

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN
EARLY MODERN BRITISH HISTORY



Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity

A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum

CAMBRIDGE

Nicholas D. Jackson

CAMBRIDGE

www.cambridge.org/9780521870061

This page intentionally left blank

Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity

This is the first full account of one of the most famous quarrels of the seventeenth century, that between the philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) and the Anglican archbishop of Armagh, John Bramhall (1594–1663). This analytical narrative interprets that quarrel within its own immediate and complicated historical circumstances, the Civil Wars (1638–1649) and Interregnum (1649–1660). The personal clash of Hobbes and Bramhall is connected to the broader conflict, disorder, violence, dislocation and exile that characterised those periods. This monograph offers not only the first comprehensive narrative of their hostilities over two decades, but also an illuminating analysis of aspects of their private and public quarrel that have been neglected in previous biographical, historical and philosophical accounts, with special attention devoted to their dispute over political and religious authority. This will be essential reading for scholars of early modern British history, religious history and the history of ideas.

NICHOLAS D. JACKSON was a University Fellow at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, from 1997 to 2005.

Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History

Series editors

ANTHONY FLETCHER

Emeritus Professor of English Social History, University of London

JOHN GUY

Fellow, Clare College, Cambridge

JOHN MORRILL

*Professor of British and Irish History, University of Cambridge, and
Fellow, Selwyn College*

This is a series of monographs and studies covering many aspects of the history of the British Isles between the late fifteenth century and the early eighteenth century. It includes the work of established scholars and pioneering work by a new generation of scholars. It includes both reviews and revisions of major topics and books which open up new historical terrain or which reveal startling new perspectives on familiar subjects. All the volumes set detailed research into our broader perspectives, and the books are intended for the use of students as well as of their teachers.

For a list of titles in the series, see end of book.

HOBBS, BRAMHALL
AND THE POLITICS
OF LIBERTY AND
NECESSITY

A Quarrel of the Civil Wars
and Interregnum

NICHOLAS D. JACKSON



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521870061

© Nicholas D. Jackson 2007

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2007

ISBN-13 978-0-511-35448-9 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-10 0-511-35448-7 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-87006-1 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-87006-2 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

It was . . . the seditious tenets of Mr Hobbes, and such like, which opened a large window to our troubles. . . . They are T. H. his own principles . . . which do serve to involve nations in civil wars.

John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh (1594–1663) (*BW*, iv, 219, 391)

He [Bramhall] further says that ‘just laws are the ordinances of right reason’; which is an error that hath cost many thousands of men their lives.

Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury (1588–1679) (*EW*, v, 176)

All books of controversies should be writ in Latin, that none but the learned may read them, and that there should be no disputations but in schools, lest it breed factions amongst the vulgar, for disputations and controversies are a kind of civil war, maintained by the pen, and often draw out the sword after.

William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle (1592–1676)
(*Life of Cavendish*, 125)

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	page ix
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Note on dates and style</i>	xvii
Introduction	1
1 Bishop Bramhall, the ‘Great Arminian’, ‘Irish Canterbury’ and ‘Most Unsound Man in Ireland’, 1633–1641	21
2 Bishop Bramhall, the Earl of Newcastle, Thomas Hobbes and the First English Civil War	40
3 Hobbes’s flight to France, <i>De Cive</i> and the beginning of the quarrel with Bramhall, summer 1645	68
4 An epistolary skirmish, 1645–1646: Bramhall’s ‘Discourse’, Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ and Bramhall’s ‘Vindication’	100
5 Bramhall and the royalist schemes of 1646–1650	125
6 Hobbes and <i>Leviathan</i> among the exiles, 1646–1651	146
7 The public quarrel: Hobbes, <i>Of Liberty and Necessity</i> , 1654, Bramhall, <i>Defence of True Liberty</i> , 1655 and Hobbes, <i>Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance</i> , 1656	180
8 <i>Castigations of Hobbes’s Animadversions</i> and <i>The Catching of Leviathan</i> , 1657–1658: Hobbes as Leviathan of Leviathans	220
9 The Restoration and death of Bramhall and Hobbes’s last word, 1668	250
Conclusion	276
<i>Bibliography</i>	305
<i>Index</i>	323

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No reader of this book's footnotes will be able to overlook my debt to dozens of scholars. Here, however, I would like to specify those to whom my gratitude is especially great. For my understanding of Bramhall's career in Ireland in the 1630s I am much indebted to John McCafferty. He allowed me to read a draft of his article on Bramhall for the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Like so many others who have studied Hobbes in the last decade, my debt to Noel Malcolm is considerable. I thank Nicholas Tyacke, whose scholarship was enormously helpful in sketching the arminian-calvinist context of the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel. Similarly, I would like to express gratitude to Lisa Sarasohn, whose work on Hobbes and Newcastle proved a good guide. All of the following scholars either answered queries, shared sources and unpublished writings, supplied images or offered advice and encouragement. Some of them did all of the above. They are: Marika Keblusek, Jack Cunningham, Thomas Pink, David Smith, Anthony Milton, Nicole Greenspan, David Sturdy, Nicholas Rogers and Jeffrey Collins. While I have disagreed with the latter in some points, his meticulous Hobbes scholarship has served as a model for my own. Early in this publishing venture, John Morrill's support and enthusiasm inspired diligent revision. I also thank the Press's anonymous reader who offered trenchant criticism and constructive suggestions for revision. At Cambridge I was fortunate to have been managed by a talented editor, Michael Watson. His nudging was always experienced as charm for the grace with which it was applied.

This book began as a dissertation. While it was still in that form it benefited from the reading of several historians at Syracuse University. For their perusal and criticism I thank Ralph Ketcham, Chris Kyle and Pamela Edwards. I am even more indebted to one of their fellow examiners, Gordon Schochet. His exceptional generosity began when he agreed to serve as a member of my dissertation committee. Not deserving that, I have been even more undeserving of all the subsequent attention he has paid to my work. My acquaintance with Dr Schochet has allowed me to understand how sincerely Hobbes must have thanked patrons like the Cavendishes.

One of the more powerful incentives to publish a book is to obtain the opportunity to thank in public all those who have sustained the writer over many years of toil. I am heavily indebted to an advisor and mentor who has also proved a friend. I thank Joseph Levine not only for his critical tenacity while this was still being written as a dissertation (and before that, a seminar paper), but equally, more generally, for all the personal guidance and care I did not deserve as his graduate student. My gratitude to him is especially great for supporting me on all those occasions when even I would not support myself. My family, too, has supported me many times when I was thoroughly undeserving. I thank Brandon and Mary Jackson, whose hospitality and generosity at Little Spigot in West Witton allowed me to research Bramhall's career in Yorkshire. To another aunt, Gillian White, and her family in London, I am even more indebted. While my gratitude to her, Deborah, Jonathan, and Daniel is manifold, they shall be most amused for thanking them for pretending that I was not mad to be devoting most of my existence to resuscitating a dead man from Pontefract named John Bramhall. In the same way I must thank all my siblings (JJKLNSSMSBG) who have, for so long, suffered a scholar so gladly.

Lastly, and the opposite of leastly, I thank my parents. It would be no exaggeration to say that they have been this book's and this author's *sine qua non*. During its entire existence, first as a dissertation, then as a manuscript, finally as a typescript, this book has benefited from my father's historical acumen, critical scrutiny and editorial prowess. I wish many others knew what he knows: that such a description only scrapes the surface. Likewise, any description of the love and support my mother has provided would be absurdly insufficient. To state all the things for which I am indebted to my parents would be as difficult – and long – as was the writing of this book. Like all those who cannot find satisfactory words to express gratitude, I dedicate this book to them.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Advice to Charles II* = William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, *Ideology and Politics on the Eve of Restoration: Newcastle's Advice to Charles II*, ed. Thomas P. Slaughter (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984).
- AH = John Vesey, 'Athanasius Hibernicus: or, The Life of the Most Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland' in *Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D. D., late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland* (Dublin, 1676), i–xliv.
- 'An Answer' = Hobbes, 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall', *EW*, iv, 283–384.
- Answer to Milletière* = Bramhall, *An Answer to M. de la Milletière, his impertinent Dedication of his imaginary Triumph (entitled 'The Victory of Truth')*, or his *Epistle to the King of Great Britain King Charles II*, *BW*, I, 7–81.
- Anti-White* = Hobbes, *Thomas White's 'De Mundo' Examined*, trans. Harold Whitmore Jones (London: Bradford University Press, 1976).
- Athenae Oxonienses* = Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Phillip Bliss (London, 1813–20; 4 vols.).
- Aubrey, *Brief Lives* = John Aubrey, *Brief Lives, Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, Between the Years 1669 & 1696*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford, 1898; 2 vols.).
- Baillie, *Letters and Journals* = Robert Baillie, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1841–2; 3 vols.).
- Behemoth* = Hobbes, *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, ed. Ferdinand Toennies (1889); intro. Stephen Holmes (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

Bodl. = Bodleian Library, Oxford University.

BL = British Library, London.

Brief View = Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *A Brief View and Survey of the Dangerous and Pernicious Errors to Church and State, in Mr Hobbes's Book Entitled Leviathan* (Oxford, 1676).

BW = *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall*, ed. A. W. Haddan (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842–5; 5 vols.).

Carte = *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers, concerning the Affairs of England, from the Year 1641 to 1660, found among the Duke of Ormonde's Papers*, ed. Thomas Carte (London: James Bettenham, 1739; 2 vols.).

Castigations = Bramhall, *Castigations of Mr Hobbes his Last Animadversions in the Case concerning Liberty and Universal Necessity; wherein all his exceptions about the controversy are fully satisfied*, BW, IV, 197–506.

Catching = Bramhall, *The Catching of Leviathan, or the Great Whale*, BW, IV, 507–97.

CCSP = *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library*, eds. O. Ogle, W. H. Bliss, W. D. Macray and F. J. Routledge (Oxford: Clarendon, 1869–1970; 5 vols.).

CD = *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, ed. S. R. Gardiner (3rd edn, Oxford: Clarendon, 1906).

CJ = Journals of the House of Commons.

CJI = Journals of the House of Commons, Ireland.

Clarendon, *History of Rebellion* = Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. D. Macray (Oxford: Clarendon, 1888; 6 vols.).

Considerations = Hobbes, *Considerations upon the Reputation, Loyalty, Manners, and Religion of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*, EW, IV, 409–40.

Corr. = *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Noel Malcolm (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994; 2 vols.).

CSP = Calendar of State Papers.

CSPD = Calendar of State Papers, Domestic.

CSPI = Calendar of State Papers, Ireland.

DC = Hobbes, *De Cive, On the Citizen*, trans. Michael Silverthorne, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Defence = Bramhall, *A Defence of True Liberty from Antecedent and Extrinsic Necessity, being an answer to a late book of Mr Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, entitled, A Treatise of Liberty of Liberty and Necessity*, BW, IV, 3–196.

Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student = Hobbes, *A Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student, of the Common Laws of England*, ed. Joseph Cropsey (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971).

‘Discourse’ = Bramhall, ‘A Treatise of Liberty and Necessity upon Occasion of Some Opinions of Thomas Hobbes about these’, BW, IV, 3–196.

DNB = *Dictionary of National Biography*, eds. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (London, 1885–1900; 63 vols.).

Elements of Law = Hobbes, *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic/Human Nature and De Corpore Politico*, ed. J. C. A. Gaskin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Evelyn, Diary and Correspondence = *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S., to which is subjoined The Private Correspondence between King Charles I and Sir Edward Nicholas and between Sir Edward Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon and Sir Richard Browne*, ed. William Bray (London: George Bell & Sons, 1906; 4 vols.).

EW = *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*, ed. William Molesworth (London: J. Bohn, 1839–45; 11 vols.).

Fair Warning = Bramhall, *A Fair Warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline, as being of all others most injurious to the Civil Magistrate, most oppressive to the Subject, most pernicious to both*, BW, III, 237–87.

HJ = *Historical Journal*.

HMC Cowper = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (12), Appendix, Part II, on the Manuscripts of Earl Cowper, K. G., preserved at Melbourne Hall, Derbyshire*, vol. II (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888).

HMC Hastings, IV = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (78) on the Manuscripts of the late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, Esq., of the*

- Manor House, Ashby de la Zouch*, vol. iv, ed. Francis Bickley (London: HMSO, 1947).
- HMC Ormonde(a), I = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (14), Appendix, Part VII: The Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, preserved at the Castle, Kilkenny*, vol. I, ed. John T. Gilbert (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895).
- HMC Ormonde(b), I = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K. P., preserved at Kilkenny Castle, New Series*, vol. I, ed. C. Litton Falkiner (London: Mackie and Co., 1902).
- HMC Pepys = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (70) on the Pepys Manuscripts, preserved at Magdalene College, Cambridge*, ed. E. K. Purnell (London: HMSO, 1911).
- HMC Portland, I = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (13) on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, vol. I, ed. F. H. Blackburne Daniell (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891).
- HMC Portland, II = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (13) on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, vol. II, ed. F. H. Blackburne Daniell (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1893).
- HMC Portland, III = *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (13) on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, vol. III, ed. Richard Ward (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894).
- HPT = *History of Political Thought*.
- JBS = *Journal of British Studies*.
- Just Vindication* = Bramhall, *A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Aspersion of Criminal Schism*, BW, I, 83–279.
- Lev. = Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Edwin Curley (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994).
- Life of Cavendish* = Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, to which is added the True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life* (London: A. Maxwell, 1667; ed. Charles H. Firth. 2nd rev. edn. London: Routledge and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton, n.d.).

LJI = Journals of the House of Lords, Ireland.

Marks of an Absurd Geometry = Hobbes, *Marks of an Absurd Geometry, Rural Language, Scottish Church Politics, and Barbarisms of John Wallis, Professor of Geometry and Doctor of Divinity*, EW, vii, 357–428.

Nicholas Papers = *The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State*, ed. G. F. Warner (Camden Society, 1886–1920; 4 vols.).

NYCRO = North Yorkshire County Record Office (Northallerton).

ODNB = *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eds. H. C. G. Matthew and B. H. Harrison (Oxford and New York: Oxford University, 2004; 60 vols.).

OL = *Thomae Hobbes Malmesburiensis Opera Philosophica quae Latine scripsit omnia*, ed. William Molesworth (London: J. Bohn, 1839–45; 5 vols.).

OLN = Hobbes, *Of Liberty and Necessity: A Treatise, Wherein All Controversy Concerning Predestination, Election, Free-Will, Grace, Merits, Reprobation, &c is fully decided and cleared; in answer to a treatise written by the Bishop of Londonderry, on the same subject*, EW, iv, 229–78.

Pell-Cavendish = *John Pell (1611–1685) and His Correspondence with Sir Charles Cavendish: The Mental World of an Early Modern Mathematician*, eds. Noel Malcolm and Jacqueline Stedall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

PRO = Public Record Office, London.

PRONI = Public Record Office of Northern Ireland.

Questions = Hobbes, *The Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance Clearly Stated and Debated between Dr Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, and Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*, EW, v.

Rawdon Papers = *The Rawdon Papers, consisting of Letters on Various Subjects, Literary, Political, and Ecclesiastical, to and from Dr John Bramhall, Primate of Ireland, including the Correspondence of Several Most Eminent Men During the Greater Part of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Edward Berwick (London and Dublin: John Nichols and Son and R. Milliken, 1819).

- Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon* = Bramhall, *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon's Survey of the Vindication of the Church of England from Criminous Schism, with an appendix in answer to the exceptions of S. W.*, BW, II, 1–335.
- Rushworth = John Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (London, 1659–1701; 7 vols.).
- SC = *The Stuart Constitution*, 2nd edn, J. P. Kenyon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- Schism Guarded* = Bramhall, *Schism Guarded and Beaten Back upon the Right Owners*, BW, II, 339–646.
- Serpent-Salve* = Bramhall, *The Serpent-Salve, or, A Remedy for the Biting of an Asp*, BW, III, 291–496.
- Six Lessons* = Hobbes, *Six Lessons to the Professors of the Mathematics, One of Geometry, the Other of Astronomy, in the Chairs set up by the Noble and Learned Sir Henry Savile, in the University of Oxford*, EW, VII, 181–356.
- Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon' = Jeremy Taylor, *A Sermon preached in Christ's Church, Dublin, July 16, 1663; At the funeral of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland*, BW, I, xxxix–lxxvi.
- Thurloe State Papers* = *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. T. Birch (London, 1742; 7 vols.).
- 'Treatise' = Hobbes, 'A Treatise of Liberty and Necessity', EW, IV, 239–78.
- 'Vindication' = Bramhall, 'A Vindication of True Liberty from Antecedent and Extrinsecal Necessity', BW, IV, 3–196.
- Vindication of Episcopal Clergy* = Bramhall, *Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery*, BW, III, 499–586.
- Wing = *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England . . . 1641–1700*, 2nd edn, ed. Donald Wing (New York, 1972–88).
- Works of Laud* = William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud*, eds. J. Bliss and W. Scott (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847–60; 7 vols.).

NOTE ON DATES AND STYLE

All dates are in Old Style (O.S., Julian), except that the year is taken to begin 1 January, rather than 25 March. However, in many cases I also give the date New Style (N.S., Gregorian), especially in the case of correspondence in which one or both writers were in Europe.

With rare (and obvious) exception, quotations of both seventeenth-century book-titles and texts have been silently modernised.

Derry refers either to the county or diocese of the anglican church in Ireland; Londonderry refers only to the town.

INTRODUCTION

Historians may know that sometime in the seventeenth century the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes debated John Bramhall, Bishop of Derry. But where and what did they debate? And why did they debate the issues they did? It is not difficult to find brief descriptions or summaries of their public debate on free-will; this book provides the first comprehensive account not only of that debate, but also of their private quarrel and hostile relations during both the Wars of the Three Kingdoms and Interregnum. Hobbes and Bramhall argued about much more than ‘liberty’ and ‘necessity’ (free-will and determinism), and the following account offers a detailed historical explanation of their debating those and other issues. By situating their long and acrimonious, private and public, dispute within its contemporary context we may come to view the whole quarrel as a by-product or collateral intellectual skirmish of those rebellions and wars in the British Isles. We can also come to understand exactly what stakes they were playing for: what would a victory in the dispute mean to themselves, their friends and their audience? Although the clash of arms in their homeland was quite destructive, it was also productive of such contests of wit as the uncivil war of words between Hobbes and Bramhall that began across the Channel.

In the summer of 1645, during the First English Civil War, Hobbes and Bramhall met in Paris, at the lodgings of their mutual acquaintance, the recently retired Cavalier general, the Marquess of Newcastle. Perhaps it was just as they were all finishing dinner that the nobleman sparked a discussion of free-will. The discussion quickly turned into an argument. And shortly after this personal meeting, Hobbes and Bramhall took up the argument by pen. This epistolary quarrel remained a private one until Hobbes’s paper was published in London in 1654. This publication immediately incited a battle of books. But while many commentators have described this private and public quarrel as simply one of philosophy and theology, I argue that it was much more than that. In the first place, it is very misleading to refer to their debate on free-will as merely philosophical or theological, for in mid-seventeenth-century England (and Europe) that issue was frequently

intertwined with politics, that is, matters of concern to governments. From as early as the 1620s, one could, for example, be denounced in parliament as ‘popish’, that is, unpatriotic or treasonous, for subscribing to such doctrine. At least for some Englishmen, to assert the doctrine of free-will was to assert the distinctive doctrine of ‘arminianism’. And arminianism was, in turn, just a half-step from ‘popery’; it was crypto- or quasi-popery.¹ And popery was, of course, the religion of the Habsburgs, Bourbons and other rival continental powers – the religion of the enemy. Conversely, to deny free-will and assert predestination (theological determinism) was, in the eyes of other Englishmen, to betray one’s ‘puritanism’, which was, in its turn, also to betray a seditious and rebellious tendency. As Samuel Brooke, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, remarked in 1630: ‘Predestination is the root of Puritanism . . . and Puritanism the root of all rebellions and disobedient intractableness in parliaments . . . and all schism and sauciness in the country, nay in the Church itself.’² Thus, what many of us in the twenty-first century might regard as merely a theological position could readily be taken for a political one in seventeenth-century England. Secondly, alongside but also intertwined with the quarrel over free-will were several other separate (or separable) disputes about Christianity, law and government. Indeed, Hobbes and Bramhall took up several of the most controversial issues of the day: the nature of sovereignty and law; the government of England; the definition and nature of the church of England; and the nature of and relationship between religious and political authority. It is my contention that their most personal and bitter disagreement concerned the latter: political and religious authority. Hobbes held that all authority in a commonwealth resided in and flowed from the civil sovereign. Thus, even religious (or ‘spiritual’ or ‘ecclesiastical’) authority was wholly derived from and subordinate to that sovereign. Bramhall disagreed. He insisted that there was religious authority *not* derived from the sovereign, but from Christ immediately; that there was ‘divine’ (or ‘spiritual’) authority that did not come from the civil sovereign. This disagreement concerning religious authority was exposed especially clearly in the question of episcopacy.

¹ ‘To the extent that Popery was seen as synonymous with Arminianism this was because the teachings on predestination by the Council of Trent were so similar.’ Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530–1700* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 227. The fourth canon established in the sixth session of that council declared that the will of a created agent, operated on by divine grace, may resist that grace if the agent so chooses. Robert Sleigh, Jr, Vere Chappell and Michael Della Rocca, ‘Determinism and Human Freedom’ in *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 2 vols.), II, 1203.

² As quoted in Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 57.

Modern observers of their stubborn disagreement over episcopacy may wonder why it exercised them so much. What did it matter whether episcopacy were by divine right (*jure divino*) or not? If it were not by divine right, if it were merely by *human* right – a human contrivance or institution – then it could, like all things human, be altered or abolished as men thought fit.³ On the other hand, if episcopacy – the order of bishops in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland – were by *divine* right, it could not be altered or abolished.⁴ In the latter case, only God himself could rescind it: those who would alter or abolish it would be defying God. Thus, by asserting episcopacy *jure divino*, Bramhall was effectively preserving that order to which he belonged. On the other hand, by denying episcopacy to rest on such authority Hobbes was rendering it vulnerable to abolition. By implication he was hazarding the privileged status of Bramhall, the bishop of Derry. Hobbes was trying to persuade his contemporaries – not least sovereigns like the Stuart princes – that if they were to dispense with episcopacy they would not be defying God’s will. They would only be dispensing with a certain human arrangement that had become inconvenient. Abolishing episcopacy would be tantamount to repealing a tax that had become unpopular or impractical.

Yet Hobbes insisted in more than one of his published writings that he was opposed only to episcopacy *jure divino*; that is, that he had never had any qualms with episcopacy, so long as it was by the civil sovereign’s authority (*jure civili*). For example, in the dedication of *Problemata Physica* (1662), an epistle addressed to King Charles II, Hobbes claimed that in *Leviathan* (1651) he had written ‘nihil . . . contra episcopatum’ (‘nothing . . . against episcopacy’).⁵ However much one would like to credit this claim, there is no denying that Hobbes wrote a letter to the third earl of Devonshire in the summer of 1641 in which he expressly condoned the replacement of an episcopal by a quasi-presbyterian church organisation of lay commissioners.⁶

³ As Bramhall stated in an answer to a book by the presbyterian Richard Baxter: ‘Against divine right there is no prescription, but against human right men may lawfully challenge their ancient liberties and immunities by prescription.’ ‘For whatsoever is constituted by human right may be repealed by human right.’ *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, *BW*, III, 548, 551. On another occasion, when writing against the English Roman catholic, John Sergeant, Bramhall made the same point: ‘human institutions may be changed by human authority’. *Schism Guarded*, *BW*, II, 386. Hobbes once expressed concern about the troublesome consequences of regarding a divine command as merely *jus humanum*. Hobbes to Mr Glen, 6/16 Apr. 1636, *Corr.*, I, 30.

⁴ As Hobbes’s older contemporary and sometime associate John Selden observed: ‘The Church runs to *jus divinum*, lest if they should acknowledge [that] what they have, they held by positive [merely human] law, it might be as well taken from them as it was given them.’ *The Table Talk of John Selden*, ed. Frederick Pollock (London: Quaritch, 1927), 61.

⁵ *Problemata Physica*, *OL*, IV, 302; trans. as ‘Seven Philosophical Problems’ (1682), *EW*, VII, 5.

⁶ This letter is quoted and discussed in chapter 3.

Furthermore, the tenability of Hobbes's implied distinction between episcopacy and episcopacy *jure divino* may be regarded as dubious. What exactly would episcopacy be if divested of its divine-apostolical origin, character and sanction? One might argue that episcopacy without the *jure divino* was just a hierarchical arrangement of the church within the state. Thus, where Hobbes insisted that he only rejected episcopacy *jure divino*, we can understand why at least some of his contemporaries thought him disingenuous. At all events, we should take with a pinch of salt Hobbes's claim that he never wrote against episcopacy. Bramhall, at least, would have found that preposterous. Indeed, for Bramhall, if not also for many of his contemporaries, there was no episcopacy without the *jure divino*. In attacking episcopacy *jure divino* – as merely a remnant of 'popery' in the church of England – Hobbes was, willy-nilly, echoing or reinforcing a puritan equation of episcopacy and popery. Unwittingly or not, Hobbes was associating himself with the adversaries and critics, not the supporters, of the regime of Charles I and Archbishop Laud (and Bramhall).

Bramhall strenuously objected to Hobbes's caesaro-papist maxim that: 'True religion consisteth in obedience to Christ's lieutenants, and in giving God such honour, both in attributes and actions, as they in their several lieutenancies shall ordain.'⁷ Bramhall insisted that by making civil sovereigns Christ's lieutenants Hobbes had effectively perverted the relationship between religion and politics. As Bramhall was to put it, Hobbes had made 'policy to be the building, and religion the hangings, which must be fashioned just according to the proportion of the policy; and not . . . making religion to be the building, and policy the hangings, which must be conformed to religion'.⁸ But to concentrate on Bramhall's metaphor (a metaphor taken, curiously, from the presbyterian Thomas Cartwright) of 'building' and 'hangings', or 'policy' and 'religion' in the abstract, is to risk being distracted from the consequence that to render religion the 'building' instead of the 'hangings' – that is, to give the priority to 'religion' over 'policy' – would be in effect to make bishops (not excluding Bramhall) more powerful, and the civil sovereign to the same degree less powerful. At least for Hobbes, this was the clericalist import of arranging the 'building' and 'hangings' according to Bramhall's prescription. As a bishop, as a religious authority, the priority of 'religion' would logically make Bramhall more important than laymen, whether MPs or the king. As a layman, the king did not, after all, hold the 'keys', the power 'to loose and to bind', that is, to mediate

⁷ This aphorism recalls the formula of the Peace of Augsburg, 1555: *cuius regio, eius religio*. Insofar as this formula is 'erastian' Hobbes may be styled thus. The best recent discussion of Hobbes's erastianism is Jeffrey Collins, *The Allegiance of Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 11–57.

⁸ *Catching, BW*, iv, 596–7.

salvation. This is what bothered Hobbes so much: that by Bramhall's doctrine, the churchmen would ultimately be superior at least in this one way – a not inconsiderable way, if eternal life is reckoned infinitely greater than a mere three-score-and-ten.⁹ Hobbes's primary concern in denying episcopacy *jure divino* (as opposed to *jure civili*) was to deprive the clergy of the power of making subjects disobey the civil sovereign. Obedience to the ecclesiastic and disobedience to the civil sovereign would destroy the state: 'it is impossible a commonwealth should stand where any other than the sovereign hath a power of giving greater rewards than life, and of inflicting greater punishments than death'.¹⁰ If bishops had an authority *jure divino*, then a subject would need to be quite concerned about disobeying the bishops: by disobeying the latter he could be disobeying God and, thus, imperiling his salvation. As Hobbes argued most emphatically in *Leviathan*, this fear had often been, and could still be, exploited by clergy to make subjects disobey the civil sovereign. The civil sovereign might be able to command subjects to disobey the ecclesiastic on pain of imprisonment or death, but the ecclesiastic could command subjects to disobey the civil sovereign on pain of damnation. This would give the latter equal or more power over subjects. By denying them their divine right, Hobbes was denying them their power of determining damnation. By impugning the *jus divinum* of the ecclesiastic, Hobbes was attempting to deprive the ecclesiastic of his power to control the behaviour of subjects who would, otherwise, be concerned to obey the ecclesiastic, for fear of damnation. However much Bramhall and other bishops might have disclaimed their vested interest or mercenary motive in maintaining episcopacy *jure divino*, and however much they might have denied their wish to occupy an exalted position within society, Hobbes drew attention to these implications of their doctrine concerning spiritual authority: that they themselves would have an importance that went beyond that of the civil sovereign. By the same token, Bramhall noticed that the implication of Hobbes's rejection of this doctrine rendered the lay philosopher equal to the clergy. As Hobbes clearly thought that he had more 'reason' and 'science' than the clergy, Bramhall perceived that the philosopher was effectively placing himself above them. If Bramhall was 'selfishly' trying to maintain his own power by episcopacy *jure divino*, Hobbes was 'selfishly' trying to obtain

⁹ George Downname, Bramhall's episcopal predecessor at Derry, expressed this point in a 1608 sermon: because the custodians of the 'keys' were the brokers of salvation, 'the ministry in dignity doth excel the magistracy'. Quoted in Charles W. A. Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 14. Hobbes acknowledged eternal life to be greater than three-score-and-ten: 'Now seeing eternal life is a greater reward than the life present' and conceded that only a fool would choose the latter at the expense of the former. *Lev.*, xxxviii, xlili, 301, 398.

¹⁰ *Lev.*, xxxviii, 301.

some of that power by impugning episcopacy *jure divino* – and asserting the superiority of *his* rationality.

Again and again Hobbes repeated his contention that episcopacy *jure divino*, or any other pretence that allowed some kind of authority independent of the civil sovereign, undermined the civil sovereign's authority, and, thus, the state. But had this happened in the case of Charles I and the pretentious anglican bishops? Had the maintenance of this doctrine by bishops of the church of England undermined the authority of Charles I? Upon even superficial examination, it would be hard to allow Hobbes's claim much merit. For such churchmen as Laud and Bramhall never swerved from loyalty and submission to Charles I. They never defied him or cited episcopacy *jure divino* against him.¹¹ In the 1630s Bramhall had argued vehemently in a session of the court of the Irish high commission that the clergy were very 'useful to the ends of government and the security of princes and states'.¹² Events were to prove that Laud and his episcopal brethren were very good subjects indeed.¹³ In fact, some subjects complained that many Laudian churchmen were, in effect, mere sycophants and irresponsible advocates and propagandists of tyranny.¹⁴ In making the claim that episcopacy *jure divino* and the king's royal supremacy in religion could not stand together, Hobbes was, in

¹¹ Here I mean by 'Laudians' simply those who maintained episcopacy *jure divino*. For a convincing argument that under the early Stuarts the theory of episcopacy *jure divino* was not regarded as a diminution of the civil sovereign's royal supremacy in religious matters, that is, that episcopacy *jure divino* and royal supremacy were considered perfectly compatible, see J. P. Sommerville, 'The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy "Jure Divino", 1603–1640', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34, 4 (1983): 548–58. On the mutual reinforcement of the doctrines of episcopacy *jure divino* and monarchy *jure divino*, see J. H. M. Salmon, 'Catholic Resistance Theory, Ultramontanism, and the Royalist Response, 1580–1620' in *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 247. For royal supremacy and the Tudors, see Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1969), 19–114, and 'Churchmen and the Royal Supremacy' in *Church and Society in England: Henry VIII–James I*, eds. Felicity Heal and Rosemary O'Day (Hamden: Archon, 1977), 15–34; R. E. Head, *Royal Supremacy and the Trials of the Bishops, 1558–1725* (London: SPCK, 1962), 1–36, and E. T. Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950); for the development of arguments for episcopacy *jure divino* in the late 1580s, starting with John Bridges, see Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 90–7; for the 1590s, see *ibid.*, 220–5.

¹² Vesey, AH, xx. Similarly, Bramhall was to observe in a writing of the early 1650s that one of the ends of 'ecclesiastical discipline' was 'to preserve public peace and tranquility, to retain subjects in due obedience'. *Just Vindication*, BW, 1, 190.

¹³ For Laud's complete adherence to the king's supremacy in religious matters, see Jeffrey Collins, 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy', *Church History* 68, 3 (1999): 550–5.

¹⁴ Similarly, as Tyacke has observed: '[D]uring the Personal Rule absolutism and Arminianism [associated with Laudians] became closely identified in the popular mind.' *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 151.

fact, echoing puritans. In a sermon published in 1609, the puritan (congregationalist) Henry Jacob had attacked episcopacy thus: ‘Wherein they [the bishops] greatly prejudice your imperial crown: so they offer no mean indignity and injury to the temporal state, by intercepting and seizing upon the magistracy . . . usurping upon the supremacy of the civil magistrate, in whose power only it resteth to enact and ordain laws ecclesiastical.’¹⁵ Hobbes was employing the stratagem of papists as well as puritans: ‘Opponents of the established Church found it a useful polemical ploy to allege that [Royal] Supremacy and divine right episcopacy were incompatible. Both Catholics and extreme Protestants made this allegation.’¹⁶ Bramhall might at any time have pointed out that in subverting episcopacy *jure divino* Hobbes was effectively supporting the papists; in slandering episcopacy *jure divino* as ‘popish’ Hobbes was, ironically, validating their position:

They take their aim much amiss who look upon Episcopacy as a branch of Popery, or a device of the Bishop of Rome to advance his own greatness. Whereas the contrary is most certain, that the Pope is the greatest impugner of Bishops, and the Papacy itself sprung from the unjust usurpation of their just rights. Let it be once admitted, that Bishops are by Divine right, and instantly all his dispensations, and reservations, and exemptions, and indulgences, and his conclave of Cardinals, and the whole Court of Rome, shrink to nothing.¹⁷

Was Hobbes aware of the polemical company he was keeping with seditious papists and puritans? Bramhall, at least, seems to have detected the affinity. As I will argue, most fully in chapters 2 and 3, by not arguing in favour of the controversial doctrines and discipline of Charles’s bishops in the *Elements of Law* (1640) and *De Cive* (1642), Hobbes conspicuously failed to support Charles himself.

Whether Hobbes was aware of the fact or not, in his quarrel with Bramhall he associated himself with critics and enemies of the king’s government. He did this by his positions on two key (and related) questions: episcopacy and free-will. By impugning episcopacy *jure divino* and by arguing that such episcopacy subverted royal supremacy, Hobbes was echoing ‘disaffected’ members of the Long Parliament, some of whom were aiming at the abolition

¹⁵ Quoted in Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 136.

¹⁶ Sommerville, ‘Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy’, 556. Further, as Sommerville shrewdly observes: ‘Puritans used the allegation that the Royal Supremacy was incompatible with *jure divino* episcopacy not only to tar the bishops with the brush of sedition, but also to exculpate themselves from the charge that in attacking the bishops they were indirectly attacking the king.’

¹⁷ *Just Vindication*, BW, I, 189. Making the point succinctly in a slightly later writing, Bramhall asserted: ‘Episcopal rights and Papal claims are inconsistent.’ *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, BW, III, 529; see also *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 492; *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*, BW, II, 69. The papacy had rejected the doctrine of episcopacy *jure divino* as subversive at the Council of Trent.

of episcopacy altogether. Those MPs had also argued that episcopacy *jure divino* was not scripturally sound (only a ‘popish’ rag), and that it was incompatible with the king’s royal supremacy. In charging Bramhall with derogating from the royal supremacy by episcopacy *jure divino*, Hobbes would be echoing one of the charges that parliament had brought against Laud. Among the fourteen articles against that controversial archbishop, the sixth claimed that he had ‘traitorously assumed to himself . . . power . . . to the disinheritment of the Crown, dishonour of his Majesty and derogation of his supreme authority in ecclesiastical matters’.¹⁸ As for free-will, Hobbes’s contemptuous rejection of the idea inevitably associated him with those who had denounced it as ‘arminian’ and ‘popish’ doctrine. In light of this, one way of reading Hobbes’s attack upon Bramhall is as an echo of Prynne’s and Pym’s attacks upon Laud. Thus, from a close study of Hobbes’s quarrel with Bramhall, the philosopher emerges as no friend of the church as it was established under Charles I. And this alone may lead us to wonder whether we should consider Hobbes much of a royalist. Are we to call him a royalist who evinced no support for Charles I’s religious regime? Ought we to call him (or anyone else) a royalist who revealed no sympathy for the ecclesiastical establishment for which (at least partially) the king was to die?¹⁹ As I shall emphasise in subsequent chapters, we can discern the irony that in the case of Charles I, Hobbes failed to follow his own caesaro-papist maxim about conforming to the religion of the sovereign. While the ‘clericalist’ king had favoured arminians, and affirmed episcopacy *jure divino*, Hobbes maintained a thoroughly anti-arminian and anti-episcopacy *jure divino* position. Thus, it would seem that he deviated quite considerably from the religion of his (putative) sovereign.

What Hobbes does not seem to have appreciated was that episcopacy *jure divino* might be good propaganda for both king and bishops. To maintain that bishops derived authority from God – when in fact, they held whatever power they had from the king – would make the bishops appear less the ciphers of an omnipotent, tyrannical king. And this would have the salutary effect of making it *seem* that there was some kind of separation of powers or checks-and-balances: that king-and-bishops did not form a tyrannical monolith – when in fact they did.²⁰ So what if it were maintained that they had a so-called ‘spiritual’ authority not derived from the king? Charles and his bishops had arrived at a convenient arrangement, whereby they supported

¹⁸ *Works of Laud*, III, 406.

¹⁹ To be sure, many besides Hobbes have been classified royalist – many fought alongside the king – who did not support the church establishment of the 1630s. I would argue that the latter rendered their royalism imperfect.

²⁰ That is, when the bishops were very cooperative with the king, as they mostly were under James and Charles.

his monarchical pretensions and he supported their clericalist pretensions.²¹ The latter, of course, entailed the king's recognition of episcopacy *jure divino*. But as long as the bishops were willing to practise obedience – and not to cite such doctrine for not doing so – it would really cost the king nothing to allow this doctrine. Thus, Hobbes would appear guilty of dangerous pedantry in objecting to a doctrine that cemented the Stuarts' convenient monarchical-episcopal arrangement. Paradoxically, the clergy might maintain the king's power better if they were thought *not* to derive all their power from him. By maintaining their own independent 'spiritual' authority, they were thus able to maintain the king's political authority indirectly. If the *jus divinum* were taken away from the bishops, if it were publicly declared that they had all their authority exclusively from the king (*jure civili*), then there might have been an even greater outcry at the king's boundless tyranny – and a louder objection to the churchmen's self-interested justification of that tyranny. One might also observe that in impugning the *jus divinum* of episcopacy, Hobbes was rendering religious affairs more susceptible to *non-royal* lay control. He might have wished for total *royal* erastianism, but would the destruction of episcopalianism give way, instead, to *parliamentary* erastianism? In the event, it would appear he was aiding and abetting those MPs who were trying to deprive the king of his exclusive control of the church. Should not Hobbes of all people have realised that episcopacy *jure divino* could be good absolutist window-dressing to prevent parliament from meddling in ecclesiastical affairs – the province of the civil sovereign, as supreme authority? Hobbes seems to have underappreciated the fact that the doctrine of episcopacy *jure divino* – and, more broadly, Bramhall's assertion that religion was not simply the will or conscience of the civil sovereign – might also have administered comfort to subjects worried about a recurrence of a Roman catholic monarch like Mary Tudor. This worry would allow one merit to Bramhall's separation of powers in religious governance – and one demerit to Hobbes's caesaro-papism.

However, though Bramhall had some reason to object that Hobbes was trying to *transform* the church into a mere branch of government, the latter might have retorted that since the Henrician reformation, the church had been such a branch. On this view, the bishop was the innovator who was trying to turn back the clock, who was trying to *re-separate* church and state. Indeed, in some of Bramhall's discussion of episcopacy there is a certain sense of unreality. He knew as well as anyone that lay patronage was involved in the process that elevated a priest (or pastor) from Oxford or Cambridge to the height of a cathedral throne. For all his talk of apostolic succession, an

²¹ For Charles I's clericalist sensibility, with which, I argue, Hobbes was at such variance, see Michael Young, *Charles I* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1997), 162–3.

insider like himself understood that to reach episcopal office one had to be favoured by gentry and noblemen; Bramhall's own career clearly illustrated this.²² Hobbes was, in effect, simply observing the fact that the church, or, rather, churchmen, did not inhabit or function in a separate sphere free from the forces that determined the 'secular' or 'temporal' one. But, again, was it politic to draw attention to this plain fact? Was Hobbes the little boy who pointed out what everyone knew, that the emperor was wearing no clothes, that is, that archbishops and bishops had no real power that could not be traced to the favour of laymen, to the king, nobility and gentry? As the late Conrad Russell once noted, it could be argued that the use of bishops to maintain royal, as opposed to parliamentary, control over the church was for Charles their primary function.²³ Thus, during the Personal Rule (1629–40), the king seemed to be attempting, in effect, to extend his royal power by putting more power into the hands of the employees of his church – that is, his own personally selected ecclesiastical governors. As Charles Prior has recently observed: 'bishops were the channels through which the Crown's sovereignty over the Church was exercised'.²⁴ The church would then be his personal administrative instrument. Thus, one could argue that those who protested against episcopacy (by way of anti-*jus divinum* or not) were simply indirectly objecting that the king was augmenting his power – through the church, and most importantly, at the expense of the parliament's (the lay gentry's) power or function.²⁵ In effect, Charles was transferring power from parliament and other non-ecclesiastical institutions (including

²² Bramhall was presented to a good rural living, South Kilvington, by Sir Christopher Wandesford in 1618, for it was the latter, a layman, who possessed the advowson. See chapter 1, 23. And one cannot believe that Bramhall would have become bishop of Derry if not for Wandesford's cousin Sir Thomas Wentworth's preferring him. However, one could argue that Laud's (an apostolic successor's) approval had been necessary for Bramhall's elevation. But one could argue that the king's (a layman's) approval had been equally, or more, necessary. In any case, though, clerical matters were not at all free of lay control.

²³ Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 252.

²⁴ *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 113.

²⁵ Brief overviews of the legal/constitutional issues and developments concerning king, parliament and church during the period 1530–1640 can be found in Conrad Russell, 'Whose Supremacy? King, Parliament and the Church, 1530–1640', *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 4, 21 (1997): 700–8, and 'Parliament, the Royal Supremacy and the Church' in *Parliament and the Church, 1529–1960*, eds. J. P. Parry and Stephen Taylor (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 27–37. D. Alan Orr has observed: 'That the king was supreme in religious affairs was generally accepted. The institutional mode through which the king exercised his supremacy, convocation or parliament, remained subject to heated debate.' 'Sovereignty, Supremacy and the Origins of the English Civil War', *History* 87, 288 (2002): 479. In this article Orr explores this conflict between king and parliament about control of religious doctrine and discipline. There was conflict between king and house of commons about the governance of the church: did the Act of Supremacy of 1534 provide that the king govern it in regular consultation with parliament (king-in-parliament) or did the Act of Supremacy provide that the king govern the church without such parliamentary consultation? Hobbes

local government), to a church which he could control through his personally selected episcopate. This would be a more commodious arrangement whereby he could rule his kingdoms more ‘absolutely’.

One might argue that when the ‘disaffected’ protested against ecclesiastical ‘usurpation’ of ‘royal’ or ‘civil’ power, they were really just complaining of the increased power of churchmen like William Laud, Richard Neile and William Juxon, who were privy counsellors, and in the case of the last, lord treasurer. On this reading, the ‘disaffected’ did not so much hate episcopacy as they resented ever-more powerful archbishops and bishops, that is, certain men who were seen to be obtaining more and more power under Charles – all at the expense of lords temporal and the gentry. Thus, one may render anti-episcopacy less a matter of ‘principle’ or religious scruple than a matter of personal envy of and hostility towards clerical favourites. We might also view much of the parliamentary opposition to the bishops as merely resentment at the fact that as *ex officio* members of the house of lords, they constituted a parliamentary power-bloc that could obstruct, or rather, were obstructing, the programme of the leaders of the commons.²⁶ Several of the increasingly powerful churchmen did not come from the upper or even lower gentry. Some were perceived by the anti-prelatical ‘disaffected’ to be social upstarts. In *Behemoth*, Hobbes himself noted the natural resentment that gentry and peers could feel towards the ‘lordly prelates’ from humble origins: ‘men of ancient wealth and nobility are not apt to brook, that poor scholars should (as they must, when they are made bishops) be their fellows’.²⁷ Those beneath the socio-economic level of the families from which some bishops came could also resent the clerical imparity that episcopacy involved. There was certainly resentment in some of the parochial clergy that these bishops enjoyed a superiority over them. It would be hard to believe that a man like Hobbes had much sympathy for these parochial clergy in their resentment at this imparity. And yet it is true that the philosopher’s father had been among these lower-level clergymen. At all events, it would be remiss not to point out that the controversy over episcopacy cannot only be interpreted as, say,

and Bramhall, however, did not quarrel over this issue, the respective roles of king and *parliament* in governance of the church; rather, they quarreled over the respective roles of the king and *clergy* (particularly *episcopal* clergy) in this governance.

²⁶ There were also such related conflicts of interest involved as that between common law courts and ecclesiastical, especially episcopal, courts. Some of the opposition in the commons to the bishops had much to do with the objection to the latter, particularly the court of high commission. Bramhall himself was a very active member of both the court of high commission in York and in that of Ireland. See chapter 1, 23, 32. For a recent discussion of parliamentary opposition to the vigour of this court – and the autonomy of convocation – see Orr, ‘Sovereignty, Supremacy’.

²⁷ *Behemoth*, 29–30. The humbleness of the origins of some of the ‘lordly prelates’, however, has been in some cases exaggerated. For the case of Laud, see Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 208.

‘bishops versus gentry’ but also as ‘upper versus lower clergy’, or ‘episcopal versus parochial clergy’.²⁸ The gentry (and all of the laity) could unite with the parochial clergy to protest at the power of the elite and haughty episcopal, court and cathedral clergy.²⁹

Hobbes’s subversion of clerical authority was not confined to his rejection of episcopacy *jure divino*. In fact, his rejection of that doctrine might even be regarded as a deduction from, or at least corollary to, his determinist/predestinarian position. One might argue that this position logically implied that bishops – and all the other clergy – were not necessary for salvation. If they were not necessary for salvation, their function was rendered dubious. For if God alone elected some souls to salvation, and consigned other souls to damnation, then the acts of clergy could not be determinative. God’s determinations concerning salvation could not be affected by the clergy, for these determinations were made prior to and, thus, irrespective of clerical action. One is saved from the ‘foundation of the world’, that is, before one has been baptised or taken the bread and wine blessed by a priest (or pastor).³⁰ Thus, by the determinism/predestinarianism of Hobbes, priests and their sacraments were logically rendered soteriologically inconsequential. As Bramhall himself was to ask Hobbes: ‘How shall a man receive the blessed sacrament with comfort and confidence, as a seal of God’s love in Christ, who believeth, that so many millions are positively excluded from all fruit and benefit of the passions of Christ, [by divine, eternal decree] before they had done either good or evil?’³¹ By Hobbes’s determinism/predestinarianism, salvation comes from the eternal decree of God and not as the result of any ceremony performed at the hands of a clergyman.³² If the decree of damnation is given by God, then no sacramental action can reverse it; one cannot be repro-bated by God, and then saved by the intervention of a priest. By the same token, if the decree of salvation is given by God no lack of sacramental action can reverse it; one cannot be saved by God, and then damned because one

²⁸ For insight into the very complex socio-economic situation of clergy and laity in the early Stuart period, Christopher Hill’s *Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) remains indispensable; see also Felicity Heal, ‘Economic Problems of the Clergy’ in *Church and Society in England, Henry VIII–James I*, eds. Felicity Heal and Rosemary O’Day (Hamden: Archon, 1977), 99–118, as well as her *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

²⁹ I would not wish to endorse a socio-economic simplification of anti-episcopacy, but I believe no analysis of the phenomenon can be complete that omits consideration of such mundane implications.

³⁰ ‘Foundation of the world’: Ephesians 1:4. ³¹ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 105.

³² Which is not to say that the determinist-predestinarian must hold that the elect do not or should not participate in such ceremonies; God may *will* that the elect participate. What the determinist/predestinarian stresses is that salvation does not depend upon such participation, but upon God’s will, His ‘grace’.

does not partake of the Lord's supper. In the eyes of many contemporaries of Hobbes and Bramhall, predestination on the one hand, and priests and sacraments on the other, were logically incompatible.³³ What need of priests if they did not possess any power upon which salvation were contingent? Take away sacerdotalism, and clergy (not least bishops) come to appear as mere sponges of benefices; take away their intercessory power and they become merely sanctimonious local officials and regional governors of the king. The soteriological implications of the determinism/predestinarianism of Hobbes removed the necessity of sacerdotalism: the salvation of the laity does not depend upon the mediation of any special class of men. Thus, Hobbes's determinism/predestinarianism effectively, or by logical deduction, deprived the clergy of their importance, if not their very profession and *raison d'être*. Ultimately they are dispensable inasmuch as they are not brokers of salvation. Accordingly, such bishops as Bramhall had very good reason to combat the teaching of determinists and predestinarians like Hobbes. The latter would render them superfluous. In view of this point, one cannot be surprised at the vigour and volume with which Bramhall argued (and lobbied) against Hobbes. With this significance of determinism/predestinarianism in mind, it is easier to see why the debate of Bramhall and Hobbes on the issue of free-will was so acrimonious. By implication, Bramhall's very livelihood as a clergyman was being endangered. To accept Hobbes's position would be to render Bramhall's profession dubious. It could make the bishop appear an arrant charlatan. As I shall show, most particularly in chapter 7, Hobbes did not hesitate to insinuate that Bramhall was precisely that.

A close friend of Hobbes, the poet Edmund Waller, was once asked by John Aubrey, Hobbes's younger contemporary and first biographer, to compose some elegiac verses in honour of the philosopher. But upon this request, Waller expressed his fear of offending churchmen. According to Aubrey, Waller quoted Horace, '*Incedo per ignes / Suppositos cineri doloso*', explaining, 'That what was chiefly to be taken notice in his elegy was that he [Hobbes], being but one, and a private person, pulled down all the churches, dispelled the mists of ignorance, and laid open their priestcraft.'³⁴ It is notable that Waller thought that Hobbes had razed *all* the churches, and exposed the 'priestcraft' of *all* clergy. Waller's observation was well-warranted. From

³³ Tyacke relates a case of one contemporary who argued that calvinist teaching on predestination rendered both priest and sacraments redundant. *Anti-Calvinists*, 6. Conversely, as Tyacke observes: 'It was no accident that during the Arminian ascendancy altars and fonts came to dominate church interiors, for the two were logically connected, sacramental grace replacing the grace of predestination.' *Ibid.*, 176. Similarly, Tyacke has noted 'the sacramental emphasis of the English Arminian rejection of Calvinism'. *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 144.

³⁴ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 358. 'I tread on fire still smoldering underneath deceptive ash.' Horace, *Odes*, II, 1.

the *Elements of Law* (1640) onward, the materialist Hobbes attacked both the traditional (dualist) notion of spirit as incorporeal and that of a special spiritual authority outside and independent of the temporal.³⁵ This assault served to puncture the pretensions of all clergy, who had traditionally been distinguished from the laity by possession of some sort of spiritual power or capacity. Hobbes's quarrel with Bramhall was indicative of the philosopher's hostility to all clerical pretension – whether anglican, Roman catholic, presbyterian or congregationalist. They did not wield some unique power from God that other men (including the civil sovereign) lacked. They did not receive personal revelation from God. They were not recipients of unique insight into Scripture. When it came to interpretation of passages from St Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*, for example, Hobbes did not defer to Bramhall as a man who, *qua* bishop, possessed an authority, expertise or unique qualification to interpret correctly. Underlying all his argument with Bramhall was the tacit assumption that the latter had no more (rather much less) insight into exegetical and theological problems. Whatever authority Bramhall or any other clergyman did possess came merely from the civil sovereign. And since, evidently, Hobbes thought Bramhall could not derive authority from any sovereign during the chaos of the civil wars and Interregnum, he did not defer to Bramhall – though he continued, perhaps sarcastically, to address him as 'his lordship'. In this way, Hobbes turned King James's saying on its head: not 'no bishop, no king' but 'no king, no bishop'. As appointed ministers of the sovereign Hobbes thought bishops were to be obeyed. But that was the only reason to regard them as superiors. They were to be obeyed just like other state officials.³⁶ And that was all. They were not to be obeyed because of a divine or apostolic right or authority. They were to be obeyed in order to obey the civil sovereign. But did Hobbes himself obey? We will see how Bramhall could answer 'no'.

The quarrel between Hobbes and Bramhall erupted at about the same time as Charles I's defeat in the First English Civil War (1642–6). Focus naturally shifted to the prince of Wales, the would-be successor. Henceforth, Hobbes and Bramhall would be trying to influence the young man who would one day govern the British Isles as King Charles II. Through the latter, they would

³⁵ For the consistency of Hobbes from the *Elements of Law* (1640) to *Leviathan* (1651), see Lodi Nauta, 'Hobbes on Religion and the Church between *The Elements of Law* and *Leviathan*: A Dramatic Change of Direction?', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63, 4 (2002): 577–98. However, with the apparent affirmation of apostolic succession in DC (xvii.28), Hobbes did imply a spiritual power that he was at pains to deny in all his other writings. This apparent affirmation is discussed in chapter 3, 73ff.

³⁶ By rendering clergy *civil* officials like all other officials (e.g., JPs, lords lieutenant), Hobbes would deprive himself of the ability to complain that the 'spiritual' officers were invading or meddling in the 'temporal' sphere. Hobbes said that this very distinction of spiritual-temporal was hocus-pocus, 'to make men see double'. *Lev.*, xxxix, 316.

influence all those who would come to be his subjects. These were among the high stakes for which Hobbes and Bramhall were playing. Although none of their writings against each other was dedicated or explicitly addressed to Charles II, I would suggest that both Hobbes and Bramhall hoped to demonstrate to the young king and his closest advisors the merits of their views – and the problems and dangers of the opposite ones. Throughout the 1650s Bramhall moved within royalist circles on the continent, acting as an agent of Charles II and keeping in regular contact with fellow exiles.³⁷ Bramhall hoped to persuade the throneless king to follow in the footsteps of his father. He hoped to guide Charles II into practising and espousing a Christianity essentially the same as that of his father, whose allegiance to the church of England and its (or his) episcopate, and whose maintenance of doctrines associated with Laud and Bramhall, had in some sense cost him not only his crown but his head. Bramhall's struggle to keep the exile king within the Laudian anglican fold was made difficult by the rival shepherds of presbyterianism and Roman catholicism. As a nearly powerless king in exile – a monarch who was not only not ruling, but hardly even reigning – Charles II would be tempted to convert to presbyterianism or Roman catholicism in order to recover the title and power his family had lost. In the late 1640s and throughout the next decade, Bramhall combated these rival shepherds with all the resources at his disposal.³⁸ If Charles were to be restored by turning Roman catholic or presbyterian (or independent, that is, congregationalist), Laudian anglican clergy, especially bishops like Bramhall, could expect to be left to expire in the wilderness of exile – while their king returned in triumph. Bramhall's dispute with and campaign against Hobbes ought to be considered within this larger context. For Bramhall, Hobbes was yet another rival shepherd. Thus, while Bramhall wrote to discredit those presbyterian and Roman catholic shepherds, he also attempted to thwart Hobbes. For the latter was also a potent threat to the Laudian anglican commitment of Charles II. Hobbes's caesaro-papist and anti-arminian teaching could have the effect of persuading Charles to abandon a commitment to the kind of anglicanism his father had upheld – and the anglicanism Bramhall was now struggling to preserve and restore. If Hobbes's prescription were to prevail with Charles and his counsellors and favourites, Bramhall and his fellow Laudians might be abandoned. Ultimately, Hobbes wished to persuade the young king not to follow in the footsteps of his father, the 'Anglican martyr'. Hobbes wished to turn Charles away from, if not against, such Laudians as Bramhall. He hoped that the second Charles

³⁷ See esp. chapters 5–7.

³⁸ Bramhall's impressive performance in this combat has fetched him such epithets as 'Anglican champion of the Interregnum'. John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646–1689* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 116.

would be much more erastian and *politique* and much less clericalist than the first.

Hobbes did not spend the 1650s on the continent. At the end of 1651 he returned to England and submitted to the Rump-ruled commonwealth. But as I will argue in chapter 6, we cannot confidently conclude that Hobbes wished to harm the interest of Charles II by this move. It would appear that he did not choose to leave France; that he was, after all, forced out. At the time there was no alternative but to return to England. Although Hobbes, unlike Bramhall, did not spend the 1650s in royalist exile circles or in close contact with Charles II, there is no good reason to suppose he relinquished all hope or expectation that Charles II would eventually come to sit upon the throne of England. Thus, his writing of *Leviathan* and public quarrel with Bramhall in the 1650s may be interpreted as an endeavour to show Charles II, his prospective sovereign, the folly and danger of the doctrines and policies advocated by such ‘prelatical’ churchmen as Bramhall. Hobbes constantly stressed that sovereigns who subscribed to Bramhall’s clericalist views would undermine their own power. Although in his writings against Bramhall in the 1650s Hobbes did not expressly address Charles II, he was still interested in establishing the merits of his teaching and the problems and mischief of Bramhall’s. On one level, then, one may interpret the entire Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel as a contest for the soul of a king. And there would be some warrant for characterising the enmity between Hobbes and Bramhall as in some sense the enmity of competing advisors or courtiers. On this view, their quarrel and hostilities of the 1640s and 1650s amounted to a personal battle for supremacy in favour and counsel. In light of the fact that William Cavendish, first marquess (later duke) of Newcastle, the host of Bramhall and Hobbes’s first meeting and debate in Paris in 1645, had been the governor of Charles II from 1638 to 1641 (when the latter was still prince of Wales); and that it was Newcastle’s client and friend Hobbes who had been mathematics tutor of the same prince from 1646 to 1648; that Newcastle was privy counsellor of the young king in the early 1650s; and that Newcastle, in 1658 or 1659, on the eve of the Restoration, wrote a long letter of advice to the king, it becomes obvious that Newcastle conducted, in effect, a decades-long campaign to shape the successor of Charles I.³⁹ It appears that he hoped to be a principal advisor of the successor to a king (Charles I) who had not accorded him such a privileged position.⁴⁰ As Hobbes had been something of a creature of

³⁹ Newcastle has traditionally been considered the greatest single influence upon Charles II’s personality. Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 2.

⁴⁰ Geoffrey Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier: William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle* (New York: Taplinger, 1979), 89.

Newcastle, we might regard the former as a spokesman for Newcastle and his brand of royalism. By the same analysis, we might regard Bramhall as a representative and spokesman for Laudian and, as we shall see, *constitutional*, royalism.

In chapters 2 and 3 I show how Hobbes and Bramhall could, from the very beginning, be placed in different royalist camps. Bramhall's constitutionalism was manifest in *Serpent-Salve*, written in 1643 as an answer to Henry Parker's influential *Observations upon some of His Majesty's Late Answers and Expresses*. Hobbes's absolutism, on the other hand, was clearly manifest in the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*. Moreover, Bramhall voiced some serious constitutionalist objections to *De Cive* sometime between 1642 and 1645. In those years he went to the trouble of writing sixty objections to the privately printed Latin treatise of Hobbes, and personally submitted them to the philosopher at or around the same time that they debated free-will at Newcastle's Parisian residence. David Smith has argued that the ideas of absolutist royalists like Hobbes differed significantly from those of constitutional royalists like Bramhall.⁴¹ In this he sees 'the richness and diversity of Royalist thought during the period of the English Civil Wars'.⁴² But one would be equally warranted in speaking, not of the 'richness and diversity', but the incoherence, disunity and, thus, weakness, of royalism. In explaining the defeat of the king's cause, one might point to internal disagreements like those between Hobbes and Bramhall. The quarrel and hostilities between Hobbes and Bramhall may, accordingly, be interpreted as one battle in the war of royalist factions.

Although such scholars as Smith have labelled Hobbes a royalist, I will suggest (throughout the book) that one can, with Bramhall, doubt the fitness of such a classification. By a close reading of all of Hobbes's treatises and by placing him and his books within the context of current events – and subjecting those writings to a scrutiny governed by that context – Hobbes emerges as an author of no explicit royalism and a man whose partisanship was not readily apparent in his books.⁴³ He may have been a friend and client of prominent and powerful royalists, and a sometime tutor of the prince of Wales, but his *books* lacked clear marks of commitment to the Stuart cause. In my treatment of the *Elements of Law*, *De Cive*, and *Leviathan* I stress how unroyalist those books could be interpreted to be.

⁴¹ Smith identifies the essential tenets of constitutional royalism as (1) legally limited monarchy; (2) rightful powers of Parliament; and (3) the rule of law. *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640–1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 252.

⁴² Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 252.

⁴³ For a similar view of the lack of royalism in all of Hobbes's political treatises, see Kinch Hoekstra, 'The *De Facto* Turn in Hobbes's Political Philosophy' in *Leviathan after 350 Years*, eds. Tom Sorell and Luc Foisneau (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), 33–73.

Whereas there may be reason to call Hobbes an ‘absolutist’, there is much less to call him simply, or without serious qualification, a royalist.⁴⁴ Hobbes never denied that aristocracy and democracy were valid and viable forms of government. He acknowledged a preference for monarchy, but stated very clearly that the superiority of monarchy could not be demonstrated in any logical or scientific manner.⁴⁵ Unlike some other royalists, Hobbes offered no argument for the divine legitimacy of monarchy, or for the indefeasible right of the Stuarts to govern the British Isles.⁴⁶ With all his personal connections to royalists, Hobbes may well have been a royalist at heart – he may have hoped for the survival and prosperity of the house of Stuart – but his political treatises were far from lending direct or explicit support to the beleaguered Stuart kings and their chief ministers. As he himself later confessed, his principle of the reciprocal obligation of obedience and protection, as fully expounded in *Leviathan*, was a double-edged sword.⁴⁷ Like Excalibur, no name was inscribed upon the sword, so Cromwell was just as capable as Charles II of plucking it. Among other things, therefore, this book makes the case for not classifying Hobbes as a royalist polemicist. It lends support to Eleanor Curran’s recently argued view that Hobbes was more a royalist than a royalist *author*.⁴⁸ Glenn Burgess has written that ‘there is no evidence that Hobbes was viewed as anything but a good Royalist . . . until the 1650s’.⁴⁹ But at least one royalist, Bramhall, believed, at least as early as 1645, that Hobbes was far from a sound royalist. A careful reading of the paper written

⁴⁴ I have already pointed out, above, how Hobbes’s positions on free-will and episcopacy associated him with popular and parliamentary critics of the Caroline regime.

⁴⁵ Hobbes argued that monarchy had the least inconveniences of the three forms of government, but never claimed that aristocracy or democracy were invalid according to his ‘civil science’. Hobbes noted that the ‘aristocracy of Venice’ was perfectly stable, in *Elements of Law*, xxiv.8, ed. Gaskin, 141. Hobbes’s arguments for the conveniences and advantages of monarchy are to be found in the *Elements of Law*, xxiv, DC, x, and *Lev.*, xix. I believe most readers would agree that he makes his most persuasive case in DC. Each of the three discussions contains the same basic contention that a monarchical commonwealth is least prone to dissolution and civil war.

⁴⁶ If Johann Sommerville is correct that indefeasible hereditary right was not a hallmark of royalist orthodoxy, at least not before the Engagement controversy of 1650–1, then Hobbes’s royalist credentials are vastly improved. If some sort of legitimism (as opposed to *de-factoism*) is not required, then certainly Hobbes’s treatises appear more royalist than I have characterised them. See Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context* (New York: St Martin’s, 1992), 70.

⁴⁷ See chapter 6, 169ff, for the context of Hobbes’s remark.

⁴⁸ Eleanor Curran, ‘A Very Peculiar Royalist: Hobbes in the Context of His Political Contemporaries’, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 10, 2 (2002): 167–208. The reader should be able to see that I go much of the way with Jeffrey Collins (and Bramhall) in rendering Hobbes unroyalist, but stop where Collins turns Hobbes into something of an *anti-royalist*, that is, something of a Cromwellian-independent partisan. See his *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), *passim*.

⁴⁹ Glenn Burgess, ‘Contexts for the Writing and Publication of Hobbes’s *Leviathan*’, *HPT* 11, 4 (1990): 693.

by Bramhall in 1646, ‘A Vindication of True Liberty’, suggests as much.⁵⁰ Burgess has also stressed ‘the absence of much criticism of Hobbes’s politics in Royalist circles until after 1651’.⁵¹ But, as noted above, it was no later than 1645 that Bramhall presented Hobbes with a list of sixty exceptions taken to the version of *De Cive* printed in Paris in 1642.⁵² Of course, this was private criticism; but the objection to Burgess may still be sustained that there was robust royalist criticism of Hobbes, courtesy of Bramhall, well before 1651.⁵³ As I shall show, Bramhall’s strategy to discredit Hobbes in the eyes of Charles II and his advisors – and any other English, Scottish or Irish subjects who cared to observe – was not only to expose problems with his political precepts, but also to argue *ad hominem* that Hobbes had not himself been a good subject, let alone a good royalist, because he had not been an orthodox (that is, Caroline-Laudian) anglican or a legitimist, principled supporter of the Stuarts. Ultimately his examination of Hobbes led Bramhall to the charge that the ‘monster of Malmesbury’ was an arrogant, renegade and subversive philosopher, a Leviathan of Leviathans: ‘And for a metaphorical Leviathan, I know none so proper to personate that huge body as Thomas Hobbes himself.’⁵⁴ As Bramhall argued in his last diatribe, the *Catching of Leviathan*, Hobbes’s magnum opus would be more aptly entitled the ‘Rebels’ Catechism’. Hobbes was the seditious orator, a ‘third Cato’, whose teachings justified, if they did not incite, civil war.

Hobbes, on the other hand, attempted to show that it was Bramhall’s teaching that would undermine the authority of a sovereign like Charles II, as, indeed, it had, he suggested, undermined the authority of Charles I. Hobbes’s strategy to discredit Bramhall had also its *ad hominem* aspect. For he insinuated that Laudians like Bramhall had caused trouble for Charles I by

⁵⁰ This reading is provided in chapter 4. ⁵¹ Burgess, ‘Contexts of *Leviathan*’, 695.

⁵² Richard Tuck has asserted that ‘the arguments of *De cive* were perfectly acceptable to royalist Anglicans like [Robert] Payne’. However, royalist anglicans like Bramhall at least could not accept many of these arguments. He has also asserted that the *Elements of Law* and *DC* ‘set out a fundamentally orthodox Anglican theology’. ‘The “Christian Atheism” of Thomas Hobbes’ in *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, eds. Michael Hunter and David Wooton (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 112, 113. But Bramhall’s ‘exceptions’ indicate that he at least did not accept the orthodoxy of Hobbes’s theology in *DC*. Herbert Thorndike, another anglican divine, found very objectionable matter in *DC*. In his discussion of *A Discourse on the Right of the Church in a Christian State* (1649), which contains explicit criticism of *DC*, Jeffrey Collins notes that Thorndike’s unfavourable reaction undermines Tuck’s claim. *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 250, n.43.

⁵³ However, Burgess is still right to note that there was not *much* criticism of Hobbes before that date; and he is perfectly aware of the fact that Bramhall submitted those sixty objections to Hobbes in the 1640s. Burgess, ‘Contexts of *Leviathan*’, 698. But I am not sure that Burgess has taken into account Bramhall’s political objections to be found in the paper of 1646 (‘Vindication’) – albeit a paper focussed on the question of free-will.

⁵⁴ *Catching*, BW, iv, 517. The last section of chapter 8 treats of this ‘Hobbes-as-Leviathan-of-Leviathans’ conceit.

upsetting and alienating a large number of the latter's subjects.⁵⁵ Hobbes also repeatedly suggested that Bramhall's teaching served his own self-interest at the expense of the civil sovereign. Ultimately, Hobbes hoped to convince Charles II that the doctrine of such churchmen only served to hurt his own interest. Hobbes insisted that, whether Bramhall would admit it or not, the bishop's teachings were subversive, and served to engender social discord and civil war. Thus, both Hobbes and Bramhall attempted to discredit each other in the eyes of the king (or would-be king), Charles II, by claiming that the other man's doctrines were to some degree responsible for the Wars of the Three Kingdoms – and would lead to repetition of such political breakdown and violence.

When Hobbes and Bramhall met in Paris in the summer of 1645, they debated the question of free-will. But if their audience, the Cavalier general, the Marquess of Newcastle, had very good ears, he might have heard another debate just beginning *sotto voce*. Who was to blame for the wars in their native land? Whose politics and religion were true and good, the philosopher's or the bishop's? Whose teaching was a source of wisdom fit for counselling rulers and educating their peoples? And on a purely personal level, who was the better patriot, the better Englishman? 'Judge, reader, whether we or he be better subjects.'⁵⁶ Such questions help to explain why the quarrel of Hobbes and Bramhall was to be so rancorous.

⁵⁵ Thus one might remark that Tyacke was echoing Hobbes when he wrote that: 'The rise of English Arminianism, and the consequent outlawing of Calvinism during the 1620s, both destabilized the religious status quo and provided a cutting edge to the increasingly acrimonious politics of Charles I's reign. Puritans, who had been at least partially reconciled to the established church, were as a result driven into renewed opposition.' *Anti-Calvinists*, xviii. By the same logic, one might say that Peter White was echoing Bramhall when he undertook to contest Tyacke's thesis. See White, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present* 101 (1983): 34–54; Tyacke, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present* 115 (1987): 201–16; White, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: A Rejoinder', *Past and Present* 115 (1987): 217–29, and *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

⁵⁶ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 392.

Bishop Bramhall, the ‘Great Arminian’, ‘Irish Canterbury’ and ‘Most Unsound Man in Ireland’, 1633–1641¹

In the tumult that followed in the wake of the Ulster Rising that broke out on 23 October 1641, the anglican bishop of Derry, John Bramhall, was forced to flee for his life.² Before his flight, he had been the subject of a plot. As the Roman catholic Irish laid siege to the Scots-presbyterian-dominated Londonderry, Sir Phelim O’Neill conceived a plan to bring about the bishop’s destruction. While Bramhall was within, O’Neill, outside the walls of the town, would try to mislead the Scots into thinking that Bramhall was in league with him. O’Neill’s trick was to fabricate a letter in which Bramhall was given orders to carry out the action that they had already agreed upon: the delivery of one of the gates. This counterfeit letter was then handed to an uninformed messenger who would, it was calculated, be seized by the Scots. Upon discovery of Bramhall’s conspiracy with the Roman catholic leader, presumably the Scots would execute the unsuspecting and innocent Bramhall for betrayal. However, the plot was spoiled when the messenger aborted his mission: overcome with fear, apparently he ran off without delivering the letter.³ Having unknowingly escaped one danger, Bramhall was immediately exposed to another. Hated by those outside, he was not much less loathed

¹ ‘The most unsound man in Ireland, a great Arminian’: John Leslie, sixth earl of Rothes, *A Relation of Proceedings concerning the Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland from August 1637 to July 1638*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Ballantyne, 1830), 10. ‘Irish Canterbury’: sneer of Cromwell upon learning of Bramhall’s narrow escape from capture off the coast of Ireland after the revolt of Cork in 1649, as related by Vesey, AH, xxviii.

² For narrative and commentary on the Ulster Rising see Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580–1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 469–92; Brian Mac Cuarta, ed. *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, rev. edn (Belfast: Queen’s University of Belfast, 1997); and Michael Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994).

³ This is the story told by Jeremy Taylor in the funeral sermon preached at Bramhall’s death in 1663. *BW*, I, lxvi. Taylor’s authority seems to have been O’Neill himself: ‘This story was published by Sir Phelim himself, who added, that if he could have thus ensnared the Bishop, he had good assurance the town should have been his own.’ *BW*, I, lxvi. Vesey appears to have paraphrased Taylor’s account in his biography of Bramhall, AH, xxvi. That Vesey drew much of his information about Bramhall from Taylor is put beyond doubt by the fact that Vesey quotes directly from Taylor’s funeral sermon on p. xxxi of AH.

by those within the town. Having become dominated by a recent influx of covenanters from Scotland, Londonderry was no haven for a fierce and outspoken anti-covenant, anti-presbyterian royalist anglican bishop.⁴ One night a group of these Scots pointed an artillery piece at Bramhall's house. Urged by his friends not to interpret this as an idle threat, the bishop fled the town the next day.⁵

To understand why Bramhall was so much detested and harassed in Londonderry, by both Irish Roman catholics and Scots presbyterians, it is necessary to review his career in Ireland before the rebellion broke out in the fall of 1641. Seven years earlier, in 1633, Bramhall had gone to Ireland as the chaplain of the new lord deputy, Sir Thomas Wentworth. Early in his clerical career Bramhall had been favoured by Wentworth's distant cousin and closest friend, Christopher Wandesford.⁶ The latter, who went with Wentworth to Ireland to become master of the rolls (and later lord deputy), had been seated in Kirklington in north Yorkshire, and had preferred Bramhall to the rectory of South Kilvington, a handsome living, just outside Thirsk, in 1618, just a few years after Bramhall had left Cambridge with an MA.⁷ Presumably Bramhall and Wandesford kept in touch throughout the 1620s. A letter from 1628 suggests that their acquaintance had been close for some years.⁸ In this decade Bramhall greatly distinguished himself in the church. He was chosen to deliver a sermon at the York Synod of 1621.⁹ In 1623, in Northallerton, he seems to have won a pair of public debates against two Roman catholics.¹⁰ This triumph obtained him the notice of the fiercely anti-recusant archbishop of York, Tobie Matthew. The latter made him his chaplain and saw to his further preferment. As chaplain for an archbishop in his late and frail seventies, Bramhall must have been called upon to transact

⁴ For the settlement of Ulster by the Scottish in the early Stuart period, see Michael Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973) and *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, ch. 1.

⁵ The accounts of Bramhall's departure from Ireland vary with Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, I, lxvi, and Vesey, *AH*, xxvi. I have followed the latter's more dramatic narrative. In Taylor's account the Scots are not explicitly mentioned. As John McCafferty has noted, the plotting of O'Neill against Bramhall cannot be corroborated. 'John Bramhall', *ODNB*.

⁶ For a full account and documentation of Bramhall's ancestry, education and early clerical career, see Nicholas D. Jackson, 'Hobbes vs. Bramhall: An Uncivil War, 1645–1668', PhD thesis, Syracuse University, 2005, Appendix 1.

⁷ William Ball Wright, *A Great Yorkshire Divine of the xviith Century: A Sketch of the Life and Work of John Bramhall, D. D., Archbishop of Armagh* (York: John Sampson, 1899), 6–7; Vesey, *AH*, iii.

⁸ Bramhall to Wandesford, Ripon, 18 June 1628, *BW*, v (unpaginated); in the 1628–9 parliament Wandesford stood for Thirsk.

⁹ Bramhall's own recollection of this event is in *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, *BW*, III, 540.

¹⁰ Bramhall's own description can be found in *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, *BW*, III, 540; see also Vesey, *AH*, ii–iii and Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, I, lviii. Northallerton is about 6 miles north-northwest of South Kilvington.

a great deal of administrative business. Vesey, Bramhall's first biographer, relates that because Matthew discovered such great administrative aptitude in Bramhall, the primate came to employ him as his agent in a wide range of affairs.¹¹ In addition to being Matthew's chaplain till 1628, Bramhall was made a prebendary of Ripon Cathedral in 1623, master of St John the Baptist's Hospital near Ripon in 1624, and sub-dean of Ripon in the same year.¹² By the end of the 1620s Bramhall had clearly demonstrated exceptional talent in all roles assigned to him. It is impossible to know precisely when Wandesford's good friend Wentworth met Bramhall, but surely by the mid-1620s he had come to the former's notice by his reputation, if not by his acquaintance with Wandesford.¹³ Once Wentworth became, in 1628, lord president of the council of the north, it was not long before he was exploiting Bramhall's talent, seeing to his appointment to the York high commission. Along with Wandesford, Bramhall was made a member in 1630.¹⁴ Bramhall's probity and vigour as a member of that commission must have impressed Wentworth. When the latter was appointed lord deputy of Ireland just a few years later he could confidently turn to Bramhall to manage ecclesiastical (and many other) affairs for him.

Having been preferred by a strongly calvinist primate of York, Tobie Matthew, it is remarkable that Bramhall does not seem to have displeased Matthew's decidedly less calvinist, 'arminian' successors, Samuel Harsnett and Richard Neile.¹⁵ Furthermore, by the early 1630s, Bramhall was enjoying the favour of Laud, an archbishop of Canterbury who became the most powerful and notorious of the arminians. Since Bramhall's relations with Wandesford seem to have been fairly close throughout the 1620s, we may suppose that their churchmanship was similar. If they had not been similar, Wandesford's patronage, beginning at least as early as 1618, would be a little difficult to explain. As Bramhall attended a Cambridge college, Sidney Sussex, noted for its puritan (strongly calvinist) character, whose master was an outspoken anti-arminian, and as Bramhall had been favoured by an archbishop of York whose calvinism was quite pronounced, we would assume that at the very least Bramhall's early reputation was that of a solid (that is, not arminian-leaning) calvinist. We might assume that it was in part because of this calvinist rectitude that Wandesford chose Bramhall to

¹¹ Vesey, AH, iii–iv. ¹² It was also in 1623 that Bramhall took his BD at Cambridge.

