well as greater significance will be considered, and our omissions as well as our actions will be scrutinised. Judgement is, however, a great source of comfort to Christians but a terror to the disobedient, impenitent and unprepared. This ought to lead people to live a careful life so as to have a good conscience.[3]

Heaven is the glorious state of good people. It is beyond this world's happiness because none of the problems of this world are there to spoil. Its pleasures are manly, excellent,

---

1. Birch II, 374-404.
2. See above: Chapter 2, pp. 49-50
3. Birch II, 554-6; III, 161-2; V, 439-42; VI, 215-6; VII, 24-29 and 94-5; VIII, 24-38, 40-41, 69-72, 103-7 and 336-7

chaste and intellectual. There is perfection of knowledge, the height of love, perpetual society and friendship with all the blessed, eternal happiness, and incessant praise and adoration of God. The full details are within the veil, but the joys are beyond human imagining. All this is reached by a holy life in and through the mercies of Jesus.[1]

Hell and damnation are, by contrast, terrible. Hell is a place of punishment which involves the anguish of a guilty mind a keen sense of intolerable pains and a recognition of what happiness has been lost. God will raise up the bodies of the wicked, reunite them with their souls and cast them into the torments of hell, where their bodies will be constantly renewed for further suffering.[2] God can punish also in this world, though he often defers punishment in the hope of repentance.[3] Prudence, therefore, counsels repentance and faith in Christ. These were the views of a preacher often condemned as a cold moralist.[4]

Conclusion

To accuse Tillotson of preaching only morality and the supremacy of reason is clearly nonsense. This has arisen from an over-selective reading of his sermons. If the new 'interpreting canon' of Gerard Reedy is studied, or better still all of the sermons read, the foolishness of the traditional view can easily be seen. His preaching covered all aspects of the faith, stressed the place of scripture, the significance of reason, the relevance of tradition and the limitations of all three. Tillotson's views on all aspects of the faith were consistent with his position as an orthodox Anglican, but he never lost the scriptural foundation of his puritan upbringing. He said little about the church but showed his famous tolerance of those of different traditions. His doctrine of the sacraments accepts the supernatural grace imparted. For Tillotson heaven is an eager anticipation for the faithful but judgement and hell for the wicked are terrifying.

---

1. Birch I, 510-20.
2. Matthew 25,41
3. Birch I 408; III, 73; VII, 51, 85, 96-97 and 354-7; X, 64-66 and 83-86
4. Clifford 40

Tillotson has always been dubbed a Latitudinarian because of his spirit of conciliation, preference for essentials rather than divisive trivialities, his generally tolerant attitude to other Christian traditions, his desire to establish the teachings of Christianity on rational foundations and his rejection of the rigid 'Calvinism' of Beza. As John Spurr has argued, these views were little different from those of most of the Anglican clergy in the late seventeenth century and the term was simply one of abuse employed by the opponents of such views.[1]

Tillotson was, above all, a preacher with a deep pastoral concern for the salvation of his hearers. He had a 'passion for souls'. His emphasis on judgement and hell and the need to repent is uncompromising. His stress that sanctification and holiness of life were both vital to a Christian calling was a challenge to the solfidianism of some groups and a superficial practice of the faith amongst others. Also, in so many ways Tillotson foreshadows the Methodist theological emphases of the following century.

---

1. J. Spurr, ''Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church', in Historical Journal, 31, 1, (1988), pp. 61-2 and 81-2.

Chapter 8: Personal

Introduction

In the absence of detailed contemporary sketches of his character, of any diaries or of copious personal correspondence, any assessment of Tillotson's personality can only be provisional and partial. His work and his writings do, however, point to a conscientious, sensitive, sincere, devout Christian minister.

Opposition

Tillotson's attitude to his enemies and to their sometimes vicious attacks reveals a man, though deeply pained by their hostility, ready to pardon their injuries.

Versifying against Tillotson had occurred in the early 1690s during his attempt to further his comprehension scheme.[1] After he became archbishop, however, the attacks increased. A favourite theme was that he had never been baptised.[2] An unknown pamphleteer gave Reasons Why Dr John Tillotson May not be Confirmed Archbishop of Canterbury and widened the grounds for criticism. The post was not vacant. Tillotson might not have been baptised. He was thought to be a Socinian and a public enemy to the liturgy and constitution of the Anglican Church. The fact that his wife was Cromwell's niece would reflect on the high office and encourage rebellion. The author defended his anonymity on the grounds that someone who had been going to Doctors Commons to prove that Tillotson had not been baptised had been murdered.[3] Tillotson was also accused by others of having doubts about eternal damnation.[4]

Numerous anonymous satires in verse were printed attacking Tillotson. In particular, he was criticised for preaching passive obedience to Russell and then himself supporting the removal of James II. One piece of 161 lines was in the form of a dialogue between Tillotson and Lord Russell's ghost, and begins: "Thou filthy hypocrite of a dean".[5]

---

1. See above p. 85.
2. See above p. 11.
3. Sloane MS 179 A, f. 203.
4. Hester Chapman, Mary II Queen of England, (1953), p. 224.
5. Rawlinson MSS vol. D 361 ff. 50-3. His enemies did not recognise him as archbishop.

My Lord it cannot be denied
I always was for the upper side
Whate'er my outward will proclaim
My secret will is still the same.

Tillotson was thus accused of hypocrisy and opportunism. The ghost then says accusingly:

Whatever you can say or write
I needs must think you a hypocrite
You said my crime deserved damnation
By Law of endless obligation:
And you well know in such a case
That hic and nunc can ne'er take place;
Yet now that you have done the same
You set up for a man of fame
Tho' I can prove that of the two
If any be the worse 'tis you.
I did what just was my own sense
But you rebelled against conscience. [1]

In The Female Casuist, or Sherlock's Conversion, a poem attacking Elizabeth Sherlock for persuading her husband to conform, the writer asserts:

Passive obedience and non
Resistance out of doors are gone:
. . .

'For why', quoth she, 'Great Tillotson',
Stillingfleet, Patrick, Tenison,
Horneck, Hickman, and the whole gown
Preach up for swearing through the town.' [2]

Tillotson was accused with Burnet of causing the Revolution:

Jack Roots is blamed
And by Tillotson shamed;
For pimping and plotting for William and his mate
And blaspheming God with the word 'Abdicate'. [3]

---

1. Cameron, 5, 83.
2. Cameron, 5, 254.
3. Cameron, 5, 62; W.W. Wilkins, Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, (1860), Vol.II, p.11.

Jacobite and non-juring lines On the Promoted Bishops in 1691 suggested that Tillotson was ridiculed:

> As the pastoral staff
> We at Tillotson laugh.

With indelicacy it also stated:

> As old Babylon saith
> The Protestant faith
> Took deep root from the codpiece of Harry;
> We good witness can bring
> The new bishops did spring
> From the conduits of Nancy and Mary.[1]

Advice to an artist engraving a portrait of Tillotson ran:

> Grave a fat jovial priest, not lean and thin
> But pampered like the jolly God of wine,
> With ruddy cherry cheek and double chin,
> A brawny back and well-proportioned womb.
> Let in his face be seen no sign of care
> But how to live at ease and eat good cheer,
> Let abstinence give way to gluttony
> And the religion to impiety. [2]

Tillotson's position as archbishop was definitely not acknowledged by the one who wrote:

> Above here the graver has drawn
> Old Presbyter John, as they call him,
> With a mitre and sleeves of lawn:
> Oh how all the Whigs do extol him! [3]

Aspersions were cast on Tillotson's theological orthodoxy:

> Was ever beetle
> Blind as his people
> To think that God will own a Church with a Socinian steeple.... [4]

---

1. Cameron 5, 13; MS Rawlinson Poet. 181 ff. 2-3, this gives the last line as: "From the headpiece of William and Mary."
2. Cameron 5, 310; Sloane MS 179 A, f. 153.
3. Cameron 5, 318.
4. Cameron 5, 314; W.W. Willkins, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 30.

Under his hand upon his conscious breast
Let the impious works of dear Socinus rest
Beneath his feet a broken font display
To show he ne'er was Christened to this day. [1]

Socininan doctrine settle in the church
Then leave the perjured catiff in the lurch
Let blue-coat bishops see their effects of treason
And Calvinist exile reduce you all to reason. [2]

A parody of the litany made the same accusation:

From temporal usurpers and spiritual thieves
From anti-archbishops who's stolen his lawn sleeves
And in every religion has ta'en his degrees:
Libera nos domine.
. . . .

That it may please thee to restore
The bishops which we had before
And turn out Tillotson and Moore:
Quaesimus te, domine.

That prelates orthodox may be
And from Socinianism free
And what's as bad, Presbytery:
Quaesimus te, domine. [3]

That England ere it be too late
May see her sad and wretched state,
And Will and Moll both abdicate:
Quaesimus te, domine. 4

The anonymous author of A Letter to Dr Tillotson took a sorrowful tone, whether genuinely or ironically it is impossible to tell. He was a patriotic protestant, he wrote, considered James's ministers to have been to blame and believed that parliament could have set things to rights. The revolution had caused the loss of thousands of men and much treasure and had turned people away from God more effectively than Hobbes or Epicurus. Tillotson had rejected all that he had hitherto

---

1. MS Sloane 179 A f. 153
2. MS Rawlinson Poet. 181, f. 13.
3. For Tillotson's alleged Socinianism see above pp.54-6. Burnet had been a presbyterian in his younger days.
4. Cameron 5, 324-6.

preached, written and pretended to believe. [1]

Action was taken to attempt the suppression of these libels, and several people were arrested. Tillotson, however, very charitably begged that no-one should be punished on his account. He confessed that it was not the first time he had been attacked, he found it unpleasant but felt that the wisest way was to ignore it and forgive it. He did, however, approve of prosecutions for attacks on the late Lord Russell.[2] Once he received a sealed packet and opened it in company. His friends were shocked when out fell a mask. He smiled and pointed to pamphlets that were worse. The attacks on himself, he once commented, were disagreeable but "very tolerable in comparison of the persecution of flattery". After his death a bundle of such writings was found among his papers with his endorsement: "I pray God forgive them: I do."[3]

The political emphases in Tillotson's preaching had often been publicly challenged in his life time. In 1685 Simon Louth's Of the Subject of Church Power was published attacking Hobbes, Selden, Stillingfleet and Tillotson. He accused Tillotson and Stillingfleet of Erastianism and Hobbism, a criticism Louth shared with dissenters in the 1680s and which was to be re-echoed by the non-jurors in the 1690s. It is true that Latitudinarians did share Hobbes's concern about the unruly nature of conscience, the appeal to which nonconformists regularly made. Tillotson had argued in his sermon The Protestant Religion Vindicated that the civil magistrate had power to support true religion, ensure that it was taught and to prevent people from being seduced from it. The magistrate could not, however, reject God's true religion or declare what he, the magistrate, pleased. If individuals disagreed, they must obey passively and be ready, if necessary, to suffer for their convictions. Tillotson denied that conscience justifies people in challenging the established religion and the magistrates, unless they possess an extraordinary divine commission justified by miraculous powers.[4]

Hobbes had, indeed, stressed the private nature of faith but that individuals should obey the ruler in religion even if an infidel. Louth accused Tillotson of demolishing the duties required of an 'ordinary commission', arguing justification for disobeying laws which are hostile to the truth.

