IT was customary in seventeenth century England to mark public events of consequence with days of celebration. Should the event be one requiring dedication as, perhaps, the opening of a session of parliament, a day of fasting and humiliation was declared. Should the event be one of joy or triumph, a victory, perhaps, or a deliverance, then a day of thanksgiving was appointed. In either case, the day set aside was celebrated with church services and, as a rule, sermons particularly appropriate to the occasion.

The spring of 1660 saw the declaration of several such days. Englishmen had cause that spring both to consider and to rejoice. After nearly twenty years of civil war and unrest there was at last the prospect of peace. Oliver Cromwell had died in August 1658. His son and successor, Richard, soon proved less than able; the officers of the New Model Army had sought to extend their own influence; some among their men joined with civilians in rallying to the support of what remained of parliament. The revolution's once glorious Good Old Cause seemed hopelessly lost in petty rivalries and arguments. Then, in early January 1660, Monck, commander of the army in Scotland, began to march his forces southward, intent, he said, upon securing the authority of the parliament in England.

The parliament then in session was, in fact, nothing more than a remnant of the once great Long Parliament. In the early 1640s this parliament had led the rebellion against Charles I, raised an army, imposed taxes, and executed the business of government in much, then all, of England. By 1648 some of its members had come to want peace with the king, some to fear the power of the army. In December Cromwell ordered its ranks to be purged of those whose aims he distrusted. The remaining Rump set up the High Court which tried the king,
disestablished the Church, abolished the House of Lords and the monarchy and declared England a Commonwealth. But the Rump was itself dissolved and its Commonwealth gave way to Cromwell’s Protectorate in 1653. Then, in May 1659, Lord Protector Richard Cromwell resigned; all summer the army grandees struggled among themselves for power; in December, the old Rump of the Long Parliament reassembled. In February 1660, just two weeks after Monck and his army entered London, the members excluded in the 1648 purge took their seats. In March the Long Parliament finally dissolved, after calling elections to a new parliament which should “settle the nation” and, it was widely expected, bring in Charles I’s long exiled son, Charles II.

Thus, in the spring of 1660, the prospect of peace was a real as well as a happy one. The Convention Parliament, which met in late April, was to re-establish the ancient constitution, restore the monarch and end the disorders which had plagued England and Englishmen for two decades. And this without bloodshed. For erstwhile revolutionaries and rebels saw now that continued disorder served only the interests of military ambition and England’s enemies. Their own cause might best be served within the capacious framework of the ancient constitution if, that is, Charles II could be brought to realize—and Monck and others in communication with the king in exile gave every indication that he did indeed—that Englishmen meant to restore no claims to absolutism. The monarchy was to be constitutional, limited and regulated by law and by parliament.

On Monday, 30 April the newly-met Convention marked a day of fast and humiliation, “to seek the Lord”, declared the House of Commons, “for a Blessing on these distracted Nations”. Mr. Calamy, Dr. Cauden and Mr. Baxter were appointed to preach at St. Margaret’s, Westminster, before the Commons; Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Hardy were to address the Lords. But

1 The Convention first met on 25 April 1660; it voted on 7 May to proclaim Charles II king. On 1 June the king declared the Convention a parliament.

2 Journals of the House of Commons, viii. 1, 7; Journals of the House of Lords, xi. 3, 4, 6. Edmund Calamy (1660-66), first a Congregationalist then a Presbyterian, was active in 1660 in promoting the king’s restoration. Though he attended the Savoy Conference and gave some hope that he might conform, he...
there was joy as well as fasting. On 26 April the Commons had resolved to set apart "this day fortnight [10 May] for a Day of Thanksgiving to the Lord, for raising up his Excellency, the Lord General [Monck], and other eminent Persons, who have been instrumental in Delivery of this Nation from Thraldom and Misery". Mr. Price, Monck's chaplain, was to be invited to preach at St. Margaret's; the Lords were invited to concur.¹

At this point events began to move faster than either Lords or Commons had imagined. On 1 May Sir John Greenville declined the king's offer of the see of Coventry and Lichfield and in August 1662 suffered ejection from his living for refusing to conform to the 1662 Act of Uniformity. John Cauden (1605-1662) was an Oxford man who at one point served as chaplain to Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick. In the 1650s his position was thought to be "ambiguous", for, though he conformed to Presbyterianism, he wrote in defence of the Church of England. At the Restoration he became bishop of Exeter and in 1662 bishop of Worcester. Richard Baxter (1615-91), noted Presbyterian, writer, preacher and political figure, welcomed the king's return and participated in the Savoy Conference. Though he became chaplain to King Charles, he refused the bishopric of Hereford, and, after 1662, was silenced for nonconformity. He continued thereafter to write and to preach occasionally under licence. Edward Reynolds (1599-1676) was "active in the Commonwealth Church", but is termed by R. S. Bosher "an Anglican conformist". In 1656 Reynolds was appointed vicar and lecturer at St. Lawrence Jewry, London and in 1660 bishop of Norwich. Nathaniel Hardy (1618-70), D.D., educated at Oxford, had been first a "popular preacher with presbyterian leanings" then, after a conversion, a "strenuous, convinced episcopalian". He was present, in the parliamentary delegation, at the Uxbridge meeting with Charles I in 1645, and in 1660 was among those sent to greet Charles II at The Hague. In December 1660 he became dean of Rochester. (D.N.B., iii. 679-82, vii. 948-50, i. 1349-57, xvi. 926-7, viii. 1238-9; Robert S. Bosher, The Making of the Restoration Settlement. The Influence of the Luddims 1649-1662 (Oxford, 1951), pp. 118-19; Paul S. Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships. The Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662 (Stanford, California, 1970), pp. 278, 287).

¹ Commons Journals, vii. 5. John Price (1625?-91), educated at Eton and Cambridge, served as chaplain to Monck in Scotland, 1654-9. A royalist, he was active in bringing Monck to support the Stuart restoration, for which he was rewarded in 1661 with a D.D. degree (by royal letter) and benefices (D.N.B., xvi. 33).

presented to the Convention the king's Declaration from Breda. Charles promised a general pardon, a "liberty to tender consciences" and a willingness to abide what parliament should decide in settling the church and the complicated land question. The Convention found the king's conciliatory attitude a joy, and on 7 May the Commons voted a day of thanksgiving:

return Thanks to God for his Majesty's graciously... Declaration; and for the hearty, loyal and dutiful Conjunction, and Universal Concurrence of the Houses, and of all the Forces by Sea and Land, to bring in his Majesty, upon Terms of Justice and Honour, propounded by His Majesty.1

All ministers were enjoined to pray for Charles II. Those in London and Westminster were on Thursday next (10 May), those elsewhere in the kingdom of Thursday fortnight (24 May) to read the king's Declaration in "Their several Churches and Chapels", and to thank God for "the just and honourable concessions therein contained." For the Commons and Lords now concurred to "receive his Majesty into his Dominions and Government, according to their bounden Duty and the Laws of the Land". On Thursday, 10 May the Commons went to St. Margaret's, as appointed, to hear Mr. Price preach; the Lords went to the Abbey to hear Mr. Buck.2

