

**Hagiography and Theology for a Comprehensive Reformed Church:
John Gauden and the portrayal of Ralph Brownrigg**

The Rev'd Dr Stephen Hampton

Dean

Peterhouse

Cambridge CB2 1RD

United Kingdom

**Hagiography and Theology for a Comprehensive Reformed Church:
John Gauden and the portrayal of Ralph Brownrigg**

I) The life and death of Ralph Brownrigg

Ralph Brownrigg¹ died in his lodgings in the Temple in London on 7 December, 1659. He was buried at the Temple Church ten days later. John Gauden preached the funeral sermon, and later remarked on the quality of his audience. Brownrigg's eminence was demonstrated, he suggested,

By that honourable and ample concourse of so many eagles to his corpse and funerals, which were attended by noblemen, by gentlemen, by judges, by lawyers, by divines, by merchants and citizens of the best sort then in London; these flocked to his sepulchre, these followed the bier, these recounted his worth, these deplored their own and their age's loss of him.²

Thomas Fuller, who also attended the service, lamented the loss of Brownrigg's salutary influence upon the life of the Church. In his *History of the Worthies of England*, which was published a couple of years later, he wrote:

I know all accidents are minuted and momented by divine providence; and yet I hope I may say without sin, his was an untimely death, not to himself (prepared thereunto) but as to his longer life; which the prayers of pious people requested, the need of the Church required, the date of nature could have permitted, but the pleasure of God (to which all must submit) denied.

Otherwise, he would have been most instrumental to the composure of church differences, the deserved opinion of whose goodness had peaceable possession in the hearts of the Presbyterian party. I observed at his funeral that the prime persons of all persuasions were present, whose judgements going several ways met all in a general grief at his decease.³

Ralph Brownrigg was born in 1592. He was elected a scholar and then a fellow of Pembroke College in Cambridge, and held a number of livings nearby. He also served as chaplain to the scholarly Bishop Thomas Morton, and, in due course, received further preferment from him: first a prebend of Lichfield in 1629, then the archdeaconry of Coventry in 1631, and finally a prebend of Durham in 1641.

Brownrigg's early commitment to Reformed orthodoxy can be glimpsed in one of the theses he defended for his BD in 1621, in which he maintained that 'Aid sufficient for salvation is not given to all.'⁴ This doctrinal clarity may have commended Brownrigg to the fellows of St Catherines, when they elected him to succeed Richard Sibbes as Master in 1635. As head of house, Brownrigg encouraged conformity within the college, but aspired to do so, as he once remarked to Simonds d'Ewes, 'in a spirit of love and levity.'⁵ Brownrigg also used his position to resist innovations which he perceived as a threat to the Reformed identity of the Church of England. As Vice-Chancellor in 1637, he led the charge against Sylvester Adams, a fellow of John Cosin's Peterhouse, for preaching in defence of auricular confession.⁶ In 1639, he licensed a rejoinder to Richard Montagu's defence of sacred images.⁷ And in 1640, though no longer as Vice-Chancellor, he was involved in proceedings against another fellow of Peterhouse, William Norwich, for preaching that works were necessary to salvation.⁸ This opposition to Laudian innovation continued when, by virtue of his archdeaconry, Brownrigg sat in the lower house of Convocation in 1640. He was among the clergy who opposed its continuing to meet in order to draw up new canons, after the Short Parliament was dissolved.⁹

When the Long Parliament was called, and the Caroline regime began to crumble, Brownrigg was at the centre of the efforts being made by some conformist clergy to respond to godly concerns about the health of the Church. In January 1641, he was deputed to wait on the King, and to communicate this group's views on episcopacy. In March 1641, he was appointed to a sub-committee of the House of Lords chaired by Bishop John Williams of Lincoln, which was tasked with investigating religious innovations and settling the ecclesiastical affairs of the nation. Brownrigg was one of the members specifically mentioned, when the sub-committee's recommendations were published later that year as *A copy of the proceedings of some worthy and learned divines*.

When the Secretary of State, Sir Edward Nicholas, recommended that the King appoint men free from any taint of popery to some recently vacated bishoprics, Brownrigg was one of those chosen. He duly succeeded Joseph Hall as bishop of Exeter and was consecrated at Westminster on 3 May 1642. Enthroned by proxy, Brownrigg never lived in Exeter, but he nonetheless took an active interest in the diocese. He created a commission to oversee clerical institutions in 1643, and persisted in making appointments even after diocesan structures were officially dismantled in 1646. Seth Ward, later Bishop of Exeter himself, acted as Brownrigg's Chaplain, and accepted the then nominal precentorship of Salisbury Cathedral from him in 1656.¹⁰ Brownrigg was also one of the bishops who continued to ordain during the interregnum; Edward Stillingfleet, later Bishop of Worcester, was among those who sought holy orders from him. After Brownrigg lost the accommodation and income that came with his bishopric, he moved between the houses of various friends, until, in 1658, he was invited by both Honourable Societies of the Temple to live and preach amongst them.

As his membership of Bishop Williams's sub-committee indicates, Brownrigg's loyalty to the episcopal polity of the English Church did not prevent him from contemplating reform. He was involved in several attempts to find a comprehensive church settlement during the Interregnum as well. In 1652, he accepted Richard Baxter's invitation to talks with Presbyterians and Independents in London, for which he was sharply criticised by some less flexible Episcopalians. Henry Hammond, in particular, complained about his activities in a letter to Gilbert Sheldon.¹¹ A couple of years later, in 1655, Brownrigg was in correspondence with Richard Baxter on the subject of reduced episcopacy, Baxter having been directed to him by Richard Vines as 'the fittest man to treat with for concord with the diocesan party.'¹² Then, in 1656, Brownrigg joined with Nicholas Bernard and John Gauden in presenting Ussher's 1641 scheme for reduced episcopacy to John Thurloe, Cromwell's Secretary of State.¹³

Although Brownrigg's views on church polity were fairly moderate, his views on the monarchy were not; at least, not by the 1640s.¹⁴ Brownrigg survived the Cromwellian visitation of Cambridge, and even became Vice-Chancellor again in 1643. But, after preaching a ferociously royalist sermon in 1645, on the anniversary of the King's coronation, he was deprived of his college and university positions and briefly imprisoned. Such treatment did not soften his opinions, however, and, a few weeks before his death, Brownrigg reiterated his wholehearted commitment to the monarchy in a Gunpowder sermon on 5 November 1659.¹⁵

Given his history, it is no surprise that many churchmen saw Brownrigg as a unifying figure, and one who might have done much to heal the divisions within the English Church. He was a committed Episcopalian, but had also been an outspoken opponent of Laudian excess. He had been active in ensuring that the Church of England continued to function as best it could under the Commonwealth, but was nonetheless open to demands for reform. He enjoyed cordial relations with prominent

Presbyterians, but was also an ardent royalist, who had suffered for his loyalty to the crown. Furthermore, following the deaths of John Prideaux and John Williams in 1650, Thomas Winniffe in 1654, Joseph Hall and James Ussher in 1656, and of Thomas Morton a few months earlier, in September 1659, Brownrigg was virtually the last surviving bishop who enjoyed the confidence of the puritan community. His death was therefore a significant blow for the moderate Episcopalian cause.

In *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, a defence of the traditional polity of the English Church which was published in the months before Brownrigg's death, John Gauden had already held him out as a shining example of bishops still alive, who put the lie to Presbyterian and Independent claims that Episcopacy was inherently popish and tyrannical. As he finished his roll-call of godly bishops, Gauden wrote

I cannot forbear to conclude all with a mighty man, Dr Brownrigg, Bishop of Exeter, whose name and presence was once very venerable to many ministers, while they were orderly presbyters; now he is a dread and terror to them, since they are become Presbyterians or Independents, such grasshoppers they seem in their own eyes, in comparison of his puissance, who so filled the doctor's chair in Cambridge, and the pulpit in the place where he lived, and had filled his diocese had he been permitted to do the office of a bishop, that it would have been hard to have routed episcopacy, if he had sooner stood in the gap, being justly esteemed among the giantly or chiefest worthies of this age for a scholar, an orator, a preacher, a divine and a prudent governor; so much mildness there is mixed with majesty, and so much generosity with gentleness.¹⁶

Since Gauden held such a high opinion of Brownrigg, it is not surprising that he was invited by the two Temple societies to preach at his funeral. Soon afterwards, Gauden was encouraged by Nicholas Bernard, among others, to publish that sermon, along

with an account of Brownrigg's life. Gauden was happy to do so because, he wrote, 'If envy against worthy bishops is to be burst in pieces, this piece will do it; if sober moderate minds are reconcilable to episcopacy (as I believe many, nay most ministers and people now are) this will further invite and confirm them to study of the Church's peace, and the honour of the Reformed religion, no less than the comfort of their own calling, by returning to such temperament and patterns of Episcopal presidency, as were to be seen in Bishop Brownrigg....'¹⁷ Over the next couple of years, Gauden further burnished Brownrigg's memory, by masterminding the publication of most of Brownrigg's surviving sermons.