---

1. MS Birch 4236, ff. 351-4, pp. 3-4 and 6-7.
2. MS Lambeth 690, p. 50; MS Birch 4236, ff. 41-2 and 315-6; Birch I, clxxvi.
3. Clarke and Foxcroft 304.
4. See above pp. 47-8

By 1686 Tillotson realised he had gone too far and therefore modified the printed version of the sermon. People, he then declared, could attack a false religion, but there was no obligation to do so to imperil ones life unless one has an 'extraordinary commission' from God, attested by miracles. Tillotson thus remained unrepentant in his 'Hobbism', wishing to avoid at all costs the results of the exercise of private conscience which, as he would have feared, could lead to a repetition of the religious and political anarchy of the Interregnum.[1]

Tillotson must have been well aware of how vulnerable to criticism he was, particularly over passive obedience and the inviolability of oaths. However, when the criticism and persecution came, he accepted them, no matter how virulent they were, with the remarkable forgiveness, charity and fortitude of a true Christian martyr.

Spiritual Life

Tillotson was born into a puritan family but one of moderate convictions. He was ever grateful for this and was influenced by it for the rest of his life.[2]

At Cambridge he was known as a man of prayer. In private with his students and in public in the chapel his prayers were extempore and in this 'he had great facility; but he always performed them with gravity and fervour'. He was known for the seriousness with which he performed his religious duties. He spent much time praying alone and aloud. He frequently listened to sermons, being regularly present at four each Sunday and at the Wednesday lecture in Trinity Church.[3]

Tillotson had a spiritual sensitivity which was outraged when in 1658 he heard of the prayers offered at the time of Cromwell's last illness. Thomas Goodwin had prayed, "Lord, we pray not for thy servant's life, for we know that it is granted, but haste his health, for thy people cannot wait." Goodwin's confidence had been misplaced since Cromwell died soon afterwards. Soon after, Tillotson was present at a fast day in Richard Cromwell's house, when Peter Sterry held a Bible in his hand and prayed that if this was indeed the word of God, then as certainly 'that blessed holy spirit [Oliver Cromwell]'

---

1. John Marshall, 'Tillotson and Hobbism' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 36, no. 3, July 1985, pp. 407-287.
2. See above, pp. 11-12.
3. Birch I, cclxiv-v.

was 'with Christ at the right hand of the Father; and if he be there, what may his family and the people of God expect from him'. If Cromwell had been so useful and helpful to them in the mortal state, he added, how much more influence they would now have from him now that he was in heaven, with the Father, Son and Spirit, bestowing gifts and graces upon them through him. Sterry also prayed that Richard might be made 'the brightness of the father's glory and the express image of his person.'[1] Tillotson found all this 'a great deal of strange stuff, enough to disgust a man for ever of that enthusiastic boldness'. To him the prayers seemed to challenge the divine will and purpose and so to verge on blasphemy.[2]

Tillotson, nevertheless, retained his puritan outlook and this was manifested in his liturgical practices. According to George Hickes, at Lincoln's Inn he gave the sacrament to people sitting in their seats rather than calling them to kneel at the rail. Indeed, he was said to take the elements first to those who were seated and then to those kneeling. He did not then go inside the rail 'as decency would have directed another Man, but coming behind them, he gave it to them ... over the left shoulder'. Tillotson's practice may have arisen from the refusal of communicants to kneel, and his wish to accommodate their scruples rather than drive them to the dissenters. Hickes also complained that Tillotson performed baptisms incorrectly 'violating the prescribed Rules of Decency and Edification'.[3] Presumably Tillotson failed to make the sign of the cross.

Tillotson's low churchmanship was also illustrated by his behaviour in the King's Closet:

> For when he officiated in the Closet, instead of bowing at the Name of Jesus, or rather to Jesus at the mention of the saving Name, that he might seem to do something, and yet not to do the thing itself, he used to step and bend backwards, casting up his eyes to Heaven; which the King observing, said, He bowed the wrong way, as the Quakers do when

---

1 C.H.Firth, The Memoirs of Edward Ludlow, 1625-1672, (Oxford 1894), Vol. I, pp. 44-5; Robert Baillie, The Letters and Journals, (Edinburgh 1842), Vol. III, p. 245; Philip Warwick, Memoirs of the Reign of Charles I, (London 1702), pp. 387-8.
2 Burnet 54.
3 Some Discourses 73; Spurr 113.

they salute their friends. [1]

No contemporaries of Hickes's challenged these accusations, as they did others which he made against Tillotson, which suggests that they were true. In this case, Tillotson was not only liturgically low church but also tolerant of different people's wishes with regard to their posture at communion.

The private practice of Tillotson's faith was undoubtedly puritan. The sincerity of his faith cannot be doubted as is revealed in his private devotions before his consecration as archbishop. He spent the previous day in fasting and prayer. He sought the blessing of God and the assistance of his grace and Holy Spirit as he assumed 'the government and conduct of this miserable and distracted church in a very dangerous time'. He prayed for a heart prepared for the day. He thanked God for his goodness throughout his life, for his 'honest and religious parents, though of a low and obscure condition', for the liberal education in true religion which prepared him for ministry, for preserving him from great dangers and temptations, for health and healing in sickness, for an understanding mind, for his usefulness, for his royal favour, and, finally, for his desire to serve and please God. He confessed his 'vileness and sinfulness' and his unworthiness to receive any blessings. He admitted the folly of his childhood and the sins of his youth, his impurities of heart and evil actions.[2] He had not used his talents and opportunities for good, he had been neglectful as a pastor. At times he had been angry and impatient. He had not cultivated his mind or controlled his passions and he had wasted time. He threw himself upon the forgiving mercy of God, resolved to lead a better life and sought grace to fulfil his resolution. He petitioned for gifts and graces of the Spirit for his new responsibilities so that the church might be built up. He sought health and vigour of mind, resolution to do his duty and a willingness to spend himself in God's service. He interceded for the king and the queen, for their wisdom and safety and for children to inherit the throne.[3] Tillotson was clearly a sincere, humble and devout man.

Whilst rejecting its excesses, Tillotson never lost the puritanism of his youth. His life of prayer, his liturgical practices, his stress upon scripture and preaching, his

---

1. Some Discourses 64.
2. Psalm 25,7
3. Lambeth Palace MS 690, pp. 46-8; Birch I, clxi and X, 200-10.

conscientious execution of his duties, his consciousness of sin and of his debt to God, his humble petition for grace, and his willingness to deny his inclinations in order to shoulder the burdens of the archiepiscopate, together betray a typically puritan seriousness about his faith. He was willing to deny himself, shoulder his cross and follow his Lord's leading.

Social Relationships

Something of Tillotson's personality and character can also be gleaned from his relationships with family, friends and acquaintances. A few rare glimpses into his family life can be caught during the 1670s and 1680s. In 1675 Tillotson journeyed to Yorkshire to see his father Robert, who was by then aged 84 and living on only £40 a year. Tillotson was not, however, purely on a family visit. He preached at Sowerby twice on Whitsunday, 23 May, and at Halifax on Trinity Sunday. According to the dissenting Oliver Heywood he spoke at Sowerby 'plainly and honestly, though some expressions were accounted dark and doubtful'.[1] On one occasion when he preached in Halifax, the date of which is unknown, Tillotson's father judged that his son had preached well but done more harm than good.[2] Tillotson was a dutiful son of an independently-minded father whose London ways were not always welcome in Yorkshire.

Bereavements regularly affected Tillotson. His mother died in 1667.[3] On 16 January 1678 his brother Joshua died suddenly after vomiting blood. Tillotson was so concerned about his father's health that he asked Timothy Bentley to break the news to him.[4] In June 1681 Tillotson's younger daughter died and was interred on the 8th in St Lawrence Jewry.[5] Tillotson's father was buried at Sowerby on 22 February 1683 aged 91.[6] His elder daughter Mary, wife of James Chadwick, died in November 1687. She left two sons and a daughter.

---

1. H.P. Kendall, 'Old Haugh End' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, Vol. VII, 1910, p. 147, cited Kendall.
2. Joseph Hunter, The Rise of the Old Dissent Exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood ... 1630 - 1702, (1842), pp.435-6. Hunter dates the incident as c. 1680.
3. Kendall 144.
4. HMC 7th Report: Sir H. Verney, p. 471; Birch I, xxvi.
5. G.L. MS. 6975, p. 177.
6. Kendall 144; J.H.Turner (ed.), Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Event Books of Oliver Heywood, (Brighouse 1881-5), vol. II, p. 146; J.H.Turner (ed.), The Nonconformist Register, (Brighouse 1881), p.67.

Tillotson's reaction to his bereavements is only known in the case of Mary. He was so cast down by her death that he found it necessary to engage substitute preachers to do his Sunday duties. Tillotson, doubtless, saw all these deaths as the will of God but was, nevertheless, deeply affected by them. [1]

The nature of Tillotson's friendships is illuminated by the fragments of his correspondence which have survived. Between 1680 and 1687 he wrote regularly to Robert Nelson, the son of John, a Turkey merchant in London. Robert Nelson's mother, Deliciae, daughter of another Turkey merchant Sir Gabriel Roberts, was also a friend of Tillotson's.[2] In 1680 Nelson became a fellow of the Royal Society and early in the following year accompanied Edmond Halley, the astronomer and mathematician, to France and Italy. Tillotson kept him up with the news. Whilst Nelson was abroad between 1681 and 1682 Tillotson informed him of the sighting of Halley's Comet and the problems resulting from the exclusion contest. He reported the failures of the second Exclusion Parliament to help dissenters and commented on the elections for the Oxford Parliament.[3] He noted the general feeling of 'distraction and discontent' in the summer of 1682.[4] He warned Nelson against rash investment at a difficult time.[5] He discussed his daughter's death and the deaths of Hezekiah Burton and Thomas Gouge.[6] Tillotson was also concerned about the problems of travelling: had he persuaded Nelson to stay longer in Canterbury Nelson would have been caught in a dangerous storm in the Channel. He praised God that Nelson had not been harmed when, as a result of 'the wicked weight of the fat friar', the coach had overturned. A later coaching accident also occasioned Tillotson some concern.[7] This correspondence, brief though it is, reveals Tillotson as a warm, concerned and loyal friend but no very close relationship. With Lady Russell, however, he shared a deeper intimacy, as has been shown in Chapter 6.[8]

As Tillotson grew older he became increasingly saddened by the impossibility of trusting some people's friendship. He expressed himself to Lady Russell on the subject.[9] He disliked

---

1. Birch MS 4236 f. 242 and 288; Birch I, xc-xci.
2. Birch I, xlviii-ix.
3. Birch MS 4236 ff. 227-8; see above p.111..
4. Birch MS 4236 ff. 225, 276, 235, 285.
5. Birch MS 4236 ff. 230 and 280.
6. Birch MS 4236 ff. 233 and 284.
7. Birch MS 4236 ff. 225, 231, 237, 276, 283, 286.
8. See above pp. 143-5.
9. See above pp. 144-5.

the hypocrisy in society of people criticising or mocking those who had just left a room. He also found it hard to mount a continuous guard over his conversation which he found necessary because he knew how keenly people listened to what he said. He envied people who could lead purely private lives.[1] It is significant that the last sermon that Tillotson preached before William and Mary at Whitehall was 'Against Evil Speaking'.[2]

Tillotson's social relationships remain something of an enigma. The absence of the slightest whiff of scandal in the writings of his enemies shows that he lived a virtuous, or at least a very discreet, life. He was a reliable and supportive friend. His sensitivity and vulnerability are clear when, as an exhausted archbishop, he complained of the insincerity of the people he encountered in company. He thus admitted an absence of a sufficient number of friends with whom he could relax socially and upon whose total discretion he could rely. Tillotson felt that he, and those like him who served the church and people, deserved better from society.