On 25 May the king himself landed at Dover. On Tuesday 29 May he rode into London, preceded by dancing girls strewing flowers in his path. On 30 and 31 May the Commons and Lords agreed to petition him to set aside yet another day of thanksgiving "for the great Blessing and mercy God hath vouchsafed to the People of these Kingdoms, after their manifold and grievous sufferings, in the happy Restoration of his Majesty to his people and Kingdoms".3 On 5 June the king, in answer, proclaimed 28 June a "day of Solemn and Publick Thanksgiving

---

1 Commons Journals, viii. 15.
2 Ibid. viii. 16, 19, 20; Lords Journals, xi. 21, 24. James Buck was vicar of Stradbrook, Suffolk, and domestic chaplain to the Earl of Lincoln. His sermon, St. Paul's Thanksgiving: Set forth in a Sermon Preached before the Right Honorable House of Peers in the Abbey-Church of Westminster, on Thursday May 10. being the day of solemn Thanksgiving to Almighty God for His late Blessings upon this Kingdom (London, 1660), said nothing of politics.
3 Commons Journals, viii. 49, 50, 51; Lords Journals, xi. 49, 50.
throughout the whole Kingdom" for the restoration of his crown and throne.¹

So, between late April and the end of June 1660 there were at least three official occasions of public thanksgiving, each marked in churches all over England by prayers and sermons appropriate to the day, some marked by the reading of declarations from parliament or the crown. And there were several other occasions on which Englishmen might well find in the day’s or week’s news cause for giving public thanks. Of course, not all clerics were preachers. Many of the services must have consisted of long prayers, hymns and unremarkable, if still perhaps heartfelt, homilies. Yet many of the clergy took pride in their preaching, and certainly hundreds must have taken the special occasions offered that spring to reflect at length upon the events passing, the prospect of peace and the significance of the king’s return.

Some of these thanksgiving sermons were more than mere admonitions to the faithful. In mid-seventeenth century England, as parliament’s declaration makes clear, the clergy were expected to inform their parishioners and, by extension—it might be argued, guide and instruct them. In fact, by 1660 the “political” sermon was already a well established tradition.² Certain clerics gained reputations as preachers of political sermons, continuing, in their way, the old tradition of medieval hedgerow preaching and sixteenth century Puritanism. The service of thanksgiving, therefore, served a society still only semi-literate and still largely without other sources of news, a double purpose. The reading of the official announced to the people of England news of the event; the sermon of the preacher pronounced its significance.

¹ Robert Steele, A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns and of others published under authority (Oxford, 1910), i. 387, no. 3222, 5 June 1660. 28 June 1660 was a Thursday, as had been 10 and 24 May.
In the spring of 1660 hundreds of ministers and lecturers must have addressed thanksgiving sermons to their congregations—sermons arguing different views, serving different purposes and reflecting different degrees of enthusiasm and perception. Of most of these, neither trace nor report survives; of some forty, printed copies do. Of these, perhaps one in four has nothing at all to say of politics; some, for example, have to do with the spirit of thanksgiving rather than the occasion of it. Some are simply exercises in the rather florid rhetoric then still considered by many to be the proper display of piety and learning—long quotations from the Bible, the church fathers and the classics strung together in a manner designed more to impress the hearer than to inform him.

Still, perhaps thirty of the sermons do indeed in some manner address the issues of the day.

To what degree these printed sermons may be taken to represent the hundreds which were not preserved, to what degree the opinions and attitudes of those who wrote them, the opinions and attitudes of either their fellow clergy or their fellow countrymen, are difficult questions. They are clearly a select group. A sermon presented before an illustrious congregation might be printed regardless of its merit: James Buck’s, Nathaniel Hardy’s or Thomas Hodges’ before the House of Lords, Edward Reynolds’ before the House of Commons, Gilbert Sheldon’s before the king—all printed “by order”—Richard Feltwell’s before the “Right Worshipful Captain Roger Spelman and his Foot Company” of Grymston in Norfolk.


2 Nath. Hardy, The Choicest Fruit of Peace Gathered from the Tree of Life; Presented to the Right Honourable the House of Peers; in a Sermon Preached before them at the Abbey Church of Westminster, on April 30, 1660, being the day of their Solemn Humiliation (London, 1660); Tho. Hodges, Sions Hallelujah; Set forth in a Sermon Preached Before the Right Honourable House of Peers, in the Abbie Church of Westminster, on Thursday June 28th. Being the day of Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for his Majesties safe Return (London, 1660); Edward Reynolds, Divine Efficacy without Humane Power. Opened in a Sermon Preached at St. Margaret’s Church in Westminster before the Right Honourable the House of Commons, June 28, 1660. Being the day of solemn Thanksgiving for the happy Return of the Kings Majesty (London, 1660); Gilbert Sheldon, Davids Deliverance and Thanksgiving. For the Happy Return of His Majesty (London, 1660); R.
might be a man of great popular reputation—Richard Baxter, William Towers or Clement Barksdale—who might himself suppose, or whose friends or publisher might suppose, a wide interest in and ready market for his printed sermon.¹

Feltwell, David's Recognition, with a Parallel betwixt his and our present Sovereigns Sufferings and Deliverances; Set forth in a Sermon Preached at Grymston in Norfolk, Before the Right Worshipful Captain Roger Spelman and his Foot Company, there celebrating the 30. Anniversary of his Majesties Nativity, May 29, 1660 (London, 1660). Sheldon (1598-1677) was dispossessed of his clerical posts in 1648 and then imprisoned, but soon released on his promise “not to go to the King.” He “lived retired,” collecting moneys for the king and for poor clergy in exile, “and followed his Studies and Devotions till matters tended to an happy Restoration”. In 1659 he was restored to his post as Warden of All Souls, in 1660 became bishop of London and in 1663 archbishop of Canterbury. He is generally considered to be the architect of the restoration ecclesiastical settlement. (D.N.B., xviii. 24-26; John Walker, An Attempt towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England, Heads of Colleges, Fellows, Scholars & etc., who were Sequester'd, Harrass'd, & etc. in the late Times of the Grand Rebellion: Occasion'd by the Ninth Chapter (now the Second Volume) of Dr. Calamy's Abridgement of the Life of Mr. Baxter (London, 1714), ii. 98; and Bosher, op. cit. especially pp. 136, 180-4, 261-5. Feltwell was vicar of East Walton, presumably in Norfolk.