¹³ Jeremy Taylor relates that Wentworth only became acquainted with Bramhall after the latter had already begun his tenure as sub-dean of Ripon. 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, I, lviii–lix.

¹⁴ This was also the year in which Bramhall took his DD at Cambridge.

¹⁵ It was during Richard Neile's tenure at York (1632–40) that Bramhall received a valuable prebendal stall, Hushwaite, in 1632. John McCafferty has speculated that it was Neile who was to introduce Bramhall to Laud. 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland, 1633–1641', PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996, 10–11.

be rector of South Kilvington.¹⁶ Since Bramhall was later to be labelled an arminian, it is notable that his early patron Wandesford distinguished himself in the 1620s as a parliamentary *critic* of arminianism. J. T. Cliffe has described Wandesford's household at Kirklington as 'almost Puritan'.¹⁷ Wandesford was a leader of the house of commons' invective against arminians in 1628–9 – precisely at the time, as we noted above, that Bramhall was corresponding with him. He complained of the pardons granted to the allegedly arminian Sibthorpe, Manwaring and Cosin.¹⁸ However, the latter may be interpreted as less motivated by calvinist theology than by constitutional concerns of the Petition of Right – which both he and Wentworth supported. Nevertheless, we can still assume that Wandesford's churchmanship was far from arminian in the 1620s. But as he became a colleague, friend and supporter of arminian churchmen in the 1630s, we are left to infer that his churchmanship underwent some modification between the 1620s and 1630s.¹⁹ In his change of churchmanship, he might simply have been following Wentworth. Whereas J. P. Cooper failed to perceive any significant change in Wentworth's politics at the end of the 1620s, he concluded that the change in his churchmanship was 'undeniable'.²⁰ Wentworth's close relations with the most notorious arminian of them all, William Laud, only began early in the 1630s. As lord deputy in Ireland in that decade, Wentworth (with Bramhall) was to establish religious policies denounced as arminian and popish by his enemies.

If Wandesford followed Wentworth's lead in a change in churchmanship, it is also possible that Bramhall, in turn, followed both of them in a change of churchmanship between the later 1620s and early 1630s. That a change occurred in Bramhall is, admittedly, speculative, for we can only guess at his theological views before the 1630s. Indeed, it is quite possible

¹⁶ Michael Questier has suggested that Bramhall was placed in South Kilvington in the first place because as a man with a puritan pedigree he could be trusted to act vigorously against recusants. *Conversion, Politics, and Religion in England, 1580–1621* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 171–2.

¹⁷ *The Yorkshire Gentry: From the Reformation to the Civil War* (London: University of London Press/Athlone Press, 1969), 186.

¹⁸ *Commons Debates for 1629*, eds. Wallace Notestein and Francis Relf (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921), 176–8.

¹⁹ If Wandesford had shown puritan tendencies in the 1620s, these cannot be detected in the next decade. For his strong approval of the Laudian church of England, see his *A Book of Instructions, written by the Right Honourable Sir Christopher Wandesforde . . . to his son and heir, George Wandesforde* (written in 1636), ed. Thomas Comber (Cambridge, 1777), 19–21; and his daughter Alice Thornton's memoirs, *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton* (Surtees Society, vol. LXII), 21–6.

²⁰ Introduction, *The Wentworth Papers, 1597–1628*, ed. J. P. Cooper (Camden Society, 4th ser., XII, 1973).

that from even the early days of his clerical career Bramhall's views were, anachronistically, arminian or Laudian. But if Bramhall's churchmanship was anti-calvinist (or arminian-leaning) from Cambridge onwards, it would be hard to believe that he could have won the favour of clerical patrons like Archbishop Matthew. The latter seems to have been much more indulgent towards the strongly calvinist puritans than Roman Catholics. Ronald Marchant argued that Matthew's toleration of puritan nonconformity during his primacy allowed the latter to grow significantly in Yorkshire during James's reign and some of Charles's.²¹ Bramhall was to rise even higher in the northern church once Richard Neile and other arminians came to dominate it.²² The point to observe here is that if Bramhall was much of an arminian or Laudian (*avant la lettre*) in the early and mid-1620s, he would have been wise to conceal it from the man who had chosen him to be his chaplain. And would Matthew have allowed Bramhall to rise in the northern province if the latter had not shown himself a reliable calvinist? If Bramhall's election to the sub-deanery in 1624 depended to some extent upon the good-will of the dean, John Wilson, there is further reason to infer that there was no observable arminian churchmanship in Bramhall during most of the 1620s.²³ For Wilson had been recommended to the deanery by John Williams, James I's clerical lord keeper, a churchman who never showed himself to be a friend of arminians.²⁴ Presumably Wilson was not arminian and not disposed to countenance the election of a sub-dean whose calvinism was suspect. There is still more reason to doubt that Bramhall had been an arminian (or proto-Laudian) from the early 1620s, for if Bramhall had been something of an anti-calvinist as early as his Cambridge years, he certainly could not have seen eye to eye with Samuel Ward, the master at Sidney. Ward was a devoted student of William Perkins – a robustly calvinist authority who was, incidentally, to be cited by Hobbes against Bramhall.²⁵

²¹ Ronald Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560–1642* (London: Longmans, 1960), ch. 3. Kenneth Fincham has observed that the set of visitation articles Matthew often used reveal a 'conciliator of puritans' who 'emphasised the preaching and teaching role of the clergy and dwelt little on their observance of ritual'. This popular set of articles, printed for the use of other bishops in the province, was, tellingly, cast aside by the arminian bishop of Durham, Richard Neile, in 1624. In stark contrast with Matthew, Neile placed the emphasis on ritual, and urged confession and absolution as preparation for communion. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Suffolk: Boydell, 1994; 2 vols.), 1, xix.

²² Neile was an early patron of Laud and such arch-arminians as Richard Montagu and John Cosin.

²³ The dean's role in Bramhall's election is related by Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, 1, lviii.

²⁴ *Memorials of the Church SS. Peter and Wilfrid, Ripon*, ed. J. T. Fowler (Surtees Society, vol. LXXVIII), 261.

²⁵ Hobbes, *Questions*, *EW*, v, 266.

In his later debate with Hobbes on free-will, Bramhall certainly did not take a position Ward would have taken. Ironically, it was Hobbes who was to take the line closest to Ward's, for the latter's predestinarianism has been characterised as 'strict'.²⁶ Ward expended a great deal of polemical energy in the 1620s on attacks upon arminianism.²⁷ As master of Sidney and the university's Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Ward was deeply involved in the struggle to preserve Cambridge's calvinist orthodoxy. This was becoming increasingly difficult. In 1628, Ward observed that some university men were turning arminian 'because preferments at court are conferred upon such as incline that way'.²⁸ Did Bramhall, his own student, turn arminian to please the changing court and episcopal clergy upon whom depended high preferment?

While Ward was sufficiently puritan to refuse to consecrate the chapel of Sidney, he also believed in the sacramental instrumentality of baptism, that it was a rite through which the merit of Christ was conveyed to an infant.²⁹ At the Synod of Dort, Ward had defended episcopacy *jure divino*: not an especially puritan tenet.³⁰ Thus, as even Todd points out, Ward's puritanism became markedly less pronounced as he grew older. And thus it would certainly be very misleading to think of Ward as a puritan plain and simple. Rather he was a calvinist 'conformist', a moderate whose anti-arminianism did not prevent him from taking discipline and ceremonies seriously, or conforming without much murmuring. He seems to have become moderate enough to tolerate things he did not approve of himself.³¹ Thus, even if Ward would have disapproved of Bramhall's arminian actions in Ireland in the 1630s, he might still have indulged his old pupil. This is suggested by the fact that they seem to have maintained cordial relations throughout

²⁶ Margo Todd, 'Samuel Ward', *ODNB*.

²⁷ Ward's anti-arminian writings and policy of the 1620s and 1630s are discussed by Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, esp. 46–50, 54, 99.

²⁸ From a letter dated May 1628, quoted in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 49–50.

²⁹ Brian Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland, 1603–1662* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2002), 77.

³⁰ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 44, n.69. Tyacke paints a Ward who is not so extreme a calvinist as the one drawn by Todd. He attributes to Ward a nuanced calvinism. As a delegate to the Synod of Dort, Ward's position was not a staunch (or 'ultra') calvinist one. At the Synod of Dort, Tyacke shows that Ward was sympathetic to at least one tenet associated with arminianism, an opinion maintained by one of the Bremen delegates, Matthias Martinus. (With Martinus, Ward is labelled by Tyacke a 'hypothetical universalist'.) However, Tyacke qualifies this by pointing out that though Ward was less calvinist than the other British delegates at Dort, neither he nor any of the others can, by any stretch, be classified as arminian. *Anti-Calvinists*, 94–9. For Ward's hypothetical universalism, see also Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 186; and Peter Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635', *Past and Present* 114 (1987): 57–9.

³¹ Todd illustrates the complexity of Ward by pointing out that although he was a strict sabbatarian, in 1634 he urged that the Book of Sports be read for the sake of order. 'Samuel Ward', *ODNB*.

that decade.³² Nevertheless, clearly Bramhall's churchmanship in the 1630s was different from his college master's. And we may assume that Bramhall's churchmanship had been much closer to Ward's in his early clerical career. Since Bramhall's early preferment in the church probably depended to some degree on the recommendation of Ward, an anti-arminian, we may suppose that Bramhall was at least a moderate or 'conformist' calvinist before the 1630s. That Bramhall's theology underwent a significant change must remain conjecture. There is no proof that before he was an arminian he had been a strong calvinist. It is quite possible that if Bramhall had been a calvinist, his calvinism was yet so moderate or nuanced as to require the shortest step to cross the border. The ultimate irony, if Bramhall's views did change, is that he, not Hobbes, was the one who adhered to the latter's *politique* maxim of strict conforming to the religion of the civil sovereign. In that case, while Hobbes stubbornly remained a calvinist out of harmony with an arminian sovereign, Charles I, Bramhall switched from Jacobean calvinist to Caroline arminian.³³

In 1632 Laud was urging Wentworth to do what he could to secure a York prebend for Bramhall.³⁴ When Wentworth called upon Bramhall to serve in Ireland, the versatile churchman had already risen to some prominence in the province of York. No doubt he would have risen yet higher (and rapidly) whether in York or Canterbury, as he was now well within the favour of power-brokers in both church and state. Bramhall was made prebendary at York by the king's presentation. And not long before he decided to accompany Wentworth to Ireland, Bramhall had been proposed as chaplain to the king himself.³⁵ Turning away from good career prospects in England, then,

³² In the 1630s Bramhall made at least one generous donation to the college of which Ward was still master. Montague Rhodes James lists the following gift: 'Bramhall donated Ms no. 56: "Galfridus de Vinsauf, Etc." Vellum, 8 1/4 by 5 3/4, ff. 193, 32 lines to a page. An Ms from 15th cent. Given by John Bramhall, D. D., formerly Scholar, cir. 1632.' *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895). Perhaps Bramhall also donated item no.75 in this catalogue. McCafferty has noted that Ward and Bramhall maintained some contact throughout the 1630s, and that Bramhall took an interest in the economic welfare of his alma mater. 'Bramhall and Reconstruction', 9. See Ward to Bramhall, 24 August 1635 and n.d. (c. 1636), in the unsorted Hastings Irish Papers (Boxes 5–8) at the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

³³ It is true that Peter White has argued with some force that James's 'anti-Arminianism' (strong calvinism) has been greatly exaggerated: see 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered' and *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*. But Tyacke has offered solid counter-argument in 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', 210, and *Aspects of English Protestantism*.

³⁴ Laud wrote to Wentworth 30 July 1632: 'Now, my Lord, what do you or have you done about Dr Bramhall for the prebend? For my Lord of Durham [Morton] is actually translated so out of it.' Laud, *Works*, vi, 302.

³⁵ From the position of chaplain in ordinary, Bramhall 'by easy steps . . . might have risen to the higher honours of the church'. Vesey, AH, vii. This sort of chaplaincy was considered the short-cut to high office in the church.

Bramhall agreed to accompany the new lord deputy to Ireland. Wentworth might well have assured Bramhall of substantial compensation and high office once they settled there. In any case, it did not take long for Bramhall to obtain eminent office and considerable compensation. In July 1633 he arrived as chaplain of Wentworth, but it was only a matter of months before he acquired the treasurership of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, and then the archdeaconry of Meath.³⁶ Laud had laid down the rule that no man under forty-years-old should be made bishop.³⁷ But he thought Bramhall worthy of exception. Not a year after becoming archdeacon of Meath, Bramhall was elevated to Derry, one of the most well-endowed bishoprics in all of Ireland.³⁸ Archbishop Ussher, primate of Ireland, considered this bishopric ‘absolutely the best in this whole kingdom’.³⁹ In 1634, then, before he had even turned forty-years-old, Bramhall had become bishop of Derry, one of the richest of all the sees in Ireland. His rise from assistant curate of St Martin’s-cum-Gregory in Micklegate, York, in 1615 to bishop of Derry in 1634 was swift. As we shall see, such quickness of ascent would later render Bramhall very vulnerable to Hobbes’s insinuations that he was the consummate clerical careerist, a young-(church)man-in-a-hurry who had trimmed his Jacobean calvinist sails for smooth sailing and plunder in Caroline arminian waters.

Hobbes’s later insinuations that Bramhall’s career had been devoted to self-enrichment was furnished grounds by the fact that the latter was successful not only in obtaining property and increased revenue for the church, but also for himself and his family – and not only for his nuclear but also his extended family and Yorkshire acquaintances. In 1632, while Bramhall was still subdean at Ripon, his younger sister Katheryn had married a fellow clergyman, John Smith.⁴⁰ Whether Bramhall helped arrange this marriage cannot be determined; but we can only suppose that he was instrumental in Smith’s later preferment to the rectory of Enniskillen in Fermanagh. While Katheryn Bramhall was being married to Smith in Ripon, another of Bramhall’s sisters, Elizabeth, was in Pontefract marrying into the south Yorkshire clerical dynasty of the Pulleins. Her husband, Samuel Pulein, was

³⁶ McCafferty, ‘John Bramhall’, *ODNB*; Haddan, *BW*, I, vi, ‘s’, cxiii; ‘He had been but a little while here [Ireland] when he was made archdeacon of Meath, a dignity of good value, I think the best of that title in this Church.’ Vesey, *AH*, vii. It was in Meath that Bramhall later bought himself a large estate. McCafferty, ‘Bramhall and Reconstruction’, 11.

³⁷ Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1634, Laud, *Works*, vi, 372–8.

³⁸ Henry Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae: The Succession of the Prelates and Members of the Cathedral Bodies in Ireland* (Dublin, 1848–78; 6 vols.), III, 317; Haddan, *BW*, I, cxiii.

³⁹ Ussher to Ward, 30 Apr. 1634, Ussher, *Works*, ed. Elrington, xv, 578. Of all the sees in the four ecclesiastical provinces of Ireland, Meath, Derry, Clogher, Raphoe and Armagh were ‘by far the best-endowed . . . richer than even the archiepiscopal see of Dublin’. Hugh Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland, 1633–1641: A Study in Absolutism*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 124.

⁴⁰ NYCRO, Ripon Cathedral Registers.

probably the nephew of the Thomas Pullein who had been vicar of Pontefract while Bramhall was growing up there.⁴¹ Bramhall's family had likely been pretty close to the vicar and his. It is surely no coincidence that this brother-in-law went over to Ireland at about the same time that Bramhall himself did. While Bramhall was to go over to be chaplain of the lord deputy, Wentworth, in 1632 Pullein went over to be a chaplain of James Butler, first marquess of Ormonde, who was to become a close friend of Bramhall in the 1640s and 1650s.⁴² Yet another younger sister of Bramhall, Abigail, was to marry Robert Forward, who had replaced Bramhall as chaplain to Wentworth, and was to become dean of Dromore, no doubt not without Bramhall exerting his influence along the way.⁴³ Bramhall also found opportunities to prefer old acquaintances from England. For his tutor from Sidney, for example, Richard Howlett, he procured the rectory of Aghalurcher in the diocese of Clogher and then the deanery of Cashel.⁴⁴

Wentworth and Laud requested that the king appoint Bramhall to Derry. It was ultimately Charles I's decision to make him bishop. Since Bramhall was something of a client of the reputed arminian Laud, the former's receipt of the bishopric of Derry in 1634 may be regarded as an instance of the king's patronage of arminianism. Bramhall was only bishop of Derry, but his power was to go far beyond that see. Although he was technically subordinate to the primate of Ireland, James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, in actuality he soon came to wield more power over many church affairs than his superior.⁴⁵ Of course, this had much to do with the fact that Bramhall worked in close consultation with the lord deputy, and could justify any deviation from Ussher by citing his obedience to the king's viceregent, Wentworth,

⁴¹ That he was a nephew, or even more distant relation, I conclude from the genealogical research of Catherine Pullein, *The Pulleyns of Yorkshire* (Leeds: J. Whitehead and Son, 1915), 317–52. For more details about the Bramhalls in Pontefract and Thomas Pullein, see Jackson, 'Hobbes vs. Bramhall', Appendix 1, 377–8.

⁴² Pullein, *The Pulleyns*, 334. At the Restoration, Bramhall was to be instrumental in making this brother-in-law archbishop of Tuam. Bramhall himself performed the consecration.

⁴³ Bramhall's influence can be inferred from a letter of William Juxon, Bishop of London, to Bramhall, 1635[?], *HMC Hastings*, vi, 70.

⁴⁴ For the rectory of Aghalurcher and deanery of Cashel, see McCafferty, 'Bramhall and Reconstruction', 9 and 146, respectively. The migration to Ireland of the families of Wentworth, Wandesford and Bramhall, and those of their Yorkshire associates – such as George Radcliffe, Wentworth's secretary and legal counsel – constituted a sort of 'Yorkshire mafia' colonialism. The phrase 'Yorkshire mafia' I borrow from McCafferty, 'John Bramhall and the Church of Ireland in the 1630s' in *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland since the Reformation*, eds. Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 100. This 'Yorkshiring' of Ireland recalls the wry remark of G. B. Shaw, 'I am a typical Irishman; my family came from Yorkshire.' Quoted in G. K. Chesterton, *George Bernard Shaw* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1956), 12. I thank Jeremy C. Jackson for this reference.

⁴⁵ Bickley points out that shortly after becoming bishop of Derry: 'He was soon recognised as the virtual head of the Irish church.' *HMC Hastings*, vi, xvi. See also Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, 114, 118–19.

and, thus, to the king himself.⁴⁶ The bishop was the lord deputy's right-hand man in all ecclesiastical matters. His knowledge and administration of church affairs quickly became superior in range, depth and vigour to any in the land. As Wentworth's principal agent, 'all church business was now routed through Bramhall', as 'no transaction concerning church lands or revenues across Ireland's twenty-six dioceses was made without, at very least, his knowledge and, more usually, his active participation'.⁴⁷ Thus, although Bramhall was technically only bishop of Derry, he functioned as though he were bishop of all dioceses.⁴⁸ One could argue that only such enormous (or inordinate) power would have been adequate for fixing the enormous problems that stood in the way of establishing a strong protestant, episcopalian church in Ireland.⁴⁹ What one might call the Wentworth–Bramhall primacy in Irish ecclesiastical affairs involved more than the control of patronage.⁵⁰ This dynamic duo was also energetic and successful in carrying out deep doctrinal and ceremonial reform. They discovered puritan and presbyterian elements so formidable – not only outside but inside the protestant church of Ireland – as to require drastic measures.⁵¹ As early as August 1633, before he had become bishop of Derry, Bramhall was writing of his wish that 'both the Articles and Canons of the Church of England were established here by Act of Parliament, or State; that as we live all under one king, so we might both in doctrine and discipline observe an uniformity'.⁵² During the parliament of 1634–5 Bramhall and Wentworth attempted to move the Irish

⁴⁶ 'Bramhall always presented himself as Wentworth's representative and . . . emissary.' McCafferty, 'Bramhall and the Church of Ireland', 101.

⁴⁷ McCafferty, 'Bramhall and Reconstruction', 29.

⁴⁸ 'The degree of trust which Wentworth placed in Bramhall made it pointless to appeal against any of the bishop's actions. The solidarity made Bramhall more than just a representative. It made him a plenipotentiary.' McCafferty, 'Bramhall and Reconstruction', 51.

⁴⁹ Pluralism, long leases, defective taxation records, systematic undervaluations and illegitimate impropriations were problems identified by Bramhall in correspondence with Laud. McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', *ODNB*. See Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, for a thorough treatment of these problems in wider context.

⁵⁰ But one might just as accurately style it the Wentworth–Bramhall–Laud primacy, for, as Alan Ford recently observed: 'The prime movers in ecclesiastical matters in Ireland were the king, Wentworth, Laud and Bramhall.' "'That Bugbear Arminianism": Archbishop Laud and Trinity College, Dublin' in *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 157. The logic of the church of Ireland restoration programme undertaken by Bramhall and Wentworth, in consultation with Laud, is stated by Laud in a letter to Bramhall of 16 August 1633, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 55–6: 'The clergymen must needs be as ignorant and base as is their means.' *HMC Hastings*, iv, 55.

⁵¹ As Alan Ford has remarked, the Scots, whose migration to Ulster in the first three decades of the century was considerable, 'had created a Presbyterian church within the established one'. 'The Church of Ireland, 1558–1634' in *As By Law Established*, 65. See also Phil Kilroy, 'Protestantism in Ulster, 1610–1641' in *Ulster 1641*, ed. Brian Mac Cuarta, 25–36, for this complicated religious scene into which Bramhall was thrown – or threw himself.

⁵² Bramhall to Laud, 10 August 1633, Dublin Castle. *BW*, i, lxxx.

church towards greater conformity with the church of England.⁵³ Bramhall took the lead in the upper house of convocation in pushing for reforms, while Wentworth's chaplain, Croxton, assumed the same directing role in the lower house. It was hoped that the convocation would import and establish the English Thirty-Nine Articles of 1563. They also intended to have all of the English canons of 1604 received into the Irish church.⁵⁴ These were ambitious goals and would mean profound changes to the status quo; such reform would amount to substantial constitutional alteration of the church of Ireland. The Irish articles of 1615 which the English Thirty-Nine were meant to supplant were markedly calvinist, whereas the English were studiously ambiguous on key points.⁵⁵ The Irish articles of 1615 had incorporated the strongly calvinist tenor of the Lambeth articles of 1595, which had enunciated the most extreme position on predestination ('double predestination').⁵⁶ These Irish articles were most likely the work of Ussher.⁵⁷ And as for the English canons of 1604 which Wentworth and Bramhall hoped to establish *in toto*, they were emphatically not calvinist. Thus, the proposal to import them into the Irish church was bound to offend the calvinist primate, Ussher, who had always been indulgent towards puritans, those whose calvinism was so pronounced.⁵⁸ The 1634 articles and canons were

⁵³ Vesey, AH, xviii–xix.

⁵⁴ For the endeavour to establish the articles and canons from the church of England, see Ford, 'Church of Ireland, 1558–1634', 66–8, and McCafferty, 'Bramhall and the Church of Ireland', 'Bramhall and Reconstruction', and "God bless your free Church of Ireland": Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall and the Irish Convocation of 1634' in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641*, ed. Julia F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 187–208.

⁵⁵ Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, 115. In a letter to Laud, dated 21 August 1634, Bramhall tellingly called these Irish articles 'most incommodious'. *HMC Hastings*, iv, 61.

⁵⁶ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 155, n.167, 228; see also Alan Ford, *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590–1641* (Frankfurt, 1985), 194–201 and 'Church of Ireland, 1558–1634', 58–9; and Aidan Clarke, 'The 1641 Rebellion and Anti-Popery in Ireland' in *Ulster 1641*, ed. Brian Mac Cuarta, 145–6. However, Peter White has argued that the Lambeth articles of 1595 were not arrantly or rigidly calvinist. His argument against the 'widespread misconception' that they were can be found in *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 101–23.

⁵⁷ For the attribution to Ussher, see R. Buick Knox, *James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967), 16–18 and Amanda Capern, 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension', *HJ* 39, 1 (1996): 72, n.69. Ussher was far from alone in preferring these articles to the English, as many bishops and clergy in convocation showed themselves unwilling to adopt any change that would not at the least affirm the Irish ones. For a more recent discussion of the 1615 articles, see McCafferty, 'When Reformations Collide' in *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century*, eds. Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (Dublin: Four Courts, 2002), 194–6.

⁵⁸ Cf. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, 115, who considered this attempt to import the 1604 canons as a 'declaration of war' on Ussher and anti-arminians. One indication of Ussher's toleration of puritans may be seen in the fact that, as Ford observes, the 1615 Irish articles 'quite clearly go out of their way to ensure that those with precisian scruples should not in any way be excluded from fellowship'. 'Church of Ireland, 1558–1634', 58. He also notes,

very disturbing to the Scots presbyterians in Ulster. The latter would have serious difficulty in conforming to them. By these reforms, Wentworth and Bramhall were effectively disaffecting and driving some Scots presbyterians in Ulster out of the church of Ireland. The latter's creed was decidedly more compatible with the previous, Ussher-devised, set of articles.

In the last analysis, Wentworth and Bramhall's success in this 1634–5 ecclesiastical reform attempt was not complete.⁵⁹ But whatever assessment is made, there can be little doubt that the reform that Bramhall prosecuted was seen by many as a blatant attempt to 'arminianise' the church of Ireland. John Vesey, Bramhall's younger contemporary and first biographer, relates that as soon as news of this reform had spread, there was an outcry that 'Popery and Arminianism . . . were creeping into the Church'.⁶⁰ This helps us to understand why the fiercely anti-arminian/anti-Laudian Scots were to be such dangerous enemies of Bramhall in the autumn of 1641 in Londonderry. In the years before the Ulster Rising, Bramhall had been vigorous in enforcing conformity at the expense of these dissident Scots presbyterians in the church of Ireland. He did not hesitate to reprove and excommunicate some of them – even some outside his own diocese – for refusing to conform.⁶¹ The Irish high commission appointed in 1636 came to be dominated by Bramhall, and he was intent upon purging the church of such nonconformists and their lay supporters.⁶² The animosity of the presbyterian Scots towards Bramhall was to be all the more virulent for the fact that this Irish high commission became a scourge of all those in Ulster who supported or

ibid., 62, that Ussher was a vocal opponent of 'Arminian tendencies' in the 1620s, who had 'moved happily in English puritan circles'.

⁵⁹ McCafferty, our authority on the subject, has concluded that: 'In their final form the Irish Canons were the product of a clash between Bramhall, trying not only to ensure the greatest conformity with England but also to target specific Irish abuses and "improve" on the English Canons, and Ussher, who was seeking to preserve the broader, more godly base of the Irish church and trying to ensure that some marks of independence were included in the canons.' 'Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall', 199. Ford also notes the limited success of Wentworth and Bramhall. 'Church of Ireland, 1558–1634', 66. See also Vesey, AH, xix, who describes the compromise between Ussher and Bramhall over the canons, and notes that Bramhall's part was principal in drafting and revising them.

⁶⁰ Vesey, AH, xix.

⁶¹ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, 25. Robert Baillie, admittedly an enormously hostile source, later recalled: 'The Warner [Bramhall] (I hope) has not yet forgotten, how Doctor Bramble and his neighbour [Henry] Lesly of Down did cast out of the ministry, and made flee out of the kingdom, men most eminent in zeal, piety and learning, who in a short time had done more good in the house of God, then all the bishops that ever were in Ireland, I mean Mr. Blair, Mr. Levington [Livingstone], Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Cunningham, and others.' *A Review of Fair Warning*, 20–1: see below, chapter 5, n.68, for this book. For some specimens of Bramhall's discipline of presbyterians in Ulster, to which Baillie was referring, see Richard Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts and during the Interregnum* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909–16; 3 vols.), I, 232–5.

⁶² McCafferty, 'Bramhall and Reconstruction', 166.

condoned the presbyterian national covenant of the Scots.⁶³ By the end of 1637, Ulster Scots, many of whom had been upset by Bramhall's activities, were exhibiting approval for their prayer-book-defiant compatriots back home. Indeed, there is some irony in the fact that some of those Scots who became covenanters in 1638 were the very men that Bramhall's discipline had effectively driven out of Ireland in the mid-1630s. Wentworth and Bramhall responded to the Ulster Scots' support of the national movement back in their homeland by forcing the latter either to forswear the covenant or leave Ireland.⁶⁴ The bishop's old patron and friend, the master of rolls in Dublin, Christopher Wandesford, understood that the scourge of the presbyterian Scots in Derry might soon become a target of violence. In the summer of 1638, with covenanting fervour increasing in Scotland, and finding favour among Scots in Ulster, Wandesford pleaded with Bramhall to be careful to avoid harm at the hands of presbyterians in Derry: 'you must be careful of yourself, and be aware of those of that [covenanter] disposition in your northern parts. God knows how far the like fury may transport them also.'⁶⁵ This did not deter Bramhall from taking a hard line. In the spring of 1639 he arrested one clergyman in Londonderry for praying for the success of the covenanters in Scotland.⁶⁶ Bramhall provoked further rancour in the pro-covenant Scots in Ulster by receiving and supporting the fugitive clergy from Scotland whose episcopalianism and anti-covenant stance had rendered them unsafe in that kingdom.⁶⁷ In fact, with one of these Scottish refugees, John Corbet, Bramhall collaborated on at least one anti-covenant pamphlet.⁶⁸ In light of all this, it is not hard to account for the cutting remark of the sixth earl of Rothes, a Scottish noble who helped to orchestrate the covenanting

⁶³ See McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', ODNB.

⁶⁴ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, 26. The enforced abjuration of the covenant was dubbed the Black Oath. For Bramhall's administration of this oath and his other anti-covenant activities in 1638–40, see Wentworth to Bramhall, 7 June 1639, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xiv, and McCafferty, 'Bramhall and the Church of Ireland', 104. During these years Wentworth was endeavouring to raise an army in Ireland to bring over to Scotland to suppress the covenanters – no doubt with whatever help Bramhall could provide.

⁶⁵ Wandesford to Bramhall, 7 August 1638, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xx.

⁶⁶ Wentworth to Bramhall, 7 June 1639, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xvi.

⁶⁷ Vesey, AH, xxiii–xxiv.

⁶⁸ Vesey, AH, xxiv, says that Bramhall assisted Corbet in writing *The Epistle Congratulatory of Lysimachus Nicanor of the Society of Jesu, to the Covenanters in Scotland* (1640), and also endeavoured to find him a living in Ireland. Corbet had refused to submit to the authority of the General Assembly in 1638, and in the next year dedicated his anti-covenant *The Ungirding of the Scottish Armour* to Wentworth. John Callow, 'John Corbet', ODNB. For Bramhall and Corbet see also Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, 1, 234–5. For Bramhall's encouragement of anti-covenant clergy in Scotland, and his attempt to inform himself of developments there, see also Bramhall to David Michael, 19 December 1638, *HMC Hastings*, IV, 80. Laud's letter to Bramhall of 2 September 1639 indicates that the latter had written to the archbishop about obtaining support for fugitive anti-covenant Scottish clergy. *HMC Hastings*, IV, 83.

movement, that Bramhall was ‘the most unsound man in Ireland, a great Arminian’.⁶⁹ Nor is it difficult to explain why the Scots commissioners in London in December 1640 referred to him as the ‘vicar general of Ireland, a man prompt for exalting of Canterbury and popery and Arminianism’.⁷⁰

Bramhall’s reform efforts went well beyond doctrine, ceremony and discipline and into economic affairs between clergy and, more dangerously, between clergy and laymen. He set out to rectify illegal and unjust legal arrangements that had been depriving the church of much revenue, aiming ultimately at the full-scale recovery of the patrimony that had been considerably alienated, having fallen into the hands of laymen in the last several decades. What records survive of the Irish high commission dominated by Bramhall suggest a concentration upon clerical income and property. In this his diligence was just as impressive as in doctrine and discipline. Like the change in articles and canons, the economic reform that Wentworth and Bramhall were undertaking would mean a deep change in the status quo. And like the imposition of the English articles and canons, the enrichment of the church – or alleviation of clerical poverty – was bound to be very unwelcome to those with considerable investment in the status quo. In the 1634–5 parliament Bramhall drafted and successfully carried several acts to improve the economic welfare of the church. At the bishop’s funeral, Jeremy Taylor recalled that Bramhall had been able in just a few years to recover to the church the astonishing sum of £30,000 per annum; and Vesey related that before he had fled Ireland, Bramhall had doubled the rent of his bishopric.⁷¹ To read his correspondence with Laud and Wentworth from the 1630s is to get some idea of how brilliant a clerical businessman Bramhall was. In these letters one sees every sign of a shrewd surveyor and assessor of property and profitability.⁷² Taylor paid tribute to Bramhall’s zest for business: ‘He was a man of great business and great resort: “Semper aliquis in Cydonis domo,” as the Corinthians said; “There was always somebody in Cydon’s house.”’⁷³ As a fundraiser for the church in Ireland Bramhall’s success was so great as to breed a host of lay enemies who had been enjoying the ecclesiastical wealth that he restored to clerical ownership. Bramhall’s success

⁶⁹ See above, note 1.

⁷⁰ Bodl. Rawlinson D 921, f. 78, as quoted in McCafferty, ‘Bramhall and the Church of Ireland’, 104. In the summer of 1637 Bramhall had corresponded with John Spottiswoode, archbishop of St Andrew’s, and lord chancellor of Scotland, who had sent him a copy of the controversial Scottish prayer book – which Bramhall praised, and which had sparked the covenanting movement. See Bramhall to Spottiswoode, 13 August 1637, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xiv.

⁷¹ Taylor, ‘Funeral Sermon’, *BW*, I, lxi; Vesey, *AH*, xi. For further account of Bramhall’s financial wizardry on behalf of the church, and Laud’s great confidence in it, see Vesey, *AH*, xv.

⁷² For instance, see Bramhall to Wentworth, 17 March 1634, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 57–9, one of his field reports. Vesey, *AH*, ix, relates how active Bramhall was in ‘surveying of glebes and valuing of tithes to make the clergy richer’.

⁷³ Taylor, ‘Funeral Sermon’, *BW*, I, lxxiv.

was ultimately to cause him serious trouble: in endowing the church with property and revenues that had been in the hands of both catholic and protestant, Irish, Scottish and English laymen, he fashioned for himself a rod with which he would be beaten at the fall of Wentworth.⁷⁴ Bramhall's productivity as an ecclesiastical fundraiser was, again, to render him vulnerable to Hobbes's insinuation that he had been a bishop much more concerned with the 'temporal' than the 'spiritual'; much more a 'prelate' (haughty, domineering and worldly administrator) than a humble pastor of pastors. In that insinuation, the philosopher was to be echoing Bramhall's embittered Scots presbyterian and Irish catholic enemies – or victims.

There is no reason to suppose that King Charles I did not approve of Bramhall's actions in Ireland. In 1635 Laud wrote to Bramhall:

This passage in your letter, and the next, his Majesty likes extremely well, and in testimony of his approbation did presently without any sticking command me to write unto you, that you should go presently to overthrow the fee farm of Sir John Fitzedmonds; and promises if you do it that the £700 a year issuing out of Cloyne shall go first to buy in impropriations; and then afterwards he will either erect a bishopric at Cloyne, or confirm the union of it to Corke, as he shall find fittest for the Church and government.⁷⁵

If not for Lord Deputy Wentworth's fall and the subsequent rebellions and wars in the British Isles, Bramhall might eventually have been elevated to a high civil office such as the lord chancellorship. Just a few years before the collapse of Wentworth's regime, there was a rumour that Bramhall would be preferred to that position. In November 1637, Garrard, Wentworth's agent in London, noting Bramhall's presence there, wrote: 'I see your Bishop of Derry here, Dr Bramhall; a very able man I hear he is, and one told me he should be the Lord Chancellor of Ireland.'⁷⁶ As a sort of passport for Bramhall's trip to England in 1637, Wentworth wrote a strong letter of recommendation to Secretary Coke:

My Lord Bishop of Derry being to go into England, and after to see London, before his return back, I can do no less than to recommend him to your favour, as a person not only of very great merit in the service of the Church, but also of the Crown, in

⁷⁴ Bramhall made numerous enemies of Ulster protestants by his participation in the lord deputy's appropriation of lands that had belonged to the Londonderry Company. Bramhall was appointed administrator of the commission to carry out the transferral of lands from the company to the king. Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 297.

⁷⁵ 16 January 1635, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 63–4.

⁷⁶ Quoted by Berwick in note to Wentworth's letter to Lord Keeper Coventry, 11 September 1637, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xv. McCafferty notes that in 1634 Laud and Wentworth considered making Bramhall a privy counsellor, and in 1638, lord chancellor. 'John Bramhall', *ODNB*. Vesey relates that when asked why he did not become a member of the Irish privy council, Bramhall astutely replied: 'I should in being a privy counsellor become a judge, and could not be an advocate for the clergy'. AH, xxi.

both which I assure you, he daily expreseth, both great good affections and abilities, so far as he is a person of your respect, and to have the honour to be known to his Majesty. And it would in my poor judgment be very good, his Majesty were pleased to let him know, that he understands the good endeavours that he shows to the bettering of this kingdom and people, I do assure you I do not conceive him to be fellowed in those respects by any we have of that profession on this side, and therefore to encourage him in so good a way will do very well.⁷⁷

During this stay in London, Bramhall not only had the gratification of visiting with Laud, who confirmed his friendship, but also enjoyed the privilege of being presented to the king (by Laud), who expressed appreciation for Bramhall's efforts in Ireland.⁷⁸

Of his career in Ireland with Wentworth, Bramhall later reflected: 'The Earl of Strafford, then Lieutenant of Ireland, did commit . . . to my hands the political regiment of that Church for the space of eight years.'⁷⁹ As the lord deputy's intimate colleague and director of ecclesiastical affairs, Bramhall was bound to suffer by Wentworth's fall at the end of the decade. Wentworth having repaired to England to become chief advisor to the king, his deputy, Wandesford, lost control of the Irish parliament that met in five sessions in 1640–1.⁸⁰ The forty-four grievances concerning clerical exactions presented by the Irish house of commons in June 1640 may be read as a denial of the lawfulness of Bramhall's actions as ecclesiastical administrator. A personal attack on Bramhall may also be observed in the Irish Remonstrance of 7 November 1640, which complained of the Irish high commission, the administrative agency with which Bramhall had become so closely associated.⁸¹ On 27 February 1641, a committee in the Irish house of commons was appointed to draw up charges of impeachment against Sir Richard Bolton,

⁷⁷ Dated Naas, 12 September 1637, quoted in Vesey, AH, xxi. For a similar letter that Wentworth wrote to Lord Keeper Coventry, dated 11 September 1637, see *Rawdon Papers*, No. xv.

⁷⁸ Bramhall had an audience with the king in late October: Laud to Wentworth, 1 November 1637, Laud, *Works*, vii, 379. On the way to London, he travelled through Scotland (Laud to Wentworth, 1 November 1637) and visited Ripon, York and Pontefract. Vesey, AH, xxi, reports that at York Bramhall was very warmly received by Archbishop Neile, and 'feasted sumptuously' variously by the mayor, aldermen and prominent residents of the city.

⁷⁹ *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*, BW, ii, 124; 'the political part of the care of that Church did lie heavy upon my shoulders'. BW, v, 74. Incidentally, Hobbes, in his history of the civil war, was to note the king's approval of Wentworth's vicereignty (and, by extension, Wentworth and Bramhall's ecclesiastical programme, which was carried out under the supervision and collaboration of Laud): 'he [Charles] made him . . . Lieutenant of Ireland, which place he discharged with great satisfaction and benefit of his Majesty'. *Behemoth*, 66.

⁸⁰ McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', ODNB. On 3 December 1640, Wandesford died, attended on his deathbed by Bramhall, who also preached his funeral sermon (Christ Church, Dublin, 10 December 1640) and served as an executor of his will.

⁸¹ McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', ODNB.

lord chancellor of Ireland, Sir Gerard Lowther, lord chief justice of the common pleas, Bramhall, and Sir George Radcliffe.⁸² Most commentators have concluded that they were all impeached to deprive Wentworth of the benefit of their counsel and testimony at the latter's impeachment trial before the house of lords at Westminster.⁸³ On 4 March 1641, the Irish house of commons exhibited articles of high treason against Bramhall (and the other colleagues of Wentworth) to the Irish house of lords.⁸⁴ They were impeached for having conspired to 'subvert the fundamental laws and government of that kingdom', and to 'introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government'; to have 'pronounced many false, unjust, and erroneous judgments, against law, which had occasioned divers seditions and rebellions'; and to have 'laboured to subvert the rights of Parliament, and the ancient course of Parliamentary proceedings'.⁸⁵ Bramhall immediately travelled from Londonderry to Dublin to confront his accusers.⁸⁶

His parliamentary accusers may have been startled at his braving their presence, but this did not prevent them from promptly clapping him into a cell. Confined in Dublin Castle, Bramhall scribbled the following note to his wife, Eleanor, back in Londonderry:

I have been near a fortnight at the black rod, charged with treason. Never any man was more innocent of that foul crime; the ground is only my reservedness. God in his mercy, I do not doubt, will send us many merry and happy days together after this, when this storm is blown over. But this is a time of humiliation for the present. By all the love between us, I require thee that thou do not cast down thyself, but bear it with a cheerful mind, and trust in God that he will deliver us.⁸⁷

⁸² *CJI*, 1, 328.

⁸³ Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, 211. Jane Ohlmeyer has not challenged this older view; see, for example, 'The Irish Peers, Political Power and Parliament, 1640–1641' in *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer, 166.

⁸⁴ *LJI*, 1, 165. In claiming that Sir Brian O'Neill was the MP principally responsible for initiating impeachment proceedings against Bramhall, I assume Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, 129, is following Vesey, *AH*, xxiv, who relates that O'Neill 'laid a snare for his life' on 6 March 1641. Jeremy Taylor, while noting that over two hundred petitions were brought against him, claims that Bramhall was able thoroughly to vindicate himself, sometimes answering twenty of these petitions in one day. 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, 1, lxiii–lxiv. This flood of petitions against Bramhall began in February 1641, and was still inundating the Irish house of lords in July. John McCafferty, "'To follow the late precedents of England": The Irish Impeachment Proceedings of 1641' in *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History: Irish Legal History Society Discourses and Other Papers, 1996–1999*, eds. D. S. Greer and N. M. Dawson (Dublin: Four Courts, 2001), 68.

⁸⁵ Haddan, *BW*, 1, viii–ix. For Audley Mervyn's speech in the Irish house of lords on 4 March 1641, upon presentation of the articles of impeachment drawn up by the house of commons against Bolton, Lowther, Bramhall and Radcliffe, see Rushworth, *IV* (Pt III, vol. 1), 214–18. For the articles of impeachment of Bramhall for high treason, see Rushworth, *IV* (Pt III, vol. 1), 219–20.

⁸⁶ Vesey, *AH*, xxiv. ⁸⁷ 12 March 1641, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxx.

Bramhall then appealed to the lords justices to be allowed bail. In the first place he stressed that he had come over to Ireland only because others had persuaded him to do so.⁸⁸ He was moved to come only ‘for the good and settlement of this church’, which he had ‘endeavoured faithfully, diligently and zealously with infinite toil to myself and with great expense of mine own means’.⁸⁹ During this detainment Bramhall wrote to Ussher requesting the king’s intervention. In this letter of 26 April 1641, Bramhall imputes the ‘great affliction that has befallen me’ to his ‘zeal to the service of his Majesty and the good of this Church, in being a poor instrument to restore the usurped advowsons and appropriations to the Crown, and to increase the revenue of the Church, in a fair just way always with the consent of parties’.⁹⁰ Ussher replied within a few weeks, informing Bramhall of the measures that were being taken on his behalf.⁹¹ In another undated letter that must have been penned only a few weeks after the other, Ussher wrote:

However I have been silent all this while (expecting every day to get from his Majesty some such answer as I might hope would give you full contentment), yet I assure you my care never slackened, in soliciting your cause at Court with as much vigilance as if it did touch mine own proper person. I never intermitted an occasion of mediating with his Majesty in your behalf, who still pitied your case, acknowledging the faithfulness of your service both to the church and to him, avowed that you were no more guilty of treason than himself, and assured me that he would do for you all that lay in his power. My Lord Strafford, the very night before his suffering [12 May 1641] . . . sent me to the King, giving me charge, among other particulars, to put him in mind of you, and of the other two Lords that are under the same pressure; who thereupon declared unto me, that he had already given order, that the Parliament was not to proceed in their judgement, until they could show some precedent of such legal process exercised there since Poyning’s Act, telling them that he was loath to give into new courses, and wishing them to acquaint him with what they had to say against you, that he might do them right therein as he found cause.⁹²

Far from sacrificing him for appeasement’s sake, Charles seems to have been prepared to stand by, and vindicate his controversial arminian bishop of Derry. As Ussher indicated, the king had responded to the Irish commons’ impeachment proceedings by demanding a precedent and implying

⁸⁸ Vesey, AH, vi–vii, describes Bramhall’s great reluctance to leave England, and Wandesford and Wentworth’s successful struggle to overcome it. Among other things, there were ‘men of honour and interest’ in Yorkshire ‘who urged his continuance in his own country’. According to Vesey, all the reasons for staying in England, including anticipated promotion in the near future, were overcome by the single concern of doing his duty to help the ‘oppressed’ church of Ireland. AH, vii.

⁸⁹ Petition to lords justices, 6 March 1641, Irish Hastings Papers, 14064, at the Huntington Library.

⁹⁰ Quoted in Vesey, AH, xxv; *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxii.

⁹¹ *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxiii; the letter is undated; it must have been penned in May or June.

⁹² Ussher to Bramhall, n.d., *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxiv.

that Poyning's Law precluded such action without his express authorisation. By 13 May 1641, Bramhall had composed a formal answer to the articles exhibited against him.⁹³ Since providing a precedent for impeachment and a demonstration of its consonance with Poyning's Law was no small difficulty, the proceedings against Bramhall dwindled to almost nothing by July 1641. In August the king wrote a letter to the speaker of the Irish house of lords, instructing that house to exercise lenience in dealing with Lowther, Bolton and Bramhall.⁹⁴ When parliament itself was prorogued in that month, so ended, for the time being, the impeachment proceedings against Bramhall.⁹⁵ He was released from Dublin Castle sometime between August and 23 October 1641, when the rebellion broke out.⁹⁶ He then returned to Londonderry, in time to face the dangers described at the beginning of this chapter. He had jumped from the frying pan of imprisonment into the fire of murderous plots. At the end of 1641 or early 1642, Bramhall slipped out of Londonderry to return to England. As the First English Civil War was to erupt not long after his arrival there, it may also be observed that in fleeing Ireland for England, he was jumping from one fire into yet another. As we shall see, Hobbes was to do more than insinuate that Bramhall himself had contributed to their kindling. The implication was that if the bishop had been singed, it was by a conflagration to which he himself had contributed much fuel. Since Bramhall had been acting with the express approval, if not encouragement, of Charles I, Hobbes would be implying that the king, too, had been scorched by flames of his own kindling.

⁹³ McCafferty, 'Irish Impeachment Proceedings of 1641', 64–5, 67.

⁹⁴ *CSPI*, 332. Jeremy Taylor was later to recall the king's intervention on Bramhall's behalf: 'But . . . King Charles . . . seeing so great a champion likely to be oppressed with numbers and despair, sent what rescue he could, his royal letter for his bail, which was hardly granted to him; and when it was, it was upon such hard terms, that his very delivery was a persecution.' 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, I, lxiv–lxv.

⁹⁵ Only for the time being, as, according to McCafferty, proceedings against Bramhall did not effectively end until the Irish house of lords discharged him in April 1644. 'The Irish Impeachment Proceedings of 1641', 66.

⁹⁶ McCafferty, in *ODNB*, states that Bramhall was not released until early 1642, but I have not been able to corroborate this. Thus, I have decided to follow Vesey, who seems to indicate that Bramhall's release from Dublin Castle and return to Londonderry shortly *preceded* the outbreak of the Ulster Rising: 'the Bishop of Derry was hardly got down, before the first crack to that city'. *AH*, xxvi. However, Taylor seems to indicate that Bramhall returned to Londonderry *after* the rising had broken out: 'The rebellion breaking out, the Bishop went to his charge at Derry.' 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, I, lxvi.

Bishop Bramhall, the Earl of Newcastle, Thomas Hobbes and the First English Civil War

At the end of 1641, then, or in the first few months of 1642, Bramhall fled Ireland. Presumably he landed at Chester, the port where most Irish travellers in the seventeenth century entered England.¹ Vesey implies that it was soon after landing in England that the king received him.² Vesey was probably following Jeremy Taylor, who related that the fugitive bishop immediately took sanctuary at the king's headquarters at Oxford.³ But one must suppose that Bramhall was at least briefly in London before repairing to Oxford. For we may assume that it was not long after landing in England that he scribbled his wife the following note from the capital:

I heard great reports to terrify me from coming to London for fear of the Parliament, but find no such thing as yet but many friends in the House. The Earl of Kildare's agents arrested me at Chester and threatened me at London. I have filed a bill against them in Chancery, which I doubt not will end the matter. This has much hindered me from prosecuting the cause for supply to Londonderry.⁴

Bramhall soon removed to his native Yorkshire and by the end of 1642 he was in contact with William Cavendish, first earl of Newcastle, the leading royalist commander in the northern theatre of the First English Civil War, 1642–6.⁵ Newcastle had been serving the king in arms on and off since the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars in 1639.⁶ In the first few months of 1639 Newcastle had left London for the north to raise troops of cavalry

¹ Bramhall's younger brother, William, may still have been living in Cheshire at this time. See Laud to Bramhall, 11 August 1638, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xix.

² Vesey, AH, xxvi. By mid-March 1642 the king had moved his court to York; in October 1642 he made Oxford his headquarters.

³ Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, 1, lxvii.

⁴ *HMC Hastings*, iv, 92. The editor of this torn letter, Francis Bickley, gave a tentative dating of 1641, but suggested that it may have been written early 1642. *HMC Hastings*, iv, xxiv. I incline to the later dating.

⁵ According to McCafferty, *ODNB*, Bramhall was in Ripon by 30 September 1642, after a brief stay at Oxford.

⁶ His wife, Margaret Cavendish, later noted that for these wars Newcastle loaned Charles the prodigious sum of £10,000. *Life of Cavendish*, 9.

at his own expense.⁷ Just a year earlier, in 1638, he had been preferred to the prestigious office of governor of the prince of Wales (the future King Charles II).⁸ Newcastle's assistance in the north turned out to be far from enough to thwart the covenanters of the northern kingdom. And by June 1639 Newcastle had returned to London, and on 29 November 1639 was sworn of the privy council.⁹ He then sat in both parliaments of 1640, but in May 1641 Newcastle was implicated in the First Army Plot.¹⁰ He was nearly impeached, and in July 1641, under heavy pressure, resigned his post of governor.¹¹ Newcastle then repaired to Welbeck, his large estate in Sherwood Forest in north Nottinghamshire. Not very long afterwards he was called upon to do the king more service in Yorkshire as the conflict between Charles and the leaders of the Long Parliament escalated.

From 1642 onward Newcastle acted for the king in many of the regions in England north of the river Trent. In January the king appointed him governor of Hull. With the clash of arms looming, Hull was of enormous strategic value, for it was then, next to London, the location of the largest armoury in England, and stood in convenient coastal position to receive communications and supplies from the continent.¹² However, Newcastle was only in Hull a few days before he received a summons from parliament, and was replaced by Sir John Hotham.¹³ In June 1642, after attending the king at York, the earl was appointed governor of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, a port from which supplies from the continent would be conveyed to royalist troops.¹⁴ He was able to secure that town as well as the surrounding county, Northumberland, and the adjacent county palatine of Durham. Upon the eruption of war in late summer 1642, he was appointed a general of the king's forces in the north.

⁷ Clarendon, *History of Rebellion*, I, 164 (Bk II, 53).

⁸ G. E. Aylmer, *The King's Servants: The Civil Service of Charles I, 1625–1642* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961), 76–7. According to Hutton, *Charles II*, 2, Newcastle was chosen governor partly because of his detachment from various court factions. The official correspondence pertaining to this appointment may be found in CCSP, II, 7.

⁹ Lynn Hulse, 'William Cavendish, first Duke of Newcastle', ODNB.

¹⁰ See Margaret Cavendish's relation, *Life of Cavendish*, 8, and Firth's note, *ibid.*, n. 1; also see A. S. Turberville, *A History of Welbeck Abbey and its Owners* (London: Faber and Faber, 1938), 64–5, and Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 86. Newcastle's involvement in the scheme was only insofar as he was considered by others as a candidate to lead an army down from the north upon London. No record of his participation has been discovered. Conrad Russell, 'The First Army Plot of 1641', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 38 (1988): 85–106.

¹¹ Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, 356.

¹² The magazine held 20,000 arms, 7,000 barrels of gunpowder, and 120 field pieces. Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (New York and London: New York University, 1981), 185.

¹³ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 91.

¹⁴ Roger Howell, Jr, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution: A Study of the Civil War in North England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 144, 151; for some account of Newcastle's policies in both Durham and Northumberland, 144–62.

Newcastle was to become, in effect, Charles's viceroy for much of England north of the Trent. In many areas of this region Charles granted Newcastle such powers of coining, printing and knighting, 'which never any subject had before, when his sovereign himself was in the kingdom'.¹⁵ He exercised the power of appointing and dismissing governors and commanders and of establishing garrisons at his discretion.¹⁶ Newcastle's military service in the north was to be generally very successful. He was able to raise much money, many arms and troops and win several battles.¹⁷ The royalist cause in the north was to depend heavily upon Newcastle. As the king was to write to him in 1643, at the latter's petulant offer to resign: 'If . . . you . . . leave my service, I am sure (at least) all the North (I speak not all I think) is lost.'¹⁸

As a viceroy¹⁹ in the north, Newcastle cannot have found a more able clerical assistant than Bishop Bramhall. As we saw in chapter 1, Bramhall spent the previous decade as a colleague of the viceroy of Ireland, the recently (12 May 1641) executed lord lieutenant, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. Sometime in the fall of 1642 Bramhall and Newcastle must have met in Yorkshire.²⁰ Bramhall's connection to Strafford would have meant something to Newcastle, for the latter had been something of a client and friend of Strafford in the 1630s.²¹ In fact, it may have been through Strafford's influence, at least in part, that Newcastle had been appointed governor of the prince in 1638.²² In any case, correspondence shows that Strafford had been lobbying for Newcastle in the 1630s, when the latter was impatient to obtain royal employment.²³ Newcastle might have looked all the more

¹⁵ *Life of Cavendish*, 86.

¹⁶ Cavendish was only earl until 27 October 1643, when he was elevated to a marquise. The preamble of the patent indicates that the title was bestowed upon him as a reward for his signal efforts on behalf of the king in the northern theatre of the war. The patent is printed by C. H. Firth in *Life of Cavendish*, 94–6.

¹⁷ For an assessment of Newcastle's success in 1643, see Ronald Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642–1646* (London and New York: Longman, 1982), 83; P. R. Newman assigns Newcastle a lower mark in *The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642–1646* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 79–80, 261–6.

¹⁸ Quoted in Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 127.

¹⁹ Newcastle's official title was lieutenant-general of the six northern counties. Hutton, *Royalist War Effort*, 50.

²⁰ It is not impossible that Bramhall and Newcastle were acquainted before this time, but I know of no record to prove it. They had both been at Cambridge at the same time, but while Bramhall did nothing but study as a scholar of Sidney, Newcastle seems to have done nothing but disport himself as a fellow-commoner of St John's.

²¹ C. V. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford: A Reevaluation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1961), 90. Newcastle and Strafford had been fellow undergraduates at St John's. They might also have met in 1614, when they both sat in the Addled Parliament.

²² See Turberville, *History of Welbeck*, 50–1.

²³ This correspondence of 1628–33 is printed by Firth in the appendix to *Life of Cavendish*, 181–3. See also the very personal and candid letter written by Wentworth, in Dublin, to Newcastle, 27 January 1635. This is MS Harl. 7190 fol. 12; printed in *Original Letters, Illustrative*

kindly upon Bramhall for his close association with Strafford. If he was still grateful to Strafford for exertions on his behalf, he might have channelled the gratitude to Bramhall now that the lord lieutenant was too 'stone-dead' to receive it. Vesey, Bramhall's contemporary biographer, noted the bishop's assistance of Newcastle by his 'prudent advices'.²⁴ Yorkshire was not Newcastle's native or familiar territory; before the war he had resided chiefly in estates to the south. He had been lord lieutenant in Derbyshire (1628–38) and Wiltshire (1626–42); presumably he was better acquainted with inhabitants there than in Yorkshire.²⁵ Bramhall was well-suited to advise Newcastle in Yorkshire, for he was a native who had spent the first two decades of his clerical career in that province. In his various offices, Bramhall must have gained considerable knowledge of the whole province, its people and their affairs.²⁶ Furthermore, the bishop still had family and many friends in Yorkshire. In the 1620s, while subdean of Ripon, he had become so influential among the gentry in and around Ripon that he helped determine parliamentary elections. He had been a friend of Miles Moody, mayor of Ripon in 1625 and 1627.²⁷ Moody was elected mayor again in 1643, and this friendship (supposing it endured) would have been advantageous during the First Civil War. For Newcastle and the royalist cause in the north, such friends of Bramhall must have been valuable assets. Bramhall probably spent a great deal of his energy trying to rally gentry and popular support. In reviewing Bramhall's activities in Yorkshire during the First Civil War, Vesey claimed that 'by his brave example, by his frequent exhortations from

of English History, ed. Henry Ellis (London: Harding and Lepard, 1827; 4 vols.), III, 281–6. As Richard Tuck has noted: 'The Earl of Newcastle hitched his fortunes in the 1630s to those of Strafford, to whom he was already appealing in 1633 for favours at court, and who happened to be the brother-in-law of Hobbes's former employer, Sir Gervase Clifton.' *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 298. However, according to Wedgwood, by the time of the commons' impeachment of Strafford in the first weeks of the Long Parliament, Newcastle had grown 'alienated' from Strafford. *Strafford*, 320. For Newcastle–Strafford correspondence of 1634–9, see *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches*, ed. William Knowler (London: W. Bowyer, 1739; 2 vols.), I, 274, 410; II, 210, 246, 281.

²⁴ AH, xxvi. At least one letter survives to suggest that Bramhall wielded considerable power as Newcastle's assistant. Richard Boyle, second earl of Cork to Bramhall, probably between September 1643 and July 1644: 'I have this day waited upon my Lord Newcastle, who has promised to be careful of my interests in Yorkshire and assures me whatsoever your Lordship shall move concerning me shall be effected.' *HMC Hastings*, IV, 92.

²⁵ However, by his mother Newcastle did have many relatives up north, in Northumberland. *Life of Cavendish*, 119. In the latter and in county Durham, Newcastle was, in Hutton's judgment, the king's 'trump card', since this noble was 'an exceptionally active, popular and powerful magnate . . . who persuaded some of the gentry and urban oligarchs to secure the main strongpoints for the King'. *Royalist War Effort*, 18. See also Howell, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, 144–6.

²⁶ For the offices, see chapter 1, 23.

²⁷ For more details of Bramhall's impressive career at Ripon, see Jackson, 'Hobbes vs. Bramhall', Appendix 1, 361–2, 372–9.

the pulpit, [and] by his incessant labours with the gentry . . . he put great life into his Majesty's affairs'.²⁸ As W. E. Collins suggested, Bramhall's royalist influence in Ripon may be reflected in the fact that at least fifty-two landowners within the liberties of Ripon were to rise for the king in 1645.²⁹ The bishop contributed to the royalist cause in other ways. According to Jeremy Taylor, he 'supplied the soldiers out of his store in Yorkshire, when himself could but ill spare it', and Vesey noted that he sent 'a considerable present of plate to his Majesty at Nottingham, which was after coined for his use at Scarborough'.³⁰ One might also speculate that in the spring of 1643 Bramhall collaborated with Newcastle in devising the 'Great Sesse', a royalist tax measure in Yorkshire; perhaps he helped in the organisation of its collection.³¹

These activities did not exhaust Bramhall's royalist repertoire in Yorkshire. We have noted Bramhall's counsel of Newcastle; it is also likely that he served the commander as a secretary and ghost-writer on several occasions. After the earl had established control of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and was preparing to march south to York at the end of 1642, he issued a declaration to vindicate himself against charges of unscrupulously employing 'papists' in his army.³² Bramhall might well have had a hand in drafting or editing this. His ghost-writing for Newcastle on another occasion is more certain. Just a few months after his march from Newcastle to York, sometime after 2 February 1643, the earl published a similar declaration, this time an answer to charges issued by the parliamentary general Fairfax.³³ Although the title page says

²⁸ Vesey, AH, xxvi–xxvii.

²⁹ W. E. Collins, 'John Bramhall, 1594–1663' in *Typical English Churchmen from Parker to Maurice*, ed. W. E. Collins (London: SPCK, 1902), 84, n.3.

³⁰ Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', BW, I, lxxv. Vesey relates that Newcastle so much appreciated Bramhall's service as to offer him substantial compensation – at a time when there can have been little money to be spared: 'The Marquess much respected whatever he said, having by success in some notable instances good experience of the wisdom that conducted his counsels; and in consideration of his sufferings offered him £500 out of the public stock, which he as generously refused, and so taught all his Majesty's subjects a noble lesson, saying that to take anything from the King in his exigence was a robbing of the public, and that he had ever abhorred that, next to sacrilege.' AH, xxvii.

³¹ For details concerning the 'Great Sesse', see Martyn Bennett, *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638–1651* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 179–82.

³² *Declaration for his resolution of marching into Yorkshire, and his just vindication of himself from the unjust aspersion cast upon him, for entertaining some popish recusants in his forces*, printed in Rushworth, v (Pt III, vol. II), 78–81. It was printed at York, December 1642. According to Howell, 'It became common to refer to his [Newcastle's] troops as the Papist army in the North.' *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, 150. For Newcastle's employment of Roman Catholics, see Newman, *Old Service*, 214–17, 241–3.

³³ *A Declaration of his Excellency the Earl of Newcastle, in Answer to the Aspersions cast upon him by the Lord Fairfax, in his [Fairfax's] Warrant bearing Date Febr. 2. 1642. Together with the Said Warrant*. Printed at York by Stephen Bulkley, 1642 [1643]. Printed in Rushworth, v (Pt III, vol. II), 133–8.

it is by Newcastle himself, we may speculate that Bramhall collaborated.³⁴ There are several turns of phrase that appear in the bishop's later writings. However doubtful, it is not impossible that Newcastle wrote it all himself – and received merely editorial assistance from the bishop.³⁵ At all events, we would presume that in the writing of propaganda and miscellaneous papers from 1642 to 1644, Newcastle sometimes prompted Bramhall's pen. Apart from writing such ephemera Bramhall seems to have been busy in the pulpit. We have already noted Vesey's comment about Bramhall's 'frequent exhortations'. One can safely suppose that he preached plenty of sermons that have left no record. In January 1643 at York Minster he preached the funeral sermon for Colonel Guilford Slingsby, former secretary of Strafford in Ireland, and presumably a long-time acquaintance of Bramhall himself. Slingsby had died from injuries sustained in a skirmish at Guisborough, on the fifteenth of that month.³⁶ Several months later, at the end of June 1643, after Newcastle had won a string of engagements in south Yorkshire, culminating in the victory at Adwalton Moor, near Bradford, 29 June, Bramhall preached a sermon of thanksgiving. This had been commissioned by the general and was subsequently published at his request.³⁷ In the dedicatory epistle that served as a preface to the printed version of the sermon, the bishop expressed gratitude to Newcastle 'for your singular favours to myself, and the churches of this province, which owe to your protection their present liberty to serve God according to their duty, and the laws and rites established, and to these northern counties, which by your endeavours are totally freed from the fury of sedition'. As we shall see in the conclusion of this chapter, Bramhall was

³⁴ The title page reads: '*An Answer of the Right Honourable the Earle of Newcastle His Excellency; to the six groundlesse aspersions cast upon him by the Lord Fairefax, in his late Warrant bearing Date Feb. 2 1642 [1643].* Printed at Yorke, and reprinted at Oxford by H. H. 1642 [1643].' Following the title page is printed this command by Newcastle, here modernised: 'It is my will and pleasure, that this Answer, together with the Lord Fairfax his Warrant, be published in all Churches and Chapels within this city and county of York.'

³⁵ One must also keep in mind that in these years Newcastle still had his personal secretary, John Rolleston, at his disposal.

³⁶ See Haddan, *BW*, III, Preface. Slingsby was buried 26 January 1643; in Ireland Wentworth had appointed him lieutenant of the ordnance and vice-admiral of Munster. Robert Skaife, 'The Register of Burials in York Minster, Accompanied by Monumental Inscriptions, and Illustrated with Biographical Notices', *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* I (1870): 231–2. A close friend of Wentworth, Slingsby had assisted him most helpfully at his impeachment trial in the spring of 1641. Wedgwood, *Strafford*, 337–8.

³⁷ Preached 30 June 1643; Epistle Dedicatory dated 'York, July 18, 1643'; printed by Stephen Bulkley at York. In the epistle Bramhall writes: 'This sermon is yours in right of the author, being first preached, then published by your special command.' The phrasing on p. 23 of this sermon is very similar to that found in the declaration of Newcastle, attributed to Bramhall by Haddan: 'if that day had succeeded ill, God knows what had become of all us here present, for our estates we had been reduced to beggary, for our bodies and posterities to slavery, for our souls to heresy, Brownism, Anabaptism, or Familism, or some other more newly upstart vanity'.

also to preach before Newcastle and his army at York Minster as the latter prepared for their confrontation of the Scots in January 1644. Bramhall also found time to compose a theological essay during these tumultuous years. As the bishop was to recall in 1645, it was during this time in Yorkshire that he wrote ‘a full discourse’ on ‘how liberty [free-will] may consist with the prescience and decrees of God’, ‘in answer to a treatise against the prescience of things contingent’.³⁸ In 1646, Bramhall was to note that this essay was merely ‘in way of examination of a French treatise, which your Lordship’s [Newcastle’s] brother did me the honour to show me at York’.³⁹ This establishes that at York Bramhall was also in some contact with Newcastle’s younger brother, and good friend of Hobbes, the scholarly and mathematical Sir Charles Cavendish.⁴⁰ It also establishes that, having devoted some serious thought to the subject of free-will in these civil-war years in Yorkshire, Bramhall was quite ready to debate the issue with Hobbes in Paris in the summer of 1645.

Bramhall capped his royalist career in Yorkshire not by writing this theological treatise but rather by producing a long answer to a book by Henry Parker, the most lethal parliamentary propagandist of the First English Civil War.⁴¹ A lawyer by profession, employed as secretary to the army of the third earl of Essex in 1642, Parker had written *Observations upon some of His Majesty’s Late Answers and Expresses*. This book, published anonymously in 1642, was a direct reply to the king’s *Answer to the XIX Propositions*, which had been ghost-written by Falkland and Culpepper and published in June of the same year.⁴² As Michael Mendle has noted: ‘For an astonishingly long time, well into 1643, royalist authors queued to refute *Observations*, which they still thought of as being dangerous.’⁴³ By the latter half of 1643, Bramhall had composed his answer: *The Serpent-Salve; or a Remedy for the Biting of an Asp*. Bramhall, like Parker, published his book anonymously in

³⁸ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 155.

³⁹ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 155. This French treatise probably treated matters involved in the ‘De auxiliis’ controversy of the late sixteenth century, which involved the question of the compatibility of human free-will and divine foreknowledge and predestination. In 1588, the Jesuit Molina contributed *The Compatibility of Free Choice with the Gifts of Grace, Divine Foreknowledge, Providence, Predestination and Reprobation*. That was promptly criticised by Francisco Zumel and Banez; and Roman catholic theologians continued to argue among themselves for decades afterwards. M. W. F. Stone, ‘Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy’ in *A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 17.

⁴⁰ Hobbes’s relationship to this pair of brothers will be explored later in this chapter.

⁴¹ Michael Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public’s ‘Privado’* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), xi, 1.

⁴² For Falkland and Culpepper’s authorship, see Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 90.

⁴³ *Henry Parker and the English Civil War*, 90; and for a survey of replies to *Observations*, including Bramhall’s, see 90–110.

the spring of 1644.⁴⁴ Addressing the author as ‘the Observer’, Bramhall writes a point-by-point critique. *Serpent-Salve* was a timely and thoroughly topical piece. We do not know whether the king or one of his advisors commissioned Bramhall to write *Serpent-Salve*. It is certainly possible if not likely that one of these advisors looked it over and approved it for publication.⁴⁵ We would assume that Newcastle at least encouraged him – if he did not also offer Bramhall some compensation for his pains. How many of Bramhall’s contemporaries read the book and what they thought of it is not known. Presumably the king appreciated the effort even if he did not read it. A man in regular contact with the king at this time was notably grateful. A record of Archbishop Ussher’s appreciation of *Serpent-Salve* survives in a letter he wrote to Bramhall on 27 March 1644: ‘I cannot sufficiently commend your dexterity in clearing those points which have not been so satisfactorily handled by those who have taken pains in the same argument before you: and I profess I have profited more thereby than by any of the books which I have read before touching that subject.’⁴⁶ That the king himself might at least have glanced at *Serpent-Salve* is suggested by a letter written to Bramhall by his former associate in Ireland, Strafford’s legal advisor and secretary, Sir George Radcliffe. The latter, like Ussher, was with the king at Oxford in March 1644. In a letter dated 20 March 1644 Radcliffe commented:

I humbly thank your Lordship for your letter and both your books.⁴⁷ I presently showed the King that piece of the Scottish Liturgy, which concerns their ingratitude to this nation, printed in front of your sermon.⁴⁸ His Majesty remembered it when he saw it, and indeed it is a remarkable piece. In your answer to the *Observer*, there is enough said to vindicate the King’s right, and show the *Observer*’s folly; and yet, with as much moderation as any that I have seen on the argument; for you do the Parliament all the right that it can claim with any color of reason.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ The full title is: *The Serpent-Salve; or a Remedy for the Biting of an Asp. Wherein the Observer’s grounds are discussed, and plainly discovered to be unsound, seditious, not warranted by the laws of God, of nature, or of nations, and most repugnant to the known laws and customs of this realm. For the reducing of such his Majesty’s well-meaning subjects into the right way, who have been misled by that ignis fatuus.* Since Bramhall refers to events that occurred in April 1643, it cannot have been composed earlier than late spring of that year. On dating its composition, see Haddan’s note, *BW*, I, xxxi. Haddan reprints it in *BW*, III, 291–496, from which I quote.

⁴⁵ *Serpent-Salve* was published first in York and then in London. In the latter case perhaps Richard Royston was involved as he was for two decades the chief printer of royalist literature.

⁴⁶ *HMC Hastings*, IV, 92.

⁴⁷ That is, (1) *Serpent-Salve* and (2) the sermon preached at York Minster, 28 January 1644, to the audience of Newcastle and the troops preparing to march north to combat the Scots. For more on the latter, see below.

⁴⁸ This is printed with the sermon by Haddan, *BW*, v, 89–90.

⁴⁹ *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxvii.

Radcliffe's appreciation was very similar to Ussher's. What Radcliffe praises as Bramhall's 'moderation' will be emphasised later, when we contrast the bishop's constitutionalism with Hobbes's absolutism.⁵⁰ As for the king, if he did not peruse *Serpent-Salve*, he would, as Radcliffe suggests, have savoured the preface Bramhall placed before his sermon.⁵¹

Just a few years before Bramhall's *Serpent-Salve* Newcastle had encouraged quite a different man to write a treatise on politics. Long-time tutor and sometime secretary to the Cavendish family seated in Hardwick Hall and Chatsworth in Derbyshire, Thomas Hobbes was also, in 1640, something of an intellectual client and friend of Newcastle, head of the Cavendish branch seated in Bolsover and Welbeck Abbey, Nottinghamshire.⁵² By 1640 Hobbes was known among *cognoscenti* in England and abroad (especially France) as a philosopher of some promise. In the late 1630s, or at the beginning of 1640, he was 'commanded' by Newcastle to deduce political principles from the comprehensive philosophical system that Hobbes was then working out.⁵³ The result, *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, was dedicated to Newcastle and dated 9 May 1640 – just days after the dissolution of the Short Parliament, 5 May 1640 – but remained only in manuscript, circulating privately among a number of nobles and gentlemen.⁵⁴ Hobbes later remarked of this 'little treatise' that 'though not printed, many gentlemen had copies, which occasioned much talk of the author'.⁵⁵ Among those who read it were several members of the 'Great Tew circle', an informal intellectual association formed in the 1630s that revolved around Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland. The latter hosted its members at his estate just outside Oxford.⁵⁶ Hobbes does not seem to have been a regular visitor of Falkland at

⁵⁰ A discussion of this difference forms the conclusion of the present chapter.

⁵¹ Jason Peacey has speculated that *Serpent-Salve* was sent by Bramhall to Radcliffe in the spring of 1643, prior to its publication. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 213. But this speculation appears based on the misdating of the letter of Radcliffe to Bramhall, dated 20 March 1643/1644. There is no relevant correspondence before this letter.

⁵² It was in 1608, just after he had turned twenty and left Magdalen Hall, Oxford, that Hobbes entered employment as the tutor of William Cavendish, later second earl of Devonshire (1590–1628). Hobbes was to serve the Devonshire Cavendishes for almost seventy years – save the eleven years of exile in France (1640–51) and a few other brief intermissions. The second earl of Devonshire (Hobbes's first tutorial charge) was first cousin of Newcastle.

⁵³ Epistle Dedicatory, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 19.

⁵⁴ It is possible that Hobbes had finished, and circulated, the manuscript at least a few weeks before the dedication. Curiously, Hobbes, backed by the third earl of Devonshire, stood unsuccessfully as a candidate for Derby in the election to the Short Parliament. John Coke Sr to John Coke Jr, 5 February 1640, *HMC Cowper*, 251; see Hobbes to Devonshire, 12 May 1648, *Corr.*, i, 171, n.2.

⁵⁵ Hobbes, *Considerations*, *EW*, iv, 414.

⁵⁶ For Great Tew, see H. R. Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1987); J. C. Hayward, 'New

Great Tew, but it is clear that he was well acquainted with several of the men who were. In addition to Falkland, he seems to have been somewhat friendly with both John, later Lord Scudamore, and Sir Kenelm Digby.⁵⁷ Presumably these and several other members of the circle read Hobbes's political treatise in manuscript. We know that some other acquaintances of Hobbes from Great Tew read the *Elements of Law*: Edward Hyde, the London lawyer and MP in the Short Parliament, Gilbert Sheldon, warden of All Souls, Oxford, and Robert Payne, Newcastle's chaplain and scientific collaborator.⁵⁸ One should assume that Newcastle himself read it, and that his younger, and more bookish, brother, Sir Charles Cavendish, did so as well.⁵⁹

When Hobbes dedicated the *Elements of Law* to Newcastle the latter was one of Charles's privy counsellors, and the governor of his son, the prince of Wales (later King Charles II). It is probable that Hobbes and Newcastle met in the 1620s. By the end of that decade they were probably well-acquainted. As Noel Malcolm has noted: 'Doubtless he [Newcastle] had already had many opportunities to encounter Hobbes during the latter's years as tutor and secretary to the second Earl [of Devonshire] (1608–28); and certainly

Directions in Studies of the Falkland Circle', *Seventeenth Century* 2 (1987): 19–48; and Richard Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends* (New York: Atheneum, 1988).

⁵⁷ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I; and see Malcolm, *Corr.*, Biographical Register.

⁵⁸ For Payne, see Mordechai Feingold, 'A Friend of Hobbes and an Early Translator of Galileo: Robert Payne of Oxford' in *The Light of Nature: Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science presented to A. C. Crombie*, eds. J. D. North and J. J. Roche (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985), 265–80; Timothy Raylor, 'Newcastle's Ghosts: Robert Payne, Ben Jonson, and "the Cavendish circle"' in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*, eds. Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 92–114, and his 'Hobbes, Payne, and A Short Tract on First Principles', *HJ* 44, 1 (2001): 29–58; and Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 80–145. Newcastle himself later recalled that he and Payne performed chemical experiments at Bolsover, one of the nobleman's seats. Margaret Cavendish, 'His Excellency the Lord Marquis of Newcastle His Opinion concerning the Ground of Natural Philosophy', in *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions* (London, 1655).

⁵⁹ For Hyde's reading, see Martin Dzelzainis, 'Edward Hyde and Thomas Hobbes's *Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*', *HJ* 32, 2 (1989): 304. Perez Zagorin has argued that Falkland and some of the other members of Great Tew read the manuscript. 'Clarendon and Hobbes', *Journal of Modern History* 57 (1985): 604. Hyde's known reading of it lends this credibility, as Hyde had been a prominent member of Great Tew. In 'Falkland Circle', Hayward notes that Gilbert Sheldon also read the manuscript. Apparently Robert Payne, chaplain to Newcastle, loaned Sheldon, the future archbishop of Canterbury, a copy of it. Thus, in addition to Hyde, we can say that both Payne and Sheldon read the *Elements of Law* in 1640. We can also assume that both Newcastle and his brother, Sir Charles Cavendish, did – as well as the third earl of Devonshire, who was at the time still Hobbes's employer. Tuck has noted that in addition to Payne and Sheldon, Thomas Lockey, a fellow of Christ Church, Oxford, also had a copy of the manuscript. *Philosophy and Government*, 295. For Payne's circulation of the manuscript among his Oxford friends, see Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, 96. Malcolm has recently argued that Charles Cotton also had a copy. 'Charles Cotton, Translator of Hobbes's *De Cive*', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61, 2 (1998/2000): 275–7.