Death

In an age when infant mortality was high, life expectancy generally short and a severe visitation of the plague occurred, Tillotson, whilst failing to reach his full biblical span of three-score years and ten, did well to enjoy good health up to and beyond his sixty-fourth birthday. Tillotson's health had, at times, caused concern, particularly in 1687, but he had suffered no protracted or incapacitating illness before November 1694. Considering the burden of work that he undertook he must have had a very robust constitution.

As a child of about ten years of age, his weak constitution, liability to fainting fits and consequent need for a change of air and scenery, led to his being sent from Halifax to Colne for his education.[3] When he was in his fourth year at Cambridge at the age of twenty or twenty-one, Tillotson's health again caused some considerable alarm. He suffered 'a severe sickness, followed by an uncommon kind of intermittent delirium'. When, before his consecration as archbishop, he gave thanks for his 'recovery from a great and dangerous sickness' he may have been referring to this incident. It was certainly more prolonged than the attack he

---

1. Lambeth MS 690, p. 64; Birch MS 4236 ff. 48-51 and 320-4; Birch I, clxxxiv-vii.
2. Birch III, Sermon 42, pp. 249-78.
3. See above p.13.

had suffered in 1687.[1] From such superficial descriptions in both cases of his symptoms, it is impossible to suggest any diagnoses of his illnesses. For almost forty years after the Cambridge incident his health caused no anxiety.

However, in 1687 he was taken ill at his house in Edmonton. On or about 30 December, aged 57, he had 'a appoplectick [sic] or epilectic [sic] fit' and fell from his chair. Following bleeding and purging, within a week, Tillotson had made a good recovery. His illness was attributed to grief resulting from the death in November of his elder daughter, Mary.[2]

Tillotson revealed something of his state of mind ten days after his recovery in a letter to Nicholas Hunt, a friend in Canterbury who was suffering from cancer:

> It hath pleased God to exercise me of late with a very sore trial, in the loss of my dear and only child, in which I do perfectly submit to his good pleasure, firmly believing, that he always does that which is best. And yet, though reason be satisfied, our passion is not so soon appeased; and, when nature has received a wound, time must be allowed for the healing of it. Since that, God has thought fit to give me a nearer summons of a closer warning of my own mortality in the danger of an apoplexy; which yet, I thank God for it, hath occasioned no very melancholy reflections. But this is perhaps more owing to natural temper, than philosophy and wise consideration.[3]

Tillotson's personality, faith and humanity are all revealed in this letter. He was firm in his trust in God, but profoundly grieving. His natural temperament was, according to his own assessment, optimistic. Cast down as he was by bereavement and illness, it is not surprising that he seems to have taken little part in the momentous political developments.

Despite his recovery from what seems to have been a slight stroke, Tillotson never felt completely well ever after. He

---

1. Birch I, iii and footnote; Birch X, 203.
2. HMC 5th Report: J.R. Pine Coffin, Portledge, South Devon, p. 378; Birch I, xc.
3. Add MSS 4511 ff. 29-31; 45,359 f. 17; 5,105 f.24; Birch MS 4236 f. 289; Birch I, xci.

complained of feeling in decline when he was being considered for the archbishopric.[1] His final illness was, however, mercifully short. On Sunday 18 November 1694 he was taken ill in the chapel of Whitehall Palace. He refused to interrupt the service but grew steadily worse. Medical attention was not summoned until the following day, by which time it was probably too late. He was paralysed down one side and rarely conscious. He had clearly had a much more severe stroke than the one he had suffered six years earlier. He was not expected to recover.[2] Nevertheless he was able to speak a few words, and his understanding seemed to be clear. He suggested Tenison as his successor, refused to allow his chaplains to use the prayers for the sick, and indicated that he was at peace with God and ready to die. Robert Nelson watched over him for his last two nights. An emetic was administered and while it was working Tillotson died at 5 p.m. on Thursday, 22 November.[3] At his own wish Tillotson was buried in St Lawrence Jewry. On 30 November the hearse travelled from Lambeth, followed by an endless train of carriages, through Southwark and over London Bridge. Burnet wept as he preached the sermon.[4]

In his sermon, Burnet paid tribute to Tillotson's Christian character as well as to his arguments in defence of his faith.[5] He praised the simplicity of style of his sermons and the solemnity with which they were delivered.[6] Tillotson had challenged the corruption of the age which led people to atheism and impiety.[7] He had seen popery as the root of this evil.[8] He had tried to prove everything by using reason.[9] His attempts to unite dissenters with the church had been misunderstood as lack of zeal for the church, but he had

---

1. See above p. 30.
2. HMC 14th report, part II, vol. III, Portland, p. 560: Robert Harley to Sir Edward Harley, 20 November 1694.
3. Birch ccxxii; de Beer, vol. V, pp. 195 and 198; John Hunt Religious Thought in England, (1870-3) p. 673; A.C.Ducarel, History and Antiquities of the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, (1785), Appendix p. 83; Burnet 605; Portledge Papers p. 189; Canterbury MS Dean's Book, p. 33.
4. Portledge Papers p. 189; St Lawrence Jewry Registers, p. 192; Macaulay, V, 524-5; Clarke and Foxcroft, 328-9; Kennet, 679-82.
5. Funeral Sermon 2.
6. Funeral Sermon 13-14.
7. Funeral Sermon 15.
8. Funeral Sermon 15-16.
9. Funeral Sermon 17.

struggled on.[1] His loyalty to the revolution had been unquestioned, but his reluctance to lead the church had been well known.[2] Nevertheless, he had submitted to what he had believed to be the call of God, though he had been prepared to resign his office if the situation made it possible or his failing health desirable.[3] As archbishop he had felt it more important to consider the good of the church than to pursue 'the pompous parts of learning', though he had revised his sermons.[4] Despite the good he had done and the gentleness of his character he had suffered much unkindness and injustice. As a man he had been humble, open, accessible, good-humoured, forgiving, charitable, unworldly.[5] Although he had never had cure of souls, he had visited the sick, comforted the afflicted and sought to settle those who were troubled or uncertain in mind.[6] In theology he had not disturbed the church, he had been on good terms with people from whom he differed and preferred not to get into controversy. He had seen Christianity's main task as reforming human nature.[7]

After this eulogy Tillotson was buried in the church where he had so often preached. Among those who mourned his death were the king and queen. William III told Chadwick, Tillotson's son in law, 'I loved your father [in law]; I never knew an honester man, and I never had a better friend'. Mary spoke tearfully and tenderly for many days about him.[8] Tillotson's widow erected a memorial tablet in St Lawrence Jewry to commemorate his thirty years as lecturer there.[9] The people of Halifax remembered one of their famous sons by a plaque on the west wall of the tower of their church.[10] When a new church was built in Tillotson's home village of Sowerby between 1763 and 1766, a statue was erected in his honour.[11]

Tillotson was not, however, to be allowed to rest in peace

---

1. Funeral Sermon 17-8.
2. Funeral Sermon 21-3.
3. Funeral Sermon 23-4.
4. Funeral Sermon 25.
5. Funeral Sermon 26-9.
6. Funeral Sermon 29.
7. Funeral Sermon 30-2.
8. Kennett III, 679-82; Birch I, ccxxxviii.
9. Birch I, ccxxii.
10. E.W.Crossley The Monuments and Other Inscriptions in Halifax Parish Church, (1909), p. 45.
11 J.Stansfield, History of the Family of Stansfield, (1885), p. 169; N. Pevsner, Yorkshire: The West Riding, (2nd. edition, 1967), p. 493.

In 1695 George Hickes produced his attack upon Burnet and Tillotson: Some Discourses Upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson; occasioned by the Late Funeral Sermon of the Former upon the Later [sic], (London 1695). Hickes was a non-juror, former dean of Winchester, who, after discussion with the exiled James II concerning the perpetuation of the episcopal succession, was on 24 February 1693 consecrated suffragan bishop of Thetford.[1] Hickes attacked Tillotson's upbringing, behaviour at Cambridge, attitude to ceremonies in worship, and his theological and political views.[2] Tillotson, far from suffering for his faith, 'was of a temper and constitution that loved ease and indolency'.[3] He had caused schism by taking Sancroft's position.[4]

Samuel Wesley, however, father of the founder of Methodism, was deeply sorrowful at Tillotson's death as he showed by a poem of sixty-two verses.[5] Tillotson taught tenderness wherever it was due. He revealed God in creation, he based his teaching firmly on reason and faith. He championed the saviour, confounded heresy and slew the popish monster. He

> Taught without noise, and differed without strife
> Soft were his words, but strong his argument.[6]

Tillotson died intestate and left financial worries to his widow, Elizabeth. Within less than a week after the archbishop's death the king granted Elizabeth Tillotson the archbishop's revenues until Lady Day 1695.[7] Early in December the treasury paid £279 12s. 6d. into Tillotson's estate, this was mainly a fine for the renewal of a lease, expenses and rent arrears.[8] On 8 January 1695 administration of Tillotson's estate was granted to his widow.[9] Three months later Tillotson's books were sold at Christopher Bacon's shop in Holborn.[10] Tenison, the new archbishop, bought furniture from Elizabeth Tillotson.[11] Later Tillotson's writings were sold for

---

1. Rupp 14-5.
2. See above: pp. 12, 15, 23, 48, 117, 121, 132, 187-8.
3. Some Discourses 1.
4. Some Discourses 52.
5. Samuel Wesley, Elegies on the Queen and Archbishop, (1695), pp. 18-29.
6. Verses iv, ix-xiii, xvii, xxx.
7. Wood III, 473.
8. T52/18/30; T52/12/397; T60/4/140.
9. PROB 6/71/f.16.
10. Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana, 1695.
11. de Beer V, 213.

2,500 guineas.[1] In April 1695 the treasury voted that Mrs Tillotson should be paid £400 a year for life in recognition of her late husband's services to the crown and of the 'very necessitous condition' in which she had been left. Mrs Tillotson was also discharged and released from paying £2,682 12s. 2d. to the king which were her husband's still unpaid firstfruits.[2] A year later on 30 April 1696 the king ordered that Lady Tillotson should have £1,500 paid in annual instalments of £500 from the tenths collected from the clergy.[3] Lady Tillotson was further burdened in 1697 when Chadwick, her son in law, died leaving his family in poverty.[4] On 18 July 1698 an extra £200 a year was, therefore, awarded to her.[5] Up to her death on 20 January 1702, Elizabeth Tillotson thus had at least £600 a year from the treasury.[6]

Elizabeth Tillotson obviously felt herself badly provided for when her husband died and his revenues ceased. How Tillotson had used his income it is not possible in detail to discover. However, besides the running of the administration of the church and the upkeep of Lambeth Palace, he had spent a considerable sum on improving the Palace,[7] and he had always devoted one-fifth of his income to charity.