¹ Richard Baxter, Right Rejoycing: or The Nature and Order of Rational and Warrantable Joy. Discovered in a Sermon preached at St. Pauls before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, and the several companies of the City of London, On May 10, 1660 appointed by both Houses of Parliament, to be a day of solemn Thanksgiving for Gods raising up and succeeding his Excellency, and other Instruments, in order to his Majesties restoration, and the settlement of these Nations (London, 1660); William Towers, A Thanksgiving Sermon. For the blessed Restauration of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II. Preach'd at Upton before Sir Richard Samuel, Knight, May 29. 1660 (London, 1660) and Obedience Perpetually due to Kings. Bemuse the Kingly Power is Imperable from the One King's Person. Deliv'r'd in a Sermon to Mr. Peter Gunning's Congregation in Exeter Chappel, near the Savoy, On the appointed Thanksgiving-day, June 28. 1660 (London, 1660); Clement Barksdale, The Kings Return. A Sermon Preached at Winchcomb in Gloucestershire Upon the Kings-Day, Thursday, May 24. 1660 (London, 1660). Towers (1617-1666), “a Loyal and Religious Person”, was with Charles I at Oxford. In 1660 he was reinstated as prebend at Peterborough, where his father, John, had been bishop. Barksdale (1609-87) was born at Winchcombe, Gloucs., where his thanksgiving sermon was preached. An Oxford man, he was a royalist, teacher, and prolific author of tracts. At the Restoration he was appointed to clerical posts at Naunton and Stow-on-the-Wold, Gloucs. (D.N.B., xix. 1018; i. 1135-6; Walker, An Attempt, ii. 61). The fact that Baxter was invited to preach before the mayor and aldermen of London suggests not only his repute but the possibility that these important men shared his rather wary enthusiasm for Charles II’s return. Dr. Peter Gunning, before whose London congregation Towers preached on 28 June, was a noted Laudian. See Bosher, op. cit. pp. 12, 37, 43-44, 186.
In other cases the principle of selection is not clear. Why, for example, was Joseph Swetham's sermon, preached at All Saints, Derby, printed, or Francis Walsall's, delivered before his congregation at Sandy, Bedfordshire; why that of Richard Eedes of Bishops Cleeve, or that of William Bartholemew, vicar of Campden, both preached at Gloucester; why John Whynnell's, preached at Askwell, Dorset, or John Douch's—he was rector of Stalbridge in Dorset—preached at St. Botolph's, Aldgate, London? Presbyterian Richard Eedes' "ultra-loyal harangue" was thought to be an attempt "to conciliate the court party". He may well have paid to have it printed himself, in vain, it turned out, for he was ejected from Bishops Cleeve even as Joseph Swetham was forced to resign as curate of All Saints for refusing to conform to the 1662 Act of Uniformity. Little is known of the others. All six were certainly men of local reputation; three spoke before congregations other than their own. But men of great note they were not. Those who heard them were not lords, or even captains of the militia. Their sermons were printed, presumably, because someone (a printer, a sympathizer, perhaps the preacher himself) thought them

1 Joseph Swetham, David's Devotions Upon His Deliverances: Set forth in a Sermon at All Saints in Derby, June 28, 1660. Being the Day of publick Thanksgiving For his Majesties Happy Restauration (London, 1660); Francis Walsall, The Bowing the Heart of Subjects to their Sovereign. A Sermon Preached on the 24th of May, 1660. Being a Day of Publick Thanksgiving to the Lord for raising up his Excellency the Lord General Monck, and other eminent Persons, who have been Instrumental in the Delivery of this Nation from thraldom and misery (London, 1660); Richard Eedes, Great Britain's Resurrection. Or England's Complacencie in her Royal Sovereign King Charles the Second. A Sermon Preached in the Lecture at Gloucester, June 5 1660 (London, 1660); Wil. Bartholemew, The Strong Man Ejected by a stronger than He. In a Sermon Preached at Gloucester, the 15th of May, 1660. Being the day his Royal Majesty King Charles the Second, was Proclaimed. Shewing. How the Strong Man Satan is cast out of the Palace of the Heart, and the Lord Christ Possessed thereof. With some Application to the present Ejectment of the late Usurper, Satan's Confederate, out of the Royal Palace, and the Lords Christ, King Charles the Second Possessed thereof (London, 1660); John Whynnell, England's Sorrows turned into Joy. A Sermon Preached the 28th of June, 1660. Being a Publick Thanksgiving, for the Restauration of his Excellent Majesty, Charles II (London, 1661); John Douch, England's Jubilee: Or, Her happy return from Captivity; in a Sermon, Preached at St. Botolph's Aldgate, London (London, 1660).

worthy or, possibly, saleable. These printed sermons are, then, not only what some Englishmen heard in the spring of 1660 but also what some among them wanted others to hear. They may, therefore, be more indicative, in their variety, of what Englishmen were thinking and hoping at that momentous time than their mere numbers suggest. What, then, had the clergy to say of politics and kings, prospects and the past?

The sermons are remarkable in their variety. They certainly share some common themes: the providence of God, the triumph of David (Charles II), the happy restoration of the old social order, the rule of law and peace. But the various preachers exploit and develop their themes in different ways to, often, different ends. In the spring of 1660 there was no authority either civil or ecclesiastical capable of imposing censorship. Equally important, there was no accepted or official attitude, opinion or line of argument. So rapidly were events moving that few really knew what was happening or, in any detail, what was likely to happen. The cleric was thrown upon his own resources and from them preached his own sermon of thanksgiving.

The variety of attitudes the sermons display might, therefore, be expected. The loyal royalist shared with the cautious Presbyterian an enthusiasm for the return of monarchy, for example, though the Presbyterian saw the king's return fraught with dangers of which the happy royalist had no thought. The Puritan saw the prospect of religious persecution; the Anglican rejoiced that the evils of toleration should be no more. The erstwhile radical argued for limits upon the king's power; the traditionalist delighted in the restoration of the old order. Some preachers praised the courage of Monck; others saw him only as the instrument of God's will. Some spoke in confidence of the virtues of Charles II; one argued that Christians should trust only in King Jesus. In this variety one can see the wide spectrum of hopes, and apprehensions, with which in 1660 Englishmen saw the future.

Virtually all the preachers who said anything at all about the wars, the Commonwealth or Cromwell's rule, recalled these years past as times of trial and discord. "A Night of sorrow and oppression; a Night of disorder and confusion; a Night of
Ignorance and Errour", declared Thomas Peirce. "What tongue can express the misery we were reduced to", said Thomas Hodges. "How was peace destroyed, plenty vanisht, trading decayed, order confounded, laws subverted, truth vanisht, Orthodox Ministry contemnd, lawful Magistracy extirpated!" "Three flourishing Nations", remarked John Gauden, had been "fillipped to the cross of an ill-sodered Commonwealth". Of course, in 1660, such views were politic and discreet. Some writers, or speakers, said nothing at all about the past. Henry Adis alone spoke out in its favour. "And know, O King," he declared, "that much knowledge and true Light hath broken forth within these twelve years." But Adis was by his own account a "Fannatick".