Hobbes was acquainted with Newcastle's protégé Ben Jonson by 1628.⁶⁰ In his treatise on optics written in 1646 – also to be commissioned by Newcastle – Hobbes referred to his discussion of the theory ('that light is a fancy in the mind, caused by motion in the brain') with Newcastle at Welbeck (Newcastle's principal seat), 'about 16 years since'.⁶¹ Perhaps referring to the same occasion, Hobbes noted in a letter to Marin Mersenne, dated 30 March 1641: 'that doctrine of the nature and production of light, sound, and all phantasms or ideas, which M. Descartes now rejects, was explained by me in the presence of those most excellent brothers William Earl of Newcastle and Sir Charles Cavendish (who is our mutual friend) in the year 1630'.⁶² In the 1630s Hobbes and Newcastle must have interacted at least several times. They might have corresponded throughout the decade. The earliest extant letter from Hobbes to Newcastle is dated 5 February 1634. Hobbes, writing from London, relates his unsuccessful attempt to procure a copy of Galileo's *Dialogue concerning the Two Chief World Systems*. Either Hobbes had volunteered or Newcastle had requested him to run this bibliographical errand: 'My first business in London, was to seek for Galileo's *Dialogues*; I thought it a very good bargain, when at taking my leave of your Lordship I undertook to buy it for you, but if your Lordship should bind me to the performance it would be hard enough, for it is not possible to get it for money; there were but few brought over at first, and they that buy such books, are not such men as to part with them again.'⁶³ This letter also indicates that Newcastle had been patronising Hobbes, perhaps even generously: 'I am glad . . . I shall have the more time for the business I have so long owed to your Lordship, whose continual favors make me ashamed of my dull proceeding'.⁶⁴ There is good reason to think that those 'continual favors' were lavished upon Hobbes throughout the 1630s and by the middle of that decade there can be no doubt that Hobbes and Newcastle were more than merely client and patron. The letter Hobbes wrote to Newcastle from Paris, dated 25 August 1635, suggests as much. Hobbes begins the letter in humble acknowledgement of Newcastle's generosity: 'I have received your

⁶⁰ *Corr.*, II, 813. Arnold Rogow reasonably assumed that Newcastle was, in the 1620s, at least an occasional visitor at the second earl of Devonshire's two principal seats in Derbyshire, Chatsworth and Hardwick Hall. *Thomas Hobbes: Radical in the Service of Reaction* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1986), 57. Only about eight miles separate Welbeck, Newcastle's Nottinghamshire seat, and Hardwick. Malcolm has speculated that Hobbes's appointment in 1629–30 as tutor for the continental tour of Sir Gervase Clifton's son may have owed something to Newcastle. 'Biographical Register', *Corr.*, II, 821. Clifton and Newcastle were friendly neighbours in Nottinghamshire. More recently, Malcolm has drawn attention to a line from a letter of William Cavendish, future second earl of Devonshire, to Henry Bates, June 1624 (BL MS Add. 70499, fo. 118^r), from which can be inferred early-1620s relations between Hobbes and Sir Charles Cavendish, Newcastle's younger brother. *Pell-Cavendish*, 89–90.

⁶¹ *Corr.*, II, 813.

⁶² *Corr.*, I, 108.

⁶³ *Corr.*, I, 19.

⁶⁴ *Corr.*, I, 19.

Lordship's gift, proportioned to your own goodness, not my service. If the world saw my little desert, so plainly as they see your great rewards, they might think me a mountebank.⁶⁵ But then Hobbes clarifies (or protests) that his love towards Newcastle is 'bred out of private talk, without respect to your purse'. One may assume that Newcastle reciprocated such sentiment. In any case, Newcastle was evidently corresponding very frequently with Hobbes while the latter travelled the continent: 'your letters,' writes Hobbes, 'since coming abroad have been great testimonies of your favour'. Later in the letter Hobbes discusses some of Newcastle's personal business, namely the behavioural problems of a horse Newcastle had purchased from a famous Parisian dealer. In the remainder of the letter Hobbes appraises various natural philosophy ventures currently being carried out under Newcastle's aegis. Several other pieces of their correspondence in the 1630s survive to suggest a relationship of some intimacy. Hobbes seems to have been just as familiar with Newcastle's brother, Charles. In the letter Hobbes wrote to Newcastle from Paris, dated 23 June 1636, he begs indulgence for 'this shortness', and requests him to obtain 'pardon for me from Sir Charles that I write not to him this time'. Thus, Hobbes was probably in equally regular correspondence with Newcastle's brother.⁶⁶ He was planning to stay with Newcastle a few months at Welbeck sometime after October 1636 – after he had returned from a continental tour with Newcastle's cousin, the third earl of Devonshire. In a letter dated 26 October 1636, Hobbes expresses his wish to study at Welbeck if Devonshire will spare him:

For though my Lady and my Lord do both accept so well of my service as I could almost engage myself to serve them as a domestic all my life, yet the extreme pleasure I take in study overcomes in me all other appetites. I am not willing to leave my Lord so, as not to do him any service may not be done by another; but I must not deny myself the content to study in the way I have begun, that I cannot conceive I shall do anywhere so well as at Welbeck, and therefore I mean if your Lordship forbid me not, to come thither, as soon as I can, and stay as long as I can without inconvenience to your Lordship.⁶⁷

Apparently this residence never took place, but the mere entertainment of the idea is evidence of the close acquaintance of Hobbes and Newcastle in the 1630s.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ *Corr.*, I, 28.

⁶⁶ *Corr.*, I, 32. When he returned from the continent in 1636, Hobbes brought a copy of Galileo's *Della Scienza Meccanica* for the Cavendish brothers. Robert Payne, Newcastle's chaplain-cum-scientist, then translated it for them. *Corr.*, Biographical Register, 'Marin Mersenne', II, 863.

⁶⁷ *Corr.*, I, 37.

⁶⁸ For other treatment of the Hobbes–Newcastle relationship, see Helen Hervey, 'Hobbes and Descartes in the Light of Some Unpublished Letters of the Correspondence between Sir Charles Cavendish and Dr. John Pell', *Osiris* 10 (1952): 67–90; Jean Jacquot, 'Sir Charles

Presuming their conversations and correspondence in the 1630s were not confined to Galilean science and new theories and experiments in physics and optics, Newcastle must have had a fairly good idea of what Hobbes would produce when he commissioned the *Elements of Law*. Although dedicated to Newcastle just days after the dissolution of the Short Parliament, Hobbes's book does not appear to have been a direct response to or commentary upon that fruitless meeting. Nor does it appear to be a prescription for composing the differences between the king and uncompliant MPs. It does not directly or personally appeal to either. It does not specifically address the particular issues in contention, or the particular MPs who had been most vocal. As we have seen, Hobbes later implied that he composed the *Elements of Law* during the Short Parliament, but as Deborah Baumgold has pointedly asked, how could Hobbes have written such a dense and systematic treatise in the space of a month?⁶⁹ If all or most of the book was composed before the Short Parliament, then naturally it could not have specifically treated all the issues raised at its meetings.⁷⁰ The book resembled a mathematical treatise in its form and method. It is true that it contained principles that might be applied to the current political situation; but since they were meant, as scientific principles, to be applicable to *any* situation, they were by that very fact too general to be specifically relevant. Furthermore, it was left to the reader how to *apply* the principles to the current situation. Hobbes himself provided the reader with no guide. In the dedication to Newcastle he does but invite the reader to do so himself: 'Now (my Lord) the principles fit for such a foundation [of political science] are those which I have heretofore acquainted your Lordship withal in private discourse; and which, by your command I have here put into method. *To examine cases thereby, between sovereign and sovereign, or between sovereign and subject I leave to them,*

Cavendish and His Learned Friends: Before the Civil War', *Annals of Science* 8, 1 (1952): 13–27 and 'The Years of Exile', *Annals of Science* 8, 2 (1952): 175–91; James R. Jacob and Timothy Raylor, 'Opera and Obedience: Thomas Hobbes and A Proposition for Advancement of Moralitie by Sir William Davenant', *Seventeenth Century* 6 (1991): 215–25; Timothy Raylor, 'Newcastle's Ghosts' and 'Hobbes, Payne'; Stephen Clucas, 'The Atomism of the Cavendish Circle: A Reappraisal', *Seventeenth Century* 9, 2 (1994): 247–73; but esp. Lisa T. Sarasohn, 'Thomas Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle: A Study in the Mutuality of Patronage before the Establishment of the Royal Society', *Isis* 90, 4 (1999): 715–37 and her 'Was *Leviathan* a Patronage Artifact?' *HPT* 21, 4 (2000): 606–31, to which I am most indebted.

⁶⁹ 'The Composition of Hobbes's *Elements of Law*', *HPT* 25, 1 (2004): 16.

⁷⁰ Thus, I cannot concur with Hans-Dieter Metzger, *Thomas Hobbes und die Englische Revolution, 1640–1660* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1991), 13–53, esp. 45–53. Similarly, I do not agree with J. P. Sommerville that: 'Its [the *Elements of Law*'s] message was of the most immediate relevance to contemporary politics.' *Hobbes in Historical Context*, 163. It is one thing to say that Hobbes favoured the king (and royalists like Newcastle) in the conflict with parliament (or that part of it led by Pym); it is another to assert or imply that the *Elements of Law* was self-evidently royalist polemic, directly answering parliamentary speeches. In any case, 'immediate' relevance seems too strong.

that shall find leisure, and encouragement thereto.⁷¹ However, though the *Elements of Law* was, thus, remarkably abstract or detached, lacking in topicality and clear marks of partisanship, this is not to assert that Hobbes (and Newcastle) could not have had any intention of influencing the current situation by the *application* of the general principles. After all, in the dedication Hobbes expresses the hope that the nobleman will transmit the principles to ‘those whom the matter containeth most nearly concerneth’, for, he claims, ‘it would be an incomparable benefit to commonwealth, that every man held the opinions concerning law and policy, here delivered’.⁷² It must also be said that there are some passages in the book that can, without undue difficulty, be read as Hobbes’s reaction to certain opinions of some of his English contemporaries – in and outside parliament. These passages are usually marked by a phrase like ‘some have imagined’.⁷³ But throughout the book Hobbes shows himself more intent upon refuting the political teachings of Romans and Greeks, especially those of Aristotle, than contemporaries who have been influenced by those ancients.⁷⁴

It remains that the *Elements of Law* did not indicate precisely how it was meant to relate to the troubled situation of England in 1640.⁷⁵ There is no direct or explicit commentary upon recent court cases or mention of current political events. Throughout the book Hobbes speaks only generically of the sovereign and the principles of government. When the *location* of sovereignty (king, king-in-parliament or parliament) and the relationship between political institutions were, in effect, becoming disputed points, a general theory of government and definition of sovereignty could not have been of much use to those participating in the conflict. The philosopher himself might well have held that in England the king *alone* was sovereign, and that parliament had no share of that sovereignty. He might also have assumed that his readers would hold the same view.⁷⁶ But in the *Elements of Law* Hobbes’s

⁷¹ Epistle Dedicatory, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 19; emphasis added.

⁷² Epistle Dedicatory, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 20. See also *Elements of Law*, xxviii.8, ed. Gaskin, 176–7, where Hobbes recommends that his principles be taught at the universities.

⁷³ For examples of such passages, see *Elements of Law*, xx.13, xx.15, ed. Gaskin, 114, 115–16.

⁷⁴ E.g., *Elements of Law*, xxviii.8, ed. Gaskin, 176. Yet, one could regard this as simply the gentlest way of confuting his contemporaries. Moreover, one might also argue that Hobbes deliberately avoided specificity – direct reference to on-going events and controversial personalities – in order to appear modest, that is, in order not to appear an impertinent meddler in matters too ‘high’ for him.

⁷⁵ Tellingly, supporters of the Rump were to publish parts of the *Elements of Law*. In 1651 Marchamont Nedham printed passages of the latter in the pro-Rump *Mercurius Politicus* (no. 31, 2–9 January 1651 and no. 34, 23–30 January 1651); Nedham was also to quote it in the second edition of his *Case of the Commonwealth of England Stated* (1650). See also chapter 3, n. 15.

⁷⁶ Later, in a writing of 1662, Hobbes was to assert that before 1640 no one denied that the king was the sovereign. *Considerations, EW*, iv, 414. But as Sommerville has noted: ‘in the years before 1642 many held that the king *shared* sovereign power with the two houses of parliament’. *Hobbes in Historical Context*, 84; emphasis added.

contemporaries would have looked in vain for any explicit declaration that Charles I was, alone, the sovereign of England, or any explicit comment that the parliament at Westminster was undertaking rebellion.⁷⁷ Instead one finds Hobbes defining the sovereign as ‘that one man *or* one council’ to whom men have transferred their ‘common power’.⁷⁸ Hobbes stresses the absoluteness of the sovereign’s power (supremacy in all matters, whether of judicature, war and peace, taxation, legislation or religion), but he never claims that this sovereign must be one man, a king – let alone that Charles I is that man.⁷⁹ The absoluteness of the power of the sovereign (the people) in a democratic commonwealth or in an aristocratic commonwealth (a small number of the people) is no less than the absoluteness of the power of the sovereign in a monarchical commonwealth.⁸⁰ A contemporary of Hobbes would also have searched his treatise in vain for any explicit support or defence of the specific policies of Charles and his much maligned ministers, Laud and Strafford, Bramhall’s beleaguered colleagues. In the *Elements of Law* there is no vindication of any of them. One cannot find any defence of the doctrines and discipline maintained by Laud, or attributed to him by parliamentary and popular critics of the ecclesiastical regime he had been supervising. Hobbes’s treatise lent no support to one of the most controversial doctrines maintained by Laud, and approved by the king: the divine right of bishops, or episcopacy *jure divino*. In chapter xxvi Hobbes subordinates ecclesiastics entirely to the civil sovereign, allowing them no authority independent of that sovereign. Although he points out that ‘the government of bishops hath a divine pattern in the twelve rulers, and seventy elders of Israel, in the twelve apostles and seventy disciples of our Saviour’, Hobbes nowhere says that bishops at this time, in England, or anywhere else, possess a spiritual or divine right or authority that comes immediately from Christ, and independent of the civil sovereign.⁸¹ Nowhere does he allow that bishops have a special or extraordinary power derived from a direct apostolic succession. Again, he only allows

⁷⁷ I believe the closest Hobbes comes to such a declaration is at the conclusion of chapter xx, where he might be found doing so at least between-the-lines. *Elements of Law*, xx.19, ed. Gaskin, 117–18.

⁷⁸ *Elements of Law*, xix.10, ed. Gaskin, 107; emphasis added. A typical confirmation of the point that the sovereign can be one, few or many comes when Hobbes speaks of every man’s having transferred the use of his strength to ‘him or them, that have the sword of justice’. *Elements of Law*, xx.8, ed. Gaskin, 112.

⁷⁹ For a summary of the rights of sovereignty, see *Elements of Law*, xx.13, ed. Gaskin, 114.

⁸⁰ On Hobbes’s view, all governments are equally ‘arbitrary’: monarchy, aristocracy, democracy merely differing in number constituting the sovereign. (This is not to say that Hobbes was always strict in his terminology. In the very irresponsible rhetoric of *Behemoth*, he was indeed to use the word ‘arbitrary’ in several places.) By rejecting the concept of ‘arbitrary’ rule or government, I would argue that Hobbes effectively excluded himself from relevance to the mainstream quarrel between king and parliament. The latter were accusing each other of ‘arbitrary’ conduct.

⁸¹ *Elements of Law*, xxvi.8, ed. Gaskin, 159.

that government of bishops may be traced to a divine *pattern*. Hobbes asserts that no churchman has any right or authority that is not subordinate to and derived from the civil sovereign's; no churchman has a spiritual or divine authority that the civil sovereign lacks. The personnel of the church have no independent authority whatsoever. The bishops are not coordinate or equal to the civil sovereign; the bishops do not constitute a special authority that is set up alongside the civil sovereign's authority. The civil sovereign does not have to answer to the bishops for anything he does. They are merely his counsellors, to consult at his own pleasure. The bishops are the sovereign's *ministers*, and are to carry out his commands; they are to administer, not to lead, dictate or pronounce independently. Hobbes concludes the chapter with an unequivocal statement of the total subordination of the ecclesiastical to the civil:

And therefore in no case can the sovereign power of a commonwealth be subject to any authority ecclesiastical, besides that of Christ himself. And though he be informed concerning the kingdom of heaven, and subject himself thereto at the persuasions of persons ecclesiastical, yet is not he thereby subject to their government and rule . . . It is manifest therefore that they who have sovereign power, are immediate rulers of the church under Christ, and all others but subordinate to them. If that were not, but kings should command one thing upon pain of death, and priests another upon pain of damnation, it would be impossible that peace and religion should stand together. And therefore there is no just cause for any man to withdraw his obedience from the sovereign state, upon pretence that Christ hath ordained any state ecclesiastical above it. And though kings take not upon them the ministerial priesthood (as they might if it pleased them) yet are they not so merely laic, as not to have sacerdotal jurisdiction. To conclude this chapter: since God speaketh not in these days to any man by his private interpretation of the Scriptures, nor by the interpretation of any power, above, or not depending on the sovereign power of every commonwealth; it remaineth that he speaketh by his vice-gods, or lieutenants here on earth, that is to say, by sovereign kings, or such as have sovereign authority as well as they.⁸²

It must be emphasised that Hobbes here claims that the civil sovereign can exercise all the priestly offices (sacerdotal functions) of ecclesiastics, should he (or they) see fit. But this would seem to be directly contrary to the law as maintained by Charles I, specifically the thirty-seventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles:

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; *we give not our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the sacraments*, the which thing

⁸² *Elements of Law*, xxvi.10, xxvi.11, ed. Gaskin, 161–2. And Hobbes again emphasises the subordination of the ecclesiastical in the final chapter of the *Elements of Law*, where he discusses the nature and kinds of law: 'The civil law containeth in it the ecclesiastical, as a part thereof, proceeding from the power of ecclesiastical government, given by our Saviour to all Christian sovereigns, as his immediate vicars.' xxix.8, ed. Gaskin, 181.

the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn evil-doers.⁸³

By asserting that civil sovereigns could ‘take upon them the ministerial priesthood . . . if it pleased them’ Hobbes was going *beyond* the laws concerning the supremacy of the monarch in religious affairs, the royal supremacy maintained by Elizabeth, James I and Charles I. Hobbes was arrogating to the civil sovereign powers *not* claimed by the present king. According to Hobbes, priests do not have a sacerdotal power that the sovereign lacks. In spiritual matters, as in all other matters, there is no power above or not depending on the civil sovereign. How ‘royalist’ was the *Elements of Law*? One way of answering is to observe that in this treatise Hobbes revealed no commitment to or approval of the doctrine, episcopacy *jure divino*, maintained by the archbishop of Canterbury and the king himself, Charles I.⁸⁴

Laud had publicly asserted episcopacy *jure divino* just three years before the *Elements of Law* was dedicated to Newcastle. Charles I never censured the primate for doing so.⁸⁵ In Star Chamber, 14 June 1637, Laud responded to various complaints that he would characterise as ‘puritan’:

Our main crime is that we are bishops . . . and a great trouble ’tis to them that we maintain that our calling of bishops is *jure divino*, by divine right. . . . I will say, and abide by it, that the calling of bishops is *jure divino*, by divine right. . . . And I say further, that from the Apostles’ time, in all ages, in all places, the Church of Christ was governed by bishops. Now this is made by these men as if it were *contra regem*, against the king, in right or in power. But that’s a mere ignorant shift, for our being bishops *jure divino*, by divine right, takes nothing from the king’s right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet we may not exercise that power, either of order or jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us, that is, not in his Majesty’s or any Christian king’s kingdoms, but by and under

⁸³ Emphasis added.

⁸⁴ As late as 1646 Charles was to remark: ‘I believe that bishops are *jure divino*, because I find as much authority for them as for some articles of the creed.’ Charles I to Henrietta Maria, Oxford, 16 March 1646. *Charles I in 1646: Letters of King Charles the First to Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. John Bruce (Camden Society, vol. LXIII), 26–7.

⁸⁵ That Charles neglected Laud after 1641 does not alter the fact that the king never reproved the archbishop for maintaining this doctrine. As for the authorship or genesis of religious policy (including episcopacy *jure divino*) during the 1630s, some scholars in the last few decades have argued that it should be attributed just as much or more to Charles than to Laud. Julian Davies has attributed most to the king, effectively casting him in the role of architect, in *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: The Remoulding of Anglicanism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992). Kevin Sharpe’s view is similar to Davies’s, as he considers Laud the ‘executor rather than deviser of royal policy’. *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University, 1992), 285. Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, 16, also stressed that ‘Laudian’ was just as much ‘Caroline’ policy. But see Tyacke’s critical comment on this way of viewing the Laud–Charles equation, in *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 205.

the power of the king given us so to do . . . No man can libel against our calling (as these men do), be it in pulpit, print or otherwise, but he libels against the king and the state, by whose laws we are established. Therefore all these libels, so far forth as they are against our calling, are against the king and the Law, and can have no other purpose than to stir up sedition among the people.⁸⁶

In omitting to affirm episcopacy *jure divino* in the *Elements of Law*, and in arguing that any authority not strictly dependent upon the civil sovereign subverted that sovereign, Hobbes was in effect echoing these puritan critics to whom Laud was replying in Star Chamber. In this respect at least, Hobbes was indirectly ‘libeling’ both the ‘king and the state’. If he was not exactly ‘stirring up sedition among the people’ (Hobbes’s treatise remained in manuscript), at least he was doing nothing to diminish it. Whatever else Hobbes was doing in the *Elements of Law* he was not affirming this royally sanctioned archbishop’s doctrine concerning episcopacy. By expressly disallowing clergy anything but authority *jure civili* – authority derived from the civil sovereign – Hobbes was effectively implying that Laud’s ‘calling as bishop could not be made good *jure divino*’, that is, directly or immediately from God. King James might have reminded Hobbes: ‘No bishop, no king.’ (His son might have added: ‘No *jure divino*, no bishop.’) By not allowing the bishops apostolical, divine right, a doctrine fully approved by Charles, Hobbes was undermining the king and that king’s chief ecclesiastical officer in those sections of the *Elements of Law* that dealt with religious authority. In the Short Parliament, the dissolution of which preceded Hobbes’s dedication of the *Elements of Law* by just four days, John Pym, an opposition leader in the commons, had made a long speech listing grievances, among which was the complaint that bishops had laid claim to a ‘power which . . . they derive not from the king, nor from any law or statute, but they will immediately have it from heaven *jure divino*’.⁸⁷ Inasmuch as Hobbes, too, refused to honour any such claim in the *Elements of Law*, he was condoning this criticism delivered by Pym. Likewise Hobbes would not have been able to disapprove of similar complaints articulated in the ‘Root and

⁸⁶ SC, 147–8; Laud, *Works*, vi, 42–6; see also iii, 262. Answering the charges of impeachment brought against him four years later, on 26 February 1641 Laud re-affirmed what he had declared in Star Chamber: ‘I have not assumed papal or tyrannical power in matters ecclesiastical or temporal to the least disinheriton, dishonour or derogation of his Majesty’s supreme authority in matters ecclesiastical or temporal. I never claimed the king’s ecclesiastical jurisdiction as incident to my episcopal or archiepiscopal office in this kingdom; nor did I ever deny that the exercise of my jurisdiction was derived from the Crown of England. But that which I have said, and do still say, concerning my office and calling is this, that my order as a bishop, and my power of jurisdiction, is by divine apostolical right, and unalterable (for aught I know) in the Church of Christ. But all the power I or any other bishop hath to exercise . . . within this realm of England is derived wholly from the Crown.’ SC, 148; Laud, *Works*, iii, 407–8.

⁸⁷ Speech delivered in house of commons, 17 April 1640. SC, 186.

Branch' petition submitted to the house of commons in December 1640. In the first paragraph of the preamble, signed by 'many of His Majesty's subjects in and about the City of London, and several Counties of the Kingdom', objection was made to the bishops' arrogation of authority *jure divino*:

That whereas the government of archbishops and lord bishops, deans and archdeacons, &c., with their courts and ministrations in them, have proved prejudicial and very dangerous both to the Church and Commonwealth, they themselves having formerly held that they have their jurisdiction or authority of human authority, till of these later times, being further pressed about the unlawfulness, that *they have claimed their calling immediately from the Lord Jesus Christ*, which is against the laws of this kingdom, and derogatory to His Majesty and his state royal.⁸⁸

The same objection is reiterated in the twenty-fifth grievance:

Yea further, the pride and ambition of the prelates being boundless, unwilling to be subject either to man or laws, they claim their office and jurisdiction to be *Jure Divino*, exercise ecclesiastical authority in their own names and rights, and under their own seals, and take upon them temporal dignities, places and offices in the Commonwealth, that they may sway both swords.⁸⁹

Whether this and other such censure of the bishops was fair or deserved, Hobbes at least could not have objected to Pym's or the petitioners' rejection of episcopacy *jure divino*. At least on the question of that doctrine, Hobbes did not in the *Elements of Law* show himself to be an ally of the king and his 'arminian' and 'prelatical' churchmen.

One may wonder at this point, by what authority was Hobbes himself deciding questions of authority in the *Elements of Law*? If bishops did not have any such thing as authority *jure divino*, Hobbes had an authority neither *jure divino* nor *jure civili*. As an ordinary subject, a man elected or appointed to no office, he had no authority that he could derive from the civil sovereign. If, as he supposed, the bishops were merely subordinate ministers of the king – ordinary civil servants – Hobbes himself must merely have been subordinate to those ministers, to whom the king had delegated authority in various religious matters. At the very least Hobbes would have had to defer to them as his superiors *jure civili* – authorities established by the civil sovereign. Yet Hobbes was not, apparently, concerned to defer to the judgments of Archbishop Laud, the civil sovereign's highest ecclesiastical minister – or, by extension, to the civil sovereign himself, Charles I.⁹⁰ Indeed, while the king's principal ecclesiastical administrator was upholding the doctrine, Hobbes was writing a treatise that lent it no credit. Not only did

⁸⁸ CD, 137; emphasis added. ⁸⁹ CD, 142.

⁹⁰ Assuming, that is, that Hobbes considered Charles alone, not Charles-and-parliament, the civil sovereign.

he neglect to supply direct support of royally approved doctrine concerning episcopacy, he also went so far as to commend some of his own theological views. In chapter xxv, Hobbes took it upon himself to offer judgments about salvation. There he declares that ‘the only fundamental and necessary point of faith is the belief that Jesus is the Christ’.⁹¹ By what authority was Hobbes pronouncing this? Evidently, a man who had not been ordained, consecrated, elected or appointed might yet exercise authority. Where in the *Elements of Law* had Hobbes established that an ordinary subject like himself could exercise the authority to make judgments in such weighty matters as salvation or religious authority within a state? Yet this way of questioning Hobbes’s conduct (as seditious and unroyalist) might be considered impertinent or misconceived. The *Elements of Law* was, after all, dedicated to one of Charles’s privy counsellors, and the governor of his son, the prince of Wales. Hobbes might have pointed out that he had been *commanded* by Newcastle to pen his thoughts on issues of political theory. Blame for any of the contents of the treatise – only a privately circulated one – could not be laid on the philosopher alone. We should also note that there is no evidence that either Hobbes or Newcastle was ever criticised by the king for composing or circulating the *Elements of Law*. It is not impossible that Charles read it himself. But if he did, it is telling that it was not published. For that would suggest that it was deemed unsuitable for propaganda purposes. Of course, as we have seen, it was especially inappropriate as a defence of specific policies of the ecclesiastical regime managed by Laud. As has been suggested already, there is good reason to believe that Newcastle was sympathetic to the views expounded in the *Elements of Law*. Certainly during the 1630s Newcastle should have had ample opportunity to learn Hobbes’s thinking. In the dedicatory epistle we may detect at least the implication that these views were approved by his noble patron: ‘Now (my Lord) the principles fit for such a foundation, are those which I have heretofore acquainted your Lordship withal in private discourse; and which, by your command I have here put into method.’ We can also notice that Hobbes here fully implicates Newcastle in his endeavour. In fact, one might argue that Newcastle was more responsible for the *Elements of Law* than Hobbes, as it was he, the noble patron, who gave the command. And in 1640, that was the command

⁹¹ Some commentators have labelled Hobbes’s teaching (repeated in *DC* and *Lev.*) a ‘minimalist’ soteriology: e.g., Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 202. It is Hobbes’s minimalist Christianity, including a salient ‘adiaphorism’, which has prompted some scholars to emphasise his debt to the ‘liberal’ or ‘rationalistic’ theological tendencies of such members of the Great Tew circle as Falkland and Chillingworth. See Noel Malcolm, ‘Thomas Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology’, PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1982, 234, 238. Hobbes’s adiaphorism consists in his arguing that there is much room for diversity in worship of God – whatever worship style happens to be established by the civil sovereign, however, is to be followed unprotestingly.

of more than a patron: it was also a privy counsellor of the king and the governor of the prince of Wales.

In his capacity as governor of the prince, Newcastle had written his charge, the future Charles II, a revealing letter of instruction. This document, penned in 1638, evinces no very deep religious sensibility.⁹² Admonishing the prince, among other things, to ‘beware of too much devotion for a king’, Newcastle strikes several Machiavellian notes.⁹³ Newcastle had the reputation of a *politique*, if not an atheist. In 1643, for example, the parliamentarian Colonel Hutchinson refused to surrender to ‘a papistical army led by an atheistical general’.⁹⁴ Such a remark does not weigh much, but there are other suggestive instances. Lynn Hulse has noted that Newcastle’s lack of religious devotion nearly cost him the appointment to the governorship of the prince, as there had been talk in Whitehall that he was ‘of no religion, neither feared God nor the Devil, believed [in] Heaven or Hell’.⁹⁵ A comment in a report by George Conn, a papal agent attached to Queen Henrietta Maria and in some intimacy with the king, suggests that Newcastle was the quintessential *politique*: ‘The Earl is too indifferent. He hates the Puritans, he laughs at the Protestants, and he has little confidence in the Catholics.’⁹⁶ Later, in his *Advice to Charles II*, penned on the eve of the Restoration, Newcastle was to write in a decidedly *politique* (and relativist) vein:

Custom is the great tyrant of mankind. Doth it not for the most part make men of such religions, as they are of, and conscience, both by custom of breeding? Else why should it be against a Protestant’s conscience to go to mass, and a Papist’s conscience, to go to our prayers, but by custom of breeding? Certainly were a child educated in Turkey, he would be a Turk, and give God thanks for it, as we do the contrary. How should he do otherwise, – for St Paul sayeth, that faith comes by hearing.⁹⁷

⁹² Ronald Hutton has characterised the prince’s governor as ‘a conventional Anglican without strong religious feeling’. ‘The Religion of Charles II’ in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 231.

⁹³ *Life of Cavendish*, 185. Turberville was impressed by the letter’s *politique* tenor: ‘The most notable feature of this *Letter of Instruction* is obviously its machiavellianism. Newcastle uses the word virtue in the same sense in which it is used in *Il Principe*, and preaches *realpolitik*.’ *History of Welbeck*, 61. More recently, Lisa Sarasohn has remarked: ‘Newcastle’s letter clearly shows the influence of Machiavelli in advocating hypocrisy and irreligion as the props of power.’ ‘Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle’, 724.

⁹⁴ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 120.

⁹⁵ Hulse, ‘William Cavendish, first Duke of Newcastle’, *ODNB*. The same was to be said of Hobbes; and in view of *Lev.*, xxxviii, with ample reason. As we shall see in chapter 6, Hobbes’s appointment to the position of mathematics tutor to the prince in 1646 was to provoke the complaint that an ‘atheist’ was now in position to corrupt a future king.

⁹⁶ George Conn to Cardinal Barberini, 17 September 1638, as quoted in Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 65.

⁹⁷ *Advice to Charles II*, 70; the spelling and punctuation of Slaughter’s transcription has been modernised.

In view of these and similar remarks, throughout his life, one could think it highly unlikely that Newcastle was ever much of a ‘clericalist’ or firm supporter of episcopacy *jure divino*. For anti-parliamentary purposes, to be sure, he might well have regarded that doctrine as a useful ploy – a practical way of sparing the bishops accountability to any but the king.⁹⁸ In other words, one might suspect that he thought it a good contrivance, to be discarded so soon as it became inconvenient to the king; and as we will see, later he counselled Charles II to compromise with those great scourges of episcopacy, the Scots presbyterians.⁹⁹ Thus, while Hobbes held no brief for divine-right episcopacy, it is probable that Newcastle was not any more devoted to such doctrine.¹⁰⁰ Evidently, then, Charles’s privy council was not undivided on this key controversial issue, the nature of episcopal authority. The *politique* Newcastle cannot have seen perfectly eye to eye with the ‘high’ episcopalian Laud. Insofar as the king was of the latter persuasion, Newcastle, and any other *politiques*, must be considered the dissidents. In the *Elements of Law*, Newcastle was patron of a *politique* writing that manifestly did *not* assert royally approved doctrine concerning episcopacy. Of course, none of this is to argue that Newcastle was a personal enemy of Laud, or that he wished the dissolution or humiliation of the Caroline episcopate at the hands of the Long Parliament. Newcastle’s wife later noted that between Newcastle and Laud there ‘interceded a great and entire friendship, which he [Laud] confirmed by a legacy of a great diamond, to the value of £200, left to my Lord when he died, which was much for him to bequeath; . . . this said Archbishop was pleased to tell his late Majesty, that my Lord was one of the wisest and prudentest persons that ever he was acquainted with’.¹⁰¹ But their cordial relations need not have precluded some disagreement between them as privy counsellors, and one would not suppose that Newcastle agreed with all the policies Laud adopted or maintained. In Newcastle’s later *Advice to Charles II*, one can discern at least a gentle censure of Caroline–Laudian altar policy:

Therefore just such ceremony as the Church of England teaches which is not so much as the Roman Church, which uses so many puppet plays, as makes it ridiculous to the people, nor so little as the Presbyterians, as almost takes away the people’s reverence

⁹⁸ See Introduction, 7–9. ⁹⁹ See chapter 5, 140ff.

¹⁰⁰ If it is objected that there were – and came to be – many royalists who, like Hobbes (or Newcastle), would not accept or support episcopacy *jure divino*, one might reply that there were many who were incomplete royalists. If royalism meant following the king in every point, not embracing that controversial doctrine must be considered a defect thereof.

¹⁰¹ *Life of Cavendish*, 98; in his will, dated 13 January 1644, Laud stated: ‘I give to my much honoured friend, William, Lord Marquis of Newcastle, my best diamond ring, worth 140l, or near it.’ Laud, *Works*, iv, 443. Earlier indication of cordiality between Laud and Newcastle is to be found in Laud to Wentworth, 30 July 1632, Laud, *Works*, vi, 300–2; in a letter of Laud to Wentworth, 27 March 1638, the archbishop mentions a ‘fine great horse’ that Newcastle had given him. *Works*, vii, 418.

in your Majesty's church, and all cathedral churches, according to the Church of England, and in all other churches, according the laws of the realm, and not to force anything beyond it, as the communion table to stand altar-wise, or otherwise, according to the laws of the realm. How many books were written about the standing of the communion table, which was one thing, that began our troubles, as one said merely, there was much ado about the standing of the table wether it should stand like a dresser table, or a shuffleboard table, it is not how the table stands, but how the communicant worthily receives that Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with all reverence, and ceremony.¹⁰²

This would suggest that Newcastle could not have gone quite so far as Laud or Charles in 'beauty-of-holiness' ceremonialism.¹⁰³ Nevertheless, Newcastle was quite comfortable patronising and consorting with arminians like John Cosin, Brian Duppa, a protégé of Laud, and Bramhall in Yorkshire. But, then, one would not expect any less of a *politique*. At all events, whatever reservations Newcastle might have had in regard to doctrines and policy maintained by Laud in England (or Bramhall in Ireland), the nobleman had no difficulty supporting and collaborating with them and their colleagues. On the other hand, that Newcastle was a clericalist (or clericalist ally) in the mould of Charles I would be difficult if not impossible to sustain.

Having reviewed Hobbes's *Elements of Law* we may now return to Bramhall's *Serpent-Salve* for comparison. Clearly the books fall into different genres. Bramhall's is nothing like the abstract scientific treatise of Hobbes. *Serpent-Salve*, written in 1643, was as topical as any polemic could have been: it was a direct and detailed response to a piece of propaganda written against the cause of the king. Moreover, in sharp contrast with Hobbes, whose absolutism was remarked by contemporaries, the bishop argues from a moderate/constitutionalist position similar to that to be found in the king's propaganda of 1642, the *Answer to the XIX Propositions*. The royalist orientation of the author of *Serpent-Salve* is a legitimist and constitutionalist one, involving the concept of a monarchy limited by 'laws of the land'.¹⁰⁴ Bramhall speaks characteristically of Magna Carta as 'the Englishman's jewel and treasure' and allows that there are occasions when it is 'not lawful to

¹⁰² *Advice to Charles II*, 20–1.

¹⁰³ Peter Lake, 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s' in *The Early Stuart Church*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 161–85.

¹⁰⁴ Here I follow David Smith's usage of 'constitutional royalist'. For some criticism of Smith's nomenclature, see Paul Seaward, 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism', *HJ* 40, 1 (1997): 227–39. John Sanderson classified Bramhall as a 'conservative legitimist' in 'Serpent-Salve, 1643: The Royalism of John Bramhall', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 25 (1974): 9. J. W. Daly placed Bramhall among royalists who, 'far from being diehards or extremists, were the advocates of a political mean, and tried to defend at once the king's authority and the subject's liberty', 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation', *JBS* 11 (1971): 26.

yield active obedience to the king'.¹⁰⁵ 'If,' for example, 'the king command any thing which is contrary to the known laws of the land, if it be by an injury to a third person, we may not do it.'¹⁰⁶ Bramhall carefully qualifies this provision for disobedience to the king, and expressly forbids resistance by arms. Disobedience must be passive. But this does not change the fact that Bramhall, unlike the absolutist Hobbes, does allow for *lawful* disobedience to the sovereign in some circumstances.¹⁰⁷ And whereas an absolutist like Hobbes would say that a sovereign king cannot in any sense be under or subject to any but a divine law, Bramhall argues that 'the law [of the land] hath a directive power over kings' though 'the law hath no coercive power over him'.¹⁰⁸ Lest his constitutionalism be exaggerated at the expense of his royalism – and imply some lawful exercise of force by parliament without the king – Bramhall later emphasises the *non-coercive* check upon the sovereign, who 'owes account of his doings to God alone, [for] the law hath no coercive power over him'.¹⁰⁹ In contrast with Hobbes's *Elements of Law*, Bramhall's *Serpent-Salve* flowed smoothly within the mainstream of royalist propaganda of the early 1640s.¹¹⁰ In a recent survey of the political propaganda on the eve of the First English Civil War, J. C. Davis was struck by the absence of absolutist claims in royalist apologetics.¹¹¹ It bears repeating that Bramhall's book argued in roughly the same moderate mode as had the authors of the king's *Answer to the XIX Propositions*.¹¹² There is the same absence of any absolutist claims for the king. Whether the latter was a solid 'constitutionalist' – his sincerity can be, and has been, questioned – he authorised non-absolutist propaganda. If Hobbes intended the *Elements of Law* to support the king, it could not have been authorised as representative

¹⁰⁵ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 366, 351. ¹⁰⁶ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 351.

¹⁰⁷ Technically, however, one may interpret Hobbes's teaching as allowing for disobedience when the subject can invoke his right to self-preservation. Thus, the difference between Hobbes and Bramhall is that one allows for disobedience when it is a question of physical survival, while the other allows for disobedience only when the sovereign commands behaviour that would violate 'laws of the land' (or divine law).

¹⁰⁸ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 363. The constitutionalism of Bramhall's royalism may also be observed in the statement that: 'We challenge the laws of England as our birthright and inheritance.' BW, III, 381. For use of the distinction of 'directive' and 'coercive'/'coactive' before Bramhall, see J. P. Sommerville, 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism', *JBS* 35, 2 (1996): 180–4. Sir Robert Filmer, who employed it himself, described it as a 'familiar distinction of the schoolmen'. Quoted in Sommerville, *ibid.*, 181.

¹⁰⁹ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 383–4. See also the entire section XXIV, BW, III, 422–35.

¹¹⁰ For a survey of this mainstream, see John Sanderson, 'But the People's Creatures': *The Philosophical Basis of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), 38–72.

¹¹¹ J. C. Davis, 'Political Thought during the English Revolution' in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 379.

¹¹² Unlike the authors of that book, however, Bramhall does not identify the king as one of the three estates.

of the latter's position, as indicated in public declarations.¹¹³ Bramhall's *Serpent-Salve*, on the other hand, was orthodox royalist polemic, taking a position almost identical to the one taken in those declarations that Charles was printing over his own name.

Before leaving *Serpent-Salve* for Marston Moor, we should note that Bramhall did not devote much of his book to discussion of episcopacy. At one point, however, since 'the Observer is everywhere girding at the clergy', Bramhall proceeds to deliver a lecture on the rule of the church by bishops.¹¹⁴ He does not offer a lengthy argument for episcopacy *jure divino*, but simply responds to various objections to church government by bishops generally, defending them as lawfully constituted religious governors who have been beneficial to England throughout her history: 'If Bishops be not necessary, yet at the least they are lawful . . . And all learned men do acknowledge our English Episcopacy to be lawful; yea, even the present president and pastors of Geneva do the same. So, if we desire consent either of Protestants in particular or of Christians in general, yea, of the whole Catholic Symbolical Church, it is best for us to keep us where we are.'¹¹⁵ Bramhall defends episcopacy as an ancient institution in harmony with the rest of the political system of England. To abolish episcopacy would be to extirpate an element of the constitution. Again, Bramhall was not much concerned in this book to argue that episcopacy was by divine right, though he never implies otherwise. In fact, at one point he affirms it in passing: 'Episcopacy itself is of divine right'.¹¹⁶ He also affirms the apostolic succession of British bishops: 'Those ministers who were immediately ordained by Christ or His Apostles, did far exceed ours in personal perfections; but as for the ministerial power, no tract of time can bring the least diminution of it.'¹¹⁷ It is important to keep in mind that at the time of *Serpent-Salve*'s composition, during the latter months of 1643, any form of episcopacy was in peril: in January 1643 a bill for the abolition of episcopacy had passed both houses of parliament.¹¹⁸

¹¹³ For Charles's personal views see Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, 40–3, 194–6, 930–2, and Glenn Burgess, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 213, who stresses that the king cannot be said to have subscribed to any absolutist theory. At his trial, Charles later protested: 'If power without law may make laws, may alter the fundamental laws of the kingdom, I do not know what subject he is in England, that can be sure of his life, or anything that he calls his own.' This does not sound like an absolutist; but, then, given the circumstances this was no moment for an absolutist to speak candidly. On the other hand, if the king was at this point resigned to the fate of execution, he was probably speaking his mind.

¹¹⁴ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 466.

¹¹⁵ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 485–6. Bramhall cites Calvin and Beza to demonstrate that even fierce continental protestants were only opposed to *popish* episcopacy.

¹¹⁶ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 490. ¹¹⁷ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 321.

¹¹⁸ In October 1646 the office, title and authority of bishops was to be formally abolished by parliament, though Charles did not consent. For this and other pertinent legislative

Thus, at the writing of *Serpent-Salve* the question had become not so much episcopacy *jure divino* but episcopacy on any grounds. In response to this challenge Bramhall chose to leave the divine right claims aside in order to concentrate upon the argument that the institution of episcopacy was of legal, customary and constitutional warrant in England, that is, according to the ‘fundamental laws of the land’.¹¹⁹ It was just as legitimate an institution as parliament itself – the institution that Parker had championed in the *Observations*. In Bramhall’s view, the prerequisite of the abolition of episcopacy was a contempt for the law of the land – the kind of contempt that the king (or his counsellors) was accused of displaying.

If Bramhall wrote any more political tracts beside *Serpent-Salve*, these have not been discovered or identified. No doubt he was occupied by many other affairs. By the end of 1643 Newcastle was under great stress, as the Scots had recently crossed the Tweed, in accordance with the Solemn League and Covenant, the agreement whereby the Scots promised to fight for and with the parliamentarians against the royalists in the southern kingdom. Newcastle’s task was to halt their advance. In January 1644, Bramhall preached a sermon before Newcastle and his troops, as they prepared to undertake their march up north. The bishop attempted to impress upon his audience the enormous injustice of the Scottish invasion of England. Whereas the Scots should feel obliged to the monarchs of England for the latter’s long-practised generosity, the former have, instead, stabbed the present one in the back. Bramhall exhorts all his compatriots gathered at York Minster to have ‘the spirit and affection of that soldier who having his legs cut off in fight for his country, yet desired to be cast into the breach, that he might dull the edge of one sword more’.¹²⁰ However inspiring Bramhall’s sermon, Newcastle’s army was to have little success against the Scots. And within six months the royalist cause in the north was to collapse. Whether Bramhall preached in

action, see John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993), 148–75; William M. Abbott, ‘The Issue of Episcopacy in the Long Parliament, 1640–1648: The Reasons for Abolition’, PhD thesis, Oxford University, 1981; and William A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640–1660* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1900; 2 vols.) I, 1–144.

¹¹⁹ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 489. Bramhall points out that whatever view is taken of the divine right of the bishops, they are perfectly secure in their ‘lawful right’: ‘they are entitled by the fundamental laws of the land. How far the power of the keys, of ordination or jurisdiction, is appropriated or committed to them singly or jointly by Divine ordinance (of which subject great authors upon great reasons have declared themselves of different opinions); yet, in our case, it is not so questionable, where another lawful right is certain: and this clear satisfaction of conscience they want, who are so busy seeking after new devised forms of ecclesiastical regiment.’ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 489.

¹²⁰ The sermon was published as *A Sermon preached in York Minster before his Excellency the Marquis of Newcastle, being then ready to meet the Scotch army, Jan. 28, 1643* [1644]; printed by Haddan, BW, v, 87–110; quotation at 109.

the days before the famous fiasco at Marston Moor is not known. It was there, on 2 July 1644, that Newcastle fought his last battle for Charles I. He had objected to Prince Rupert's decision to fight that fatal day. But since Rupert insisted that he was acting by his uncle's order, Newcastle acquiesced.¹²¹ In spite of his misgivings, Newcastle fought bravely. But after the defeat, Newcastle resolved to quit the kingdom. The man who had been the king's most important commander north of the Trent from 1642 to 1644 was retiring. On the morning after the debacle, 3 July, he apprised Rupert of his intention, and then travelled to the northern port of Scarborough, now in the hands of the royalist Hugh Cholmley. Bishop Bramhall was among those who departed from York for Scarborough that day.

If Newcastle's journey was a heavy-hearted one, it was not lightened by an empty purse: his steward reported that only £90 remained.¹²² Embarking from Scarborough on 4 July 1644, Newcastle and Bramhall reached Hamburg four days later, 8 July 1644.¹²³ For John Bramhall, now forty-nine years old, the departure must have been especially painful. He had to leave his wife of twenty-five years, Eleanor, their two sons, John, twenty-four, and Thomas, twenty-two, and three younger daughters, Isabella, Jane and Anne.¹²⁴ He must have been worried about his own future, but even more about the welfare of his family. They could expect no kind treatment at the hands of the bishop's powerful enemies in Ireland, Scotland and England. What would happen to Bramhall's properties and investments in Ireland? What would be the fate of the re-endowed and reformed protestant church in Ireland, which he had endeavoured so much to fortify? He had toiled eight years in that foreign land. 'Was all the labour now lost?' Bramhall might well have wondered as he sailed across the North Sea in July 1644. When he disembarked at Hamburg he would have left the question on the ship. There was now more, and harder, work to do. There was no time to indulge in melancholy. Once more the Yorkshireman found himself in a

¹²¹ The uneasy relationship between Newcastle and Rupert and the conduct of both at York in that costly engagement is a matter of some controversy. See *Life of Cavendish*, 41–3, for the Duchess's account, Clarendon's view, and C. H. Firth's well-considered judgment.

¹²² *Life of Cavendish*, 43. For a man whose exceptional wealth had allowed him to loan the king £10,000 during the Bishops' Wars, this was poverty indeed. His wife, admittedly a woman never criticised for excessive sobriety or conservatism, later calculated that the wars cost Newcastle the staggering sum of nearly £1,000,000.

¹²³ *Life of Cavendish*, 41–4. Newcastle and his companions hired two ships to sail to Hamburg. On one of these ships he was joined by his two sons, Charles, Viscount Mansfield and Lord Henry Cavendish (later Earl of Ogle), his brother, Sir Charles Cavendish, Bishop Bramhall, Lord Falconbridge, Lord Widdrington, Sir William Carnaby and Francis Carnaby. The other ship carried the Earl of Ethyn (Newcastle's lieutenant-general) and Lord Cornworth.

¹²⁴ Isabella (the eldest daughter) and Jane must have been between twenty-two and eighteen; Anne was seventeen at the time. For more information about Bramhall's children, see Jackson, 'Hobbes vs. Bramhall', Appendix 1.

foreign land. Nevertheless, some of his political, religious and intellectual skirmishes on the continent were to be all-too-familiar to the battle-scarred 'arminian' bishop of Derry. Indeed, one might say that he was not so much leaving them behind as fighting them in a different venue. We may now direct our attention to the combat in which he engaged an English gladiator, an adversary who had, in a manner of speaking, been waiting for him in Paris. As we will come to appreciate in the next several chapters, Bramhall might well have felt that in Hobbes he was duelling a man not unlike some of those enemies who had put Strafford to death, imprisoned himself in Dublin, imprisoned (and later executed) Laud in London, and defeated Newcastle at Marston Moor – and whom the bishop thought he had left behind in Ireland, Scotland and England in July 1644. If nothing else, many of the arguments of Hobbes which Bramhall was to confront might have reminded him of such dangerous – and, for the moment, successful – enemies.

*Hobbes's flight to France, De Cive and
the beginning of the quarrel with
Bramhall, summer 1645*

Within the first few weeks of November 1640, at the beginning of the Long Parliament, Thomas Hobbes left England for the continent.¹ Early proceedings, particularly Pym's long catalogue of grievances on 7 November and the impeachment of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, seem to have inspired much fear in Hobbes. In a letter written several months later, dated 12 April 1641 and addressed to Lord Scudamore, Hobbes described his abrupt departure: 'I went to your Lordship's house in St Martin's, but found no body at all there, and thereupon made account to come again a day or two after, but in the meantime I was seized so violently with a resolution of coming hither, as I departed within 3 days after, making nobody acquainted but my Lord, and one of his servants who was to send the little money I had after me by exchange and to see my trunk shipped.'² Hobbes then explained: 'The reason I came away was that I saw words that tended to advance the prerogative of kings began to be examined in Parliament. And I knew some that had a good will to have had me troubled, and might for any thing I saw in their honesties make both the words and the witnesses. Besides I thought if I went not then, there was nevertheless a disorder coming on that would make it worse being there than here.'³ As Noel Malcolm has suggested, Hobbes might have been concerned that his 'little treatise' of 1640, the *Elements of Law*, would be denounced in the same way that some royalist sermons had been. Hobbes's later claim that his book was written to vindicate the absolute power of the king against those who would deprive him of it would lend credibility to the view that he feared trouble for writing the *Elements of*

¹ Perez Zagorin offered the plausible approximate date of 15 November: 'Thomas Hobbes's Departure from England in 1640: An Unpublished Letter', *HJ* 21 (1978): 158.

² *Corr.*, I, 114.

³ *Corr.*, I, 115. Malcolm, reading D'Ewes's journal and other contemporary accounts, supposes that this was a reference to Pym's denunciation of 'frequent preaching for monarchy' by Dr Beale and others in the 7 November session. In August 1641, Beale, master of St John's, Cambridge, faced articles which, among other things, complained that he had preached against liberty of subjects. *Corr.*, I, 115–16.

Law. According to Hobbes, the numerous copies of the manuscript stimulated so much talk about the author that he would have suffered persecution if Charles had not dissolved the Short Parliament.⁴ When the Long Parliament convened only months later, Hobbes's fears would naturally have been revived. As he later claimed, those averse to the king's interest 'proceeded so fiercely in the very beginning, against those that had written or preached in the defence of any part of that power . . . that Mr Hobbes, doubting how they would use him, went over into France, the first of all that fled, and there continued eleven years, to his damage some thousands of pounds deep'.⁵ Hobbes seems to have been referring to such royalist preachers as Sibthorpe and Manwaring, who had been chaplains to the king in the 1620s. In the latter years of that decade, when Charles was taking such unpopular revenue-raising measures as the Forced Loan, they preached that the king's will transcended the law and were arraigned by parliament for doing so.⁶ Hobbes's first biographer John Aubrey reported that: 'he [Hobbes] told me that Bishop Manwaring (of St David's) preached his doctrine; for which, among others, he was sent prisoner to the Tower. Then thought Mr Hobbes, 'tis time now for me to shift for my self, and so withdrew into France, and resided at Paris.'⁷ It is not clear whether Hobbes himself told Aubrey about this latter prudent calculation, or whether Aubrey merely inferred it. In the prose autobiography that he dictated in or around 1676, Hobbes again referred to this stressful period in November 1640. Having consulted some MPs who had attended the first days of the parliament, Hobbes, concluding that civil war was inevitable, fled to France.⁸ In this version Hobbes does not say that he was in personal danger. Instead, the fear is simply of civil war generally. His danger would be that of any subject caught in the crossfire of such a war.⁹

These autobiographical reflections of Hobbes must be taken with a grain of salt. They were written in the 1660s and 1670s, when he was much concerned to portray himself as a perfectly virtuous royalist. His claim that the Short Parliament might have persecuted him if it had not been dissolved

⁴ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 414. ⁵ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 414.

⁶ For Sibthorpe's and Manwaring's controversial sermons and the response of parliament, see Hillel Schwartz, 'Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624–29', *JBS* 12, 2 (1973): 59–68.

⁷ *Brief Lives*, I, 334. See also Philip Milton, 'Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington', *HPT* 14, 4 (1993): 501–2 and J. P. Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (London and New York: Longman, 1986), 127–31.

⁸ *Prose Life*, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 247. For the dating and circumstances of this autobiography see Gaskin, *ibid.*, xlix.

⁹ *Prose Life*, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 247. In the Latin verse autobiography, 'Vita Carmine Expressa', Hobbes does not relate anything to revise the account. See *Verse Life*, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 254–64.

is only plausible if the *Elements of Law* had been circulating well before its dedication (9 May 1640). But if that treatise was being read by MPs in April, and if it had ‘occasioned much talk’, as Hobbes later claimed, then why do we find no mention of Hobbes or his book in any of the diaries of the Short Parliament?¹⁰ Hobbes’s apprehension of the Long Parliament is more plausible. Quentin Skinner has suggested that Hobbes’s decision to flee was determined by his fear of the consequences of his close relationship with the Cavendishes, both the third earl of Devonshire and Newcastle.¹¹ As Newcastle had, by November 1640, shown signs of being a hardline supporter of the king against the house of commons, and as Hobbes had dedicated to Newcastle a book that might be construed as anti-parliamentarian in intent, Hobbes might have had reason to fear being attacked by some MPs. Hobbes may well have intended his treatise to support the king, but one can doubt that MPs would have concerned themselves with the private scribbling of a servant of peers. It seems more likely that Hobbes suffered a little from delusions of grandeur and a bit of paranoia. But even if his fears were not well warranted, it is not impossible that he had them. Although the cool and theoretical *Elements of Law* could not have marked him a royalist in the same way that the unmistakably partisan polemic *Serpent-Salve* would have marked Bramhall, those few MPs who might have got their hands on it might still have read the treatise as Hobbes’s clever attempt to justify the king’s actions – and censure his critics in and out of parliament.¹² But I would emphasise that we cannot, in the first place, assume that any of the parliamentary adversaries of the king read the manuscript. Furthermore, Noel Malcolm has suggested that in the summer of 1640 Hobbes may have been contemplating a move to France as much for ‘intellectual stimulus’ as for safety from parliamentary persecution. Hobbes’s finances were in very good shape at this time: ‘In September 1640 Hobbes recovered £100 which he had asked the steward of Chatsworth to invest for him; he also had £400 banked with the Cavendish family (at 6 per cent interest), so if he withdrew all his money on deposit he must have felt financially independent enough to embark on a long period of residence abroad.’¹³ It is quite possible, then, that

¹⁰ Milton, ‘Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington’, 502.

¹¹ Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 229. But at the time of the Short Parliament the royalism of Devonshire was not yet so apparent, or relevant. In the Long Parliament he was to vote against Strafford’s impeachment, and in July 1642 he was dismissed from the house of lords and order was made for his imprisonment. Victor Stater, ‘William Cavendish, third Earl of Devonshire’, *ODNB*.

¹² I have emphasised that it *might* have been so construed, for, as I have argued in chapter 2 (52–4), the *Elements of Law* was not explicit royalist polemic or specific commentary on speeches delivered in the Short Parliament.

¹³ Noel Malcolm, ‘A Summary Biography of Hobbes’ in *Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. Tom Sorell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 28.

Hobbes's departure for Paris in 1640 was much more intellectual than political in motive: participation in Marin Mersenne's circle, an informal scientific society in the French capital, was an attractive alternative to remaining in an increasingly turbulent England.¹⁴

Although Hobbes had gone to Paris by the end of 1640, he probably kept himself well informed of the escalating conflict back in England. And within only two years of dedicating *Elements of Law* he had dedicated a similar treatise, *De Cive*. It is not obvious why Hobbes thought that a rendition of his 'civil science' at this particular time would be any more pertinent in an ancient tongue. Like the *Elements of Law*, it did not directly address any topical issues in his native land; like the *Elements of Law*, it was concerned with general principles of human nature, society and government, not with the particular details and peculiar personalities of the current situation.¹⁵ *De Cive* did not enter into the discourse between parliamentarians on the one side and Charles I on the other.¹⁶ It did not, for example, offer any criticism of the leaders of the house of commons for the legally dubious impeachment, attainder and execution of Strafford in the spring of 1641. The book also neglected the opportunity to criticise these leaders for impeaching and imprisoning Bramhall's other friend and colleague, Laud. Just as he had in the *Elements of Law*, Hobbes in *De Cive* systematically avoided all explicit reference to men and affairs in England. In the dedicatory epistle to the third earl of Devonshire, dated Paris, 1 November 1641, he noted: 'I have paid careful attention through the whole length of my discourse not to say anything of the civil laws of any nation, i.e. not to approach the shores which are sometimes dangerous because of rocks, sometimes because of *current storms*.'¹⁷ In chapter XIII he reiterated: 'It is not my plan to descend to particular points in which princes may do things differently from each other; this must be left to experts in the practical politics of individual commonwealths.'¹⁸

¹⁴ Noel Malcolm, 'Thomas Hobbes', ODNB. This circle of Mersenne is described below, 80–1, and in the Conclusion, 299–300.

¹⁵ Some indication of how scientific and abstract and non-partisan both the *Elements of Law* and *DC* were can be seen in the publication of them by non-royalists and anti-royalists in the late 1640s and 1650s. See the seminal articles of Quentin Skinner: 'The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought', *HJ* 9, 3 (1966): 286–317; 'Conquest and Consent: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement Controversy' in *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646–1660*, ed. G. E. Aylmer (London: Macmillan, 1972), 79–98; and 'The Context of Hobbes's Theory of Political Obligation' in *Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essays*, eds. Maurice Cranston and Richard S. Peters (New York: Doubleday, 1972), 109–42. Hobbes himself later noted that 'rebels' in England exploited *De Cive* for their own purposes. In his verse autobiography he observed: 'those / Commend it too, whom I do most oppose.' Verse Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 258.

¹⁶ Thus, I disagree with Jeffrey Collins who has asserted that *DC* was 'a piece of political commentary specifically responding to the first year of the Long Parliament'. *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 61.

¹⁷ Emphasis added. ¹⁸ *DC*, XIII.1.

Thus, Hobbes declined to comment on the ‘current storm’ raging in England. *De Cive* was all the more practically irrelevant to English affairs for its being written in Latin.¹⁹ It could not have been meant for popular consumption, in England or on the continent. In fact, as Richard Tuck has stressed, the book was not published but only printed in 1642.²⁰

Incidentally, in the second edition of *De Cive*, published in 1647, Hobbes seems to have become more interested in reaching a wider audience, perhaps even some of his compatriots back home. There Hobbes was to come much closer to explicit reference to issues involved in the ‘current storms’. A few passages of this preface might even be construed as direct commentary on recent political events in England. It would not be difficult, for example, to read the following as a censure of some members of the commons: ‘How many rebellions have been caused by the doctrine that it is up to private men to determine whether the commands of kings are just or unjust, and that his commands may rightly be discussed before they are carried out, and in fact ought to be discussed?’²¹ Nevertheless, even in the second edition of *De Cive* Hobbes remained careful to keep aloof from the contemporary events and controversial issues in his homeland. His subsequent remarks would even allow a tendentious reader to suppose that the author considered the houses of parliament sovereign partners in an aristocratical government (king-in-parliament, with king merely *primus inter pares*) – not a rebellious group of subjects usurping authority within a purely monarchical one. In the penultimate paragraph of the 1647 preface he was to write:

¹⁹ Further, the use of French words in some of his illustrations shows that Hobbes was at least half-concerned with a French audience: see *DC*, viii.2 for such an example. *DC*’s detachment from the current political situation in the British Isles is consistent with a fact that Malcolm has recently emphasised, that within the ‘European Republic of Letters’ in the early 1640s, Hobbes was much better known as a metaphysician than a political theorist. *Aspects of Hobbes*, 497. *DC* was a conspicuous exception to Hobbes’s preoccupation with questions of mathematics and optics or, more broadly, natural philosophy. As we will see, his quarrel with Bramhall began with the classic metaphysical question, free-will, shortly after Hobbes had written a massive review of a discussion of Galilean science. See below, 80–1.

²⁰ For details of the printing (Paris, April or May 1642) and very limited circulation of the first edition, see Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, 315, and his editorial introduction to the translation of *DC*. In the preface to the 1647 Amsterdam (Elzevir) publication of *De Cive*, Hobbes recalled: ‘So as not to rashly publish anything that ought not to be published, I refused to allow what I had written to be made public immediately, and took the trouble to distribute to friends a few privately printed copies, so that after testing other people’s reactions, I might correct, soften and explain anything that seemed erroneous, harsh or obscure.’ *DC*, 1647 Preface, 14; emphasis added. Clearly, Hobbes was, at least in 1642, much more interested in a select European audience. And it was his French friend Mersenne, after all, who organised its printing. It is most reasonable to suppose, in accordance with Hobbes’s own suggestion, that in *DC* the philosopher intended (with breathtaking ambition) to offer a political treatise that might help to calm all of Europe’s ‘current storms’ – the storms that comprised what used to be called ‘the seventeenth-century crisis’.

²¹ *DC*, 1647 Preface, 8–9.

Finally, throughout my discourse it has been my aim, first, not to give decisions on the justice of particular actions, but to leave them to be settled by the laws. Secondly, not to say anything about the laws of any particular commonwealth, i.e. to say what law is rather than what the laws are. Thirdly, not to give the impression that citizens owe less obedience to an aristocratic commonwealth or a democratic commonwealth than they owe to a monarchical commonwealth. For though I have deployed some arguments in the tenth chapter to press the point that monarchy has more advantages than other forms of commonwealth (the only thing in this book which I admit is not demonstrated but put with probability), I say everywhere explicitly that every commonwealth must be allowed supreme and equal power.²²

In view of these lines it would be hard to deny Hobbes his claim to the objectivity of science, as professed in the concluding sentence of this preface: 'they [the words of *De Cive*] are not the words of a partisan'.²³ But in granting Hobbes his objectivity, neutrality and lack of partisanship, one would need to deny him *royalism*. It was precisely the lack of a *parti pris* that would naturally have displeased committed and outspoken royalists. Hobbes should surely have expected that his impartiality might be construed as lack of 'party spirit'. One might argue that his vaunted 'civil science' (as propounded in all three of his political treatises, *Elements of Law*, *De Cive* and *Leviathan*) was simply an ingenious system of chameleonism or trimmerism: submission to the powers-that-be for the sake of self-preservation.²⁴ Since his fundamental principle was self-preservation, and since he successfully adapted to many different situations, at home and abroad, there is reason to regard Hobbes as not only the consummate theorist but also a talented practitioner of political weathercockery; a man ready to be turned by the strongest wind of any given moment.²⁵ A royalist (or parliamentary) critic of Hobbes could have denounced his 'civil science' as nothing but the principles of lack of political commitment, for individual safety's sake. The virtue of 'objectivity' or 'scientific detachment' can be denigrated as the vice of lack of commitment and devotion to the cause.²⁶

²² DC, 1647 Preface, 14. ²³ DC, 1647 Preface, 15.

²⁴ One might venture further that Hobbes's 'civil science' was at bottom no more than a 'logical', 'deductive' or 'rationalist' formulation of Romans XIII, the injunction to obey all established authority.

²⁵ This point about Hobbes's political chameleonism will be developed more fully in chapters 6 and 8. What I emphasise here is that such chameleonism (or 'de-factoism') did not begin in *Lev.*; one can observe it in both the *Elements of Law* and *DC*.

²⁶ For Hobbes's own awareness of this rhetorical operation of moral re-description, *paradiastole*, see Quentin Skinner, 'Thomas Hobbes: Rhetoric and the Construction of Morality', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 76 (1991): 1–61. One could argue that what Hobbes may have hoped is that his 'civil science' would demonstrate, objectively (that is, with no conspicuous *parti pris*), that MPs and subjects should obey the king. In other words, he might have hoped to strengthen the royalist cause precisely by *appearing* objective and unpartisan (unroyalist) in his argument. One might maintain that Hobbes was attempting to achieve the *effect* of royalist polemic (obedience to and victory of the king rather than parliament) without writing royalist polemic.

We find two major structural differences between the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*. Firstly, *De Cive* contains almost none of the discussion of human nature (or what we would call psychology) that occupies Hobbes in the first thirteen chapters of the *Elements of Law*.²⁷ The other notable difference between the two treatises is that in *De Cive* Hobbes devotes an entire section to religion. The work consists of three parts: ‘Liberty’ (*Libertas*), ‘Government’ (*Imperium*) and ‘Religion’ (*Religio*). The discussion of religion is the second longest. In ‘On the Kingdom of God by Nature’ (chapter xv), the first chapter of the section on religion, Hobbes states: ‘Only one thing more is needed to complete our knowledge of our civil duty: we must know what the laws or commands of God are.’²⁸ As he did in the *Elements of Law*, Hobbes tacitly assumes the authority to pronounce upon various controversial theological questions. So the question is begged again: as a private subject, holding no office from a sovereign (whether in England or France), by what authority, according to his own teaching, did he think himself warranted in making such judgments? In contradistinction to the merely private manuscript-circulation of the *Elements of Law*, Hobbes was now publicising (albeit not widely – and in a learned tongue) such pronouncements concerning the ‘laws or commands of God’. With regard to the question of episcopacy, there is nowhere in *De Cive* explicit mention of its disputed *jus divinum*. However, in the conclusion of chapter xvii there is a passage that bears upon the issue:

But to decide questions of faith, i.e. questions about God, which are beyond human understanding, one needs God’s blessing (so that we may not err, at least on essential questions) and this comes from Christ himself by laying on of hands. For our eternal salvation we are obliged to accept a supernatural doctrine, which because it is supernatural, is impossible to understand. It would go against equity if we were left alone to err by ourselves on essential matters. Our Saviour promised this Infallibility (in matters essential to salvation) to the Apostles until the day of judgment, i.e. to the Apostles and to the Pastors who were to be consecrated by the Apostles in succession by the laying on of hands. As a Christian, therefore, the holder of sovereign power in the commonwealth is obliged to interpret holy scripture, when it is a question about the mysteries of faith, by means of duly ordained Ecclesiastics. And so in Christian commonwealths judgment of spiritual and temporal matters belongs to the civil authority. And the man or assembly which holds sovereign power is the head of both the commonwealth and the Church; for a Christian Church and a Christian commonwealth are one and the same thing.²⁹

Hobbes begins with what appears to be an assertion of the doctrine of apostolic succession. And if the bishops in England could be placed within

²⁷ This discussion of human nature was intended ultimately to form the second of his tri-partite Latin exposition of his philosophical system: *de corpore, de homine, de cive*. But *De Homine* had to wait until 1658 for publication.

²⁸ DC, xv.1. ²⁹ DC, xvii.28.

Hobbes's group of 'Apostles and Pastors', then we might suppose that he was at least indirectly supporting the doctrine of episcopacy *jure divino*.³⁰ By allowing apostolic succession, Hobbes would seem to imply that the 'Apostles and Pastors', or 'duly ordained Ecclesiastics', possess an authority derived from Christ, not merely from the civil sovereign. Thus the civil sovereign, being Christian, is 'obliged', in essential matters, to interpret scripture as the divines ('duly ordained Ecclesiastics') would direct. Yet what Hobbes gives with one hand he seems to take back with the other. Just when it appears Hobbes is allowing episcopacy *jure divino*, he stresses that the judgment is ultimately the *civil* sovereign's: he (or they) may be 'obliged' to consult them, but the decision is still entirely his (or their) own to make. Even after asserting their infallibility, the ecclesiastics are subordinated to the civil sovereign: 'And so in Christian commonwealths judgment of spiritual and temporal matters belongs to the civil authority.' Thus, though Hobbes grants at least a semblance of divine authority to ecclesiastics, he still refuses them an authority independent of the civil sovereign: the latter's judgment on all questions, even scriptural ones, is supreme.³¹ However, in stark contrast with the *Elements of Law*, Hobbes does imply that, as the successors of the apostles, 'duly ordained Ecclesiastics' have an exclusive gift or capacity. This is precisely why the civil sovereign is obliged to confer with them. If the civil sovereign possessed it himself, why would he be obliged to do so? Nevertheless, it is still the case that Hobbes leaves it to the civil sovereign ultimately to decide *when* he should consult the ecclesiastics. He does not assert that the ecclesiastics possess an authority to tell the sovereign when a matter is 'spiritual' and when 'temporal'. And, again, it is the civil sovereign who will render the final judgment on any question. Thus, the 'infallibility' of the ecclesiastics in practice only obtains where the civil sovereign says it does; in what he determines to fall within the 'mysteries of the faith'.³² It is a subtle (or incoherent) scheme: the apostolic successors are infallible, but

³⁰ It was in light of this passage that Richard Tuck argued that in *Lev.* Hobbes was to depart significantly from the 'orthodox Anglicanism' of *DC*. "'Christian Atheism" of Hobbes'. Lodi Nauta has offered a robust challenge to Tuck's view in 'Hobbes on Religion and the Church'. As I will suggest below, in one respect, Hobbes's position on the relationship between the civil-ecclesiastical authorities in *DC* does bear some resemblance to the Laudian one. Only to that extent may one find 'orthodox Anglicanism' in *DC*.

³¹ Hence, in the previous section he concludes with the comment: 'In every Christian Church, i.e. in every Christian commonwealth, the interpretation of holy scripture, i.e. the right to settle all disputes, should depend on and be derived from the authority of the man or group of men in whose hands lies the sovereignty in the commonwealth.' *DC*, xvii.27.

³² One must also bear in mind what Hobbes had asserted in an earlier chapter: 'the one man or council to whom sovereign power has been committed by the commonwealth, also has the right both to decide which opinions and doctrines are inimical to peace and to forbid their being taught'. *DC*, vi.11. See also the revealing note to this passage inserted in the 1647 edition.

only where the civil sovereign says they are. The ecclesiastics have authority; but it is delimited and supervised by the civil sovereign.³³ The interesting thing is that this suggests a position not far from Laud's – or, as we shall see, Bramhall's: that bishops do have a unique divine authority, but cannot *exercise* it without the sovereign's leave; without the latter they have no *jurisdiction* in which to apply it.³⁴ In conclusion, then, whereas in the *Elements of Law*, one can find no hint of an allowance of episcopacy *jure divino*, in *De Cive* one can find at least the suggestion of its validity. In fact, as we shall see, Bramhall interpreted this passage of *De Cive* as an affirmation of the *jus divinum* of ecclesiastics. But, as we shall also see, Hobbes rejected that interpretation of what he had written.³⁵

However hard it would have been for his contemporaries, especially clergy of the church of England, to see how Hobbes could have considered himself a 'duly ordained Ecclesiastic', this did not prevent his ending the book with a chapter on the subject 'What is Necessary for Entry into the Kingdom of Heaven'. There he delivers the judgment he had first enunciated in the *Elements of Law*: 'And I say that no other article of faith is required of a Christian man as *necessary* for salvation but this one, that Jesus is Christ.'³⁶ In *De Cive* Hobbes again seems to arrogate to himself the authority to pronounce on religious matters. As he pointed out in the preface to the 1647 edition, he had shown 'what duties are indispensably requisite to entrance into the kingdom of heaven'.³⁷ This certainly assumes a considerable power or wisdom in the author: to judge what God requires of all men – a power or wisdom which had, traditionally, been considered the unique mark of clergy, not laymen – or, in Hobbes's erastian/caesaro-papist scheme, the province of the civil sovereign, not a private subject unappointed to any office of religious authority. But in neither the *Elements of Law* nor *De Cive* does Hobbes explain why he thinks himself possessed of such authority. One can only assume that he thought his authority derived from his superior 'reason'; in the *Questions concerning Necessity, Liberty and Chance* (1656), Hobbes was to claim that his opinion on a certain point was correct, and Bramhall's

³³ This is confirmed in the [next chapter](#) when Hobbes writes: 'in *spiritual matters* (i.e. those which are to be settled through holy scripture) God's commandments are the laws and doctrines of the commonwealth, i.e. of the Church (for a Christian Church and a Christian commonwealth are the same thing), published by duly ordained Pastors, *who have received authority to do so from the commonwealth.*' DC, xviii.13. I have placed emphasis on the last clause: if the Pastors (apostolic successors) *have* an authority derived ultimately from Christ, by laying on of hands, it would seem that it cannot be *exercised* without the civil sovereign's authorisation.

³⁴ For Laud's position, see chapter 2, 55–6.

³⁵ For another discussion of this passage, and views of other Hobbes commentators, see Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 66–9, who describes it as a 'puzzling' one that 'runs against the broader grain of the work'. For anyone hoping to render Hobbes consistent, this is a passage to ignore.

³⁶ DC, xviii.6. ³⁷ DC, 1647 Preface, 13.

false, because it was he who was 'in possession of a truth derived to me from the *light of reason*'.³⁸ But in most of his writings Hobbes dismissed attempts to establish the validity, credibility or authority of a view by a claim to reason. He himself had ridiculed the notion of the authority of reason (or *recta ratio*) in controversial points – whether theological or otherwise. At the conclusion of the *Elements of Law* he addressed those who insisted that 'reason' should decide contentious issues. Sarcastically he protested that he himself would gladly let 'reason' (*recta ratio*) decide questions, if only he could find such a thing *in rerum natura*. From personal experience he had learned that the men who clamoured so noisily for the adjudication of 'right reason' meant nothing but their own reason.³⁹ Nonetheless, throughout *De Cive* Hobbes claimed that he was arguing according to 'right reason', and the unstated assumption of his judgments regarding religious issues would seem to be their superior rationality (as opposed, say, to their being divinely inspired or authorised).⁴⁰ As Bramhall later complained when criticising Hobbes for usurping authority to render judgment upon controversial political and religious questions (echoing Hobbes's own derision of 'right reason' in the *Elements of Law*), the author of *De Cive* could ultimately claim no warrant but his own reason, as neither God nor any civil sovereign had delegated such authority to him.

As we have noted, *De Cive* was dedicated at the beginning of November 1641, in Paris, to the third earl of Devonshire, whose father, the second earl, Hobbes had tutored all the way back in 1608, immediately after leaving Oxford. Hobbes had begun to tutor the third earl about ten years before *De Cive*, and had, more recently, in 1634–6, guided him on a tour of Europe. The younger brother of the third earl of Devonshire, Charles Cavendish,⁴¹ had volunteered to fight for the king as soon as the First English Civil War had commenced. He was among the cavalry that followed Prince Rupert into the battle of Edgehill in the autumn of 1642. In 1643 he formed his own regiment, funded by the family wealth, with which he scored some victories for the king in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. He was slain

³⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 337; emphasis added.

³⁹ *Elements of Law*, xxxix.8, ed. Gaskin, 180–1. In a later writing, posthumously published, Hobbes pointed out the mischief of appealing to 'reason' in determining the justice of a law: 'any man, of any law whatsoever, may say it is against reason, and thereupon make a pretence for his disobedience'. *Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student*, 54–5.

⁴⁰ For plenty of instances of 'right reason' see *DC*, chapters 1 and 11; however, see Hobbes's qualification of right reason (not 'an infallible faculty') in the note to 11.1 in the 1647 edition. Hobbes's frequent citation of right reason (*recta ratio*) in *DC* has been noted by Malcolm, 'Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology', 194. Hobbes believed he had founded the *science* of politics precisely because none of his principles or deductions could be shown to be 'against reason'. Near the conclusion of *DC*, 111, Hobbes claims that all the 'laws of nature' he has propounded are 'simply the dictates of right reason'.