As Jessica Martin, Anthony Milton and Alan Ford have all shown; both before and after the Restoration, the historiography of the recent past became a key battleground for religious polemicists. The portrayal of the Early Stuart Church, and of the clergymen who had played a prominent role in it, became a vehicle for responding to the changing political and ecclesiastical landscape of the 1650s and 1660s, and for promoting a particular vision of the Church's future.¹⁸ Gauden's contribution to this explosion of historiography has been noted, but only in relation to his writing up of Richard Hooker,¹⁹ not in connection with Ralph Brownrigg.²⁰ This article will show that Gauden's posthumous treatment of Brownrigg should be ranked alongside the other polemical histories of the Restoration period.

Through his address at Brownrigg's funeral, his account of Brownrigg's life and his management of the posthumous publication of Brownrigg's sermons, Gauden was presenting Brownrigg as an ideal bishop for the restored Church of England. He was consciously using Brownrigg's reputation amongst the godly to show what a moderate Episcopalian settlement, of the sort he favoured, might look like, and to make it attractive to those who were wary of such a development. He was, in other words, offering both a hagiography and a theology for a comprehensive Church; a Church which could unite different ecclesiological emphases, through a moderate

church settlement and a shared commitment to Reformed orthodoxy.²¹ The way Gauden presented Brownrigg closely reflected the preoccupations which emerge from his own writing during the Interregnum and in the period before 1662; but it was also sensitive to the changing political and religious environment, as the nation moved from Commonwealth to Restoration. A comparison can therefore be drawn between Gauden's evolving presentation of Brownrigg, and Nicholas Bernard's contemporaneous treatment of James Ussher;²² a comparison which is the more relevant, because Gauden and Bernard had collaborated in the promotion of a moderate Church settlement during the 1650s.²³

II) John Gauden's platform for a comprehensive Church settlement

Born in 1599, John Gauden was several years Brownrigg's junior, and his early career was shaped by godly and aristocratic, rather than by episcopal and academic patronage. Gauden accompanied the young Francis Russell of Chippenham to Wadham College in 1631, and received from him both his first incumbency, in 1640, and his sister's hand in marriage, at about the same time. Francis Russell later fought with the Parliamentarian army, one of his daughters married Henry Cromwell, and he held several significant offices under the Protectorate. So Gauden's alliance with the Russell family connected him closely with the Commonwealth regime. Furthermore, by the time he married Elizabeth Russell, Gauden had also become a domestic chaplain to Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick. And he received, through the Earl's good offices, the Deanery of Bocking in 1642, a post which he retained throughout the Commonwealth.

It appears that Gauden shared many of the anxieties of his circle about the way the Church had moved under Charles I. In the *Τέρὰ Δάκρυά* (1659), Gauden discussed the character and policies of William Laud, 'against whom,' Gauden wrote, 'I confess I was prone in my greener years to receive many popular prejudices, upon the common

report and interpretation of his public actions.’ Intriguingly, though, Gauden claims to have spoken with Laud during the Archbishop’s imprisonment in the Tower, and drawn a more positive conclusion about him from that conversation. In the *Ἱέρὰ Δάκρυά*, he refutes the charge that Laud was a crypto-papist, arguing instead that he was simply committed to the legally established polity of the Church of England, and resistant to the suggestion that private persons should have the liberty to depart from it.²⁴ ‘And truly,’ Gauden added, ‘in this I am so wholly of his Lordship’s opinion, that I think we have in nothing weakened or disparaged more our religion, as Reformed in England, than by listening too much to, and crying up beyond measure, private preachers or professors, be they what they will, for their grace, gifts or zeal; who by popular insinuations here and there aim to set up with great confidence their own or other men’s (pious it may be, I am sure) presumptuous novelties, against the solemn and public constitutions of such a Church as England was.’²⁵ Gauden’s professed change of heart about Laud may, of course, have been an attempt to build bridges with those conformists who, like Peter Heylyn, had shown themselves keen, in the 1650s, to defend the late Primate’s reputation, and the religious policies with which he had been associated.²⁶

Whatever reservations Gauden originally had about Caroline religious policy, he was alarmed by the ecclesiastical and political disorder which followed it and absolutely horrified by the execution of the King. He wrote an open letter to Thomas Fairfax, in an attempt to prevent it. ‘No power that I know,’ Gauden wrote ‘hath; or can under heaven invest you with authority to do what you seem to intend.’²⁷ And in a prefatory epistle to the reader, he warned that his generation was ‘ready to father upon God and the Christian Reformed religion, one of the most adulterous, deformed and prodigious issues that ever the corrupt heart of the men of this world conceived, their unbridled power brought forth, or the sun beheld.’²⁸ When the event he so deplored took place, Gauden’s outrage was given eloquent vent in *A just invective*, a pamphlet which was only published after the Restoration.²⁹

Gauden expressed his loyalty to the crown through his close involvement with the publication of *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη* in 1649. The extent of his contribution is not entirely clear, but the most recent critical edition states that ‘there is no doubt that Gauden was involved in the composition and production’ of the book.³⁰ Furthermore, Robert Wilcher has suggested that the sections of the *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη* which deal specifically with questions of liturgy and church polity may well have been written by Gauden himself.³¹ It is no surprise, therefore, that the recorded opinions of the martyred monarch anticipate a number of the positions which Gauden later elaborated in his *Interregnum* polemic, and which duly reappeared in his writing up of Bishop Brownrigg.

In *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη*, Gauden’s Charles I defends the use of set forms of prayer in general and the Book of Common Prayer in particular. ‘For the manner of using set and prescribed forms,’ he writes, ‘there is no doubt that wholesome words, being known and fitted to men’s understandings, are soonest received into their hearts, and aptest to excite and carry along with them judicious and fervent affections.’³² The Lord’s Prayer, he suggests, is ‘the warrant and original pattern of all set liturgies, in the Christian Church.’³³ And although there is a place for extemporary prayer in public worship, the use of an individual minister’s gifts in this way should not displace the careful compositions of so many learned and godly men.³⁴

This principle applies particularly to the Book of Common Prayer, whose doctrinal purity cannot be impugned. ‘As for the matter contained in this book,’ the King writes, ‘sober and learned men have sufficiently vindicated it against the cavils and exceptions of those who thought it part of piety to make what profane objections they could against it; especially for Popery and superstition; whereas no doubt the liturgy was exactly conformed to the doctrine of the Church of England; and this by all Reformed Churches is confessed to be most sound and orthodox.’³⁵ But although the

King is keen to defend the Prayer Book, he also makes it clear that he is not opposed to all liturgical change. Quite the contrary: he would ‘easily consent’ to amend the Prayer Book ‘in what upon free and public advice might seem to sober men inconvenient for matter of manner.’³⁶

The King is equally vocal in his support for Episcopacy. ‘My judgment is fully satisfied,’ he writes, ‘that it hath of all other the fullest scripture grounds, and also the constant practice of all Christian Churches.’³⁷ It is clear, he suggests, that the primitive Church was governed first by Apostles and then by bishops; and that, for 1500 years, there was no settled Church which lacked them. It is also clear that bishops have always retained the authority to ordain, and to administer ecclesiastical discipline. An orderly subordination within the Church is, the King suggests, quite as rational as orderly subordination within civil government.³⁸ And although conceding that he was not always successful in discerning the worthiest men to govern the Church, he avers nonetheless ‘some bishops, I am sure, I had, whose learning, gravity and piety, no men of any worth or forehead can deny.’³⁹

The King’s commitment to Episcopacy does not, however, mean that he will not contemplate reform. He is prepared to accept changes to the way in which bishops exercise their power. In particular, the King is open to what sounds like a distinctly Ussherian model of Episcopal primacy. ‘Not that I am against,’ he writes, ‘the managing of this presidency and authority in one man, by the joint counsel and consent of many presbyters; I have offered to restore that, as a fit means to avoid those errors, corruptions and particularities, which are incident to any one man; also to avoid tyranny, which becomes no Christian, least of all churchmen.’⁴⁰ Naturally, the King laments the divided and impoverished state of the Church under the Commonwealth,⁴¹ and he argues that the only sure way to heal these distempers is to call a national synod. ‘I have offered,’ he writes, ‘to put all differences in church affairs and religion to the free consultation of a synod or convocation rightly chosen;

the results of whose counsels, as they would have included the votes of all, so it's like they would have given most satisfaction to all.'⁴²

In *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη*, Gauden's Charles I is striking a careful balance. Andrew Lacey is therefore wrong to suggest that the book presents him as opposed to reformation or innovation.⁴³ On the contrary, the King concedes that the Church of England's liturgy and structures may well need reform. In particular, he welcomes a return to a more consultative and primitive model of Episcopal government, and concedes that not all her leaders have been exemplary. That said, the King affirms the fundamental soundness of the Church of England's polity, and underlines that many of her bishops have been beyond reproach: he also suggests that the best forum for bringing reform and healing to the Church is the orderly deliberation of a national synod. In other words, in Gauden's hands, Charles I is revealed as a moderate conformist churchman.