Disorder had wasted law, trade and peace. "It is evident then, that the want of a fixed Government, whether in Church or State, doth utterly destroy the being and constitution of either", wrote Samuel Brunsell, rector of Bingham. The

1 Tho. Peirce, England’s Season for the Reformation of Life. A Sermon Delivered in St. Paul’s Church, London. On the Sunday next Following His Sacred Majesties Restauration (London, 1660). The author may be Thomas Pierce (1622-91), royalist, controversialist, and musician, first chorister, then Fellow of Magdalen, Oxford. Expelled in 1648, he spent eight years travelling on the continent as tutor to the son of the Countess of Sunderland. In 1656 he returned to England; in 1659 he was reinstated as Professor of Theology at Magdalen. At the Restoration he became chaplain to the king, then dean of Salisbury. The sermon’s author is identified on its title page only as "Rector of Brington" (D.N.B., xv. 1146-8).

2 Hodges, Sions Haleuyjah, p. 14; also Gilbert Ironsyde, A Sermon Preached at Dorchester in the County of Dorset at the Proclaiming of his Sacred Majesty Charles the II, May 15. 1660 (London, 1660), p. 25. Ironside (or Ironsyde) the elder (1588-1671), Oxford educated, was appointed prebend at York in 1660 and in January 1661 bishop of Bristol (D.N.B., x. 483).


4 Henry Adis, A Fannaticke’s Mite Cast into the Kings Treasury : Being a Sermon Printed to the King. Because not Preach’d before the King (London, 1660), p. 15. On the title page Adis is identified as "an upholdsterer".

people of England had been "much troubled", agreed John Douch, "for the want of a King over them"). The revolutionary governments had never been sound. "The stately, magnificent Fabrick of Regall Government was changed into the low flat-roof'd structure of a Commonwealth", observed John Martin. And "this was so much dislik'd by some who...conceived their plans ill bestowed, in contributing all their endeavours...to so homely a Pile". But the pile had not lasted long. "The ground being somewhat boggie and unsound, wherein the foundation was layd; this heavy stone after a while, sank into the very bowels of the earth". Ames Short was more direct: "When the seat of Authority is vacant, or possessed by Usurpation; every man, as he is Affected, will be contending to be ruled under this or that particular form of government, or by this or that particular person". Short gave thanks to God that Englishmen now found themselves "freed from our feares and dangers of being haressed by the attempts of every aspiring, ambitious Adonijah, to make himself King".

And now the king himself returned. He came in peace, "so suddenly, so sweetly, without effusion of blood", said

1 John Douch, Englands Jubilee, p. 2.
2 J. M. [John Martin], Hosannah: A Thanksgiving-Sermon, June 28th. 1660 (Oxford, 1660), pp. 7, 8. Martin (1619-93), Oxford educated, was implicated in the royalist Penruddock rising of 1655 (D.N.B., xii. 1166-7).
3 "We need not now to feare the aspiring ambition of either a Cromwell or a Lambert", said Short (Ames Short, God Save the King: or, a Sermon Preach'd at Lyme-Regis May 18. 1660 at the Solenn Proclamation of his most Excellent Majesty Charles the II (London, 1660), pp. 18, 29). "His Majesties restauration silenceth all disputes amongst ambitious spirits (who shall be the greatest?)" agreed John Spencer in The Righteous Ruler. A Sermon preach'd at St. Maries in Cambridge June 28. 1660. Being appointed a day of publick Thanksgiving to God for the happy restauration of His Majesty to his Kingdomes (1660), p. 31. Short was educated at Oxford and in 1647 ordained by the London classis. In 1663 he was deprived of his living as vicar of Lyme-Regis, Dorset, but remained thereafter active in preaching to conventicles. He was reported to be, variously, "a genteel and well bred Man, grave and serious", "not learned", and "much respected by the local gentry" of Lyme Regis. Spencer is probably the University preacher and Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, an "erudite theologian and Hebraist" (Matthews, Calamy Revised, pp. 440-1; Edmund Calamy, A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected and Silenced after the Restoration in 1660, by or before the Act of Uniformity (London, 1727), pp. 416-20; D.N.B., xviii. 767-8).
Thomas Hodges; "without a Sea, nay without a Showre, I had almost said without one drop of Blood", echoed Robert Mossom. "We have escaped the Miseries of War, and of a Civil War", rejoiced Gilbert Sheldon; "mighty Forces were conquered without a Fight, and scattered without a Rout", agreed Nathaniel Hardy.

Everyone, it seemed, joined in the celebration. The king was greeted "with so general an acclamation, and so hearty an affection from Nobles and Gentry, Ministers, Citizens and Country", declared Mossom, "as is not to be exprest with the Tongue of Angels". Yet, clerics did not hesitate to express their affections. "Are there not Pulpit as well as street-Raptures?" asked William Towers. And there were.

The old order was restored. In late April Hardy exulted as the Lords and Commons reconvened in what was to be the first step of the restoration. "Our eyes now behold," he said,

instead of those brambles and thorns, which thought themselves firmly rooted, a Garden of choice flowers of the Gentry transplanted as it were from all parts of the Countrey into the House of Commons. Our goodly Cedars are now planted again in their own House, which was for so many years empty, unless when those mushrooms crept in it, and we hope ere long to see the Stately Oak.

In contrast to those who had usurped his power, Charles II was himself "no spurious Mushrume self-created Prince". He was, declared Ames Short, "A Prince by lineal succession and inherent birth-right", a "Legitimate and a lawful Prince". His return meant the return of law. "Our Laws which were

---

1 Hodges, Sions Hallelujah, pp. 15-16; also Hardy, The Choicest Fruit of Peace, p. 5; and R. Mossom, England's Gratulation For the King and his Subjects Happy Union. First preach't On the Day of Publique Thanksgiving appointed by the Parliament, May the 10th. 1660 (London, 1660), p. 24. Robert Mossom (d. 1679), was educated at Cambridge. Until he was silenced in 1655, he regularly preached, offered communion and conducted services according to the Book of Common Prayer at St. Peter's, Pauls Wharf, London, where he preached this thanksgiving sermon in May 1660. At the Restoration he became Dean of Christ Church, Dublin, and bishop of Derry (D.N.B., xiii. 1083-4).

2 Sheldon, David's Deliverance, p. 32; Hardy, The Choicest Fruit of Peace, p. 25; also Short, God Save the King, p. 51.

3 Mossom, England's Gratulation, p. 24; also Hodges, Sions Hallelujah, p. 15.

4 Towers, Obedience, p. 2; also Peirce, Englands Season, p. 24.

5 Hardy, The Choicest Fruit of Peace, p. 25.

6 Short, God Save the King, p. 29.
broken shall be reestablished ", rejoiced John Douch, and " our Religion, which for many years together had been lost. . . . Our Laws, our liberty, our estates, our priviledges, our religion, and what not? shall all be sav'd under this Royal Canopy of Monarchy ".1 " When England lost her King," said Francis Gregory, " subjects as children lost their father . . . subjects as sheep lost their sheepheard." Have not, he asked, " the wolves devour'd us ever since? "2 John Douch agreed: " Kingly power is the onely curb to Sacriledge, Oppression, Murther, Perjury & etc. ".3