Conclusion

Tillotson's career as administrator, preacher, thinker, pastor, writer and politician both ecclesiastical and secular, reveals him as a hard-working, conscientious man. There was, however, nothing superhuman about him. He was a well-meaning and very sensitive person and was, therefore, deeply hurt by the attacks of his enemies and the disloyalty of his acquaintances. Bereavement and illness brought him unhappiness

---

1 Tatler, 29 November 1709; Birch I, ccxxxix.
2 T29/8/5: 17 April 1695; T52/18/128-9: 24 April 1695; Rawlinson MS A241 f. 68: 20 May 1695; T53/12/529: 22 May 1695; T53/13/408: 15 December 1697; T53/15/80: 23 March 1700; T53/14/366: 2 May 1699; Birch I, ccxxxix.
3 T52/18/401: 30 April 1696; T53/13/128: 5 May 1696; T60/4/290: 8 May 1696.
4 Birch I, ccxxxix-xli.
5 T29/10/207: 18 July 1698; T27/16/2: 28 July 1698; T29/10/209: 28 July 1698; T52/20/4: 14 August 1698; Birch I, ccxxxix.
6 George J. Armitage (ed.), William Musgrave's Obituary Prior to 1900, (1901), Harleian Society, vol. VI, p. 97.
7 See above p. 113.

and, to his sorrow, a gradual ebbing of his powers. Unfortunately, his decline coincided with his appointment to the highest preferment his church could offer and, therefore, reduced the effectiveness that he might otherwise have shown. He was a sincere Christian, practising in private what he proclaimed in public. He forgave, tolerated and pleaded for his enemies. He was committed to prayer. There was also a firmness and an uncompromising approach to his religious practice. He conformed to the Prayer Book but not to the fashionable liturgical gestures of the period. The neglect of his personal finances by a man so effective in dealing with those of the church suggests an attitude of other-worldiness. Unfortunately the results of that were visited upon his widow. In both public and private life throughout his ministry Tillotson remained committed to much of the moderate puritanism of his youth.

Conclusion

Maligned in his own day, neglected by biographers and regularly misrepresented by writers, John Tillotson deserves better. Living, as he did for sixty-four years of the seventeenth century, he experienced, and even influenced, some of the most momentous developments in English religious and political life.

Tillotson's career illustrates the way that it was possible with education, application, ability and eventually the support of influential friends for a person of relatively humble origins to rise to the highest office that the Church of England could bestow. His tenures of lectureships at Lincoln's Inn and St Lawrence Jewry, of the deaneries of Canterbury and St Paul's, as well as of the senior episcopate were all distinguished. He carried all his duties with conscientious efficiency, whether he was attending to ecclesiastical administration, governmental business or preaching the gospel. However routine, or even tedious, his responsibilities were fulfilled.

Tillotson showed no signs of being ambitious for high office. As a cradle puritan, he wrestled at the Restoration with the decision as to whether or not he should conform, even though it was obvious from the start that the Church of England would in some form be restored. Tillotson's marriage was not very diplomatic, if he had royal patronage in view. Later, despite his earlier unequivocal beliefs in non-resistance, he espoused the Whig cause during the Exclusion Contest and in the reign of James II. As the Revolution or its permanence were not inevitable, Tillotson was courting political disaster. He was well-aware of his vulnerability to criticism for his change of view, but he had sincerely reached the conviction that William of Orange would be the instrument of divine deliverance. The offer of the episcopate by William and Mary was not greeted as a blessing. His reluctance to accept was genuine, but his sense of duty prevailed. He struggled to do what he believed to be right and accepted Canterbury contrary to his own wishes and desires.

One of Tillotson's greatest concerns throughout his ministry was the healing of the divisions within English protestantism that had resulted from unsolved problems bequeathed by the Elizabethan Church Settlement and considerably exacerbated by ecclesiastical fragmentation during the Civil War and Interregnum. Tillotson laboured tirelessly to bring the moderate nonconformists into the fold of the Church of England. He knew well that, on principle, Independent groups would never conform. Though tolerant towards Christians of other traditions, Tillotson was not

interested in the grant of official toleration to dissenters. He wanted them within the Church of England. In this way a strong, united, protestant church could successfully confront Roman Catholicism, heresy, atheism and irreligious living. Tillotson never seems to have considered that a comprehensive church, holding in tension a wide variety of opinions, might collapse into internal feuding and so imperil its future and enfeeble its witness. Tillotson was, of course, well aware of the dangers of nonconformist individualism and 'enthusiasm', which he challenged in his preaching, but he seems to have assumed that these would disappear in a united church. He also failed to understand the strength of opposition to comprehension on both sides of the religious chasm, the equivocal attitudes of politicians involved and, above all, that once William and Mary were firmly established on the throne the danger from Catholicism had abated. In any case, the Revolution had shown that protestants could unite politically in the face of a common enemy even though they were not united ecclesiastically.

Tillotson's greatest contribution to the seventeenth-century church, and indeed to the next century and a half, was his writing and preaching. Tillotson challenged what he saw as the enemies of biblical Christianity. He engaged the atheists and the Roman Catholics from the pulpit and in the press. Never did he descend, however, to scurrilous invective. He always treated his opponents with respect, honestly represented their views, and clearly and logically sought to reply to them.

In his preaching, Tillotson set an example of well-considered, clearly-expressed and orderly-presented sermon construction, which was followed by future generations. He was no rationalist, as has often been said, seeking religious truth solely through reason, but he was concerned to provide a logical apologetic for his theology. He was even prepared to admit that there were areas of Christian doctrine that were beyond reason. All that Tillotson wrote and preached was orthodox protestant theology, firmly rooted in scripture as understood in the light of reason and tradition.

Tillotson has repeatedly been accused of being simply a moralist. A study of his sermons gives the lie to this oft-repeated criticism. Tillotson preached regularly and consistently on all the doctrines of the creeds and ranged widely for his texts from both Old and New Testaments. He did, it is true, emphasise the necessity of the outworking of religious belief in everyday life. This was what he saw as the task of the preacher of his day when faced with the licentiousness of the age. Above all, Tillotson was an evangelist, concerned that people might tread the way to salvation and eternal life and avoid the w iles of the devil and all his works.

Tillotson's preaching and writing did much to enhance the intellectual respectability of the Christian faith at a time when the challenges of atheism and a new scientific frame of mind appeared as threats. The public reading of his sermons in full, in part, or in adaptation, for well over a century may be seen as a sign of clerical idleness or incompetence, but surely it also bears witness to the outstanding quality of his work.

Tillotson's powerful intellectual capacity cannot be overlooked. The clarity of his expression, his profound knowledge of scripture, the classics, the Fathers and the biblical languages, reveal a man of great reading and sophisticated judgement. He was not, however, a cold intellectual. Tillotson was a concerned and compassionate pastor eager to help individuals, charities, educational projects and even servants and children. Above all, he was a man of prayer and of sincere and robust faith. He weathered the personal disasters and the assaults of his enemies with truly Christian fortitude.

Tillotson was archbishop for only three brief, but difficult, years, coming as they did in the wake of the Revolution, the non-juring schism and the failure of the comprehension schemes. Tillotson's occupancy of the See of Canterbury was neither dramatic nor spectacular, but he was the ideal choice for the situation. His reputation as a sound and popular preacher, his tolerant and conciliatory personality, and his hardworking and efficient ways, enabled the church to settle down peacefully and quietly and to watch as non-juring withered and the popish threat receded. The church he left had successfully survived the troubles of the century and had a confident liturgy and theology at its core. It may not, as an organisation, have been sufficiently flexible to respond rapidly to the changing circumstances of the eighteenth century. The piety of its members may not have been very profound. Its worship and spirituality may not have been very stirring and inspiring. It was, however, the church which nurtured the Wesleys, their clerical followers and their evangelism in the next century.

Tillotson was not a time-serving, ambitious, rationalist, moralist. He was a conscientious, industrious, efficient and committed Christian minister. One can only marvel at the amount and variety of the work that he undertook and achieved in the conditions of the century in which he lived. Tillotson was a 'good and faithful servant', without whom the church of his day, and of later generations, would have been considerably impoverished.

Table 1 TILLOTSON'S INCOME AS PREBENDARY OF CANTERBURY 1671-2

Stipend

Nativity	1671	£ 9	15s.	5d.	
Annunciation	1672	9	19s.	2d.	
St John the Baptist	1672	10	0s.	5d.	
Michaelmas	1672	10	7s.	11d.	
		£40	2s.	11d.	1

Dividends

15 December	1671	£11	1s.	0d.	
6 February	1672	57	2s.	6d.	
19 April	1672	10	14s.	0d.	
31 May	1672	[3	4s.	6d.]	2
12 July	1672	10	2s.	6d.	
5 September	1672	19	3s.	6d.	
30 November	1672	3	15s.	0d.	
		£115	3s.	0d.	3

Other Payments

Diet: 19 November	1672	£ 8	8s.	0d.	
Seals: 30 November	1672	11	19s.	0d.	
		£20	7s.	0d.	4

Totals

Stipend	£ 40	2s.	11d.
Dividends	115	3s.	0d.
Others	20	7s.	0d.
	£175	12s.	11d.

1. St Paul's MS Treasurer's Book, 1673, pp. 8-11.
2. No figure is given for Tillotson, but all the other canons received this amount.
3. St Paul's MS Treasurer's Book, 1671-2, pp. 50-4.
4. St Paul's MS Treasurer's Book, 1671-2, pp. 54-5.

Table 2[1] CANTERBURY CHAPTER MEETINGS AND TILLOTSON'S ATTENDANCES

	J.	F.	M.	A.	M.	J.	J.	A.	S.	O.	N.	D.
1672											6-6	5-0
1673	1-0		3-0	2-1	1-0	2-0		4-4	2-2		2-2	4-4
1674						5-5	2-1			1-1	3-3	9-9
1675	1-0				1-0	7-7	3-1			2-2	6-6	7-7
1676		1-0			1-0	3-3	1-1		1-0		6-6	5-5
1677				1-0	2-0	7-7	1-1				8-7	4-4
1678	4-1	1-1				5-5					3-0	2-0
1679						6-6	1-1	1-1	1-0		3-3	6-6
1680			1-0		2-0		6-0				5-5	6-6
1681		1-0				6-6	1-1	1-1		1-0	4-4	4-3
1682		1-0	1-?			5-0		2-1	1-0		4-2	2-0
1683	1-0					1-1	1-0				3-3	3-3
1684	2-0	2-0	2-0	2-0		2-1	1-1				7-7	5-5
1685						3-3				1-0	5-5	4-4
1686	2-0	1-?	1-?		1-0	6-6					6-6	1-1
1687						6-0		1-0	1-0		4-4	3-3
1688						2-2	1-0				2-1	
1689		1-0				3-3		3-0		1-0	1-?	

Note: the first figure denotes possible attendances and the second the actual. The question mark is shown where no list of names has been recorded.

1. Information drawn from Canterbury MS Acta Capituli, 1670-1710, pp. 12-110.

Table 3[1] ST PAUL'S CHAPTER MEETINGS AND TILLOTSON'S ATTENDANCE

	J.	F.	M.	A.	M.	J.	J.	A.	S.	O.	N.	D.
1678		1-1	2-2		1-1							
1679	1-1				3-3					1-1		
1680		1-1			3-3			1-0				
1681		1-1									2-0	
1682		1-1	2-2	1-1	1-0	1-1				3-3		
1683		2-2		2-2	1-1				1-0			
1684		1-1			1-1						1-0	1-0
1685		2-2			1-1	1-0	1-1		1-0	1-1	1-0	
1686	2-2	3-1	1-0	1-0					2-2		1-1	
1687	1-1			1-0						2-1	1-0	2-0
1688		1-1				1-1				1-1	1-1	
1689		1-1	3-2		1-0		1-1		1-1		2-2	
1690	1-1	2-2	1-1									
1691			1-1									

Note: the first figure denotes possible attendances and the second the actual.