In the polemical works which he published up to the Restoration, Gauden echoed and amplified the points which he had made in the martyred monarch's name in *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη*. In *Hieraspistes* (1653), Gauden addressed the question of church government. The Church, he insists, has been governed by bishops since the apostolic age.⁴⁴ And bishops have always exercised the twin powers of ordination and ecclesiastical discipline.⁴⁵ Indeed, Gauden urges, Episcopal authority is a vital element of sound Church government. 'For I find,' he writes, 'by the proportion of all polity and order; that if Episcopal eminency be not the main weight and carriage of Church government; yet it is as the axis or wheel which puts the whole frame of Church, society and communion into a fit order and aptitude for motion.'⁴⁶ Gauden underlines, however, that Episcopal authority was anciently exercised in consultation with the presbyters and even, under certain circumstances, the people of the diocese.⁴⁷ 'I confess,' he writes, 'after the example of the best times and the most primitive Churches, I always wished such moderation on all sides, that a primitive episcopacy (which imported, the authority of any grave and worthy person, chosen by the

consent, and assisted by the presence, counsel and suffrages of many presbyters) might have been restored, or preserved, in this Church.’⁴⁸

Gauden developed this theme in the *Ἱερά Δάκρυά* (1659). Once again, he trumpets the superiority of Episcopal government. ‘Episcopacy,’ he writes, ‘justly challengeth the advantage, rights and honour of Apostolic and primitive antiquity, or universality and unity, beyond any pretenders.’⁴⁹ Many of the great reformers acknowledged this.⁵⁰ But, as Gauden also underlines, ‘the primitive constitution... the first and best practices of episcopacy... seems to have had more of aristocracy, by the joint counsel and assistance of select and grave presbyters, than of absolute monarchy or sovereign and sole authority.’⁵¹ Bishops were anciently assisted and guided by presbyters and deacons, and, in his advocacy for the restoration of an Episcopal polity, Gauden insists that he envisages ‘no more than such a paternal presidency and order, as may best preserve the undoubted power of ordination and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, as it was primitively settled in, and transmitted by, the hands of the first bishops.’⁵²

Gauden admits that not all bishops have been saints, particularly in recent times.⁵³ However, he argues that the evils incident upon episcopacy arise not from the office, but from the faults of individual bishops, and in particular from a lack of due regard for the fraternal counsel of their clergy.⁵⁴ This, he suggests, could easily be corrected if his primitive model of episcopacy were embraced, and especially if bishops were once again elected by their presbyters.⁵⁵

Furthermore, Gauden underlines, many of the English bishops have been great luminaries of the Church. The bishops since the Reformation were consistently loyal to the crown. They also resisted popery, demonstrated charity and hospitality, endowed numerous Churches and, far from being enemies to piety, were rather the principal pillars of it.⁵⁶ Furthermore, Gauden opines, so many English bishops have been excellent preachers, that ‘doubtless none of the primitive bishops and Fathers went

beyond ours in England.⁵⁷ Gauden then offers an extensive list of orthodox Protestant bishops that starts with the Reformation martyrs Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper and Latimer, runs through Morton, Juxon, Duppa, King, and culminates, as we have seen, with Ralph Brownrigg. ‘No men were more gracious and spiritual,’ he insists, ‘none did more good, than many of the bishops of England;’⁵⁸ such worthy bishops comfortably matched their best presbyters in their zeal for the Reformed religion.⁵⁹

Gauden acknowledges that certain English bishops have been accused of crypto-popery; but this accusation, he suggests, ‘never had... any further ground than this: some bishops pleased themselves beyond what was generally practised in England, with a more ceremonious conformity than others observed.’⁶⁰ And although Gauden did not approve ‘some of the things which some of them said and did, as to unseasonableness, rigour or excess,’ he insisted that none of the Laudian bishops had been closet Roman Catholics.⁶¹ Even a thousand ceremonies, he argues, will not make one a Papist. Ceremonies are matters indifferent, which can be arranged as the appropriate authorities in Church and State see fit. So, Gauden writes:

Ceremonies may possibly be thought superfluous, because not of the substance of the duty; but they are not to be charged as superstitious, where the devotion of the heart is holy, and the duty is sincerely performed for the essentials of it, as it is instituted by Christ and enjoined by the word of God, who hath left the ceremonious part of religion, more or less, very much to the prudence of his Church, according to the several customs of civil respect and decency used in the world.⁶²

Given the sorry state of the English Church under the Commonwealth, Gauden believes that ‘There will be no hopes of healing in religion, not when toleration or indulgence is granted to all opinions and professions, which list to christen themselves; but when such a public way of solid and sincere religion, both as to

doctrine and practice, is seriously debated, duly prepared, publicly agreed upon, and solemnly established.’⁶³ So, just like the King in the *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη*, Gauden proposes that a national synod should be called. Indeed, he argues, synods should become a regular part of the Church’s life; ‘holy and happy assemblies of ministers, consisting of authoritative bishops and orderly presbyters.’⁶⁴ Such assemblies would examine the state of religion and enact suitable reforms. They would also function as a court of appeal in questions of doctrine and discipline.⁶⁵ Unlike the Westminster Assembly, Gauden underlines, these synods would be freely elected and summoned only by lawful authority.⁶⁶

Gauden reiterated the importance of a national synod, when he was invited to offer a thanksgiving sermon, for the return of the excluded members to Parliament in February 1660. He also took the opportunity gently to remind these laymen about their limits in church affairs.

The perfect healing of the Church and religion, as Christian and reformed, (whose divisions, hurts and deformities are many) will hardly be done without calling those spiritual physicians together, after the primitive pattern in ecclesiastical synods or national councils.... I confess I cannot see how a committee of Parliament for religion is proper for the work, further than to be... the promoters of it, when put into fit hands of able ministers.⁶⁷

From Gauden’s writings during the Interregnum, a programme for a comprehensive Church settlement emerges with some clarity. The seeds of this programme can be seen in *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη*, and they were developed in the polemical literature which Gauden produced up to the Restoration. For Gauden, a genuinely inclusive ecclesiastical settlement would require: an acknowledgement of the Church’s authority to impose ceremonies, balanced with an acceptance of their indifferent nature; a judicious revision of the Prayer Book, but one which retains its existing

strengths; a liturgical regime with some provision for extemporary prayer; and a return to the primitive model of episcopacy, in which the power of a bishop is exercised in consultation with his presbyters, but in which Episcopal prerogatives in ordination and ecclesiastical censure are respected. All this will be impossible, Gauden thinks, without the calling of a national synod, for which legitimate authority is needed. So it was also a case, for Gauden, of no King, no church settlement.

III) The *Memorials* (1660)

The way Brownrigg is presented in the *Memorials of the Life and Death of Bishop Brownrigg*, which Gauden published with his funeral sermon in 1660, closely reflects the ecclesiastical agenda which Gauden had developed during the Interregnum. In Brownrigg, Gauden had an ideal opportunity to exhibit an attractive model of exactly the kind of moderate Episcopal practice which he hoped would unite churchmen of differing views.