The times had been disordered. " Servants rid on horse-back ", remarked Thomas Hodges, " and Princes went on foot ".4 But the threat had passed. Now, said Francis Walsall, Englishmen were " moved by their own Angel again, their own intelligence, their native Sovereign ". They enjoyed " a firm Peace setled in the State upon true Foundations ". They rejoiced " to have reverence and obedience paid to the Fundamental Laws of the Land: to have Justice equally and impartially administered to all men ".5 " Every one beginnes to move in his own Orbe," observed Clement Barksdale, " to sit under his owne Vine, and his own Figge-tree "; to " enjoy his own as well as the King enjoys his own ".6

1 Douch, Englands Jubilee, p. 10. Kings are " Corner-stones and heads, in reference to the publike State, or government ", agreed Hen. White in ΘΥΣΙΑ ΑΓΙΝΕΣΕΙΛΕ or a Thank-offering to the Lord, For the happy Recal of Our dread. Soveraign Charles By the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith & etc. to His Kingdoms and People. Delivered in a Sermon at Rougham in Suffolck, May 24, 1660. A day (as we heard) set apart for that purpose (London, 1660), p. 14. See, too, Anthony Walker, God Save the King: or Pious and Loyall Joy, the Subjects Duty, for their Soveraigns Safety. Opened in a Sermon at Aldermanbury, upon the 30 of May, being the day after his Majesties most happy, joyfull and Triumphant Entrance into London (London, 1660), p. 4.


3 Douch, Englands Jubilee, p. 11.

4 Hodges, Sions Hallelujah, p. 14.

5 Walsall, The Bowing the Heart, p. 16.

Not all those who welcomed the king were indeed long to enjoy what they considered "their own". Barksdale and, very likely, Douch were to flourish after the Restoration, but Short and Hodges were to be ejected from their livings. Of Walsall nothing is known. The unlucky two may simply not have read the future correctly. Surely Hodges, called to address the Convention House of Lords, could not have foreseen that he would soon be deprived. The restoration of the monarchy clearly implied the restoration of the established church.\(^1\) Whether that church would provide within its fold a place for those of Presbyterian or Puritan leanings was still, in 1660, unclear. Short and Hodges were not alone in hoping then that the broader view of church settlement might win out, and they were not unreasonable. They were, time soon proved, simply mistaken.

Still, the point of order which the preachers raised went far beyond the question of church politics. The disruption of her institutions had threatened England's very fabric, and there had been genuine concern lest the disappearance of monarchy presage the disappearance of law, of property, of the social order itself. It was not only lawyers who welcomed the re-establishment of the familiar courses of law and legal processes.\(^2\) Further, Englishmen had been bled financially. Cromwell had suffered no scruples in demanding taxes to finance his government. Royalists had been forced to compound for their political sins. "We found", remarked Simon Ford, "that a pretended Common-wealth, had reduced us really to a common beggary: and our Liberties were kept by a name without a thing".\(^3\) Now

---

1 Sheldon, Davids Deliverance, p. 32; Barksdale, The Kings Return, p. 12.
2 See, e.g., An Eccho to the Plea for a limited Monarchy &c. Written and presented to his Excellency the Lord Generall Monck in January last, and now re-asserted by the same Author (London, 1660), especially pp. 1, 2; No Droll, But a Rational Account, Making out the Probable Fall of the Present, with the Rise and Succession of what the English would understand by the Term of a Free Parliament (London, [1660]), p. 8; and England's Safety in the Laws Supremacy (London, 1659).
3 Simon Ford, ΠΩΡΑΔΑΛΗΛΑΑ: Or, the Loyall Subjects Exultation For the Royal Exiles Restauration. In the Parallel of K. David and Mephibosheth on the one side, and Our Gracious Sovereign K. Charls, and his Loving Subjects, on the other. Set forth in a Sermon Preached at All-Saints Church in Northampton, Jun. 28.
that has past. "From this May-Day we promise ourselves... a pleasant Spring, yea, a joyful summer of prosperity, after a cold winter of tribulation", declared Nathaniel Hardy; "This year is England's Jubilee", echoed John Douch.¹ And Englishmen agreed.

Not all Englishmen. Ralph Farmer, vicar of St. Nicholas, Bristol, was outspoken. In April he warned his congregation: "King Charles cannot save your soules; but if King Jesus rule in your hearts, he can and will".² Farmer did not regard Charles himself as the author of evil. "Prophaneness is already in the Nation". But, he remarked, "all the ungodly and prophan people in the nation have a very great and strong desire of the Kings coming in, as hoping to have as much liberty to be prophan and to exercise it as they had before. Oh!" he went on, "how hath the Parliament Acts and Ordinances hampered and chained, and fettered these beasts; They cannot swear, be drunk but they must pay for't. Taverns, Innes, and Ale-houses must be shut on the Lords day, all day long, that they cannot tipple & be drunk... And oh! How like a wilde Bul in a net, have they fretted, and vexed, and raved at it?"³ At the king's return, feared Farmer, his subjects would backslide into the very immoral and profane habits from which the acts and ordinances of a puritan parliament had been meant to protect them.

And so indeed it did happen, reported self-confessed fanatic Henry Adis. He did not regret the "Solemnity and Triumph" which had attended the king's return to England, "the noise of


² [Ralph Farmer], A Plain-dealing, and Plain-meaning Sermon, Preach't in the Parish Church of St. Nicholas, Bristol, April 6, 1660. Being the day appointed by the Parliament for publique Fasting and Humiliation for the sins of the Nation, & etc. (London, 1660), p. 13. The copy in the British Library (Thomason collection) bears the date 19 May. Farmer was ejected from his post at St. Nicholas, Bristol in 1660, but preached at another Bristol parish until August 1662, when he was silenced (Matthews, Calamy Revised, p. 190).

³ Farmer, Plain-dealing, p. 21.
which," he declared to the king "hath rejoiced the hearts of foreign Princes, daunted the spirits of thy Domestic Enemies, made thy Friends merry, and the rude multitude mad". Indeed, he said, "the meerly Rational may plainly behold in it an high Act of Divine Providence". But, he went on, "the Moon-sick madness of the multitude, yet unrepented of, together with the revived and daily continued Acts of abomination in Stage-playes, May-games, and Pastimes, with the many bitter and most horrid Oaths and Execrations [and] . . . damming and debauched Bawdy-houses", made those of honest virtue recoil. "Fear is gathering into a black thick Cloud over the Land," he said, "& in special over rude, revelling, ranting London; out of which it is to be feared . . . will be poured one or more of those heavy Judgments of God, Plague, Sword or Famine".¹