⁴¹ Not to be confused with the younger brother of Newcastle, of the same name.

in an engagement against some of Cromwell's forces at Gainsborough, in 1643.⁴² By contrast, the third earl of Devonshire did not participate in any battles.⁴³ Nonetheless, he had proved a strong supporter of Charles and had, as a peer, voted against the attainder of Strafford. He attended the king at York in the summer of 1642, but fled to France later that year after being impeached.⁴⁴ He was still in England, then, in 1641, when Hobbes, in Paris, dedicated the book to him. And it was to Devonshire that Hobbes had written about episcopacy in the summer of 1641, just months before he had completed – or at least dedicated – the Latin political treatise. The letter is especially valuable for its private nature: Hobbes's candour may be assumed. The important point for our purposes is that Hobbes reveals himself to be entirely uncommitted to the current regime of bishops. Commenting on a recent Nottinghamshire petition against episcopal government, Hobbes writes:

I have seen the Nottinghamshire petition against BBs. In it there are reckoned up abundance of abuses committed by Ecclesiastical persons and their officers, which can neither be denied or excused. But that they proceed from Episcopacy itself, is not so evidently proved. Howsoever since the covetousness and supercilious behaviour of the persons, have made the people weary of that form, I see nothing, to be disliked in the new way propounded.⁴⁵

Here we see in Hobbes no devotion to the 'duly ordained Ecclesiastics' of the king, no insistence upon their authority or infallibility as derived from apostolic succession, or any evident attachment to the peculiar institution of episcopacy. It would seem that Hobbes would not mind if the king discarded the bishops for the sake of placating the people – as a king would cashier any other group of officers or ministers for the sake of obtaining popularity. As we saw above, in *De Cive* Hobbes had implied a 'spiritual' power in the apostolic successors, the 'duly ordained Ecclesiastics'. This letter suggests that Hobbes's (apparent) affirmation of apostolic succession in *De Cive* was not sincere – or that we should not read that passage from *De Cive* as

⁴² John Pearson, *Stags and Serpents: The Story of the House of Cavendish and the Dukes of Devonshire* (London: Macmillan, 1983), 41, 42.

⁴³ In 1638 he had become lord lieutenant of Derbyshire; in February 1640, high steward of Amptill; and in January 1642, joint commissioner of array for Leicestershire. *Corr.*, II, 816. For Devonshire's notably vigorous conduct as lord lieutenant, see Lynn Beats, 'Politics and Government in Derbyshire, 1640–1660', PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1978, 54–69.

⁴⁴ Pearson, *Stags and Serpents*, 41. He was impeached from the house of lords on 20 July 1642. Subsequently he was ordered to be detained in the Tower. *Corr.*, II, 816.

⁴⁵ Hobbes to Devonshire, Paris, 23 July/2 August 1641, *Corr.*, I, 120. For petitioning against episcopacy from other counties in the months after London's 'Root and Branch' petition, see Fletcher, *Outbreak of the English Civil War*, 91–7. The 'new way propounded' was a non-episcopal, quasi-presbyterian ecclesiastical structure which would involve shifting powers from bishops to lay commissioners.

any such affirmation. To be sure, the remainder of the letter makes clear that Hobbes does not propose that all church organisation or hierarchy be abolished; but he does not care who the ecclesiastics are, so long as they submit to the civil sovereign. He does not mind if 'that form' (episcopacy) be abolished, so long as most of the people are 'weary' of it. He himself does not think that episcopacy (a certain hierarchical arrangement) is *in itself* corrupt or inconvenient; but if many people think so, Hobbes is perfectly willing to acquiesce in its abolition. Certainly, he does not exhort his noble patron to fight for its preservation. However else one interprets the letter, it is clear that Hobbes neither allows divine-right warrant for the maintenance of bishops nor reveals any commitment to episcopacy as a long-established institutional arrangement, as a 'pillar', say, of the 'constitution' – a point urged by Bramhall in *Serpent-Salve*.

Petitions to abolish episcopacy like the one that Devonshire and Hobbes had seen were drawn up not only in many other English counties, but also in parts of Ireland.⁴⁶ In late spring 1641, such petitions from Ulster were produced for abolition of episcopacy in Ireland, to be submitted to the parliament at Westminster.⁴⁷ The petitions from Ulster would mean, specifically, the abolition of *Bishop* Bramhall. There is no reason to think that what he had condoned in the Nottinghamshire petition Hobbes would have rejected in the Ulster ones. Thus, in effect, Hobbes was condoning the abolition of Bramhall's office. And, in effect, Hobbes would be condoning the action of an Ulster planter, Sir John Clotworthy – a nemesis of Strafford and Bramhall in Ireland; a man who had been adversely affected by their economic policies in the 1630s, and a man who had come over to England in 1640 to take a seat in the Long Parliament in order, among other things, to compass the destruction of the lord lieutenant and his colleagues, including Bramhall. In June 1641, Clotworthy proposed that the English house of commons extend the 'Root and Branch' bill to provide for the abolition of episcopacy in Ireland as well.⁴⁸ Hobbes was no Clotworthy, but he could have found no reason to object to the latter's legislative agenda in this regard. Hobbes's letter to Devonshire in the summer of 1641 signified acquiescence in the actions

⁴⁶ The ultimate purpose of most of these petitions was to lend support to the earlier and grander petition, the London-based Root and Branch, which had been presented to the Long Parliament at the end of 1640.

⁴⁷ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, 113–14. There was correspondence between Ussher and Bramhall about these Ulster petitions, and Bramhall seems to have organised some contrary petitions. See Bramhall to Ussher, 26 April 1641, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxii, Ussher to Bramhall, n.d., *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxiii, Ussher to Bramhall, n.d., *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxiv, and Ussher to Bramhall, 19 June 1641, PRONI T 415:22.

⁴⁸ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, 113–14; Clotworthy's attempt failed: see Robert Armstrong, 'Protestant Churchmen and the Confederate Wars', in *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer, 233.

of anti-episcopalian politicians like Clotworthy. I am not, however, suggesting that we regard Hobbes as some kind of anti-episcopacy cheerleader; rather, I would assert that Hobbes, lacking any conviction in the uniquely divine nature of episcopacy, was not prepared to lift a finger to preserve it in England.

Nor would I wish to suggest that in the early 1640s Hobbes's chief pre-occupation was the question of the fate of the Laudian–Caroline–episcopal church in England, let alone the one in Ireland that Bramhall had established in collaboration with Strafford. As noted in passing above, these years saw Hobbes much more concerned with questions of mathematics and optics, that is, natural philosophy. From his arrival on the continent in 1640 to his return to England at the end of 1651 Hobbes spent most of his time in and around Paris. In an autobiography composed decades later, he recalled that having returned to Paris in 1640 he became a close colleague of Mersenne and Gassendi in various mathematical and scientific pursuits.⁴⁹ Along with Gassendi and François du Verdus, Mersenne was one of Hobbes's closest French friends. A friar of the Minim Convent de L'Annonciade in Paris, Mersenne maintained something like a *salon* in his cell there. As Quentin Skinner has noted, the cell was perhaps 'the most important *salon* for the learned' in Europe in the 1640s.⁵⁰ And as Lisa Sarasohn has noted: 'Mersenne knew everyone in Europe involved in the new mechanical philosophy, and through his vast correspondence encouraged productivity, communication and controversy within that community.'⁵¹ Hobbes himself later paid handsome tribute to Mersenne, recalling how the latter had been 'like an axis . . . each star wheel'd round, as in its orb or sphere'.⁵² Besides Gassendi, Hobbes and Descartes, Mersenne's cell was frequented by such outstanding thinkers as Pascal, Fermat, Peiresc and Roberval.⁵³ A friend

⁴⁹ Prose Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 247. In a letter from December 1644, Sir Charles Cavendish mentioned Hobbes's 'great friendship with Gassendi'. Cavendish to John Pell, 10/20 December 1644, *Pell-Cavendish*, 395.

⁵⁰ Skinner, 'Ideological Context', 288.

⁵¹ Sarasohn, 'Was *Leviathan* a Patronage Artifact?', 611. Peter Dear has noted that Mersenne's 'new kind of philosophical community for studying nature' amounted to 'a new scientific community'. *Mersenne and the Learning of the Schools* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988); for Mersenne's activities in the 1640s, see Dear, *ibid.*, 201–22.

⁵² Verse Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 259; 'Circa Mersennum convertebatur ut axem/Unumquodque artis sidus in orbe suo.' 'Vita Carmine Expressa', *OL*, 1, xci. Mersenne has with good reason been likened to the 'intellectual intelligencer' Samuel Hartlib. For Hartlib, see Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor, eds., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Curiously, in 1648 Hartlib was to be forwarding correspondence of the chemist Robert Boyle about his experiments to Hobbes in Paris. Quentin Skinner, 'Thomas Hobbes and the Nature of the Early Royal Society', *HJ* 12 (1969): 232.

⁵³ For further information about Mersenne's circle and Hobbes's participation, see Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, Volume 3: *Hobbes and Civil Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge

of both Hobbes and Descartes, Mersenne served as a go-between in their ill-tempered mathematical and metaphysical squabbles. Gassendi, the neoplatonist, was Hobbes's comrade-in-arms in the war against 'Aristotelism' (scholasticism); like Hobbes, he was very critical of Descartes.⁵⁴ In 1643 Hobbes was championing materialism and Copernican–Galilean astronomy and physics against an attempted neo-scholastic–Galilean synthesis.⁵⁵ In 1642, his compatriot, the Roman catholic Thomas White, had written a critical appraisal of Galileo's *Dialogue concerning the Two Chief World Systems*.⁵⁶ White was a close friend of Hobbes's friend Sir Kenelm Digby and, along with Hobbes, frequented Mersenne's cell throughout the 1640s. Evidently, Mersenne requested Hobbes to offer an assessment of White's *De Mundo Dialogi Tres* (1642).⁵⁷ Late in 1642 or early in 1643 Hobbes had completed a lengthy critique that Mersenne circulated among a small number of associates.⁵⁸ The *Anti-White*, as modern scholars usually refer to it, contains Hobbes's most thorough treatment of metaphysics and natural

University Press, 2002), 308–23, and Armand Beaulieu, 'Les Relations de Hobbes et de Mersenne' in *Thomas Hobbes: Philosophie Première, Théorie de la Science et Politique*, eds. Yves-Charles Zarka and Jean Bernhardt (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990). For an older but still useful treatment of the Hobbes–Mersenne relationship, see Brandt, *Hobbes's Mechanical Conception of Nature* (Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1928), 154–61, 167–74.

- ⁵⁴ For Hobbes's and Gassendi's criticism of Descartes's *Meditations*, and the latter's replies, all of which were assembled and published by Mersenne and Descartes, see *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, eds. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984; 2 vols.), II, 121–37 (Hobbes), 179–277 (Gassendi); for some recent commentary, see *Descartes and His Contemporaries: Meditations, Objections, and Replies*, eds. Roger Ariew and Marjorie Grene (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995). Hobbes's critique can also be read in *OL*, v, 249–74. For the Hobbes–Descartes mathematics–optics quarrel of 1641, by correspondence, through the mediation of Mersenne, see *Corr.*, I, 54–120. In November 1640 Hobbes also seems to have written a lengthy (fifty-six-page) critique of Descartes's *Dioptrique* in the form of a letter to Mersenne. See Karl Schuhmann, *Hobbes: Une Chronique: Cheminement de sa pensée et de sa vie* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1998), 63–5. This critique exhibited Hobbes's materialist metaphysics. For Hobbes and Gassendi, see Lisa Sarasohn, 'Motion and Morality: Pierre Gassendi, Thomas Hobbes and the Mechanical World-View', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985): 363–80.
- ⁵⁵ For a recent treatment of the Hobbes–Galileo relationship, which emphasises Hobbes's debt, see Douglas Jesseph, 'Galileo, Hobbes, and the Book of Nature', *Perspectives on Science* 12, 2 (2004): 191–211.
- ⁵⁶ Beverley Southgate has characterised White's *De Mundo* as synthetical, incorporating concepts from 'the current new [mechanistic] philosophy within a traditional Aristotelian framework . . . accommodat[ing] Copernican heliocentric cosmology and newly revived atomic theory'. 'Thomas White', *ODNB*.
- ⁵⁷ White has been well served by the recent biography of Southgate, *'Covetous of Truth': The Life and Work of Thomas White, 1593–1676* (Dordrecht, Boston and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993); there one may find the full context and a tidy exposition of White's treatise.
- ⁵⁸ This critique remained unpublished until 1973. For details of its composition, see introduction to *Critique du 'De Mundo' de Thomas White*, eds. Jean Jacquot and H. W. Jones (Paris: Vrin, 1973).

philosophy before *De Corpore* (1655). As Douglas Jesseph has recently observed: ‘the treatise is not so much a critique of White as an exposition of Hobbes’s own theories, set out in a format that defends the fundamental claims of Galilean science’.⁵⁹ By 1643, then, Hobbes had worked out, if not refined, much of his materialist metaphysics and mechanical natural philosophy. When he met Bramhall in Paris it was merely a matter of applying some of the arguments against White to the bishop, whose metaphysics was, like White’s, Aristotelian. Moreover, in his argument with Bramhall about free-will, beginning in the summer of 1645, he was to repeat some of the same points and use some of the same illustrations that appeared first in the *Anti-White* about two years earlier.⁶⁰

No matter how absorbed Hobbes was in Paris with endeavours of interest to Mersenne and his circle of mathematicians and natural philosophers, he probably extended a cheerful welcome to an old English friend in the spring of 1645. From July 1644 onwards, the Marquess of Newcastle had been an impecunious exile in northwestern Europe, attempting to obtain credit by virtue of his noble name.⁶¹ He remained in Hamburg until 16 February 1645,⁶² at which time he sailed to Rotterdam, whence he departed for Brussels by coach, then on to Cambrai, and finally, *via* Peronne, to Paris, which he reached 20 April 1645.⁶³ Presumably Newcastle shifted

⁵⁹ Jesseph, ‘Hobbes, Galileo’, 198. Malcolm has judged this Hobbes’s ‘most thorough attack on the old [Aristotelian] metaphysics’. ‘Hobbes and Spinoza’, *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1400–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 533.

⁶⁰ *Anti-White*, chapters xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvii. There were also some passages in *Elements of Law* (xi) and *DC* (v.8, vi.11 and ix.9) that treated free-will, but these were briefer than the discussion in *Anti-White*.

⁶¹ While Newcastle was still in Hamburg, John Constable in Rotterdam reported that the former was in quite a ‘poor condition’. Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 142; *Life of Cavendish*, 45–6. For his much-improved condition later in exile, see *Life of Cavendish*, 59.

⁶² We may presume that Newcastle lodged with his brother Charles in Hamburg. By that assumption, we obtain the inferential confirmation of Newcastle’s presence in Hamburg in August 1644, by correspondence between John Pell in Amsterdam and Sir Charles in Hamburg, July 1644–February 1645, *Pell-Cavendish*, 352–409. That the Cavendish brothers remained in Hamburg together till they both went south for Paris in late February/early March may be assumed from comments in Sir Charles’s letters to Pell; e.g., ‘my letter which I sent last week by my brother’s servant’. Charles Cavendish to John Pell, 17/27 December 1644, *Pell-Cavendish*, 397. From July 1644 to February 1645 we cannot be sure where in Hamburg the Cavendish brothers stayed. However, in the latter month, John Pell addressed a letter to Sir Charles thus: ‘M. Cavendish, English knight, at Hamburg. Directed to his brother, the Marquess of Newcastle, staying near St. John’s Church.’ Pell to Cavendish, 8/18 February 1645, *Pell-Cavendish*, 409.

⁶³ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 144–5. As late as 4/14 February 1645, Newcastle wrote from Hamburg to Prince Charles. *HMC Portland*, II, 134. On 20 March 1645 (N.S.), Newcastle was writing from Rotterdam, possibly to John Poliander Kirkhoven. At the beginning of April 1645, Sir Charles was writing to Pell from Antwerp, and from the beginning of May, from Paris. *Pell-Cavendish*, 410–13.

to Paris primarily to be close to Queen Henrietta Maria and a large concentration of royalist exiles. That city was the continental capital of such exiles in 1645. The queen was splitting her time between an apartment in the Louvre and the palace of Saint-Germain-en-Laye on the outskirts of Paris.⁶⁴ Newcastle may also have been attracted to the French capital by the intellectual diversions it would afford. In fact, he seems to have enjoyed one rather entertaining evening within just a few months of his arrival. It was in the late spring or early summer of 1645 that the retired Cavalier general hosted an odd couple of friends, Thomas Hobbes and Bishop Bramhall.

In a paper Bramhall addressed to Newcastle some time after 20 April 1646, the bishop noted: 'My conversation with him [Hobbes] hath not been frequent; yet I remember well, that when this question was agitated between us two in your Lordship's chamber by your command, he did then declare himself in words, both for the absolute necessity of all events, and for the ground of this necessity, the flux or concatenation of the second causes.'⁶⁵ From this remark we can establish that some kind of debate between Hobbes and Bramhall took place in Newcastle's Parisian residence before April 1646. This meeting in Paris is confirmed by a later comment of Hobbes about 'meeting with the Bishop of Derry at Paris, where we discoursed together'.⁶⁶ This meeting cannot have been earlier than April 1645, because, as we have already noted, Newcastle had only arrived in Paris at the end of that month. The end of April 1645 is, then, our *terminus a quo*.⁶⁷ Bramhall's letter of 1646 to Newcastle was, we learn from the text itself, a response to a paper written by Hobbes. In this letter Bramhall comments: 'The first day that I did read over T.H. his defence of the necessity of all things, was April 20, 1646: which proceeded not out of any disrespect to him . . . first my journey, and afterwards some other trifles (which we call business), having diverted me until then. And then my occasions permitting me, and an advertisement from a friend awakening me, I set myself to a serious examination of it.'⁶⁸ If we interpret this as an apology for a fairly tardy response to Hobbes's paper, Bramhall cannot have received that paper (a 'defence of the necessity

⁶⁴ Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 26. On 10/20 November 1644, Henrietta Maria, in Paris, had written a letter to Newcastle, still in Hamburg, answering one of his, and assuring him of 'the continuance of my esteem'. *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. M. A. E. Green (London: Richard Bentley, 1857), 261.

⁶⁵ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 26. ⁶⁶ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 2.

⁶⁷ However, we might safely assume this *terminus* May instead of late April; Newcastle and his brother had travelled from Hamburg to Paris together, and the latter's first letter to Pell from Paris was dated 1/11 May 1645. *Pell-Cavendish*, 412–13. Of course, this is not conclusive.

⁶⁸ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 23–4.

of all things') any later than the end of 1645 or early 1646. Hobbes's paper, in turn, had been a reply to an original paper by Bramhall.⁶⁹ This paper of Hobbes, which takes the form of a letter to Newcastle, contains a reference to Bramhall's 'Discourse of Liberty and Necessity'.⁷⁰ This 'Discourse', the first paper written by the bishop, cannot have come *before* the meeting in Paris, for Bramhall was later to note that his paper 'was only to press home those things in writing which had been agitated between us by word of mouth'.⁷¹ The oral debate preceded the 'Discourse', which had been composed some-time during 1645.

In 1645, Hobbes was, among other things, working on *De Corpore*. A letter from his French friend Samuel Sorbière verifies that he was in Paris during 1645.⁷² In this letter, dated Lyon, 11 July 1645 (N.S.), Sorbière speaks of his having met with Hobbes in Paris.⁷³ As the letter's modern editor points out, Sorbière, who lived mainly in Holland from 1642 to 1650, stayed for a short time in Paris in the early summer of 1645.⁷⁴ Thus, Hobbes must have been in Paris at least during that season of the year. That he was not in Paris for all of 1645 is established by a letter he wrote to Edmund Waller, dated Rouen, 8 August 1645 (N.S.). In this Hobbes explains that: 'I came hither to see my lord of Devonshire.'⁷⁵ There is no precise indication of when Hobbes had arrived in Rouen from Paris.⁷⁶ But he does state his intention of returning to Paris in a fortnight: 'Though at the foot of my letter . . . you find from Rouen, and from me, I pray you believe that in my absence I have left your son and nephew such directions as they will not lose their time. And I hope within this fortnight to be with them again.'⁷⁷ Hobbes's concern about his tutorial charges, Waller's son and nephew, suggests that his stay in Rouen was to be short. If he stayed another fortnight, he would have returned to Paris around 23 August (N.S.). Supposing he had arrived in Rouen about a week before he wrote to Waller, his stay in Rouen was 1–23 August (N.S.). That Hobbes was there in late July or early August 1645 is confirmed by a letter from the correspondence of Sir Charles Cavendish. In a letter to his

⁶⁹ Bramhall subsequently clarified that Hobbes's paper was a reply to his own original paper: 'my first discourse, to which he wrote that answer'. 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 19.

⁷⁰ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 239.

⁷¹ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 17. Bramhall's paper, 'Discourse', is BL Sloane 1012, ff. 1–16, and bears the date Paris, 1645.

⁷² Unfortunately for the Hobbes biographer, there are no extant letters written by or to Hobbes between August 1641 and 1/11 July 1645. Nevertheless, judging from other sources there is no reason to doubt that he spent almost all of this period in Paris.

⁷³ *Corr.*, i, 122. ⁷⁴ *Corr.*, i, 123. ⁷⁵ *Corr.*, i, 124.

⁷⁶ In this period, a trip from Rouen to Paris usually took two days – staying the night at an inn.

⁷⁷ *Corr.*, i, 124. For further commentary on this letter, see Philip Wikelund, "'Thus I passe my time in this place': An Unpublished Letter of Thomas Hobbes", *English Language Notes* 4 (1968–9): 263–8.

friend, the mathematician John Pell, dated Paris, 27 July O.S. (6 August, N.S.), he notes: 'Mr Hobbes is gone to Rouen and I doubt will not return whilst we are here.'⁷⁸ Thus, we can safely assume that Hobbes had left for Rouen no later than 6 August (N.S.).⁷⁹

We have already established that the meeting of Hobbes and Bramhall cannot have occurred before Newcastle arrived in Paris, at the end of April 1645 (the *terminus a quo*). We have also determined that the first two papers that followed the debate must have been written some months before April 1646, presumably no later than the end of 1645. Hobbes's paper, the response to Bramhall's first ('Discourse'), was later to be published twice (in 1654), each time with a different date.⁸⁰ In the first publication it bore the date 'Rouen, 20 Aug. 1652'; in the other, 'Rouen, 20 Aug. 1646'.⁸¹ The variation is, then, only in the year.⁸² Since Bramhall, in his paper of 1646, referred to his reading of Hobbes's paper in *April* of that year, it could not have been composed either in August 1652 or August 1646. But perhaps the *month* is not inaccurate: 20 August 1645 would satisfy the requirement of falling between April 1645 and April 1646. If we suppose that Hobbes was in Rouen from 1–23 August (N.S.) and bear in mind that his letter in answer to Bramhall was dated 20 August 1645, then we will have narrowed the window of the *viva voce* debate to late April–1 August 1645 (N.S.). We can narrow it further by supposing that some time, say, at least a week, must have elapsed between the oral debate and Bramhall's first paper, and at least a week before Hobbes received it, and another week before he wrote his answer, dated 20 August 1645. Taking all this into account, the timeframe for their meeting and debate in Paris would be something like 1 May–mid-July 1645 (N.S.). We cannot narrow it further by Bramhall's movements because these cannot be determined. Bramhall had landed in Hamburg with Newcastle on 8 July 1644. After arriving at the northern German port, the bishop eventually made his way to Brussels where, for much of the next few years, he lived with or near Sir Henry de Vic, the king's resident. Bramhall travelled frequently in the years 1644–8.⁸³ The distance between Brussels and Paris is not so great that trips back and forth would have been prohibitively

⁷⁸ Pell-Cavendish, 421–2.

⁷⁹ After the letter to Waller of 8 August 1645 (N.S.), there is no Hobbes correspondence until 16 May 1646 (N.S.).

⁸⁰ See chapter 7, 193.

⁸¹ For details of the two editions, see Hugh Macdonald and Mary Hargreaves, eds., *Thomas Hobbes: A Bibliography* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1952), 37–8.

⁸² I assume that 20 August is in both cases New Style.

⁸³ Vesey, AH, xxvii. In Brussels he was preaching and administering the sacraments regularly: 'The English merchants of Antwerp, ten leagues thence [from Brussels] used to be monthly of his audience and communion, and were his best benefactors.' For more information about Bramhall's activities in the mid- and late 1640s, see chapter 5.

costly or tedious. We know that the bishop was in Brussels, 20 June 1645.⁸⁴ Some weeks before or after that date he must have been in Paris to meet Newcastle and Hobbes.

Sometime in May, June or July 1645, therefore, Hobbes and Bramhall met their mutual friend Newcastle in Paris. If Hobbes and Bramhall had not been acquainted previously, that does not mean that their reputations had not preceded them.⁸⁵ They could have anticipated each other's opinions on some issues. Most importantly, there is no doubt that Bramhall had read *De Cive*, if not the *Elements of Law*.⁸⁶ Since Bramhall was in close and regular contact with Newcastle – and at least infrequent contact with his brother Sir Charles, in Yorkshire from 1642 to 1644 – he might well have been able to read one of the copies of the *Elements of Law* manuscript – a writing which had, after all, been dedicated to Newcastle. Whereas we may only speculate that Bramhall had read the *Elements of Law*, it is certain that he was one of the few to read the 1642-printed version of *De Cive*. Shortly before, or at the time of their meeting in the chamber of Newcastle, Bramhall gave to Hobbes a long list of objections to that Latin treatise.⁸⁷ Very likely one of the copies of *De Cive* had been sent to Newcastle and Sir Charles in Yorkshire shortly after its Paris printing. We can suppose that Bramhall, also in Yorkshire, was able to have a look at the copy sent to them.⁸⁸ That Sir Charles sometimes shared manuscripts with Bramhall we know from Bramhall's comment about a French treatise that Charles had shown him while they were both in Yorkshire.⁸⁹ That Bramhall would have had many objections to *De Cive* cannot surprise anyone who has read *Serpent-Salve*, or reviewed the bishop's antebellum career. There are fundamental differences between the assumptions and reasoning of *De Cive* and *Serpent-Salve*. In view of those two books (and the *Elements of Law*), and Bramhall's long list of objections to *De Cive*, their political disagreement can, thus, be established before they met in the summer of 1645. We have no evidence that Hobbes

⁸⁴ BW, I, x, 'q'. Here he wrote 'An Answer to two Papers brought him June the 19th, 1645, about the Protestants' Ordination'. This little piece is dated Brussels, 20 June 1645, the day after he received the said papers.

⁸⁵ One can, however, only *assume* that this was the first meeting of Hobbes and Bramhall.

⁸⁶ It is unlikely but not impossible that Bramhall had read Hobbes's critique of White's *De Mundo*.

⁸⁷ In 1655 Bramhall was to write: 'Whereas Mr Hobbes mentions my objections to his book *De Cive*, it is true, that ten years since I gave him about sixty exceptions, the one half of them political, the other half theological, to that book, and every exception justified by a number of reasons; to which he never yet vouchsafed any answer.' *Defence*, BW, iv, 20.

⁸⁸ But it is still possible that Bramhall only read it later, after he had arrived on the continent, in July 1644. In either case I think it likely that he read a copy owned or obtained by Newcastle or his brother.

⁸⁹ 'Discourse' and 'Vindication', BW, iv, 155.

had read *Serpent-Salve*.⁹⁰ But if he had, he might have anticipated the kind of objections Bramhall submitted to him at or about the time of their meeting in Paris in the presence of Newcastle.

At this meeting, Newcastle proposed that they debate the question of free-will. That Hobbes and Bramhall debated it in a rather modest residence may be inferred from Newcastle's wife's later recollection: 'Some two years after my Lord's marriage [November or December 1645], when he had prevailed so far with his creditors that they began to trust him anew, the first thing he did was, that he removed out of those lodgings in Paris where he had been necessitated to live hitherto, to a house which he hired for himself and his family, and furnished it as well as his new-gotten credit would permit.'⁹¹ The participants in the debate were as oddly matched physically as intellectually. Hobbes was quite tall by contemporary standards: 'He was a tall man, higher than I am by about half a head, i.e. I could put my hand between my head and his hat. He was six foot high, and something better.'⁹² His face was somewhat truncated but surmounted by an 'ample forehead'; his whiskers were 'yellowish-reddish, which naturally turned up'; he was close-shaven, except for a little tip under his lip; and his eyes were lively and hazel.⁹³ The bishop, on the other hand, was not a tall, let alone an imposing man: 'His person was of the middle stature, and active, but his mien and presence not altogether so great as his endowments of mind. His complexion highly sanguine, pretty deeply tintured with choler, which in his declining years become predominant and would sometimes overflow not without some tartness of expression, but it proceeded no further.'⁹⁴ The only portrait of Bramhall that survives shows a short man, with a clean-shaven, fleshy face, dominated by an aquiline nose.⁹⁵

For the details of this live debate in Newcastle's chamber we are left to conjecture. Neither Newcastle nor Hobbes nor Bramhall ever suggested that

⁹⁰ While in France Hobbes might have read a great deal of the propaganda that was being printed in England by both royalists and parliamentarians. As his letter to Devonshire shows, he read, for example, the Nottinghamshire petition against episcopacy. (Perhaps Devonshire forwarded that to him.) It is also possible that Hobbes had read *Serpent-Salve* without knowing that Bramhall was its author, for the latter published anonymously. But, of course, Newcastle, among others, could have informed him of the bishop's authorship.

⁹¹ *Life of Cavendish*, 46.

⁹² Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 347, 349. Even in his old age Hobbes's height was remarked. As late as 1675 a German visitor in London, Adam Ebert, noted that the octogenarian was 'ein langer Mann'. Quoted in Noel Malcolm, '*Behemoth Latinus*: Adam Ebert, Tacitism, and Hobbes', *Filozofski vestnik* 24, 2 (2003): 99.

⁹³ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 348. The various portraits we have corroborate Aubrey's description.

⁹⁴ Vesey, AH, xliii.

⁹⁵ The engraving of H. B. Hall, after the portrait now in the possession of the archbishops of Armagh, serves as frontispiece to the first volume of the Anglo-Catholic Library edition of his works. There is a copy of this portrait in the Sidney Sussex Library. I thank its librarian Nicholas Rogers for sending me a digital image of it.

the nobleman had planned to have his friends debate this issue. Thus, it would not be unreasonable to suppose that it was a moment's whim of Newcastle, perhaps a certain turn in the conversation, that sparked it. The debate may have simply sprung up after they had been conversing on other subjects. Margaret Cavendish's mention of her husband's several discussions with Hobbes while in Paris suggests their frequency. She described one of them this way:

When my Lord was at Paris in his exile, it happened one time, that he discoursing with some of his friends, amongst whom was also that learned philosopher Hobbes, they began, amongst the rest, to argue upon this subject, namely, Whether it were possible to make man by art fly as birds do; and when some of the company had delivered their opinion, viz. That they thought it probable to be done by the help of artificial wings; my Lord declared, that he deemed it altogether impossible, and demonstrated it by this following reason. Man's arms, said he, are not set on his shoulders in the same manner as bird's wings are; for that part of the arm which joins to the shoulder is in man placed inward, as towards the breast, but in birds outward, as toward the back; which difference and contrary position or shape hinders that man cannot have the same flying action with his arms, as birds have with their wings. Which argument Mr Hobbes liked so well, that he was pleased to make use of it in one of his books called *Leviathan*, if I remember well.⁹⁶

It is quite plausible, then, that the debate between Hobbes and Bramhall occurred during a wide-ranging conversation like the one described above. Incidentally, with and without Hobbes and Bramhall, Newcastle clearly liked to play host to philosophical *convivia*. He entertained such French philosophers as Descartes and Gassendi – the latter, as we have noted, a close friend of Hobbes.⁹⁷ From late September 1644 to late July 1645, Mersenne was not in Paris, but in Rome.⁹⁸ With the friar absent from Paris, meetings in his cell could not have taken place. So, in these several months the Mersenne circle was without a place to convene. Perhaps Newcastle presented himself as a substitute host; maybe his residence became, for this brief time, the meeting-place for the Mersenne circle. Indeed, even when Mersenne was in Paris, Newcastle's lodgings might have served, in the years 1645–8, as something of an alternative venue for some members of the Mersenne circle to engage in discussion.

⁹⁶ *Life of Cavendish*, 106–7. None of the editions of *Lev.* contains any parallel to this 'man-a-faulty-bird' discourse, which fact does serve to diminish the credibility of Margaret Cavendish.

⁹⁷ *Life of Cavendish*, 106–7. Aubrey noted: 'I have heard Mr. Edmund Waller say that W. Lord Marquis of Newcastle was a great patron of Dr Gassendi, and M. Des Cartes, as well as to Mr. H., and that he hath dined with them all three at the Marquis's table, at Paris.' Quoted by Firth, *Life of Cavendish*, 106. Newcastle and Descartes also kept up a fairly regular correspondence in the years 1645–8. See *Oeuvres de Descartes*, eds. Charles Adam and Paul Tannery (Paris: J. Vrin, 1996; 11 vols.), iv, 188–92, 325–30, 568–77; v, 133–9, 554.

⁹⁸ *Pell-Cavendish*, 382, n.4.

Precisely in what fashion or order Hobbes and Bramhall argued at this meeting is impossible to say. Nor can we be sure how heated the debate was. Eleven years later Hobbes recalled that: 'we discoursed together of the argument now in hand; from which discourse we carried away each of us his own opinion, and for aught I remember, without any offensive words, as blasphemous, atheistical, or the like, passing between us; either for that the Bishop was not then in passion, or suppressed his passion, being then in the presence of my Lord of Newcastle'.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, we might suspect from their subsequent writings on the subject – and their pugnacious personalities – that at least by the end of the live debate they had become fairly annoyed at each other. Such a supposition would have the merit of making it easier for us to account for some ill-tempered passages from those writings of the 1650s. That the debate became somewhat heated and a little ill-tempered we might extrapolate from an observation Bramhall recorded about a year after the meeting. Explaining his intention in writing a position-paper shortly after the *viva voce*, the bishop noted:

mine aim . . . was only to press home those things in writing, which had been agitated between us by word of mouth (a course much to be preferred before verbal conferences, as being freer from passions and tergiversations, less subject to mistakes and misrelations, wherein paralogisms are more quickly detected, impertinences discovered, and confusion avoided).¹⁰⁰

Perhaps his experience with Hobbes strengthened his conviction that 'agitating' such questions in person always led to heat and lost tempers.¹⁰¹ But this is all speculative, and Hobbes later wrote: 'He is here, I think, mistaken; for in our *verbal* conference there was not one passionate word, nor any objecting of blasphemy or atheism, nor any other uncivil word; of which in his *writing* there are abundance.'¹⁰² As previously noted, it was shortly after

⁹⁹ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 2. From this passage we might guess that Newcastle was the only auditor. It is likely since Hobbes only mentions 'the presence of my Lord of Newcastle' in explaining Bramhall's not being 'in passion'. However, it is possible that Sir Charles was also in attendance at the debate, as he was in Paris at the time. As his letter to Pell, quoted above, suggests, Cavendish was in frequent correspondence and contact with Hobbes during the mid-1640s. And we have noted that Charles knew Bramhall from at least a few years before 1645, when they were both in Yorkshire during the First English Civil War.

¹⁰⁰ 'Vindication', Dedicatory Letter, *BW*, iv, 17.

¹⁰¹ *Viva voce* was never preferred by Bramhall; it was not only in the case of Hobbes that he thought oral debates undesirable. On another occasion he wrote: 'Conferences in words do often engender heat, or produce extravagancies or mistakes; writing is a way more calm, more certain, and such as a man cannot depart from.' 'To Miss Cheubien', *BW*, v, 191. Since this remark was written during exile, one wonders how much of it was indebted to the bishop's experience with Hobbes. Certainly, however, Bramhall's pre-1645 career had provided numerous opportunities to engage in such debates. Early in his 1620s clerical career, as we saw in chapter 1, 23, he undertook to debate in public with two Roman Catholics.

¹⁰² *Questions*, *EW*, v, 22; emphasis added.

the debate in Paris that Hobbes sojourned in Rouen in early August 1645. While there with Devonshire, he wrote the letter to Edmund Waller from which we have already quoted. This letter also contains a revealing passage that shows how Devonshire seems to have used Hobbes for his amusement:

I came hither to see my Lord of Devonshire, but am no less in other company than his; where I serve when I can be matched as a gladiator; my odd opinions are baited, but I am contented with it, as believing I have still the better, when a new man is set upon me; that knows not my paradoxes, but is full of his own doctrine, there is something in the disputation not unpleasant. He thinks he had driven me upon an absurdity when t'is upon some other of my tenets and so from one to another, till he wonder, and exclaim and at last finds I am of the antipodes to the schools. Thus I pass my time in this place.¹⁰³

This cannot be a reference to the debate with Bramhall: the latter took place in the few months before Hobbes's stay in Rouen. But, as will become clearer when we examine their subsequent writings in chapter 4, it is not hard to imagine Bramhall's thinking he had trapped Hobbes within an absurdity 'when t'is upon some other of his tenets and so from one to another, till *Bramhall* wonder, and exclaim and at last finds Hobbes is of the antipodes to the schools'. Hobbes's debate with Bramhall might have been very similar to those held in Rouen. But I would stress that Bramhall could not have been such 'a new man . . . that knows not my paradoxes'. The bishop's reading of *De Cive* had surely done something to prepare (or brace) him for Hobbes's singularity and disregard of traditional philosophical and theological authorities. In fact, a careful reading of that treatise would have informed Bramhall that Hobbes did not accept that the will of humans is free; if the bishop had also read the *Elements of Law* and the critique of White's *De Mundo*, he could not have had any doubt about the philosopher's arrant determinism.¹⁰⁴

Whether Newcastle interjected at all during the debate is an interesting and unanswerable question. And, unfortunately, he left no record of what he thought of the arguments made by his two friends. We might, however, surmise that Newcastle sympathised very little with the thoroughly scholastic-libertarian line that Bramhall took.¹⁰⁵ As we will see in the following chapters, the bishop usually took the 'school' position in questions of philosophy and theology. Of Newcastle's education his wife later remarked that: 'to school learning he never showed a great inclination'.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, whereas Newcastle and Bramhall might well have grown friendly

¹⁰³ *Corr.*, I, 124. ¹⁰⁴ See above, n.60.

¹⁰⁵ Overhoff, in *Hobbes's Theory of the Will*, 136, has ascribed to Newcastle a libertarian 'conviction' like Bramhall's; but he cites no source.

¹⁰⁶ *Life of Cavendish*, 104. That Newcastle could not, or preferred not to, read Latin is suggested by the fact that in 1646 he requested that Hobbes put his treatise on optics into English. Hobbes's *A Minute or First Draught of the Optiques* (transcribed and illustrated by William Petty) was dedicated to Newcastle in 1646. *EW*, vii, 468.

as royalist colleagues in Yorkshire during the First Civil War, the intellectual camaraderie of Newcastle and Hobbes was almost twenty-years-old by 1645. Although we may assume that Newcastle took pains to show no favouritism as auditor or moderator, he may not have been entirely successful in concealing a better liking for Hobbes's position. If, as is most probable, Bramhall knew of their long acquaintanceship, and Newcastle's keen interest in the new, experimental and anti-scholastic mechanical natural philosophy, he might well have expected the marquess to reveal a preference for Hobbes's materialism, determinism and extreme anti-Aristotelianism.¹⁰⁷ If Newcastle thought much like Hobbes, then in listening to the debate the nobleman might have been quite curious to see whether Bramhall could refute his own view.

When this battle of wits occurred in Paris, the First English Civil War (1642–6) had not yet ended. In fact, if the debate occurred in June 1645, it happened in the same month as the last major battle of that war, Naseby, the conclusive defeat of the king. A modern reader may wonder why Newcastle, a recently retired Cavalier general, should have encouraged his friends to debate free-will, a seemingly academic or trivial topic. Was it not a little inappropriate or frivolous for three Englishmen to be entertaining such a subject at such a time? Insouciance in Newcastle would be easier to impute if the question of free-will in 1645 had not been something more than a merely abstract philosophical or theological issue. At this time the question had a significance that went beyond the academic interests of philosophers and theologians like Hobbes and Bramhall. In fact, Hobbes was later, in 1656, to suggest that the issue was momentous enough to explain the very fact that they were all in Paris to 'agitate' it:

freewill is a thing that never was mentioned amongst them [ancient philosophers], nor by the Christians in the beginning of Christianity. For St Paul, that disputes that question largely and purposely, never useth the term of freewill; nor did he hold any doctrine equivalent to that which is now called the doctrine of freewill; but deriveth all actions from the irresistible will of God, and nothing from the will of him that runneth or willet. But for some ages past, the doctors of the Roman Church have exempted from this dominion of God's will the will of man; and brought in a doctrine, that not only man, but also his will is free, and determined to this or that action, not by the will of God, nor necessary causes, but by the power of the will itself. And though by the reformed Churches instructed by Luther, Calvin, and others, this opinion was cast out, yet not many years since it began again to be reduced by Arminius and his followers, and became the readiest way to ecclesiastical promotion; and by discontenting those that held the contrary, was in some part the cause of the following troubles; which troubles were the occasion of my meeting with the Bishop of Derry at Paris, where we discoursed together of the argument now in hand.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ For Newcastle's deep interest in the new scientific thinking and experimentation, see Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, 89–92.

¹⁰⁸ *Questions, EW*, v, 1–2.

Here Hobbes was echoing the popular (parliamentary and non-parliamentary) puritan charge that powerful clergy like Laud and Bramhall had introduced ‘popish’ doctrines to poison the church. In a book published all the way back in 1628, *An Appeal to the Parliament, or Sion’s Plea against the Prelacy*, Alexander Leighton had made the point that ‘Arminianism was merely old Popery in new guise’.¹⁰⁹ In 1629, William Prynne had fulminated: ‘This infernal monster . . . is but an old condemned heresy, raised up from hell of late, by some Jesuits and infernal spirits, to kindle a combustion of all Protestant states and Churches’.¹¹⁰ Hobbes’s assertion was basically the same as Leighton’s and Prynne’s: the followers of Arminius had (wittingly or not) resuscitated the teachings of the ‘Doctors of the Roman Church’. Not surprisingly, the bishop was not to take kindly to the insinuation that as a defender of free-will, as an arminian, he had contributed to the war. *He* was not to blame for their being in Paris in the summer of 1645. The bishop’s retort, penned in 1657, concluded with a recrimination:

He [Hobbes] accuseth Arminius to have been a restorer or ‘reducer’ of the Romish doctrine of free will by a *postliminium*. I do not think that ever he read one word of Arminius in his life, or knoweth distinctly one opinion that Arminius held. It was such deep controvertists as himself that accused the Church of England of Arminianism, for holding those truths which they ever professed before Arminius was born. If Arminius were alive, Mr Hobbes, out of conscience, ought to ask him forgiveness. . . . It was not the speculative doctrine of Arminius, but the seditious tenets of Mr Hobbes, and such like, which opened a large window to our troubles.¹¹¹

By the phrase ‘the seditious tenets of Mr Hobbes, and such like’ Bramhall was suggesting Hobbes’s association with puritans, the rabid anti-arminians – anti-Laudians – or anti-Carolines.¹¹² According to the bishop, it was the ignorant and malicious slanders of Hobbes and the puritans that were decisive in engendering discord and war.

As has already been implied by reference to Leighton’s *Sion’s Plea* and Prynne’s *Old Antithesis*, Hobbes’s claim about the corrupt origins and harmful effects of free-will (‘Arminian’) doctrine leads us back to the late 1620s. Deliberately or not, Hobbes was echoing some speeches of MPs from that

¹⁰⁹ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 162.

¹¹⁰ *The Church of England’s Old Antithesis to the New Arminianism* (1629), as quoted in White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 3.

¹¹¹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 218–19. For some modern commentary on the contemporary misunderstanding of Arminius, of which Bramhall is here accusing Hobbes, see Peter White, ‘The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered’, 41, n.25. White stresses that Arminius cannot be classified simply as an ‘anti-Calvinist’; likewise, it is emphasised that the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort, 1618–19, were not so much anti-Calvin as anti-Beza.

¹¹² If one admits the merit of Davies’s *Caroline Captivity*, one must allow for the possible equivalence of anti-Laudian and anti-Caroline on this point. See chapter 2, n. 85.

time.¹¹³ The house of commons on 11 June 1628 issued a remonstrance to Charles I, in which they complained of unhealthy innovation in church and state, namely the growth of arminianism and popery: 'It being now generally held the way to preferment and promotion in the Church, many scholars do bend the course of their studies to maintain those [arminian] errors.'¹¹⁴ A committee of the commons later renewed this complaint against what they alleged was an innovatory and insidious trend: 'That we call to mind, how that, in the last session of this parliament, we presented to his Majesty a humble declaration of the great danger threatened to this Church and state, by divers courses and practices tending to the change and innovation of religion.'¹¹⁵ The MPs observe 'an extraordinary growth of popery'. Tellingly, in the same paragraph, arminianism is named. Here was the same association between popery and arminianism that Hobbes was echoing:

The subtle and pernicious spreading of the Arminian faction; whereby they have kindled such a fire of division in the very bowels of the state, as if not speedily extinguished, it is of itself sufficient to ruin our religion; by dividing us from the Reformed Churches abroad, and separating amongst ourselves at home, by casting doubts upon the religion professed and established, which, if faulty or questionable in three or four articles, will be rendered suspicious to unstable minds in all the rest, and incline them to Popery, to which those tenets, in their own nature, do prepare the way.

In other words, acting as a stalking-horse, arminian tenets prepare the way for popery. Less than a fortnight after this committee report, the house of commons registered an anti-arminian 'Protestation'. In the first article of this document, dated 2 March 1629, it is resolved: 'Whosoever shall bring in innovation of religion, or by favour or countenance seek to extend or introduce popery or Arminianism, or other opinion disagreeing from the true and orthodox Church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this Kingdom and Commonwealth.'¹¹⁶ 'Popery' had much the same force as 'treason', and

¹¹³ For parliamentary anti-arminian and anti-popery rhetoric in the 1620s, see Hillel Schwartz, 'Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624–29', *JBS* 12, 2 (1973): 41–68. As Peter White has noted, referring to the proceedings of the house of commons regarding arminianism in 1628–9: 'Doctrinal issues became the plaything of faction.' White, 'Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', 51.

¹¹⁴ *SC*, 133; Rushworth, I, 633. Likewise, Samuel Ward, Bramhall's master at Sidney Sussex, had observed in May 1628 that some university men were turning arminian 'because preferments at court are conferred upon such as incline that way'. Quoted in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 49–50.

¹¹⁵ *CD*, 77. These 'Resolutions on Religion drawn by a sub-committee of the House of Commons' were dated 24 February 1629.

¹¹⁶ *CD*, 83; Rushworth, I, 660. In the same parliament Francis Rous delivered a speech in which, after alluding to the Armada of 1588 and the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, he described arminianism as a 'Trojan horse' whereby religion and liberty might be overthrown. On the same occasion, Edward Kirton linked arminianism to crypto-papist clerical ambition.

‘arminianism’, proto-popery, suggested sedition. To be labelled arminian was to be *accused*. (It was not very different from being labelled a communist in the McCarthy era of American history.)

Since there was no meeting of parliament between 1629 and 1640, the 1630s saw no parliamentary declaration repeating these grievances. But it is rather likely that the ‘arminian’ doctrine of free-will continued to be one of the principal grievances voiced by critics of church and state in this decade, since, in 1640, we find it broadcast again as a charge against the ecclesiastical regime of Charles and Laud. A petition purportedly signed by 15,000 Londoners was presented to the house of commons on 11 December 1640. This, the so-called ‘Root and Branch’ petition, was chiefly concerned to eradicate episcopacy. And one of the reasons given for abolishing the ‘prelates’ is their countenancing the doctrine of free-will and associated arminian tenets. Thus in the second article under the rubric, ‘A Particular of the manifold evils, pressures, and grievances caused, practised and occasioned by the Prelates and their dependents’, we read:

The faint-heartedness of ministers to preach the truth of God, lest they should displease the prelates; as namely, the doctrine of predestination, of free grace, of perseverance, of original sin remaining after baptism, of the sabbath, the doctrine against universal grace, election for faith foreseen, *free-will* against antichrist, non-residents, human inventions in God’s worship; all which are generally withheld from the people’s knowledge, because not relishing to the bishops.¹¹⁷

Similarly, in the ninth article, the petitioners complain that books against arminianism (or, books that impugn the doctrine of free-will) are bowdlerised or suppressed: ‘The hindering of godly books to be printed, the blotting out or perverting those which they suffer, all or most of that which strikes either at Popery or Arminianism; the adding of what or where pleaseth them, and the restraint of reprinting books formerly licensed, without licensing.’¹¹⁸ Thus, in the Root and Branch petition a loud protest is made against the censorship of books that attack free-will, the allegedly fundamental arminian doctrine. Just a year later the house of commons itself drafted a petition, the Grand Remonstrance, not unlike Root and Branch, and presented it to the King on the 1 December 1641. The MPs denounced the wicked counsellors surrounding the king, ‘actors and promoters’ of a ‘malignant and

Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 134–5. For quotation and discussion of these and other anti-arminian speeches of the 1628–9 parliament, see also Dewey D. Wallace, Jr, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 88–90.

¹¹⁷ CD, 138; Rushworth, iv, 93.

¹¹⁸ CD, 139. See also article 10: ‘The publishing and venting of Popish, Arminian, and other dangerous books and tenets’; and 28: ‘only Papists, Jesuits, Priests, and such others as propagate Popery or Arminianism, are countenanced, spared, and have much liberty’.

pernicious design of subverting the fundamental laws and principles of government, upon which the religion and justice of this kingdom are firmly established'.¹¹⁹ Among other things, these devious and conspiring counsellors 'cherish the Arminian part in those points wherein they agree with Papists'.

To cite all these remonstrances, petitions and resolutions is not to argue that free-will caused the First English Civil War. What we have been able to observe is that one of the chief issues of contention and grievance leading up to the outbreak of that war was the 'arminian' doctrine of free-will. Denunciations of this doctrine, the definitive doctrine of arminianism, came from the mouths and pens of those who were making the noisiest protests against the regime of Charles I. Whether one calls it an 'intellectual', 'theological' or 'philosophical' issue, it was no less an invidious political one.¹²⁰ Execration of 'popish' free-will and those who maintained or tolerated the doctrine became common in pieces of anti-government discourse. In the 1640s, one's position on free-will could lead to summary political classification. It does not much matter that this kind of Procrustean partisan classification ignored important nuances – or ignored the fact that one could, say, be anti-arminian without being especially pro-parliamentarian.¹²¹ In the highly charged and increasingly polarised situation of the early 1640s, nuances were not to be regarded: it was time for drawing of battle lines and closing of ranks. No matter how much one might have liked to claim a 'moderate' stance on free-will, any declaration whatever might invite a simple identification of 'puritan' or 'arminian'.¹²² Newcastle's inciting a debate on free-will is all the more notable in light of the fact that one of its participants, Bramhall, had already acquired quite a reputation for arminianism.¹²³ He was one of those popish, free-will 'prelates' against whom protests had specifically been made. Indeed, if Bramhall had lingered much longer in England, and fallen into the hands of the parliamentarians, he might have met an ugly fate similar to

¹¹⁹ CD, 206; Rushworth, iv, 437.

¹²⁰ In making this point I do not intend to challenge a judgment of Kenneth Fincham, with whom I fully agree: 'Religion may have been the central discourse of 1642 [and earlier], yet we must acknowledge that it embodied and mediated a host of secular concerns and values.' 'Introduction' in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 22.

¹²¹ Bramhall's master at Sidney Sussex, Samuel Ward, for example, had been a vehement critic of arminianism in the 1620s, but supported the king against parliament in the war. He died in 1643 a prisoner of Cromwell, his former student at Sidney.

¹²² In a similar vein, Michael Mendle has observed: 'Everyone knew that "priest" and "presbyter" were mere variants of the same etymon, but to use one or the other was to toss in one's lot with a religious faction.' *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (University of Alabama Press, 1985), 175.

¹²³ For the sources of this reputation, see chapter 1.

that of his fellow arminian Laud.¹²⁴ Given his record as an arminian bishop, the question his noble host asked him to debate with Hobbes was quite a personal and touchy one for Bramhall. Only months before the bishop's debate in Paris, Laud had been executed in part, at least, for holding (or winking at) such 'popish' doctrines as free-will.¹²⁵ In view of how personal an issue free-will was for Bramhall, it even argues the nobleman's bad manners to have commanded some 'agitation' of it. In any case, as Newcastle and Hobbes knew Bramhall's background and recent clerical-political career, neither could have thought that this would not strike a very raw nerve in the émigré bishop of Derry, that 'Great Arminian' and 'Irish Canterbury'.¹²⁶ As I have already suggested, Hobbes's taking an anti-libertarian, anti-arminian position in the debate of 1645 associated him with puritans. Whether Hobbes liked it or not, the rejection of free-will had become, in the 1640s, intertwined with sedition and rebellion against the regime of Charles I. The king had never denounced or repudiated arminian doctrine. On the contrary, the king had favoured and patronised many of those who had been reputed its adherents and champions.¹²⁷ Thus, whenever it might suit him, Bramhall could make the argument that Hobbes was an ally of the 'disaffected' and 'saucy' who had opposed and denounced the doctrine of free-will as popish. In his associating arminianism with popery, Hobbes was, apparently, revealing a paranoid anti-popery mentality similar to that of William Prynne, the personal nemesis of Laud.¹²⁸ By the same token, Hobbes could make the same arguments against arminianism that the puritans had articulated in their public protests – protests that charged the arminian churchmen with 'innovation' in and corruption of the church, and ultimately treason against the commonwealth.

The issue debated by Hobbes and Bramhall in Paris in the spring or summer of 1645 was, therefore, of significant political relevance. If nothing else, by this time it was a metaphysical problem that had recently collected much political baggage. It was just about as timely, controversial and serious an issue as they could have taken up at the time. The fact that they debated this particular question while the First English Civil War was being waged (or, in view of Naseby, only just ended) is not unfitting. For the question

¹²⁴ At the Uxbridge Convention of January 1645, parliament excepted both Laud and Bramhall from a proposed general pardon.

¹²⁵ Peter White has emphasised that: 'At Laud's trial the charge [of arminianism] was a virtual non-runner.' *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 311; but the fact remains that the archbishop was widely perceived, portrayed and loathed as 'arminian'.

¹²⁶ See chapter 1, n.1. ¹²⁷ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 247.

¹²⁸ The phrasing I borrow from Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, 103, who noted Prynne's ability to see 'popish and Jesuit conspiracies everywhere . . . especially wherever he smelt "Arminianism"'. Throughout this book, I wish to suggest that Hobbes was to Bramhall in some sense what Prynne had been to Laud (and Bramhall).

that exercised them had, to some degree, agitated some of the people who rose up to fight against the king, his noble followers (Newcastle) and his loyal bishops (Bramhall). It was not possible for any Englishman paying attention to current events not to be somewhat interested in the issue of free-will. And any reasonable resolution of the issue would be more than interesting: it might ultimately contribute to the cause of peace. Perhaps Newcastle set his friends to resolving the issue with the ambitious, or vain, hope of reconciliation. But whether or not Newcastle solicited the debate as some sort of 'peace process', the engagement only served to highlight and stiffen the differences. Although London might have been the best location for such an engagement, Paris, in 1645, was not at all inappropriate. If Paris did not have its 'arminians' and 'puritans', it had the next best thing: Jesuits (particularly Molinists) and Jansenists. Thus far I have stressed that the issue of free-will was a controversial one in England in the 1640s. But it was hardly less so in France. The Jansenist controversy involved interpretations of the teaching of St Augustine upon free-will. Cornelius Jansen, bishop of Ypres, had published his provocative *Augustinus* in Louvain in 1640; the following year it was also published in Paris. The book affirmed predestination as taught by Augustine, and rejected free-will.¹²⁹ The Jesuits in both France and the Spanish Netherlands attacked the book as heretical. Soon after its publication the Jesuits of Louvain denounced Jansen for teaching doctrines of that notorious predestinarian Calvin. After examination by the Inquisition in Rome, Pope Urban VIII in 1643 issued the bull *In eminenti*, condemning Jansen's book for violating the ban on discussion of various controversial issues. However, this bull failed to prevent the multiplication of editions of Jansen's book in France. In 1644, the year before the debate of Hobbes and Bramhall, Isaac Habert, a capitular clergyman of Notre-Dame-de-Paris, published an attack upon *Augustinus*; in the same year, Antoine Arnauld increased the heat of the controversy by anonymously publishing an answer to Habert, *Apologie de Monsieur Jansenius*, which contained an exposition of Jansen's teaching from *Augustinus*, in French vernacular – now it would be more accessible to the French populace. In response to this and other writings of Arnauld, Habert and the Jesuits began to denounce him as a crypto-calvinist, and entreated the papacy to condemn specific propositions found in Jansen's book. In 1645, Arnauld published another vindication of Jansen. Those in the French church who took the side of Habert claimed that the teaching of Jansen was essentially no different from the predestinarian teaching of Calvin. The defenders of Jansen in France accused his critics, the allies and supporters of Habert, of taking a free-will

¹²⁹ For a summary of Jansen's *Augustinus*, see Nigel Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936).

position that was close to, if not, pelagianism, a heresy condemned in the fifth century.¹³⁰

Both Hobbes and Bramhall might well have followed this Jansenist controversy of the 1640s. In the early 1650s, after that controversy had evolved, and grown more complicated, the bishop was to note: ‘Who hath not heard of a book composed by Jansenius Bishop of Ypres, called “Augustinus”; and of those great animosities and contentions that have risen about it in most Roman Catholic countries?’¹³¹ The French treatise upon which Bramhall imposed a critique in 1642–4 – the treatise shown to Bramhall by Sir Charles Cavendish while they were in Yorkshire together – was undoubtedly related to issues raised in the Jansenist controversy that had begun in 1640. The bishop’s critique had involved, or focussed upon, the harmonisation of human free-will and the prescience and decrees of God; apparently the author of the French treatise had asserted (as Hobbes was to assert) their incompatibility, arguing against ‘the prescience of things contingent’.¹³² Before he had arrived on the continent in July 1644, Bramhall must have had a pretty good idea about the free-will–predestination argument as it was being agitated in France. As Hobbes was to take a position which he himself linked to Calvin, one might say that, crudely speaking, the philosopher was taking the ‘Jansenist’ position in Paris. At any rate, if forced to choose between the sides, Hobbes would have been more inclined to the Jansenist one. Conversely, Bramhall’s libertarian position would have rendered the bishop more sympathetic to arguments made by the anti-Jansenist Jesuits (particularly Molinists), as the position of the latter was one that was in some respects very similar to the arminian one.¹³³

¹³⁰ Alexander Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France: Voices from the Wilderness* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1977), 49–51; William Doyle, *Jansenism: Catholic Resistance to Authority from the Reformation to the French Revolution* (New York: St. Martin’s, 2000), 22–4. Tyacke has suggested that ‘Semi-Pelagianism’ may be considered ‘an early [pre-sixth-century] Christian equivalent of Arminianism’. *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 211. For controversies touching free-will among French protestants in the 1630s and 1640s, see Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969). Some of Amyraut’s opponents in the Huguenot community judged his teaching arminian.

¹³¹ *Just Vindication*, BW, I, 236. Bramhall referred to the persecution of the Jansenists by the Jesuits in *Schism Guarded*, BW, II, 508.

¹³² ‘Discourse’, BW, IV, 153.

¹³³ M. W. F. Stone has pointed out Arminius’s debt to Molina in ‘Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy’ in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 18. Bramhall’s (and other arminians’) debt to Molina has been observed by Sleigh, Chappell and Della Rocca in ‘Determinism and Human Freedom’, 1225. Molina held that ‘the will is free only in cases when it is possible not to accomplish the act it accomplishes’, Sarasohn, ‘Motion and Morality’, 372, n.35. Bramhall may be called a ‘Molinist’ inasmuch as he took precisely this position against Hobbes.

No matter how simultaneous and closely related in subject matter, the free-will debate between Hobbes and Bramhall ought not, however, to be considered just another episode of the Jansenist controversy. Nor should that debate be considered simply or only as another episode of the arminian controversy that had arisen in England in the 1620s and 1630s – however related one can observe it to be. But the existence of both of those controversies helps us to explain the unique fact that a couple of English exiles argued that issue, and not some other, in Paris, in the summer of 1645. To be sure, free-will had always been a popular topic of debate among philosophers and theologians.¹³⁴ But at this time it was all the more interesting, if not urgent, for its having been intertwined with political discord, rebellion and civil war. As we have seen, Hobbes himself suggested that it might be considered among the causes of the civil war that ultimately brought him, Newcastle and Bramhall together in the French capital. In the summer of 1645, Bramhall and Hobbes were not, of course, actually fighting a battle of the English Civil War in a Parisian theatre. But we may regard their debate as at least a remote ‘arminian–puritan’ skirmish. And each one could blame the other for their both being in Paris to debate free-will in the summer of 1645. After Bramhall’s preaching to Newcastle in the midst of the latter’s military campaigns in the north, the tables were in a certain sense turned. Now Newcastle was the non-combatant, the spectator, watching Bramhall fight with a formidable determinist foe. And because the issue of free-will was one with a great deal of political associations, Newcastle listened to a repetition of a quarrel that contributed something to the occurrence of the physical conflict which had brought him to Marston Moor. Whereas the battle at Naseby was a decisive defeat of the royalists, we do not know whether the free-will battle in Newcastle’s chamber saw the decisive defeat of the ‘arminian’ or the ‘puritan’ – the royalist or the rebel. But whether Hobbes can rightly be called the ‘rebel’ is a question that can only be answered after examining the case that the bishop was to make, in private and public, in the years that followed their oral debate.

¹³⁴ The perennial interest in the question of free-will is treated in the Conclusion.

*An epistolary skirmish, 1645–1646:
Bramhall’s ‘Discourse’, Hobbes’s
‘Treatise’ and Bramhall’s ‘Vindication’*

Since nothing like a transcript of the live debate was ever made, it goes without saying that we will never know precisely how Hobbes and Bramhall argued their positions in Newcastle’s chamber in Paris. But what took place shortly afterwards furnishes us with a good idea. Sometime before August 1645 Bramhall penned a position paper on free-will, in the form of a letter to Newcastle. From the dating of the oral debate established in the [previous chapter](#) we may suppose that Bramhall composed the paper in June or July of 1645. Bramhall’s cover page reads: ‘To ye Right Honourable ye Marquess of Newcastle’. On a separate line below this is written ‘At Paris’. We can assume, then, that Bramhall was in Paris at the writing of it. We have seen that Bramhall probably spent most of 1645 in Brussels, Antwerp and elsewhere in the southern Netherlands. He must have been in Paris at least a few times, and composed the paper on one of these visits. In 1646, Bramhall clarified that he had written his 1645 paper merely to provide a fuller statement of the position he had argued against Hobbes in person: ‘Mine aim, in the first discourse, was only to press home those things in writing, which had been agitated between us by word of mouth.’¹ He entitled it ‘A Treatise of Liberty and Necessity upon Occasion of some Opinions of Thomas Hobbes about these’.² Obviously, then, Bramhall composed his essay with Hobbes’s opposite position fully in mind. He set himself the task of establishing free-will in the wake of the arguments that Hobbes had articulated at their meeting with Newcastle. He sent the paper to Newcastle with a request that the latter elicit a response from Hobbes.³ It is likely enough that Bramhall wrote the paper at his own, not Newcastle’s, prompting. In a later

¹ ‘Vindication’ (post-20 April 1646), Dedicatory Letter, *BW*, iv, 17.

² BL Sloane 1012, ff. 1–16. For reasons which shall appear below, I refer to this paper as ‘Discourse’ – as Hobbes called it – reserving the title ‘Treatise’ for Hobbes’s first paper (the reply to the ‘Discourse’). Thus I have adopted the nomenclature employed by Vere Chappell, *Introduction, Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

³ This we know from Hobbes’s later (1656) statement: ‘Afterwards the Bishop sent to his Lordship his opinion concerning the question in writing, and desired him to persuade me to

writing he spoke of his purpose to expose the absurdities and perniciousness of Hobbes's determinism to the view of some of his (Bramhall's) noble friends.⁴

In arguing for the existence of free-will in the 'Discourse' Bramhall employed many of the terms of St Thomas Aquinas and his more modern scholastic followers.⁵ Bramhall's presentation of a series of distinctions at the beginning of the paper is indicative of his intellectual orientation and mode of argument throughout. His *modus operandi* is unmistakably scholastic. It is with the concepts of Aquinas and his followers that Bramhall frames the issue of 'liberty against necessity', that is, free-will against determinism. The bishop's argumentation presupposes the soundness of the apparatus devised by Aquinas and maintained by his medieval and modern followers. Bramhall presents the traditional scholastic distinctions between types of free-will without feeling any need to justify them. They are the givens, and function as the alphabet of his language on the subject. As early as the second paragraph he draws directly from Peter Lombard and Cardinal Bellarmine.⁶ Bramhall's paper is dominated by what we might call arguments of moral appeal. One *should* or *must* accept 'liberty' against 'necessity', lest all manner of evil ensue. For example, to deny 'true liberty' would be to make a mockery of the Bible. Since God frequently chides mankind in the Bible, and since, as Bramhall argues, such chiding presupposes that mankind has free-will not to do evil, Scripture would be rendered absurd by the denial of free-will.⁷ Bramhall's stratagem is to make the consequences of 'inevitable necessity' (Hobbes's determinism) appear so disturbing as to make his reader opt for 'true liberty' simply on the ground that such determinism would stultify Scripture and God. Bramhall implies that to understand Scripture aright, one must posit free-will; that is, that Scripture presupposes it. Conversely, the bishop implies that he who would maintain 'inevitable necessity' must

send an answer thereunto in writing.' *Questions*, EW, v, 2. Since Bramhall never contested this, we are not obliged to question it.

⁴ 'Vindication', BW, iv, 192.

⁵ Throughout his debate with Hobbes on this question, Bramhall's most frequently cited authorities are Anselm, Peter Lombard, Aquinas, and Suarez. As a recent commentator has noted: 'His [Bramhall's] philosophical views in general are traditional and orthodox, replicating to a large extent the Aristotelian Scholasticism of the High Middle Ages, though sometimes with modifications introduced in the sixteenth century [by such theologians as Molina and Suarez].' Chappell, *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity*, xii. For the need to distinguish Bramhall's thinking from Aquinas's, however, see *ibid.*, xv, n.6.

⁶ For quotations, see Haddan's footnote, BW, iv, 33. The 'Discourse' was later combined with the two succeeding papers ('Treatise' and 'Vindication') to form *Defence* (1655). I will quote from Haddan's amply annotated edition of the latter, BW, iv, 3–196. Chappell, *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity*, 1–14, has also provided some helpful footnotes to the 'Discourse'.

⁷ 'Discourse', BW, iv, 56–7.

either reject Scripture or contrive a deeply perverse, if not heretical, reading of it.

Thus, Bramhall concerns himself not so much with demonstrating the existence of free-will as pointing out the wicked psychological consequences of denying it. ‘Necessity’, that is, determinism, would destroy the very concepts or reality of ‘sin’ and ‘evil’: ‘Take away liberty, and you take away the very nature of evil, and the formal reason of sin . . . If there be no liberty to produce sin, there is no such thing as sin in the world.’⁸ But because there is, manifestly, according to Bramhall, sin and evil, there is free-will. This is, of course, circular reasoning. The proof that free-will exists is sin and evil. But sin and evil, for Bramhall, presuppose the existence of free-will. Bramhall saw no need to prove the existence of sin and evil: did not the Bible and common-sense show that the world was full of it? Hobbes’s determinism would render Adam unfree.⁹ If unfree, how could he have sinned? If Adam could not have sinned, would not God have to be the author of sin? In a later section, Bramhall pursues further disquieting implications: if free-will and sin do not exist, there can be no Last Judgment, nor heaven and hell, both of which presuppose them.¹⁰ Throughout the short paper Bramhall resorts to the kind of arguments that had been urged against the determinist/predestinarian position associated with Calvin – and with the extreme protestants in the British Isles: puritans in England, presbyterians in Scotland.¹¹

After concluding the first section, ‘Proofs of Liberty out of Scripture’, by that enumeration of disturbing consequences, Bramhall begins the next, ‘Proofs of Liberty from Reason’, in a similar vein of moral appeal: ‘This very persuasion – that there is no true liberty – is able to overthrow all societies and commonwealths in the world.’¹² Again, Bramhall concentrates upon moral and psychological repercussions. How could laws be *just* if men had no ability, by free-will, to avoid committing forbidden actions?¹³ If men do not *believe* they have free-will, the ability to choose good or evil, then they will no longer strive to be virtuous.¹⁴ If everything happens by necessity, all human effort is futile: ‘all things come to pass . . . whether we be idle or industrious, by unalterable necessity’.¹⁵ Hobbes’s position, Bramhall observes, is really no different from the ancient (and, importantly,

⁸ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 112. ⁹ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 58. ¹⁰ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 64.

¹¹ This point is developed further below and in the Conclusion. ¹² ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 84.

¹³ The logic of the Roman legal maxim ‘necessitas legem non habet’ seems to have governed Bramhall’s thinking here. If something were *necessary*, it could not be *unjust* (punished). Any law that punished such a necessity would itself be unjust. Since Hobbes’s determinism rendered *everything* necessary, Bramhall argued, it rendered every *law* unjust. Bramhall referred directly to this maxim in his subsequent writing against Hobbes, *Castigations*, *BW*, iv, 286.

¹⁴ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 101–2. ¹⁵ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 84.

heathen) ‘fatalist’ one of the Stoics. The bishop explicitly associates Hobbes’s notions with ‘Stoical fancies’.¹⁶ In conclusion, Bramhall calculates that the consequences of denying free-will are so harmful that any decent Christian, or civilised man, must reject determinism: ‘Either allow liberty, or destroy Church as well as commonwealth, religion as well as policy.’¹⁷

No later than July 1645 this short paper by Bramhall was sent to Hobbes, probably forwarded by Newcastle, with a request that he respond. As Hobbes recalled:

Afterwards [i.e., after the debate in Newcastle’s chamber] the Bishop sent to his Lordship his opinion concerning the question in writing [‘Discourse’], and desired him to persuade me to send an answer thereunto likewise in writing. There were some reasons for which I thought it might be inconvenient to let my answer go abroad; yet the many obligations wherein I was obliged to him, prevailed with me to write this answer.¹⁸

It was in August, while the philosopher was staying in Rouen with the third earl of Devonshire, that he composed his reply for the perusal of both Newcastle and Bramhall.¹⁹ In this paper, which, like Bramhall’s, takes the form of a letter addressed to Newcastle, Hobbes says:

I had once resolved to answer my Lord Bishop’s objections to my book *De Cive* in the first place, as that which concerns me most; and afterwards to examine his Discourse of Liberty and Necessity, which, because I had never uttered my opinion of it, concerned me the less. But seeing it was your Lordship’s and my Lord Bishop’s desire that I should begin with the *latter*, I was contented so to do, and here I present and submit it to your Lordship’s judgment.²⁰

Bramhall must have received a copy of it sometime after 20 August 1645, and some months before 20 April 1646.²¹ In explaining his decision to reply to Bramhall’s letter, Hobbes was later to write: ‘Whether my Lord’s desire and the Bishop’s modest entreaty were enough to produce a will in me to write an answer to his treatise, without other concurrent causes, I am not sure. Obedience to his Lordship did much, and my civility to the Bishop did somewhat, and perhaps there were other imaginations of mine own that contributed their part.’²² Since it was at the prompting of both Newcastle and Bramhall, Hobbes addressed his reply to the marquess, but fully expected

¹⁶ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 102. ¹⁷ ‘Discourse’, *BW*, iv, 102. ¹⁸ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 2.

¹⁹ See Hobbes to Waller, 8 August 1645, as quoted in chapter 3, 84.

²⁰ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 239. The manuscript ‘Treatise’ is BL Harl. MS 6207, ff. 71–101v. I quote from Molesworth’s edition of the paper in the form in which it was later published (in 1654), *EW*, iv, 239–78. For an edition of this text that incorporates minor emendations, by a comparison of the MS and published versions, see Chappell, *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity*, 15–42. For another recent exposition of some of the argumentation of Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ see Overhoff, *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 134–9.

²¹ For this dating, see chapter 3. ²² *Questions*, *EW*, v, 36.

that Bramhall would read it as well. This is confirmed twice: once when Hobbes requests that his letter be kept private by both of them, and once when concluding the letter: 'I humbly beseech your Lordship to communicate it only to my Lord Bishop.'²³ Hobbes's reluctance to reply is indicated several times in the letter. In a petulant tone he notes: 'This doctrine, because my Lord Bishop says he hates, I doubt had better been suppressed, as it should have been, if both your Lordship and he had not pressed me to an answer.'²⁴ Later, responding to Bramhall's claim that certain 'inconveniences' must follow from the taking of Hobbes's determinist position, he concedes: 'It is true that ill use might be made of it, and therefore your Lordship and my Lord ought, at my request, to keep private what I say here of it.'²⁵ Just a few pages later we find Hobbes expressing his concern about divulgence, in view of the 'sensual' character of most men:

I must confess, if we consider the greatest part of mankind, not as they should be, but as they are, that is, as men, whom either the study of acquiring wealth, or preferment, or whom the appetite of sensual delights, or the impatience of meditating, or the rash embracing of wrong principles, have made unapt to discuss the truth of things: I must, I say, confess that the dispute of this question will rather hurt than help their piety; and therefore if his Lordship had not desired this answer, I should not have written it, nor do I write it but in hopes your Lordship and his will keep it private.²⁶

Lastly, Hobbes concludes his letter to Newcastle with the request that none but himself and the bishop look at it.²⁷

Hobbes begins his reply with a disparaging observation of the bishop's lack of originality: that Bramhall has offered no argument for free-will that he has not encountered before.²⁸ He follows this with some sarcastic commentary on Bramhall's prefatory gambit: 'The preface is a handsome one, but it appeareth even in that, that he hath mistaken the question.'²⁹ Having suggested that the bishop lacks the capacity even to grasp the question, Hobbes proceeds to review Bramhall's scholastic distinctions. There is ill-concealed condescension in Hobbes's remark that: 'It had been better to *define* liberty, than thus to *distinguish*. For I understand never the more what he means by liberty; and though he say he means liberty from *necessitation*, yet I understand not how such a liberty can be, and it is a taking of the question without proof. For what is else the question between us, but whether such a liberty be possible or not?'³⁰ Not only has Bramhall failed to make a clear point; he has committed the cardinal sin of argument, *petitio principii*, 'taking of the question without proof'. Hobbes spends much of the 'Treatise' attempting to demonstrate that Bramhall's arguments contradict one another. He also

²³ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 256, 278.

²⁴ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 247.

²⁵ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 252.

²⁶ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 256–7.

²⁷ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 278.

²⁸ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 239.

²⁹ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 239.

³⁰ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 240.

shows himself quite comfortable, if not eager, to battle the bishop on scriptural grounds. He too can quote the Bible to support his position. Hobbes flatly denies that various passages of the Bible describing choice presuppose free-will. Choice does not require freedom of the will; choice and necessity are not mutually contradictory. A decision, like any other action or operation, is determined by antecedent causes.³¹ Hobbes affirms that all things are caused, that all things happen, ultimately, by God's eternal will or decree.³² Every decision and action can be traced to God's will; every one of them is determined by that will. Man's will, Hobbes argues, is determined by God's – or, more proximately, by those things that God has caused which, in turn, necessitate that will. The cause of a man's will is not, then, 'in his own disposing'.³³ Thus, every choice a man makes is determined by things outside himself and, ultimately, by God, who has produced all those things.³⁴ It is at this point that Hobbes, like any good calvinist, turns to St Paul's *Epistle to the Romans* for a direct answer to Bramhall.³⁵ Hobbes points out that Bramhall's objection to determinism is really no different from the objection answered by St Paul. Thus, Hobbes piously reasons, his own answer must be the same. By this sly stroke, Hobbes effectively pits Bishop Bramhall not against himself but against an unimpeachable Christian authority.³⁶ However, Hobbes was also associating himself with those determinist rebels, the puritans, whose staunch calvinist (anti-arminian) position on free-will was frequently justified by consideration of precisely such verses.³⁷ It was Calvin himself who, faced with objections practically identical to those brought by Bramhall against Hobbes in the 'Discourse', cited these same verses from chapter IX of *Romans*.³⁸ In commenting on the passages from this book Hobbes reveals his Ockhamist, voluntarist theological position, a position which he attributes to St Paul himself: 'the *power* of God alone . . . is sufficient

³¹ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 241. ³² 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 246. ³³ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 274.

³⁴ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 246–7.

³⁵ In his 1643 critique of Thomas White's *De Mundo*, Hobbes had alluded to the same passage from *Romans* ix. See *Anti-White*, xxxviii.2 (1976), 461.

³⁶ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 248–9.

³⁷ For the way in which Hobbes echoed the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, William Twisse, see Malcolm, 'Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology', 206–7. Twisse had been an anti-arminian warrior in the 1630s. In *The Riches of God's Love unto the Vessels of Mercy, consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessels of Wrath*, published while the Assembly was still sitting, Twisse had dealt with the kinds of arminian objections raised by Bramhall against Hobbes. In answering the bishop, Hobbes took much the same tack that Twisse had. In 1645, then, Hobbes was, in effect, endorsing the position of the then-meeting Assembly, the authority that had been set up to replace the ecclesiastical regime of which Bramhall had been an integral part.