Gauden was not the only clergyman keen to recruit a dead bishop to his cause. As Alan Ford has shown, Nicholas Bernard was doing exactly the same with the memory of James Ussher. In 1656, Bernard published both a life of Ussher and a scheme for reduced episcopacy which Ussher had originally drawn up in the quite different political environment of 1641. As Ford underlines, although Bernard was clearly engaging in Protestant hagiography, he ‘was offering Ussher as more than just a model for individual Christians. This saint also offered a broader vision of how an inclusive English Protestant Church could be constructed.’⁶⁸ In particular, Bernard was commending Ussher’s revised model of Episcopal government, in combination with his loyalty to orthodox Reformed divinity, as a way of mediating between Presbyterian and Episcopalian opinion, at a time when such an inclusive settlement seemed both an attractive and a realistic prospect.⁶⁹

In his *Memorials*, Gauden undertook a similar exercise with Ralph Brownrigg, elaborating the dead bishop's convictions in a way that reflected the main points of Gauden's Interregnum polemic, and his hopes for a comprehensive church settlement. Brownrigg had been convinced, Gauden recalled, that episcopacy was the most ancient form of government within the Christian Church:

As to the government of the Church by Episcopal presidency, to which prince and presbyters agree, he was too learned a man to doubt, and too honest to deny the universal custom and practice of the Church of Christ in all ages and places for fifteen hundred years, according to the pattern (at least) received from the Apostles, who without doubt followed, as best they knew, the mind of Christ.⁷⁰

That said, Brownrigg was ready to contemplate a degree of reform in the way episcopacy was managed. 'No man' Gauden claimed, 'was more ready to condescend to any external diminutions, and comely moderations, that might stand with a good conscience and prudence, as tending to the peace and unity of the Church.'⁷¹ In fact, Brownrigg's preferred model of Episcopal government turns out to have been similar to the one proposed by James Ussher: 'In the matter of episcopacy,' Gauden writes, 'he differed little from Bishop Ussher's model of the ancient synodical government.'

Gauden also underlined that Brownrigg's Episcopalian sympathies did not lead him to un-church those Protestant polities that lacked bishops. 'He hath sometimes said to me,' Gauden related, 'that he held other Reformed Churches which had no bishops, to have *verum esse*, a true being of ministers and other Christians, but it was *esse defectivum*: they had as wandering people, *esse naturale*, but not *esse civile*, they might be Christ's sheep, but not so folded and under such shepherds, as the Church had every used from the Apostles' days.'⁷² Brownrigg's stance was, therefore, helpfully conciliatory over the vexed question of whether presbyterally ordained

ministers needed to be reordained - an issue which would cause difficulty during the Worcester House Conference of October 1660 - because he clearly viewed presbyterally ordained ministers as true ministers.⁷³

On liturgical matters, Brownrigg again seems to echo Gauden's own position. Brownrigg, he suggested, had a very tolerant stance on ceremonial matters.

In matters of outward rites and ceremonies, he allowed latitude and liberty, without breach of charity; it was a maxim I have heard him use, that nothing was less to be stickled for or against than matters of ceremony, which were as shadows not substances of religion, as they did not build, so they could not burthen, if kept within their bounds, as was done in England's Reformation.⁷⁴

Brownrigg's own liturgical sympathies appear to echo those of Gauden's Charles I. He approved of set forms of liturgy and greatly admired the Prayer Book.⁷⁵ Just like the late King, Brownrigg was not opposed to extemporary prayer; indeed, Gauden notes, he frequently used it himself.⁷⁶ Furthermore, Brownrigg was quite as open to liturgical reform, as he was to the reform of Episcopal government, so long as it was conducted under lawful authority by a legitimately constituted synod. Gauden writes:

Not that he was such a formalist, verbalist and sententialist as could not endure any alteration of words, or phrases or method, or manner of expressions of the liturgy, to which either change of times, or of language, or things, may invite; he well knew that there had been variety of liturgies in Churches, and variations in the same Church; he made very much, but not too much of the English liturgy; not as the scriptures, unalterable; but yet he judged that all alterations in such public and settled concerns of religion, ought to be done by the public spirit, counsel and consent of the prophets, prince and people.⁷⁷

And to Brownrigg's mind, as Gauden also made clear, that meant 'a full and free Parliament, consisting of King, Lords and Commons; counselled, as to matters of religion, by a full and free Convocation.'⁷⁸

Gauden was keen to underline that Brownrigg had combined these moderate views on church polity, with an unflinching commitment to Reformed orthodoxy. Gauden made clear that Brownrigg had had no time for the catholicizing tendencies of some of his contemporaries, describing them as 'mongrels and Mephibosheths in religion... a kind of ambiguous and dough-baked Protestants.'⁷⁹ He aligned Brownrigg, instead, with those clergymen who had defended the theology of Dort:

As for those differences of other parties in some opinions, which there began to grow very quick and warm in England, as well as the Netherlands, he seemed always most conformed to and satisfied with the judgement of his learned and reverend friends, Bishop Ussher, Bishop Davenant and Dr Ward, who were great disciples of St Austin and Prosper in their contests against the Pelagians.⁸⁰

For Gauden, the best prospect for the Church of England, in 1660, was to combine a reduced and primitive model of Episcopacy, with a revised liturgy, and a commitment to Reformed orthodoxy; and that is precisely what he saw in the ministry of Ralph Brownrigg.

IV) The *Forty Sermons* (1661)

In the aftermath of the Restoration, Gauden quickly rose to become a figure of significance within the Church. He clearly enjoyed the support of Charles II. He was made a royal chaplain soon after Charles's return, was nominated by the King to open negotiations with the leading Presbyterians on 16 June,⁸¹ and then, on 20 October

1660, was appointed to succeed his hero Brownrigg in the bishopric of Exeter, despite Gilbert Sheldon's disapproval.⁸² Robert Beddard has argued that Gauden's advancement was not due to any personal esteem for Gauden on Charles's part, but rather to the King's *politique* desire to keep the Church of England as broadly based as possible.⁸³ Be that as it may, such was Gauden's prominence, during the immediate post-Restoration period, that Barry Till considers him 'virtually the spokesman for the peace-making Anglican position.'⁸⁴ He was certainly a leading figure in the discussions which led to the moderate Worcester House Declaration of 25 October 1660.⁸⁵

Just as Gauden was rising to personal prominence, however, the prospects of the moderate settlement which he sought, were becoming rather bleak. Across the country, the traditional structures of the Church of England were re-established with remarkable speed.⁸⁶ Clergy such as Gilbert Sheldon and John Cosin, who were unsympathetic to many aspects of Reformed theology,⁸⁷ were appointed to strategic sees. And as Alan Ford has observed, 'As 1660 passed into 1661..., it became apparent that radical changes to episcopacy, prayer book and discipline were to be ruled out;' in particular, 'The high-church party and advisers such as Edward Hyde saw primitive episcopacy as the first step to the abolition of bishops entirely.'⁸⁸ As the most prominent spokesman for an ecclesiological position which was losing political support, Gauden had to choose his words with care.

Gauden was a moderating voice during the Savoy Conference, which met from 15 April 1661, but he could not win much leeway for those who had scruples about conformity.⁸⁹ Richard Baxter later recalled that 'Bishop Gauden was our most consistent helper.... He was the only moderator of all the bishops (excepting our own Bishop Reynolds): he showed no logic, nor meddled in any dispute, or point of learning; but a calm, fluent, rhetorical tongue: and if all had been of his mind, we had been reconciled.'⁹⁰ During the Parliamentary debates leading up to the passing of the

Act of Uniformity on 19 May 1662, Gauden supported the King's unsuccessful efforts to mitigate the severity of the bill.⁹¹ And, in a last ditch effort to build bridges with the nonconformists, Gauden even succeeded in reviving a modified version of the Black Rubric and having it inserted into the revised Book of Common Prayer. This rubric made clear that kneeling at the receipt of communion did not imply any adoration of the elements, since 'the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substance, and therefore may not be adored... and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here.' Gauden successfully faced down the Sheldon's opposition to its inclusion, with the support of George Morley and the Earl of Southampton.⁹² It was clear, though, that Gauden was one of the few moderates still trying to hold back the tide of authoritarian Conformity.