Farmer's fears, and Adis's, were in this instance moral; there were other apprehensions. What, in fact, would happen? The king, from Breda, had promised a general pardon, and "a liberty to tender consciences". What could this mean? "O King," pleaded Adis, "be persuaded to leave men to their Liberties . . . England's subjects will be sooner won by their Kings kindness, than brought under by his cruelty . . . think not to make thyself strong, by forcing thy Subjects to forswear themselves, in swearing for thee".² Gilbert Sheldon, already at work drawing up the religious settlement to be embodied in the 1662 Act of Uniformity and the rest of the repressive Clarendon Code, in 1660 spoke ambiguously of "the free Exercise of Religious Duties . . . dear to a Christian Common-wealth".³ Clement Barksdale was more explicit. "Is it not a Favour to the People, to have Religion establisht, and good Order prescribed for the publick Service of God, and a lawful ministery countenanced and maintained? that the people may be no longer tossed to and fro with every winde of new Doctrine, nor seduced by false, unordained Teachers, nor deprived any longer of the benefit and comfort of the Holy Sacraments?" The king had returned home, Barksdale declared, "not only to enjoy himself,

¹ Adis, A Fannatica's Mite, pp. 1, 2.
² Adis, A Fannatica's Mite, p. 2 of "An After-writing to the King". As a "fanatic", Adis had no hope of an ecclesiastical settlement to which he could conform.
³ Sheldon, Davids Deliverance, p. 32.
but to give his Kingdoms too the publick exercise of true Religion, liberty of solemn and regular Devotions, and a free Administration of the Word and Sacraments". National, and not Notional Righteousness is, and hath ever bin, esteemed the surest Foundation for National and Personal peace and happiness", asserted Samuel Keme. Let us hope, prayed Ames Short, that the king's accession will be "a meanes, in time, to free us... From our soul-destroying and damning universal tolleration".

What of the king's enemies? The king, once restored, would "likely prove mercifull", thought Francis Gregory; Charles was a "Gracious, mercifull, and compassionate Prince", declared Short, ready "to pardon his worst Enemies". But not all the preachers spoke of mercy or justice. Onetime adversaries who were truly repentant might expect a measure of the king's favour. Those who "become Loyall Subjects" of "their lawfull Sovereign...shall be exalted", said Robert Mossom. "The Honours, Dignities, Profits, and Employments of...[the] Court Royal, Camp Martial, and Courts Judicial, they shall be all, the rewards of their dutifull Obedience". Yet, even those whom Charles must disappoint must themselves remain loyal, declared Gregory, even as Jonathan's crippled son Mephibosheth, deprived unjustly of half his heritage by Ziba's false slanders and David's mistaken judgement yet continued to love and honour his king.

1 Barksdale, The Kings Return, pp. 11, 12, 13.
2 Samuel Keme, King Solomon's Infallible Expedient for Three Kingdoms Settlement : or, Better Men make Better Times. Delivered in a Sermon Preached in the Renowned and Famous City of Gloucester, the Lord's Day before their Election of Burgesses for Parliament (London, 1660), p. 3. The sermon, preached and published in late March or early April 1660 (Thomason date 19 April) is monar-chist in tenor and clearly presages the Restoration. Kem or Keme (1604-70), an Oxford man, served as chaplain first to the earl of Essex and then to the earl of Warwick, whom he accompanied to Oxford in 1644 to treat with Charles I. Though noted for his republican sermons, at the Restoration he "became loyal" and preached in favour of monarchy (D.N.B., x. 1250-1).
3 Short, God Save the King, p. 31. Short, among others, appears to have hoped for the restoration of a state church on Presbyterian lines.
4 Gregory, David's Returne, p. 21; Short, God Save the King, p. 61.
5 Mossom, England's Gratulation, pp. 11-12.
6 Gregory, David's Returne, p. 1; also Ford, Loyall Subjects Exultation, on the Mephibosheth theme.
Not everyone would be happy. “It cannot be expected that monarchy with its greatest advantages should satisfie all, or fully put to silence the ignorance of men”, remarked Samuel Brunsell. “The clearest light in heaven is observ’d to have some spots”.¹ But, said Richard Eedes, “God having given us a King...Let us not line his Crown of Gold with a Crown of Thones”.² To those who were dissatisfied, Nathaniel Hardy would give short shrift, even as God “who heard our cry put an hook in the nostrils of those wilde Phanaticks, who did ride over our heads, and trampled us under their feet”.³ To those who might once again rise in rebellion, John Spencer gave warning. “Let no private hand of Joab (no joint force of people in a way of open War) resist the power thus ordained of God. Rebellion is the sin of Witchcraft”.⁴

Spencer was no absolutist. As he warned Englishmen against rebellion, so he advised the king to be righteous and wise. “That Prince is most likely to be attended with success,” he said, “who makes use of this wisdome, not to promote his own unwarrantable designes, but to discover other mens”.⁵ William Walwyn had further words of warning. “Princes are not to be like Sharp-pointed Pyramids, which are raised on high, but support nothing; but they must be like pillars, seeing they are erected by God to sustain and uphold the whole frame and fabrick of the Church and State from Ruine...indeed,” he said, “Kings and Potentates are set over the People, not as Comets, to pour forth nothing but plagues upon those below them, but as benign stars to cast down upon their inferiors, Light, Heat and Life”.⁶ “A truely wise and prudent Prince

² Eedes, Great Britain’s Resurrection, p. 12.
³ Hardy, The Choicest Fruit of Peace, p. 25; also Mossom, England’s Gratitude, p. 11.
⁴ Spencer, The Righteous Ruler, pp. 18-19.
⁵ Spencer, The Righteous Ruler, p. 22.
⁶ William Walwyn, God Save the King, or a Sermon of Thanksgiving, For His Majesties Happy Return to his Throne. Together with A Character of His Sacred Person. Preached in the Parish-Church of East Coker in the County of Sommerset, May 24. 1660 (London, 1660), p. 14. Walwyn (1614-71) was ejected from his Fellowship at St. John’s, Oxford, in 1648. In 1660 he became a canon of St. Paul’s (D.N.B., xx. 745; Walker, An Attempt, ii. 118). He is not to be confused with the Leveller William Walwyn.
...will engage the hearts of his conscientious Subjects to become his servants for ever”, remarked Ames Short. Charles I, said Henry Adis, had lost his crown as had King Ahaz for his “mis-actings”, “Abominations”, and “greediness”; his son Charles II would do well to take King Hezekiah as his pattern and act “according to the written Law of God, for such a Reformation onely will stand, and thou with it”, he warned. “But, thou do it according to the former custom, and what thy Father did before thee, thou sawest that fell, and him with it”. For “When Gods People cry to him, there is no staying the raising of an Army or Money, or the Making or Providing Ammunition”.