³⁸ *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III.xxiii, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, ed. John T. McNeill (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960; 2 vols.), II, 947–64; see also book III.xxii and book III.xxiv. See the Conclusion for more discussion of affinities between Hobbes and Luther and Calvin, and Bramhall and Erasmus.

justification of any action he doth . . . That which he does, is made just by his doing it.³⁹ Hobbes proceeds to furnish a biblical illustration commonly adduced by calvinist theologians: God ‘justified’ his affliction of Job merely by citing his superior power: ‘Hast thou, saith God, an arm like mine?’⁴⁰

Whereas Bramhall had protested that laws could not be just if they prohibited actions which men were bound by necessity to do, Hobbes answers that the justice of laws has nothing to do with actions being freely willed. The law that provides for the punishment of a man who was ‘necessitated’ to steal serves to deter other men from engaging in the same kind of action. Does not that law, Hobbes asks, serve to produce justice, that is, the not-doing of crime?⁴¹ Thus, Hobbes urges a strikingly modern non-retributive, utilitarian penology: ‘The intention of the law is not to grieve the delinquent, for that which is past, and not to be undone; but to make him and others just, that else would not be so, and respecteth not the evil act past, but the good to come; insomuch as without the good intention for the future, no past act of a delinquent could justify his killing in the sight of God.’⁴² The justice of punishment, whether execution or imprisonment, does not depend upon the assumption that men freely will (choose or elect) to do certain acts; rather, it only requires that punishment serve to diminish ‘noxious’ behaviour, that is, actions that are ‘contrary to men’s preservation’.⁴³ In a similar way Hobbes disposes of Bramhall’s claim that determinism renders sin impossible or absurd. It is not the free willing of certain actions that makes them sins: it is only their contrariety to a law of behaviour previously laid down.⁴⁴ If it is objected that God, on this view, ‘unjustly’ punishes those He causes to sin, Hobbes recurs to his earlier point: merely the fact that God does it makes it just. God is not capable of being unjust. For God to be unjust would require the existence of an authority above, beyond or independent of Him. But, according to the voluntarist Hobbes, combating the essentialist Bramhall, there is nothing beyond or independent of God – no objective, independent justice outside God, against which the latter could be judged. There is nothing in the world *in itself* just

³⁹ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 249. Cf. William of Ockham’s line: ‘By the very fact that God wills something it is right for it to be done. . . . Hence if God were to cause hatred of himself in anyone’s will . . . neither would that man sin nor would God.’ Quoted and translated from the Latin by Malcolm, ‘Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology’, 133. Hobbes later in the paper echoes the latter clause: ‘This I know; God cannot sin, because his doing a thing makes it just, and consequently, no sin.’ *EW*, iv, 250. Malcolm’s dissertation demonstrated in great detail how thoroughly indebted Hobbes’s metaphysics and scientific thinking were to Ockhamist thought. However, as Malcolm points out, and as is well known from the works of scholars of Reformed theology, that thought deeply influenced Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, so that we need not hold that Hobbes’s Ockhamism came immediately from Ockham. ‘Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology’, 133.

⁴⁰ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 249, quoting Job xxviii:4. ⁴¹ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 253.

⁴² ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 253. ⁴³ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 254. ⁴⁴ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 259–60.

or unjust, that is, nothing just or unjust irrespective of God. In the same way, God does not will something because it is good; it is good only because God wills it.

Hobbes rarely lets an opportunity pass in the ‘Treatise’ to scoff at the scholasticism that abounds in Bramhall’s ‘Discourse’. Throughout the paper he sneers at the bishop’s ‘school’ distinctions. He suggests that the bishop is engaging in obscurantism, for he ‘darkeneth . . . [the] meaning and the question . . . with jargon . . . and pretending distinction where none is’.⁴⁵ It would be one thing for Hobbes to claim that Bramhall had reasoned erroneously. It is quite another to suggest that the bishop is, like some pettifogger, deliberately obfuscating. By the latter insinuation Hobbes raises some doubt about the bishop’s probity. In answer to Bramhall’s postulation of two different kinds of necessity, Hobbes complains to Newcastle of the fraudulence of those who use such ‘school’ language: ‘I would have your Lordship take notice hereby, how easy and plain a thing, but withal false, with the grave usage of such terms as “hypothetical necessity”, and “necessity upon supposition”, and such like terms of Schoolmen, may be obscured and made to seem “profound learning”’.⁴⁶ Hobbes suggests that scholastics like Bramhall are charlatans, whose distinctions are specious, consisting of ‘terms invented by I know not whom to cover ignorance, and blind the understanding of the reader’.⁴⁷ After dissecting and dismissing some more of Bramhall’s distinctions, Hobbes goes so far as to claim that most rebellions against religious authority have involved lay disgust at the obscurantist nonsense of the clergy: ‘I do not doubt but that the imposing of them, by authority of “doctors” in the church, hath been a great cause that men have laboured, though by sedition and evil courses, to shake them off; for nothing is more apt to beget hatred, than the tyrannizing over men’s reason and understanding, especially when it is done, not by the Scriptures, but by the pretence of learning, and more judgment than that of other men’.⁴⁸ Hobbes does not clarify to what degree ‘shaking them off’ refers to recent events in England and Scotland. Perhaps he only alludes to revolts and reformations of earlier centuries; but certainly this passage might be read as a scolding of Bramhall and his arminian clerical brethren for maintaining the kind of scholastic nonsense so apt to provoke ‘sedition and evil courses’. In any case, Hobbes half-justifies puritans and presbyterians for rebelling against the ecclesiastical regime maintained by Charles I, Laud and Bramhall. Furthermore, Hobbes indirectly, even if inadvertently, chides the beleaguered Charles I for employing and supporting such purveyors of pious nonsense

⁴⁵ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 241. ⁴⁶ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 262. ⁴⁷ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 263.

⁴⁸ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 264. Later Hobbes emphasises that Bramhall’s scholastic terminology, employed to support free-will, is not scriptural. See especially *EW*, iv, 271.

in the highest offices in the church of England – or in the case of Bramhall, church of Ireland.

Hobbes concludes his paper with the claim that he has been able to show that all the ‘inconveniences’ that were supposed by Bramhall to follow from denying free-will have been taken away. He points out, again, that the inconveniences of accepting or denying free-will are not strictly relevant to the question of whether such a thing exists. But to show that he too can play that game, Hobbes ends by offering a list of some unpalatable consequences that follow the doctrine of free-will:

It destroyeth both the decrees and the prescience of God Almighty; for whatsoever God hath purposed to bring to pass by man, as an instrument, or foreseeeth shall come to pass; a man, if he have liberty, such as his Lordship affirmeth, from necessitation, might frustrate, and make not to come to pass, and God should either not foreknow it, and not decree it, or he should foreknow such things shall be, as shall never be, and decree that which shall never come to pass.⁴⁹

In other words, the libertarian (arminian or Molinist) must commit a kind of theological *lèse majesté*: in asserting human free-will, Bramhall must rob God of omniscience and omnipotence. If man’s will is somehow independent or free from God’s determination, God cannot perfectly know and control it. In effect, Hobbes, the layman and private subject, accuses Bramhall (the ‘duly ordained ecclesiastic’ and bishop of Charles I) of committing blasphemy. By implication the king is also culpable, for supporting the churchmen who have been perpetrating theological *lèse majesté*. Having already signed himself Newcastle’s ‘most humble servant’, and dated the letter ‘Rouen, Aug. 20, 1645’, a few more general thoughts occurred to Hobbes. He could not refrain from adding a postscript on the difficulties inherent in theology. Hobbes argues that fundamental and impossible problems are caused by the mingling and confounding of religion and philosophy.⁵⁰ Men commonly make the mistake of treating matters of religion as if they were philosophical problems susceptible of rational analysis or solution. They think about God as if He were a proper subject of philosophy; and then they find themselves drowning in a sea of conundrums and antinomies. Determining the proper jurisdictions of philosophy and theology, Hobbes here attempts to show Newcastle and Bramhall the error of the bishop’s ways: theologically corrupted natural philosophy and philosophically corrupted religion. Considering all this, Hobbes concludes: ‘We ought not to dispute of God’s nature; He is no fit subject of our philosophy.’ Religion is not a matter of

⁴⁹ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 278.

⁵⁰ Striking similarities between the postscript of the ‘Treatise’ and several passages written by Hobbes about two years earlier, in his critique of White’s *De Mundo*, are exhibited in Jackson, ‘Hobbes vs. Bramhall’, Appendix III.

philosophy. Rather, ‘True religion consisteth in obedience to Christ’s lieutenants, and in giving God such honour, both in attributes and actions, as they in their several lieutenantancies shall ordain.’⁵¹ Religion is but law; and law is the command of Christ’s lieutenants, civil sovereigns – not bishops. As he had in both the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*, Hobbes assumes the competence and authority to make judgments about religious questions. In those other books, as we have seen, he determined the essential article of Christian faith, the minimum requirement for salvation, the ‘one thing needful’ for entry into heaven. Similarly, in the ‘Treatise’ he enunciates the definition of ‘true religion’. But as this consists of ‘obedience to Christ’s lieutenants’, this begs a question: in 1645, at the writing of his paper, whom did Hobbes consider Christ’s lieutenant, the civil sovereign to whom *he* owed obedience in religion? It was certainly not Bishop Bramhall, to whom Hobbes was not submitting – against whom, rather, he was arguing. And by implication at least, it was not Charles I; for if it had been, would not Hobbes have been obliged to defer to a ‘duly ordained ecclesiastic’ whom Charles had appointed? But since Hobbes was in Rouen, perhaps his sovereign was Louis XIV, or whoever (Anne of Austria, Cardinal Mazarin) was acting for the young king? Yet Hobbes was certainly not writing like a Roman (or even Gallican) catholic.⁵²

Hobbes recognised that intellectual disagreement was no light matter. By his own principles, his contradiction of Bramhall was tantamount to declaring the latter a fool. In arguing against free-will – in the oral debate and in the ‘Treatise’ – Hobbes’s treatment of Bramhall was ultimately a display of ‘dishonour’. For in the *Elements of Law*, Hobbes had laid down, as one of his laws of nature: ‘That no man reproach, revile, deride, or any otherwise declare his hatred, contempt, or disesteem of any other.’⁵³ Did the philosopher break his own rule in writing a paper that scarcely concealed his contempt for Bramhall’s intellect – and exposed this contempt to Newcastle? Hobbes himself noted, immediately after laying down the ‘anti-derision’ rule, that ‘this law is very little practised’.⁵⁴ One would have to count Hobbes among the many who failed to practise it. In the same vein, Hobbes was to write in *Leviathan*: ‘To agree with in opinion, is to honour; as being a sign of approving his judgment, and wisdom. To dissent, is dishonour; and an

⁵¹ ‘Treatise’, postscript, reproduced by Bramhall in ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 193. The unauthorised publication of Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ in London in 1654, *Of Liberty and Necessity*, did not include this postscript. Molesworth’s edition of this book in the collected works of Hobbes (*EW*, iv) repeats this omission.

⁵² In *DC*, vii.18, Hobbes laid down the rule that in the case of a man who leaves his native commonwealth for another: ‘he is now bound by the laws of his new commonwealth’. So was Hobbes now obliged to turn Roman (or Gallican) catholic?

⁵³ *Elements of Law*, xvi.11, ed. Gaskin, 92. ⁵⁴ *Elements of Law*, xvi.11, ed. Gaskin, 92.

upbraiding of error; and (if the dissent be in many things) of folly.⁵⁵ In *De Cive*, Hobbes had made much the same point:

Intellectual dissension too is extremely serious; that kind of strife inevitably causes the worst conflicts. For even apart from open contention, the mere act of disagreement is offensive. Not to agree with someone on an issue is tacitly to accuse him of error on the issue, just as to dissent from him in a large number of points is tantamount to calling him a fool; and this is apparent in the fact that the bitterest wars are those between different sects of the same religion and different factions in the same country, when they clash over doctrines or public policy.⁵⁶

So, again, as Hobbes disagreed with Bramhall on ‘a large number of points’, he was in effect ‘calling him a fool’. But if he considered Bramhall a ‘duly ordained ecclesiastic’ of Charles I, Hobbes was, by implication, calling the king himself a fool. Many years later Hobbes was to reproach the presbyterian minister and Oxford mathematician John Wallis for having disrespected the king’s church in 1645.⁵⁷ But had not Hobbes, in his own fashion, done the same deed? If Hobbes was, by 1645, regarding the English parliament in London – not the all-but-defeated king – as ‘Christ’s lieutenant’ in England, then, of course, he did not need to respect Bramhall as a representative of a civil sovereign: the bishop was no ‘duly ordained ecclesiastic’ of that parliament. Only if Hobbes now considered himself a subject of *parliament* (and its successful New Model Army) could his lack of deference to Bramhall be fully reconciled with his teaching about deference to the civil sovereign, and his (or its) ministers. As noted earlier, in January 1643, parliament, acting entirely independently of Charles I, had passed a bill for abolishing episcopacy. If Hobbes recognised parliament’s authority in such legislation, he would no longer have needed to recognise Bramhall as his superior in religious matters. Hobbes’s ‘disesteem’ of Bramhall in 1645 implied disesteem of Charles I, for the bishop of Derry was the latter’s appointee. Conversely, Hobbes’s disesteem of the king implied esteem of the group of parliamentarians sitting in London in 1645.

To say precisely when Newcastle and Bramhall received Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ is not possible. But the timing of Bramhall’s perusal was mentioned by the bishop himself in his answer:

The first day that I did read over T.H. his defence of the necessity of all things, was April 20, 1646 [N.S.]: which proceeded not out of any disrespect to him; first my journey, and afterwards some other trifles (which we call business), having diverted me until then. And then my occasions permitting me, and an advertisement from a friend awakening me, I set myself to a serious examination of it.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ *Lev.*, x, 52. ⁵⁶ *DC*, 1.5. ⁵⁷ *Considerations*, *EW*, iv, 418.

⁵⁸ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 23–4. It is probable that Bramhall ran an errand in Spain in late 1645 or early 1646. He speaks of some Spanish business in a letter of 30 June 1646 to Sir

From this we may infer that Bramhall received a copy of Hobbes's reply not long after 20 August 1645: otherwise, Bramhall would not have had enough tardiness to excuse. In the 'Treatise', Hobbes had concluded: 'This is all that hath come into my mind touching this question since I last considered it. And I humbly beseech your Lordship to communicate it only to my Lord Bishop.'⁵⁹ In his critique of the 'Treatise', Bramhall directly responds to this concern for privacy: 'He is very careful to have this discourse kept secret, as appears in this section, and in the fourteenth and fifteenth sections. If his answer had been kept private, I had saved the labour of a reply; but hearing that it was communicated, I thought myself obliged to vindicate both the truth and myself.'⁶⁰ Apparently, then, Hobbes had shown his paper to some of his acquaintances, and Bramhall had learned of this. Later (in 1657) the bishop noted: 'He [Hobbes] acknowledgeth that he shewed it to two; and if my intelligence out of France did not fail, to many more.'⁶¹ This was after Hobbes had, in 1656, admitted: 'I confess, that before I received the bishop's reply, a French gentleman of my acquaintance in Paris, knowing that I had written something of this subject, but not understanding the language, desired me to give him leave to get it interpreted to him by an English young man that resorted to him; which I yielded to.'⁶² In vindication of his conduct Hobbes added: 'I said nothing, but that I would have my Lord of Newcastle to communicate it only to the Bishop. And in his [Bramhall's] answer he says, "if I had desired to have it kept secret, the way had been to have kept it secret myself". My desire was, it should not be communicated by my Lord of Newcastle to all men indifferently. But I barred not myself from showing it privately to my friends.'⁶³ Therefore, it is quite certain that between August 1645 and April 1646, Hobbes shared the 'Treatise' discreetly – but not discreetly enough for Bramhall not to hear of it. Since Hobbes's private rebuttal, the 'Treatise', was circulating – albeit not widely – Bramhall decided that a rejoinder should be offered. One would suppose, then, that the private circulation of a refutation of his own 'Discourse' is largely what prompted the bishop's reply, the 'Vindication', penned some time after April 1646. Bramhall prefaced this rejoinder to Hobbes's paper with a short epistle to Newcastle. In the rejoinder itself Bramhall also addresses himself to the marquess.⁶⁴ But Bramhall was writing to Hobbes as well: he expected Newcastle to show it to him. For in the course of his later disavowal of any intention to publish, Bramhall noted: 'Concerning myself, I can safely say,

Richard Browne, the king's resident in Paris. We may suppose that this was the journey, at least among other things, that prevented his reading Hobbes's reply before April 1646.

⁵⁹ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 278.

⁶⁰ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 192.

⁶¹ *Castigations*, *BW*, iv, 251–2.

⁶² *Questions*, *EW*, v, 25.

⁶³ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 434.

⁶⁴ The manuscript of this reply ('Vindication') is BL Sloane 1012, ff. 117–64. It does not bear a title page or the epistle addressed to Newcastle.

that I was so far from “intending” my defence “for the press”, that since it was perfected, and one only copy transcribed for the Marquis of Newcastle and himself, it hath scarcely ever beheld the sun.⁶⁵ Bramhall’s answer cannot have been composed long after 20 April 1646 – the date at which he read it over. For Hobbes received a copy of it no later than 1647. In 1655 Bramhall was to state that Hobbes had had a copy of this rejoinder in his hands for eight years.⁶⁶

In the prefatory note to Newcastle, Bramhall states his aim as the modest one of vindicating the points he had already made in the ‘Discourse’: ‘But as mine aim, in the first discourse, was only to press home those things in writing, which had been agitated between us by word of mouth . . . so my present intention is only to vindicate that discourse, and together with it, those lights of the Schools, who were never slighted but where they were not understood.’⁶⁷ As he had in the ‘Discourse’, so Bramhall in the ‘Vindication’ stigmatises Hobbes’s determinist doctrine as a nefarious one: ‘If I pretended to compose a complete treatise upon this subject, I should not refuse those large recruits of reasons and authorities, which offer themselves to serve in this cause, for God and man, religion and policy, Church and commonwealth, against the blasphemous, desperate, and destructive opinion of fatal destiny.’⁶⁸ The opposition set up is between the blasphemous, desperate and destructive Hobbes as against Bramhall, the supporter of God, man, religion, policy, church and commonwealth. After the prefatory epistle Bramhall proceeds to characterise Hobbes as one who takes much ‘delight in paradoxes’, a man with a fetish for novelty and singularity.⁶⁹ As for his own lack of originality, Bramhall shrewdly remarks that if Hobbes was already so familiar with his position then he should have been able to write a better reply.⁷⁰ Moreover, originality has nothing to do with the truth or falsity of an argument. Pointing out his lack of originality is no refutation.⁷¹ The bishop ends the opening section with the suggestion that Hobbes is ill-equipped, scrambling and squirming in the difficulties of his position: ‘When a respondent

⁶⁵ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 252.

⁶⁶ *Defence*, ‘To the Reader’, BW, iv, 19. Here it is worth pointing out the inaccuracy of Overhoff’s recent account. He erred in stating that: ‘after Hobbes had sent his letter *Of Liberty and Necessity* [“Treatise”] to Newcastle, the Marquess passed it on to Bramhall, and with the latter’s receiving of the treatise their discussion seemed to be settled. Neither Newcastle nor Bramhall felt the need to respond a second time.’ *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 140. Bramhall’s rejoinder of 1646, ‘Vindication’, was the result of his ‘need to respond a second time’. Overhoff’s mistake, in other words, was the omission of the entire third part of the private, epistolary quarrel – jumping from the second part of this to the first stage of the public controversy that began in 1654 with the publication of Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ in London. See chapter 7 for the latter.

⁶⁷ ‘Vindication’, BW, iv, 17.

⁶⁸ ‘Vindication’, BW, iv, 17.

⁶⁹ ‘Vindication’, BW, iv, 24.

⁷⁰ ‘Vindication’, BW, iv, 26.

⁷¹ ‘Vindication’, BW, iv, 26–7.

leaves many things untouched, as if they were too hot for his fingers, and declines the weight of other things, and alters the true state of the question, it is a shrewd sign, either that he hath not weighed all things maturely, or else that he maintains a desperate cause.⁷² Thus, Hobbes is supposed to be unable to answer Bramhall and, being unable to answer, to dodge the question by re-formulating it.⁷³

One of Bramhall's recurrent complaints in the 'Vindication' is that Hobbes flies in the face of the common-sense of all ages, or 'contradicts the sense of all the world.'⁷⁴ The bishop's view, on the other hand, is the 'belief of all mankind'. Hobbes is among just a handful of perverse men who have 'poisoned their intellectuals'.⁷⁵ The philosopher's contempt for scholasticism is another mark of his perversion. Although he claims not to understand the bishop's distinctions, the latter insists that this is quite disingenuous: Hobbes deems them nonsense in order not to have to grapple with them.⁷⁶ Whereas Hobbes in the 'Treatise' had depicted scholastics as obscurantist, if not deceitful, the bishop urges Newcastle to consider that: 'the greatest fraud and cheating lurks commonly under the pretence of plain dealing. We see jugglers commonly strip up their sleeves, and promise extraordinary fair dealing, before they begin to play their tricks.'⁷⁷ Bramhall portrays Hobbes as an arrogant and iconoclastic upstart who has nothing but ignorant contempt for ancient and traditional authorities. He is the rebellious 'third Cato' or Prometheus who has discovered a new truth that renders all the old wisdom foolishness.⁷⁸ This phrase 'third Cato', from Juvenal, was one of Bramhall's favourite terms of opprobrium. Cato was his byword for troublemaker. In the late 1630s he had been applying it to the Scots covenanters. Now he was applying it to Hobbes – evidently, in Bramhall's mind, something of a fellow-traveller.⁷⁹ As for Hobbes's rebuke of the 'doctors of the church' for engendering rebellion by their theological nonsense and intellectual fraud, this provokes in Bramhall righteous indignation: 'What a presumption is this! for one private man . . . to assume to himself a licence, to control so magistrally, and to censure . . . the "doctors of the Church" . . . only for a few necessary and innocent distinctions.'⁸⁰

Bramhall spends much of the early sections of the 'Vindication', as he had the 'Treatise', describing instances of choice, taken mostly from the

⁷² 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 27.

⁷³ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 28.

⁷⁴ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 31.

⁷⁵ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 31–2.

⁷⁶ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 35.

⁷⁷ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 127.

⁷⁸ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 35; similarly, Bramhall will later liken Hobbes to Icarus: *Castigations*, *BW*, iv, 260.

⁷⁹ See Bramhall to David Michael, 19 December 1638, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 80, *Fair Warning*, *BW*, iii, 277, 278. For instances of the phrase in *Serpent-Salve* and the *Catching of Leviathan*, see chapter 8. For the quotation of Juvenal, see Haddan's note at *BW*, iv, 35.

⁸⁰ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 128–9.

Bible, to prove that free-will exists. Since people choose (deliberate and elect), people have free-will, for choosing presupposes free-will. As he had in the first paper, the bishop presses the point: ‘deliberation and election cannot possibly subsist with an extrinsical predetermination [necessity]’.⁸¹ Repeatedly in this essay the bishop insists that Hobbes had failed to demonstrate the reality of determinism (‘absolute’ and ‘inevitable necessity’) in the ‘Treatise’. But probably most modern readers of the ‘Vindication’ would agree that Bramhall for his part rather asserts than demonstrates free-will. To be sure, in Bramhall’s paper there is no scarcity of *description* of how free-will exists and operates; but that such description proves the reality of free-will – and the falsity of necessity – is another matter. A modern reader may wonder, for instance, what is accomplished by the declaration, in the middle of the ‘Vindication’, that free-will is ‘a truth demonstrable in reason, received and believed by all the world’.⁸² Bramhall, I would argue, succeeds in challenging but not disproving Hobbes’s determinism – which is not to say that I disagree with Bramhall that Hobbes, for his part, had failed to establish determinism in the ‘Treatise’. Moreover, as I shall maintain in the conclusion, it is not at all apparent how one could prove or demonstrate free-will – or necessity. In other words, Bramhall’s failure to prove free-will is nothing unique or surprising. It is the failure of one who tries to prove the metaphysical. The failure to demonstrate the existence of free-will is no different from a failure to demonstrate that God exists: it is the outcome that awaits anyone who attempts to prove the unprovable.⁸³ One might object that the existence of free-will or God is not unprovable. Thus, we reach an impasse. For how is one to *prove* that something is proveable or unprovable? But perhaps the more fundamental problem is that we cannot all agree on what can qualify as *proof* or *demonstration*. At all events, Hobbes and Bramhall certainly could not agree on what had been – or could be – proved or demonstrated. But the tacit assumption of both was that free-will could be proved or demonstrated to be true or false.

Bramhall affects some reluctance to take up Hobbes’s argument from passages of St Paul’s *Epistle to the Romans*. But because, as the bishop observes, Hobbes has reposed so much of his case upon this text, he will deal with it.⁸⁴ Firstly, to dissociate Hobbes from the apostle, the bishop characterises

⁸¹ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 49. Like he had in the ‘Discourse’, Bramhall throughout the ‘Vindication’ relies upon scholastic definitions and distinctions, particularly those of Lombard and Aquinas.

⁸² ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 155.

⁸³ It is rather suggestive that both Hobbes and Bramhall (especially the latter) spill so much ink on the moral, psychological and theological *consequences* or *ramifications* of accepting or denying free-will or necessity. Since they are unprovable, there is no reason *not* to concentrate on such considerations.

⁸⁴ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 67.

Hobbes's view not as 'Pauline' but as 'Stoical'.⁸⁵ Far from its being a sound Christian view, Hobbes's is rather to be classified as heathen or pagan. Bramhall then offers a detailed critique of Hobbes's exegesis of the passages from the New Testament epistle and other parts of scripture. The bishop emphasises that the chapter from *Romans* which Hobbes (like Calvin) quoted *in extenso* is not relevant in the way that the philosopher asserted. In treating the text in question, the bishop urges a distinction that had, by this time, become associated with those who had been labelled arminian in England. Bramhall argues that the passage quoted by Hobbes may indicate God's decree ('predetermination') that some humans be saved; but it does not indicate God's decree that some be damned.⁸⁶ In other words, while there is some suggestion of predestination in those biblical verses, there is no suggestion whatever of reprobation; the text does not, Bramhall argues, support the claim that God predestines or necessitates some souls to damnation. The bishop's further arguments concerning the interpretation of *Romans* also expose what some of his contemporaries would have called (fairly or not) arminianism.⁸⁷ Bramhall distinguishes between God's 'antecedent' and 'consequent' intention: God's *antecedent* intention or will is that all men achieve salvation; but His *consequent* intention or will is that those who sin and do not repent receive damnation. Bramhall argues that God only predestines some to punishment (and ultimately, damnation) because He *foresees* their iniquity ('prevision of sin') – He does not cause them to perpetrate the iniquity.⁸⁸ God does not predestine some to sin; He merely foresees their sin, and punishes and damns them for it. So, according to the bishop, man, exercising free-will, chooses to sin; God has not *determined* or *caused* any man to sin. God does not will that man sin; He does not will that some suffer damnation; rather, God merely *permits* or *suffers* man to sin and receive damnation.⁸⁹ Thus, contrary to Hobbes's teaching, God does not cause sin. As Bramhall protests, the philosopher's determinism, on the other hand,

⁸⁵ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 67. Later Bramhall emphasises the point: 'T. H. rusheth boldly . . . upon the grossest destiny [determinism] of all others, that is, that of the Stoics. . . . And he himself is the first who bears the name of a Christian that I have read, that hath raised this sleeping ghost out of its grave, and set it out in its true colours.' *BW*, iv, 119.

⁸⁶ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 67.

⁸⁷ And later in the 'Vindication' Bramhall presents the libertarian (arminian) view that man 'concur[s] . . . freely with the grace of God'. *BW*, iv, 106. This doctrine of 'concurrence' effectively renders salvation a co-operative process between man and God: the latter *offers*, but the former (exercising free-will) must choose to *receive* grace.

⁸⁸ As is evident in the later *Castigations*, Bramhall held, conversely, that the 'elect' are chosen as a result of God's 'prevision' of their faith. This was the infamously arminian doctrine of election *ex praevisa fide*.

⁸⁹ This describes Bramhall's distinction between God's *operative* and *permissive* will, maintained throughout 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 64–82 – and, later, *Castigations*. By Bramhall's time, this was a customary distinction made by libertarian (free-will-affirming) theologians. Calvin, like Hobbes, had impugned this distinction. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III.xxiii.

carries the 'horrid consequence' of turning God into the Devil, and man, His noble creature, into a mere beast.⁹⁰ For if God, by eternal decree, determines ('necessitates') *everything* that happens, then man's sinful action is ultimately caused by God. Hobbes's teaching renders God the 'introducer of all evil and sin into the world'. In this way, the bishop suggests that Hobbes has committed theological and anthropological *lèse majesté*. This appears to Bramhall ample justification for his utter loathing of determinism: 'Though I honour T.H. for his person and for his learning, yet I must confess ingenuously, I hate this doctrine from my heart.'⁹¹ Bramhall concludes that: 'It were better to be an atheist, to believe no God; or to be a Manichee, to believe two Gods, a God of good, and a God of evil; or with the heathens, to believe thirty thousand Gods; than thus to charge the true God to be the proper cause and the true author of all the sins and evils which are in the world.'⁹² And as for Hobbes's dictum, from the postscript of the 'Treatise', that men should not dispute of God's nature because He is 'no fit subject of our philosophy', Bramhall detects nothing but guile and cynicism. The bishop retorts:

It is the mode of these times to father their own fancies upon God, and when they cannot justify them by reason, to plead His omnipotence, or to cry, 'O altitudo!' that 'the ways of God are unsearchable'. If they may justify their drowsy dreams because God's power and dominion is absolute, much more may we reject such fantastical devices, which are inconsistent with the truth, and goodness, and justice of God, and make Him to be a tyrant, who is 'the Father of mercies', and 'the God of all consolation'. The unsearchableness of God's ways should be a bridle to restrain presumption, and not a sanctuary for spirits of error.⁹³

Far from being some kind of pious mystic, Hobbes is one of those 'spirits of error', brimming with 'presumptions, fancies, drowsy dreams, and fantastical devices', who abuse the mystery of God to justify false and impious opinions.⁹⁴ Hobbes's 'mysticism' (or 'negative theology' or 'fideism') has merely been a cover under which he could more effectively perform theological, that is, heretical or atheism-tending mischief.

Bramhall protests that God is unlike a tyrant who acts simply as he lists. Rather, God acts according to justice and eternal law. God only wills or

⁹⁰ For Bramhall's further associating Hobbes with Satan, see 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 104–5.

⁹¹ Cf. Laud's similar Erasmian/arminian confession of loathing of predestinarianism in answer to Lord Saye and Sele: 'Almost all of them [puritans] say that God from all eternity reprobates by far the greater part of mankind to eternal fire, without any eye to their sins. Which opinion my very soul abominates.' Laud, *Works*, vi, 133.

⁹² 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 63–4. In the same vein, Bramhall exclaims: 'How impious is it then to conceive, that God did create so many millions of souls to be tormented eternally in Hell without any fault of theirs, except such as He Himself did necessitate them unto.' *BW*, iv, 78; see also 104–5.

⁹³ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 76. Bramhall's scriptural allusions are Romans xi:33, II Cor. i:3, Romans xv:5.

⁹⁴ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 76.

acts something if it is ‘agreeable to His justice’ and according to ‘that law which Himself had constituted’.⁹⁵ Hobbes, as a voluntarist, had argued that God’s will and act are good or just by the simple fact that they are God’s.⁹⁶ Something is good or just only because God wills it; God does not will something because it is good or just. The bishop flatly disagrees. He asserts that God wills ‘what is just and right’.⁹⁷ In other words, as against Hobbes’s voluntarism, Bramhall brings the essentialist notion that there is goodness and justice in some sense *outside* or *independent* of God. There is, then, as Bramhall implies, an objective moral reality, not dependent upon God’s will. He also objects to Hobbes’s argument that since there can be no power above it to command and demand obedience of it, supreme and absolute power justifies itself.⁹⁸ Hobbes had argued that it was absurd to speak of any entity’s being subject to itself: to be bound merely to oneself was really not to be bound at all. Tellingly, the bishop’s anti-voluntarist theological criticism shifts almost imperceptibly to constitutionalist political criticism. Bramhall points out that, just as Hobbes’s determinism transforms God into a cosmological tyrant, so his absolutist political theory – as taught in *De Cive* and reiterated at various places in the ‘Treatise’ – transforms the human ‘sovereign magistrate’ into a tyrant. Bramhall points out that in the sixth chapter of *De Cive* Hobbes had, by exactly the same logic, invested the *human* sovereign with the same absolute and self-justifying power:

The same privilege which T.H. appropriates here to ‘power absolutely irresistible’, a friend of his, in his book *De Cive*, ascribes to power respectively irresistible, or to sovereign magistrates; whose power he makes to be ‘as absolute as a man’s power is over himself, not to be limited by any thing but only by their strength’. The greatest propugners of sovereign power think it enough for princes to challenge an immunity

⁹⁵ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 78.

⁹⁶ ‘That which he [God] does, is made just by his doing it.’ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 249. Cf. Calvin’s formulation: ‘For God’s will is so much the highest rule of justice that whatever he wills, by the very fact that he wills it, must be considered just.’ *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III.xxiii.2 (II, 949); I have emended the translation of Battles, substituting ‘justice’ and ‘just’ for ‘righteousness’ and ‘righteous’, for in the French version Calvin used ‘justice’ and ‘juste’.

⁹⁷ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 80.

⁹⁸ ‘The power of God alone without other helps is sufficient justification of any action he doth’ and ‘Power irresistible justifies all actions, really and properly’. ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 249, 250; for a parallel passage in *Lev.*, see xxxi, 236. God cannot possibly ‘sin’ or do ‘injustice’ because that would require that He break a law dictated to him by a superior legislator: ‘God cannot sin, because his doing a thing makes it just, and consequently, no sin; as also because whatsoever can sin, is subject to another’s law, which God is not. And therefore it is blasphemy to say, God can sin.’ ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 250–1. There is no power above God to make a law for God to break. The only law that exists is His own. And, as Hobbes, the thorough voluntarist, argues, it would be absurd to say that God could break His own law, as that law is precisely what He wills and does. To break His own law would require that He could will and not will, do and not do, the same thing.

from coercive power, but acknowledge, that the law hath a directive power over them. But T.H. will have no limits but their strength. Whatsoever they do by power, they do justly.⁹⁹

Here we notice a key difference between the political thinking of Bramhall and Hobbes. The constitutionalist (or ‘moderate’) royalist author of *Serpent-Salve* maintains that there is some law independent of the king (or any other sovereign) according to which he governs, and against which his actions might be deemed just or unjust by subjects. If those actions were blatantly inconsistent with the laws and customs of the land (the constitution), then subjects would protest, and the ruler would rightly be called a tyrant, that is, a ruler governing *unlawfully* or *unjustly*. The absolutist Hobbes, on the other hand, had maintained that there was no such objective law outside or independent of the sovereign against which his (or their) actions could be judged unlawful or unjust. For law was simply the command of the sovereign. (Those ‘laws and customs of the land’ had the force of law only because of the tacit assumption of the sovereign’s approval.) Thus, although Hobbes says that the ruler should govern according to God’s will (divine or natural law), God is the only one who can judge whether the ruler’s actions are just or unjust.¹⁰⁰ A subject cannot in any sense judge the sovereign, for he and all his fellow subjects had established the sovereign in the first place to judge *them* – in order to escape a violent state of nature in which every man judged for himself. Thus, in the case of a subject before his sovereign, as in the case of a man before God, there cannot be any valid protest against *unjust* action. The sovereign might misgovern in the sense that he (or they) might break God’s law; but the subject must not arrogate to himself the divinity to declare that God’s law had been broken. That judgment and, much more, the punishment, must be left to God. The *human* sovereign is, properly speaking, only a subject of the absolute and *divine* sovereign. If the former were in any sense subject to another human, he (or they) would not be sovereign.

Quite clearly, the scholastic, essentialist and constitutionalist Bramhall was much disturbed at the conception of law that Hobbes had articulated in the ‘Treatise’ – a conception that was the same as the one that the bishop had encountered in *De Cive*. Hobbes had asserted that no law could be

⁹⁹ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 78.

¹⁰⁰ Insofar as Hobbes says that the sovereign should rule according to God’s law, Bramhall is wrong to claim that Hobbes does not allow even a ‘directive’ (non-coercive) power over him (or them). That is, Hobbes’s ‘divine’ or ‘natural’ law might be called ‘directive’. However, God alone, not any of the sovereign’s subjects, can judge that this directive power has been defied. Bramhall is not wrong to claim (object) that Hobbes thoroughly rejects the notion of a sovereign’s being subject to ‘laws of the land’ (or an ‘ancient constitution’). The laws of God (divine or natural law) may be ‘directive’ in a way that the latter cannot.

unjust.¹⁰¹ As the heavenly sovereign's willing something makes it just by his willing it, so the earthly sovereign's legislating is just by his (or their) willing (or enacting) it. Against this Bramhall opposes a conception of law that allows for the possibility of a sovereign's unjust legislation. As 'just laws are the ordinances of right reason', so a sovereign could make an *unjust* law by disregarding or violating right reason.¹⁰² Since 'just laws are instituted for the public good', then if a law were found to be harmful to the public good, it could be judged unjust. Bramhall then supplies examples of unjust laws from ancient history: Pharaoh's, Nebuchadnezzar's, Darius's, Ahasuerosh's, and those of the Pharisees.¹⁰³ The bishop penetrates to the core of Hobbes's political theory by questioning the nature of the subject's obedience to the sovereign. He claims that the root of Hobbes's error is his principle that 'every man makes by his consent the law which he is bound to keep'.¹⁰⁴ This, Bramhall protests, is simply not true. Although consent may be given to the sovereign at the founding of the government, future obedience is conditional upon just legislation and rule. The subjects establish the sovereign, and pledge their allegiance 'in hope and trust, that they [sovereigns] would make just laws'. Consequently, when sovereigns 'abuse this trust and deceive the hopes of the people by making tyrannical laws', subjects cannot be thought to have consented to such misrule. Thus, 'the people's implicit consent doth not render the tyrannical laws of their legislators to be just'. Bramhall also indicates his fundamental disagreement with Hobbes's political theory by objecting to the latter's conception of a state of nature. Bramhall flatly denies that there was ever any such state of nature. Instead, he insists: 'paternal government was in the world from the beginning' and 'there was never a time when it was lawful ordinarily for private men to kill one another for their own preservation'. After contesting some other points concerning rights of private men, and the transfer of them to sovereigns, Bramhall laments Hobbes's misanthropy: 'I am sorry to hear a man of reason and parts to compare the murdering of men with the slaughtering of brute beasts.'¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ 'No law can possibly be unjust, inasmuch as every man maketh, by his consent, the law he is bound to keep and which consequently must be just, unless a man can be unjust to himself.' 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 252–3. As he explains elsewhere, citing the old Roman legal maxim *volenti non injuria*, no man can be unjust to himself. *DC*, iii.7.

¹⁰² 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 88.

¹⁰³ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 88, 89. For reiteration of the point that a law is not necessarily just see also *BW*, iv, 99.

¹⁰⁴ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 90.

¹⁰⁵ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 90, 95. Then follows Bramhall's affirmation of the Great Chain of Being: 'The elements are for the plants, the plants for the brute beasts, the brute beasts for man.' 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 95. One way of understanding the difference between the political thought of Hobbes and Bramhall is to appreciate that Hobbes never once

There is every reason to suppose that most or all of these strictures upon Hobbes's political teaching were among the 'sixty exceptions' that the bishop had submitted to him at or just before their meeting in Paris in the summer of 1645. The 'Vindication' is full of quotations and paraphrases of *De Cive*. In this way the 'Vindication' became a vehicle for Bramhall to convey a refutation of Hobbes's political philosophy. The bishop seems to have viewed Hobbes's political absolutism as perfectly consistent if not logically intertwined with the philosopher's disturbing determinism and theology – or a-theology. He found Hobbes's theological voluntarism and political absolutism hard to distinguish – and easy to abominate. We can observe in the bishop's 'Vindication', written sometime after April 1646, that the debate had lost its focus on 'liberty' and 'necessity', and been widened to encompass tangential, separate (though not unrelated) issues. In the 'Vindication', argument concerning free-will was much diverted by argument over issues of law, morality and government. This is not to say that Bramhall was suddenly hijacking or sabotaging the debate. In the 'Treatise' Hobbes had taken up such issues in order to refute Bramhall's 'Discourse'. Hobbes had made many of the arguments about law, morality and government that he had made in the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*.

In the 'Vindication' Bramhall also showed himself concerned to acquit himself of personal responsibility for the rebellions and wars that had broken out in the British Isles. Whereas Hobbes had implied that the controversial arminian bishop of Derry was to some degree to blame for the puritan revolt, Bramhall responds with an insinuation that the disorders and violence in the British Isles and on the continent were indebted to Hobbes, a 'third Cato':

It is not the School divines, but innovators and seditious orators, who are the true causes of the present troubles of Europe. T.H. hath forgotten what he said in his book *De Cive* (chapter IX) – that it is 'a seditious opinion', to teach, that 'the knowledge of good and evil belongs to private persons' (chapter XVII) that in 'questions of faith' the civil magistrates ought to consult with 'the ecclesiastical doctors', to whom 'God's blessing is derived by imposition of hands', so as 'not to be deceived in necessary truths', to whom 'our Saviour hath promised infallibility'. These are the very men whom he traduceth here. There he ascribes 'infallibility' to them; here he accuseth them of gross superstitious ignorance. There he attributes too much to them; here he attributes too little. Both there and here he 'takes too much upon' him.¹⁰⁶

refers to this Great Chain of Being, even indirectly. In this, and in the philosopher's lack of patriarchalism, Bramhall was able to sense Hobbes's dangerously egalitarian tendency. The philosopher was snubbing a very traditional idea. See Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936).

¹⁰⁶ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 130. The biblical reference is Numbers xvi:3, 7, whose context is, significantly, Korah's rebellion, in which the common Levites (like Hobbes, a common layman) arrogated to themselves priestly functions.

In other words, Hobbes has contradicted his own teaching from *De Cive*. Hobbes, a private man, has arrogated to himself the authority which he himself expressly forbade private men – forbade for the purpose of obviating sedition, rebellion and civil war. The philosopher has usurped the authority to judge of good and evil, right and wrong. He has conferred upon himself the office to pronounce on weighty ‘questions of faith’, though he is not one of those duly constituted ‘ecclesiastical doctors’ who has received the blessing of imposition of hands, and though he is not among those whom the sovereign is directed to consult in such matters. For doing this, Hobbes must be placed in that group of ‘innovators and seditious orators’ who have caused serious and widespread trouble, and war, in the British Isles and Europe. We have seen how Hobbes concluded the postscript of the ‘Treatise’ with a striking erastian aphorism about true religion being merely obedience to civil sovereigns.¹⁰⁷ The bishop concludes the ‘Vindication’ with a long answer to this. Stressing again the illegitimate assumption of religious authority by Hobbes, Bramhall sarcastically notes that ‘T.H. hath found out a more compendious way to Heaven’.¹⁰⁸ The bishop then offers a gloss upon Hobbes’s dictum: ‘Be of the religion of every Christian country where you come.’ He proceeds to argue against the philosopher’s caesaro-papist doctrine of the supremacy of the civil sovereign in matters of religion. According to him, to set up the civil sovereign as ‘Christ’s lieutenant’, supreme authority in all matters of religion, to whom all must submit, is ‘a doctrine so strange, and such an uncouth phrase to Christian ears, that I should have missed his meaning, but that I consulted with his book *De Cive*, xv.16 and xvii.28’.¹⁰⁹ Having reviewed those passages, Bramhall asks pointedly:

What if the magistrate shall be no Christian himself? What if he shall command contrary to the law of God or nature? Must we ‘obey him rather than God’? Is the civil magistrate become now the only ‘ground and pillar of truth’? I demand then, why T.H. is of a different mind from his sovereign, and from the laws of the land, concerning the attributes of God and His decrees?¹¹⁰

Bramhall’s objection, then, is twofold. Not only is Hobbes’s doctrine of the supremacy of the civil magistrate in religion contrary to biblical injunction to obey God, not man, but even if the doctrine is not unacceptable, Hobbes himself has not followed it, for Hobbes is ‘of a different mind from

¹⁰⁷ ‘Treatise’, as quoted in ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 193.

¹⁰⁸ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 195. ¹⁰⁹ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 196.

¹¹⁰ ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 196. The biblical references are Acts v:29 and 1 Tim. iii:15. The fact that Bramhall had, evidently, a copy of the 1642-printed *DC* on hand to consult, and that he had already drafted and submitted sixty objections to it, suggests that he might have been among those who were given copies in order that Hobbes might receive some feedback before publishing it. (In the 1647 preface to *DC* Hobbes noted that he had initially circulated *DC* for such feedback.)

his sovereign, and from the laws of the land'. Written not long after April 1646, the bishop presumably intended the phrase 'his sovereign' to refer to Charles I. Bramhall's claim that Hobbes's religion deviated from that of Charles I might have rested upon several different grounds. Firstly, on the issue of predestination Hobbes was extremely calvinist and anti-arminian where Charles was not.¹¹¹ Thus, Hobbes seems to have broken his own rule by holding a position that was contrary to the one favoured (patronised) by the king. Secondly, Hobbes was thoroughly erastian in ecclesiology where Charles was 'high' episcopalian and clericalist.¹¹² If 'true religion' meant conforming exactly to the civil sovereign, and if Hobbes's civil sovereign was Charles I, Hobbes would, by his own teaching, be guilty of false religion. But perhaps, as I suggested earlier, by 1645–6 Hobbes did not consider Charles the civil sovereign? The king had all but lost the throne; after the battle at Naseby in June 1645 there could be no doubt that the parliament at Westminster was sovereign *de facto*. In the 'Vindication' Bramhall might have argued that Hobbes had ceased to recognise Charles as his sovereign, as indicated by his deviation from those doctrines maintained by the king and his bishops, the 'duly ordained ecclesiastics'. If Hobbes in 1645 still considered Charles the civil sovereign, the sovereign to whose views he must conform, why was he arguing opinions that were not the king's but were rather those held by many of the (now triumphant) *enemies* of the king? If Bramhall had had no wish to be tactful, he might have concluded the 'Vindication' with a question: Does the philosopher now consider the parliament at Westminster – and the generals of the New Model Army – the civil sovereign back in his homeland? Since Bramhall knew that Hobbes taught that sovereignty is a matter of force – that the side which prevails in a civil war is, as the strongest, the sovereign – he would not have been surprised if Hobbes had answered in the affirmative.

Hobbes must have received Bramhall's 'Vindication' no later than 1647.¹¹³ But if Hobbes bothered to write a response, he did not send it to Bramhall,

¹¹¹ Nicholas Tyacke has emphasised 'the basic Arminian intransigence of King Charles'. *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 153; see also his *Anti-Calvinists, passim*; and Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, 114. Peter White has attempted to discredit this characterisation of the king, most recently in *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 238–55, where he argues that in the 1620s Charles was hardly a patron of arminianism, and merely endeavoured to bring peace to church and state by silencing the warring sides in the controversy surrounding predestination. Notwithstanding, I follow Tyacke in classifying Charles as arminian. If nothing else, the king consistently preferred reputed arminians throughout the 1630s.

¹¹² As Jeffrey Collins has similarly stressed: 'Hobbes's Erastianism . . . alienated him from the cause of Charles I, whose own deference to a corporatist, sacramental understanding of the clerical estate had become increasingly central to royalism throughout the 1640s.' *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 276–7.

¹¹³ *Defence*, 'To the Reader', BW, iv, 19.

and no evidence of such a response has survived. While Bramhall was writing this ‘Vindication’ sometime after April 1646, Hobbes was awaiting the publication of a second, annotated edition of *De Cive* by Elzevir in Amsterdam. He spent much of the next year deathly ill.¹¹⁴ But his sickness, and labour devoted to other writing projects, is not needed to explain his failure to respond to Bramhall. In view of the reluctance with which he wrote his reply to the bishop’s first paper, we cannot doubt that Hobbes had little wish to continue the debate – a debate that had become more personal and acrimonious and was no longer much focussed on ‘liberty’ and ‘necessity’. But if Hobbes did not respond directly to Bramhall’s paper, it is possible that the Elzevir edition of *De Cive* offered some answers to the kind of objections found in the ‘Vindication’ – as well as to the sixty objections that the bishop had submitted in 1645.¹¹⁵ To be sure, this edition of *De Cive* did not offer answers to Bramhall’s extensive arguments for free-will in the ‘Vindication’. But if the bishop got hold of this edition he might have read some of Hobbes’s notes as replies to some of his theological and political criticism. In the preface to this edition of *De Cive*, Hobbes recalled the adverse reaction to the edition of 1642:

I found my book very sharply criticised: on the ground that I have immoderately enhanced the civil power, but by Churchmen; on the ground that I have taken away liberty of conscience, but by Sectarians; on the ground that I have exempted Sovereigns from the civil laws, but by lawyers. I was not moved by their criticisms to do more than tie those knots more tightly, as each one was simply defending his own position. But for the sake of those who have been perplexed by the principles, namely the nature of man, the right of nature, the nature of agreements and the generation of a commonwealth, as they have not followed their passions but their own real understanding in making their comments, I have added notes in some places, which I thought might satisfy my critics.¹¹⁶

This and other notes responded to just the sort of strictures that the bishop had communicated in the ‘Vindication’ – and, presumably, in those sixty animadversions to parts of the 1642-version of *De Cive*. Bramhall’s complaint at the conclusion of the ‘Vindication’ was precisely what Hobbes mentions here: ‘that I have immoderately enhanced the civil power’. He objected that Hobbes had made the civil sovereign such an authority in religious matters as

¹¹⁴ At about the middle of April 1647 Hobbes came down with a serious illness that appeared fatal. Between that time and September his friend Sorbière ceased to trouble him about arrangements for further publication and sale of *DC*. Hervey, ‘Hobbes and Descartes’, 71.

¹¹⁵ Hobbes must have received the ‘Vindication’ too late – sometime after April 1646 – for his notes to the 1647 *DC* to have been influenced by his reading of Bramhall’s paper. These notes to accompany the slightly revised manuscript seem to have been sent to Sorbière in Amsterdam early in 1646.

¹¹⁶ *DC*, 1647 Preface, 15. Jeffrey Collins has observed other annotations in the 1647 *DC* that would have irritated Bramhall and his fellow Laudian clergy. *Alliance of Hobbes*, 93.

to require full and unswerving obedience from all subjects; or, in other words, Hobbes had invested the sovereign with 'immoderate' power by granting him (or them) the religious sovereignty of Christ's lieutenant. Thus, when in the 1647 edition of *De Cive* Hobbes noted that churchmen 'very sharply criticised' the 1642 edition for having 'immoderately enhanced the civil power', there can be no doubt that Bishop Bramhall was one of the men Hobbes had in mind. And when, in *Leviathan*, Hobbes tied those 'knots' of *De Cive* even more tightly, Bramhall's criticism was to become even more strident.

*Bramhall and the royalist schemes
of 1646–1650*

Hobbes offered no reply to Bramhall's 'Vindication' and the bishop must have been content to let that paper stand as the last word. After their engagement in Paris in the summer of 1645, Hobbes spent the next few years in France while Bramhall resided principally in the southern Netherlands. Both men had more than enough other business with which to occupy themselves. For Bramhall and the rest of the anglican clergy in exile, the ultimate task was to restore the king and themselves in England, Ireland and Scotland.¹ Before and after the debate in Paris, Bramhall appears to have lived mostly in Brussels, with the king's resident, Sir Henry de Vic.² While mainly in Brussels in the years 1644–8, Bramhall busied himself in various clerical functions for the benefit of fellow Englishmen abroad. De Vic maintained a chapel for anglican services and it was there that Bramhall must have been most active. As Vesey noted, English merchants in Antwerp travelled every month to Brussels to hear his sermons and receive the sacrament; they also provided financial support.³ But though in Brussels much of the time, the bishop's existence seems to have been fairly nomadic in this period. In addition to visiting Paris, where Prince Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria were now resident (since July 1646), Bramhall seems to have been running errands in the Netherlands,

¹ Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662* (London: Dacre, 1951), 49, estimated that from 1644 onwards there were over 100 such clergy in exile.

² Sometime between 1644 and 1648, Bramhall penned 'A Short Discourse to Sir Henry De Vic, about a passage at his table, after the Christening of his daughter, Anne Charlott; of persons dying without baptism'. *BW*, v, 167–80. Presumably it was also when Bramhall was staying with De Vic that he wrote 'An Answer to two papers, brought by Captain Steward, June 19, 1645' and 'A Letter to Miss Cheubien'. *BW*, v, 181–92. The letter to Miss Cheubien indicates that Bramhall was preparing to debate with some Roman catholics on the questions of purgatory and prayer to saints. Miss Cheubien and her friends had requested Bramhall to debate these issues in their presence. Vesey, *AH*, xxvii, notes some other unpublished controversial labours of these years.

³ Vesey, *AH*, xxvii. Walter Cooper was one such communicant and benefactor. It was Cooper himself who provided Vesey with this information. The distance from Antwerp to Brussels is ten leagues, about thirty miles.

imperial Rhineland territory and coastal and northern France.⁴ He also made at least one trip into Spain.⁵ In the summer of 1646 – at about the time he must have been writing his rejoinder to Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ – Bramhall was on the move, but was in Antwerp at least long enough to jot a note to Sir Richard Browne, the king’s resident in Paris.⁶ Dated 30 June 1646 (N.S.), Bramhall refers to some recent business he had in Spain, and tells Browne that though still unsure of his next movements, he expects to be in Liège at least briefly.⁷ That Bramhall was in regular correspondence with Browne in the late 1640s is suggested by the existence of another letter written by the bishop in January 1648.⁸ From it we may infer that Bramhall was in Paris shortly afterward: ‘I hoped to have been at Paris this day, but am necessitated to stay the next post from England . . . upon Tuesday, by God’s good leave, I take my journey . . . hence to be with you without fail upon Wednesday and to stay so long as Mr O’Neale will give me leave and no longer.’⁹

Sir Richard Browne proved a generous friend of Laudian clergy throughout their exile. At his ambassador’s residence in Paris, he, like De Vic, maintained an oratory where Laudian (or ‘high’) anglican services were conducted. Divines like Bramhall were frequent visitors (when not officiants) and John Cosin, dean of Peterborough (later bishop of Durham), regularly performed services for royalists in Paris.¹⁰ Cosin served as a chaplain to the anglicans at Henrietta Maria’s court.¹¹ It is likely that whenever Bramhall spent time in Paris during his exile, he made visits to Browne’s house, where

⁴ In the years 1646–8, the prince and queen were hosted at St Germain-en-Laye, the royal palace situated in a forest just outside the city.

⁵ Sometime between the debate in Paris in the summer of 1645, and 20 April 1646 (N. S.), Bramhall must have made a journey into Spain. ‘Vindication’, *BW*, iv, 23–4. A story of Bramhall’s near apprehension by the Spanish Inquisition on this or another trip is told by Vesey, *AH*, xxxiii. One may speculate that Bramhall’s errand in Spain was connected to royalist activity in Ireland. In the latter Bramhall’s associate from the 1630s, James Butler, first marquess of Ormonde, now lord lieutenant, was endeavouring to forge an alliance between royalists and moderate Roman catholic confederates. It is possible, for example, that Bramhall was involved in attempts to arrange for supplies to be sent to Ormonde in Ireland. For Bramhall’s later collaboration with Ormonde in Ireland, see below.

⁶ *BW*, i, cxvi–cxvii.

⁷ Bramhall concludes his letter: ‘I beseech you present my humble respects to my good Lady and your pretty daughter.’ Browne’s daughter Mary wed the diarist John Evelyn. Evelyn later styled Bramhall an ‘old friend’ upon meeting him back in England in 1660.

⁸ Dated 4 January 1648 (N.S.), BL Add. 4274, f. 137. ⁹ BL Add. 4274, f. 137.

¹⁰ In a writing of the late 1650s, Bramhall implied his being frequently at Browne’s. *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, *BW*, iii, 513. Richard Steward was another Laudian exile active in the 1640s, preaching regularly at St Germain in 1647–8. Geoffrey Browell, ‘Richard Steward’, *ODNB*. He and Bramhall must have become acquainted if they had not been previously.

¹¹ Bramhall’s acquaintance with Cosin preceded the wars. In the fall of 1637, during his brief stay in York, Bramhall and he debated strategies of enforcing conformity. Vesey, *AH*, xxi–xxii.

he could converse with the ambassador, as well as the Stuarts and their followers. In the years that Bramhall was in contact and correspondence with Browne, the latter was in frequent correspondence with Edward Hyde, later lord chancellor and earl of Clarendon.¹² In the late 1640s and 1650s Hyde, like Browne, proved a firm supporter of displaced anglican clergy, whether on the continent or in their internal exile back in England.¹³ He seems to have kept up quite cordial relations with Cosin throughout these years. In 1652, at the express request of Hyde, Cosin was to write an apologetical work in defence of the anglican church.¹⁴ As we will see, Bramhall was also to write anglican polemic at the behest of Hyde. Hyde also corresponded with Gilbert Sheldon, an old acquaintance from Great Tew who remained in England – and later became archbishop of Canterbury.¹⁵ On the continent there were other clergymen from Great Tew days with whom Hyde kept in contact. He chose George Morley (later bishop of Winchester) to be his chaplain and kept up a correspondence with John Earle.¹⁶ At the same time that Hyde was corresponding with Earle from Jersey, he also wrote to Bramhall in December 1646.¹⁷ Bramhall and Hyde must have been in some contact after the latter had left Jersey to join the Stuarts in France in 1647. Hyde and Bramhall shared several mutual friends in the late 1640s and might well have conversed at the émigré gatherings around the prince and queen. When they did happen to meet, they had some things they could agree on. They shared a distinctly constitutional royalist perspective. While Hyde had articulated this political position in declarations written for the king before

¹² For Browne–Hyde correspondence, see Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, iv, 229–323.

¹³ Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 56, laid heavy stress upon the influence of the Laudian clergy on Hyde. But more recent commentators, Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends*, esp. 42–4, and Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* – both following B. H. G. Wormald, *Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion, 1640–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), 240–325 – have argued that Hyde’s Laudianism was not very strong. Nevertheless, as Wormald himself stressed: ‘it was Hyde . . . who in the period 1646–60 became the repository of Charles I’s original [early 1640s] uncompromising churchmanship’. *Clarendon*, 307. If Hyde was not the most loyal of Laudians, he was the next best (or worst) thing: the most loyal of ‘Carolines’.

¹⁴ Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 63. As we shall see later, Bramhall was also to write at the behest of Hyde.

¹⁵ In 1649 Hyde wrote warmly to Sheldon: ‘You are one of those few by whose advice and example I shall most absolutely guide myself, and upon whose friendship I have an entire dependence.’ BL Add. 4162, f. 20, as quoted by Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 55. John Barwick, dean of St Paul’s, was Hyde’s ‘most active and courageous agent among the clergy [in England]’. Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends*, 204.

¹⁶ Earle was often at Browne’s house, active, like Cosin, in conducting services. Morley must also have been there on many occasions. For Hyde’s acquaintance with Earle and Morley at Great Tew in the 1630s, see Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends*, 37. For more about Earle’s activity among the Stuarts and exiles, see chapter 6.

¹⁷ In this letter, dated 19 December, O.S., Hyde recommended the bearer, one Mr Cooter, a candidate for orders, to a vacant benefice on the island. CCSP, 1, 349.

and during the First English Civil War, Bramhall had done so in *Serpent-Salve*.¹⁸ No doubt Hyde would have appreciated the bishop's contribution to royalist polemics, just as Archbishop Ussher and Sir George Radcliffe had done. And, as we will see, Hyde, like the bishop, was to oppose the young King Charles II's alliance-making with Scots covenanters after the execution of his father in January 1649.

No doubt Bramhall had many more associates and friends in exile in the 1640s than we will ever discover. Yet several more acquaintances can be documented and should be noted here. Throughout exile Bramhall must have kept in touch with clerical brethren on the continent, and corresponded with some in England and Ireland.¹⁹ With Michael Honywood he must have met many times. Honywood, later dean of Lincoln, performed anglican services at Utrecht, and maintained an impressive library, accessed numerous times by Bramhall and other émigrés.²⁰ In the joint publication of his *Schism Guarded and Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops* in 1659, Bramhall referred in the postscript to finding a certain book 'in the library of my kind friend Mr Michael Honywood'; and in a letter to Nicholas Bernard, written at The Hague in August 1658, Bramhall was to note: 'I went yesterday to Leiden with Mr Honywood and Mr [William] Sancroft, to bring them so far on their way towards Utrecht.'²¹ At least later, in the 1650s, Bramhall was to become well-acquainted with Thomas Browne, to whom the bishop gave some presentation copies of his books.²² The bishop might well have become equally intimate with his brother, Samuel Browne, the printer, who 'established himself as the most important distributor of royalist news and propaganda within the exile community on the continent, producing in 1649 alone more than thirty pamphlets and newspapers discussing political events in the British Isles'. In the 1650s he published books by exiled clergy, including Bramhall.²³ Evidently the bishop was also in touch with Viscount Scudamore, the lay Laudian ally – and the man to whom Hobbes

¹⁸ Hyde had, for example, composed the king's response to the Grand Remonstrance of December 1641. See Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends*, 61–6.

¹⁹ As John Spurr has noted: 'Although geographically isolated from one another, [Henry] Hammond, John Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, Robert Sanderson, Matthew Wren, and other Anglican luminaries kept up a correspondence, sharing ideas and knowledge, swapping tidbits of academic and royalist gossip, and encouraging each other in the service of "our distressed mother and church".' Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 10.

²⁰ Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 60.

²¹ *BW*, III, 12; I, xcvi. A forthcoming book by Marika Keblusek will provide details about Honywood's library in Utrecht, and document its visitation by such exiles as Bramhall. In another book she will shed much light on the lives and relations of all the royalist exiles. I thank her for the correspondence in which she shared this and information about Bramhall, Honywood, the brothers Thomas and Samuel Browne, and the Orange and Stuart courts.

²² Keblusek, 'Thomas Browne', *ODNB*.

²³ Keblusek, 'Samuel Browne', *ODNB*. For other publishing ventures of Browne see Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 119.

had written the letter in 1641 about his abrupt departure during the early sittings of the Long Parliament.²⁴ The bishop may have been in somewhat regular contact with the English ambassador at The Hague, William Boswell. They had corresponded amiably in the late 1630s.²⁵ The ‘Mr. O’Neill’ that Bramhall had mentioned in his letter to Browne was Daniel O’Neill, an acquaintance of Bramhall from Ireland, and a friend and agent of the Marquess of Ormonde.²⁶ According to correspondence of the late 1640s and 1650s, Bramhall was in regular contact with O’Neill.²⁷

The bishop’s relationship with Ormonde calls for special attention. They were in constant correspondence, when not in personal contact, throughout the late 1640s and 1650s. Prior to the outbreak of the rebellions and wars in the Stuart kingdoms they had known each other, and perhaps fairly well. Ormonde had been a sturdy ally of Strafford in the 1630s.²⁸ When Strafford left Ireland in April 1640 he put Ormonde in charge of raising and managing the army that Strafford hoped to use against the covenanters in the Second Bishops’ War. Strafford was also to recommend that the king make Ormonde lord deputy when Wandesford died in office in December 1640.²⁹ In February

²⁴ Haddan, *BW*, I, x, ‘t’, notes that Scudamore provided Bramhall with some financial assistance in these years. Bramhall received £10 from Scudamore in May 1659. Ian Atherton, *Ambition and Failure in Stuart England: The Career of John, First Viscount Scudamore* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 66.

²⁵ Boswell to Bramhall, 8/18 April 1637; same to same, 27 October/3 November 1637, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 72–3, 76; same to same, 16 September 1637, *Rawdon Papers*, No. XIII. In fact, judging by these letters, Boswell had served Bramhall as something of an intelligencer, reporting developments in the Dutch–Spanish fighting, events of the Thirty Years’ War and new publications coming out of the Dutch presses. The latter serves to corroborate Alan Stewart’s point that though Boswell was a very talented diplomat, he was also a ‘bibliophile and manuscript collector, and the hub of an impressive continental network of lettered men’. ‘William Boswell’, *ODNB*. There is frequent mention of Boswell in the correspondence between John Pell and Sir Charles Cavendish. Apparently Boswell frequently travelled from The Hague to Paris in 1644–5, for on several occasions he carried Pell and Cavendish letters while the latter was in the French capital. See *Pell-Cavendish*, *passim*. Tyacke has pointed out Boswell’s arminian contacts and possible sympathies in that direction. *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 233–4.

²⁶ For O’Neill see the articles of Donal Cregan cited in the bibliography.

²⁷ In Ormonde’s letter to Bramhall of 21 August 1648, the former speaks of ‘your letters to Mr. O’Neill’. *HMC Hastings*, iv, 93. On 15 January 1654, Bramhall was to be in Flushing where he wrote to O’Neill at Paris. He had just received a letter from O’Neill dated 2 January. See *CCSP*, II.

²⁸ J. C. Beckett, *The Cavalier Duke: A Life of James Butler, 1st Duke of Ormond* (Belfast: Pretani, 1990), 14–19. Ormonde has been called ‘Strafford’s protégé’. Jane Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell, Marquis of Antrim, 1609–1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1. Insofar as this is true, it was quite fitting that he and Bramhall, Strafford’s old colleague, became intimate associates in the decades after the lord lieutenant’s death.

²⁹ Ormonde had also been a good friend of Wandesford. With Bramhall, he attended Wandesford on the latter’s deathbed, and both served as executors of his will. Thornton, *Autobiography*, 21–2.

1641, Ormonde had endeavoured to achieve a majority in the Irish house of lords to defeat the attempt to impeach Bramhall and Strafford's other colleagues.³⁰ From the beginning of the commotions in Ireland in the autumn of 1641, Ormonde had proved a loyal and energetic servant of the king. He sought to tame the rebellious parties – Roman catholic 'confederates', the insurgents of 1641, and Ulster, pro-covenant Scots – the groups that had, between them, effectively ejected Bramhall from Ireland.³¹ In January 1644, the king had appointed Ormonde lord lieutenant. After a few years' fruitless effort to restore order and amass an army to bring over to England to fight for the now defeated king, Ormonde left for England in July 1647. Having conferred with the king at Hampton Court that summer, Ormonde remained in England until February 1648, when, upon hearing of designs against him, he departed for France. In Paris for the next few months, he advised Queen Henrietta Maria and Prince Charles on policy for Ireland. After Ormonde had arrived at the queen's court-in-exile at St Germain-en-Laye, representatives of the confederates soon followed to negotiate a deal whereby the prince might come over to Ireland to become head of a coalition army. It was then resolved that Ormonde should return to Ireland to try again to form such an army to aid the king now in captivity in England.³² If Bramhall was not consulted as the Stuarts and Ormonde schemed in Paris, the marquess must have conferred with Bramhall shortly afterwards. Not long before Ormonde's departure in August 1648 he wrote to Bramhall from Caen, in Normandy:

I have several times found so kind mention of me in your letters to Mr O'Neill that I must account myself very blameworthy in that I am now to make my excuse for omitting returns to them in this way, but that shall be supplied by all the offices of faithful and affectionate friendship that shall lie in my way to do you. I am now at length dispatched from St Germain's and do hope before you receive this to be under sail towards the place where my part is designed me. I should have held my business there in a good measure done if the temper of that place had been such as that I durst have invited your Lordship to my assistance, as I should have done however it is but that I had such experience of their injustice to you as made me fear what ever they would deem my fault would be imputed to you, but if there be such a settlement as may put that past fear, you will thereupon speedily receive a very hearty invitation from and welcome to your Lordship's affectionate humble servant.

³⁰ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, 124–5; Ohlmeyer, 'The Irish Peers, Political Power and Parliament, 1640–1641', 170; John McCafferty, "'To follow the late precedents of England": The Irish Impeachment Proceedings of 1641' in *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History: Irish Legal History Society Discourses and Other Papers, 1996–1999*, eds. D. S. Greer and N. M. Dawson (Dublin: Four Courts, 2001), 60, 69.

³¹ Patrick Little, 'The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645–1647' in *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610–1745*, eds. Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), 83.

³² Ronald Hutton, *Charles II*, 23.

Postscript: I have written to Mr Colliwer to venture corn to the safest ports in Ireland. I beseech you forward the doing it where you are or have power to persuade.³³

Thus, evidently, having already expressed his desire to go there himself, Bramhall was engaged in assisting Ormonde in the mission of establishing a coalition in Ireland for Charles. Not long after leaving Caen, where Ormonde had deposited his wife and children, he was to sail from Le Havre. But embarking in August he met with shipwreck, and his trip to Ireland was delayed until the end of September 1648, when he finally landed at Cork. Not many months afterwards Bramhall followed Ormonde. In January 1649 Ormonde had been able to prepare the way by devising a peace among the factions.³⁴ Within several weeks of this peace the bishop must have arrived and by the end of April 1649 he was writing to Ormonde from Kilcolgan, in Galway.³⁵

The design of Ormonde and Bramhall in the years 1649–50 was to assemble a royalist army in Ireland for Charles II. If successful, the latter would then be able to come over to lead the troops against the forces of the Rump's commonwealth there, and then in England. Just before Bramhall left for Ireland the young king issued him the following instructions:

1. He shall deliver the King's letter to Ormond.
2. He shall acquaint him [Ormonde] that the King of Portugal gives the liberty of the port of Lisbon and others in Portugal to King Charles' ships.
3. He shall also acquaint Prince Rupert of this.
4. He shall acquaint them both that the King of Portugal will send to Ireland an Irishman called Domingo de Rosario, with addresses to the King (though not with any avowed public quality) and if he come before the King is there in person, he is to be received with all civility, and Ormond and Rupert are to treat with him.
5. King Charles is about to send an Ambassador to the King of Spain, from whom he expects more aid for Ireland than from Portugal. Caution and secrecy must therefore be observed in transactions with Rosario.
6. The Bishop [Bramhall] shall follow any directions given to him by Ormond in the King's name.³⁶

Bramhall was evidently appointed to function as the liaison between Charles and Ormonde, before actually joining the latter. In this Irish expedition,

³³ Ormonde to Bramhall, 21 August 1648, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 93.

³⁴ At the end of 1648 there were three major factions in Ireland: 1) the forces directed by the English parliament; 2) an uneasy alliance of Irish royalists (led by Ormonde and Inchiquin) and moderate Irish Roman catholic confederates; and 3) hardliner Irish Roman catholic clergy and confederates in Ulster. Randall MacDonnell, second earl of Antrim, a great rival of Ormonde, was allied with the last group.

³⁵ *HMC Ormonde*(b), i, 122.

³⁶ King Charles II's Instructions to John, Bishop of Derry, 10/20 April 1649, *HMC Pepys*, 252–3.

Bramhall did not return to Ulster, but seems instead to have laboured only in the south and west, for about a year (spring 1649–spring 1650). His collaboration with Ormonde may have been similar to his collaboration with Newcastle in Yorkshire during the First English Civil War. Bramhall was appointed Ormonde's agent, undertaking the office of procurator-general and special commissioner for the taking of royal shares of the goods seized after the peace of January 1649.³⁷ This office must have required the bishop to place himself in coastal areas.³⁸ Bramhall's venture in Ireland was a dangerous one. As recently as October 1648, just months before his return to Ireland, the English parliament had demanded that the bishop be excluded from a general pardon that would be part of a peace settlement with Charles I.³⁹ On the one hand, Bramhall would be running the risk of falling into the hands of Cromwell or one of the other generals or agents of the Rump Parliament now governing England; on the other hand, he would be exposing himself to the danger of being taken by some of his old Irish Roman catholic enemies. Bramhall himself was later to recall: 'When I was last in Ireland, and the Romanists had wrested some part of the power of the sword into their hands, they prosecuted no English Protestant more than myself, and never left until they had thrust me out of the kingdom, as conceiving me to be a great impediment to them in their making of proselytes.'⁴⁰ At the revolt

³⁷ McCafferty, 'Bramhall', ODNB. This appointment was made 9 March 1650.

³⁸ At one point he spent time with the king's lieutenant-general, the Marquess of Clanricarde, at the latter's castle, Portumna, in Galway. Bickley, *HMC Hastings*, iv, xxv. Two months after writing from Kilcolgan (1 April 1649, *HMC Ormonde*(b), i, 122), Bramhall was at Kilkenny: *CSPI, 1647–1660*, 367. In October 1649 he was with Ormonde at Limerick, where he received the confession of the dying Earl of Roscommon, Strafford's brother-in-law. Vesey, AH, xxvii–xxviii. Later that month he moved south to Cork, from where he departed as soon as that city declared itself for parliament. On 15 March 1650, apparently he was at Quin in County Clare: *CSPI, 1647–1660*, 378. For all his movements during this time, see Bickley, *HMC Hastings*, iv, xxv. That Bramhall was in Ireland in 1649 is corroborated by the memoirs of Ann Fanshawe. Leaving Cork for Limerick in November 1649: 'She and her husband met the Bishop of Londonderry and the Earl of Roscommon, who was then Chancellor of Ireland. Sir Richard Fanshawe and the Bishop and the Earl being together writing letters to the King about the state of affairs, when they were going down stairs from my Lord Roscommon's chamber, while striving to hold a candle at the stairs head, because the privacy of the dispatch admitted not a servant to be near, my Lord Roscommon fell down the stairs, and his head fell upon the corner of a stone which broke his skull in three pieces, of which he died five days after.' *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*, ed. John Loftis (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 124–5.

³⁹ W. E. Collins, 'John Bramhall', 101, n.5. The same demand for exclusion was made at Uxbridge in January 1645 and in parliament's articles of peace submitted to the king while he was at Newcastle in the custody of the Scots, in July 1646. Bramhall had been listed among those in the 'First Qualification' against whom parliament demanded licence to prosecute. *Thurloe State Papers*, i, 80. Along with Newcastle, Bramhall was also to be excluded from the Act of Indemnity of 1652.

⁴⁰ *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, BW, III, 540. Given the context of this remark, however, one might take it with a grain of salt. Writing in 1659 or 1660 against the presbyterian

of Cork, that is, its declaration of allegiance to the English commonwealth, Bramhall's escape from capture provoked an annoyed Cromwell to remark that he would have given 'a good sum of money' to have gotten a hold of that 'Irish Canterbury'.⁴¹ With Laud now dead and gone, Bramhall was obviously the next best 'prelatical' arminian target. The bishop's escape seems to have been quite narrow: 'the little bark he was in was closely hunted by two of the parliament's frigates, many of them being then on this coast, and when they were come so near that all hopes of being saved were taken away . . . on a sudden, just as they were ready to seize the prey, the wind slackened on the two ships into a perfect calm, and as it were flew upon her wings into the sails of the little vessel and carried her away in view'.⁴² Bramhall probably left Ireland in or shortly after March 1650, after Cromwell had established control of much of the island.⁴³ Ormonde remained in Ireland till the end of 1650, but his was to be an exercise in futility as the Rump's forces, directed by Cromwell's Irish successor, and son-in-law, Henry Ireton, enlarged their domination of the island.⁴⁴ Meanwhile, Bramhall returned to the Netherlands where, among other things, he provided some kind of assistance to Ormonde's wife.⁴⁵ When Ormonde himself returned to the continent at the end of 1650, after landing at Perose in Brittany, he returned to Paris to join the royalist exile community that revolved around Henrietta Maria. It was time for some fresh plotting to assist Charles II who was now undertaking a restoration *via* Scotland.

A Stuart restoration in all the British kingdoms beginning in Ireland was not the only option for the would-be king. The obvious, and quite viable, alternative was a restoration beginning in Scotland. In fact, upon the execution of Charles I at the end of January 1649, it was the Scottish kingdom that had declared his son their sovereign – albeit with some strings attached.⁴⁶ This Scottish way to restoration was naturally anathema to Bramhall, for it would inevitably involve concessions to the bishop's old enemies, the Scots

Baxter's accusation of his complicity in a plot to Romanise the church of England, Bramhall was describing his anti-popery efforts.

⁴¹ Vesey, AH, xxviii. In the last weeks of October 1649, the protestant royalist garrison controlled by Inchiquin at Cork revolted, surrendering to Lord Broghill and his English commonwealth troops. James Scott Wheeler, *The Irish and British Wars, 1637–1654: Triumph, Tragedy, and Failure* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 217.

⁴² Vesey, AH, xxviii. ⁴³ McCafferty, 'Bramhall', ODNB.

⁴⁴ Not entirely futile, however, for after Cromwell had succeeded in thwarting Ormonde and most of his allies by the end of 1649, the residue of resistance, including Ormonde, could still serve a diversionary purpose once Charles II landed in Scotland in the summer of 1650. Wheeler, *Irish and British Wars*, 218.

⁴⁵ Marchioness of Ormonde to Bramhall, 23 June 1650, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxviii. Writing to the king in January 1651, Bramhall recalled: 'My Lord Marquis of Ormond did commit a trust unto me for the support of his noble Lady.' 16/26 January 1651, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xli.