Nicholas Bernard had observed the changing political climate, and he adjusted his presentation of James Ussher accordingly. In 1661, he published with Robert Sanderson *Clavi Trabales*, which burnished Ussher's credentials as a royalist, a staunch supporter of the traditional polity of the English Church and a die-hard opponent of Nonconformity.⁹³ *Clavi* also explained that Ussher's scheme for reduced episcopacy had been an entirely pragmatic response to the disorder of the early 1640s, not a magisterial statement of Ussher's convictions about church government.⁹⁴ Bernard contradicted his earlier claims about Ussher's openness to extemporary prayer, and downplayed Ussher's Reformed theological credentials, suggesting instead that Ussher had been in fundamental sympathy with men such as Lancelot Andrewes, Adrian Saravia and Richard Hooker. As Ford puts it, '*Clavi Trabales* represented a startling, one is tempted to say shameless, *renversement* on the part of Bernard, as he moved Ussher from one context, and placed him in utterly different company.'⁹⁵

Ralph Brownrigg's sermons were actually prepared for publication by William Martyn, rather than John Gauden. It is clear, though, that Gauden was closely

involved in the process. Martyn claimed as much in *An Advertisement*, with which he prefaced the collection. He wrote: ‘Here in this volume are such sermons of his Lordship’s, as the Right Reverend Father in God, John Gauden, hath perused and approved of. And nothing hereafter shall be made public by me under the name of Bishop Brownrigg, but what shall first be commended to the view of His aforesaid Reverend and Worthy Successor.’⁹⁶ In addition to deciding which of Brownrigg’s sermons should be published in the collection, Gauden provided a letter to William Martyn, which he intended to be printed with the sermons. Gauden’s letter, which is dated 12 June 1661, offers a second account of Brownrigg’s ecclesiastical convictions, and one which significantly alters the way Brownrigg is portrayed, even if Gauden’s approach was more subtle than Bernard’s handbrake turn.

The Church Fathers, with whom Gauden now chose to identify Brownrigg, were not Prosper and Augustine, who had been repeatedly deployed to attack Arminian soteriology. Instead, deftly shifting his focus from doctrinal content to homiletic style, Gauden writes: ‘To me, St Chrysostom and Chrysologus, St Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzum, seemed to be revived in this one, acute, elegant and heroic preacher.’ Gauden is still content to associate Brownrigg with the anti-Arminians of an earlier generation. However, he no longer emphasises their shared commitment to the orthodoxy of Dort, focussing only on the loss suffered by the Church upon their deaths. This enabled him to drop, from his account of Brownrigg’s life, the names of Davenant and Ward, both of whom had been present throughout the Synod and were associated with its decrees, but to retain the names of Hall, who left the Synod early, and subsequently became better known for defending *iure divino* Episcopacy, and Morton, who never went to Dort at all.⁹⁷

Turning to questions of liturgy, Gauden now chose to emphasise not Brownrigg’s relaxed attitude to such matters, but rather his conviction that the Church was entitled to regulate external worship as it saw fit.⁹⁸ He writes: ‘No man more asserted the

prudence, liberty, and authority of this (as all Churches) within their respective polities and communions, to choose and use, yea, to prescribe and impose upon themselves, by public consent... particular forms and modes of external solemnity, order, reverence and decency....⁹⁹ In exercising this power, the Church did not, Brownrigg though, have the authority to decree that any ecclesiastical ceremony was a necessary part of religion. That said, once the Church had decided to impose a ceremony, he believed that Christians no longer enjoyed the liberty to neglect it.¹⁰⁰ True religion, Brownrigg felt, ‘cannot be carried on, but in conformity to the Word of God, which commands, as our exact obedience to divine precepts and institutions, in point of holiness; so our submission to the Church’s appointment, in point of peace and decency, as to things of indifferency, that are not punctually enjoined or forbidden by the Word of God.’¹⁰¹

Most striking of all, though, is the complete absence of any reference to reduced Episcopacy. The closest Gauden comes to it, is when he reiterates Brownrigg’s openness to church reform: ‘No man more zealous for just and sober reformations, where any decays were owned by public wisdom, and supreme authority, or evidenced by private humble remonstrances from God’s Word, and the laws in force.’¹⁰² Admittedly, an attentive reader might still discover the truth about about Brownrigg, since William Martyn’s letter *To the readers* directs the reader to Gauden’s original account of Brownrigg in the *Memorials*. Even so, Gauden’s silence on this issue is remarkable, given his long-term commitment to reduced Episcopacy. He had restated this commitment as recently as 13 January 1660, in a sermon delivered to the recently ordained clergy of Exeter Diocese, a sermon which also referred explicitly to Brownrigg, as an example of primitive practice.¹⁰³ It seems difficult to conclude that the absence of reduced Episcopacy from Gauden’s second account of Brownrigg’s life, was not a tactical response on Gauden’s part to the changing political scene, and more particularly to the election of the Cavalier

Parliament in May 1661, which made a comprehensive church settlement increasingly unlikely.¹⁰⁴

Gauden had not, of course, backtracked on limited Episcopacy, in quite the egregious manner Bernard had done. He did not undermine the idea by suggesting that it was no more than a pragmatic expedient, fit only for the unique circumstances of 1641; he simply passed over it in silence. It is clear, in fact, that Gauden had not changed his mind on the issue. There is evidence that he tried to operate a form of reduced episcopacy within the diocese of Exeter.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, Gauden's edition of Richard Hooker's works, which he published early in 1662, included Book VII of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, in which Hooker suggested that the ancient pattern of Episcopal government was a consultative and collegial one.¹⁰⁶ As Michael Brydon has underlined, 'Through its publication, Gauden clearly hoped to assure churchmen that limited episcopacy had a rational and respectable conformist precedent, at the same time as indicating to the English Presbyterians that their views could be comprehended by a newly re-established Church.'¹⁰⁷ That is indeed one of the reasons why Gauden's edition of Hooker was so unwelcome to clergy such as Gilbert Sheldon.¹⁰⁸ But Gauden's polemical approach in this edition was to let Hooker speak for himself, rather than to flag up the issue of limited episcopacy in the prefatory account of Hooker's life. This somewhat unflattering portrait certainly touched on Book VII, but did not take the opportunity to identify it with reduced Episcopacy.¹⁰⁹

Gauden adopted a similar tactic in relation to Brownrigg's theology. Having gently muddied the waters of his doctrinal affiliation in the prefatory letter to Martyn, Gauden authorised a set of sermons which display Brownrigg as the orthodox Reformed theologian that he was. Since Brownrigg's sermons have received very little scholarly attention to date, it is worth setting out their doctrinal content in some detail, as they make it possible to offer a reasonably detailed account of his theology.

Brownrigg underlines the woeful state of fallen and unregenerate humanity. ‘By nature, you are evil and sinful,’ he writes, ‘tainted with corruption.... Indeed our spiritual endowments, they are totally lost; all, in respect of them, are become abominable.’¹¹⁰ Because of the Fall, he insists, human beings are spiritually blind. ‘In supernatural truths we want both eyes: not only, like Pelagius, born with one eye, but stark blind. The most glorious mysteries are, to a natural man so many gross absurdities.’¹¹¹ As a result, our only hope lies with God’s grace: ‘Education, laws, magistrates, may suppress for a time: but ‘tis grace alone that can thoroughly and effectually transform us.’¹¹²

Brownrigg confidently embraces the language of election and the language of reprobation. He is clear that Christ did not die for all people, but only for the elect. ‘The passion and resurrection of his natural body was all and only for his mystical body.’¹¹³ The gospel is therefore a means of sorting the elect from the reprobate: ‘It makes a collection of God’s people and so by consequence a separation. It fits men by grace, and gathers the elect: and the Church being once finished and that blessed number being accomplished, judgement hastens upon the world of unbelievers.’¹¹⁴ But this division, Brownrigg underlines, is not the result of our own response to the gospel, because ‘The grace of the gospel, ‘tis not alike open to all.’¹¹⁵ So, he argues, ‘They that will not obey the gospel, are lost in God’s account and estimation, nay, more than so, they are lost in his purpose and resolution. He hath passed upon such a decree of perdition.’¹¹⁶ That said, Brownrigg urges that the divine decrees are fundamentally mysterious, and should not be a matter for human curiosity. He writes,

We cannot give out copies of God’s decrees, give men an assurance of heaven; or seal up unto them their final perdition: but must proceed by a just inference from those qualifications and conditions, which the gospel expresses.... That gives us warrant to assure you, if you repent, and believe and live holily, you

are elected and shall be saved: if you persist in ignorance and impiety, and will not lay hold on Christ and his gospel, you are lost and cast-aways.¹¹⁷