Such warnings revealed a certain apprehension of what the future might hold, in some cases a distrust of the multitude, in some a distrust of Charles himself or of kings or royalists in general. Apprehension, distrust, reservation or even fear could be expressed in another, more subtle, way. It was commonly accepted that the Restoration had been God’s will. Some rejoiced in what they considered the providence of heaven. “It is the Lord’s doing to bring the King again”, said Clement Barksdale; “an high Act of Divine Providence”, agreed Henry Adis; “a very special hand of God”, concurred John Martin. Men did as God designed. God had “stird up the worthy General [Monck] to be his instrument”, Monck, “whom the Lord hath made the Healer of our Breaches” to “heal a broken and divided House...a broken and divided Kingdom”. These were simple sentiments, revealing nothing more than rather conventional piety and, perhaps in some cases, resignation. But why had God acted? “God’s government of the World is full of Riddles and Mysteries”, suggested John Spencer; “the Temple out of which the Angels (the ministers of Divine Providence) proceed, is said to be full of smoak”. And why had He acted so late, why so suddenly? “Our eyes [had] even failed

1 Short, God Save the King, p. 52.
2 Adis, A Fannatrick’s Mite, pp. 15, 20.
3 Barksdale, The Kings Return, p. 3; Adis, A Fannatrick’s Mite, p. 1; Martin, Hosannah, p. 18.
4 Hodges, Sions Halelujah, p. 15; also Walsall, The Bowing the Heart, p. 5.
with looking for the salvation of our God", declared Thomas Hodges; enemies "seemed fixed like eternal Mountains and everlasting hills; yet even then was the Lord seen in the Mount, and our necessity was his opportunity". The ways of God were not for men to know.

Presbyterian Richard Baxter, perhaps the most learned and certainly the most notable of those divines whose thanksgiving sermons survive, spoke before the Mayor and Aldermen of London on 10 May. Though he opposed neither monarchy nor Stuarts, he could not welcome the prospect of Anglicanism restored. Preaching on the subject Right Rejoycing; or the Nature and Order of Rational and Warrantable Joy, he spoke guardedly of men as instruments of God's will. Englishmen were right to rejoice, he said, but too often "corruption took an advantage by it, to puff them up with pride and vain-glory". Men "took too great a share of the honour to themselves," he warned, "being more affected to see what great things they were made the instruments to accomplish, than what honour did thereby accrew to God". And he saw danger ahead. For, he said, men "that have seemed humble, fruitful, flourishing, and stedfast while they dwelt in the valleys of a mean, a low afflicted state, have proved sun-burnt, weather-beaten sinners, apostates, prov'd vain-glorious and barren, when they removed their habitations to the mountains of prosperity". Men must remember that God, not they, had ordered the Restoration; their vainglory and their petty vengeance was to be feared. And far away in Aberdeen only a month later, Alexander Scrougie made the same point. Men should take care, he said, for "if the Lord had not moved their hearts, they had not moved... the work... Let no instrument mistake himself, for the authour, nor appropriate to himself the Lords prerogative".

Of Charles himself, his subjects had great hopes. He was

1 Hodges, Sions Halelujah, p. 15.
2 Baxter, Right Rejoycing, pp. 2, 5, 6, 11.
3 Alexander Scrougie, Mirabilia Dei, or Britannia Gaudio Exultans. Opened in a Congratulatory Sermon for the Safe Return of our Gracious Sovereign, and happy Restitution to the full and free exercise of His Royall Authoritie (Edinburgh, 1660), pp. 23, 24. The sermon was preached 14 June 1660, at King's College, Aberdeen.
many times declared to be a very King David, "the pattern of an afflicted King, and a praying King; a delivered King, and a praise-returning King". Like David, Charles had been "despised and refused, thrown away as good for nothing". He had "met with hard terms, coarse usage, driven into straits, put to his shifts". The rigours he had suffered would surely make of him a better king. "A Prince is then most fit to rule," observed Francis Gregory, "When he hath first learnt what it means to suffer.... Banisht Princes, when once restored" were likely to prove "religious", "righteous" and "merciful". Were we to ask counsel of all the Kings, Princes in Europe, and Asia too," agreed John Douch, "to choose one to Regn and Rule over England ... who can we choose better than he, who hath been so long in the school of affliction, trained up from the rod to the scepter?"

Young King Charles had conducted himself and his affairs well, declared Ames Short. "By his choosing rather to get accession to his throne by the lawful, dutiful and loyal endeavors of his most pious and prudent subjects, than by the forcible assistance of Forreigners and Strangers", he had proved himself wise. Now, "by casting himself upon his Parliament in order to" settle "his Dominions", he proved himself prudent, "for

1 Joh. Nelme, England's Royal Stone At the Head of the Corner, Through the Wonderful Working of the Almighty God. Set forth in a Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church at Gloucester : the 28th day of June. Being a day of publick and solemn Thanksgiving for His Majesties Happy Restauration (London, 1660), p. 6. On the "David" theme, see too Barksdale, The Kings Return; William Creed, Judah's Return to their Allegiance : And David's Returne to his Crown and Kingdom. A Sermon Preacht at St. Mary Woolchurch upon June 28. 1660. Being the Day of Solemn Thanksgiving For the Happy Return of His Majestie (London, 1660); Feltwell, Davids Recognition; Gregory, David's Returne; Sheldon, Davids Deliverance; and Swetham, Davids Devotions. In singular contrast, Thomas Arnold develops the theme of Charles II as Daniel, delivered from the lions. T.A., TAPEIN AINOΣ, Humble Praise, Offered up in the Publick Solemnity, June the 28th 1660. Being a day of Thanksgiving for his Majesties Happy Restauration (London, 1660), pp. 1-5. Creed (1614-63) preached before Charles I at Oxford. In 1648 he was ejected from his Fellowship at St. John's but apparently continued as rector of Codford St. Mary, Wilts. In 1661 he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford (D.N.B., v. 69; Walker, An Attempt, ii. 118).
2 White, A Thank-offering, pp. 8, 14.
4 Douch, Englands Jubilee, pp. 6, 7.
by this means he hath, and will, engage the hearts of his conscientious Subjects to become his servants for ever". Then, "by his willingness to part with his Lands and Revenues (if the Parliament shall think fit) in order to the settlement of these Nations in peace and tranquillity", he proved himself "self-denying"; in his readiness to grant a general pardon, he declared himself compassionate; in his "desire...to be dealt plainly with, in respect of his own personal sins, and the sins of his Family", he showed himself "truly pious and religious". In "resolving upon the reformation and settlement of the Church by consent of Parliament, according to the advice of a select Assembly of pious and learned Divines", he proved himself "proper and prudential".¹

To a degree Short's sermon was nothing more than an exposition of Charles's Declaration from Breda. The king had indeed agreed to a "free and general pardon" and "a liberty to tender consciences" embodied in "such an act of parliament as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence" and he had agreed to leave the complicated question of land "grants, sales and purchases" to the decision of Parliament.² But Charles had said nothing of an assembly of divines and certainly nothing of parting with royal lands or revenues. Clearly, Short was reading into the king's Declaration what he hoped it meant. Apparently Short's congregation in Lyme Regis thought as he did, for the sermon, according to report, was printed at the request of the Mayor and Magistrates, though whether as a tribute to Short's eloquence or as an exhortation, even a warning, to the king, is not clear.³

Though some were apprehensive of the future, virtually none of the preachers opposed the restoration of monarchy. "Mon-

¹ Short, God Save the King, pp. 50, 51, 52, 54, 60, 61. Short compares Charles II with his grandfather, Henry IV of France, who "after he had fought many Battels...chose to obtain possession of his Crown...by treaty and capitulation, rather than to endeavour the recovery of it by making use of further force and violence".