1. Information drawn from St Paul's MSS FC 2 and 3.

Table 4[1] CANTERBURY CHAPTER: RENEWAL OF LEASES

Year	Leases	Timber Grants	References
1672[2]	14	0	13-15
1673[3]	26	3	15-22
1674	42	6	22-28
1675	40	2	28-37
1676	27	0	37-42
1677	32	3	43-48
1678	25	0	49-53
1679	25	3	53-57
1680	31	5	57-62
1681	36	1	62-68
1682	47	2	68-74
1683	35	4	74-79
1684	30	1	79-86
1685	21	1	87-90
1686	40	2	91-96
1687	26	0	97-100
1688	38	5	100-106
1689[4]	24	0	106-110
Totals:	559	38	

1. Information drawn from Canterbury MS Acta Capituli, 1670-1710, pp. 12-110. Page numbers are given under 'References'.
2. From 14 November only.
3. On 3 June the details are not given, the record simply states 'leases'. A minimum of two has, therefore, been included in this first figure.
4. To 25 November only.

Table 5[1] CANTERBURY CHAPTER: SEAL MONEY

Year	Amount	References
1672[2]	£ 204 10s. 0d.	66-68
1673	£ 820 10s. 10d.	68-76
1674	£2435 3s. 4d.	76-85
1675	£1215 11s. 0d.	86-93
1676	£1162 10s. 0d.	93-99
1677	£1182 12s. 4d.	100-108
1678	£1210 7s. 8d.	109-115
1679	£ 373 0s. 0d.	116-121
1680	£1005 17s. 0d.	121-127
1681	£2511 15s. 0d.	128-140
1682	£1997 8s. 0d.	140-145
1683	£2541 3s. 4d.	146-157
1684	£1141 15s. 0d.	158-166
1685	£1645 14s. 0d.	166-172 and 1-3
1686	£1193 0s. 0d.	4-10
1687	£1256 10s. 0d.	10-18
1688	£ 699 15s. 0d.	19-26
1689[3]	£ 887 15s. 0d.	27-35
Total:	£23484 17s. 6d.	

1. Information drawn from Canterbury MSS Seal Books 1664-1685 and 1685-1709. Page numbers are given under 'References'.
2. 4 November to 31 December only.
3. To 2 October only.

Table 6: TILLOTSON'S INCOME AS DEAN OF CANTERBURY, 4 NOVEMBER 1672 TO 19 NOVEMBER 1689

Years:				References:[1]
1672:				
Stipend:	£ 72	3s.	4d.	1674,9
Dividend:	£ 3	15s.	0d.	1671-2, 57
Diet:	£ 8	8s.	0d.	1671-2, 54
Seals:	£ 11	19s.	6d.	1671-2, 55
Corn etc.	£ 41	0s.	6d.	1672, 97--113
Total:	£137	5s.	10d.	
1673;				
Stipend:	£300	0s.	0d.	1674, 10-11
Dividends:	£145	6s.	0d.	1673, no page numbers
Diet:	£ 9	16s.	0d.	1673, 71
Seals, Corn etc.	£ 88	17s.	0d.	1673, 22, 57-62
Total:	£543	19s.	0d.	
1674:				
Stipend:	£300	0s.	0d.	1675, 9-10
Dividend:	£235	8s.	0d.	1674, 444-47
Diet:	£ 11	16s.	0d.	1674, 38
Seals, Corn etc.	£124	17s.	0d.	1674, 35, 41, 65-75
Total	£672	1s.	0d.	
1675:				
Stipend:	£300	0s.	0d.	1676, 11-15
Dividend:	£139	19s.	0d.	1675, 45-47
Diet:	£ 10	14s.	0d.	1675, 40
Seals, Corn etc.	£131	18s.	0d.	1675, 47, 49, 89-99
Total:	£598	11s.	0d.	

1. The figures for Stipend, Dividends, Diet and Seals are drawn from the Treasurer's Book, and the Corn Rents and small payments from the receiver's Books. The year and page references are given where possible.

Table 6 ctd.

1676:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1677, 14-19 and 105.
Dividends	£ 57	5s.	0d.	1677, 101-103.
Diet	£ 9	16s.	0d.	1677, 80.
Seals	£ 17	0s.	0d.	1677, 12.
Corn etc.	£112	7s.	3d.	1676, 43-44, 78-82.
Total	£496	8s.	3d.	
1677:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1677, 106; 1678, 6-7.
Dividends	£124	19s.	0d.	1677,110-111; 1678, 37.
Diet				
Seals				
Corn etc.	£108	13s.	2d.	1677, 37,41, 61, 83-89.
Total	£533	12s.	2d.	
1678:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1678, 7; 1679, 5-6.
Dividends	£203	6s.	0d.	1678, 38-44; 1679,37.
Diet				1678, 30.
Seals				1678, 4.
Corn etc.	£138	9s.	4d.	1678, 47, 52, 91-111.
Total	£641	15s.	4d.	
1679:				
Stipend	£300	0s	0d.	1679, 7; 1680, 7-8.
Dividends	£ 85	14s.	0d.	1679, 37; 1680, 59.
Diet	£ 10	14s.	0d.	1679, 30.
Seals	£ 4	7s.	0d.	1679, 5.
Corn etc.	£ 93	15s.	0d.	1679, 26, 46-50.
Total	£494	10s.	0d.	
1680:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1680, 8-9; 1681, 7-8.
Dividends	£173	9s.	0d.	1680,60-61;1681-no nos.
Diet	£ 11	16s.	0d	1680, 41.
Seals	£ 10	12s.	0d.	1680, 5.
Corn etc	£128	0s.	0d.	16809, 20, 49-56,
Total	£623	17s.	0d	

Table 6 ctd.

1681:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1682, 6-7.
Dividends	£203	11s.	0d.	1681, no nos.;1682,4-5.
Diet	£ 10	14s.	0d.	1681, 30.
Seals	£ 9	5s.	0d.	1681, 4.
Corn etc.	£ 85	1s.	0d.	1681, 39, 55-59.
Total	£608	11s.	0d.	

1682:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1682,8; 1683, 5.
Dividends	£301	7s.	0d.	1682, 45-59; 1683, 34.
Diet	£ 9	16s.	0d.	1682, 40.
Seals	£ 21	0s.	0d.	1682, 5; 1683, 4.
Corn etc.	£132	13s.	0d.	1682, 28, 34;1683,34-5.
Total	£764	16s.	0d.	

1683:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1683, 6-7; 1684, 6.
Dividends	£219	12s.	0d.	1683, 35-41; 1684, 45.
Diet	£ 11	16s.	0d.	1683, 26.
Seals				
Corn etc.	£ 91	11s.	0d.	1683,21,35-38; 1684,30.
Total	£622	19s.	0d.	

1684:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1684, 6-7; 1685, 12.
Dividends	£175	2s.	0d.	1684, 46-49, 60.
Diet	£ 11	16s.	0d.	1684, 38.
Seals	£ 16	14s.	0d.	1684, 5.
Corn etc.	£ 89	7s.	0d.	1684, 19, 31-40.
Total	£592	19s.	0d.	

1685:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1685, 13-15; 1686, 8.
Dividends	£152	6s.	0d.	1685, 68-74; 1686, 60.
Diet	£ 25	9s.	0d.	1685, 67.
Seals	£ 8	0s.	0d.	1685, 9.
Corn etc.	£136	5s.	0d.	1685, 24, 39-53.
Total	£622	0s.	0d.	

Table 6 ctd.

1686:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1686, 8-9; 1687, 11.
Dividends	£103	16s.	0d.	1686, 61-63; 1687, 63.
Diet	£ 11	16s.	0d.	1686, 61.
Seals	£ 11	1s.	0d.	1686, 7.
Corn etc.	£109	16s.	0d.	1686, 50, 60-9.
Total	£536	9s.	0d.	
1687:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1687, 11-14; 1688, 10.
Dividends	£243	9s.	6d.	1687, 64-67; 1688, 61-4.
Diet	£ 10	14s.	0d.	1687, 52.
Seals	£ 9	9s.	0d.	1687, 9.
Corm etc.	£ 95	1s.	0d.	1687, 37, 45-9.
Total	£658	13s.	6d.	
1688:				
Stipend	£300	0s.	0d.	1688, 10-11; 1689, 10.
Dividends	£ 65	1s.	0d.	1688, no nos.
Diet	£ 23	12s.	0d.	1688, 60.
Seals	£ 9	0s.	0d.	1688, 8.
Corn etc.	£ 83	18s.	0d.	1688-9, no nos.
Total	£481	11s.	0d.	
1689;				
Stipend	£227	16s.	8d.	1689, 10-11.
Dividends	£ 87	9s.	0d.	1689, no nos.
Diet				
Seals				
Corn ets.	£ 86	19s.	0d.	1689, no nos.
Total	£402	4s.	8d.	

TOTALS:

Stipend	£5,100	0s.	0d.
Dividends	£2,720	14s.	6d.
Diet	£ 188	13s.	0d.
Seals	£ 144	7s.	0d.
Corn etc.	£1,878	8s.	3d.
Total	£10,032	2s.	3d.

TABLE 7

TILLOTSON'S ATTENDANCES AS ARCHBISHOP AT THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL, 1691-4

Period	Lords[1]	Council[2]	1	2
1691				
June		4-3		74/193-00
July		6-3		74/201-16
Aug.		4-3		74/222-31
Sept.		4-1		74/235-45
Oct.	6- 4	7-7	xiv, 624-31	74/248-63
Nov.	22-21	4-4	xiv, 642-65	74/268-75
Dec.	23-18	7-4	xiv, 666-xv, 8.	74/278-00
1692				
Jan.	22-14	4-1	xv, 12-54	74/303-17
Feb.	20- 9	4-1	xv, 55-91	74/324-36
Mar.	0- 0	6-5		74/339-67
April	1- 0	5-4	xv, 94	74/369-83
May	1- 1	11-6	xv, 96	74/386-11
June	1- 1	6-6	xv, 97	74/413-28
July	1- 1	6-5	xv, 98	74/432-48
Aug.	1- 1	7-7	xv, 100	74/451-74
Sept.	1- 0	10-3	xv, 101	74/477-03
Oct.	0- 0	10-7		75/ 1-20
Nov.	20-12	5-3	xv, 102-29	75/ 22-33
Dec.	23-19	6-4	xv, 131-40	75/ 35-61
1693				
Jan.	24-19	5-4	xv, 169-07	75/ 64-71
Feb.	23-13	4-3	xv, 211-52	75/ 87-96
Mar.	12- 9	5-5	xv, 254-87	75/102-22
April	0- 0	5-4		75/127-41
May	1- 0	4-4	xv, 291	75/146-60
June	0- 0	8-6		75/164-77
July	0- 0	4-4		75/178-87
Aug.	0- 0	5-4		75/191-05
Sept.	1- 1	5-4	xv, 292	75/217-29
Oct.	2- 2	7-6	xv, 293- 4	75/245-64
Nov.	15- 7	7-6	xv, 295-09	75/268-86
Dec.	20- 6	4-2	xv, 310-29	75/292-02

1694				
Jan.	24-12	6-1	xv, 330-56	75/310-28
Feb.	22-14	6-2	xv, 357-80	75/330-61
Mar.	27-20	8-6	xv, 381-07	75/363-85
April	19-18	9-3	xv, 408-25	75/389-06
May	0- 0	10-9		75/407-22
June	0- 0	5-5		75/429-39
July	0- 0	4-2		75/443-48
Aug.	0- 0	7-3		75/451-65
Sept.	1- 1	8-2	xv, 427	75/467-78
Oct.	1- 1	6-5	xv, 428	75/488-96
Nov.[3]	2- 2	5-4	xv, 429-30	75/497-06

TOTALS:

House of Lords:	possible:	336
	actual:	226
	absences:	110
	Attendances:	67.26%
Privy Council:	possible:	253
	actual:	171
	absences:	82
	Attendances:	67.59%

---

1. House of Lords Journal vol. and page numbers. Tillotson did not take up his seat until 5 October 1691. The first figure in the table denotes possible, the second actual, attendances.
2. Privy Council references preceded by PC. The figures arranged as for House of Lords.
3. Attendances up to 18 November when he was taken mortally ill.