For Brownrigg, the first consequence of a believer's election is free justification. 'Sin is cleansed,' he writes, 'in our justification, when 'tis pardoned and forgiven us. This cleansing belongs only to God, 'tis he alone that can cleanse us, 'tis he alone that can blot out our iniquities.'¹¹⁸ The only merit in the process of redemption belongs to Christ. 'Neither *gaudia patriae* nor *solatia viae*, neither the joys of heaven nor the comforts here on earth can be merited by us; but are all obtained by Christ's intercession. The good use of grace doth not merit the increase of grace; but only procure it: and that not in its own strength, but in the power and dignity of Christ's intercession.'¹¹⁹ Even so, a saving faith must be a working faith, and one fruitful in good works. 'Tis only the working faith,' Brownrigg insists, 'that obtains the pardon: in this case, though faith be actually destitute, yet 'tis such a faith as will be industrious. God gives grace unto it, as to a poor beggar; but not as to a lazy one: and faith receives it with an empty hand, but not with an idle one.'¹²⁰

If a believer has such a working faith, Brownrigg suggests, then Christian assurance will be its logical consequence. Indeed, he argues, 'fullness of assurance, firmness of persuasion, is a necessary requisite in a true believer.'¹²¹ Saving faith, he points out, involves not only an intellectual assent to the truth of the gospel and reliance upon that truth for salvation. It also involves 'a personal persuasion of our own state and condition... when the conscience doth testify, I believe steadfastly, therefore I trust I shall be saved certainly.... This is not presumption, but a well grounded confidence, without which, the soul of a Christian will still be distracted with fears and perplexities.'¹²²

Justification is but the beginning of a Christian's road to heaven. For, as Brownrigg also underlines,

Sin hath another cleansing, and that's by mortification and regeneration and conversion. The progress of these acts God works in us and by us; his Spirit enables us to carry forward this work, which he graciously begins, and to cleanse ourselves. He gives the first stock of grace and enables us to improve it. This work, as 'tis principally God's so 'tis ours also under God, and in the strength of his grace we may and must perform it.¹²³

In this process of sanctification,¹²⁴ believers must carefully attend to the moral law contained in the scriptures. Because, Brownrigg urges, 'Christian liberty doth not free us from moral duty; the law of piety is still in full force, and blessed is the man that meditates therein day and night. The same law of God doth still bind us, though not upon the same terms, that it doth bind those that are out of Christ.'¹²⁵ Even so, under the gospel, Christ alleviates the burden of the law, and accepts our imperfect performances in place of the rigorous perfection which the Law required. Consequently, Brownrigg states, 'The law as enjoined by Moses, 'tis insupportable; but as Christ imposes it in the gracious equity of the gospel, so 'tis a gentle yoke, an easy burden.'¹²⁶

For Brownrigg, the chief instrument which God uses to effect a believer's conversion is preaching. 'God's word in general,' he writes, 'that's the means, that works this compunction, that's the choice, sanctified instrument; appointed by God for this sacred work. The speaking to exhortation and doctrine, is the way to convince and convert souls.'¹²⁷ And this is because 'The sense of hearing,' he argues, 'tis the main inlet of all saving knowledge.... The ear, 'tis the mouth of the soul, whether for meat or medicine, for our first conversion, or for after instruction.'¹²⁸ But within God's ample word, it is the gospel, Brownrigg thinks, rather than the law, that provides a believer's chief comfort, as well as his clearest insight into the divine nature. The gospel, Brownrigg writes, 'Tis the masterpiece of all God's workmanship. In it is the

concurrence of all his glorious attributes. His wisdom, his power, his justice, his goodness, all shine forth most gloriously in this work of redemption. Nay not only the concurrence of all his attributes, but the concord and agreement of them, appears in the gospel.¹²⁹ And since the gospel contains such an abundant revelation of God's nature, it is also the source of the inner transformation, by which humanity's lost likeness to God can be restored. 'This looking-glass of the gospel, 'tis a rare looking-glass,' Brownrigg says, 'tis not only for representation; but hath a virtue of transformation. It not only shows beauty, but conveys beauty to us.'¹³⁰

For Brownrigg, the sacraments hold their place alongside the preached word as instruments of salvation. Of the Eucharist, he writes: 'The strengthening bread and the comforting and refreshing wine; Christ becomes both to us. These two are not only similitudes, but raised to be mysterious sacraments, effectual conveyances of our spiritual nourishment.'¹³¹ In common with the wider Reformed tradition, Brownrigg considers that a proper understanding of the resurrected body of Christ is necessary to a right conception of the Eucharist. He underlines, 'tis a glorified body, and yet within the compass and condition of a true natural body, to be transferred by motion from one place to another.'¹³² As a result, it cannot exist in more than one place at the same time. This, Brownrigg suggests,

'Tis a useful truth to be known, against that gross error of the corporal presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. The papists, that they may maintain that Christ is present in the sacrament, not only spiritually but corporally; not only to the soul of the believer but on the altar, and under the appearances of the bread and wine; not only received in faith, but by the mouth of the body, and taken into the stomach as other meats; have turned this mystery, not so much into a miracle, as into a monster.¹³³

Brownrigg believed, therefore, that Christ is not present physically, in the Eucharist, but spiritually, and spiritually nourishes the believer through it. As he puts it,

The grain of wheat was broken with the flail of affliction, bruised and broken, and grounded to dust, baked and made bread in the furnace of his passion: this fruitful grape, this goodly bunch of Eskol was put into the wine-press, the blood of this grape was crushed out in his passion: and both these make up our spiritual sustenance; our souls feed on this blessed bread, and we drink of this sacred wine, that we may live by it.¹³⁴

The opposition to Roman Catholicism, which can be seen in Brownrigg's discussion of the Eucharist, crops up throughout the *Forty Sermons*. Brownrigg castigates 'Babylonish Rome, that now usurps and tyrannizes over the Church of God.'¹³⁵ He accuses the Roman Catholic Church of promoting idolatry, of cultivating expensive display rather than piety, of indulging in cruelty and persecution.¹³⁶ He attacks Rome's misinterpretation of the scriptures,¹³⁷ her plotting against lawful authority,¹³⁸ her elevation of human traditions over the word of God,¹³⁹ her endorsement of beggary as a holy way of life.¹⁴⁰ The selection of sermons thus distances Brownrigg from any taint of popery. The Brownrigg on display here is the Brownrigg who, as Gauden put it, followed Ussher, Hall and Morton as one of those 'who are sufficient to make an everlasting divorce between prelacy and popery.'¹⁴¹

Roman Catholicism is not, however, Brownrigg's only polemical target in the *Forty Sermons*. He also attacks that other great Reformed bugbear: Socinianism. Whilst discussing the atonement, Brownrigg insists that Christ 'did it by the means of making a full satisfaction to the justice of God for us. That's properly to propitiate; not as Socinus wickedly affirms, to mediate only and entreat for pardon.' He insists, again against Socinus, that the Holy Spirit is a person, not a motion or quality.¹⁴² And he defends the sacraments against what he calls the Socinians' 'infidelity and carnal

reason' that takes exception to the idea that God may bring about spiritual effects through physical instruments.¹⁴³ 'Purposely' he says, 'God employs very mean instruments, that our faith may only depend upon his power, and that our thankfulness may ascribe it only to his glory.'¹⁴⁴

The *Forty Sermons* demonstrate Brownrigg's Protestant orthodoxy, and display his credentials as a doughty champion of the Reformed religion. But it also underlines his commitment to the monarchy.¹⁴⁵ In Laud and Buckeridge's 1629 edition of Lancelot Andrewes' *XCVI Sermons*, the sermons for the explicitly royal commemorations of the Gowrie Conspiracy and the Gunpowder Plot were placed after the sermons connected to the feasts of the liturgical year. In the *Forty Sermons*, by contrast, the sermons celebrating the inauguration of King Charles and the foiling of the Gunpowder Plot open the collection. These sermons send out a very strong message about the monarch's importance to the health of the Church and the nation. As Brownrigg puts it, 'There must be not only religion, but a *defensor religionis*: not only peace but a *custos pacis*: not only plenty, but a *curator annonae*: without which neither religion, peace, nor plenty will long continue.'¹⁴⁶ Describing the happy state of Israel under King David, Brownrigg writes 'Here is a nation blessed in a devout and religious king. This crowns all the other blessings, and makes them complete; a king that gladly hears of the flourishing and prosperity of religion in his kingdom, and of those that attend it.'¹⁴⁷ He compares David's attitude with the solicitude shown by English monarchs for the well-being of the Church of England,¹⁴⁸ and exclaims of Charles I, 'Did England ever know a prince more frequent, more constant, more attentive and devout in the worship of God? We commend it in private persons, and 'tis justly commendable; how much more in a King?'¹⁴⁹

Brownrigg is clear that monarchs have both responsibility for and power over the Church. 'The business of religion,' he says, 'belongs to their cognizance. Hence we see all alterations in the Church ascribed to the Prince.... The establishing of