³ A "very loyal sermon", reports Calamy, A Continuation, p. 417.
archy”, asserted Samuel Keme, is not only “most agreeable to the Nation’s well-being, but God’s order”. The Excellency of Kingly Dignity, shines in their Supremacy, which is the most expresse Character of Himself which God can put upon a man”, argued William Walwyn; “Kingly power . . . is more desirable than all other kindes of Government”, agreed William Towers, “Tis so 1. By instinct. 2. By reason. 3. By the word of God”.

God had set up kings of earth; He “hath dignified them with his name”, said Richard Eedes. “Tis no small blessing to humane society to obtain this Ordinance of God,” observed Anthony Walker, “without which, Each man would be a Wolf or Tiger to his neighbour, and therefore Kings are called . . . the foundations of their people, the Shields of the earth, the Shepherds of the flock, the Scept and Hedge of Religion, Peace and Property, the Fathers of their Country, the Nurses of the Church”. “Corner-stones and heads”, added Henry White; “the headstone of the corner”, agreed John Martin.

Monarchy was the way of nature. “It would be tedious,” argued William Towers, “to show you, out of Authors, some footsteps and glimpses of Monarchy in every creature under the Sun”; “Tis the lively Image of Paternal Government . . . and nature gives emblems of it in the Bees, the Cranes, &c.”, concurred Walker. Even the mechanical world gave evidence, thought Samuel Brunsell, “Because the more closely Soveraign power is united (as when the Sun-beams are drawn towards a point by a Burning-glass) the greater strength and aptitude it hath to obtain its end in the safety and honour of the whole Community.” “One great light was made to rule the day”, agreed Towers.

The rule of a king could best secure the peace and safety of his subjects. “Think not,” warned Robert Mossom, “that you shall keep your religion, your Laws, your Liberties, your Goods,

1 Keme, King Solomon’s Expedient, p. 6.
2 Walwyn, God Save the King, p. 12; Towers, Obedience, p. 4.
3 Eedes, Great Britain’s Resurrection, p. 6; also Gregory, David’s Retarme, p. 9.
4 Walker, God Save the King, p. 4.
6 Towers, Obedience, p. 5; Walker, God Save the King, p. 5.
8 Towers, Obedience, p. 5.
your Lives, and cast off your Soveraign".1 John Douch made the same point. "When we had no King, call to minde what strange and unheard of violence, and out-rages have our eyes (for many years) beheld committed".2 And so did John Spencer. "We have now a great matter of joy, in that we have a fixed and established Ruler over us . . . His Majesties restoration silenceth all disputes among ambitious spirits".3 "We shall enjoy a settled Government," agreed Ames Short, "our Antient Government of King, Lords and Commons: the best forme of Government that the wisdome of man could ever yet contrive, to prevent Tyranny on the one hand, and Anarchy and Confusion on the other".4

Kings were not perfect. David, King of Israel, had his sins, observed Francis Gregory, and so had Charles of England. "But yet remember, the spots of Princes are magnified by the person that wears them. That which looks but an Infirmity in the Subject, in the King would look like a Crime".5 Gilbert Sheldon said the same thing. Kings "stand high, all eyes are upon them, nothing they say or do escapes observation and censure: . . . a Mote will be called a Beam, a Gnat, a Camel".6 Since princes were "called by God himself GODS, they should thence learn to behave towards their inferiors like gods indeed . . . and imitate the Supreme God whose image they bear", remarked William Walwyn, but clearly he had not, really, much hope.7

Nor was the monarchy without defect. Governments were established, said William Brunsell, so "that Subjects may be secured, as far as possible, from danger and mischief, through strife, violence, and war, in the confused tyranny of one another". And that form of government should be preferred "which best
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obtains that... notwithstanding its being obnoxious, as all forms are through one accident or another, to some defects or obliquities". For, he continued, "engines that have many wheels will sometimes be out of order, though no disparagement to him that either made or keeps them". Richard Eedes concurred. "Well grounded Politicians say it's better to tolerate a well-grounded government though circumstantiated with some evil, than to innovate, and be given to change".

A well-grounded government, it could be said, involved something more than a crown. Magistrates as well as kings were properly called gods, declared William Walwyn; "The King, that is not only the person of the King but by a Synecdoche specie, All Magistrates", agreed S.S. "I can look upon my County as an Epitome of the Kingdom", asserted William Towers at Upton near Peterborough on the day Charles rode into London. "I can honour the King in every Petty-Constable... High Constable... Sheriff... in a resembled Parliament too... I can honour the King for whom they serve". However, just a month later, on 28 June, Towers stressed another point to the congregation of Exeter Chapel near the Savoy in London. Power, he said, was the king's. "Either power is perpetually in his Person, or it devolves upon another", in which case, he said, "there may be a King and no King upon the Throne". That should "change England into a Theatre", a "Stage". True, the power of a child king, an aged king or an absent king might properly be executed by his Councillors, but the "law presumes he would say, and do, as they Vote and Act". It "were endless", argued Towers now, "to summe up the Person and authority joyned together by God". What "God hath joyned, let not men put asunder". Nothing was said in the Exeter Chapel of sheriffs, constables and parliaments.

1 Brunsell, Solomons Blessed Land, p. 23.
2 Eedes, Great Britain's Resurrection, p. 8.
3 Walwyn, God Save the King, p. 13; S.S., A Receipt for the State-Palsie. Or a Direction for the Setting the Government of the Nation: Delivered in a Sermon upon Proverbs 25. 2 (London, 1660), p. 4. S.S.'s sermon (Thomason date 2 February) is not one of thanksgiving. However, though it predates, it clearly pre-indicates the restoration, and speaks to the prospect.
4 Towers, Thanksgiving, p. 3.
5 Towers, Obedience, pp. 7, 9.
By late June 1660 the king had been four weeks upon the throne and it was wiser, perhaps, and safer to enlarge upon the powers of the crown.

Such expressions might have struck Hobbes, James Harrington, George Lawson or any other theorist of the day as naive. But neither Towers nor his fellow preachers (with the possible exception of Richard Baxter) claimed to be theorists. They simply spoke as they, and undoubtedly many other Englishmen, thought. Some spoke before great men, some before small; some in London or Westminster, some in the country. But their written words were for anyone to read.

The preachers saw in the spring of 1660 good cause for giving thanks: "a firme and lasting peace" appeared to be at hand, "an equall distribution of law and justice", "a freedome of Trade", and "honour and renowne both at home and abroad". The ancient constitution was to be restored, ancient traditions honoured, the social order re-established, God's ordinances and nature's observed. But the welcome they gave the king was in certain respects guarded; some saw in the future the threat of danger as well as the vision of peace. Their expectations, their joy and their apprehensions were in themselves both an exhortation and a warning to the King. Would his return fulfil its high promise? In 1660 everyone hoped, but no one knew.

*Research for this paper was made possible in part by grants from the American Philosophical Society and the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle Graduate Research Board.

1 Ibid.
2 Short, God Save the King, pp. 32, 33.