⁴⁶ The Channel Islands and some parts of Ireland did so as well.

presbyterians. The covenanters would demand at least the same presbyterian (anti-episcopal) concessions that Charles I had granted in negotiations at the Isle of Wight in the winter of 1647–8.⁴⁷ Any such deal would naturally entail the sacrifice of Laudian bishops like Bramhall. In the years 1649–50, the royalists in exile were far from agreed on which policies to adopt, or how to pursue the ends on which they could agree. Various factions formed to push the young Charles II in various directions. Some lobbied for a two-pronged, seemingly contradictory, restoration scheme involving alliances with both confederate Roman Catholics in Ireland and covenanter presbyterians in Scotland. The difficulty with such a scheme was that making concessions to one would, logically, at least, require denying concessions to another: deceit, or at least the breaking of promises, could not be avoided in the prosecution of such a scheme. Immediately after the execution of his father, Charles II and the royalist exiles faced the hard task of deciding what arrangement – if any – to make with the very Scots who had precipitated all the revolts and wars of the 1640s. The Scots presbyterians who now governed the northern kingdom sent a deputation to negotiate with Charles in the spring of 1649. Precisely then, presumably just before departing for Ireland to join Ormonde, Bramhall produced what might be regarded as a policy paper in the form of a pamphlet entitled *A Fair Warning to Take Heed of the Scottish Discipline*.⁴⁸

As we noted in chapter 1, hostilities between Bramhall and the Scots presbyterians had commenced in the 1630s. As bishop of Derry he had lived in an Ulster increasingly settled by these presbyterians; familiarity had bred contempt. Among other things, *Fair Warning* provided an outlet for such contempt. It also provided an opportunity indirectly to vent his resentment at the Scots for contributing so heavily to the destruction of the Laudian–Caroline regime of which he had been an important part. We have seen how vigorous he had been in the attempt to purge the church in Ireland of puritanism and presbyterianism; we have seen how he collaborated with Strafford in disciplining the Scots in Ulster who cheered for the covenant cause

⁴⁷ With his back to the wall, Charles had agreed to a three-year trial establishment of presbyterianism in England. See note 54 below.

⁴⁸ The rest of the title admonishes that presbyterianism is ‘of all others most injurious to the Civil Magistrate, most oppressive to the Subject, most pernicious to both’. This short treatise was edited by Haddan in *BW*, III, 237–87. Printed at Delft, it must have been composed between 30 January 1649 and April 1649, for Bramhall refers to ‘our late gracious King Charles’ and in April 1649 the commissioners at The Hague noted that Bramhall had just printed the pamphlet ‘the other day at Delft’. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III, 87. It is possible that Bramhall went over to Ireland sometime in February or March, but then returned to The Hague for a few weeks in April 1649, and then returned to Ireland shortly afterwards. His presence at The Hague in April may be inferred from a reference in John Byron to Ormonde, 15 April 1649, *Carte*, I, 270, and from Baillie’s remarks in *A Review of Fair Warning*, as quoted below.

in the late 1630s: the bishop's *Fair Warning* of 1649 may be considered a resumption or extension of that programme.⁴⁹ In this pamphlet Bramhall argues that new presbyter has all along been nothing but old papist writ large: the presbyterians have been guilty of enormous hypocrisy in the fact that, denouncing the corruption and tyranny of anti-Christian popes and bishops, they themselves have perpetrated as much or more: 'Their profession of humility is just like that Cardinal's hanging up of a fisher's net in his dining-room, to put him in mind of his descent; but so soon as he was made Pope, he took it down, saying, "The fish was caught now, there was no more need of the net."⁵⁰ They would thoroughly tyrannise over the civil magistrate. Encroaching upon the supreme magistrate, they would reassert the power of the pope for themselves: 'they have thrust out the Pope indeed but retained the Papacy'.⁵¹ Bramhall's strategy is to show the young would-be king (and his counsellors) that any deal with covenanters is bound to make him a pathetically weak king – a king only in name. For a king could not really be a king in the midst of such an ecclesiastical regime: '[In Scotland] the king hath no more legislative power in ecclesiastical causes than a cobbler.'⁵² Only a king desiring degradation would be king of Scotland on covenanter terms. In *Fair Warning* Bramhall in effect echoes the lately beheaded king's apprehension of presbyterianism. Charles I had written in 1646: 'The giving such way to presbyterian government as will content the Scots is the absolute destruction of monarchy.'⁵³ Not long after declaring that, the same king had reiterated: 'Show me any precedent where ever presbyterian government and regal was together without perpetual rebellions . . . the ground of their doctrine is anti-monarchical.'⁵⁴ This was, in turn,

⁴⁹ It was also an opportunity to play again upon a theme he had sounded in his sermon to Newcastle and the royalist soldiers about to march against the Scots in the first few months of 1644. See chapter 2, 46.

⁵⁰ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 260.

⁵¹ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 261. The following should suffice as representative of this theme: 'this Discipline, which they so much adore, is the very quintessence of refined Popery, or a greater tyranny than ever Rome brought forth'. BW, III, 242; 'What? is old Edinburgh turned new Rome, and the old presbyters young Cardinals, and their consistory a conclave, and their committees a junto for propagating the Faith? Themselves stand most in need of reformation.' BW, III, 267.

⁵² *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 245. Similarly: 'they attribute nothing to the magistrate, but only what may render him able to serve their own turns, and supply their needs'. BW, III, 252; 'The Pope as well as they, and they as well as the Pope (neither barrel better herrings), do make kings but half-kings, kings of the bodies, not of the souls, of their subjects.' BW, III, 262.

⁵³ Bodl. Clarendon 97, fo. 41r, Charles I to Culpepper, Jermyn and Ashburnham, 31 August 1646, as quoted by Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 130; I have modernised spelling and style in this and the following quotation.

⁵⁴ Bodl. Clarendon 91, fo. 33r, Charles I to Culpepper, Jermyn and Ashburnham, 7 September 1646, as quoted by Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 130. However, as noted above, this

Charles I echoing his father's dictum, 'Presbytery agrees with monarchy as well as God and the Devil.'⁵⁵ Curiously, Bramhall argues in much the same way as Hobbes against the establishment of two separate authorities within one state. In chapter IX, to prove the assertion 'That this discipline makes a monster of the Commonwealth', he argues that the presbyterians turn the commonwealth into 'an amphisbaena, or a serpent with two heads, one at either end' by allowing 'two supremes in the same kingdom or state, the one civil, the other ecclesiastical'.⁵⁶ Bramhall observes the same dilemma that Hobbes does: when two trumpets issue contrary commands, 'What should the poor soldier do in such a case? or the poor subject in the other case? If he obey the civil magistrate, he is sure to be excommunicated by the Church; if he obey the Church, he is sure to be imprisoned by the civil magistrate.'⁵⁷ Indeed, against Hobbes later, Bramhall might have cited *Fair Warning* as proof that he was quite sensitive to the problem of ecclesiastical tyrants, or churchmen encroaching upon the king's jurisdiction. Bramhall points out in *Fair Warning*: 'You see sufficiently in point of practice, how the Disciplinarians [presbyterians] have trampled upon the laws, and justled the civil magistrate out of his supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs.'⁵⁸ Hobbes would have made the same observation. One could even mistake Bramhall for a student of Hobbes when the bishop writes: 'The last appeal ought to be the supreme magistrate, or magistrates, within his or their dominions, as to the highest power under God. And where it is not so ordered, the commonwealth can enjoy no tranquility.'⁵⁹ Bramhall's peroration, a display of his rhetorical verve, contains a conceit that anticipates one of Hobbes's aphorisms:

Let all Christian magistrates, who are principally concerned [namely Charles II], beware how they suffer this cockatrice-egg to be hatched in their dominions. It were worth the inquiring, whether the marks of Antichrist do not agree as eminently to the Assembly General of Scotland, as either to the Pope, or to the Turk. This we see plainly, that they spring out of the ruins of the civil magistrate; they 'sit upon the Temple of God,' and they advance themselves above those whom the Holy Scripture calleth Gods.⁶⁰

did not prevent Charles, in his desperation on the Isle of Wight in December 1647, from conceding to the Scots commissioners three years of presbyterian church government. This concession purchased for Charles the Second English Civil War. Certainly his father's compromise furnished Charles II with a precedent as the latter entertained the terms of the Scots commissioners at The Hague in the spring of 1649. Doubtless, the advisors of Charles II who were urging concessions appealed to this precedent.

⁵⁵ This was one of his retorts to the presbyterian-inclined English clergy at the Hampton Court conference, 1604.

⁵⁶ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 272.

⁵⁷ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 272.

⁵⁸ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 249.

⁵⁹ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 255.

⁶⁰ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 287.

The bishop's 'they spring out of the ruins of the civil magistrate' is virtually the same thought conveyed by Hobbes's line from *Leviathan*: 'the papacy is no other than the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire sitting crowned upon the grave thereof'.⁶¹ Although Bramhall does not treat of episcopacy *jure divino* in this tract, he does remark in passing that: 'There is not a text which they wrest against Episcopacy, but the Independents may with as much colour of reason and truth urge it against their presbyteries. . . . There is not a text which they produce for their presbytery, but may with much more reason be alleged for Episcopacy.'⁶² Bramhall impugns the assertion of divine right by the presbyterians: 'This "*Jure Divino*" is that which makes their sore incurable, themselves incorrigible, – that they father their own brat upon God Almighty, and make this mushroom, which sprang up but the other night, to be of heavenly descent.'⁶³ Evidently, tellingly, in the bishop's mind the 'Disciplinarians' and Hobbes were associated. For while Bramhall here complains of the former's fathering their own brat upon God, in the 'Vindication', penned just a few years earlier, he had complained that Hobbes was among those who 'father their own fancies upon God' and then cry 'O altitudo!'⁶⁴

Some measure of the efficacy of Bramhall's pamphlet may be taken from the reaction of Robert Baillie, the covenanter minister who served in the Scottish deputation sent to The Hague in the spring of 1649 to negotiate with Charles II. Baillie had written some venomous attacks upon Laud and arminianism in the early 1640s. In 1640 he had been one of those commissioners sent down to London in order to lobby for a presbyterian church in England.⁶⁵ Clearly, then, Baillie and Bramhall were arch-enemies well before 1649. In April 1649 Baillie and his colleagues wrote back to Scotland in keen disgust at *Fair Warning*: 'Doctor Bramble of Derry has printed the other day at Delft a wicked pamphlet against our Church: We have no time, nor do we think it fit, to print an answer.'⁶⁶ Bramhall might have taken the description 'wicked pamphlet' as a tribute to its merit, just as his biographer, John Vesey, remarked that one proof of the merit of Christianity was that Nero persecuted it. Notwithstanding that comment of Baillie and his fellow commissioners, they later thought it worthwhile to publish a response

⁶¹ *Leviathan*, XLVII, 483.

⁶² *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 270. However, Hobbes would no doubt have pointed out that there was nothing that Bramhall could use against presbyterians and independents that the Roman catholics could not use against him; and that there was nothing that Bramhall could use against Roman catholics that the presbyterians and independents could not use against him.

⁶³ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 270. ⁶⁴ 'Vindication', BW, IV, 76.

⁶⁵ The most immediate goal of Baillie and his colleagues was to abolish episcopacy in England. See Shaw, *History of the English Church*, I, 125–44.

⁶⁶ John Kennedy, George Winraham, Robert Baillie, James Wood to the Commission, The Hague, 3 April 1649. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III, 87.

to Bramhall's pamphlet. Baillie was quite right to understand *Fair Warning* as the bishop's attempt to sabotage the alliance project of the covenanters and Charles II. Before the year 1649 had ended, Baillie had published *An Answer to Fair Warning* in Delft. According to Baillie, Bramhall submitted *Fair Warning* in person not only to Charles II, but also to the prince of Orange, William II, the king's brother-in-law, and several of those in the circles that surrounded them at The Hague.⁶⁷ As the feisty Scotsman stresses, he had hoped to avoid engaging, but when he saw how aggressively Bramhall had written and propagandised, he could not forbear:

I saw . . . the man's spirit so extreme saucy, and his pen so waspish and full of gall, that I judged him unworthy of any answer. But understanding his malicious boldness to put his book in the hand of His Majesty, of the Prince of Orange, and all the eminent personages of this place, who can read English; yea to send it abroad unto all the universities of these Provinces, with very high and insinuating commendations, from the prime favourers of the Episcopal cause; hearing also the threats of that faction to put this their excellent and unanswerable piece, both in Dutch, French, and Latin; that in the whole neighbouring world the reputation of the Scots might thereby be wounded, killed, and buried without hope of recovery; I found it necessary, at the desire of divers friends, to send this my review after it.⁶⁸

Bitterly recalling Bramhall's career as a scourge of presbyterians in Ireland, a supporter and collaborator of Baillie's anti-covenant compatriots, John Corbet and Bishop Maxwell, and a client of Laud and 'a zealous lover of all the Arminianism, popery, and tyranny', Baillie complains that 'Doctor Bramble' (perhaps a contemptuous misspelling) and the 'prelatical faction' at The Hague 'continue resolute, that the King and all his people shall perish, rather than the prelates, not restored to former places of power, for to set up

⁶⁷ Bramhall's acquaintance with members of the house of Orange and their Stuart relatives in the late 1640s and 1650s appears to have been close. For the 1650s this is indicated by a letter of Bramhall to Ormonde, 4/14 May 1653, *HMC Ormonde*(b), 291–2. Marika Keblusek has informed me that in exile he was at one point connected to the court of Mary Stuart and speculates that he may have found housing at either her court or that of her aunt, Elizabeth of Bohemia. The latter possibility is strengthened by the fact that at the Restoration Elizabeth of Bohemia wrote to Bramhall from The Hague to offer her personal congratulations upon his elevation to primate of Ireland. Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia to Bramhall, 10 December 1660 (N.S.), *HMC Hastings*, iv, 100–1; see also same to same, 23 April/3 May 1661, *The Hague*, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 103.

⁶⁸ Prefatory letter addressed 'For the Right Honourable the Noble and Potent Lord, John Barle of Cassils, Lord Kennedy, & c. one of Majesties Privy-Counsell, and Lord Justice generall of Scotland', and signed 'R. B. G.' [Robert Baillie of Glasgow], dated Hague 28 May/7 June 1649, *A review of the seditious pamphlet lately published [sic] in Holland by Dr. Brambell, pretended Bishop of London-Derry; entitled, His faire warning against the Scots discipline. In which, his malicious and most lying reports, to the great scandall of that government, are fully and clearly refuted. As also, the Solemne League and Covenant of the three nations justified and maintained.* / By Robert Baylie, minister at Glasgow, and one of the commissioners from the Church of Scotland, attending the King at the Hague, Printed at Delph: by Mich. Stait, dwelling at the Turf-Market, 1649. Wing B467.

popery, profanity, and tyranny, in all three kingdoms'.⁶⁹ Baillie protests that Bramhall has attempted to prejudice the young Charles II against giving fair consideration to the commissioners from Scotland:

While the commissioners of the church and kingdom of Scotland, were on their way to make their first addresses to his Majesty, for to condole his most lamentable afflictions, and to make offer of their best affections and services for his comfort, in this time of his great distress; it was the wisdom and charity of the prelatical party, to send out Doctor Bramble, to meet them with his *Fair Warning*. For what else? but to discourage them in the very entry from rendering their propositions, and before they were ever heard, to stop his Majesty's ears with grievous prejudice, against all that possibly they could speak; though the world sees that the only apparent fountain of hope upon earth, for the recovery of the woefully confounded affairs of the king, is in the hands of that anti-prelatical nation: but it is the hope of these who love the welfare of the King and the people, of the churches and kingdoms of Britain, that the hand of God which hath broken all the former devices of the prelates, shall crush this their engine also.⁷⁰

If Bramhall's primary purpose in this admonitory pamphlet was to dissuade Charles II from ever striking a deal with Scots covenanters, then eventually he was to be disappointed. In June 1650, just before landing in Scotland, Charles was finally (and most begrudgingly) to covenant. In the short term, however, Bramhall's book seems to have been successful: in the spring of 1649 Charles refused to accept all the terms that were pressed.⁷¹ And the fact that Charles later offered firm resistance to covenanting-conditions in the spring of 1650 may also be cited as testament to the compelling argument of *Fair Warning*.⁷² But a young and impressionable king was not the only concern of Bramhall in this book. He also wished to dissuade his fellow Englishmen from letting presbyterianism migrate and settle south of the Tweed. He appeals to nobility and gentry in the chapter devoted to a demonstration 'that this discipline is hurtful to all orders of men'.⁷³ Just

⁶⁹ *Review of Fair Warning*, 2, 20–1, 35; the last quoted is from the title of chapter 1. On pages 2 and 14 Baillie effectively accuses Bramhall of plagiarising Corbet's *Lysimachus Nicanor* and Bishop Maxwell's *Issachar's Burden*. But at least in the case of the former, Bramhall might have been co-author – in which case he was just plagiarising himself. See chapter 1, n.68. That Bramhall did lift at least several passages straight from Maxwell's book is confirmed by Haddan's notes in *BW*, III, 237–87. Also suggestive is a speculative comment of William Spang about the origin of Bramhall's *Fair Warning*: 'I am certainly informed, by a printer, that the infamous person who goes under the name of Grallator [i.e., one who walks on stilts or crutches], has a big volume ready, of the late practices of the Scottish Kirk in the exercise of discipline, which ye may think are willingly furnished to him by some banished Scotsmen.' William Spang to Robert Baillie, The Hague, 9/19 March 1649. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III, 79.

⁷⁰ *Review of Fair Warning*, 1.

⁷¹ For a summary of these terms, which included the taking of both the National Covenant (1638) and Solemn League and Covenant (1643) see Wheeler, *Irish and British Wars*, 227.

⁷² Paul Seaward, 'Charles II, ODNB. ⁷³ *Fair Warning*, chapter XII.

as the supreme magistrate will be dominated by the presbyterians, so will all nobles and gentlemen: ‘The nobility and gentry must expect to follow the fortune of their prince . . . they shall lose all their advowsons . . . they shall hazard their appropriations and abbey-lands . . . they shall be bearded and mated by every ordinary presbyter . . . It is nothing with them [the presbyterians] for a pedant to put himself into the balance with one of the prime and most powerful peers of the realm.’⁷⁴ Presbyterianism meant socio-economic, democratising upheaval. Thus, Bramhall stressed the less obvious implications of further ‘godly’ reformation: egalitarian revolution.

Bramhall’s effort to steer Charles in an Irish-confederating rather than a Scottish-covenanting direction can be seen both in his *Fair Warning* and in his labours with Ormonde in 1649–50. If he and Ormonde had succeeded in assembling a sizeable anti-Rump force for Charles, then the young king would not have had to cast his lot with the covenanters in the spring of 1650. But as we have seen, while Charles was waiting in the wings, at Jersey, the Commonwealth’s forces, and eventually those troops led by Cromwell, had achieved decisive victories in Ireland in the autumn of 1649. The plan for the king to go to Ireland had to be discarded.⁷⁵ With no other option in sight, Charles returned to the continent, to Holland, to negotiate an agreement with the Scottish commissioners in the spring of 1650. While Bramhall and other anglican royalists had been lobbying against a deal with the covenanters in 1649, the bishop had had an ally in the person of James Graham, Marquess of Montrose, the most powerful anti-covenant Scottish royalist.⁷⁶ The latter had been at The Hague with the new king in February 1649 attempting to dissuade him from taking the covenant. That spring Charles was encouraging Montrose to prepare an invasion of Scotland. Bramhall must have been among the most enthusiastic supporters of that enterprise – a Scottish restoration venture that would not involve considerable presbyterian concessions. But one royalist nobleman who had been urging Charles to make some deal with the covenanter Scots was Bramhall’s old acquaintance, the Marquess of Newcastle. After the debate between his friends Hobbes and Bramhall in the summer of 1645, Newcastle had remained in Paris for the next few years. In the fall of 1645 the widower was busy wooing a second wife, Margaret Lucas, one of Henrietta Maria’s maids of honour, whom he married by the end of the year.⁷⁷ As we saw in chapter 3, Newcastle often hosted meetings of French and English mathematicians and natural philosophers, including

⁷⁴ *Fair Warning*, BW, III, 279–80.

⁷⁵ Clarendon, *History of Rebellion*, v, 102–3 (xii.116–17).

⁷⁶ Vesey, AH, xxix, says that Bramhall was a close friend of Montrose. In a later writing Bramhall was to pay tribute to the ill-fated ‘gallant Marquis of Montrose’, ‘one of the most ancient gentlemen in Europe’. *Answer to Milletière*, BW, I, 75.

⁷⁷ They were married at Sir Richard Browne’s chapel. Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 198.

prominent members of Mersenne's circle. In June 1648 Newcastle's former pupil, Prince Charles, had left Paris for The Hague, whence he and Rupert were to organise and then embark upon a royalist naval operation on the southeastern coast of England. This operation was to be a contribution to the Second English Civil War of 1648. At least Rupert hoped that they might be able to rescue the king, his uncle, by a surprise landing on the Isle of Wight.⁷⁸ Apparently the queen had begged Newcastle to accompany her son and nephew on this venture.⁷⁹ But Newcastle's creditors in Paris would not permit him to go without first making some payment. Although the queen pledged herself for his debts, Newcastle was still in so discreditable a position as to need a loan from friends.⁸⁰ In fact, the old patron–client relationship of Newcastle and Hobbes had now in a certain sense to be reversed, for Newcastle was reduced to borrowing ready money from Hobbes. The old Cavendish family servant was able to lend the marquess 100 pistoles.⁸¹ Having appeased his creditors in Paris, in late July 1648 Newcastle tardily followed the young men north.⁸²

If Newcastle passed through Brussels along the way, he might well have met up with Bramhall. After missing the prince and Rupert's naval venture of 1648, Newcastle repaired to Rotterdam where he then stayed about six months. While there he and Bramhall corresponded. On the first of October 1648 Newcastle wrote:

My Lord, your Lordship must needs do me the favour as to come and dine with me tomorrow, that we may discourse of a thing that concerns me very much. Therefore I beseech your Lordship not to fail me. There is [*sic*] little hopes in the North, as Sir Thomas Glenham is newly landed here with twenty more as they say. In all conditions I am and will be your Lordship's most faithful servant, W. Newcastle.⁸³

⁷⁸ In the event the royalist fleet did little more than harass the parliamentary fleet in the waters at the mouth of the Thames, and Prince Charles soon returned to Holland.

⁷⁹ 'Begged' is the word used by Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 158. Probably Newcastle would have been a little slow to mix with Rupert again, after his experience with the young hot-head at Marston Moor. Perhaps this is why the queen had to beg.

⁸⁰ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 159.

⁸¹ *Corr.*, II, 814. Before Newcastle left Paris he sold his entire collection of telescopes to Hobbes – seven telescopes for 106 pistoles. *Pell-Cavendish*, 503, n.8; *Corr.*, II, 621, n.3.

⁸² As Sir Richard Browne, writing from Paris on 18 July 1648, informed Sir Edward Nicholas: 'My Lord Marquis of Newcastle goes next week towards Holland by the way of Flanders, with his Lady.' Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, IV, 348. That by 23 July/2 August 1648, Newcastle had reached Rotterdam we know from the fact that, having travelled with his brother, Sir Charles, the latter was writing from there at that date. *Pell-Cavendish*, 509.

⁸³ This is quoted by Berwick in a note to the letter from Radcliffe to Bramhall, 20 March 1644, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxvii. Perhaps as a testament to Newcastle's endeavour to rescue the captured king, he was first on the list of those to be excepted from pardon in the negotiations between king and parliament in 1648. Newcastle was first on the list of the seven who were to be executed if seized. They referred to him as 'the first fire-brand in the North'. Paul H. Hardacre, *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff,

This letter suggests that Bramhall was not very far from Rotterdam, otherwise Newcastle would not have requested Bramhall to dine with him the next day. However cordial their relations may have been in the late 1640s, though, in their counsel of Charles II they must have disagreed. Nevertheless, it should be borne in mind that neither Newcastle nor Bramhall was an intimate advisor of the prince in the autumn of 1648. According to his recent biographer, Charles's closest counsellors at this time were Rupert, Culpepper, Hyde, Cottington, Hopton, Willoughby and Brentford. Also in frequent attendance at his court were Lords Percy, Gerard, Wentworth, Wilmot and Widdrington. The presence of the second duke of Buckingham was just as constant and Robert Long served as secretary to the council.⁸⁴ But whenever Newcastle did, in the late 1640s, have the opportunity to advise, he seems to have recommended making a deal with the covenanters, whatever their terms. The nobleman was urging this policy while he and the prince were at St Germain in 1648.⁸⁵ Newcastle argued that Charles could make whatever concessions those presbyterians wanted, and then later disregard them – as promises obtained under duress. That would certainly have been consistent with the spirit of the *politique* governor of the prince of Wales.⁸⁶ In Breda in the spring of 1650, while the king was negotiating with the Scottish commissioners, Newcastle travelled there from Antwerp. Sometime that spring Newcastle was sworn of the privy council; he had also been made a knight of the garter.⁸⁷ The Duke of Buckingham, Lord Percy and Robert Long all seem to have pressed the king to make the necessary concessions to satisfy the Scottish commissioners. Newcastle joined them in urging the wisdom of making a deal. The rival royalist advisors Hopton, Nicholas, Hyde and Cottington all strongly opposed such a course.⁸⁸ Hopton and Nicholas were subsequently excluded from Charles's cabinet at Breda for opposing compromise with the Scots. On learning of this turn of events, and, in particular, of Newcastle's participation in counsels, Hyde in Madrid wrote sardonically to Nicholas: 'You have a

1956), 37; the six others were Digby, Langdale, Grenville, Byron, Doddington and Jenkins. According to Trease, on 14 March 1649 Newcastle was sentenced to death *in absentia*. *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 166.

⁸⁴ Hutton, *Charles II*, 469, n.79. ⁸⁵ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 166.

⁸⁶ See chapter 2 for Newcastle's *politique* (or Machiavellian) advice to the young prince.

⁸⁷ Nicholas informed Ormonde in a letter of 3 April 1650: 'The King hath lately sworn of his Privy Council here [Breda], the Dukes of Buckingham and Hamilton and the Marquis of Newcastle.' *Carte*, I, 376. At a meeting of the privy council on 6 April 1650, it was decided to expel Nicholas, as well as Hopton, for counselling rejection of the terms presented by the commissioners. Smith, *Cavaliers in Exile*, 29.

⁸⁸ Though Hyde and Cottington opposed this policy, they were at the time in Madrid, so they could not resist in person. Nicholas, as Warner pointed out in his introduction to the secretary's papers, 'was the leading opponent of the Scotch expedition and of the King's previous concessions to the Commissioners of the Estates and Kirk'. *Nicholas Papers*, I, vii.

very precious junto to determine concerning three kingdoms; you will find the Marquis of Newcastle a very lamentable man, and as fit to be a general as a bishop.⁸⁹ Nicholas replied in the same vein, exclaiming: ‘God help us, when Mr Long, Newcastle and Buckingham rule in Council!’⁹⁰ Was Bramhall also displeased to hear that his old royalist colleague Newcastle had the king’s ear?

As his wife later recalled, Newcastle favoured substantial concessions to the Scots in negotiations at Breda because he ‘could perceive no other and better way at that present for his Majesty, but to make an agreement with his subjects of Scotland, upon any condition, and to go into Scotland in person himself, that he might but be sure of an army, there being no probability or appearance then of getting an army anywhere else’.⁹¹ As Margaret Cavendish also noted, Charles’s brother-in-law, William II, prince of Orange, concurred with Newcastle that a deal with the Scots was the only viable option in the desperate circumstances.⁹² By this time it had become clear that Charles could expect no significant support from the continent: ‘A major diplomatic effort by Charles during 1649 and 1650, with missions dispatched to a range of European countries from Portugal to Russia, had brought only modest results: some money, many expressions of goodwill but not military alliances.’⁹³ And, again, as his wife suggested, Newcastle (along with Buckingham) felt that anything Charles signed before taking a coronation oath could not bind him. Once Charles had finally put himself firmly in the saddle and began to sway a long enough sword, who would be able to enforce the covenanting?⁹⁴ In other words, while at Breda Charles could agree to anything, and then later, after he had been crowned, he could, with a king’s good conscience, ignore whatever pre-coronation promises he had made. Newcastle himself proved very eager to accompany the king to Scotland, but the Scots would have none of it.⁹⁵ His reputation for atheism (or associating with Roman Catholics) might have had something to do with that.⁹⁶ Probably more important was the fact that he had personally tried to thwart them in the north in 1644.

⁸⁹ CCSP, III, 20. One might infer from this remark about Newcastle’s unfitness to be a bishop Hyde’s perception that Newcastle’s religion was skin-deep. As we saw in chapter 2, Newcastle’s written advice to the prince would permit such a view.

⁹⁰ Quoted in Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 167. ⁹¹ *Life of Cavendish*, 53.

⁹² Pieter Geyl, *Orange and Stuart, 1641–1672*, trans. Arnold Pomerans (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1969), 54. For William II’s support of a Scottish rather than Irish scheme for the Stuarts in 1648–9, see Simon Groenveld, ‘The House of Orange and the House of Stuart, 1639–1650: A Revision’, *HJ* 34, 4 (1991): 967–8.

⁹³ Smith, *Cavaliers in Exile*, 28. ⁹⁴ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 167.

⁹⁵ Early in 1650, before the negotiations at Breda in the spring, Newcastle had been commissioned to set up a bridgehead for an invasion of England from Scotland. This, however, was never executed. Hutton, *Charles II*, 44.

⁹⁶ See chapter 2 for this reputation.

Bramhall, having recently returned from Ireland, was also at Breda in the spring of 1650. The bishop cannot have liked the drift towards covenanting by Charles; but he might have recognised the necessity of the evil in light of the lack of alternatives. The failure of himself and Ormonde in Ireland had eliminated the western-kingdom restoration operation. Bramhall may have heartily disapproved of the policy advised by Newcastle; on the other hand, perhaps he did not find it easy to reprove those who were pressing the young king to pick up the only restoration project that remained on the table in the spring of 1650. Nevertheless, in the face of this new royalist development, émigré anglican clergy with pasts like Bramhall's had to have been deeply worried. This might well be just the first step towards a complete divorce of Charles from Laudian, episcopalian anglicanism – or, now, Bramhallian anglicanism. In other words, it might lead to the establishment of a Stuart regime in the British Isles divested of its antebellum ecclesiastical character.⁹⁷ If that came to pass, Bramhall could, crudely speaking, be out of a job. Nevertheless, Bramhall found a way of countering this development when Charles was on the point of leaving for Scotland. On 25 May 1650, just a day before the king's departure, and against the vehement protests of the Scottish commissioners, Charles knelt at the altar in his chapel for the bishop of Derry to administer the sacrament and pronounce a blessing upon him.⁹⁸ Afterwards Bramhall might well have prayed earnestly that God would grant Charles the same episcopalian anglican obduracy as his father.⁹⁹ The king having left to test his fortune with the Scots, both Bramhall and Newcastle spent the next few years in the southern Netherlands, mainly in Antwerp and Brussels.

After Newcastle was denied the opportunity to accompany Charles to Scotland, he was instead sent as an ambassador 'extraordinary' to obtain support from the king of Denmark.¹⁰⁰ He then returned to Antwerp where he rented Rubens's old house from the artist's widow, and managed to live the rest of exile in some comfort and style. As we shall see, Newcastle never seems to have recovered his position within the innermost circle of Charles II. In view of the fact that Newcastle and Bramhall must have differed in their royalist policy positions in 1649–50, it is curious that in 1651 in Antwerp they seem to have been in fairly regular contact. A letter from that year survives to suggest cordial relations. Newcastle jested with his correspondent:

⁹⁷ Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 68.

⁹⁸ This was related by one of these commissioners, John Livingstone. *A Brief Historical Relation of the Life of Mr John Livingstone*, ed. Thomas Houston (London: J. Johnstone, 1848), 124–5.

⁹⁹ For evidence of Charles II's allegiance to a Laudian church of England during and despite his Scottish venture of 1650–1, see Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 68.

¹⁰⁰ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 167.

to pass the time away withal, my Lord Bishop of Derry, my Lady O'Neill and myself gravely sat in council, as wise and provident parents to provide the best we could for our children, agreed upon a match between my son Harry and her daughter, and gravely articulated, bought eighteen pennyworth of ribbon for the wooing, the old Lady a lean chicken in a pipkin for the dinner, with three preserved cherries, and 5 drops of syrup by them for the banquet.¹⁰¹

If Bramhall had been disappointed that Newcastle had joined Buckingham and the others in urging the acceptance of the terms of the Scottish commissioners in Breda in the spring of 1650, this did not, apparently, prevent his keeping up cordial relations with the marquess afterwards. Of course, a deal with those Scots need not have alienated Newcastle and Bramhall, as the former could assure the latter that he calculated that the king could not be bound to honour what was extorted from him – and expected him to renege. Throughout their exile, Newcastle and Bramhall were bound together by the fact that they were both permanent *personae non gratae* in the British Isles ruled by the Interregnum governments. From the Act of Oblivion, 24 February 1652, both were to be excepted. But while Newcastle faded from the royalist centre stage after 1651, Bramhall was to remain at least on the periphery surrounding Charles's innermost circle.¹⁰² In the Marquess of Ormonde, Bramhall had a friend at the very core. At the end of 1651, it was Ormonde who would inform Hobbes that the philosopher and mathematics tutor was no longer welcome at Charles's court in Paris. Bramhall was to have something to do with the philosopher's, the 'third Cato's, disgrace.

¹⁰¹ Newcastle to unknown recipient, dated Antwerp, 8 February 1650 [1651], quoted by Firth, *Life of Cavendish*, 205. Throughout the 1650s, Newcastle seems to have maintained good relations with Ormonde too. Margaret Cavendish later reminisced that while Newcastle was in Antwerp in the 1650s, 'the then Marquis, now Duke of Ormond . . . often used to honour my Lord with his company'. *Life of Cavendish*, 62. See also Ormonde to Bramhall, 4 February 1652, *HMC Ormonde(b)*, 1, for reference to Newcastle.

¹⁰² Although he faded from the scene, occasionally Newcastle was engaged in royalist affairs. This is at least suggested by a report of James Allin to Major General Skippon, 3 December 1655, N.S., *Thurloe State Papers*, iv, 233–4. But in the next year an observer, Sir M. Vernatti, noted that Newcastle 'seldom comes near' Charles II. Brussels, 9 August 1656, N.S. *Thurloe State Papers*, v, 257.

Hobbes and Leviathan among the exiles, 1646–1651

Thomas Hobbes and the Marquess of Newcastle both lived in Paris in the years 1646–8. They travelled some during this period, but not nearly as much as Bishop Bramhall. Among other things, the philosopher seems to have been working intermittently, and painfully slowly, on what would be published in 1655 as *De Corpore*.¹ Early in 1646 Hobbes was busy preparing the second edition (first publication) of *De Cive*. His French friend in Amsterdam, Samuel Sorbière, supervised the publication by the Dutch firm Elzevir.² Hobbes was planning to spend the summer of 1646 in Mountauban, in southern France, where he would stay with his young friend, Thomas de Martel, and where he hoped to work uninterruptedly on *De Corpore*.³ Meanwhile, having just left Jersey, Prince Charles arrived in Paris in July 1646, to spend the next few years alongside his mother, Henrietta Maria, at St Germain. For Hobbes, Languedoc and *De Corpore* would have to wait, for shortly after the arrival of Newcastle's former royal pupil, Hobbes was appointed to teach mathematics to the future King Charles II. The arrangement was for Hobbes to teach the sixteen-year-old boy mathematics for one hour and Dr John Earle, the anglican divine, to instruct him in religion and other subjects for another hour.⁴ Earle was a good friend of Hyde from Great Tew days, both had been with the prince in Jersey, and the two corresponded while Hyde remained at Jersey and Earle moved on to Paris to be with the

¹ Hobbes to Sorbière, 22 May/1 June 1646, *Corr.*, I, 151.

² See Hobbes–Sorbière letters of 1646 in *Corr.*, I, and *De Cive: The Latin Version*, ed. Howard Warrender (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), Appendix B. Elzevir published three editions of *DC* in Amsterdam in 1647. Macdonald and Hargreaves, *Hobbes Bibliography*, 17–18.

³ Hobbes to Sorbière, 6/16 May 1646, *Corr.*, I, 126.

⁴ Hyde to Sir Edward Nicholas, 1 January 1647 (N.S.), MS Clarendon 29, fo. 40r–40v; quoted by Dzelzainis, 'Edward Hyde and Thomas Hobbes's *Elements of Law*', 304. Since Earle had been a member of Great Tew, it is possible that Hobbes knew him before the wars. Earle may well have been a friend, and was certainly an acquaintance, of Bramhall, throughout their exile. See Hyde to Bramhall, 1 January 1659, *HMC Hastings*, IV, 98. In 1641 he had replaced Brian Duppa as the prince's tutor and chaplain, and in the 1650s, Earle, later bishop of Salisbury, was to continue as Charles's chaplain. That position alone would have brought him into some contact with Bramhall.

prince. When Hyde learned that Hobbes had published the Elzevir edition of *De Cive*, he wrote to Earle for the latter to procure him a copy. Earle was evidently able to send Hyde the book without any delay.⁵

It is reasonable to presume that Newcastle had something to do with Hobbes's appointment as tutor. Newcastle had not only been governor of the prince before the wars, but he seems also to have remained on good terms with the prince's mother in the mid-1640s, after Marston Moor. One modern commentator asserted that Newcastle had everything to do with this appointment.⁶ Unfortunately, he did not adduce any proof; and we cannot disregard a letter of Newcastle's brother that suggests that Newcastle did not have anything to do with the appointment. Sir Charles Cavendish wrote to his friend, the mathematician John Pell: 'Mr Hobbes's journey to Mountauban was stayed, being employed to read mathematics to our prince; my Lord Jermyn did (I believe) do him that favour and honour; for his friends here I am confident had no hand in it.'⁷ Still, as Lisa Sarasohn has recently noted, Jermyn, a favourite of Henrietta Maria, was connected to Newcastle through William Davenant, the poet who had served as Newcastle's lieutenant-general of ordnance during the First English Civil War and the man who was now Jermyn's secretary.⁸ One might, therefore, speculate that Newcastle had an indirect influence. In other words, the marquess's promotion of Hobbes might have been achieved *via* Jermyn. But again, according to Sir Charles, none of the Cavendishes had any 'hand in it'. It is still possible (if unlikely) that though he was 'confident', Sir Charles was not well-informed, and that his brother had urged Jermyn to persuade the queen to choose Hobbes. As for Hobbes himself, he later remembered:

By this time [1646] there were . . . many who . . . joined the Prince of Wales . . . in Paris. He [Hobbes] was by then planning to stay on the estates of certain friends of his of the Languedoc nobility, and had already made arrangements to move, taking with him such things as were necessary for his work. However, on being recommended to the Prince of Wales as a teacher of mathematics, he decided to remain in Paris.⁹

Hobbes offers no more information. Notwithstanding the letter of his younger brother, it is still tempting to suspect that Newcastle, *via* Jermyn, orchestrated Hobbes's appointment, in the hopes, perhaps, that his pet

⁵ Clarendon, *Brief View*, 3–4.

⁶ 'It was during Newcastle's Parisian exile that he brought Hobbes and Charles together. The earl, still an unofficial supervisor of the prince's education, secured Hobbes's appointment as a tutor for Charles.' Thomas Slaughter, Introduction, *Advice to Charles II*, xxvi–xxvii.

⁷ Sir Charles Cavendish to John Pell, 27 November/7 December 1646, *Pell-Cavendish*, 495. This letter is Sommerville's grounds for guessing that Jermyn procured the place. *Hobbes in Historical Context*, 21; 'Lofty Science and Local Politics' in *Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. Tom Sorell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 260.

⁸ Sarasohn, 'Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle', 731.

⁹ Prose Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 247–8.

philosopher would subtly and discreetly teach the prince the ‘atheistical’ wisdom as expressed in the *politique* maxims that Newcastle himself had imparted to the prince several years before. Upon learning of Hobbes’s appointment, Robert Baillie – the same Scots covenanter who was to reply so angrily to Bramhall’s *Fair Warning* – wrote that ‘the placing of Hobbes (a professed atheist, as they speak) about the prince as his teacher, is ill taken’; ‘let [Hobbes] and such wicked men be put from about him’.¹⁰ Presumably Baillie thought of Newcastle and Hobbes as fellow ‘atheists’; and he might have assumed that Newcastle, or another royalist of that ilk, had been responsible for the appointment.

The news of Hobbes’s appointment excited his friend (and Amsterdam literary factor) Sorbière to write: ‘How worthy of you is that duty which has been laid upon you! How fortunate your country will be when it receives a King full of wisdom and imbued with your teachings!’¹¹ Hobbes’s reply, written 4 October 1646, was intended to sober his friend:

I acknowledge your goodwill in congratulating me on my present employment; but beware of thinking it more important than it is. For I am only teaching mathematics, not politics. I would not be able to teach him the political doctrines contained in the book which is being printed, both because he is too young, and because my doing so will always be forbidden by those whose counsels, justly, govern him.¹²

This is insufficient to prove that Hobbes taught only mathematics; but we could simply take Hobbes’s word for it. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that Hobbes may have wanted people (including friends) to believe that he was only teaching mathematics, while he fed the prince bits of political wisdom approved by Newcastle, or by whoever had had most to do with his appointment. At least one later writer suggested that Hobbes’s tutoring went beyond numbers, figures and equations.¹³ That Hobbes was deeply

¹⁰ Baillie to Alexander Henderson, 13 August 1646, and the same to William Murray, 8 September 1646, *Letters and Journals*, II, 388, 395. That Baillie used the word ‘atheism’ rather loosely, however, may be observed, for example, in the last two pages of his *Review of Fair Warning*, where he charged Bramhall of all people with holding principles smacking of it.

¹¹ *Corr.*, I, 137. No date appears on this letter, but there is no reason to question Malcolm’s approximation of September 1646.

¹² *Corr.*, I, 140–1. This was written from St Germain. Charles was sixteen-years-old: was he too young? Hobbes’s point is not convincing.

¹³ Gilbert Burnet was to claim that the Duke of Buckingham, with the cooperation of Lord Percy, got Hobbes the post of mathematics tutor in order to teach the prince some things quite beyond the purview of that subject: ‘He [Buckingham] found the king [prince of Wales at the time], when he came from his travels in the year forty-five, newly come to Paris, sent over by his father when his affairs declined: and finding the king enough inclined to receive ill impressions, he, who was then got into all the impieties and vices of the age, set himself to corrupt the king, in which he was too successful, being seconded in that wicked design by the lord Percy. And to complete the matter Hobbes was brought to him, under the pretence of instructing him in mathematics: and he laid before him his schemes, both

concerned about what people thought about the nature of his tuition of the prince is further demonstrated by what he wrote to Sorbière while *De Cive* was being printed in Amsterdam. On discovering that copies of the book would bear a portrait of the author, accompanied by a Latin caption meaning ‘academic tutor of the Prince of Wales’, Hobbes was alarmed enough to write a frantic letter. In fact, there is not in the entire Hobbes correspondence a letter of such urgency:

I have received from Mersenne your letter of 4 March from Leiden, enclosing the first sheet, which contains my portrait. I am sure you put this in at the beginning of my book with the best of intentions towards me. Nevertheless, the matter is such that, given the times we are in, I would willingly have paid a great deal for it not to have been put in, or at least for that inscription beneath it, ‘Academic Tutor to His Serene Highness the Prince of Wales’, to have been removed, erased, or cut out. For, in the first place, and most importantly, those who are at present in power in England are assiduously searching for and seizing upon any pretexts on which to stir up popular feeling against the royal family. So when they see his name set before a political theory which offends the opinions of almost everyone, his enemies will attack him in a haughty and hateful way, claiming that he is now revealing what sort of sovereignty he expects, and intends to demand. Then whatever ill consequences follow from that (or will be said to be capable of following from it, by those people at the Prince’s Court who are ready to aggravate my every fault with their own interpretations and glosses), they will all be blamed on my carelessness and vanity, to my great dishonour.

Secondly, this title will prevent me from returning to my own country, if the desire to return ever comes over me – and I do not see why I should not wish to return, if it is permitted, when England has somehow or other been pacified. After all, I am not the Prince of Wales’s tutor, nor any sort of servant of his – which is a third reason why I do not want that title to be inscribed there – but just like one of those teachers who are hired on a monthly basis. So my enemies will be able to say that I lied out of ambition; and they are not few.¹⁴

As Sarasohn has observed of this passage: ‘It seems strange that Hobbes, at a time when the Stuart hopes for regaining the throne of England from its Parliamentary foes were still alive, would not welcome a tie to a most noble prince – particularly if Hobbes’s philosophy needed protection from his many foes.’¹⁵ In any case, to posterity Hobbes must appear Janus-faced, protean as ever. On the one hand, he shows himself concerned for the prince

with relation to religion and politics, which made deep and lasting impressions on the king’s mind. So that the main blame of the king’s ill principles and bad morals was owing to the duke of Buckingham.’ *History of His Own Time*, ed. Martin Joseph Routh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833; 2 vols.; first pub. 1723/1734), 1, 184. Unfortunately, there is nothing to confirm the veracity of Burnet, a second-hand source.

¹⁴ 12/22 March 1647, *Corr.*, 1, 157–8. The portrait was in fact removed from the third 1647 edition of *DC* by Elzevir. Hargreaves and Macdonald, *Hobbes Bibliography*, 18. Where Hobbes states in this letter that he is not the prince’s tutor, he might have clarified that Earle was the one who deserved to be styled thus.

¹⁵ ‘Was *Leviathan* a Patronage Artifact?’, 606.

and his family; on the other, he reveals concern about his own reputation in the eyes of that family's enemies back home. He certainly seems worried about the welfare of the Stuarts, or the prince, his pupil, as they may suffer by being closely associated with an 'atheist' and 'absolutist'. Yet he seems equally worried about his own welfare, as he may suffer by association with a 'popish' and discredited (and, now, foreign) dynasty. This need not be considered self-contradiction; it seems to me much more like a hedging action. Hobbes may wish the Stuarts well, but he still prefers to maintain a reputation for independence and non-partisanship: he is not disposed to stand up and be counted or burn any bridges. But neither does he desire to hurt the Stuarts by allowing them to be associated with him. At all events, here we can note the same political chameleonism that was observed in the case of the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*. Once again we see that if Hobbes was indeed a royalist, then he was a royalist thoroughly *sui generis*.

The letter to Sorbière is also important for its indication that as early as March 1647 Hobbes had – or had reason to think he had – devoted enemies amongst those who attended Prince Charles at St Germain. To his French friend he had described a group of people at the court 'who are ready to aggravate my every fault'. Since Bramhall seems to have been in Brussels and the southern Netherlands more than at Paris between 1646 and 1648, perhaps Hobbes did not count the bishop among them. But it is still quite possible that he did. And even if Bramhall was not among those to whom Hobbes was referring, certainly some of the bishop's allies at the court-in-exile would have been. Perhaps Sir Richard Browne, Bramhall's friend and correspondent, and the anglican divines on the spot, Cosin and Earle, the latter Hobbes's tutorial colleague, were among those lobbying against the philosopher. As we saw in chapter 4, in the 'Vindication', written sometime after April 1646, Bramhall had noted that one of his friends reminded him to answer Hobbes's 'Treatise'.¹⁶ Perhaps one of these friends – who had urged Bramhall to write because Hobbes was circulating his refutation ('Treatise') in Paris – was among those ready to 'aggravate' Hobbes's every 'fault'. Hobbes spent most of 1647 in Paris and nearby St Germain. The Elzevir edition of *De Cive* did not lead to his dismissal from the post of mathematics tutor. But in August 1647 Hobbes was struck with something worse: a life-threatening illness. To Sorbière in November he wrote:

In about mid-August I fell ill with a very severe and continuous fever, which not only weakened my body but also injured my mind. So much so that I could not recognize some friends who came to visit me when they stood at my bedside. That fever kept

¹⁶ 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 23–4.

me in bed for six weeks; then as it subsided it broke into abscesses which kept me in bed for another four weeks; then when the abscesses had been cured they were replaced by a swelling of the hip-joints which was immensely painful.¹⁷

Letters from May and June 1648 show that after this sickness Hobbes was at St Germain and that he was still not out of favour with the Stuarts. As we saw, the prince went to Holland in June 1648 to embark upon the unsuccessful naval operation off the southeast coast of England during the Second English Civil War. At his pupil's departure, Hobbes wrote to Mersenne from St Germain: 'When the Prince returns to Saint-Germain, if he stays here for any length of time (for I do not know whether he will go back soon to England) I shall see if I can try out his glass, if possible, with you in your house. But I suspect it will be very difficult to arrange, unless I bring with me the person who is its keeper.'¹⁸ The mention of the perspective glass (telescope) suggests that the prince had become interested in optics. If so, who better to teach him than Hobbes? By the end of 1645 the latter was drafting 'A Minute or First Draught of the Optiques', dedicated to Newcastle in 1646.¹⁹ It seems likely that Hobbes had been teaching the prince that subject as well as mathematics. Of course, optics involved a great deal of mathematics, so it is true that this need not be regarded as very important. This letter also suggests that however many and fierce the émigré royalist enemies Hobbes had by 1648 – and whether Bramhall was among them – the philosopher-tutor was still on good terms with the prince himself.

While we can only assume that Hobbes was in regular contact with Newcastle in the years 1646–8, we know for certain that Hobbes was corresponding with the third earl of Devonshire during this time. Hobbes's letter to him in 1648 suggests as much. It is likely that Hobbes was still receiving some money from him, for Hobbes was helping to obtain a French tutor for the earl's son. In fact, Hobbes even expressed a wish that he himself might serve as tutor, if only circumstances would allow.²⁰ Devonshire had

¹⁷ Hobbes to Sorbière, 17/27 November 1647, *Corr.*, I, 164. Rogow guessed it was septicaemia or typhoid fever. *Thomas Hobbes*, 136.

¹⁸ *Corr.*, I, 175. As noted earlier, before Newcastle was to leave Paris in July 1648, to follow Prince Charles and Rupert, he sold his entire collection of telescopes to Hobbes. *Pell-Cavendish*, 503, n.8. For Hobbes's considerable activity and achievement in the field of optics, see Conclusion, 298, n. 85.

¹⁹ See postscript to Sir Charles Cavendish to John Pell, 1/11 November 1645, *Pell-Cavendish*, 434; Hobbes to Sorbière, 1 June 1646, *Corr.*, I; and Raylor, 'Thomas Hobbes and "The Mathematical Demonstration of the Sword"', 182. This treatise survives as BL Harl. 3360, and for the dedication to Newcastle, see *EW*, VII, 467–71. Just two years earlier Hobbes had written the essay on optics, *Tractatus Opticus* (*OL*, v, 215–48) for Mersenne's volume *Cogitata Physico-Mathematica* (Paris, 1644).

²⁰ But perhaps expressing such a wish was merely etiquette.

returned to England in 1645 to compound for his properties. In a previous letter, Devonshire must have suggested that Hobbes return home, for in this letter Hobbes writes:

If I understand your letter, you ask me what inclinations I have to the place you are now in. I have no inclinations to the place where there is so little security, but I have such inclinations to your Lordship as I will come to any place (if I may have a pass) where your Lordship shall be. I am now tied to Mr Ridgely but t'is thought the occasions there, will cause his remove hence thither, or to some other place. Which if it fall out, I shall desire nothing so much as to be where you are, and to serve you in that employment you seek another for. When I consider how dangerous a time there is like to be for peaceable men, I am apter to wish you on this side, than myself on that side of the sea. As soon as I hear of Mr Ridgely's resolutions I will not fail to advertise you.²¹

Obviously, then, Hobbes had some inclination to return home, but was understandably worried about the peril of doing so. England was far from settled in 1648. There is further indication of Hobbes's wish to return to England in a letter from September 1649: 'I am in fairly good health for my age, and I am certainly looking after myself, preserving myself for my return to England, should it happen by any chance.'²² In the next few years, Hobbes spent most of his time in Paris. Since the prince had left by July 1648, Hobbes now had much more time to devote to various writing projects. He seems to have returned to his concentration upon the first part of his tripartite philosophical system in Latin. In August 1648, Sir Charles Cavendish was writing to John Pell to inform him that Hobbes had resumed work on the writing that he would later publish as *De Corpore*.²³ Meanwhile, back in England some of Hobbes's other writings would be published in 1650. An unauthorised publication of the first thirteen chapters of the *Elements of Law* appeared as *Human Nature; or the Fundamental Elements of Policy*.²⁴ The other chapters of the *Elements of Law*, the political ones, were also published without Hobbes's consent, under the title *De Corpore Politico; or*

²¹ Hobbes to Devonshire, 2/12 May 1648, St Germain, *Corr.*, 1, 170. Hobbes's last letter from St Germain was dated 9 June 1648. Letters after that one were marked Paris.

²² Hobbes to Gassendi, 12/22 September 1649, *Corr.*, 1, 179.

²³ *Corr.*, 1, 151. In 1649 Sir Charles Cavendish was to settle in Antwerp with his brother, Newcastle. By 14/24 October 1648, he was writing from Antwerp that 'we are now in Antwerp; and likely to remain here till it shall please God to reduce the affairs of England to such a condition of peace or war as may become honest men to return home'. Cavendish to Pell, 14/24 October 1648, *Pell-Cavendish*, 515. In November 1651 Charles was to return to England with his sister-in-law, Margaret Cavendish.

²⁴ Jeffrey Collins, 'Christian Ecclesiology and the Composition of *Leviathan*: A Newly Discovered Letter to Thomas Hobbes', *HJ* 43, 1 (2000): 220. Macdonald and Hargreaves, *Hobbes Bibliography*, 9.

The Elements of Law.²⁵ In the first few months of 1651, there also appeared in London an unauthorised English translation of *De Cive*.²⁶

The labour upon *De Corpore* was soon displaced by the writing of *Leviathan*. Exactly when Hobbes began the composition of his masterpiece remains uncertain, but it was probably sometime in 1649.²⁷ By May 1650, Hobbes had completed most of the chapters, that is, thirty-six of the eventual forty-seven.²⁸ By the beginning of 1651, *Leviathan* was ready to be printed, for on 30 January 1651 the book was registered by the Stationer's Company in London.²⁹ Thus, the composition of *Leviathan* took up the years 1649–50. In the late 1660s, Hobbes recalled the English context of the writing of the book. At this time in England, Hobbes reflected, there had been no 'human laws left in force to restrain any man from preaching and writing any doctrine concerning religion that he pleased'. In this unsettled situation, the 'peace of the state' could not be disturbed because there was none: 'And in this time it was, that a book called *Leviathan* was written in defence of the King's power, temporal and spiritual, without any word against episcopacy, or against any bishop, or against the public doctrine of the church.'³⁰ Thus, we have Hobbes's claim that *Leviathan* had been written for the Stuart cause, for monarchical government and, by implication, in support of an episcopalian church. In the prose autobiography, written about the same time as the foregoing, Hobbes offered some more details:

It was seen through the press in England, in 1651, while he remained in Paris. In that work he described the right of kings in both spiritual and temporal terms, using both reason and the authority of sacred scripture. This was done so that it might be made

²⁵ Collins, 'Christian Ecclesiology and the Composition of *Leviathan*', 220. Macdonald and Hargreaves, *Hobbes Bibliography*, 9.

²⁶ Noel Malcolm has convincingly argued that the translator was Charles Cotton. 'Charles Cotton, Translator of Hobbes's *De Cive*'. The French translation of *DC* by Sorbière (*Elements philosophiques du citoyen*) was published in Amsterdam in 1649. In a letter of Charles Cavendish to John Pell there is indication that Newcastle possibly read this French translation: 'I give you also many thanks for Mr Hobbes's book which my brother now hath, and reads, and seems to like it as well, as formerly he desired it much; though at Breda he seemed not so earnest of it.' 10 June 1650, *Pell-Cavendish*, 559.

²⁷ According to Quentin Skinner, Hobbes began writing it in July 1646. *Reason and Rhetoric*, 331. Since he does not cite a source one can only presume that he has extrapolated this from some lines of Hobbes's verse autobiography, in which one can certainly infer that Hobbes had been working on it since 1646. Jeffrey Collins has argued persuasively that Hobbes only began its composition sometime in 1649, after the execution of Charles I. *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 117–18.

²⁸ Robert Payne to Gilbert Sheldon, 13 May 1650, BL Harl. MS 6942, no. 128.

²⁹ See Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 17.

³⁰ 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall, and An Historical Narration concerning Heresy, and the Punishment thereof', *EW*, iv, 406–8. This book, composed in the late 1660s, but only published after Hobbes's death, is discussed in chapter 9.

clear to all that it was impossible to establish peace in the Christian world unless that doctrine was accepted, and unless a military force of considerable magnitude could compel cities and states to maintain that concord. He hoped that this work might convince his countrymen, especially those who had rejected episcopacy, of its truth. He also wished at the same time to deal with theological matters in the text, because the administrative structures and powers of the Church were in abeyance, and of no importance. (This was the power to declare that certain doctrines were heretical. It subverted the power of the King, for when it was exercised, the King's own power was lessened proportionally.) However, he took great care not to write in any way against the sense of sacred scripture, or against the doctrines of the Church in England, as established by royal authority prior to the outbreak of the war. Then as now, he had always preferred ecclesiastical government by bishops to all other forms of administration as he made clear on two separate occasions.³¹

By both of these accounts, *Leviathan* was not only a solid pro-Stuart text but also a pro-episcopal one. But does the book bear Hobbes out? Can we find and could contemporaries have found explicit support for Charles II and the episcopal church of England 'as by law established' before the outbreak of the civil wars – support for that church's various distinctive claims, doctrines and ecclesiology, specifically, episcopacy?

In the dedication of the published edition of *Leviathan* that appeared in London shops in the spring of 1651, Hobbes addressed Francis Godolphin, the younger brother of Sidney Godolphin, a friend of the philosopher who had been slain early in the First English Civil War. It is probable that Hobbes and Sidney Godolphin met at Great Tew in the 1630s.³² Francis Godolphin had served as royalist governor of the Scilly Islands during the wars, until he was forced to cede control of them in 1646.³³ Edward Hyde, an acquaintance of both Godolphin and Hobbes, claimed that the latter never knew the former personally, but that by dedicating *Leviathan* to him he was hoping to obtain the £200 bequest that Sidney had made before his death in 1643.³⁴ Hyde himself was not only the one who informed Hobbes of this bequest in January 1647, but also the one who gave him some advice about how he might secure it: 'This information,' he claimed, 'was the ground of the dedication of this

³¹ Prose Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 248. In chapter 2, I pointed out that Hobbes's assertion of the sacerdotality of the sovereign in the *Elements of Law* appears impossible to reconcile with the thirty-seventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles. This sacerdotality was once again asserted – indeed, stressed – in *Lev.*, making it difficult to understand how Hobbes could have thought (or claimed) that he did not 'in any way' write against 'the doctrines of the Church in England, as established by royal authority prior to the outbreak of the war'.

³² Hyde implied that he was the one who introduced them. *A Brief View and Survey of the Dangerous and Pernicious Errors to Church and State, in Mr Hobbes's Book Entitled Leviathan* (Oxford, 1676), 3. Wing C 4420.

³³ *Lev.*, I, n.1.

³⁴ According to *DNB*, Sidney Godolphin's will, dated 23 June 1642, contained the bequest of £200 to Hobbes.

book to him, whom Mr Hobbes had never seen.³⁵ In this dedication, dated 15/25 April 1651, at Paris, Hobbes himself anticipated some difficulties his readers would encounter: ‘I know not how the world will receive it, nor how it may reflect on those that shall seem to favour it.’ Moreover, later in the dedication he anticipates a hostile reaction, conceding that it may well be ‘generally decried’. After speaking of a ‘way beset with those that contend, on one side for too great liberty, and on the other side for too much authority’, Hobbes considers his task ‘to pass between the points of both unwounded’. Rather than speak of rulers or governments by name, he prefers simply to ‘endeavour to advance the civil power’. But if, as his later accounts suggested, Hobbes was writing expressly for Charles II – not for the Rump, or any of its leaders, or any of the generals of the army – why did he not say so? Why does he speak only generically and noncommittally of a ‘civil power’? Indeed, Hobbes himself emphasises his detachment: ‘I speak not of the men, but (in the abstract) of the seat of power.’³⁶ This abstractness is of a piece with the abstractness of the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*. Hobbes obviously thought that such abstractness was necessary in a *science* of politics – in contradistinction to the mere polemic and propaganda of day-to-day politics. In *Leviathan*, as in his earlier treatises, Hobbes is interested in providing a civil science that, being non-partisan, is applicable to *any* human community or situation. Thus, in chapter xxxi he speaks of his hope that: ‘one time or other, this writing of mine may fall into the hands of a sovereign who will consider it himself (for it is short, and I think clear), without the help of any interested or envious interpreter, and by the exercise of entire sovereignty in protecting the public teaching of it, convert this truth of speculation into the utility of practice’.³⁷

We might suppose that here Hobbes expresses the hope that somehow the young King Charles would receive the wisdom of his book without its being filtered and misrepresented by courtiers and royalist counsellors opposed to the philosopher’s principles. But this will not alter the fact that Hobbes studiously avoids naming any sovereign in this and other passages in *Leviathan*. In the appendix to the book, the ‘Review and Conclusion’, Hobbes speaks equally unspecifically: ‘And thus I have brought to an end my discourse of civil and ecclesiastical government, occasioned by the disorders of the present time, without partiality, without application, and without other design than

³⁵ Clarendon, *Brief View*, 7.

³⁶ Furthermore, in chapter xxx, Hobbes not only speaks very vaguely of ‘those that have the power to make use’ of his teachings, but also expresses indifference as to whether they do or not: ‘whether they come not into the sight of those that have power to make use of them, or be neglected by them or not, concerneth my particular interest, at this day, very little’. *Lev.*, xxx, 221.

³⁷ *Lev.*, xxxi, 243–4.

to set before men's eyes the mutual relation between protection and obedience.³⁸ What might well have bothered most exile royalists, and the young king himself, was precisely this *lack* of 'partiality' and 'application'. Did Hobbes mean that he was not partial to the Stuart monarch? Indeed, in the context of the Engagement controversy of 1650–1, Hobbes's evident impartiality would allow his compatriots to interpret *Leviathan* as just as much for the benefit of the Rump as for the benefit of the Stuarts. The uncertainty of the identity of the figure representing Leviathan, the 'mortal God', in the frontispieces of both the published and fair-copy versions of *Leviathan*, rendered the book all the more noncommittal. The face of this figure has been variously identified as that of Charles II, Oliver Cromwell and Hobbes himself. As Maurice Goldsmith has wondered, if the figure had been intended to represent Charles II, why did not Hobbes point this out when later defending himself against charges of disloyalty?³⁹

In *Leviathan*, as in the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*, Hobbes allows that the absolute and undivided sovereignty of a commonwealth may reside in one, many or all: the form of government may be monarchy, aristocracy or democracy. Hobbes discusses the conveniences and inconveniences of the three respective forms in chapter XIX. There he asserts that monarchy is safest, but admits that this cannot be demonstrated: it is a mere opinion not a scientific principle. But this does not mean that Hobbes considered England an aristocracy or democracy. At least in *Leviathan* it is apparent that he thought of England as a monarchy. In chapter XVIII, he offers an analysis of the civil wars that condemns those who held England to have had an aristocratic or democratic government:

If there had not first been an opinion received of the greatest part of England, that these powers [of sovereignty] were divided between the King, and the Lords, and the House of Commons, the people had never been divided and fallen into this civil war, first between those that disagreed in politics, and after between the dissenters about the liberty of religion, which have so instructed men in this point of sovereign right that there be few now (in England) that do not see that these rights are inseparable, and will be so generally acknowledged at the next return of peace; and so continue, till their miseries are forgotten, and no longer, except the vulgar be better taught than they have hitherto been.⁴⁰

This may certainly be construed as some sort of absolutist and legitimist monarchist position, and indirect support of the Stuarts. For here is

³⁸ *Lev.*, 'Review and Conclusion', 496–7.

³⁹ Goldsmith, 'Hobbes's Ambiguous Politics', 672–3. I believe (following Margery Corbett and Ronald Lightbrown) that the face of this Leviathan figure resembles Hobbes's more than either Charles's or Cromwell's. *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-page in England, 1550–1660* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), 229–30. For the conceit of Hobbes himself as Leviathan, see chapter 8.

⁴⁰ *Lev.*, XVIII, 115–16.

unambiguous criticism of those who held that England had always had an aristocratic (or democratic) form of government in which sovereignty was shared between king, lords and commons. And there is indeed a legitimist passage in *Leviathan*, though it is conspicuously solitary. In chapter XIX, Hobbes confirms the view that Charles I had been, by himself – that is, without parliament – the sovereign. Parliament had infringed upon the sovereignty that was already securely and clearly established in him (and his family) alone:

Therefore, where there is [a sovereign established] *already* . . . And I know not how this, so manifest a truth, should of late be so little observed that in a monarchy, he that had the sovereignty from a descent of 600 years, was alone called sovereign, had the title of Majesty from every one of his subjects, and was unquestionably taken by them for their king, was notwithstanding never considered as their representative, that name without contradiction passing for the title of those men [MPs] which at his command were sent up by the people to carry their petitions, and give him (if he permitted it) their advice. Which may serve as an admonition for those that are the true and absolute representative of a people, to instruct men in the nature of that office, and to take heed how they admit of any other general representation upon any occasion whatsoever, if they mean to discharge the trust committed to them.⁴¹

What spoiled the legitimism and royalism in *Leviathan* was the ‘Review and Conclusion’, the appendix attached to the published edition of 1651. In this short essay there is a glaring omission of any traditional concept of legitimacy or usurpation. Here Hobbes most explicitly argues that obedience is due to the powers-that-be: there is no attempt to determine who is the just or rightful or lawful power – and there is no assertion that Charles II is that power. Furthermore, Hobbes had devoted none of his forty-seven chapters to a discussion of usurpation. Most disturbing from a legitimist royalist perspective must have been a passage from chapter XXI, ‘Of the Liberty of Subjects’:

In case a great many men together have already resisted the sovereign power unjustly, or committed some capital crime for which every one of them expecteth death, whether have they not the liberty then to join together, and assist, and defend one another? Certainly they have; for they but defend their lives, which the guilty man may as well do as the innocent. There was indeed injustice in the first breach of their duty; their bearing of arms subsequent to it, though it be to maintain what they have done, is no new unjust act. And if it be only to defend their person, it is not unjust at all.⁴²

⁴¹ *Lev.*, XIX, 119–20; emphasis added. That some contemporaries could find royalism in *Lev.* is indicated by a comment of William Rand in a letter to Samuel Hartlib. Rand noted that some elements of the book pointed to a man ‘passionately addicted to the royal interest’. Quoted in Jason T. Peacey, ‘Nibbling at *Leviathan*: Politics and Theory in England in the 1650s’, *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61, 2 (1998/2000): 252.

⁴² *Lev.*, XXI, 143. Upon this passage Hyde was later to comment: ‘which unreasonable indulgence of his, cannot but be thought to proceed from an unlawful affection to those who he saw had power enough to defend the transcendent wickedness they had committed, though

Subjects like Pym, Essex, Fairfax and Cromwell might well have justified their dissent from and opposition to, and their subsequent violence towards the king on this ground. Hobbes furnishes a warrant for their self-interest in escaping capital punishment. Sir John Hotham might have cited the *Leviathan* principle of self-preservation when he explained to Lord Digby that he denied Charles entry into Hull in the spring of 1642 only because he had received a message ‘from one very near his majesty, that he [Hotham] should have his throat cut as soon as the King entered the town’.⁴³ This passage from chapter XXI helps us to understand why Bramhall was to feel perfectly justified in nicknaming *Leviathan* the ‘Rebels’ Catechism’. It was evidently with this passage in mind that the bishop later complained: ‘T. H. alloweth rebels and conspirators to make good their unlawful attempts by arms. Was there ever such a trumpeter of rebellion heard of before?’⁴⁴

Many years after the publication of *Leviathan*, Edward Hyde, turned first earl of Clarendon, claimed that Hobbes’s purpose in that book had been anything but royalist.⁴⁵ In *A Brief View and Survey of the Dangerous and Pernicious Errors to Church and State, in Mr. Hobbes’s Book, entitled Leviathan*, he levelled the charge that Hobbes had written and published the book in order to please Cromwell and the Rump. He observed that Cromwell was obliged to Hobbes in 1651 for having ‘defended his usurpation’.⁴⁶ According to Clarendon, Hobbes calculated that this book would allow him to return to England and live in safety:

When I went some years after from Holland with the King (after the murder of his father) to Paris, from whence I went shortly his Majesty’s ambassador into Spain [1650], Mr Hobbes visited me, and told me that Mr Godolphin confessed the legacy, and had paid him one hundred pounds, and promised to pay the other in a short time; for all which he thanked me, and said he owed it to me, for he had never otherwise known of it. When I returned from Spain by Paris [early spring 1651] he frequently came to me, and told me his book (which he would call *Leviathan*) was then printing in England, and that he receiv’d every week a sheet to correct, of which he showed me one or two sheets, and thought it would be finished within little more than a month; and showed me the epistle to Mr Godolphin which he meant to set before it, and read it to me, and concluded, that he knew when I read his book I would not like it, and thereupon mention’d some of his conclusions; upon which I asked him, why he would publish such doctrine: to which, after a discourse between jest and earnest upon the subject, he said, ‘The truth is, I have a mind to go home.’⁴⁷

Supposing Hobbes really said this, there would appear to be no other interpretation possible but that Hobbes thought that *Leviathan*, or at least its

they were without an advocate to make it lawful for them to do so, till he took that office upon him in his *Leviathan*’. *Brief View*, 45.

⁴³ Clarendon, *History of Rebellion*, II, 260 (v.434). ⁴⁴ *Catching*, BW, IV, 555.

⁴⁵ Clarendon’s critique of *Lev.* was completed at Montpelier, in April 1670.

⁴⁶ Clarendon, *Brief View*, 5. ⁴⁷ Clarendon, *Brief View*, 7–8.

‘Review and Conclusion’, would serve to placate the Rump in England. In his review of chapters x–xii, Clarendon claims that Hobbes subtly commended the Machiavellian religious politics of Cromwell at the time of *Leviathan*’s publication: ‘a very seasonable intimation of the wisdom of Oliver’s politics at that time when he published his *Leviathan*’.⁴⁸ In his review of chapters xvii–xviii, Clarendon suggests that by the publication of *Leviathan* Hobbes had a design to ‘induce’ men in England ‘to submit to the Usurper’.⁴⁹ In critiquing chapter xix, Clarendon frequently harps on the same theme, that Hobbes wrote many passages of *Leviathan* in support of Cromwell.⁵⁰ As for chapter xxi, from which we just quoted, Clarendon argues that the disloyalty and rebellion of subjects received ‘countenance and justification’ by the teaching of *Leviathan*. Cromwell, Clarendon claims, found that submission to Hobbes’s principles resulted in a submission to him. Conversely, Hobbes’s teaching extinguished loyalty to Charles II and caused many subjects to submit to the usurper, as a legitimate sovereign.⁵¹ Clarendon claims that the ‘Review and Conclusion’ was ‘a sly address to Cromwell’, who would read it, Hobbes calculated, for its brevity: ‘he made [it] short enough, to hope that Cromwell himself might read it’.⁵² Moreover, Clarendon asserts that Hobbes could not plead his own doctrine of coercion (or necessity) for justification of and submission to Cromwell (or the Rump): ‘being then out of the kingdom, and so being neither conquered nor his subject, he [Hobbes] might by his return submit to his government, and be bound to obey it; which, being un-compelled by any necessity or want, but having as much to sustain him abroad as he had to live upon at home, could not proceed from a sincere heart and uncorrupted’.⁵³ Furthermore, Hobbes would, by publishing his book, have a much wider effect in favour of Cromwell’s regime. In *Leviathan* Cromwell would not only receive ‘the pawn of his new subject’s allegiance, by his declaring his own obligation and obedience, but by publishing such doctrine, as being diligently infused by such a master in the mystery of government, might secure the people of the kingdom (over whom he had no right to command) to acquiesce and submit to his brutal power’.⁵⁴

Clarendon was not the only contemporary to make a public claim that Hobbes had sought in *Leviathan* to please Cromwell – and, thus, provide himself safety, if not favour, in Rump-ruled, Cromwell-dominated, England.

⁴⁸ *Brief View*, 23; see also 53–4. ⁴⁹ *Brief View*, 44–5.

⁵⁰ *Brief View*, 60–1. ⁵¹ *Brief View*, 92–3.

⁵² *Brief View*, 317. He considers the ‘Review and Conclusion’ to be ‘only an abridgment and contracting the most contagious poison that runs through the book, into a less vessel or volume, lest they, who will not take the pains to read the book, or reading it may by inadvertency and incogitancy not be hurt enough by it, may here in less room, and more nakedly, swallow his choicest doctrine at one morsel’. *Brief View*, 317.

⁵³ *Brief View*, 317. ⁵⁴ Clarendon, *Brief View*, 317.

In the early 1660s John Wallis also claimed that ‘upon deserting his royal master in distress’ Hobbes had written *Leviathan* ‘in defense of Oliver’s title, or whoever, by whatsoever means, can get to be upmost; placing the whole right of government merely in strength, and absolving all his Majesty’s subjects from their allegiance, whenever he is not in a present capacity to force obedience’.⁵⁵ Wallis does not offer any first-hand evidence or anecdote, as Clarendon did, to support this claim. Although Hobbes steadfastly denied any attempt to justify or please Oliver Cromwell, he himself provided the warrant for the claim that his book was meant to provide a *rapprochement* between the commonwealth and its adversaries, the royalists. In 1656, Hobbes pointed out that the doctrine contained in *Leviathan* ‘hath framed the minds of a thousand gentlemen to a conscientious obedience to present government, which otherwise would have wavered in that point’.⁵⁶ Hobbes does not here claim that his book induced such obedience precisely in 1651, but, more generally, in the years 1651–6: it ‘hath framed’, not it ‘did frame’.⁵⁷ But after pointing out that his book had induced conscientious obedience to the government in England in the early 1650s, Hobbes insisted that this was no betrayal of the royalist cause. In the early 1660s, again answering charges made by Wallis, Hobbes insisted that he wrote and published ‘far from the intention either of disadvantage to his Majesty, or to flatter Oliver, who was not made Protector till three or four years after, on purpose to make way for his return’.⁵⁸ On the contrary, he

⁵⁵ John Wallis, *Hobbius Heauton-timorumenos* (1662), 5; quoted by Hobbes, *Considerations*, *EW*, iv, 413. John Whitehall, a much younger contemporary (and thus, from second-hand, at best), was to perpetuate the claim of Hyde and Wallis in his *Leviathan Found Out*, published in 1679. In that book Whitehall claimed that with *Lev.* Hobbes was ‘bending his mind to the establishment of a new government, to be then erected, and the advance of himself in it, when our King was murdered and his royal son beaten from his rights’. Quoted in John Bowle, *Hobbes and His Critics: A Study in Seventeenth Century Constitutionalism* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1951), 176. The claim that Cromwell offered Hobbes the position of secretary was made by John Dowel in 1683, in *The Leviathan Heretical*. Philip Milton has judged this latter claim ‘preposterous’. ‘Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington’, 510.

⁵⁶ *Six Lessons*, *EW*, vii, 336. This passage, published by Hobbes in 1656, must have been the passage Hyde had in mind when he wrote: ‘he persuaded many to take the Engagement as a thing lawful, and to become subjects to the Usurper, as to their legitimate sovereign; of which great service he could not abstain from bragging in a pamphlet he set forth in that time, that he alone and his doctrine, had prevail’d with many to submit to the government, who would otherwise have disturb’d the public peace, that is, to renounce their fidelity to their true sovereign, and to be faithful to the Usurper’. Clarendon, *Brief View*, 92–3.

⁵⁷ As Geoffrey Smith has established, most of the cavaliers who went into exile returned to England before the Restoration. *Cavaliers in Exile*, 109.

⁵⁸ *Considerations*, *EW*, iv, 415. In several places in his epistle to the ‘Victory of Truth’ (1651), the Frenchman Milletière spoke of Cromwell as a dictator, and even used the phrase ‘Cromwell’s commonwealth’: e.g., *BW*, i, cxlv. Further, a German envoy about this time overheard a conversation in London of politicians speaking of Cromwell as *de facto* king (*in effectu rex*). See Leo Miller, *John Milton and the Oldenburg Safeguard* (New York:

says, he was content to remain in Paris and had ‘neither encouragement nor desire to return into England’.⁵⁹ It is true, Hobbes concedes, he went home, but only because ‘he would not trust his safety with the French clergy’.⁶⁰ As for *Leviathan*, Hobbes avers that not only did he not aim to please Cromwell, but that he also wished to excoriate him throughout: ‘For there is scarce a page in it that does not upbraid both him, and you [Wallis], and others such as you, with your abominable hypocrisy and villainy.’⁶¹ Hobbes overdoes it with this extravagant claim: if *Leviathan* was so full of castigation of Cromwell, how could Hobbes have hoped for any safety upon his return? In fact, the claim that there is ‘scarce a page’ in *Leviathan* that does not ‘upbraid’ Cromwell is beyond exaggeration; it is blatantly false.