Churches, 'tis an act of sovereignty, and supreme authority, though others labour in it. In this case, the skill and ability of the clergy and people are all to be employed by this architectural and supreme power.'¹⁵⁰ Kings, Brownrigg argues, are God's vicegerents: they are individually chosen by him¹⁵¹ and subject immediately and solely to Him alone.¹⁵² For this reason, Brownrigg insists, 'Religion doth not exempt us from the authority and power of magistrates and rulers; though they be infidels and heathens, and strangers to religion. The ties and bonds of duty, and subjection to them, are sacred and inviolable.'¹⁵³ Indeed, he goes on, 'Subjection and fidelity is due from Christians to kings, and princes, though they prove oppressors to the Church.'¹⁵⁴ That, he thinks, is the example provided by all the martyrs. Naturally, Christians cannot obey a wicked command from their sovereign, but any such refusal must be made without contempt, and with an ongoing protestation of loyalty.¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, 'though we dare not perform our active obedience, in doing what they command; yet we must perform our passive obedience in submitting to their punishments.'¹⁵⁶ For Brownrigg, in other words, 'no wrong or injury, can exempt or discharge our persons from our lawful sovereign;' on the contrary, 'this is thankworthy with God, if we be wronged, not to mutiny or repine, not to revile or oppose; but to suffer as Christians in meekness and patience.'¹⁵⁷ For, as he makes very clear, 'Piety towards God, loyalty to his King. They may, they must be joined together.'¹⁵⁸

V) Conclusion

Ralph Brownrigg may have died before the Restoration, but John Gauden was determined that his shadow should still loom over it. Such was Brownrigg's high reputation among the godly, that his memory could still prove useful in the ecclesiastical predicament of the 1660s. In his memorial of Brownrigg's life, and in his supervision of the *Forty Sermons*, Gauden presented Brownrigg as a model 'primitive' bishop. Here was a man of impeccable Reformed orthodoxy, who was committed to the traditional polity and liturgy of the Church of England, yet open to

orderly and synodical reform. Here was a man who had resisted the Laudian innovations of the 1630s, but who was nonetheless unswervingly loyal to the King. Here was a man who, in life, might have helped unify the Church, and who, in death, could still offer the Church a promising way forward.

The Brownrigg who emerges from Gauden's publications closely reflects Gauden's own programme for church settlement. This was a programme which he first set out in the *Εἰκὼν Βάσιλικη*, and developed through the polemical works of the following decade and a half. For Gauden, only the Crown in Parliament, advised by a free and lawful Convocation could bring healing to the English Church. This healing would involve a modest revision to the Book of Common Prayer, which would reflect some of the anxieties the godly had about it, and a greater degree of liturgical flexibility in the future. It would also involve the restoration of Episcopal government, but along the lines proposed by Archbishop Ussher in 1641, in which bishops, whilst preserving their rights to ordain and censure, would act in closer collaboration with their presbyters.

After the Restoration, Gauden worked hard to make this programme a reality, but he was increasingly swimming against the tide. His presentation of Brownrigg had to be revised in order to suit the changing political environment. So Gauden no longer sought to identify Brownrigg with the lost cause of reduced Episcopacy, even though his own support for the idea seems to have been unaffected. He underlined Brownrigg's belief in the Church's authority to impose ceremonies, and upon the people's corresponding duty of obedience. He also chose to let Brownrigg's theological position speak for itself, rather than drawing the reader's attention to it in advance. Even so, it is clear that Gauden was offering Brownrigg as a theological model, as much as a pastoral one. He believed that the restored Church of England should be marked by its commitment to Reformed orthodoxy, and its hostility to both popery and Socinianism.

Gauden's posthumous treatment of Brownrigg is a significant expression of the widely acknowledged Restoration appetite for fighting the battles of the present, using the historiography of the recent past. But it also parallels, in a number of striking ways, John Buckeridge and William Laud's treatment of Lancelot Andrewes, after Andrewes's death in 1626. Buckeridge preached Andrewes's funeral sermon and then masterminded the publication of his sermons. With William Laud, he arranged the sermons in liturgical order, and then dedicated the collection to the King. Gauden did exactly the same for Brownrigg. The same pattern of folio printing, Episcopal editing and royal dedication was followed. In fact, Brownrigg's sermons were not merely dedicated to Charles II, but personally presented to, and received by the Monarch.¹⁵⁹ Brownrigg's sermons therefore received the same degree of official endorsement that Andrewes's had done, thirty years before.¹⁶⁰ With the *XCVI Sermons*, Laud and Buckeridge had been trying to recalibrate the theology of the English Church and distance her from Reformed orthodoxy. With the *Forty Sermons*, Gauden was attempting to steer the Restoration Church away from the theological experiments of the 1630s, and return her to the mainstream of the European Reformed tradition.

¹ Brownrigg's name is often spelt 'Brownrig' notably on the title pages of various printings of his sermons.

² John Gauden, *A Sermon preached in the Temple chapel at the funeral of the Right Reverend Father in God Dr Brownrigg, with an account of his life and death* (London 1660), Epistle Dedicatory.

-
- ³ Thomas Fuller, ed. John Freeman, *The Worthies of England* (London 1952), 540-541.
- ⁴ David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2007), 154.
- ⁵ *ODNB* s.v. ‘Ralph Brownrigg’
- ⁶ Hoyle, *Religious Identity*, 176-177.
- ⁷ Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: the Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2007), 169.
- ⁸ Hoyle, *Religious Identity*, 205
- ⁹ Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain* 3 vols (London 1837), iii 406.
- ¹⁰ *ODNB* s.v. ‘Seth Ward’
- ¹¹ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 285. F.J.Trott, ‘Prelude to Restoration: Laudians, Conformists and the struggle for “Anglicanism” in the 1650s,’ London Ph.D Thesis, 1993, 18-19.
- ¹² Richard Baxter, ed. Matthew Sullivan, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London 1656), 172.
- ¹³ Trott, ‘Prelude to Restoration,’ 18.
- ¹⁴ In 1618, Brownrigg had been reprimanded for maintaining, in private, that a monarch might be resisted under certain circumstances. He was required to recant, and appears not to have flirted with such dangerous ideas again. Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: the construction of a confessional identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2009), 165.
- ¹⁵ *ODNB* s.v. ‘Ralph Brownrigg’
- ¹⁶ John Gauden, *Ἰέρὰ Δάκρυά Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria* (London 1659), 615-616.
- ¹⁷ John Gauden, *A Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, Epistle Dedicatory.
- ¹⁸ Jessica Martin, *Walton’s Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001), 78-82. Anthony Milton, *Laudian*

and royalist polemic in seventeenth-century England: the career and writings of Peter Heylyn (Manchester: Manchester University Press 2007), 197-213. Alan Ford, ““Making dead men speak””: Manipulating the memory of James Ussher’ in eds Mark Williams and Stephen Paul Forrest, *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History, 1600-1800* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2010), 49-69.

¹⁹ Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1600-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006), 96-98. Martin, *Walton’s Lives*, 240-241.

²⁰ Gauden’s portrayal of Brownrigg does not appear, for example, on Martin’s list of ‘godly prototypes’ for Walton’s *Lives*; though Martin underlines that her list is not exhaustive. Martin, *Walton’s Lives*, 68-71.

²¹ Gauden was by no means the only advocate of Reformed orthodoxy within the Restoration Church. Recent scholarship has underlined the continuing presence of Reformed thought within the established Church into the Eighteenth Century. John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, Conn., and London: Yale University Press 1991), 311-313, 315-316. Stephen Hampton, *Anti-Arminians: the Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2008), 266-274. Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: variety, persistence and transformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2011), 205-242.

²² Alan Ford, ““Making dead men speak,”” 49-69.

²³ Ed Thomas Birch, *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe* (7 vols) (London 1742), v, 597-600.

²⁴ Gauden, Ἱέρὰ Δάκρυά, 630-631.

²⁵ Gauden, Ἱέρὰ Δάκρυά, 631.

²⁶ Anthony Milton, *Laudian and royalist polemic*, 174-175.

²⁷ John Gauden, *The religious and loyal protestation of John Gauden* (London 1648), 3.