TABLE: 8

TILLOTSON'S ANNUAL INCOME AS ARCHBISHOP[1]

1. 1 January 1691 - 31 December 1691: (from July 1691)

Rents etc.				Fines		
£ 632	9s.	11 d.		£ 50	0s.	0d.
£		1½d.				
£1213	4s.	10½d.		£ 264	0s.	0d.
£ 684	14s .	5½d.		£ 236	0s.	0d.
£2530	9s.	4½d.		£ 550	0s.	0d.
£ 58	11s.	7½d.	1-5 January 1692	£ 65	0s.	0d.[2]
£2471	17s.	9 d.		£ 485	0s.	0d.

Rents etc.	£2471	17s.	9d.
Fines	£ 485	0s.	0d.
Total:	£2956	17s.	9d.

2. 1 January 1692 - 31 December 1692:

Rents etc.				Fines:		
£ 58	11s.	7½d.	Carried forward	£ 65	0s.	0d.
£ 608	4s.	8½d.		£ 23	0s.	0d.
£ 829	6s.	11 d.		£ 893	15s.	0d.
£ 52	1s.	3¾d.		£ 20	0s.	0d.
£ 791	8s.	8 d.		£ 465	0s.	0d.
£ 869	1s.	8 d.		£ 102	0s.	0d.
£1070	8s.	7½d.		£ 20	0s.	0d.
£ 834	15s.	4¼d.				
£5113	18s.	10½d.		£1588	15s.	0d.[3]
£ 299	13s.	6¾d.	2-9 January 1693			
£4814	5s.	3¾d.		£1588	15s.	0d.

Rents etc.	£4814	5s.	3¾d.
Fines	£1588	15s.	0 d.
Total:	£6403	0s.	3¾d.

---

1. Lambeth Palace MS. T.F. 11: Accounts of the Receiver General. All page numbers refer to this book. The accounts for December include the first week of the January following. For the purposes of the table, this sum has been subtracted and added to the proper year.
2. Pp. 1-2.
3. Pp. 2-7.

p3. 1 January 1693 - 31 December 1693:

Rents etc.				Fines		
£ 299	13s.	6¾d.	Carried forward			
£ 850	16s.	4½d.		£ 150	0s.	0d.
£ 505	1s.	3 d.		£ 122	0s.	0d.
£ 722	14s.	4 d.		£ 410	0s.	0d.
£ 892	14s.	8½d.		£ 613	0s.	0d.
£ 889	10s.	2 d.		£ 150	0s.	0d.
£1271	4s.	6½d.		£ 120	0s.	0d.
£ 780	10s.	10¼d.		£ 72	0s.	0d.
£6212	5s.	9½d.		£1637	0s.	0d.
£ 309	8s.	4¾d.	2-17 January 1694	£ 55	0s.	0d.[1]
£5902	17s.	4¾d.		£1582	0s.	0d.

Rents etc.	£5902	17s.	4¾d.
Fines	£1582	0s.	0 d.
Total:	£7484	17s.	4¾d.

4. 1 January 1694 - 31 December 1694:

a) 1 January to 22 November:

Rents etc.				Fines:		
£ 309	8s.	4¾d.	Carried forward	£ 55	0s.	0d.
£ 486	14s.	4½d.		£ 263	0s.	0d.
£ 229	8s.	6 d.		£ 855	0s.	0d.
£ 818	11s.	6¾d.		£ 590	0s.	0d.
£ 965	14s.	0 d.				
£ 530	1s.	2 d.				[2]
£3339	18s.	0 d.		£1763	0s.	0d.

Rents etc.	£3339	18s.	0d.
Fines	£1763	0s.	0d.
Total:	£5102	18s.	0d.

1. Pp. 7-11.
2. Pp.11-14.

b) 22 November to 31 December 1694:

Rents etc.			Fines
£ 400	1s.	8 d.	
£ 601	12s.	10¼d.	
£ 239	16s.	8 d.	
£1241	11s.	2¼d.	£

[1]

Paid to his widow:

Rents etc.	£1241	11s.	2¼d.
Fines			
Total:	£1241	11s.	2¼d.

Full year:

Rents etc.	£3339	18s.	0 d.	Paid to Tillotson
	£1241	11s.	2¼d.	Paid to widow
Fines	£1763	0s.	0 d.	
Total:	£6344	9s.	2¼d.	

5. Summary: 1691-1694:

	Rents etc.			Fines			Totals		
1691:	£2471	17s.	9 d.	£ 485	0s.	0d.	£2956	17s.	9 d.
1692:	£4814	5s.	3¾d.	£1588	15s.	0d.	£6403	0s.	3¾d.
1693:	£5902	17s.	4¾d.	£1582	0s.	0d.	£7484	17s.	4¾d.
1694:	£3339	18s.	0 d.	£1763	0s.	0d.	£5102	18s.	0 d.
	£1241	11s.	2¼d.				£1241	11s.	2¼d.
	£17770	9s.	7¾d.	£5418	15s.	0d.	£23189	4s.	7¾d.

1. Pp. 14-15.

TABLE: 9

REVENUES OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY 30 NOVEMBER 1690 TO 11 JULY 1691[1]

Tenths to Christmas 1690	£358	16s.	10 d.
Rents to Christmas 1690	235	19s.	6½d.
Ten quarters of oats valued at	6	0s.	0 d.
Christmas profits	600	16s.	4½d.
20 quarters of wheat due at Candlemas valued at	21	0s.	0 d.
Rents due at Candlemas	17	13s.	5 d.
40 quarters of barley due on 14 February	21	0s.	0 d.
Rents due on Lady Day	908	8s.	3¼d.
40 quarters of wheat	42	0s.	0 d.
50 quarters of wheat	27	10s.	0 d.
33 whethers at 20s.	33	0s.	0 d.
20 whethers at 18s.	18	0s.	0 d.
42 whethers at 20s. due at Easter	42	0s.	0 d.
50 whethers at 20s. due 1 May	50	0s.	0 d.
Perquisites and profits of Court at Croydon, 5 May	1	18s.	9½d.
Perquisites and profits of Court at Lambeth, 8 May	34	16s.	7 d.
Rents due on 10 May	20	0s.	0 d.
Rents and payments due at Pentecost	132	1s.	11½d.
Rents and payments due on John the Baptist's Day	269	6s.	2½d.
Profit on timber cut	400	0s.	0 d.
	£3,240	7s.	9¾d.

1. T52/16/38-46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Manuscripts:

a) British Library
Tillotson letters in Add. MSS, Birch MSS, Harley MSS, Landsdowne MSS, Sloane MSS

b) Canterbury Cathedral
Accounts, 1670-7 and 1678-89
Acta Capituli, 1670-1710
Dean's Book, 1691-1747
Dean's Small Book
Dr Parker's Book
General Register, vols 28-9, 1667-90
[Treasurer's] Notebook
Receiver's Books, 1672-89
Seal Books, vols I and II, 1664-1709
Treasurer's Books, 1671-89

c) St Paul's Cathedral
Account Book of Dean and Chapter, 1671-87
Dean and Chapter Muniment Book, 1660-95
Seal Book, 1660-98
William Stanley's Account
John Tillotson's Accounts, 1682-3

d) Lambeth Palace, London
Accounts of the Archbishop's New Year Gifts, 1628-1747
Account Book of the Receiver, 1694-1708
Accounts of Ralph Snowe, 1689-90
Check Rolls of Wages of the Archbishop's Officials and Servants, 1614-1788
Commonplace Book
Day Book, 1679-1704
Gibson Papers
Register of Leases
Rental, 1692-1703
View of Estates

e) Bodleian Library, Oxford
Tillotson's letters in Ballard MSS, Bodleian Add MSS, Rawlinson MSS, Tanner MSS

f) Dr Williams's Library, London
Richard Baxter's Letters

g) Clare College Library, Cambridge
Masters' Letter Book

h) Guildhall Library, London
Episcopal Registers

Guildhall Chapel Preachers, 1676-1717
Index to Repertories
Orders for Payment to Sundry Persons out of the Collection in Relief of the Poor French Protestants
Parish Registers of St Lawrence Jewry, 1538-1715
Preachers at St Paul's Cross, 1677-1723
Presentments
Spital Sermons, 1671-1723
Vestry Minute Books of St Lawrence Jewry
St Mary le Bow Preachers, 1680-90

i) H.M. Register House Edinburgh
Copies of letters to Sir Robert Atkyns, 1660-74

j) Lancashire Record Office, Preston
Barcroft Diary and Accounts, 1689-1732

k) Public Record Office, London
Probates: Tillotson's Estate
Privy Council Register
State Papers (Domestic)
State Papers (Treasury)

l) Halifax Parish Church
Baptismal Register

2. Printed Documents

Ailesbury, T, Earl of, Memoirs ofg Thomas Earl of Ailesbury, 1890
Annesley, S., The Morning Exercises at Cripplegate, 1844
[?], An Appeal for Funds for ... Pious Treatises in the Welsh Language, 1675
Atterbury, L., A Vindication of Archbishop Tillotson's Sermons ...., 1709
Barker, R., A Sermon Preached at St Mary le Bow ... at the Consecration of ... John, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury ...., 1691
Baillie, R., Letters and Journals, Edinburgh, 1842
Baxter, R., Reliquae Baxterianae, 1696
Beer, E.S. de., The Diary of John Evelyn, 1955
[?], Biographia Britannica, 1763
Blencowe, R.W. (ed.), Diary of the Times of Charles the Second by the Honourable Henry Sidney, 1843
Blount, C., Great is Diana of the Ephesians or The Original of Idolatry, 1680
Bond, M.(ed.), The Diaries and Papers of Sir Edward Dering, 1976
Bongaerts, T., The Correspondence of Thomas Blount (1618-72), Amsterdam, 1978
[?], A Book of the Valuation of all Ecclesiastical Preferments in England and Wales, 1680
Burnet, G., Reflections upon a Pamphlet Entitled 'Some Discourses upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson', 1696
Calendars of State Papers (Domestic), 1668-1695
Calendar of Treasury Books, 1689-99
[?], A Caution against Deceivers with Respect to the Subordination of the Son of God; and a