As for his justification of royalist compromise in compounding for estates, Hobbes claimed that by this cooperation with the Rump these royalists were *hurting*, not helping, the non-monarchical regime: ‘They that compounded . . . helped the Parliament less by their composition, than they should have done, if they had stood out, by their confiscation.’ In this way Hobbes could argue that the ‘Review and Conclusion’ was far from anti-royalist and pro-Rump.⁶² By making a composition with that regime, royalists could deprive the regime of some of the land that it would otherwise obtain. Two close acquaintances of Hobbes had done precisely this: Devonshire in 1645 and Sir Charles Cavendish in 1651. In November 1651 Newcastle sent his wife and Sir Charles to salvage whatever they could from the Rump government. There is a good chance that Newcastle himself had been exploring the possibility of compounding as early as the spring of 1649.⁶³ We know that at precisely this time, in May 1649, his younger brother had petitioned the committee for compounding.⁶⁴ Furthermore, when, in late 1650,

Loewenthal, 1985), 49. Thus, it would seem that it was already well known on the continent in 1651 that Cromwell was *primus inter pares*, or the *de facto* ruler of the British Isles. Thus, Hobbes’s claim that at the publication of *Lev.* he could not possibly have considered Cromwell a sovereign is not persuasive.

⁵⁹ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 415. ⁶⁰ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 415.

⁶¹ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 415.

⁶² A man with so solid royalist credentials as Sir Robert Filmer was among those who tried to demonstrate the compatibility of Engagement and loyalty to the Stuarts. See Gordon J. Schochet, *The Authoritarian Family and Political Attitudes in Seventeenth-Century England: Patriarchalism in Political Thought* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction, 1988), 134, n.47. For a recent discussion of Filmer’s response to the Engagement, see Edward Vallance, ‘Oaths, Casuistry and Equivocation: Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy’, *HJ* 44, 1 (2001): 64–5, where it is noted that: ‘Of the royalist authors who commented on the Engagement controversy, Robert Filmer argued for giving the greatest degree of obedience to a usurper.’

⁶³ This is the inference one can draw from Henrietta Maria to Newcastle, 16 April 1649 (N.S.), *Letters of Henrietta Maria*, ed. M. A. E. Green (1857), 359–60.

⁶⁴ ‘Sir Charles Cavendish’, E. I. Carlyle, rev. Timothy Raylor, ODNB.

Newcastle sought some reimbursement from the king, *via* Buckingham, the latter replied, presumably on behalf of the king: ‘The best counsel that I am able to give you, considering your own condition, and the present state of our affairs, is to make your peace, if it be possible, in England, for certainly your Lordship’s suffering for the King has been great enough to excuse you if you look a little after yourself now, when neither he is able to assist you, nor you in a possibility of doing him service.’⁶⁵ In other words, Charles himself was discreetly condoning compounding in such desperate circumstances.⁶⁶ And in response to a query from some other royalists about taking the Engagement, in April 1650 Charles had encouraged them to exercise their own discretion, granting them ‘what liberty their consciences shall give them to do, to preserve themselves for the King’s service’.⁶⁷ Buckingham himself attempted (unsuccessfully) to make a bargain for his extensive estates, first with the Rump, then with Cromwell.⁶⁸ Newcastle himself might well have tried to strike a deal with the rulers of the commonwealth if not for the fact that he was considered unpardonable.⁶⁹ By the spring of 1651, even some of the most dedicated of émigré royalists were considering compromise back in England. Edward Nicholas and Lord Hopton ‘discussed together whether the time had come to cut their losses and apply for permission to return to England. In the opinion of Nicholas, “now the King’s party are in a manner destroyed in England, I do not see how I can be any use or service to his Majesty, and shall therefore take the best course I can to preserve myself and my poor family from starving”. This attitude was probably widespread at this time among the exiled Cavaliers.’⁷⁰ Although he was mostly critical of such compromise, it was Clarendon himself who in 1651, at Newcastle’s request, persuaded Sir Charles that it would not be indecent to do so. It would seem odd, at best, for Clarendon later to complain of Hobbes’s

⁶⁵ Buckingham to Newcastle, 5 December 1650, *HMC Portland*, II, 138.

⁶⁶ Thomas White later recollected that Charles had approved some compromising with the Protectorate in the mid-1650s: ‘His Majesty’s friends were under such a cloud that they were in danger to be totally ruined at one blow, it being then in agitation to destroy all those who would not by oath renounce all his Majesty’s stock and race . . . [when] his Majesty permitted divers of his most loyal servants to make their accommodation with the usurper.’ BL Add. MS 41846, fols. 84–6, as quoted by Southgate, *Life and Work of Thomas White*, 44.

⁶⁷ *CSPD, 1650*, 88–9. According to Edward Vallance, citing private correspondence and pamphlets, the king’s flexibility on the question of taking the Engagement became widely known among royalists. ‘Oaths, Casuistry and Equivocation’, 64. Taking the Engagement required the following utterance: ‘I do declare and promise, that I will be true and faithful to the Commonwealth of England, as it is now established, without a king or House of Lords.’ This was not an oath, for God was not invoked – deliberately, to make it easier for the scrupulous.

⁶⁸ Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends*, 171.

⁶⁹ As previously noted, from the Act of Oblivion, 24 February 1652, he was to be excluded.

⁷⁰ Smith, *Cavaliers in Exile*, 30.

justification of compounding when he himself had been personally advising some to do precisely that.⁷¹

Thus, in the ‘Review and Conclusion’ of *Leviathan* Hobbes seemed to justify both those royalists who had promised obedience to and compounded with the Rump regime, and all those who would do so in the next few years. Significantly, Hobbes was justifying the action of his patrons, most especially the Cavendishes, the third earl of Devonshire and Sir Charles Cavendish.⁷² Hobbes himself later reiterated the point that *Leviathan* was written to justify composition by royalists:

It was written in the behalf of those many and faithful servants and subjects of his Majesty, that had taken his part in the war, or otherwise done their utmost endeavour to defend his Majesty’s right and person against the rebels: whereby, having no other means of protection, nor, for the most part, of subsistence, they were forced to compound . . . and to promise obedience for the saving of their lives and fortunes; which in his book he [Hobbes] hath affirmed they might lawfully do, and consequently not lawfully bear arms against the victors.⁷³

While Hobbes certainly served the interest of royalists, like his patrons the Cavendishes, it is more doubtful that he served the Stuarts by this justification. The latter depends on how convincing one finds Hobbes’s argument that by making composition with the Rump, these royalists were harming the Rump government – that ‘they that compounded . . . helped the Parliament less by their composition, than they should have done, if they had stood out, by their confiscation’.⁷⁴

In the ‘Review and Conclusion’, which must have been the last part of *Leviathan* written, in late 1650, Hobbes indicated his belief that England was in an entirely unsettled condition, a land in which no government was yet established. There he implies that the church and religious doctrine, like all other political institutions and laws, are not yet established. This, he says, is why he has felt justified in offering his opinions on the definition, nature and doctrine of a Christian church to be set up in his native land. Hobbes takes care to excuse himself from the possible charge of usurping teaching authority:

In that part which treateth of a Christian commonwealth there are some new doctrines, which (it may be) in a state where the contrary were already fully determined were a fault for a subject (without leave) to divulge, as being an usurpation of the place of a teacher. But in this time, that men call not only for peace, but also for truth, to offer such doctrine as I think true (and that manifestly tend to peace and

⁷¹ For Clarendon’s complicated (or incoherent) attitude towards compounding, see Ollard, *Clarendon and His Friends*, 116–18. For royalist compounding generally, see Vallance, ‘Oaths, Casuistry and Equivocation’.

⁷² See Sarasohn, ‘Was *Leviathan* a Patronage Artifact?’, 627.

⁷³ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 420–1. ⁷⁴ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 424.

loyalty) to the consideration of those that are yet in deliberation is no more but to offer new wine to be put into new cask, that both may be preserved together. And I suppose that then, when novelty can breed no trouble nor disorder in a state, men are not generally so much inclined to the reverence of antiquity as to prefer ancient errors before new and well proved truth.⁷⁵

In the dedication of *Leviathan*, Hobbes had recognised that his eccentric religious views would trouble many readers: ‘That which perhaps may most offend are certain texts of Holy Scripture, alleged by me to other purpose than ordinarily they use to be by others. But I have done it with due submission, and also (in order to my subject) necessarily; for they are the outworks of the enemy, from whence they impugn the civil power.’ At the beginning of chapter xxxviii, Hobbes speaks of his subjugation to the authority of the ‘commonwealth’. This seems quite telling, for he might just as easily have said the ‘king’ or the ‘sovereign authority’. Before offering an interpretation of Adam’s plight in the garden of Eden, he emphasises that he does so ‘with submission, nevertheless, both in this and in all questions whereof the determination dependeth on the Scriptures, to the interpretation of the Bible authorised by the commonwealth whose subject I am’.⁷⁶ In a similar vein, and in the same chapter, Hobbes again makes it clear that he considers the situation in England still unsettled. After asserting the controversial claim that the kingdom of God will be on earth, Hobbes writes:

But because this doctrine (though proved out of places of Scripture not few, nor obscure) will appear to most men a novelty, I do but propound it, maintaining nothing in this, or any other paradox of religion, but attending the end of that dispute of the sword concerning the authority (not yet amongst my countrymen decided) by which all sorts of doctrine are to be approved or rejected, and whose commands, both in speech and writing, whatsoever be the opinions of private men, must by all men that mean to be protected by their laws be obeyed. For the points of doctrine concerning the kingdom of God have so great influence on the kingdom of man, as not to be determined but by them that under God have the sovereign power.⁷⁷

This may be interpreted as Hobbes’s way of justifying his taking the liberty to offer his own theology and ecclesiology. But this way of justification clearly implies that he no longer regards the bishops and other anglican clergy as his authorities in such matters. He seems to assume that in the unsettled situation of the late 1640s and early 1650s, a ‘private man’ like himself had just as much authority as anyone else. And, indeed, in a very real sense, he was entirely correct: at the time, who could discipline or punish him for broadcasting his heterodox (or heretical) opinions? Bramhall might have claimed that he had an apostolic-divine authority that Hobbes did not have; but where in the British Isles or Europe was a civil sovereign established,

⁷⁵ *Lev.*, ‘Review and Conclusion’, 495.

⁷⁶ *Lev.*, xxxviii, 301.

⁷⁷ *Lev.*, xxxviii, 305.

from whom Bramhall might be given a jurisdiction in which to exercise that authority? He might have had a right in some sense, but where exactly was he to invoke and practise it? In chapter XLVII, Hobbes reveals his understanding of the past and present religious situation in England:

First, the power of Popes was dissolved totally by Queen Elizabeth, and the bishops, who before exercised their functions in right of the Pope,⁷⁸ did afterwards exercise the same in right of the Queen and her successors (though by retaining the phrase *jure divino*, they were thought to demand it by immediate right from God) . . . After this the presbyterians lately in England obtained the putting down of episcopacy. . . . And almost at the same time the power was taken also from the presbyterians. And so we are reduced to the independency of the primitive Christians, to follow Paul, or Cephas, or Apollos, every man as he liketh best. Which . . . is perhaps the best.

This makes it unmistakably clear that at the time of writing *Leviathan* Hobbes considered himself entirely free of the obligation to conform to doctrine or conduct prescribed by displaced bishops like Bramhall. He could now follow Paul, Cephas or Apollos – Bramhall the anglican, Baxter the presbyterian, or Owen the independent – just as he liked best.⁷⁹ But in view of the thoroughly eccentric theology of *Leviathan* (especially his doctrines regarding the Trinity, heaven and hell, and the soul), Hobbes seems to have preferred to follow himself. Certainly Hobbes had good reason, or rather, much need, to excuse himself from the charge of usurping authority to pronounce on religious questions. His ambition in books III and VI was prodigious. In those books, comprising chapters XXXII–XLVII, Hobbes was offering, in effect, a comprehensive interpretive scheme for reading the Bible. He was, in no trivial sense, presenting his own conception of Christianity – his own Christian creed, Hobbesian Christianity.⁸⁰

In chapter XXXIX of *Leviathan*, Hobbes defines the church as ‘a company of men professing Christian religion, united in the person of one sovereign, at whose command they ought to assemble, and without whose authority they ought not to assemble’. He then proceeds to some important implications. There is no universal church on earth to which all Christians owe obedience, for there is no universal sovereign to whom all Christians owe obedience. Echoing the old formula of the Peace of Augsburg, *cuius regio eius religio*, Christians are to conform to the religion of the sovereigns whose lands they

⁷⁸ Incidentally, in writings published in the 1650s, Bramhall makes clear that he would contest this claim; for he was to argue that the bishops in England in the sixteenth century, and long before, had an authority *not* derived from the pope – and the pope was merely a bishop, the bishop of Rome.

⁷⁹ John Owen has often been characterised as the most influential independent of the 1650s.

⁸⁰ As Malcolm has noted, ‘In the third part of *Leviathan* he subjected the Bible to a more thorough course of rational textual criticism than had been attempted by any previous English writer.’ *Aspects of Hobbes*, 40.

happen to inhabit: 'every one of them [Christians] is subject to that commonwealth whereof he is himself a member'. Hobbes also points out that a church is, accordingly, identical with the civil commonwealth: 'Temporal and spiritual government are but two words brought into the world to make men see double and mistake their lawful sovereign.' Hobbes elaborates in the last paragraph of the chapter: 'There is, therefore, no other government in this life, neither of state nor religion, but temporal; nor teaching of any doctrine, lawful to any subject, which the government both of the state and of the religion, forbiddeth to be taught. And that government must be one, or else there must needs follow faction and civil war in the commonwealth between the church and the state; between spiritualists and temporalists; between the sword of justice and the shield of faith; and (which is more) in every Christian man's own breast between the Christian and the man.' Hobbes concludes by stressing that the 'chief pastor' must be the civil sovereign, for, he claims, 'the Scripture hath assigned that office to him [or them]'. In chapter XLII, Hobbes clearly denies apostolic succession to be some kind of supernatural operation whereby certain men are granted unique 'spiritual' powers. He demystifies such rituals as ordination, laying on of hands and consecration. Bishops do not derive any kind of divine right (*jus divinum*) or power as a consequence of any such ceremony. The ceremony is only a convenient formalisation or public certification of their pastoral office to teach in the commonwealth, which office has no coercive dimension unless the civil sovereign endows it that way. Bishops, like all other clergy, have no other authority but that which is strictly *jure civili*, that is, derived solely from the power of the civil sovereign: 'But who are those now that are sent by Christ, but such as are ordained pastors by lawful authority? And who are lawfully ordained, that are not ordained by the sovereign pastor? And who is ordained by the sovereign pastor in a Christian commonwealth, that is not ordained by the authority of the sovereign thereof?'⁸¹ As Hobbes asserts at the end of chapter XLII, any other claim to authority would be clerical subversion of, or naked rebellion against, the civil sovereign: 'For whatsoever power ecclesiastics take upon themselves (in any place where they are subject to the state) in their own right, though they call it God's right [*jure divino*], is but usurpation.'⁸²

A Laudian bishop like Bramhall would have found such a passage deeply offensive. What was a bishop without his uniquely apostolic-divine and sacerdotal powers, without his special ability to perform ceremonies and administer sacraments? Nevertheless, it is quite curious that Hobbes himself seems

⁸¹ *Lev.*, XLII, 385. Just a few pages later Hobbes notes: 'Kings, therefore, may in the like manner ordain and deprive bishops, as they shall think fit, for the well governing of their subjects.'
Lev., XLII, 390.

⁸² *Lev.*, XLVI, 468.

to concede the justice of the distinction Laud had made in the 1630s – and that Bramhall continued to make throughout his life: that there was a difference between right and exercise of a right. As we saw in chapter 2, Laud had held that bishops had a divine right independent of any civil, lay sovereign, but that they had no right to exercise that right, unless given permission by the civil sovereign of the land in which they happened to dwell. Seemingly in spite of himself, and certainly inconsistent with what he says elsewhere, Hobbes remarks in *Leviathan* that:

After that certain Churches had renounced this universal power of the Pope, one would expect in reason that the civil sovereigns in all those Churches should have recovered so much of it [supremacy in religious matters] as (before they had unadvisedly let it go) was their own right and in their own hands. And in England it was so in effect, saving that they by whom the kings administered the government of religion, by maintaining their employment to be in God's right [*jure divino*], seemed to usurp, if not a supremacy, yet an independency on the civil power. And but seemed to usurp it, inasmuch as they acknowledged a right in the king to deprive them of the exercise of their functions at his pleasure.⁸³

Hobbes himself admits that it only 'seemed' a usurpation: precisely what Laud was stressing all along in the 1630s, when episcopacy *jure divino* came to be construed and denounced as a violation of the king's royal supremacy in religion. For those who would prefer a perfectly consistent and coherent Hobbes, this passage is quite troublesome. Everywhere else Hobbes argued or implied that the maintenance of episcopacy *jure divino* was seditious and subversive, as incompatible with royal supremacy. But here he concedes that bishops who held that doctrine only *appeared* to be seditious and subversive: like all other good subjects they acknowledged a right in the civil sovereign to dismiss them from their posts, and discipline them as he thought appropriate. But apart from this apparent acceptance of the Laudian (and Bramhallian) distinction of right and exercise of right, Hobbes devotes much labour in *Leviathan* to establishing the civil sovereign as absolutely supreme and omniscient in all 'spiritual' matters within the commonwealth. The civil sovereign is, in this sense, just another name for the governor of the church, as the commonwealth is another name for the state church – as Hobbes argues, the citizens or subjects of a commonwealth are the same as the communicants of the commonwealth. Throughout *Leviathan* Hobbes can offer nothing but contempt for the supposed difference between temporal and spiritual power, curtly observing at one point: 'For this distinction of temporal and spiritual power is but words.'⁸⁴

We have seen already how Clarendon was to claim that in *Leviathan* Hobbes had intended to buttress the Rump and Cromwell, and thereby

⁸³ *Lev.*, XLVII, 478.

⁸⁴ *Lev.*, XLII, 392.

provide himself with a passport for England. Our review of Hobbes's pre-1650 correspondence leaves us secure in the belief that Hobbes had some notion and inclination to return. But even if Hobbes had a strong desire to return to England, it does not necessarily follow that *Leviathan* was conceived as a means of helping him do so. By the end of the decade it was natural for Hobbes to have had a desire to return home. By the end of 1648, his royal tutorial charge had left France and few of his friends remained in Paris. Devonshire had returned to England in 1645; Newcastle and his brother had removed to the Low Countries in 1648; Gassendi had gone to Provence; Mersenne was now dead.⁸⁵ Furthermore, the commotions of the Fronde (1648–53) in and around Paris might well have made Hobbes increasingly uncomfortable or nervous. A desire to return to his native land might also have been strengthened by sheer age: in 1648 Hobbes had turned sixty. What would be more natural than for the increasingly infirm Hobbes to desire a return to England, where he could count on some support from Devonshire?

Although composed entirely in France, *Leviathan* was to be published in London in the spring of 1651.⁸⁶ While it is notable that Hobbes wrote in English, perhaps little can be made of this fact because he was simultaneously authorising a French translation.⁸⁷ Clearly the cosmopolitan civil scientist was still (and always) interested in reaching more than a provincial audience. The appearance of *Leviathan* in England coincided with Charles II's restoration venture in Scotland and England in the years 1650–1. By the summer of 1650 the young king was in Scotland trying to rally men to his cause of Stuart restoration in all the British Isles. It was at this time that Hobbes was reviewing the proofs of *Leviathan*. In other words, the philosopher had completed its composition well before the Scots lost to Cromwell at Dunbar on 3 September 1650 – and even longer before Charles, the Scots and English royalists suffered their decisive defeat at the hands of Cromwell at Worcester exactly a year later.⁸⁸ Thus, *Leviathan* was composed long before

⁸⁵ Sarasohn, 'Was *Leviathan* a Patronage Artifact?', 626.

⁸⁶ It appeared no later than May, for in that month Robert Payne referred to its appearance in a letter to Gilbert Sheldon, 6 May 1651, BL Harl. MS 6942, no. 132. In this letter to Sheldon, Payne (Newcastle's old chaplain and a longtime friend and correspondent of Hobbes) complained that *Lev.* 'seems to favour the present government [the Rump]'. Although it is not extant, Hobbes–Payne correspondence of the late 1640s and early 1650s is indicated in the Payne–Sheldon correspondence of these years. See Collins, 'Christian Ecclesiology and the Composition of *Leviathan*', and Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, 99–100.

⁸⁷ See Payne to Sheldon, 13 May 1650, BL Harl. MS 6942, no. 128.

⁸⁸ Clarendon later noted that Charles had not been displeased by Cromwell's victory against the Scots at Dunbar because most of those Scots were hardly royalist. In this way, Dunbar was not quite a *royalist* defeat. *History of Rebellion*, v, 148–50 (xiii.22–4). A modern commentator, James Wheeler, has similarly observed: 'Cromwell's victory at Dunbar shattered the power of the extreme Kirk party in the Scottish government and demonstrated the need for the Scots to unite. Charles II was, in this sense, the beneficiary of the destruction of Leslie's

Hobbes could have known that Cromwell would vanquish Charles II and his supporters and allies. There is, then, no reason to rule out the possibility that at the time of writing his book Hobbes entertained the hope that Charles would, whatever the difficulties, succeed in restoring himself. His friend Sir Charles Cavendish, residing in Antwerp in 1650–1, certainly had such a hope, if not expectation. Writing to John Pell at Breda, Cavendish noted: ‘if the business go well with our King, which I trust in God it will, I hope there may be occasion fitting to call you home’.⁸⁹ It is quite possible, therefore, that when Hobbes referred noncommittally to the ‘civil sovereign’ throughout *Leviathan*, he may have had Charles in mind – as the *soon-to-be* sovereign in England. Nevertheless, it is still true, as I have emphasised, that Hobbes never names Charles in the text, and speaks only generically of sovereigns. In this respect, as we have noted, *Leviathan* was no different from the *Elements of Law* or *De Cive*.⁹⁰

After Charles was beaten by Cromwell at Worcester he made his famous miraculous escape, sneaking across England to depart for the continent. The ejected king arrived at last in Paris in late October 1651.⁹¹ Hobbes was still in Paris where, in August, he had fallen deathly ill.⁹² By September he was well again, at least healthy enough to receive a visit from John Evelyn, now

army. Henceforth, his influence grew in Scottish affairs. The reconciliation of the Engagers, royalists, and moderate Covenanters enabled the Scots to rebuild their army and to hold out against Cromwell for another nine months, forcing the English to maintain a large army in Scotland through the winter.’ *Irish and British Wars*, 235–6.

⁸⁹ Cavendish to John Pell, 6/16 December 1650, *Pell-Cavendish*, 570.

⁹⁰ The lack of principled and explicit commitment to any sovereign is at the bottom of the fact that, as J. G. A. Pocock and Gordon Schochet have aptly pointed out: ‘Hobbes offered little advice . . . on what to do when two contenders for the role of Leviathan were in the field, each demanding the subject’s allegiance at the point of the sword.’ ‘Interregnum and Restoration’ in *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800*, eds. J. G. A. Pocock, Gordon Schochet and Lois Schwoerer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 160. In this situation, Hobbes could only advise application of the tape-measure.

⁹¹ On 15 October 1651, he sailed from Brighton and arrived in Paris 20/30 October 1651.

⁹² The French physician Guy Patin related in a letter dated 22 September 1651: ‘I found him in a very bad state: constricted breathing, pain, vomiting – such suffering that he must have had thoughts of killing himself. He is a stoic philosopher, melancholic, and in addition to that, English. I made him a little better with food and baths, but he refused to be bled, though in great need of it, under the pretext he was sixty-four years old. The following day, I being a little more in his good graces, he permitted me to bleed him, which brought him much relief. . . . After that, we became comrades and great friends. I let him drink a little beer he wanted, and after a purgative, he felt much better. He thanked me very much and said he wished to send me something beautiful when he returned to England.’ Quoted in Rogow, *Thomas Hobbes*, 149–50. The last remark of Patin hints that Hobbes was then (August 1651) meditating a return to England very soon. Modern experts believe that Hobbes was stricken with Parkinson’s disease. The shaking palsy of Hobbes which had begun before 1650 became severe enough in the 1660s to require the employment of an amanuensis: ‘He had the shaking palsy in his hands, which began in France before the year 1650 and has grown upon him by degrees ever since; so that he has not been able to write legibly since 1665 or 1666, as I find by some of his letters to me that he honoured me withal.’ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, 1.

the son-in-law of the royal resident and close acquaintance of Bramhall, Sir Richard Browne.⁹³ Not long after Charles returned to Paris at the end of October, Hobbes presented his former student with a handsome vellum manuscript of the book he had published just a few months earlier.⁹⁴ It was either in November or December 1651 that Hobbes made this presentation, for Hobbes was to return to England by January 1652. One might argue that the fact that the ‘Review and Conclusion’ was not included in this manuscript was quite significant.⁹⁵ Was it not omitted because it was blatant support of the Rump and Cromwell? But, again, we must remember that the whole of *Leviathan*, not excluding the ‘Review and Conclusion’, was published *before* both Dunbar and Worcester. However, *after* Charles’s defeat in October 1651, it would be possible to read the ‘Review and Conclusion’ as exclusively an argument for supporting the Rump and Cromwell: for after Dunbar and Worcester it was only insanity itself that could consider Charles the ‘civil sovereign’. For the latter had not sufficient power (or even potential power) to require obedience for protection. If anyone in England in November 1651 was the sovereign *de facto* (and according to Hobbes’s teaching), it was the Rump and Cromwell. Now the ‘Review and Conclusion’ would justify all those who would want to submit to their authority, the authority of the longest sword. So now the ‘Review and Conclusion’ became an embarrassment to Hobbes, and thus would he have omitted its presentation to the recently thwarted would-be king. About ten years later he offered something of an apology to the king; the peculiar way in which he did so should be noted: ‘Therefore I most humbly beseech your sacred Majesty not to believe so ill of me upon reports, that proceed often, and may do so now, from the displeasure which commonly ariseth from difference of opinion; nor think the worse of me, if snatching up all the weapons to fight against your enemies, *I lighted upon one that had a double edge.*’⁹⁶ The ‘Review and Conclusion’ was certainly a double-edged sword. It could ‘justify’ submission to whoever won at Worcester. Since Cromwell won, it justified submission to him.

⁹³ It was 7 September 1651 that Evelyn recorded his visit to Hobbes in Paris. *Diary and Correspondence*, I, 280.

⁹⁴ The presentation of this *Lev.* ‘engross’d in vellum in a marvellous fair hand’ is related by Clarendon, *Brief View*, 8. The consensus among scholars is that BL Egerton 1910 is the copy that was presented to Charles II. For the uncertain history of this manuscript, see Goldsmith, ‘Hobbes’s Ambiguous Politics’, 671, n.74.

⁹⁵ The ‘Review and Conclusion’ was also omitted from the Latin translation of *Lev.* published in 1668.

⁹⁶ ‘Seven Philosophical Problems’, *EW*, VII, 5–6; ‘Quae cum ita sint, lectores meos monitos hic vellem, ne malevolorum convitiis temere credentes aliter de me quam aequum est sentire velint: nec vitio vertant, si contra hostes tuos pugnans, et quaecunque potui tela corriprens, gladio uno usus sum ancipite.’ *Problemata Physica*, *OL*, IV, 303.

In the ‘Review and Conclusion’ all the royalists in exile who disliked Hobbes now had a very handy sword with which to sever relations between him and Charles II. In Clarendon’s later critique of *Leviathan* he expressed his wonder at Hobbes’s audacity in presenting the book as a gift to Charles II upon the latter’s return from defeat at Worcester. Having, according to Clarendon, made no scruple to give Cromwell *carte blanche* against all his enemies (especially Charles, obviously), it was in Hobbes ‘a marvellous confidence that introduced him into the King’s presence, and encouraged him still to expect, that his doctrine should be allowed to be industriously taught and believed’.⁹⁷ According to Clarendon:

Within a very short time after I came into Flanders [summer 1651], which was not much more than a month from the time that Mr Hobbes had conferred with me [spring 1651], *Leviathan* was sent to me from London; which I read with much appetite and impatience. Yet I had scarce finish’d it, when Sir Charles Cavendish (the noble brother of the Duke of Newcastle who was then at Antwerp) . . . showed me a letter he had receiv’d from Mr Hobbes, in which he desir’d he would let him know freely what my opinion was of his book. Upon which I wished he would tell him, that I could not enough wonder, that a man who had so great a reverence for civil government, that he resolv’d all wisdom and religion itself into a simple obedience and submission to it, should publish a book, for which, by the constitution of any government now establish’d in Europe, whether monarchical or democratical, the author must be punish’d in the highest degree, and with the most severe penalties. With which answer (which Sir Charles sent to him) he was not pleased; and found afterwards when I return’d to the King to Paris [December 1651], that I very much censur’d his book, which he had presented, engross’d in vellum in a marvelous fair hand, to the King; and likewise found my judgment so far confirmed, that few days before I came thither, he was compell’d secretly to fly out of Paris, the justice having endeavour’d to apprehend him, and soon after escap’d into England, where he never receiv’d any disturbance.⁹⁸

Hobbes presented the vellum manuscript despite his knowledge that Hyde disliked it: their conversation while Hobbes was reviewing the proofs in the spring established Hyde’s disapproval. When Hyde moved from Antwerp to Paris in December 1651 he joined in the chorus around the king that denounced *Leviathan*. It is important to keep in mind that there was already a chorus singing before Hyde arrived on the scene. Something of a royalist consensus against Hobbes seems to have formed, and the king must have been persuaded that the author of *Leviathan* was not a man with whom he should associate. From this account it is clear that Hobbes was disgraced *before* Hyde had arrived. Hobbes’s flight was caused by the pursuit of some French officials: ‘the justice having endeavour’d to apprehend him’. Hyde’s judgment was ‘confirmed’, presumably, in the fact that French authorities recognised the impiety and subversiveness of *Leviathan*.

⁹⁷ *Brief View*, 142. ⁹⁸ *Brief View*, 8–9.

It is fortunate that we need not rely solely on Hyde's account in the *Brief Survey of Leviathan*. Edward Nicholas wrote to Hyde 1/11 January 1652: 'All honest men here, who are lovers of monarchy, are very glad, that the K. hath at length banished from his court that father of atheists, Mr Hobbes, who, it is said, hath rendered all the Queen's court and very many of the D. of York's family atheists and, if he had been suffered, would have done his best to have likewise poisoned the K.'s court.'⁹⁹ Just a week later, Nicholas at The Hague wrote again to Hyde:

I hear Lord Percy is much concerned in the forbidding Hobbes to come to court, and says it was you and other episcopal men, that were the cause of it. But I hear, that Wat. Montagu and other Papists (to the shame of the true Protestants) were the chief cause, that that grand atheist was sent away: and I may tell you, some say the Marq. of Ormonde was very slow in signifying the K.'s command to Hobbes to forbear coming to court, which I am confident is not true, though several persons affirm it.¹⁰⁰

Interestingly, Lord Percy was 'much concerned in the forbidding Hobbes to come to court'. This would suggest that Lord Percy had been supporting Hobbes. According to Anthony Wood, writing many years later – admittedly quite a second-hand source – Percy had 'lived and died a perfect Hobbit at Paris'.¹⁰¹ From Percy Nicholas has learned that it was Hyde and 'episcopal men' that brought about the disgrace of Hobbes. But from another source, Nicholas has heard that it was, rather, Walter Montagu and the papists that effected it. He has also heard a rumour, not to be trusted, he thinks, that Ormonde favoured Hobbes enough to be reluctant to deliver the bad news. It must be noted that at least according to these letters of Nicholas, we would assume that it was more the atheism (or heresy) than the politics of *Leviathan* that led to Hobbes's expulsion. All variety of anglicans (if not protestants) and Roman catholics would have had little difficulty agreeing that the iconoclastic materialist had undermined the standing of many traditional conceptions, such as the incorporeality and immortality of the soul, the Trinity and the afterlife.

Hyde's reply to Nicholas clarifies a few points: 'I had indeed some hand in the discountenancing of my old friend, Mr Hobbes, nor was my Lord Lieutenant [Ormonde] at all slow in signifying the King's pleasure. . . . What the Catholics wished, I know not, but sure they contributed nothing to that justice.'¹⁰² Here, then, is Hyde's claim that he had something

⁹⁹ *Nicholas Papers*, I, 284. ¹⁰⁰ Dated 8/18 January 1652, *Nicholas Papers*, I, 285.

¹⁰¹ *Athenae Oxonienses*, II, col. 293. But see Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 128, n.3, for some qualification based on another contemporary source.

¹⁰² Hyde to Nicholas, 17/27 January 1652, CCSP, III, 45. In an issue of the London newsheet *Mercurius Politicus* published January 1652 it was reported that Ormonde refused Hobbes access to the king when Hobbes showed up at court to receive, as he hoped, the king's

to do with Hobbes's expulsion from the court. But this does not mean that Hyde influenced French authorities to persecute Hobbes. We must distinguish Hobbes's disgrace from the court, on the one hand, from the action of the French authorities on the other. As for Hyde's part in the disgrace of Hobbes, we do not know any details. We have seen that in the *Brief Survey* he related that Hobbes had departed before he himself had arrived in Paris from Antwerp. We may suppose that there was some correspondence of Hyde from 1651, not extant, that indicated his wish to see Hobbes expelled. It is not implausible that Charles forbade Hobbes to come to his court in Paris in order to please his mother and the hosts of their family, the French, who, especially the Roman catholic clergy, had every reason to be greatly offended by *Leviathan*: the last chapters of the book were a savage and satirical attack that even the easy-going Mersenne would not have been able to stomach.¹⁰³ Charles might well have been upset with Hobbes for so gratuitously and provocatively assaulting the religion of his hosts, and his mother. Charles would certainly have felt some pressure to dissociate himself from someone who had insulted all Roman catholics. It was simply good (or necessary) diplomacy for Charles to deny Hobbes any privilege of attendance. And there is some reason to suppose that Charles would not have had much choice, as he was entirely at the mercy of his French hosts in 1651. Furthermore, fresh from his humiliating Scottish-presbyterian venture, it might now appear that his only support for restoration would have to come from Roman catholic continental powers. The Stuarts would not want to associate themselves at all closely with a scourge of that religion. But lest we be inclined to think that Hobbes's disgrace was motivated solely by Charles's regard for his mother and for continental alliance calculations, we must remember that at the time of his disgrace anti-Roman catholic royalists like Hyde, Nicholas and Ormonde had become his dominant advisors. Of course, they could still agree with Henrietta Maria and the English, Irish

gratitude for the presentation copy of *Lev.*: 'Hobbes "sent one of his Books as a Present to the K. of Scots, which he accepted". But the priests about the king then accused its author of atheism, and "therefore when M. Hobbs came to make a tender of his service to him in person, he was rejected".' Richard Tuck, Introduction, *Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), xxiv, citing *Mercurius Politicus* 84 (8–15 January 1652): 1344.

¹⁰³ Noel Malcolm has described the fourth book of *Lev.*, 'Kingdom of Darkness', as full of 'ferociously sarcastic comments on Roman Catholicism'. *Aspects of Hobbes*, 466. That some Roman catholics in France had been disgusted even by *DC*, a book that did not present anything comparable to that invective, is suggested by a correspondent of Mersenne who wrote to the latter in September 1642 after reading the first edition. He considered that Latin treatise 'une rapsodie d'héresies. . . . Cela ne mérite correction que du feu.' Quoted in Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 75. In 1649 and 1651, Sorbière published and re-published, respectively, a French translation of *DC*. In 1654 this book of Hobbes was placed on the Index Librorum Prohibitorum. See Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, 470, for details of the indexing.

and French Roman Catholics that Hobbes was a mischievous writer – if not a dangerous atheist.

As already noted, Hobbes later made a claim that he had had no desire to leave Paris, but had, instead, been thrust out. Writing in the early 1660s, he related that his departure was forced upon him by fear of French clergy: ‘. . . he staid about Paris, and had neither encouragement nor desire to return into England. . . . Mr Hobbes came home . . . because he would not trust his safety with the French clergy.’¹⁰⁴ Presumably these French clergy were, or had something to do with, the French ‘justice’ to which Hyde referred. In his prose autobiography years later, Hobbes described the circumstances of his flight from France:

In 1651 copies of this book [*Leviathan*], which was published in London, were sent into France, where certain English theologians condemned doctrines contained in the text as being heretical, and in opposition to the King’s interest. These calumnies gained wide acceptance, with the result that he was banished from the King’s household. Stripped of the King’s protection, and fearing malicious attacks by Roman clerics whose teachings he had successfully attacked, he had little option other than to take refuge in England.¹⁰⁵

None of this disagrees with Hyde’s account; rather, it corroborates it. Hobbes’s treatment of these events in the verse autobiography was slightly more informative, but did not contradict any of the points in the prose autobiography:

Th’ambition of the stateliest clergymen,
 Did not at all prevail in England then.
 Hence many scholars to the King did go,
 Expel’d, sad, indigent, burthensome too.
 As yet my studies undisturbed were,
 And my Grand Climacterick past one year.
 When that book was perus’d by knowing men,
 The gates of Janus temple opened then;
 And they accus’d me to the King, that I
 Seem’d to approve Cromwell’s impiety,
 And countenance the worst of wickedness;
 This was believ’d, and I appear’d no less
 Than a grand enemy, so that I was for’t
 Banish’d both the King’s presence and his court.
 Then I began on this to ruminat
 On Dorislaus, and on Ascham’s fate,
 And stood amazed, like a poor exile,
 Encompassed with terrour all the while.
 Nor cou’d I blame th’young King for his assent

¹⁰⁴ *Considerations, EW*, iv, 415. Later in the same book from 1662, Hobbes spoke of his having been ‘driven back’ to England. *Considerations, EW*, iv, 417.

¹⁰⁵ Prose Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 249.

To those intrusted with his government.
 Then home I came, not sure of safety there,
 Though I cou'd not be safer any where.¹⁰⁶

In the early 1660s, Hobbes admitted that the king had been displeased with him, if only briefly: 'he was displeased for a while, but not very long'.¹⁰⁷ But, as Hobbes proceeded to explain, this was only because of those around the king who misrepresented *Leviathan*: 'They that complained of, and misconstrued his [Hobbes's] writings, were his Majesty's good subjects, and reputed wise and learned men, and thereby obtained to have their misconstruction believed for some little time: but the very next summer [summer 1652] after his coming away, two honourable persons of the Court, that came over into England, assured him, that his Majesty had a good opinion of him; and others since have told me, that his Majesty said openly, that he thought Mr Hobbes never meant him hurt.'¹⁰⁸ Hobbes seems to have enjoyed the best of both worlds – or sovereigns. For while Charles II from the continent informed him in 1652 that he was not displeased with him, authorities in London pampered him – at least according to Nicholas, who wrote to Lord Hatton in February 1652 that 'Mr Hobbes is at London much caressed, as one that hath by his writings justified the reasonableness and righteousness of their arms and actions'.¹⁰⁹

Hobbes was, then, effectively forced out of France by the impending persecution of French authorities; but only after he had incurred the displeasure of Charles's dominant counsellors, and, in turn, of the king himself. If Bramhall was not one of those counsellors, he was at least a most intimate and influential associate of some of them, especially of the Marquess of Ormonde. Hobbes cannot have been ignorant of Bramhall's close association with these counsellors, including the one, Ormonde, who had informed Hobbes not to come to court any more. According to a contemporary report, after the king had returned to Paris and set up court at the Louvre, in the last months of 1651, Bramhall was among those who repaired to him: 'The old Court flies begin now again to flock about him from all parts. . . . Some of them are come to the Louvre already out of Flanders, as Hyde, a man of dignity too, that calls himself the Chequer Chancellor; here is also Bramhall of Londonderry, Dan O'Neill, Fraizer a physician, and one Lloyd,

¹⁰⁶ Verse Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 260. For Isaac Dorislaus and Anthony Ascham, propagandists and agents of the Rump who were assassinated by royalists on the continent in 1649 and 1650, respectively, see Jason T. Peacey, 'Order and Disorder in Europe: Parliamentary Agents and Royalist Thugs, 1649–1650', *HJ* 40, 4 (1997): 953–76. Hobbes's fear of meeting their fate recalls his (arguably) paranoid fear of parliamentary persecution in 1640.

¹⁰⁷ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 424. ¹⁰⁸ *Considerations*, EW, iv, 424–5.

¹⁰⁹ Nicholas to Hatton, 12/22 February 1652, *Nicholas Papers*, i, 286–7.

a chaplain.¹¹⁰ In December 1651, then, the month of Hobbes's disgrace and departure, Bramhall was in Paris, at the king's court. Whether Bramhall was directly involved in the operation of disgracing Hobbes at the king's court – that is, whether Bramhall talked directly to the king about banishing Hobbes – the philosopher must have suspected some measure of participation by Bramhall. Hobbes's later disrespectful writing against Bramhall suggests that he had the bishop in mind in his allusion to 'certain English theologians' in France who 'condemned doctrines contained in the text as being heretical'.¹¹¹ Bramhall was probably very diligent in the endeavour to convince the king to dismiss Hobbes. He would have had no difficulty in arguing that Hobbes's doctrines were heretical and in opposition to Charles's interest. Indeed, in his objections to *De Cive* and in his oral and epistolary debates with Hobbes the bishop had already been developing this case, that Hobbes was bad for the Stuarts' health. The 'Review and Conclusion' of *Leviathan*, as it appeared after 3 September 1651, made Bramhall's case even easier to make. After Hobbes's reception of the bishop's objections to *De Cive*; after Hobbes's argument with him in Paris in the summer of 1645; and after the subsequent written debate, Hobbes must have anticipated how thoroughly *Leviathan* would displease Bramhall. We saw that Hobbes claimed to have had considerable enemies at the court of the prince while he taught him mathematics. Bramhall was mostly in Brussels during these years (1646–8), but there can be little doubt that he was doing what he could on his visits to Paris, and through his allies residing there, to bring Hobbes into disfavour.

There is further reason to think that Bramhall was lobbying hard against Hobbes well before the publication of *Leviathan*. Reviewing the Payne–Sheldon correspondence of the late 1640s in which Payne attempted to incline Sheldon to a liking of Hobbes (his friend from their mutual acquaintance with Newcastle in the 1630s), Mordechai Feingold has noted that Payne tried to vindicate Hobbes's alleged attack on the anglican church by pointing out that his friend was merely *reacting* to attempts by émigré anglican clergy to prejudice the prince (then king) against Hobbes.¹¹² Around 7 March 1649, Payne wrote to Sheldon of Hobbes's complaint 'that he had lost the reward of his labours with the Pr[ince] by the sinister suggestions of some of the clergy as to their purpose'.¹¹³ In other words, such clergy

¹¹⁰ News account written in Paris, 30 December 1651, quoted in Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, iv, 263, n.1.

¹¹¹ Prose Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 249.

¹¹² For Payne, former chaplain of Newcastle, member of Great Tew and one of the first readers of *Elements of Law*, see chapter 2, 48.

¹¹³ Mordechai Feingold, 'A Friend of Hobbes and an Early Translator of Galileo: Robert Payne of Oxford' in *The Light of Nature: Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science presented*

had brought about the termination of Hobbes's pension. We may certainly suppose that Bramhall was among the clergy in question.¹¹⁴ If he was, we can observe that Bramhall had successfully deprived Hobbes of money he thought was rightfully his. In an August 1650 letter Payne had complained to Sheldon of certain members of the anglican clergy who had rendered Hobbes an adversary of their church: 'If our tribe have got so sharp an adversary you may guess whom we may thank for it.'¹¹⁵ Presumably Bramhall was among those he would wish to thank. If Bramhall was involved in this personal campaign against Hobbes in the late 1640s, there is all the more reason to suppose that Hobbes thought that Bramhall was foremost in achieving his disgrace at Charles's court in Paris at the end of 1651. Hobbes, then, had undergone Bramhall's formidable hostility before he started *Leviathan*. This hostility should be considered one key element of the context for the composition of *Leviathan* in 1649–50. One could easily construe many lines of that book as rancorous insults aimed at the scholastic-Laudian bishop of Derry. If Hobbes learned that Bramhall was broadcasting 'calumnies' in 1651, he could not have been very surprised. Perhaps the real shock was that Laudians like Bramhall and like-minded royalists – Hyde, Nicholas and Ormonde – had come to control the young king; and that there was no longer anyone close enough to him to intercede on his behalf. But the most distressing fact of all was that Charles himself, his former student, was, at least temporarily, displeased with him. Newcastle, the king's other former

to A. C. Crombie, eds. J. D. North and J. J. Roche (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985), 278–9; Feingold quotes from the following letter of Payne to Sheldon: 'Mr Palmer . . . told me, from one who was an eye-witness, that in a letter from my friend Mr H[obbes], directed to the e[ar]l of D[evon], and intercepted by the grantees at West[minster], and after sent to the e[ar]l of D[evon], there was this passage: "that he had lost the reward of his labours with the Pr[ince] by the sinister suggestions of some of the clergy as to their purpose". I am very sorry to hear any of our coat have had the ill fortune to provoke so great a wit against the Church . . . I shall now less wonder if my arguments prevail not.' Robert Payne to Gilbert Sheldon, 7/17 March 1650; also quoted in Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 115–16. For a similar letter that indicates that Hobbes had been upset by the clergy about the court, see Henry Hammond to Matthew Wren, 21/31 October 1651, as quoted in Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 125. For Payne's correspondence with Hobbes in which he remonstrated with him not to write in prejudice of Laudian anglicanism, see Collins, 'Christian Ecclesiology and the Composition of *Leviathan*'.

¹¹⁴ It may also be relevant that the man who had been Hobbes's fellow royal tutor in 1646–8, Dr John Earle, was probably a friend of Bramhall. See the reference in Hyde to Bramhall, 1 January 1659, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 98.

¹¹⁵ Feingold, 'A Friend of Hobbes', 279. In the same letter Payne informed Sheldon: 'I have written to my friend [Hobbes] abroad again and again since I writ you last, and heard from him; he assures me he hath no particular quarrel to that [Bramhall's] tribe, only this position he shall set down and confirm, that the civil sovereign (whether one or more) is chief pastor, and may settle what kind of church government he shall think fit for the people's salvation.' Robert Payne to Gilbert Sheldon, 19/29 August 1650, as quoted in Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 119.

teacher, became unwelcome at court at about the same time that Hobbes had. For one effect of Charles's failure in Scotland and England in 1650–1 was the abandonment of a presbyterian alliance, and the émigré counselors who had urged it. The 'Louvre' gang of Jermyn, Wilmot and Percy was supplanted by the 'old royalist' one of Hyde, Nicholas and Ormonde.¹¹⁶ If, as Sir Charles Cavendish believed, Jermyn had been most responsible for Hobbes's appointment as tutor in 1646, he was now unable – if he was willing – to save his old philosopher friend from the mortification of court disgrace. Ormonde and Hyde grew especially close after 1650, having lived together in Paris for some time. Along with Nicholas they formed something of a constitutionalist and episcopalian anglican royalist cabinet.¹¹⁷ In the summer of 1651, Newcastle was in Antwerp and still a member of the privy council. In Antwerp at the same time were Hyde (who had just returned from his embassy to Spain) and Nicholas – both of whom were also of the council.¹¹⁸ But when the king returned, Newcastle was among those banished from the king's inner circle of advisors, apparently for having favoured an alliance with the Scots covenanters.¹¹⁹ Newcastle's banishment from court may have been related to Hobbes's banishment from court. As Newcastle no longer had influence at court, so Hobbes was all the more vulnerable to personal attacks by royalists like Hyde and Bramhall.

But it is not even certain that Newcastle, had he been a favourite of Charles in the autumn of 1651, would have done much for Hobbes. It is possible that relations between Newcastle and Hobbes had cooled considerably after the marquess left Paris in July 1648. If they corresponded at the end of the decade, or in the 1650s, none of the letters has survived. It is also striking that after the Restoration they do not seem to have conversed or corresponded.¹²⁰ There is no evidence of a rupture or unfriendly relations in the 1650s or 1660s, but one cannot safely assume that the relations between Newcastle and Hobbes continued along the old lines after the end of the 1640s. Did Newcastle disapprove of *Leviathan*? Had Hobbes gone too far, even in the eyes of a free-spirited and *politique* noble? As the biographer of Seth Ward was to put it: in *De Cive* 'there is *verbum sapienti*, enough said to let the

¹¹⁶ David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 52, 60.

¹¹⁷ For a classification of Ormonde as constitutional royalist see Little, 'Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament', 98. Ronald Hutton has described Ormonde as 'stoutly anglican'. 'Religion of Charles II', 243. For Ormonde's brand of anglicanism see also Beckett, *Cavalier Duke*, 144–5; and for some of his private devotions, Thomas Carte, *The Life of James, Duke of Ormond*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1851; 6 vols.), v, 188–96.

¹¹⁸ Clarendon, *History of Rebellion*, v, 267 (xiii.178).

¹¹⁹ Hutton, *Charles II*, 73. Hutton even goes so far as to say that with Robert Long and Culpepper, Newcastle was 'not forgiven'.

¹²⁰ For some reasons why Hobbes and Newcastle might have drifted apart after the Restoration, see Sarasohn, 'Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle', 735–7.

intelligent reader know what he would be at; but in his *Leviathan* he spreads his butter so thin, that the courseness of his bread is plainly perceived under it'.¹²¹

In the last analysis, then, it is hard to credit Clarendon's later claim that Hobbes wrote and published *Leviathan* to support the Rump and Cromwell. Thus, I cannot concur with Jeffrey Collins (something of a latter-day Clarendon), who has argued that it was the triumph or ascendancy of independency after 1649 that engendered in Hobbes both the desire to return home and the idea of writing *Leviathan* (or at least the 'Review and Conclusion') to please Cromwell and the independents.¹²² Hobbes certainly seems to have desired to return to England by the end of the 1640s. And he was not in principle, or necessarily, opposed to an independent (congregationalist) ecclesiastical arrangement.¹²³ But while he wrote and when he published his book it was still not certain who would be uppermost in England. As he had in the *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*, Hobbes wrote *Leviathan* seemingly Janus-faced and with a 'double edge', that is, in such a way as to allow for submission to *any* winner of the grand power struggle in England. If Charles and not Cromwell had been victorious at Worcester, the 'Review and Conclusion' would have justified all Englishmen in submitting to the authority of a Stuart. At the time of the writing and publication of *Leviathan* there was still a chance – if increasingly slim – that Charles would restore the Stuart monarchy in the British Isles. Could not Hobbes have hoped, with the would-be king, his mathematics student from a few years ago, that more royalist uprisings would occur in England as the pretender marched down from Scotland in 1651? When Clarendon recalled Hobbes's remark about having 'a mind to go home', even he admitted that Hobbes was speaking half in jest. Half-jesting and holding a double-edged sword: this was Hobbes, the consummate chameleon, neither the principled or die-hard royalist nor Cromwellian enthusiast; the master theorist – and practitioner – of self-preservation. Like a gipsy, Hobbes told a fortune in two ways, so that 'if the one miss, the other may be sure to hit'.¹²⁴

¹²¹ Walter Pope, *The Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, Seth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury* (London, 1697), 117; quoted in Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 131.

¹²² Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes, passim*. My understanding of Hobbes's composition, publication and presentation of *Lev.* is most indebted to Burgess, 'Contexts of *Leviathan*'; Goldsmith, 'Hobbes's Ambiguous Politics'; and Sommerville, *Hobbes in Historical Context* and 'Lofty Science and Local Politics'. Despite my disagreement with Collins, I am heavily indebted to him as well.

¹²³ For substantial differences between Hobbes and the independents, see J. P. Sommerville, 'Hobbes and Independency', *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* 59, 1 (2004): 167–73. For a slightly different view, see James R. Jacob, *Henry Stubbe: Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 8–24.

¹²⁴ *Catching, BW*, iv, 592.

The public quarrel: Hobbes, Of Liberty and Necessity, 1654, Bramhall, Defence of True Liberty, 1655 and Hobbes, Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance, 1656

However much Bramhall had to do with Hobbes's disgrace and subsequent departure from France at the end of 1651, the bishop's main concern in the late 1640s and early 1650s was not to carry out a vendetta against a political philosopher whom he deemed noxious, and who had crossed him in a debate before the Marquess of Newcastle and afterwards in writing. To be sure, it was important to remove Hobbes as far away as possible from the new king. For the author of the *Elements of Law*, *De Cive*, the 'Treatise' and *Leviathan* was harmful to the anglican and constitutional royalist cause embodied and espoused by Bramhall. To discredit and expel Hobbes was clearly in the interest of the bishop of Derry. What might have worried Bramhall more during the early 1650s – after the failure of the Scots-presbyterian restoration venture of 1650–1 – was the possibility of the king's turning Roman catholic. Henrietta Maria's children and the émigré entourage of the Stuarts were all susceptible in these troubled years. Since Charles's Scottish alliance had proved fruitless, the Roman catholics on the continent now had their opportunity to propose an alliance for the purpose of restoring the Stuarts. As support from the dominant faction of Scots had required covenanting on the part of Charles, so support from Roman catholics would require some substantial concessions and promises, if not conversion, on the part of the young king. If *Fair Warning* had been Bramhall's attempt to dissuade Charles from making a deal with covenanters in 1649, his *Answer to Milletière* may be considered his attempt to dissuade the young king from making a deal with the Roman catholics.

Théophile Brachet de la Milletière was counsellor-in-ordinary to the king of France, the young Louis XIV, when in 1651 he wrote a letter addressed

to Charles II, recently returned from England.¹ The epistle was written and published late in 1651 as a preface to Milletière's 'The Victory of Truth'.² Presumably with the approval of the young Louis XIV or one of his ministers, Milletière appealed to Charles to convert to Roman catholicism.³ In the epistle Milletière argues that Charles II has been suffering for the sins of his fathers who abandoned the true church.⁴ Milletière reasons that Charles I's death was God's judgment visited upon him and the English for the sin of schism – and also a warning to other princes of schismatical (protestant) churches.⁵ Milletière is not so crass as to say so explicitly, but the message is that to turn Romanist would considerably improve Charles's chances of gaining the continental support necessary for establishing himself as king of England. However, at one point he speaks explicitly enough in urging Charles to consider: 'Will you doubt, but that in thus seeking His Kingdom, you will find also your own?'⁶ In the penultimate paragraph, Milletière makes an appeal by prophecy: 'when He shall have restored you to His Church, the throne, that was unjustly rent away both from her and from you, may be restored to you in the midst of your subjects, there to re-establish, by the same grace, the Kingdom of Jesus Christ'.⁷ If only between the lines Milletière was asking: Is not England worth a mass?⁸

¹ Milletière had been an elder of the consistory of Charenton, and sometime confidant and assistant of Pierre Du Moulin, before, in 1645, being excommunicated by the synod of Charenton (for some heterodoxy in his irenicist programme), and turning Roman catholic. R. J. M. Van de Schoor, *The Irenical Theology of Théophile Brachet de la Milletière (1588–1665)* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 15, 28; for an episode involving Milletière and Du Moulin and Moise Amyraut when the former was still within the protestant fold, see Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 88, 96–9.

² 'La Victoire de la Verité pour la Paix de l'Eglise, au Royalisme de la Grande Brétagne. Pour convier Sa Majesté d'embrasser la Foy Catholique.' A translation of the dedicatory epistle to Charles II is in *BW*, I, cxxi–cl. All quotations of Milletière are from this volume. There is internal evidence that Milletière wrote in late 1651, after Charles's defeat at Worcester. See *BW*, I, cxlv.

³ In February 1652 Milletière sent a copy of his address to Charles II. In a letter dated 12 February 1652, Paris, to be carried by Gabriel Naudé to Mazarin, who had not yet been able to return to the city because of Fronde disorders, he wrote: 'Je lui [Naudé] ai aussi mis entre les mains, pour l'envoyer a Votre Eminence un petit ouvrage que j'ai adressé au Roi de la Grande Bretagne pour sa conversion a la foi Catholique, dont j'espère que l'evenement, qui doit suivre le moyen que j'en propose, trouvera sa conjuncture favorable dans le bonheur de la paix, que j'augure comme une suite du retour de Votre Eminence.' Quoted in Van de Schoor, *Irenical Theology*, 249–50, transcription of ms. 881, ff. 261–2 in Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Mémoires & Documents de France.

⁴ Dedicatory epistle, 'Victory of Truth', *BW*, I, cxxvi.

⁵ See Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 11, for the popularity of this argument of the Roman catholics.

⁶ Dedicatory epistle, 'Victory of Truth', *BW*, I, cxliv.

⁷ Dedicatory epistle, 'Victory of Truth', *BW*, I, cxlix.

⁸ Charles II's French grandfather, Henri IV, is supposed to have remarked 'Paris vaut bien une messe' on converting, *à la politique*, from protestant to Roman catholic.

Probably early in 1652, Bramhall wrote for Charles II a reply to Milletière's epistle.⁹ From at least one phrase we can infer that he did so while in Paris – or somewhere else in France.¹⁰ That the reply was requested or approved by the king can be concluded from a letter Bramhall wrote to Ormonde in March 1652:

I hope Mr Crowther hath presented to you my answer to Milletière.¹¹ Perhaps some things in it may appear too sharp, which I gave order to be marked in the margin that His Majesty and yourself might view particularly and expunge them or change them as you thought fit. The other treatise¹² which is to vindicate our church from schism and lay it at the right door I shall bring along with me, which I think will say more than hath yet been said in that cause in defence of our Kings and Church.¹³

Thus, through Joseph Crowther, the Duke of York's chaplain, Bramhall was submitting anglican propaganda to Ormonde and Charles for editorial review. Perhaps the bishop's cleverest (or most spiteful) point in reply to Milletière is that Charles II cannot *convert* to catholicism because he is already a catholic: the church of England is as catholic as any church on earth.¹⁴ Rather, Milletière and his fellow papists need to convert from Romanism to catholicism.¹⁵ It is the Roman catholics, not the Christians of the church of

⁹ As we saw at the end of chapter 6, Bramhall was in Paris in October 1651, and at Charles's court, 30 December 1651. Haddan supposed that it was precisely at this time that Bramhall composed the *Answer to Milletière*. *BW*, I, xi, 'u'.

¹⁰ 'this kingdom': *Answer to Milletière*, *BW*, I, 23.

¹¹ Here and elsewhere Bramhall misspelled Milletière, but I have quietly corrected the spelling in all quotations.

¹² I.e., *Just Vindication*, for which see below.

¹³ Bramhall to Ormonde, 28 February/9 March 1652, Calais, *HMC Ormonde(b)*, I, 262–3. Bramhall's answer was only published about a year after this letter, and anonymously, at The Hague, 1653. Apparently this publication was not authorised by Bramhall: see Haddan, *BW*, I, xxvi. In Bramhall's *Just Vindication*, published in 1654, he acknowledged the reply to Milletière as his work. The *Answer to Milletière* was re-published at The Hague in 1654. According to the editor of the French translation of Bramhall's book ('Réponse faite par le Commandement du Roi de la Grande Bretagne à l'Épître Dedicatoire du Triomphe Imaginaire de M. de la Milletière') published in Geneva, in 1655, Charles II had commissioned Bramhall to write this answer: see Haddan, *BW*, I, xxvi. But this Geneva editor's source is not disclosed. Bramhall himself later noted that his book had been approved at Geneva and translated into French. *Vindication of Episcopall Clergy*, *BW*, III, 547.

¹⁴ *Answer to Milletière*, *BW*, I, 24–5. The full title: 'An Answer to M. de la Milletière, his impertinent Dedication of his imaginary Triumph (entitled 'The Victory of Truth'), or his Epistle to the King of Great Britain King Charles II, wherein he inviteth his Majesty to forsake the Church of England, and to embrace the Roman Catholic Religion: with the said Milletière's Epistle prefixed'. Haddan's edition is in *BW*, I, 7–81, from which I quote.

¹⁵ Near the conclusion of the book Bramhall offers the following syllogism: 'That Church which hath changed the Apostolical Creed, the Apostolical succession, the Apostolical regiment, and the Apostolical communion, is no Apostolical, orthodox, or Catholic Church. But the Church of Rome hath changed the Apostolical Creed, the Apostolical succession, the Apostolical regiment, and the Apostolical communion. Therefore the Church of Rome is no Apostolical, orthodox, or Catholic Church.' *Answer to Milletière*, *BW*, I, 72.

England, who have divided themselves from the rest of the universal Christian church. In answer to Milletière's suggestion that Charles II's allegiance to the church of England (or, more personally, his commitment to Bramhall and other Laudian clergy) should now be wavering in the wake of all his recent misfortunes, Bramhall says: 'All these blustering storms have radicated him deeper in his religion: and chiefly that which you make the chiefest motive to his apostating, the martyrdom of his Royal father, and an hereditary love to that Church which he hath justified with his blood.'¹⁶ As for the proposition that a conversion to Roman catholicism might serve to procure Charles II the British crowns, Bramhall judges it preposterous. Bramhall recalls the Old Testament story of Jeroboam, who failed in his mercenary attempt to change religion for 'temporal respects'. By such a conversion, Charles would, on the contrary, spoil his chances. Such a change would, on the one hand, alienate friends, and, on the other hand, strengthen his enemies by providing 'in some sort the justification of their former feigned fears [of Stuart-condoned popery]'.¹⁷ Bramhall goes so far as to scold Milletière for *hurting* Charles's chances for restoration:

If your *charity* be not to be blamed . . . yet prudent men desire more *discretion* in you, than to have presented such a treatise to the view of the world under his Majesty's protection, without his license, and against his conscience. Had you not heard that such groundless insinuations as these [that Charles II has come to be convicted of the error of protestantism], and other private whisperings concerning his father's apostatizing to the Roman Religion, did lose him the hearts of many subjects? If you did, why would you insist in the same steps, to deprive the son of all possibility of recovering them?¹⁸

And with regard to Charles II's present sufferings as an exile, Bramhall argues that Milletière has been wrong to consider them a final punishment for the maintenance of protestantism in England: rather, the sufferings are 'merely probatory'.¹⁹

In the course of answering Milletière, Bramhall reveals his opposition to a Hobbesian conception of the civil sovereign as supreme pastor or priest. He claims that no English sovereign – not even Henry VIII – ever intended to arrogate to himself (or herself) either a 'spiritual Headship' or 'ecclesiastical Headship'. Furthermore, Bramhall wishes to speak for all his compatriots, clergy and laity, in declaring that: 'we did never believe, that our Kings in their own persons could exercise any act pertaining either to the power of order

¹⁶ *Answer to Milletière*, BW, 1, 67.

¹⁷ *Answer to Milletière*, BW, 1, 73. Bramhall refers to the story of Jeroboam in 1 Kings 12:26, 33.

¹⁸ *Answer to Milletière*, BW, 1, 24. ¹⁹ *Answer to Milletière*, BW, 1, 29.

or jurisdiction'.²⁰ This is a direct contradiction of Hobbes's view as enunciated most clearly in *Leviathan* (published about a year before Bramhall's *Answer to Milletière*), that the civil sovereign can perform any act that a priest or bishop does.²¹ In refuting such a view, Bramhall quotes the thirty-seventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles: 'If you [Milletière] will not trust me, hear our Church itself: – "When we attribute the sovereign government [of the Church] to the King, we do not give him any power to administer the Word or Sacraments; but only that prerogative which God in Holy Scripture hath always allowed to godly princes, to see that all states and orders of their subjects, ecclesiastical and civil, do their duties, and to punish those who are delinquent with the civil sword.'"²²

According to the letter he wrote to Ormonde in March 1652, Bramhall had been working on a treatise 'to vindicate our church from schism'.²³ This treatise was originally conceived as an appendix to the *Answer to Milletière*. In the latter, he wrote: 'I have shaped a coat for a schismatic, and had presented it to you in this Answer; but, considering that the matter is of moment, and merits as much to be seriously and solidly weighed as your naked crimination without all pretext of proof deserves to be slighted, lest it might seem here, as an impertinent digression, to take up too much place in this short discourse, I have added it at the conclusion of this Answer in a short tract by itself, that you may peruse it if you please.'²⁴ Thus, by early 1652, Bramhall had been working not only on a reply to Milletière's epistle, but also on a systematic treatise vindicating the church of England from various Roman catholic charges and criticism. Bramhall continued to work on this book after March 1652. As late as May 1653, Bramhall was still adding passages.²⁵ This book was to be published in 1654, in London, as *A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schism*.²⁶ This apologetic was occasioned by several writings by

²⁰ *Answer to Milletière*, BW, I, 29. For Bramhall's similar formulation in *Just Vindication*, see BW, I, 272, where the sovereign's spiritual power is said to be merely 'architectonical'.

²¹ Hobbes stressed that the civil sovereign could perform any act *if he wished*, but that he would probably be too busy with other matters to have any desire to do so.

²² *Answer to Milletière*, BW, I, 30. As noted earlier, Hobbes does not seem to have recognised his deviation from this legal statement of the civil sovereign's *lack* of sacerdotality, effectively a limitation of the royal supremacy.

²³ Bramhall to Ormonde, 28 February/9 March 1652, Calais, HMC Ormonde(b), I, 262–3.

²⁴ *Answer to Milletière*, BW, I, 36.

²⁵ Chapter VII includes a discussion in which Bramhall refers to a recent event of 12 May 1653. *Just Vindication*, BW, I, 236.

²⁶ The title elaborates: 'Wherein the nature of criminal schism, the divers sorts of schismatics, the liberties and privileges of national churches, the rights of sovereign magistrates, the tyranny, extortion, and schism of the Roman Court, with the grievances, complaints, and opposition, of all princes and states of the Roman Communion, of old and at this very day, are manifested to the view of the world.' Just several years later it was re-published, bound with the same title page, with *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon* (1656), in London, 1661. A. W. Haddan, BW, I, xxvii.

English Roman Catholics in which the Anglican church was accused of schism and, as a consequence, being a false church.²⁷ Undoubtedly with Bramhall's sermon at the York synod of 1621 and his doctoral thesis of 1630 in mind, the bishop's nineteenth-century editor Haddan remarked that the subject of the *Just Vindication* 'had dwelt in the author's mind long previously, and appears to have been his favourite topic'.²⁸ *Just Vindication* was in a sense the revision and enlargement of that doctoral thesis, with commentary on more recent (post-1630) developments, including topical treatment of issues of moment while he was composing (c. 1651–3).²⁹ The central claim of the *Just Vindication* is that it was the Roman court that broke with the rest of the Christian church, and that the papacy had never possessed anything but usurped authority over the British church. Echoing his point from the *Answer to Milletière*, Bramhall observes: 'by how much we should turn Roman . . . by so much we should render ourselves less Catholic'.³⁰ Throughout the book Bramhall insists that the papacy has been responsible for all the great schisms in Christendom. In chapters III and IV, Bramhall cites precedents for the sweeping acts of Henry VIII and more recent monarchs of England. The burden of chapter IV is to show that in separating from Rome 'the king and kingdom of England' did not make any new law but merely vindicated 'the ancient law of the land'.³¹ As we will see, Bramhall became a prolific anti-papal controversialist in the mid-1650s; the *Just Vindication* remains the best known of his output.³²

It was probably sometime during 1654 that Bramhall presented a collection of his writings to members of the royal family and his fellow royalists

²⁷ In chapter II (at *BW*, I, 99), Bramhall refers to Henry Holden's *De Resolutione Fidei* (which included an appendix, 'De Schismate') (Paris, 1652) and Knott's *Infidelity Unmasked* (Ghent, 1652). Another defence of the church of England was made by Bramhall's fellow polemicist in England, Henry Hammond, who published *Of Schism* in London, in 1653. In the same year Ferne published *Of the Division between the English and Romish Church upon the Reformation* in London, 1653; and after Bramhall's *Just Vindication* appeared in 1654, Roger Twysden published *Historical Vindication of the Church of England in point of Schism* (London, 1657).

²⁸ Haddan, *BW*, I, xxviii.

²⁹ For the doctoral thesis, see Jackson, 'Hobbes vs. Bramhall', Appendix I, 375–7.

³⁰ *Just Vindication*, *BW*, I, 96.

³¹ Chapter IV, *BW*, I, 129–52; see also 196–7. Bramhall concludes the chapter by arguing that Henry VIII did not innovate any more than his predecessors had done: 'the laws made by King Henry . . . were not operative but declarative; not made to create any new law, but only to vindicate and restore the ancient law of England, and its ancient jurisdiction to the crown'. *BW*, I, 151.

³² Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 64. Boshier notes that it was very widely read and appreciated: in one of his letters Henry Hammond spoke of *Just Vindication* as 'B. B.'s excellent book on Schism'. *Restoration Settlement*, 36, 65. For George Morley's (Hyde's chaplain's) similar appreciation, see Vesey, *AH*, xxx–xxxii. For the Roman Catholic answers that *Just Vindication* provoked, see chapter 8. And for a good summary of Bramhall's arguments in *Just Vindication*, see Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 117–18.

in exile. In a letter that Sir George Radcliffe wrote from Paris, he informed his old Yorkshire friend and former colleague in Ireland, then at The Hague: ‘Your Lordship’s five books I got to be bound, and presented them as you appointed, to the Duke [of York] the Dean [Cosin], Mr Bennett, and Mr Crowther, and my own. Mr Crowther lent his to my Lord Dunkald, who bade me write to your Lordship for one for him.’³³ Bramhall’s engagement in royalist affairs in these years was not confined to anti-Roman catholic polemic. In fact, perhaps only a small fraction of his time was spent on such literary toil. That Bramhall was occasionally commissioned to write things on behalf of the king and the church of England, we know from the case of the reply to Milletière. Sometime in 1653 Bramhall seems to have considered composing a declaration for the king, apparently for striking some sort of deal with a dissident group in England. But he thought better of doing so without the king’s commission, writing to Ormonde, then in Paris: ‘I had thought to have made a draft. But I durst not be so saucy without command.’³⁴ The bishop’s travels on the continent seem to have been frequent and his activity quite varied. It was probably in 1651 or 1652, for example, that he ran another errand in Spain.³⁵ He may have gone into Spain in order to explore some kind of anglican–Roman-catholic compromise which would enable a Habsburg (or Habsburg-related) princess to marry Charles II. Since Vesey related that around this time (early 1650s) Bramhall made a trip into Spain for some liturgical project (and nearly suffered persecution at the hands of the Inquisition), perhaps Bramhall was involved in an attempt to devise some religious form that a Spanish queen would be permitted to practise in England.³⁶ In any case, we can wonder whether the Spanish excursion was for some such marital or alliance project, as conceived by Charles and his advisors.³⁷ Bramhall’s correspondence shows that his travels were mostly along the coasts of the southern Netherlands and

³³ *Rawdon Papers*, No. xxxix. The letter’s editor, Berwick, offered no approximate dating, but reference to the ‘Protector’ places it after December 1653, and reference to Charles II’s presence in France places it before 1655.

³⁴ Received 8/18 June 1653, Bramhall to Ormonde, *HMC Ormonde*(b), 1, 294. Incidentally, this letter indicates that Bramhall sometimes corresponded with Henry Bennett, sometime secretary of the Duke of York and, thus, another exile at the centre of Stuart affairs.

³⁵ On 17/27 February 1653 (*Rawdon Papers*, No. xlii), he wrote to his eldest son John at Ripon: ‘I made a tedious and chargeable voyage into Spain, where I received some money from Mr Jackson, and gave him acquittance for the same; and after a year or two my friend received other moneys from him, to whom I gave power to acquit him so much as he received, but not otherwise.’ For Bramhall’s first excursion into Spain, see chapter 5, 125.

³⁶ AH, xxxiii.

³⁷ In the letters appended to Bray’s edition of Evelyn there is a note on a Spanish intrigue in which Bramhall might have played a part. See Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, iv, 259, n.1.

northwest France.³⁸ These were the travels required of an effective royalist agent. Bramhall's business was, broadly speaking, fundraising, and his specific task was to obtain money for Charles (and fellow royalists) from the proceeds of prizes from ships seized by royalists and royalist-commissioned privateers.³⁹ Such privateers were especially active in French ports in the years 1649–53, and in Dutch ports in the years 1652–4. In November 1652, during the Anglo-Dutch War, Bramhall was appointed official receiver of funds to which the Duke of York was entitled as lord high admiral. In Flushing, where Charles was allowed an admiralty court, Bramhall presided.⁴⁰ The bishop was well-suited for such a role, as he had been, in the Irish venture with Ormonde in 1649–50, procurator-general and special commissioner for the taking of the royal share of the goods seized after the peace of 17 January 1649. For such a job few royalist resumé's could have measured up to Bramhall's.

Perhaps a bishop's entry into such occupation was bound to cause some murmuring. Relations between Bramhall and Hyde were already uneasy because the bishop had scolded the latter for tardiness in the fitting out of privateers. According to Hyde, Bramhall 'read me such a lecture as I never heard'. A week later Hyde wrote to Nicholas that the bishop 'hath lately had as rough an encounter with me as ever I met with in my life, and tho' he complains of me for using some sharp expressions to him, trust me he gave me greater provocations than can be imagined'.⁴¹ Nicholas replied: 'I am very sorry that a person of the Bp. of Derry's calling should abuse his function so much as to busy himself with such affairs as it seems by yours he pretends to.'⁴² But in the next letter from Nicholas to Hyde it emerges that the former's reproach was not without at least the hint of an ulterior motive. Nicholas seems to have wished that the post would be assigned to his son:

I humbly thank you for your care of my request to the K. and D. of York on behalf of my son Ned. If that employment [of receiving the fifths of the prizes] had not been disposed of to others before my letter came, I am confident my son would have therein done very good and faithful service. And indeed I cannot marvel enough why the Bp.

³⁸ In the years 1651–4 he wrote at least one letter from each of the following cities: The Hague, Rotterdam, Vlissingen, Ghent, Antwerp, Brussels, Calais, Paris.

³⁹ Bickley, *HMC Hastings*, iv, xxvi.

⁴⁰ J. R. Jones, *Britain and Europe in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1966), 37. Bramhall's presence in Flushing in the latter months of 1653 is confirmed by various letters of intelligence in *Thurloe State Papers*, i, 464, 514, 585–6, and *CCSP*, ii, 270, 300. Bramhall seems to have been in such perpetual motion that we can hardly say he resided anywhere. In December 1653 he went from Paris to Nantes to assist O'Sullivan Beara in the purchase of arms for Ireland. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Partis Quintae* A.9.87.

⁴¹ Hyde to Taylor, 2 November 1652, *CCSP*, ii, 153; Hyde to Nicholas, 9 November 1652, *CCSP*, iii, 111.

⁴² Nicholas to Hyde, 4/14 November 1652, *Nicholas Papers*, i, 317.

of Derry should covet so improper a province. I believe he is the first bishop that ever busied himself with such a maritime employment, and I doubt that some who wish not well to the K. and Church of England have put his Lordship upon it, that they may speak the louder against both. I thought that, for the Marquis of Ormonde's sake, that Bp. would have paid you more respect than it seems he did lately; and I believe he is the only person of his function that would so unjustly have uttered such words of you, who have ever had so great a reverence for all churchmen.⁴³

The close relations of Bramhall and Ormonde, and the latter's close relations with Hyde and Nicholas, did not, evidently, preclude discordial relations between Bramhall and Hyde and Nicholas.⁴⁴ A further source of enmity between Hyde and Bramhall was to arise in 1653 when the bishop was accused of spreading the implausible rumour that Hyde was supplying information to and receiving a pension from Cromwell. In 1653 in Flushing it seems Bramhall had had a conversation with Sir Richard Grenville, who told him that, according to Colonel Wensham (the king's resident at Boulogne), Hyde was receiving a pension from Cromwell for performing some treacherous service. Apparently Bramhall mentioned this report to others, and eventually it found its way to Charles, who had it investigated.⁴⁵ On the king's behalf Ormonde confronted Bramhall.⁴⁶ Whether Bramhall completely vindicated himself or not, Hyde and Nicholas, if not Charles, could not have been on very friendly terms with Bramhall for some time. In a letter of May 1653, Nicholas had made a sarcastic reference to 'that excellent Bishop'.⁴⁷ At around the same time Hyde wrote mockingly of 'the noble prelate'.⁴⁸ As late as February 1654, Nicholas was nurturing the grudge by jesting with Hyde: 'Your good friends the Bishop of Derry and Sir Richard Grenville are fallen extremely out and very bitter against each other.'⁴⁹

Tensions must have been running especially high among the royalist exiles in these trying years in the wilderness. And it was precisely at this time

⁴³ *Nicholas Papers*, I, 318. A letter in the *Thurloe State Papers* contains similar derision: 'The Bishop of Londonderry, from a fisher of men (if ever he was that) is also turned caper, having this day held a vendition here [Vlissingen] of several goods which were surpris'd in the River Thames by Robert Hall, a Scotchman, in a ketch called the Swallow, bound for Edinburgh.' *Thurloe State Papers*, I, 464.

⁴⁴ It might be worth pointing out that insofar as Hyde had been, in the Short and Long Parliaments, a critic of Strafford and Laud, he had been, by extension, a critic of Bramhall. Thus, in the late 1640s and 1650s, there would naturally have been a little bit of hard feelings or awkwardness. In 1641, Hyde had probably voted for the attainder of the bishop's friend and colleague.

⁴⁵ *CCSP*, II, 259, 279.

⁴⁶ *CCSP*, II, 263, 270, 279. An exculpatory letter regarding the Grenville-Hyde affair was written by Bramhall, at Vlissingen, to Ormonde: 6/16 October 1653, *HMC Ormonde(b)*, I, 296-7; another one was written to George Radcliffe, dated Vlissingen, 6 November 1653, *CCSP*, II, 270.