-
- ²⁸ John Gauden, ‘To the reader’ in Gauden, *Religious and loyal protestation*.
- ²⁹ John Gauden, *Stratoste aiteutikon: A just invective against those of the army and their abettors, who murdered King Charles I* (London 1661)
- ³⁰ Eds Jim Daems and Holly Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Editions 2006), 19.
- ³¹ Robert Wilcher, ‘What was the king’s Book for? The evolution of “Eikon Basilike,”’ *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 21 (1991), 226.
- ³² *Eikon Basilike*, 131.
- ³³ *Eikon Basilike*, 132.
- ³⁴ *Eikon Basilike*, 132.
- ³⁵ *Eikon Basilike*, 131.
- ³⁶ *Eikon Basilike*, 131.
- ³⁷ *Eikon Basilike*, 136.
- ³⁸ *Eikon Basilike*, 139.
- ³⁹ *Eikon Basilike*, 142.
- ⁴⁰ *Eikon Basilike*, 139.
- ⁴¹ *Eikon Basilike*, 155.
- ⁴² *Eikon Basilike*, 155.
- ⁴³ Andrew Lacey, *The cult of King Charles the martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2003), 83.
- ⁴⁴ John Gauden, *Hieraspistes: A defence of the ministry and ministers of the Church of England* (London 1653), 262.
- ⁴⁵ Gauden, *Hieraspistes*, 285.
- ⁴⁶ Gauden, *Hieraspistes*, 276.
- ⁴⁷ Gauden, *Hieraspistes*, 262.
- ⁴⁸ Gauden, *Hieraspistes*, 263.
- ⁴⁹ Gauden, Ἱέρὰ Δάκρυά, 452.

-
- ⁵⁰ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 463. He mentions by name Calvin, Peter Martyr, Bucer, Zanchi, Chemnitz and Gerhard.
- ⁵¹ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 404.
- ⁵² Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 441.
- ⁵³ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 611.
- ⁵⁴ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 448.
- ⁵⁵ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 448.
- ⁵⁶ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 556, 575-576, 600.
- ⁵⁷ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 610.
- ⁵⁸ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 620.
- ⁵⁹ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 622.
- ⁶⁰ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 626.
- ⁶¹ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 628.
- ⁶² Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 627.
- ⁶³ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 398.
- ⁶⁴ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 484.
- ⁶⁵ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 497.
- ⁶⁶ Gauden, *Ἱερά Δάκρυά*, 495.
- ⁶⁷ John Gauden, *A sermon preached in St Paul's Church, London* (London 1660), 101.
- ⁶⁸ Ford, “‘Making dead men speak,’” 55.
- ⁶⁹ Ford, “‘Making dead men speak,’” 55-56.
- ⁷⁰ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 173.
- ⁷¹ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 175.
- ⁷² Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 190.
- ⁷³ Barry Till, ‘The Worcester House declaration and the restoration of the Church of England’, *Historical Research* vol 70 (2002), 207, 210-211.
- ⁷⁴ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 164.

-
- ⁷⁵ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 169-170.
- ⁷⁶ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 228-229
- ⁷⁷ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 171.
- ⁷⁸ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 169.
- ⁷⁹ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 163.
- ⁸⁰ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 164-165.
- ⁸¹ Barry Till, 'The Worcester House declaration,' 209.
- ⁸² I.M.Green, *The re-establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford : Oxford University Press 1978), 89.
- ⁸³ Robert Beddard, 'A reward for services rendered: Charles II and the Restoration bishopric of Worcester, 1660-1663,' *Midland History*, Vol. 29 (2004).
- ⁸⁴ Till, 'The Worcester House declaration,' 212
- ⁸⁵ Till, 'The Worcester House declaration,' 213-218.
- ⁸⁶ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 36
- ⁸⁷ It should be noted that a lack of sympathy for Reformed theology was frequently a particularised issue, and was not directed at Reformed theology in the most general sense. For example, Sheldon and Cosin were both unsympathetic to non-episcopal views of church government and to Reformed understandings of predestination; but Cosin held a broadly Reformed view of sacramental presence.
- ⁸⁸ Ford, "'Making dead men speak,'" 66.
- ⁸⁹ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 38-39.
- ⁹⁰ Richard Baxter, ed. Matthew Sullivan, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London 1696), 363-364.
- ⁹¹ Green, *Re-establishment*, 213. & 217. Robert Bosher, *The making of the Restoration settlement* (London: Dacre Press 1957), 242 & 253
- ⁹² G.J.Cuming, *A history of Anglican liturgy* (London: Macmillan 1969), 161.
- ⁹³ Ibid.
- ⁹⁴ Ford, "'Making dead men speak,'" 67.

⁹⁵ Ford, ““Making dead men speak,”” 68.

⁹⁶ Ralph Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons* (London 1661), Advertisement. Martyn did not stick to his promise, and published a second volume of Brownrigg’s sermons in 1664, dedicating them to the man who had opposed Gauden’s appointment as Bishop of Exeter, Gilbert Sheldon, without a single reference to Gauden. Ralph Brownrigg, *Twenty-five Sermons* (London 1664), Epistle Dedicatory. The *Forty Sermons* were re-published in 1665 and 1685; the *Twenty-five Sermons* in 1674 and 1685. There were also composite editions of all *Sixty-five Sermons* in 1674 and 1686.

⁹⁷ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, ‘To his reverend friend Mr Martyn.’ Gauden had used the Ussher/Hall/Morton triumvirate to make the same point about the Church’s loss in his earlier work. Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 236.

⁹⁸ Gauden had made this point, in his own name, in a pamphlet published earlier in the year. John Gauden, *Considerations touching the liturgy of the Church of England* (London 1661), 37.

⁹⁹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, ‘To his reverend friend Mr Martyn.’

¹⁰⁰ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, ‘To his reverend friend Mr Martyn.’

¹⁰¹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, ‘To his reverend friend Mr Martyn.’

¹⁰² Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, ‘To his reverend friend Mr Martyn.’

¹⁰³ John Gauden, *Joannis Episcopi Exoniensis Consilia* (London 1661), 16 & 25.

¹⁰⁴ Brydon, *Evolving Reputation*, 89.

¹⁰⁵ Barry Till, ‘The Worcester House declaration,’ 224.

¹⁰⁶ Richard Hooker, *Works* (London 1662), VII, vii.

¹⁰⁷ Brydon, *Evolving Reputation*, 101.

¹⁰⁸ Martin, *Walton’s Lives*, 241.

¹⁰⁹ John Gauden, ‘The life and death of Mr Richard Hooker,’ in Hooker, *Works*, 24-25.

¹¹⁰ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 207.

¹¹¹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 88.

-
- ¹¹² Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 244.
- ¹¹³ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 185.
- ¹¹⁴ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 362.
- ¹¹⁵ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 118. Brownrigg had, of course, defended this thesis for his BD in 1621.
- ¹¹⁶ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 404.
- ¹¹⁷ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 405.
- ¹¹⁸ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 256.
- ¹¹⁹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 222.
- ¹²⁰ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 242.
- ¹²¹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 145.
- ¹²² Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 146.
- ¹²³ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 256.
- ¹²⁴ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 105.
- ¹²⁵ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 221.
- ¹²⁶ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 221.
- ¹²⁷ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 132.
- ¹²⁸ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 132.
- ¹²⁹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 427.
- ¹³⁰ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 431.
- ¹³¹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 165.
- ¹³² Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 189.
- ¹³³ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 189.
- ¹³⁴ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 165.
- ¹³⁵ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 43.
- ¹³⁶ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 43-44.
- ¹³⁷ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 186.
- ¹³⁸ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 63.

-
- ¹³⁹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 93
- ¹⁴⁰ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 283.
- ¹⁴¹ Gauden, *Sermon preached in the Temple chapel*, 236.
- ¹⁴² Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 225.
- ¹⁴³ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 233.
- ¹⁴⁴ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 233.
- ¹⁴⁵ Bernard also underlined Ussher's dedication to the Monarch in his *Clavi Trabales*; as Ford puts it, 'The Calvinist Commonwealth sage had become the Anglican Royalist paragon,' Ford, "Making dead men speak," 68.
- ¹⁴⁶ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 18.
- ¹⁴⁷ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 2.
- ¹⁴⁸ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 8.
- ¹⁴⁹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 30.
- ¹⁵⁰ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 15.
- ¹⁵¹ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 28.
- ¹⁵² Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 22.
- ¹⁵³ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 33.
- ¹⁵⁴ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 33.
- ¹⁵⁵ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 54.
- ¹⁵⁶ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 34.
- ¹⁵⁷ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 34.
- ¹⁵⁸ Brownrigg, *Forty Sermons*, 40.
- ¹⁵⁹ John Gauden, *Twenty Five Sermons*, Dedicatory Epistle.
- ¹⁶⁰ Peter McCullough, 'Making dead men speak: Laudianism, print, and the works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-1642,' *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (1998), 410.