Defence of Several Eminent Divines, viz. A.B. Tillotson, Dr Owen, Dr Manchester etc., 1720
Calamy, E., An Abridgement of Mr Baxter's History of his Life and Times; An Account of the Ministers, Lecturers and Fellows and Schoolmasters ...., 1713
Calamy, E., (ed.), Memoirs of the Life of the Late Mr John Howe, 1724
Calamy, E., The Nonconformist Memorial, ed. S. Palmer, 1802
Cameron, W.J., Poems on State Affairs, 1660-1714, Yale, 1971
[Cave, W.?], A Discourse Concerning the Unity of the Catholic Church, 1684
Clarendon, Henry, Earl of, Diary 1687-90: Life and Correspondence, 1828
[ed.?], The State Letters of Henry Earl of Clarendon, 1765
Clark, A., The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1632-1695, Described by Himself, 9th ed., 1894
Clarke, H.W.H. (ed.), Register of St Lawrence Jewry, 1538-1676, 1940
[ed.?], A Collection of State Tracts Published during the Reign of King William III, 1706
[?], A Complete Collection of State Trials upon High Treason and other Misdemeanours from the Reign of King Richard II to the End of the Reign of King George I, 1730
[?], Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity Occasioned by Four Sermons Preached by his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, 1694
[?], Considerations about Subscription Submitted to the Convocation on Behalf of the Conformable Clergy, 1690
Coxe, W., Private and Original Correspondence of Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, 1821
[Darrell, W.], The Layman's Opinion Sent in a Private Letter to a Considerable Divine of the Church of England, 1687; The Layman's Answer to the Layman's Opinion in a Letter to a Friend, 1687
[?], A Discourse Concerning the Unity of the Catholic Church .... , 1684
Dunkin, E.H.W. and Jenkins, C.(eds), Index to the Act Books of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1663-1839, 1938
Ecton, J., Liber Valorum and Decimarum, 1711; Thesaurus Rerum Eccelsiasticarum, 1763
[?], An Elegy of His Grace John, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, 1695
Elliott, G.P. (ed.), Diary of Dr Edward Lake, Camden Society, vol. 39, Miscellany vol. I
Firth, C.H., The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, 1625-72, Oxford, 1894
[Gother, J.?], An Answer to a Discourse on Transubstantiation, 1687
Hall, R., Works, 1845
Hardy, T.D., (ed.), J. le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, Oxford 1854
Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports
Horne, J.M., John le Neve: Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1974
Horsfall, E. (ed.), The Parish Registers of Heptonstall, Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 1975
House of Commons Journals
House of Lords Journals
Hunter, J. (ed.), The Diary of Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, 1843
Janeway, R., A Specimen of a Bill for Uniting the Protestants, [?]
Japkisse, N., Correspondentie van Willem III en van Hans Willem Bentinck, The Hague, 1977
Jenkins, C. and Fry, E.A., (eds), Index to the Act Books of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1938
Jessop, A. (ed.), The Lives of the Norths, 1890
Laing, D. (ed.), The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1842
[?], Late Proposal for the Union among Protestants Reviewed and Rectified...., 1679
[?], A Letter formerly sent to Dr Tillotson, and for Want of an Answer made Public and now Reprinted with the said Doctor's Letter to Lord Russell a little before his Execution, [?]
[Long, T.], Vox Cleri or the Sense of the Clergy, 1690

Maurice, H., Remarks from the Country upon Two Letters relating to the Convocation and Alterations in the Liturgy, 1689/90
Mechtild, B., Lettres et Memoires de Marie Reine d'Angleterre, Epouse de Guillaume III, The Hague, 1880
Mitchell, A.F. and Struthers, J. (eds), The Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1874
Neve, J. and Horn, J.M., Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1969
Patrick, S., Autobiography, Oxford 1839
[Payne, W.], An Answer to Vox Cleri, 1690
Quality, A Person of, A View of the Soul in Several Tracts ....The Third Consists of Several Epistles to the Reverend John Tillotson, D.D. and Dean of Canterbury, 1662
[?], The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn\; the Black Books, 1899
[?], Remarks from the Country upon Two Letters Relating to the Convocation and Alterations in the Liturgy, 1689/90
Robinson, H.W. and Adams, W. (eds), The Diary of Robert Hooke, 1672-1689, 1935
Serjeant, J., Sure Footing in Christianity or Rational Discourses on the Rule of Faith, 1665; A Letter of Thanks from the Author of Sure Footing to his Answerer Mr John Tillotson, 1666; Faith Vindicated from the Possibility of Falsehood, 1667; Method to Arrive at Satisfaction in Religion, 1671; Reason Against Raillery: or a Full Answer to Dr Tillotson's Preface against J.S., 1672; Sixth Catholic Letter, 1688
Selwood, T. (ed.), Letters of Lady Rachel Russell, 7edtn., 1909
Sherlock, W. [?], or Jane W. [?], A Letter to a Friend Containing some Queries about the New Commission, n.d.
Sherlock, W., Letter to a Dissenter, 1689
[?], Short Animadversions upon a Sermon lately Preached by the Rev. Dr Tillotson upon Joshua 24,15 and since Published, 1680
Singer, S.W., The Correspondence o Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and of his Brother Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, with the Diary of Lord Clarendon from 1687-1690 ... and the Diary of Lord Rochester ..., 1828
[?], Some Select Queries humbly Offered for the Consideration of the D- of C-t-by, 1682
Stubbs, W., Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, Oxford, 1887
Taylor, A. (ed.), The Works of Simon Patrick, Oxford, 1858
Tenison, T., 'Discourse Concerning the Ecclesiastical Commission ... 10 October 1689' in A Collection of State Tracts Published on Occasion of the Late Revolution in 1688 ..., vol. I, 1705
Thompson, E.M. (ed.), Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, Camden Society 23 (NS), vol II, p.32
[Thorpe, G.], A Discourse Concerning the Unity of the Catholic Church Maintained in the Church of England, 1684
[?], Transubstantiation Defended, and Proved from Scripture in Answer to the First Part of a Treatise Entitled a Discourse Against Transubstantiation, 1687
Turner, J.H. (ed.), Autobiography, Diaries, Anecdote and Event Books of Oliver Heywood, Brighouse, 1881-5; The Nonconformist Register, Brighouse, 1881
[?], 'The Unprejudiced Laymen's Free Thoughts on the Subject the Convocation are upon', 1690, in Collection of State Tracts Published during the Reign of King William III, 1706
[?], Vox Laici, or the Laymen's Opinion Touching the Alterations in our Established Liturgy in Answer to a Letter from a Member of Convocation, 1689
[?], Vox Populi, or the Sense of the Sober Layman of the Church of England, Concerning the Heads Proposed in his Majesty's Commission to the Convocation, 1690
[?], Vox Regis et Regni, 1690

Warwick, P., Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles I ... Together with a Continuation to the Happy Restoration of King Charles II, 1702
Webster, S. (ed.), The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and of his brother, Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, 1828
Wesley, S., Elegies on the Queen and Archbishop, 1695
Whiston, W., Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr William Whiston...., 1749
Whitefield, G., Journals, 19600
Wilkins, W.W., Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1860
Williams, J., Diary, 1854

3. Tillotson

[?], Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana ...., 1695
Birch, T., The Works of Dr John Tillotson, 1752
Burnet, G., A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of ... John ... Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, 1694
Hickes, G., Some Discourses upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson Occasioned by the Late Funeral Sermon of the Former upon the Latter, 1695
Humphrey, W.G., 'Tillotson the Practical Preacher' in The Classic Preachers of the English Church, 2nd series, 1878
Locke, L.G., 'Tillotson: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Literature' in Anglistica, vol. iv Copenhagen, 1954
Lightfoot, R., Dr Edwards's Vindication Considered in a Letter to a Friend wherein the Late Archbishop Tillotson and Others are more fully Vindicated from his unjust Reflections, 1710
Mackay, J., 'John Tillotson: A Study of his Life and of his Contribution to the Development of English Prose', Oxford D.Phil. Thesis, 1952
Moffatt, J., The Golden Book of Tillotson, 1926
O'Higgins, J., 'Archbishop Tillotson and the Religion of Nature' in Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. vol. xxiv, part I, April 1973
Reedy,G., ' Interpreting Tillotson' in Harvard Theological Review, 86:1, January 1993
S., N., A Twofold Vindication of the Late Archbishop of Canterbury, 1696
Simon, I., Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South, Tillotson, Paris, 1967
Tillotson, J. (ed.), The Works of the Learned Isaac Barrow, D.D., ... , 1683
Tillotson, J., A Dissuasive from Popery, 1768
Tillotson, J., A Discourse to his Servants, Concerning Receiving the Sacrament, no date or place

4. Church History

Abernathy, G.R., 'The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration' in Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. vol. LV, 1965
Aderne, J., Directions Concerning the Matter and Stile of Srrmons, Oxford, 1952 ed.
Allison, C.F., The Rise of Moralism, 1966
Aristotle, Ethics, V
Aquinas, T., Summa Theologiae, 1974 edtn.
Armstrong, A., The Church of England, the Methodists and Society, 1973
Bainton, R.H., Here I Stand, Nashville 1950; The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, 1953
Beddard, R.A., 'The Restored Church' in Jones, J.R., (ed.), The Restored Monarchy, 1660 -1688, 1979

Bennett, G.V., 'King William III and the Episcopate' in Bennett, G.V. and Walsh, J.D., (eds) Essays in Modern Church History, New York, 1966
Bennett, G.V., White Kennett, 1957; The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730, Oxford, 1975
Bennett, G.V., 'Conflict in the Church' in Holmes, G. (ed.), Britain After the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714, 1969
Bosher, R.S., The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, New York, 1951
Boyer, R.E., English Declarations of Indulgence, 1678 and 1688, The Hague, 1968
Bradshaw, P.F., The Anglican Ordinal, 1971
Brandt, W.I., Luther's Works: The Christian Society, Philadelphia, 1966
Bretton, R., 'Bishop John Lake' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, 1968
C., N., A Modest and True Account of the Chief Points in Controversy between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, 1696
Calvin, J., Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis, J.King ed., Edinburgh 1850
Calvin, J., Commentaries on the Book of Psalms, J. Anderson ed., Edinburgh, 1845
Calvin, J., Institutes , Florida, n.d.
Cardwell, E., A History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690, Oxford, 3rd ed., 1849
Carpenter, E.F., ThomasSherlock, 1936; Thomas Tenison, 1948; The Protestant Bishop, 1956
Carpenter, E., Cantuar: the Archbishops in their Office, 1971
Carroll, P.T., The Commonsense Philosophy of Religion of Bishop Edward Stillingfleet, The Hague, 1975
Chadwick, O., The Reformation, 1964
Chillingworth, W., The Religion of the Protestants: A Safe Way to Salvation, Oxford, 1638
Clarke, T.E.S. and Foxcroft, H.C., A Life of Gilbert Burnet, Cambridge, 1907
Clifford, A.C., Atonement and Justification, English Evangelical Theology, 1640-1790: An Evaluation, Oxford, 1990
Colie, R.L., Light and Enlightenment: A Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians, Cambridge, 1957
Collins, J.R., 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy' in Church History, vol. 68, no. 3, September 1999
Collinson, P., The Religion of the Protestants, 1559-1625, Oxford, 1982
Cragg, G.R., Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660-88, Cambridge, 1957; The Church in the Age of Reason, 1648-1749, 1960
Davies, H.M., Worship and Theology in England from Andrewes to Baxter and Fox, 1603-90, 1975
Davies, R., Methodism, 1963
Disley, E., 'Degrees of Glory: Protestant Doctrines and the Concepts of Rewards Hereafter' in The Journal of Theological Studies, ns April 1991, vol. 42, Part 1
Dugmore, C.W., Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland, 1942
Edwards, J., The Preacher, 1705-7
Farrar, F.W., The Deans of Canterbury, 1899
Fawcett, T. J., The Liturgy of Comprehension, Southend on Sea, 1973
Gillow, J., A Literary and Biographical History or Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, NewYork, n.d.
Gretton, P., A Vindication of the Doctrines of the Church of England in Opposition to those of Rome, 1725

Green, I.M., The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663, Oxford, 1978
Green, V.H.H., The Young Mr Wesley, 1961
Grub, G., An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland from the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Time, Edinburgh, 1861
Haller, W., The Rise of Puritanism, New York, 1957
Hart, A.T., The Life and Times of John Sharpe, Archbishop of York, 1949; William Lloyd, 1952
Hawkins, L.M., Allegiance in Church and State, 1928
Head, R.E., Royal Supremacy and the Trials of Bishops,1558-1725, 1962
Henderson, P.A.W., Life and Times of John Wilkins, 1910
Hooke, W.F., Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1860-76
Horwitz, H., 'Protestant Reconciliation in the Exclusion Crisis' in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 15, 1964
Howard, R., The History of Religion as it has been managed by Priestcraft, 1694
Hunt, J.,Religious Thought in England, 1870-3
Hunter, J., The Rise of the Old Dissent Exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood ... 1630-1702, 1842
Hunter, M., 'The Problem of Atheism in Early Modern England' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, 1985
Jortin, J., Tracts, Philological, Critical and Miscellaneous, 1790; Discourses Concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion and Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, 1805
Keeble, N.H., (ed.),The Autobiography of Richard Baxter, 1974
Lathbury, T., A History of the Non-Jurors, 1845; A History of the Book of Common Prayer, 1858; A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, 1853
Leslie, C., The Charge of Socinianism against Dr Tillotson Considered ....., Edinburgh 1695; Reflections upon a Libel lately Printed, entitled, 'The Charge of Socinianism against Dr Tillotson Considered',1696; The Case Stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, 1713
Marchant, R.A., The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642, 1960
Marshall, J., 'The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men, 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson and 'Hobbism'', in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 36, no.3, July 1985
Marshall ,W.M., George Hooper, 1976
Matthews, A.G., Calamy Revised, Oxford, 1934
McKim, D.K., The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach San Francisco, 1979
McLachlan, J., Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England, Oxford,1951
Miall, J.G., Congregationalism in Yorkshire, 1868
Mitchell, W.F., English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: A Study of its Literary Aspects, 1932
Moorman, J.H., A History of the Church of England, 1953
More, R.E. and Cross, F.L. (eds), The Thought and Practice of the Church of England illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century, 1935
Neale, D., The History of the Puritans, 1822
Nuttall, G.F. and Chadwick, O. (eds), From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962, 1962
Oakeshott, M., Leviathan or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiastical by Thomas Hobbes, Oxford, n.d.
Oberman, H.A., The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Mediaeval and Early Reformation Thought, Edinburgh, 1986
O'Day, R. and Heal, F. (eds), Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800,

Leicester, 1981
Orr, R.R., Reason and Authority: The Thought of William Chillingworth, Oxford, 1967
Oyly, G.d'., Life of William Sancroft, 1821
Perry, G.G., A History of the English Church, 1500-1717, 1900
Plumtree, E.H., Thomas Ken, 1891
Pruett, J.H., The Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: the Leicestershire Experience, 1978
Rack, H.D., Reasonable Enthusiast: John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism, 1989
Reventlow, H.G., The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World, 1984
Richardson, J., The Athanasian Creed Vindicated, York, 1822
Riche, H.A.L., Thomas Ken: Bishop and Non-juror, 1964
Rogers, J.B. and McKim, D.K. (eds), The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach, San Francisco, 1979
Rose, R. and Neill, S.C. (eds), A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 2nd edtn, 1967
Rupp, E.G., Religion in England 1688-1791, Oxford, 1988
Sharp, T., Life of John Sharp, 1835
Simon, W.G., The Restoration Episcopate, Folkestone, 1980
Smyth, A., A Curious Letter from a Gentleman to Mr Whitefield ..., 1740
Sole, J., Le Debat entre Protestants et Catholiques Francais de 1598 a 1685, Paris, 1985
Spurr, J., 'The Church of England, Comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689' in English Historical Review, vol. civ, no. 413, October 1989
Spurr, J., "Latitudinarianism' and the Restoration Church' in Historical Journal, 31,1,1980
Spurr, J., The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689, 1991
Spurr, J., 'Religion in Restoration England', in Glassey, L.K.J. (ed.), The Reigns of Charlesd II and James VII and II, 1992
Stephen, L., History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, 1927
Stone D., A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 1909
Stoughton, J., Ecclesiastical History of England: The Restoration, 1870
Straka, G., Anglican Reactions to the Revolution of 1688, 1968
Stromberg, R.N., Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth-Century England, Oxford, 1954
Swinden, T., An Enquiry into the Nature and Place of Hell, 1714
Sykes, N., 'The Sermons of a Country Parson: James Woodforde in his Pulpit' in Theology, vol.xxxviii, February, 1939, no. 224
Sykes, N., 'The Sermons of Archbishop Tillotson' in Theology, vol. lviii, January 1955, no. 415
Sykes, N., The English Religious Tradition: Sketches of its Influence on Church, State and Society, 1953
Sykes, N., Old Priest and New Presbyter, Cambridge, 1957
Tavard, G.H., Holy Writ and Holy Church, 1959
Taylor, A. (ed.)., The Works of Simon Patrick, Oxford, 1858
Taylor, J., The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living ..., Oxford, 1863 edtn
Thomas, R., 'Comprehension and Indulgence' in Nuttall, G.F. and Chadwick, O., From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962, 1962
Troeltsch, E., The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, O. Wyon trans., 1931
Tyacke, N., Anti-Calvinism: the Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640, Oxford, 1987
Walker, D.P., The Decline of Hell: Seventeenth-Century Discussions of Eternal Torment, 1964
Watson, E.W., 'An Eighteenth-Century Clergyman' in Church Quarterly Review, vol. 105, 1928
Wiener, C.Z., 'The Beleaguered Isle: a Study of Elizabethan and Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism' in Past and Present, 51, 1971

5. General History

Abbott, W.C., Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, Cambridge, 1937
Aiken, W.A., The Conduct of the Earl of Nottingham ..., Yale, 1941 edtn
Ailsbury, T, Earl of, Memoirs of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury, 1890
Airy, O., Burnet's History of My Own Time, 1897-1900
Aylmer, G., The States Servants, 1973
Bell, W.G., The Great Plague in London 1665 and The Great Fire of London, 1920
Berry, M., Some Account of the Life of Rachel Wriothesley, Lady Russell, 1819
Birch, T., The History of the Royal Society of London ..., 1756
Bowle, J., Western Political Thgought, 1947
Browning, A., Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds, 1632-1712, 1951
Burnet, G., The Life of Sir Matthew Hale, Knt., Oxford, 1806
Carr, J., Annals and Stories of Conlne and Neighbourhood, Manchester 1878
Chapman, H.W., Mary II, Queen of England, 1953
Chauncy, H., The Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire ... , 1720
Churchill, I.J., Canterbury Administration, 1933
Clarke, B.F.L., Parish Churches of London, 1966
Coward, B., The Stuart Age, 1980
Cox, T., A Popular History of the Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth at Heath near Halifax, Halifax, 1879
Crossland, C., ' Contributions to Halifax Biography and Authors' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, vol. 12, 1915
Crump, W.B., 'Ancient Highways of the Parish of Halifax' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, vol. 25, 1928
Defoe, D., Tour Through the Whole of Great Britain, 1928 edtn
Doebner, R., Memoirs of Queen Mary, 1886
Ducarel, A.C., History and Antiquities of the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, 1785
Echard, L., The History of England, 1718; The History of the Revolution and the Establishment of England in the Year 1688, 1725
Every, G., The High Church Party, 1688-1718, 1956
Eliot, G., Scenes from Clerical Life, 1973 edtn
Ella, G.M., William Cowper: Poet of Paradise, Darlington, 1993
Feiling, K., A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1715, Oxford, 1924
Foxcroft, H.C., The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., 1898; A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time, 1902
Gill, R., A Textbook of Christian Ethics, Edinburgh, 1985
Glassey, K.J. (ed), The Reigns of Charles II and James VII and II, 1997
Greven, P., The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child Rearing, Religious Experience and the Self in Early America, 1971
Gwatkin, H.M., Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne, 1917
Haley, K.H.D., The First Earl of Shaftesbury, Oxford, 1968
Hall, R., Works, 1845, Bohn edtn
Hands, A.P. and Scouloudi, I., French Protestant Refugees Relieved through the Threadneedle Street Church, London, 1681-7, 1971
Hanson, T.W., The Story of Old Halifax, Halifax, 1920
Harris, T., Politics Under the Later Stuarts, 1993
Harrison, D.J., The History of Colne Grammar School, Colne, 1977
Harrison, W.J. and Lloyd, A.H., Notes on the Masters, Fellows, Scholars and Exhibitioners of Clare College, Cambridge, Cambridge, 1953

Holmes, G., The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain, 1660-1722, 1993
Horwitz, H., Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch, Second Earl of Nottingham, Cambridge, 1968; The Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-3, Oxford, 1972
Hurd, R., The Works of the Right Honourable Joseph Addison, 1856
Jane, W. or Sherlock W., A Letter to a Friend Containing some Queries about the New Commission, 1689
Jones, J.R., The First Whigs, Oxford, 1961; The Revolution of 1688 in England, 1972; Country and Court England 1658-1714, 1978;
Josten, C.H., Elias Ashmole, Oxford, 1966
Kenyon, J.P., The Popish Plot, 1972; Revolution Principles: the Politics of Party, 1689-1720, Cambridge, 1977
Kendall, H.P., 'Old Haugh End' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers vol. vii, 1910
Kennett, W. A Complete History of England, 1796; A Register and Chronicle Ecclesiastical and Civil, 1728
Lang, J., Rebuilding St Paul's After the Great Fire of London, 1956
Lee, M., The Cabal, Urbana, 1965
Luttrell, N., A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, Oxford, 1857
Macaulay, T.B., History of England from the Accession of James I, 13th edtn, 1857
Matthews, W.R. and Atkins, W.M. (eds), A History of St Paul's Cathedral, 1957
Miller, J., Restoration England: The Reign of Charles II, 1985; James II: A Study in Kingship, 1991
Milman, H.H., Annals of St Paul's Cathedral, 1869
Morgan, V. 'Cambridge University and the Country, 1560-1640' in Stone, L., The University and Society, Oxford, 1975
Mullett, M., James II and English Politics, 1678-1688, 1994
Mullinger, J.B., The University of Cambridge from Earliest Times, Cambbridge, 1884
Nicholson, T.C. and Turbeville, A.S., Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, Cambridge, 1930
Notes and Queries, 9th series, vol. ii, 1898
Ogg, D., England in the Reign of Charles II, Oxford, 1956
Pollock, L., Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500-1900, 1983
Prideaux, R.M., Prideaux: A West Country Clan, Chichester 1989
Priestley, J.H., 'Brigg Royd and Ripponden Old Bridge' in Halifax Antiquarian Society Papers, 1935
Redmonds, G., English Surnames: Yorkshire - The West Riding, 1973
Robb, N., William of Orange, 1966
Russell, Lord J., The Life of William Lord Russell, 1819
Seaward, P., The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667, Cambridge, 1989
Sabine, G.H., A History of Political Theory, 1951
Sainty, J.C. and Dewar, D., Divisions in the House of Lords: An Analytical List, 1685-1687, 1976
Seaward, P., The Restoration: 1660-1688
Skinner, Q., The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Cambridge, 1978
Somerville, C.J., The Discovery of Childhood in Puritan England, 1992
Sprat, T., The History of the Royal Society of London, 1667
Stansfield, J., The History of the Family of Stansfield of Stansfield, 1885
Stone, L., The University in Society, Oxford, 1975
Stone, L., The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800, 1977

Turner, F.C., James II, 1848
Venn, J. and J.A., Alumni Cantabrigienses, Cambridge, 1922
Wardale, J., Clare College: Letters and Documents, Cambridge, 1903
Watson, J.W., The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Halifax in Yorkshire, 1775
Wild, C.R., A History of the Royal Society, 1848
Wilkins, W.W., Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1860
Witcombe, D.T., Charles II and the Cavalier House of Commons, 1663-74, Manchester, 1966
Wright, T., The Antiquities of the Town of Halifax in Yorkshire, Leeds 1738
Zee, H. and B. van der, William and Mary, 1975