⁴⁷ Nicholas to Hyde, 19/29 May 1653, *Nicholas Papers*, II, 13. ⁴⁸ *CCSP*, II, 237.

⁴⁹ Nicholas to Hyde, 9/19 February 1654, *Nicholas Papers*, II, 61.

that Bramhall was to be annoyed by an exile of whom he thought he had already disposed, the mathematics tutor from Malmesbury who had been disgraced at the end of 1651.⁵⁰ Years later, in his verse autobiography, Hobbes recounted what his conduct had been upon returning to England:

Then home I came, not sure of safety there [France],
Though I cou'd not be safer any where.

...

At London, lest I should appear a spy,
Unto the state myself I did apply;
That done, I quietly retired to
Follow my study, as I us'd to do.⁵¹

After Hobbes returned to England in early 1652, he lived mainly in London, in Fetter Lane, where the Earl of Devonshire owned a house.⁵² There he enjoyed the conversation of such *cognoscenti* as John Selden, William Harvey and John Vaughan.⁵³ On at least several occasions he had the company of William Brereton and Sir Charles Cavendish, Newcastle's younger brother, who had returned to England in November 1651 in order to compound.⁵⁴ A more recent biographer of Hobbes has substantially confirmed Aubrey's account, reporting that from his return in 1652 to the Restoration in 1660, Hobbes spent little time at Hardwick or Chatsworth, Devonshire's two seats in Derbyshire.⁵⁵ As we have noted, Bramhall seems to

⁵⁰ The bad blood between Bramhall and Hyde may not have lasted very long. It was their mutual interest to get along, and their friend Ormonde might well have effected some reconciliation promptly. Although they were never close friends, relations between Bramhall and Hyde grew cordial as exile wore on. At least by the late 1650s, there is evidence that they were on amicable terms. In a letter from 1 January 1659 (N.S.), Hyde, in Brussels, expressed his hearty good wishes to Bramhall, at Utrecht, on the new year; and offered generous praise for his recent book, *Schism Guarded*. In the same letter Hyde also spoke of visiting him in the near future. *HMC Hastings*, iv, 98. Bramhall's reply to this letter of 1 January 1659 is dated 31 December 1658 (O.S.), Utrecht. *CCSP*, iv, 126.

⁵¹ Verse Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 260; 'In patriam redeo tutelae non bene certus, / Sed nullo potui tutior esse loco: / . . . Londinum veniens, ne clam venisse viderer, / Concilio Status conciliandus eram. / Quo facto, statim summa cum pace recedo, / Et sic me studiis applico, ut ante, meis.' 'Vita Carmine Expressa', *OL*, i, xciii. 'Concilio Status conciliandus eram' suggests but does not prove that Hobbes took the Engagement. I thank Chris Kyle for urging this point.

⁵² Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, i, 337. Hobbes's presence in London in 1652 is verified by journal entries of Loedwijk Huygens, who paid him a visit there. *The English Journal, 1651–1652*, eds. and trans. A. G. H. Bachrach and R. G. Collmer (Leiden: E. J. Brill/Leiden University, 1982), 74, 151. For Hobbes in London in the 1650s, see also Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 162–6.

⁵³ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, i, 337. Vaughan was to become chief justice of the common pleas, 1668–74. Hobbes's circle in London probably included Edmund Waller, Abraham Cowley, Thomas White and William Davenant.

⁵⁴ William Brereton to John Pell, London, 5/15 March 1652, BL MS Add. 4278, fo. 104r; *Pell-Cavendish*, 139.

⁵⁵ Rogow, *Thomas Hobbes*, 205; see also Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 159–60. For Hobbes's movements in the 1650s, see Schuhmann, *Une Chronique*, 114–68.

have spent much of 1653 on the island of Flushing in Zeeland. In May of the following year he was in Antwerp, where he was undoubtedly able to keep himself well informed of continental and British and Irish developments.⁵⁶ Bramhall was probably in Antwerp or Brussels in 1654 when he received some disturbing news.⁵⁷ The private paper Hobbes had written in Rouen in the summer of 1645, the ‘Treatise’, had been published in London. Equally irritating (if unsurprising) was the fact that apparently neither his first paper, the ‘Discourse’, nor his rejoinder, the ‘Vindication’, had accompanied Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ into print. If that was not enough to vex the bishop, prefixed to Hobbes’s paper was a virulent anti-clerical preface. Hobbes’s paper was published in London in 1654 under the title *Of Liberty and Necessity*.⁵⁸ Bramhall’s controversial plate was already full, for the English Roman catholic bishop of Chalcedon, Richard Smith, had immediately answered his *Just Vindication* published early in 1654.⁵⁹

In 1656 Hobbes himself reviewed the events that had led up to the publication of the ‘Treatise’ two years before:

Afterwards [in 1645] the Bishop sent to his Lordship [Newcastle] his opinion concerning the question in writing [‘Discourse’], and desired him to persuade me to send an answer thereunto likewise in writing. There were some reasons for which I thought it might be inconvenient to let my answer go abroad; yet the many obligations wherein I was obliged to him, prevailed with me to write this answer, which was afterwards not only without my knowledge, but also against my will, published by one that found means to get a copy of it surreptitiously.⁶⁰

Hobbes then elaborated upon this publishing by ‘one that found means to get a copy’:

Before I received the bishop’s reply [‘Vindication’], a French gentleman of my acquaintance in Paris, knowing that I had written something of this subject, but not understanding the language, desired me to give him leave to get it interpreted to him by an English young man that resorted to him; which I yielded to. But this young man taking his opportunity, and being a nimble writer, took a copy of it for himself, and printed it here, all but the postscript, without my knowledge, and (as he knew) against my will; for which he since hath asked me pardon.⁶¹

⁵⁶ ‘Antwerp received all the news-sheets and pamphlets published by the Dutch, who followed English affairs closely.’ Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier*, 166.

⁵⁷ He was at Brussels in September 1654, according to a report in *Thurloe State Papers*, II, 601.

⁵⁸ The full title: *Of Liberty and Necessity: A Treatise, Wherein All Controversy Concerning Predestination, Election, Free-Will, Grace, Merits, Reprobation, &c is fully decided and cleared; in answer to a treatise written by the Bishop of Londonderry, on the same subject.* For ease of reference I have used the edition by Molesworth in *EW*, IV, 229–78.

⁵⁹ See chapter 8 for more details about the quarrel between Bramhall and Smith.

⁶⁰ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 2. ⁶¹ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 25–6.

Presumably this young nimble writer might also have penned the unsigned anticlerical letter that preceded Hobbes's 'Treatise'. This prefatory letter goes beyond the anticlerical and into the heretical. At least in some points of its treatment of conventional Christian notions about the Bible one may detect mockery. Scripture is sarcastically styled 'those transcendent writings', and its authors condescendingly described as 'a sort of innocent harmless men, that had little acquaintance or familiarity with the world'.⁶² The author then points out that its modern interpreters (clergymen) are anything but innocent or harmless or unworldly. Rather than renounce the world, they attempt to enrich themselves and live in luxury. This they are able to achieve by defrauding naive laymen. They use the words of Scripture as 'decoys', to divert and ensnare the minds of the laity. They befuddle and confuse the consciences of laymen by convoluted theology. The author does not indicate that he has only Roman catholic and anglican clergy in mind, for he refers disparagingly to *all* the clergy in England in the Protectorate competing against each other to establish the authority of their own confessions.⁶³

The author then proceeds to extravagant praise of Hobbes as a man who, not being a clergyman or theologian, has, in just a few pages, 'performed more than all the voluminous works of the priests and ministers, and that in points of soul-concernment and Christian interest . . . and human salvation'.⁶⁴ The brilliant Hobbes is favourably compared to the clergy, the 'black-coats', who are 'a sort of ignorant tinkers, who in matters of their own profession, such as in the mending and soldering of men's consciences, have made more holes than they found'.⁶⁵ The address to the reader is concluded with the scoffing boast that Hobbes's treatise 'will cast an eternal blemish on all the cornered caps of the priests and Jesuits, and all the black and white caps of the canting tribe'. Hobbes is commended to the reader as 'that man, who, in matters of so great importance as those of thy salvation, furnishes thee with better instructions, than any thou hast ever yet been acquainted with, what profession, persuasion, opinion, or church soever thou art of'.⁶⁶ Since Hobbes disclaimed any involvement in or knowledge of the publishing of his essay, and since references to him are in the third person, one would assume that the vitriolic epistle was not written by the philosopher himself. Yet it would be imprudent to ignore two facts. Firstly, Hobbes was, throughout his life, markedly anticlerical. Even if he had no

⁶² *Of Liberty and Necessity* (OLN hereafter), 'To the Sober and Discreet Reader', *EW*, iv, 231.

⁶³ OLN, 'To the Sober and Discreet Reader', *EW*, iv, 232, 233.

⁶⁴ OLN, 'To the Sober and Discreet Reader', *EW*, iv, 235; similarly: 'This book, how little and contemptible soever it may seem, contains more evidence and conviction in the matters it treats of, than all the volumes, nay libraries, which the priests, Jesuits, and ministers have, to our great charge, distraction, and loss of precious time, furnished us with.' *EW*, iv, 236.

⁶⁵ OLN, 'To the Sober and Discreet Reader', *EW*, iv, 235. ⁶⁶ OLN, *EW*, iv, 238.

part in writing this letter, doubtless, he had said and written similar things.⁶⁷ Thus, at the very least Hobbes offered inspiration to such authors as that of the epistle. Secondly, Hobbes wrote dialogues and autobiographies in which he referred to himself in the third person. Accordingly, reference to Hobbes in the third person is not sufficient proof of his not being the author of a writing. Therefore, if Hobbes did have something to do with the publication of his paper, it is not impossible that he himself wrote or contributed to the anticlerical preface. But is there anything more to suggest his participation in the printing of the ‘Treatise’?

The ‘young nimble writer’ was identified in the seventeenth century by Anthony Wood and John Aubrey. According to Wood in *Athenae Oxonienses*, it was John Davies of Kidwelly, Wales.⁶⁸ Among Aubrey’s miscellaneous notes for a catalogue of Hobbes’s books is to be found the following passage: ‘A letter to the duke of Newcastle about liberty and necessity [‘Treatise’], printed 1676, and 1677. I have this somewhere among my books, printed about 30 years since. It was edited first [in 1654] by John Davys of Kidwelly.’⁶⁹ As the most prolific and versatile English translator of French literature in the seventeenth century, Davies was more than competent to translate Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ into polished French.⁷⁰ According to a contemporary source, Davies was in France from 1649 to late 1651.⁷¹ If he was the one who made the translation, at the time Hobbes specified – that is, 1645 or 1646 – then he must have been there a few years earlier as well. In these years he might easily have translated the short paper for Hobbes’s French friend and, in the process, made a copy ‘surreptitiously’ for himself. Having returned to England, Davies spent the next twenty-five years between Wales and London.⁷² Thus, Hobbes and Davies could have mingled in the 1650s. Davies seems to have moved freely amongst various London literary circles.⁷³ But if Davies was the translator, we need not

⁶⁷ Compare passages in ‘Treatise’, *EW*, iv, 264, and *Lev.*, xii, 73–4, with the prefatory letter’s ‘the practices of such men [clergy] have been] the greatest disturbance, burden, and vexation of the Christian part of the world’. *OLN*, *EW*, iv, 232. Hobbes’s later *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *OL*, v, 341–408, completed in 1671, harped upon the same theme. For the origin and dating and discussion of this verse history, see Patricia Springborg, ‘Hobbes, Heresy, and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 55, 4 (1994): 553–71.

⁶⁸ *Athenae Oxonienses*, iv, 382–5. ⁶⁹ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, i, 359.

⁷⁰ Joseph E. Tucker, ‘John Davies of Kidwelly (1627?–1693), Translator from the French, with an Annotated Bibliography of His Translations’, *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 44 (1950): 119.

⁷¹ Tucker, ‘John Davies’, 120; David Hook, ‘John Davies of Kidwelly: A Neglected Literary Figure of the Seventeenth Century’, *Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 11 (1975): 108.

⁷² Hook, ‘John Davies’, stresses that scholars like Tucker have underestimated how much time Davies spent in his native Wales rather than London.

⁷³ Remarkably active, in the next few decades there was rarely a year that did not see something of his published. While Davies translated all genres of French literature (except poetry and drama), he devoted most of his labour to novels. Tucker, ‘John Davies’, 121, 123.

assume that he was the author of the anticlerical preface. If there is no reason why he could *not* have been this author, there is yet no proof that he was. Nevertheless, it makes sense that the person who submitted the text for publication should have been the one who provided the preface. Of course, it is not impossible that another of Hobbes's admirers wrote the epistle.⁷⁴

Hobbes disavowed any involvement in the publication of his paper, but assuming he thought that Bramhall had been at least partially responsible for his loss of a royal pension and disgrace in Paris, he had motive enough to desire the airing of a portion of a private debate whereby the bishop's intellectual inferiority and charlatanism could be exposed to public view. According to this line of conjecture, the publication of the 'Treatise' as *Of Liberty and Necessity* could have been Hobbes's revenge for Bramhall's hostility in France. The first edition of *Of Liberty and Necessity* in 1654 represented Hobbes as having signed his letter to Newcastle at Rouen on 20 August 1652; the second edition of 1654 presented the date of the letter as Rouen, 20 August 1646.⁷⁵ As we were able to determine in chapter 3, neither of these dates was accurate, for Hobbes must have written the 'Treatise' in August 1645. But 1646 is much more accurate than 1652. So, presumably someone involved in the publication of the second edition of *Of Liberty and Necessity* knew that 1652 was far wide of the truth. One might suspect that Hobbes informed this person involved in the printing. Who else in London at the time knew that 1652 was quite far from the mark? It is true that some of his friends in London would have known, but perhaps none of them would have provided any information to those involved in an unauthorised publication. The alteration of the date from the first to the second edition in 1654 at least hints at Hobbes's (or one of his friends') complicity in at least the latter edition.⁷⁶ To be sure, Davies himself knew that 1652 was incorrect, so it is quite possible that he alone was responsible for the alteration in the second edition. But assuming Hobbes's willingness to deceive, we may wonder whether the false date of 1652 was, in fact, put in the first edition by him. Such an act would have had the merit of providing 'plausible deniability'. If *he* had been involved, so the reasoning would go, the date would not have been inaccurate. Two years later, in 1656, Hobbes was to urge precisely

⁷⁴ Hobbes's independent and Cromwellian admirers in England in the 1650s are examined by Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 159–241.

⁷⁵ *Of Liberty and Necessity* was not published by Hobbes's customary printer Crooke. Rather, it was published by 'W. B.' for F. Eaglesfield at the Marygold in St Paul's Churchyard. Macdonald and Hargreaves, *Hobbes Bibliography*, 38, provided William Bentley, printer in Finsbury, 1645–56, for these initials.

⁷⁶ For this line of speculation I am indebted to Rogow, *Thomas Hobbes*, 181, who concludes that Hobbes was, at best, not ignorant of or concerned about the publishing of the second edition of 1654.

this as proof of his not being privy: 'He [Bramhall] might have perceived also, by the date of my letter, 1652, which was written 1646 (which error could be no advantage to me), that I knew nothing of the printing of it.'⁷⁷ Hobbes's participation in the second edition seems all the more likely by the fact that he recalled 1646 (not 1645) as the year in which he wrote his letter. The second edition of *Of Liberty and Necessity* in 1654 bore Hobbes's (not uncharacteristic) misrecollection.⁷⁸

As for the savagely anticlerical address to the 'Sober and Discreet Reader', we must concede that while its tenor is Hobbesian enough, its style is not. But, then, if Hobbes had anything to do with it, and wished to keep this unknown, what better way than to adopt an uncharacteristic style? Thus, it is not impossible, though admittedly far fetched, that Hobbes mischievously penned this letter himself. Was Hobbes above such a prank? Very likely. We would assume that Hobbes was insufficiently imprudent to risk the repercussions of such guile. If detected, the dishonour of such deceitfulness would be enormous. Furthermore, the possible cost would be much greater than any possible profit – say, the humour of an inside joke. However attractive the theory of Hobbes's direct involvement in an unauthorised publication may be, there is not enough material for us to consider it better than a 'conspiracy theory'. We cannot assume that whenever something of Hobbes was published, he had something to do with it. In the seventeenth century unauthorised publication was far from rare. With the copying and circulation of books in manuscript form, this was a predictable occurrence. Such unauthorised publishing happened to Hobbes as well as to many other authors. Unauthorised publication of sections of the *Elements of Law* and of a translation of *De Cive* took place in England while Hobbes was in France.⁷⁹ And later his *Behemoth* was apparently published without his consent. All things considered, we can accept that Hobbes was probably just as surprised (but not annoyed) as Bramhall to discover that his paper had been published by a certain 'W. B.' Nevertheless, since Hobbes was not always perfectly honest or precise in recollection, I do not think it is unwise to leave open the possibility that Hobbes participated in the publication of his 'Treatise' more than he ever acknowledged. Should we not at least suppose that he didn't lift a finger to prevent the second edition of *Of Liberty and Necessity*? If he really did permit the publication of his paper, there would be some irony to observe. For he was the one who had been most concerned about keeping their debate private:

⁷⁷ *Questions*, EW, v, 25.

⁷⁸ 'Not uncharacteristic' in light of the inaccuracies and gaps to be found in his various autobiographies; for a description of the latter, see Robertson, *Hobbes*, 2, n.1.

⁷⁹ Of course, one could wonder whether these, too, were not so unauthorised as has always been assumed.

I must confess, if we consider the greatest part of mankind, not as they should be, but as they are, that is, as men, whom either the study of acquiring wealth, or preferment, or whom the appetite of sensual delights, or the impatience of meditating, or the rash embracing of wrong principles, have made unapt to discuss the truth of things: I must, I say, confess that the dispute of this question will rather hurt than help their piety; and therefore if his Lordship had not desired this answer, I should not have written it, nor do I write it but in hopes your Lordship and his will keep it private.⁸⁰

Penned in the summer of 1645, this was now, in 1654, public (and popular) reading in London.⁸¹ Had the time become ripe for the greatest part of mankind to have their piety hurt by an unedifying dispute? Or was the greatest part of mankind now sufficiently reformed and enlightened (by, say, *Leviathan*) not to be damaged? Perhaps, instead, the greatest part of mankind (in England) was now too corrupt or jaded – from wars, political vicissitude and religious experiments – to have any piety to lose. Whatever the case, the greatest part of mankind in England, or at least London, was now to be treated to another spectacle of war, or rather a public duel between the two gladiators who had first crossed swords in private in Paris in the summer of 1645.

In 1655, Bramhall seems to have been living just as nomadically as he had been in earlier years of exile.⁸² In the mid-1650s, the ultimate objective of the royalist exiles was to destroy Cromwell's Protectorate. Bramhall might have considered Hobbes one of the regime's defenders. In any case, he understood that Hobbes's political teachings, whether read in *De Cive* or *Leviathan*, justified submission to Cromwell's government. Bramhall may also have been considering the problem of Hobbes's broader influence, beyond England. The philosopher's principles might still be adopted by a king who might one day be restored. A serious concern of Bramhall and the other émigré anglicans (lay and clerical) was to prevent any policy that would sever the Stuart cause from the form of Christianity and church government that had been established before the rebellions and wars. For the exiled bishop of Derry, Hobbes represented one formidable threat to the preservation of a union of Charles II and Laudian (Bramhallian) anglicanism. Hobbes's philosophy and theology undermined the credibility of that anglicanism, and

⁸⁰ 'Treatise', *EW*, iv, 256–7.

⁸¹ That *OLN* was popular I extrapolate from a point made by Mark Goldie, who claims that Hobbes's next contribution to the debate, *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance* (1656), may have been more widely read than Hobbes's major works (e.g., *Lev.*). 'The Reception of Hobbes' in *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 607.

⁸² From *CCSP*, III, 22, we know he was at Flushing in March 1655. He had been attending Charles's court at Aachen in September of the preceding year. Letter of Intelligence, Aachen, 22 September 1654, *Thurloe State Papers*, II, 601.

called into question the authority of its bishops. As we will see in the [next chapter](#), Bramhall would try to demonstrate that Hobbes represented a threat to the authority (and, thus, welfare) of the Stuarts – and all the other hereditary rulers of Europe. The siege of Hobbes’s philosophical, theological and political fortress that Bramhall undertook in the years 1655–8 cannot be fully appreciated without considering the bishop’s peculiar concerns as an exile anglican royalist bishop. His polemical activity was a function of the exceedingly insecure situation in which he and other ousted clergy found themselves.⁸³ Hobbes was only contributing to that insecurity. And if the Stuarts were somehow restored there was still the danger that something like a Hobbesian, *Leviathan*-minded sovereign would dispense with subversive ecclesiastics who laid claim to a unique apostolic-divine and independent authority; churchmen who pretended that they wielded power for which they were indebted to no earthly ruler.⁸⁴

Whether or not we have sufficient reason to suppose that Hobbes had been complicit in the publication of his ‘Treatise’ in 1654, Bramhall seems to have suspected it. When the bishop first heard that Hobbes’s private paper had been published it was natural for him to assume that Hobbes had played some part in the production. Bramhall did, however, allow for the possibility of an unauthorised publication.⁸⁵ But he still portrayed himself indignant at the breach of their privacy pact, and professed himself quite annoyed that Hobbes’s paper was unaccompanied by his rejoinder. He must have immediately resolved to set the record straight, for shortly afterwards he had published in London both the papers he composed in 1645–6, the ‘Discourse’ and the ‘Vindication’ (the answer to Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’). Thus, in 1655 appeared Bramhall’s *A Defence of True Liberty from Antecedent and Extrinsic Necessity*.⁸⁶ Under this title Bramhall printed the dedicatory epistle of the ‘Vindication’ that he had addressed to Newcastle. In this letter he

⁸³ For Bramhall’s own description of the hardships of exile, written in 1653–4, see *Just Vindication*, BW, 1, 276–7.

⁸⁴ For a concise description of the plight of the anglican clergy in exile at this time, see Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 52; for one nearly contemporary representation of the difficulties of the anglican clergy in England, worry about the interruption of the apostolic succession and measures taken to prevent it, see Peter Barwick, *The Life of Dr John Barwick, Dean of St Paul’s*, trans. Hilkiah Bedford, ed. G. F. Barwick (London: E. E. Robinson and Co., 1903), 105–10. I say ‘nearly contemporary’ because Peter Barwick began writing the biography of his brother in about 1671.

⁸⁵ ‘if the edition were with his own consent’: Preface, *Defence*, BW, iv, 19; emphasis added.

⁸⁶ The full title is *A Defence of True Liberty from Antecedent and Extrinsic Necessity; being An Answer to a late book of Mr Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, entitled A Treatise of Liberty and Necessity*. I quote from Haddan’s edition in BW, iv, 3–196. Assuming that the copy of the *Defence* now in the Lincoln Cathedral Library was Michael Honeywood’s, dean of Lincoln after the Restoration, Honeywood probably received his copy, inscribed ‘ex dono authoris’, while in Utrecht in 1655. The corrections in this copy appear to be Bramhall’s own.

had identified himself with the cause of ‘God and man, religion and policy, Church and commonwealth’ – as against Hobbes and his ‘blasphemous, desperate, and destructive’ cause of ‘fatal destiny’. For the *Defence* Bramhall also offered a prefatory letter addressed to the ‘Christian Reader’ wherein he tells of the origin of the controversy, the private oral debate in Paris in 1645.⁸⁷ He points out that the writings now before the reader had not been intended for publication, but only ‘privately undertaken’ in order that the ‘ventilation of the question’ would allow for the truth to be established.⁸⁸ Bramhall then informs his public audience that Hobbes had also wished to keep the debate private, ‘but either through forgetfulness or change of judgment, he hath now caused or permitted it to be printed in England, without either adjoining my first discourse, to which he wrote that answer, or so much as mentioning this reply, which he hath had in his hands now these eight years. So wide is the date of his letter, – “in the year 1652,” – from the truth, and his manner of dealing with me in this particular from ingenuity (if the edition were with his own consent).’⁸⁹ To remedy this, the bishop will present ‘all that passed between us upon this subject, without any addition, or the least variation from the original’. Bramhall then turns his attention to the anticlerical epistle, but can muster only contempt. He disdains to take seriously the author’s ‘ignorant censures’ and ‘hyperbolic expressions’, but is content to let the sycophant of Hobbes ‘lick up the spittle of Dionysius by himself’.⁹⁰ In sum, the author of the epistle is unworthy of refutation, for the epistle reveals ‘his knowledge in theological controversies is none at all’.⁹¹

In view of what was to happen in the next few years (1656–8), the last paragraph of Bramhall’s ‘Letter to the Christian Reader’ is of particular interest. Now that Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ had been published, the public knew that the bishop had written a critique of *De Cive*. For in that letter addressed to Newcastle, Hobbes had referred to the objections that Bramhall had submitted in or shortly before the summer of 1645. So in the last paragraph of the prefatory letter of the *Defence*, Bramhall clarifies that ‘ten years since’ he had given Hobbes sixty strictures, half of them political, half of them theological.⁹² But, Bramhall points out, Hobbes has not answered them. Now, however, Bramhall would not care to receive any answer concerning *De Cive*, for since he wrote his critique of that book something much more perverse has reared its head, *Leviathan*: ‘Monstrum horrendum, informe,

⁸⁷ *Defence*, BW, iv, 19–21. ⁸⁸ *Defence*, BW, iv, 19.

⁸⁹ *Defence*, BW, iv, 19. Bramhall’s mention of 1652 suggests that Bramhall had only got his hands on the first edition of *OLN*, for the second edition, it will be recalled, bore the date 1646.

⁹⁰ The ruler Dionysius of Sicily was a seventeenth-century byword for tyrant, as Hitler or Stalin is now a byword for dictator.

⁹¹ *Defence*, BW, iv, 19–20. ⁹² *Defence*, BW, iv, 20.

ingens, cui lumen ademptum.’ This menacing ‘monstrous bulk, deformed, deprived of sight’, ‘affords much more matter of exception’ than *De Cive*.⁹³ But Bramhall thinks he might be spared the task of slaying *Leviathan*. He is informed that there are already at least two men undertaking the work: ‘one of our own Church, the other a stranger, who have shaken in pieces the whole fabric of his city, that was but builded in the air, and resolved that huge mass of his seeming Leviathan into a new nothing’.⁹⁴ Bramhall expects that these books will be published soon. However, if his information proves incorrect, he promises to take up the cudgels himself. He would not begrudge his Christian reader a clear demonstration that Hobbes’s principles are ‘pernicious’, to government and social harmony as well as to religion; that the principles found in *Leviathan* are ‘destructive to all relations of mankind, between prince and subject, father and child, master and servant, husband and wife’. Anyone who would maintain such principles would be more fit to live among wild beasts than in any Christian or civilised community.⁹⁵

As we have noted, Bramhall stated that the contents of the *Defence* were ‘all that passed between us upon this subject, without any addition, or the least variation from the original’.⁹⁶ What follow Bramhall’s prefatory letter are not only his two papers (the ‘Discourse’ and ‘Vindication’) but also Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ – which had come between. Bramhall cut and pasted the three texts and distributed them in thirty-eight different sections. The first twenty-four contain passages from Bramhall’s ‘Discourse’, Hobbes’s ‘Treatise’ and Bramhall’s ‘Vindication’ (so that the reader could read point, counterpoint, counter-counterpoint); the final fourteen sections contain passages from only the last two (so that the reader could read

⁹³ *Defence*, BW, iv, 20. The quotation is Virgil’s description of the Cyclops in *Aeneid*, III.658, and I have given the translation of Dryden. At Sidney Sussex Bramhall probably filled a commonplace book with such quotations. See William Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum in Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 32, for these student books. All of Bramhall’s writings are intercalated with Latin tags.

⁹⁴ *Defence*, BW, iv, 20–1. The identity of these authors I have not been able to determine. It is unlikely that ‘one of our own Church’ refers to William Lucy, whose *Examinations, Censures and Confutations of Divers Errors in the Two First Chapters of Mr Hobbes His Leviathan* was to appear in 1656 (under the pseudonym William Pike), for some remarks in the epistle to the reader suggest Bramhall had no knowledge of Lucy’s intentions or toil. See chapter 8 n 20. Only slightly more likely is that the phrase refers to George Lawson, because the latter’s *An Examination of the Political Part of Mr Hobbes his ‘Leviathan’* did not appear until 1657. It is possible that Bramhall was referring to Seth Ward, whose *In Thomae Hobbii Philosophiam Exercitatio Epistolica* appeared in 1656 or, less likely, Thomas Pierce, because the latter’s *The Self-Avenger Exemplified* did not appear until 1658. See Samuel I. Mintz, *The Hunting of Leviathan: Seventeenth-Century Reactions to the Materialism and Moral Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 157, for these and other candidates.

⁹⁵ *Defence*, BW, iv, 21. ⁹⁶ *Defence*, BW, iv, 19.

point-counterpoint). In chapter 4 we reviewed all these writings; the point to stress here is that all these writings were now exposed to public view. Hobbes was probably in London in 1655 when he learned that Bramhall had published the *Defence of True Liberty*.⁹⁷ So it would not have taken him very long to obtain a copy of it. After he had done so, he must have decided at once to publish an answer to it. Whether Hobbes would have acknowledged it or not he was now the one who was re-kindling the quarrel. For, excepting the prefatory matter, both his own *Of Liberty and Necessity* and the bishop's *Defence of True Liberty* were merely publications of the old papers from the previous decade. To compose and publish an answer to the *Defence* would be to contribute something new. This might seem surprising, in view of the fact that Hobbes had earlier stressed that for the 'greatest part of mankind', such disputes would 'rather hurt than help piety'.⁹⁸ After being so concerned to keep quiet about determinism in 1645, in 1656 Hobbes now issued a systematic answer to Bramhall's libertarian, arminian 'Vindication' (published under the title *Defence*): *The Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance*.⁹⁹ The situation in England, and of Hobbes, had changed much in the years 1645–56. Was Hobbes willing to publish a writing against Bramhall only now that he was in England, settled in Cromwell's regime, while Bramhall, on the continent, lived the precarious and impotent life of an exile, wielding little or no authority *qua* 'bishop of Derry'? One might surmise that in these years Hobbes did not fear a restoration of Bramhall in Ireland or England in the near future. It is not probable that the philosopher would have risked retaliation for publishing such an excoriating answer to the bishop's book.

In the *Questions* itself, Hobbes offered a lengthy description of his motivation for replying to Bramhall. Near the conclusion he wrote that:

A little before the last parliament of the late king, when every man spake freely against the then present government, I thought it worth my study to consider the grounds and consequences of such behaviour, and whether it were conformable or contrary to reason and to the Word of God. And after some time I did put in order and publish my thoughts thereof, first in Latin, and then again the same in English; where I endeavoured to prove both by reason and Scripture, that they who have once submitted themselves to any sovereign governor, either by express acknowledgement of his power, or by receiving protection from his laws, are obliged to be true and faithful to him, and to acknowledge no other supreme power but him in any matter or question whatsoever, either civil or ecclesiastical. In which books of mine, I pursued my subject without taking notice of any particular man that held any opinion contrary

⁹⁷ All the correspondence from 1655 indicates that he was in London. Furthermore, in November Evelyn reported his visiting Hobbes there. *Diary and Correspondence*, III, 163.

⁹⁸ 'Treatise', *EW*, IV, 256–7.

⁹⁹ Philip Tanny's letter to Hobbes of 13–14/23–4 May 1656 suggests that *Questions* was published before that date. *Corr.*, I, 276.

to that which I then wrote; only in general maintained that the office of the clergy, in respect of the supreme civil power, was not magisterial, but ministerial; and that their teaching of the people was founded upon no other authority than that of the civil sovereign; and all this without any word tending to the disgrace either of episcopacy or of presbytery. Nevertheless I find since, that divers of them, whereof the Bishop of Derry is one, have taken offence especially at two things; one, that I make the supremacy in matters of religion to reside in the civil sovereign; the other, that being no clergyman, I deliver doctrines, and ground them upon words of the Scripture, which doctrines they, being by profession divines, have never taught. And in this their displeasure, divers of them in their books and sermons, without answering any of my arguments, have not only exclaimed against my doctrine, but reviled me, and endeavoured to make me hateful for those things, for which (if they knew their own and the public good) they ought to have given me thanks. . . . I have been publicly injured by many of whom I took no notice, supposing that that humour would spend itself; but seeing it last, and grow higher in this writing [the *Defence*] I now answer, I thought it necessary at last to make of some of them, and first of this Bishop, an example.¹⁰⁰

In other words, Bramhall and other clergymen have resented and attacked him because he has denied them authority *jure divino*, arguing, instead, that they possess no authority save what is conferred upon them by the civil sovereign. One can only wonder how Hobbes could have thought that this would not be taken as ‘disgrace of episcopacy’ when so many anglicans held that bishops possessed some authority as successors of the apostles, and not simply as appointees of the civil sovereign. This passage from the *Questions* also shows clearly Hobbes’s awareness of the objection that he himself, as a mere private subject, had usurped authority to pronounce upon religious questions. Hobbes’s defence here seems to be that he has grounded all his pronouncements upon Scripture, so that his authority is not his own but that of the Word of God. But in other writings Hobbes himself had recognised what a specious justification this was: any man could claim such scriptural warrant, no matter how bizarre or heretical the doctrine. A commonwealth would be reduced to chaos and violence unless all subjects conformed to the interpretation made or licensed by the civil sovereign and his or its ministers. As early as the *Elements of Law* Hobbes had emphasised that Scripture had to be interpreted, and that one could not avoid falling into one of the theological camps: ‘Nor can a man be said to submit himself to Holy Scripture, that doth not submit himself to some or other for the interpretation thereof; or why should there be any church governmentt at all instituted, if the Scripture itself could do the office of a judge in controversies of faith?’¹⁰¹ To what interpretation was Hobbes submitting himself? Seemingly, the Hobbesian – or calvinist; certainly not the arminian.

¹⁰⁰ *Questions, EW*, v, 453–5.

¹⁰¹ *Elements of Law*, xxv.13, ed. Gaskin, 153–4.

In the next section, ‘The Fountains of Argument in this Question’, Hobbes declares his position concerning intellectual authorities. Although he will answer any of Bramhall’s arguments derived directly from Scripture, he denies that he is obliged to defer to any of Bramhall’s ‘human authorities’ that are not ‘consonant’ with Scripture and reason.¹⁰² The bishop’s scholastic authorities, as merely human authorities, cannot be regarded as unimpeachable or infallible. So being, they will be subject to Hobbes’s own judgment. Throughout the *Questions* we see Hobbes citing and interpreting Scripture. Thus he assumes the authority to contradict the bishop on the latter’s own professional grounds. And he excuses himself by pleading that he is only opposing the bishop and schoolmen – not Scripture itself. He is always careful to stress that he opposes the bishop and the schoolmen only because they stray from a sound understanding of Scripture. Hobbes casts himself as the spokesman for Scripture against the false and unscriptural doctrines of the schoolmen. Thus, in challenging one of Bramhall’s tenets, he asks: ‘But what infallible evidence hath the Bishop, that a man shall be after this life eternally in torments and never die? Or how is it certain there is no second death, when the Scripture saith there is? Or where doth the Scripture say that a second death is an endless life? Or do the Doctors only say? Then perhaps they do but say so, and for reasons best known to themselves.’¹⁰³ Hobbes concludes this last of the prefatory sections of the *Questions* in a contemptuous strain: ‘And this I take to be enough to clear the understanding of the reader, that he may be the better able to judge of the following disputation. I find in those that write of this argument, especially in the Schoolmen and their followers, so many words strangers to our language, and such confusion and inanity in the ranging of them, as that a man’s mind in the reading of them distinguisheth nothing. And as things were in the beginning before the Spirit of God was moved upon the abyss, *tohu* and *bohu*, that is to say, confusion and emptiness; so are their discourses.’¹⁰⁴ This is the first utterance of Hobbes’s refrain in the *Questions*: Bramhall’s whole discourse on the subject of free-will and necessity is *tohu* and *bohu*, or ‘confusion and emptiness’ – Hobbes’s translation of the Hebrew phrase from the first chapter of Genesis. This will be repeated again and again.¹⁰⁵

Hobbes does feel obliged to acquit himself of the charge of complicity in the publication of the ‘Treatise’. Reviewing Bramhall’s letter to the Christian Reader of *Defence*, Hobbes comments:

¹⁰² *Questions*, EW, v, 6. ¹⁰³ *Questions*, EW, v, 17. ¹⁰⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 19–20.

¹⁰⁵ E.g., ‘confused and empty words’, ‘*Tohu* and *Bohu*’, ‘mere confusion and emptiness’, ‘nothing but *Tohu* and *Bohu*’. *Questions*, EW, v, 35, 63, 77, 301.

It is true that it was not my intention to publish any thing in this question. And the Bishop might have perceived, by not leaving out those four passages,¹⁰⁶ that it was without my knowledge the book was printed: but it pleased him better to take this little advantage to accuse me of want of ingenuity. He might have perceived also, by the date of my letter, 1652, which was written 1646 (which error could be no advantage to me), that I knew nothing of the printing of it. I confess, that before I received the bishop's reply ['Vindication'], a French gentleman of my acquaintance in Paris, knowing that I had written something of this subject, but not understanding the language, desired me to give him leave to get it interpreted to him by an English young man that resorted to him; which I yielded to. But this young man taking his opportunity, and being a nimble writer, took a copy of it for himself, and printed it here, all but the postscript, without my knowledge, and (as he knew) against my will; for which he since hath asked me pardon. But that the Bishop intended it not for the press, is not very probable, because he saith he writ it to the end 'that by the ventilation of the question, truth might be cleared from mistakes'; which end he had not obtained by keeping it private.¹⁰⁷

Thus, not only is Hobbes to be absolved of any responsibility for the publication, but the bishop is to be suspected of having had a long-harboured design to publish his own papers – and, thus, by implication, that Bramhall was just waiting for a pretext. Towards the end of the *Questions* Hobbes briefly revisits the matter once more:

I said nothing, but that I would have my Lord of Newcastle to communicate it only to the Bishop. And in his answer he says, 'if I had desired to have it kept secret, the way had been to have kept it secret myself'. My desire was, it should not be communicated by my Lord of Newcastle to all men indifferently. But I barred not myself from showing it privately to my friends; though to publish it was never my intention, till now provoked by the uncivil triumphing of the Bishop in his own errors to my disadvantage.¹⁰⁸

Hobbes does not, then, apologise for anything. He does not show any contrition for the two editions of the 'Treatise' published in 1654. Rather, as we have seen, he counters that Bramhall has for a long time been itching to fight him on a public stage. The further implication is that for all the bishop's show of indignation at the publication of the 'Treatise', he was glad at the opportunity to publish his criticism of Hobbes.

The tone of the *Questions* proves significantly more acrimonious than that of the 'Treatise' (published as *Of Liberty and Necessity*). Whereas in the latter Hobbes had written somewhat sarcastically at a few points, in the *Questions* he scoffs openly throughout. In concluding his comments on Bramhall's dedication to Newcastle, he speaks of the bishop's concluding

¹⁰⁶ I.e., the passages in which Hobbes pleads for privacy of debate: see discussion of 'Treatise' in chapter 4. Thus, Bramhall was slightly exaggerating when he said that the *Defence* contained only what had passed between him and Hobbes previously.

¹⁰⁷ *Questions*, EW, v, 25–6. ¹⁰⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 434.

line as ‘a buffoonly abusing of the name of God to calumny’.¹⁰⁹ Hobbes the ‘private man’, the layman, suggests that the bishop is a buffoon. In a similarly disparaging vein, Hobbes takes notice of Bramhall’s obtuseness: ‘I wonder how he that was before so witty as to say, my first words tripped up the heels of my cause, and that having line enough I would confute myself, could presently be so dull as not to see his argument was too weak to support so triumphant a language.’¹¹⁰ Hobbes seizes every opportunity in the *Questions* to characterise Bramhall as the prototype of the worldly, careerist churchman. In the course of commenting upon his framing of the dispute, Hobbes suggests that the bishop has done so as shrewdly and technically as he would have drawn up a real-estate lease.¹¹¹ Surely Hobbes was here exploiting the background of Bramhall’s controversial career as Strafford’s ecclesiastical agent in Ireland, and the bishop’s career as a royalist fundraiser on the continent – especially his activities as a prizemaster on the coasts of the Netherlands and France. And surely Hobbes expected many of his readers to know of this background. In concluding his argument that the thought or belief in free-will does not prove that it exists, Hobbes adverts to the bishop’s preoccupations with economic profit:

A wooden top that is lashed by the boys, and runs about sometimes to one wall, sometimes to another, sometimes spinning, sometimes hitting men on the shins, if it were sensible of its own motion, would think it proceeded from its own will, unless it felt what lashed it. And is a man any wiser, when he runs to one place for a benefice, to another for a bargain, and troubles the world with writing errors and requiring answers, because he thinks he doth it without other cause than his own will, and seeth not what are the lashings that cause his will?¹¹²

The description of a man running around for benefices and bargains fits Bramhall’s clerical career rather well. According to Hobbes, all the revenue ventures, episcopal administration and professional obligations, such as preaching, have diverted Bramhall so much as to render him unqualified to treat the difficult philosophical and scientific questions that their debate has raised.¹¹³ Bramhall ‘hath been obliged most of his time to preach unto the people, and to that end to read those authors that can best furnish him with what he has to say, and to study for the rhetoric of his expressions, and of

¹⁰⁹ *Questions*, EW, v, 27. ¹¹⁰ *Questions*, EW, v, 34.

¹¹¹ *Questions*, EW, v, 3. ¹¹² *Questions*, EW, v, 55.

¹¹³ But for all his disdain for Bramhall the episcopal businessman, Hobbes was not unfamiliar with or inept at such tasks: with the second earl of Devonshire he had participated in managing the affairs of the Virginia Company – as well as having served as a secretary to the Cavendishes for many years of his employment. For the Devonshires he worked out an accounting system for handling their finances. See Noel Malcolm, ‘Hobbes, Sandys, and the Virginia Company’, *HJ* 24, 2 (1981): 297–321. I am not aware that any Hobbes biographer has suggested the possibility that the philosopher’s interest in mathematics grew out of such mundane bookkeeping activities.

the spare time (which to a good pastor is very little) hath spent no little part in seeking preferment and increasing of riches'.¹¹⁴ Thus, Hobbes more than implies that Bramhall is the epitome of the avaricious bishop-businessman. Such a man preoccupied with mercenary interests is unfit to debate him: 'he showeth so clearly that he understandeth nothing at all of natural philosophy, that I am sorry I had the ill fortune to be engaged with him in a dispute of this kind. There is nothing that the simplest countryman could say so absurdly concerning the understanding, as this of the Bishop.'¹¹⁵ In another spot Hobbes bites with fangs dripping with sarcasm: 'If this be the bishop's meaning, as it is the meaning of the words, he is a very fine philosopher.'¹¹⁶

In Hobbes's view, the bishop could offer nothing but the stale nonsense of scholasticism – old crotchets, long exposed as useless for solving the important questions of natural philosophy, or advancing the new experimental and mathematical sciences informed by mechanico-materialist metaphysics. Even so, in the *Questions*, Hobbes went to the trouble of providing a point-by-point refutation. There are replies, entitled 'Animadversions', to each of the thirty-eight sections of Bramhall's *Defence*. Inevitably there is, like the *Defence*, much repetition; much of the *Questions* sees Hobbes merely putting the same points, refuting the same points, in slightly different ways, with different illustrations and usually more petulantly and contemptuously. Well before completing answers to all the sections of *Defence*, Hobbes probably felt that there was little more he could do to expose the absurdity of the libertarian-arminian view of the bishop. Hobbes might have felt that he was not so much refuting Bramhall as all those old discredited authorities irrelevant to all moderns enlightened by such men as Copernicus, Bacon, Kepler, Gilbert, Galileo and Harvey.¹¹⁷ Indeed, at one point Hobbes observes that much of Bramhall's writing has been merely plagiarism of the sixteenth-century scholastic Francisco Suarez: 'whosoever chanceth to read Suarez's *Opuscula*, where he writeth of free-will and of the concurrence of God with man's will, shall find the greatest part, if not all, that the Bishop hath urged in this question'.¹¹⁸ Lombard, Aquinas, Scotus, Suarez and Bellarmine are the 'ignorant men' who have provided Bramhall with the 'rash precept' he

¹¹⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 63. ¹¹⁵ *Questions*, EW, v, 77.

¹¹⁶ *Questions*, EW, v, 92. For similar comments about Bramhall's incompetence, see *ibid.*, 51, 300, 372.

¹¹⁷ This point is developed further in the Conclusion.

¹¹⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 37. Hobbes seems to have been referring to Suarez, *Varia Opuscula Theologica* (Lyon, 1599). For Suarez's position, from which Bramhall's does not differ in any substantial way, see Sleight, Chappell and Della Rocca, 'Determinism and Human Freedom', 1199–2000. For a more recent exposition of Suarez's teaching concerning free-will, see Thomas Pink, 'Suarez, Hobbes and the Scholastic Tradition in Action Theory' in *The Will and Human Action: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, eds. M. W. F. Stone and Thomas Pink (London: Routledge, 2004), 127–53. I thank Dr Pink for sending me a copy of this essay.

has been uncritically following.¹¹⁹ Hobbes's charge of Suarez-borrowing by Bramhall may be considered doubly devastating. For some of the philosopher's learned English (predominantly protestant) readers this remark would have had something of the force of 'you quote the devil himself on this subject'. Suarez was a Jesuit, and a Spanish one at that. Furthermore, as Bramhall had drawn directly from Aquinas at many points in his argument about free-will in the 'Defence' and 'Vindication', the bishop would have disturbed many English readers aware of the fact that the Council of Trent had established Aquinas as the Roman catholic church's philosophical and theological authority. The Jesuits embraced Aquinas as their guide and deployed him in polemic against protestants; as for Suarez, he wrote substantial and sympathetic commentary on some of Aquinas's books.¹²⁰ By observing Suarez to be a primary source of Bramhall's thinking, Hobbes was also effectively associating the bishop with a well-known (and, thus, much detested) Jesuit champion of papal power. The Spaniard's *Defensio Fidei Catholicae*, written against James I's *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance*, had been published in 1613. As J. H. M. Salmon has noted: 'Gallican and Anglican royalists saw his [Suarez's] *Defensio* as a singularly aggressive example of papalist theory.'¹²¹ Certainly Bramhall would not have wished to be linked to a Spanish Jesuit who had justified papal deposition of secular rulers (and papal incitement of revolt within the realms of such rulers) and had described circumstances in which it was right for even a private individual to undertake the assassination of a king.¹²² Hobbes highlights the disreputable Suarez–Bramhall affinity, implying that the former is the latter's instructor in politics, when

¹¹⁹ *Questions*, EW, v, 61. Hobbes always found it hard to contain his contempt for such authorities. In one outburst, in *Behemoth*, he was to remark that Lombard and Duns Scotus were 'two of the most egregious blockheads in the world, so obscure and senseless are their writings. [From these two] the schoolmen . . . learnt the trick of . . . [confounding] true reason by verbal forks; I mean, distinctions that signify nothing, but serve only to astonish the multitude of ignorant men.' *Behemoth*, 41. For a similar passage that includes a reference to Suarez, see *Behemoth*, 17–18. Hobbes's affinity with Prynne once again reveals itself. In 1629, the latter had denounced the 'poisonous works of Aquinas, Lombard, Scotus, Suarez, Bellarmine and such like Popish schoolmen . . . read by too many, whence they smell and stink of Popery'. *The Church of England's Old Antithesis to the New Arminianism* (1629), as quoted in White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 2.

¹²⁰ M. W. F. Stone, 'Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy' in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 16. Since Hobbes harped on Bramhall's lack of originality, it is only fair to point out that the former's originality has often been overestimated. That Hobbes was heavily indebted to one current of late scholasticism, the Ockhamist-voluntarist tradition, has been thoroughly demonstrated by Malcolm, 'Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology'. More recently Jurgen Overhoff has offered a well-informed assessment of the originality of Hobbes's determinism. *Hobbes's Theory of the Will*, 232–3. The question of Hobbes's indebtedness to Luther and Calvin will be treated in the Conclusion.

¹²¹ 'Catholic Resistance Theory', 240.

¹²² Salmon, 'Catholic Resistance Theory', 239–40.

he asks: ‘Did he [Bramhall] ever read in Suarez of any tyrant that made a law commanding any man to do and not to do the same action, or to be and not to be at the same place in one and the same moment of time?’¹²³ In the mind of Hobbes’s reader Bramhall is linked with the infamous papal ‘resistance’ theorist. And just as the doctrine of episcopacy *jure divino*, so, Hobbes implies, the Suarez-scholastic doctrine of free-will renders Bramhall guilty of popery, or even Jesuitism.

Hobbes often recurs in the *Questions* to the proposition that Bramhall is either a dullard or a con-man: ‘If he has not been able to distinguish between these two questions, he has not done well to meddle with either: if he has understood them, to bring arguments to prove that a man is free to do if he will, is to deal uningenuously and fraudulently with his readers.’¹²⁴ Thus, he does not insist that Bramhall is an ignoramus: he might only be an obscurantist, attempting to make ignorance appear profundity; concealing himself behind inscrutable terminology. Hobbes suggests this possibility in observing: ‘It is very possible I may have mistaken him; for neither he nor I understand him. If they be one, why did he without need bring in this strange word, “spontaneous”? Or rather, why did the School-men bring it in, if not merely to shift off the difficulty of maintaining their tenet of free-will?’¹²⁵ In yet another passage, Hobbes implies that the bishop may be stupid or he might simply be deceitful: ‘here putting together two repugnant suppositions, either craftily or (be it spoken with all due respect) ignorantly, he would have men believe . . .’¹²⁶ One may wonder how Hobbes – or anyone – can with ‘due respect’ accuse a man of acting ignorantly. The incivility of the *Questions* continues in Hobbes’s review of various phrases and sentences of Bramhall, which ‘are all nonsense, unworthy of a man, nay, and if a beast could speak, unworthy of a beast, and can befall no creature whose nature is not depraved by [scholastic] doctrine’.¹²⁷ Hobbes complains that instead of simply admitting that he does not know, Bramhall introduces pseudo-explanatory, vacuous jargon: ‘I may tax therein the want of ingenuity in him that had rather say, that heavenly bodies do “work by an occult virtue”, than that they “work he knoweth not how”; which he would not confess, but endeavours to make “occult” be taken for a “cause”.’¹²⁸ In the same

¹²³ *Questions*, EW, v, 176. Whereas he never quotes from the notorious *Defensio Fidei* in any of his published writings, Bramhall does quote from Suarez’s *De Legibus in Just Vindication*, BW, I, 165.

¹²⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 5. Similarly: ‘The Bishop is either mistaken, or else he makes no scruple to say that which he knows to be false, when he thinks it will serve his turn.’ *Questions*, EW, v, 353. Later Hobbes complains that Bramhall is full of either ‘childish deceit or childish ignorance’. *Ibid.*, 423.

¹²⁵ *Questions*, EW, v, 91. ¹²⁶ *Questions*, EW, v, 101. ¹²⁷ *Questions*, EW, v, 113.

¹²⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 113. As Stephen Menn has noted, in such lines Hobbes was echoing such anti-Aristotelian humanists as Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1469–1533), who

way, Hobbes complains that the bishop does nothing but employ the term free-will ('liberty') as a substitute for ignorance of the cause of an action; as if there were any point, that is, explanatory import, in the statement that a man did (or 'chose' to do) something *because of* his free-will.¹²⁹

Hobbes also responds to Bramhall's complaint that the renegade philosopher, or 'third Cato', would like to abolish all technical vocabulary. The scholastic terms he has rejected are only words devised 'to blind the understanding' and are useful for nothing more than 'to seduce young students'. Hobbes's advice to Bramhall is curt: 'fling them away'.¹³⁰ As for the metaphysician (implicitly Bramhall), Hobbes sneers: 'I would have him quit both his terms and his profession, as being in truth (as Plutarch saith) not at all profitable to learning, but made only for an essay to the learner.'¹³¹ For his part, Hobbes complains that writings of the schoolmen 'have troubled my head more than they should have done, if I had known that amongst so many senseless disputes, there had been so few lucid intervals'.¹³² But Hobbes thinks that Bramhall has not been so fortunate as to recognise the madness of the scholastics. With enormous condescension he remarks: 'And if this be contrary to all the rules of right reason, that is to say, of logic, that he hath learned, I should advise him to read some other logic than he hath yet read, or consider better those he did read when he was a young man and could less understand them.'¹³³ The bishop has written such 'perfect nonsense' as a man might deliberately write to arouse laughter: 'And all that he hath elsewhere and here dilated upon it, is as perfect nonsense, as any man ever writ on purpose to make merry with.'¹³⁴ Hobbes suggests that Bramhall is so intoxicated with scholastic Latin jargon that he has become a stranger to his own native tongue: 'So that this objection of his proceedeth only from this, that he understandeth not sufficiently the English tongue. . . . An English reader, who hath not lost himself in School-divinity, will very easily conceive

complained that scholastics had contrived abstract nouns in lieu of real (or informative) causal explanation. 'The Intellectual Setting' in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers, 45–6. See also, Conclusion, 299, for discussion of the context of Hobbes's anti-Aristotelian discourse.

¹²⁹ See also Conclusion, 295, for analysis of Hobbes's view of the absurdity of Bramhall's libertarian position. For other passages in which Hobbes accuses Bramhall of subterfuge to cover his ignorance see *Questions*, *EW*, v, 313, 314; for another passage in which he proposes that Bramhall is either stupid or deceitful, see *ibid.*, 353.

¹³⁰ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 267.

¹³¹ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 268. In *Anti-White* Hobbes had written disdainfully, 'as though metaphysics . . . were nothing but a freedom to utter rash words about God'. *Anti-White*, xxviii.9 (1976), 347. In *Questions* Hobbes strikes the same note he had harped upon in *Anti-White*, and sounded in the postscript to the 'Treatise', that treating God in a 'philosophical' or 'scientific' way only produces nonsense or blasphemy: 'By which we may see, what fine stuff it is that proceedeth from disputing of incomprehensibles.' *Questions*, *EW*, v, 424.

¹³² *Questions*, *EW*, v, 342.

¹³³ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 372.

¹³⁴ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 343.

what I have said.¹³⁵ Hobbes derides Bramhall for uncritically repeating cant. The bishop is but a parrot, that ‘thinketh not himself upon the things’, but merely ‘taketh those words on trust from puzzled Schoolmen’.¹³⁶ Hobbes argues that a perfectly ignorant man is not as bad off as men like Bramhall who have stuffed their heads with nonsense: ‘is there any unlearned man so stupid as to think’.¹³⁷ The natural ignoramus is better off than the scholastic, for at least the former has not been corrupted by false knowledge. The uneducated man may be an ignoramus, but, preserving himself from scholastic terminology, he will not, at least, become a lunatic. It takes some such false learning to go insane: ‘There is scholastic learning required in some measure to make one mad.’¹³⁸ Thus Hobbes ultimately concludes that Bramhall is more Bishop of Bedlam than Derry: ‘These words, “the will hath power to forbear willing what it doth will” and these, “the will hath a dominion over its own acts”; and these, “the power to will is present *in actu primo*, determinable by ourselves” are as wild as ever were any spoken within the walls of Bedlam.’¹³⁹ If the bishop is not a con-man or juggler who deals in ‘hocus-pocus’, his mind is so utterly confused as to render him practically insane.¹⁴⁰

To reiterate, Hobbes presents the reader with the choice of thinking Bramhall deeply deceived or cynically deceiving. Neither of these would be particularly appropriate traits in a Christian bishop, a pastor of pastors, a shepherd of many flocks. The overall effect of the *Questions* is thus not only to suggest Bramhall’s intellectual ineptitude but also to cast doubt upon his fitness to hold an office traditionally reserved for only the most holy of men. Is such a man worthy to exercise ‘spiritual’ or any other kind of authority? Hobbes accuses Bramhall of bad manners, lack of discretion and crudity: ‘And whereas he says, “consent takes away the rape”; it may perhaps be true, and I think it is; but here it not only inferreth nothing, but was also needless, and therefore in a public writing is an indecent instance, though sometimes not unnecessary in a spiritual court.’¹⁴¹ Hobbes observes another such instance: ‘It had been fitter for a man in whom is required gravity and sanctity more than ordinary, to have chosen some other kind of instance.’¹⁴²

¹³⁵ *Questions*, EW, v, 352–3. For similar remarks see *Questions*, EW, v, 355, 370, 382.

¹³⁶ *Questions*, EW, v, 359. For similarly cutting remarks on Bramhall’s thoughtlessness, see *ibid.*, 377, 397, 399.

¹³⁷ *Questions*, EW, v, 399. ¹³⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 400. ¹³⁹ *Questions*, EW, v, 388.

¹⁴⁰ ‘In these few lines he hath said the cause of the generation of a monster is sufficient to produce a monster, and that it is insufficient to produce a monster. How soon may a man forget his words, that doth not understand them. This term of *insufficient* cause, which also the School calls *deficient*, that they may rhyme to *efficient*, is not intelligible, but a word devised like *hocus-pocus*, to juggle a difficulty out of sight.’ *Questions*, EW, v, 383–4.

¹⁴¹ *Questions*, EW, v, 286.

¹⁴² *Questions*, EW, v, 362–3.

Hobbes upbraids Bramhall for an unbishoply line of interrogation: ‘Subtle questions, and full of episcopal gravity!’¹⁴³ Hobbes later concludes the *Questions* with a general review of Bramhall’s bad manners in debate: ‘for the manners of it (for to a public writing there belongeth good manners), it consisteth in railing and exclaiming and scurrilous jesting, with now and then an unclean and mean instance’.¹⁴⁴ Hobbes implies the irony that a man supposed, by his vocation, to be of uncommon piety is guilty of the most disgraceful vulgarity.¹⁴⁵ Earlier in the *Questions* Hobbes had giped at Bramhall in concluding a discussion about God’s goodness and omnipotence: ‘It is the Bishop that errs, in thinking nothing to be power but riches and high place, wherein to domineer and please himself, and vex those that submit not to his opinions.’¹⁴⁶ Many of Bramhall’s old enemies in Ireland or England from before the wars might have recognised this as a description of Strafford’s abrasive, grasping and domineering bishop of Derry. In further vituperation of Bramhall, Hobbes takes the opportunity to suggest that some of the bishop’s opinions regarding justice and law contributed to the civil wars. The bishop’s assertion that ‘Those laws are unjust and tyrannical, which do prescribe things absolutely impossible to be done, and punish men for not doing of them’ is especially dangerous. Hobbes considers it absurd to speak of laws being ‘unjust’: ‘they are made by every man that is subject to them; because every one of them consenteth to the placing of the legislative power’.¹⁴⁷ In other words, it is impossible to be ‘unjust’ to oneself;¹⁴⁸ a man cannot object to a law that he himself has pre-approved, by having already consented, in effect, to the sovereign’s legislating. As Hobbes says, later in the same section, ‘all laws made by him to whom the people had given the legislative power, are the acts of every one of that people, and no man can do injustice to himself’.¹⁴⁹ As for Bramhall’s notion of ‘just laws’ being ‘ordinances of right reason’, urged so stridently by the bishop in the ‘Vindication’, it is precisely such a foolish idea that caused the bloodshed of the wars:

He further says that ‘just laws are the ordinances of right reason’; which is an error that hath cost many thousands of men their lives. Was there ever a King, that made a law which in right reason had been better unmade? And shall those laws therefore

¹⁴³ *Questions*, EW, v, 405. ¹⁴⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 448.

¹⁴⁵ Hobbes also takes the opportunity in his conclusion to associate Bramhall with the wicked deceivers of the ‘kingdom of darkness’, the Roman catholics whose distinctive tenets Hobbes had debunked so insultingly in the fourth book of *Lev*. Bramhall’s ‘elocution’ is ‘the same language with that of the kingdom of darkness’. *Questions*, EW, v, 448.

¹⁴⁶ *Questions*, EW, v, 212. ¹⁴⁷ *Questions*, EW, v, 175.

¹⁴⁸ As expressed in the old Roman legal maxim: *volenti non injuria*.

¹⁴⁹ *Questions*, EW, v, 178–9. Or as he formulates it several pages later: ‘all laws are just, as laws, and therefore not to be accused of injustice by those that owe subjection to them’. *Questions*, EW, v, 182.

not be obeyed? shall we rather rebel? I think not, though I am not so great a divine as he. I think rather that the reason of him that hath the sovereign authority, and by whose sword we look to be protected both against war from abroad and injuries at home, whether it be right or erroneous in itself, ought to stand for right to us that have submitted ourselves thereunto by receiving the protection.¹⁵⁰

Hobbes renders Bramhall the one guilty of sedition: the bishop is the real rebel. So much the worse, perhaps, if Bramhall has been purveying seditious doctrine *unwittingly*. Hobbes implies that Bramhall is the one whose political ideas had undermined Charles I's government – and, thus, incidentally, bore some considerable responsibility for his own and Charles II's exile.

To disparage the bishop still further in the *Questions* Hobbes insinuates that Bramhall has been an ecclesiastical trimmer, who switched to an arminian churchmanship for career advancement.¹⁵¹ Moreover, the rise and ascendancy of arminianism (quasi-popery) in the church of England, to which Bramhall had so much contributed, kindled the rebellions and wars: 'But for some ages past . . . the readiest way to ecclesiastical promotion; and by discontenting those that held the contrary, was in some part the cause of the following troubles.'¹⁵² As I noted in chapter 3, Hobbes's charge against the arminian-innovating troublemakers reads like that of Laud's nemesis, William Prynne. In a book of 1641 Prynne had spoken of 'the popish and Arminian factions, which disquieted both our Church and State', a crew of 'incendiaries and innovators both in the Church and State'. Deliberately or not, Hobbes was echoing the language of those whom Charles I deemed rebels. Hobbes's charge against Bramhall in the *Questions* served as an endorsement of the earlier charges that had been made against leaders of the Caroline church. It should occasion no surprise that Bramhall was to become so indignant at Hobbes's claims of loyalty to his sovereign – a sovereign who had personally appointed these ecclesiastical leaders.

No further quotation of the *Questions* should be necessary to establish that throughout this book Hobbes addresses Bramhall with enormous disrespect. But was not Bramhall still 'Johannes Derensis', 'John, the Right Reverend

¹⁵⁰ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 176. Similarly, Hobbes points out that: 'he who holds that laws can be unjust and tyrannical, will easily find pretence enough, under any government in the world, to deny obedience to the laws, unless they be such as he himself maketh, or adviseth to be made'. *Questions*, *EW*, v, 235. Hobbes later in the section explains what takes the place of Bramhall's 'right reason': 'because neither mine nor the Bishop's reason is right reason fit to be a rule of our moral actions, we have therefore set up over ourselves a sovereign governor, and agreed that his laws shall be unto us, whatsoever they be, in the place of right reason, to dictate to us what is really good. In the same manner as men in playing turn up trump, and as in playing their game their morality consisteth in not renouncing, so in our civil conversation our morality is all contained in not disobeying of the laws.' *Questions*, *EW*, v, 194.

¹⁵¹ For the possibility of Bramhall's trimming in the late 1620s, see chapter 1.

¹⁵² *Questions*, *EW*, v, 1–2.

Bishop of Derry'? In 1656 it is plain that Hobbes did not regard Bramhall as a superior to whom deference had to be shown. Indeed, Hobbes speaks explicitly in one place of Bramhall's authority as past: 'I have not had the authority he *has had*.'¹⁵³ At the time of the *Questions* Hobbes, a subject of Protector Cromwell, could afford to consider Bramhall as nothing more than a fellow Englishman, and public enemy of the Protectorate, who happened, moreover, to be in exile on the continent: 'I have not had the authority he has had, to teach what doctrine I think fit. But *now*, I . . . may with as good a grace despise the Schoolmen and some of the old Philosophers, as he can despise me, unless he can shew that it is more likely that he should be better able to look into these questions sufficiently . . . than I.'¹⁵⁴ The playing field was now level. That Hobbes thought of Bramhall in the same way as any presbyterian or independent churchman – that is, as a man of no more authority than the civil sovereign has conferred – is suggested by a passage in *Marks of an Absurd Geometry*, a book he published only a year after the *Questions*. There he spoke of the presbyterian John Wallis's lack of authority in the same way: 'And if the sovereign power give me command, though without the ceremony of imposition of hands, to teach the doctrine of my *Leviathan* in the pulpit, why am not I, if my doctrine and life be as good as yours, a minister as well as you, and as public a person as you are?'¹⁵⁵ Hobbes might have addressed these lines to Bramhall without altering a syllable. Whether Bramhall might claim some authority by divine right, in reality he wielded no power in the land that Hobbes inhabited. Furthermore, Bramhall had been a bishop in Ireland, not England: so Hobbes might have pointed out that in England, Bramhall had *never* been his superior. By now it goes without saying that Hobbes did not consider himself subordinate to Bramhall on account of the latter's claim of episcopal, divine authority – that is, according to the doctrine that Hobbes had rejected so emphatically in *Leviathan*, episcopacy *jure divino*. In 1656 that was about the only authority Bramhall might have pretended to; that was the only doctrine to which the bishop might have appealed; for *his* sovereign, a throneless Stuart, had effectively no jurisdiction to which to appoint him. In the *Questions*, then, Hobbes does not refrain from spelling out his complete rejection of Bramhall's authority in all matters.

In maintaining that episcopacy *jure divino* was not incompatible or subversive of the king's sovereignty, Laudians like Bramhall insisted on the distinction between a right and an exercise of right. Bishops had a divine right as successors of the apostles but they could not exercise that right within any realm without the consent of the sovereign. Similarly, Bramhall had argued in the 'Vindication' that there was a distinction between a power to act in

¹⁵³ *Questions*, EW, v, 63; emphasis added. ¹⁵⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 63; emphasis added.

¹⁵⁵ *Marks of an Absurd Geometry*, EW, vii, 397.

general and a power to act in particular – or the power to act and the exercise of that power to act. In *Questions* Hobbes impugns this reasoning. He contends that to have the one is to have the other. Not to have one is not to have the other. They are but two ways of speaking of the same thing. In exploding this, Hobbes takes the opportunity to dispose of the distinction of the episcopacy *jure divino* theorists:

As if there were a power that were not the power to do some particular act; or a power to kill, and yet to kill nobody in particular. . . . This argument is much like that which used heretofore to be brought for the defence of the divine right of the bishops to the ordination of ministers. They derive not, say they, the right of ordination from the civil sovereign, but from Christ immediately. And yet they acknowledge that it is unlawful for them to ordain, if the civil power do forbid them. But how have they right to ordain, when they cannot do it lawfully? Their answer is, they have the right, though they may not exercise it; as if the right to ordain, and the right to exercise ordination, were not the same thing.¹⁵⁶

No one, then, has a right if he does not have the right to *exercise* it: to say that one has a right but no right to *exercise* it is just a long-winded way of saying that one has no right at all. Hobbes would insist that if the sovereign had granted them a right to ordain, then they had a right to ordain. If the sovereign had not so granted, they had no such right. For without the ‘exercise’ from the king, the ‘right’ amounted to nothing. In rejecting the distinction between right and exercise of right, Hobbes was, like any fellow-traveller of Prynne, flatly rejecting Laud’s point urged at the end of the 1630s: ‘Our being bishops *jure divino*, by divine right, takes nothing from the king’s right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet we may not *exercise* that power, either of order or jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us, that is, not in his Majesty’s or any Christian king’s kingdoms, but by and under the power of the king given us so to do.’¹⁵⁷ Since Hobbes rejected this notion of a right distinct from the exercise of it within a particular commonwealth, the clear implication is that in 1656, at the writing of *Questions*, Bramhall had no right whatever. He was nothing more than a former bishop, a *former* ‘duly ordained ecclesiastic’. Perhaps, then, there was some sarcasm in Hobbes’s addressing him as *Bishop* Bramhall in print. Hobbes implies that Bramhall has no more power than he does to offer a solution to any theological conundrum: ‘He approveth my modesty in suspending my judgment concerning the manner of how the good angels do work, necessarily or freely, because I find it not set down in the articles of our faith, nor in the decrees of our Church. But he

¹⁵⁶ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 142–3.

¹⁵⁷ Emphasis added; for full quotation and discussion of this speech by Laud, see chapter 2, 56ff.

useth not the same modesty himself.¹⁵⁸ The bishop has no more authority than Hobbes, not even in theological questions central to the exposition of anglican Christianity.

It is notable that Hobbes responds to Bramhall's charge that in the 'Treatise' (1645) he had contradicted his own teaching from *De Cive* (1642). As we saw, the bishop had pointed out that while in *De Cive* Hobbes seemed to assert that the 'duly ordained ecclesiastics' possessed an infallible judgment in theological matters, in the 'Treatise' he allowed nothing of the sort. The philosopher takes the opportunity to gloss his own passage from *De Cive*:

And for the infallibility of the ecclesiastical doctors by me attributed to them, it is not that they cannot be deceived, but that a subject cannot be deceived in obeying them when they are our lawfully constituted doctors. For the supreme ecclesiastical doctor, is he that hath the supreme power: and in obeying him no subject can be deceived, because they are by God himself commanded to obey him. And what the ecclesiastical doctors, lawfully constituted, do tell us to be necessary in point of religion, the same is told us by the sovereign power. And therefore, though we may be deceived by them in the belief of an opinion, we cannot be deceived by them in the duty of our actions. And this is all that I ascribe to the ecclesiastical doctors. If they think it too much, let them take upon them less. Too little they cannot say it is, who take it, as it is, for a burthen. And for them who seek it as a worldly preferment, it is too much.¹⁵⁹

Hobbes then replies to Bramhall's pointed suggestion that the philosopher has usurped an authority that his own political teaching denies him:

I take, he says, too much upon me . . . This is it that he finds fault with in me, when he says that I am a private man, that is to say, no prophet, that is to say, no bishop. By which it is manifest, that the Bishop subjecteth not his spirit but to the Convocation of bishops. I admit that every man ought to subject his spirit to the prophets. But a prophet is he that speaketh unto us from God; which I acknowledge none to do, but him that hath due authority so to do. And no man hath due authority so to do immediately, but he that hath the supreme authority of the commonwealth; nor mediately, but they that speak such things to the people, as he that hath the supreme authority alloweth of. And as it is true in this sense, that 'the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets'; so it is also true that 'we ought not to believe every spirit, but to try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world' (I John 4.1). Therefore I that am a private man, may examine the prophets; which to do, I have no other means but to examine whether their doctrine be agreeable to the law; which theirs is not, who divide the commonwealth into two commonwealths, civil and ecclesiastical.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 264. Thus, Hobbes considers himself just as qualified as Bramhall to determine the nature of devils as found in Scripture. He delivers a short lecture on the subject at *Questions*, EW, v, 210–11.

¹⁵⁹ *Questions*, EW, v, 269. Notice that at the end of this passage Hobbes takes yet another opportunity to insinuate that Bramhall has been the typical clerical careerist whose chief preoccupation has been worldly preferment.

¹⁶⁰ *Questions*, EW, v, 269–70.

Not only does Hobbes not need to submit to Bramhall, but the latter maintains seditious doctrine that corrupts and destroys commonwealths. This is further explicit indication that Hobbes does not hold Bramhall for a ‘lawfully constituted authority’ to whom he must defer in questions of faith. Moreover, Hobbes levels the serious charge that Bramhall has maintained doctrine in conflict with the law (royal supremacy). Hobbes is obviously referring to the bishops who have maintained episcopacy *jure divino* doctrine concerning the authority of ecclesiastics when he speaks of those who ‘divide the commonwealth into two commonwealths, civil and ecclesiastical’. Hobbes avers that by Bramhall’s arrangement, no society can avoid discord and civil war. Bramhall’s reckless use of ‘Obey God, not man’ opens Pandora’s box, as every man can glibly justify rebellion by appealing to this injunction:

This sentence, and that which he saith, that neither the civil judge is the proper judge, nor the law of the land is the proper rule of sin, and divers other sayings of his to the same effect, make it impossible for any nations in the world to preserve themselves from civil wars. For all men living equally acknowledging, that the High and Omnipotent God is to be obeyed before the greatest emperors; every one may pretend the commandment of God to justify his disobedience. And if one man pretendeth that God commands one thing, and another man that he commands the contrary, what equity is there to allow the pretence of one more than another? Or what peace can there be, if they be all allowed alike? There will therefore necessarily arise discord and civil war, unless there be a judge agreed upon, with authority given to him by every one of them, to show them and interpret to them the Word of God; which interpreter is always the emperor, king, or other sovereign person, who therefore ought to be obeyed. But the Bishop thinks that to shew us and interpret to us the Word of God, belongeth to the clergy; wherein I cannot consent unto him.¹⁶¹

Once again, Hobbes flatly rejects Bramhall’s authority. In 1656, Bramhall was no delegate or minister of the sovereign in England. So the ‘Bishop of Derry’ possesses no authority that Hobbes is obliged to recognise and submit to. But, by the same token, what authority or sovereignty did ‘King Charles II’ possess? Thus, Hobbes was, in the same way, denying the authority of Charles, his old mathematics pupil and would-be king. Of course, all this was consistent with Hobbes’s teaching about sovereignty and protection and obedience. It was not, however, consistent with an allegiance to the Stuarts. As we shall see in the [next chapter](#), Bramhall was to argue that Hobbes’s royalism was just as suspect – or lacking – as his Christianity.

In the striking conclusion to the *Questions*, Hobbes again makes the argument that Bramhall and like-minded clergy subverted the authority of the civil sovereign by maintaining the doctrine of episcopacy *jure divino*. First, Hobbes suggests that Bramhall attempts to make himself an authority over the civil sovereign:

¹⁶¹ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 289–90.

If it be lawful for Christians to institute amongst themselves a commonwealth and magistrates, whereby they may be able to live in peace one with another, and unite themselves in defence against a foreign enemy; it will certainly be necessary to make to themselves some supreme judge in all controversies, to whom they ought all to give obedience. And this is no such strange doctrine, nor so ‘uncouth’ a phrase to Christian ears, as the Bishop makes it, whatsoever it be to them that would make *themselves* judges of the Supreme Judge himself.¹⁶²

And, in order to anticipate Bramhall’s objection, Hobbes writes:

No; but, saith he, Christ is the Supreme Judge, and we are not to obey men rather than God. Is there any Christian man that does not acknowledge that we are to be judged by Christ, or that we ought not to obey him rather than any man that shall be his lieutenant upon earth? The question therefore is, not of who is to be obeyed, but of what be his commands.¹⁶³ If the Scripture contain his commands, then may every Christian know by them what they are. And what has the Bishop to do with what God says to me when I read them, more than I have to do with what God says to him when he reads them, unless he have authority given him by him whom Christ hath constituted his lieutenant? This lieutenant upon earth, I say, is the supreme civil magistrate, to whom belongeth the care and charge of seeing that no doctrine may be taught the people, but such as may consist with the general peace of them all, and with the obedience that is due to the civil sovereign.¹⁶⁴

Yet again Hobbes emphatically denies Bramhall any authority as, say, an apostolic successor whose intercession is necessary for salvation; Hobbes pushes his anti-sacerdotalism to extremity. The clause ‘unless he have authority given him by him whom Christ hath constituted his lieutenant’ presupposes that Bramhall has no such authority given to him. Notably, Hobbes neglects to name the ‘supreme civil magistrate’. Writing in 1656, in England, was it not, for Hobbes, Oliver Cromwell? Hobbes then explores the problems entailed by the alternative view, in which the bishops possess a divine authority not derived from the civil sovereign: ‘In whom would the Bishop have the authority reside of prohibiting seditious opinions, when they are taught (as they are often) in divinity books and from the pulpit? I could hardly guess, but that I remember that there have been books written

¹⁶² *Questions*, EW, v, 444; emphasis added.

¹⁶³ To be fair to Hobbes let me clarify that he never once disputed obedience to the injunction ‘Obey God, not man’; what he did dispute was the validity of his contemporaries’ (especially the puritans’) frequent appeal to and application of it. This frequent appeal was regarded as appallingly wanton, so Hobbes pointedly asked how ‘godly’ men could be so confident that *they* were the ones who knew God’s will and were following it, against that ‘man’ opposed to God, namely a superior. As quoted above as well, he remarks in *Questions*: ‘All men . . . equally acknowledging, that the High and Omnipotent God is to be obeyed before the greatest emperors; every one may pretend the commandment of God to justify his disobedience. And if one man pretendeth that God commands one thing, and another man that he commands the contrary, what equity is there to allow the pretence of one more than of another?’ EW, v, 289–90.

¹⁶⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 444–5.

to entitle the bishops to a *divine right*, undervived from the civil sovereign.¹⁶⁵ Hobbes concludes the section with a barbed historical lecture:

The Bishop knows that the kings of England, since the time of Henry VIII, have been declared by act of Parliament supreme governors of the Church of England [royal supremacy], in all causes both civil and ecclesiastical, that is to say, in all matters both ecclesiastical and civil, and consequently of this Church supreme head on earth; though perhaps he will not allow that name of *head*. I should wonder therefore, whom the Bishop would have to be Christ's lieutenant here in England for matters of religion, if not the supreme governor and head of the Church of England, whether man or woman whosoever he be, that hath the sovereign power, but that I know he challenges it to the Bishops, and thinks that King Henry VIII took the ecclesiastical power away from the Pope, to settle it not in himself, but them. But he ought to have known, that what jurisdiction, or power of ordaining ministers, the Popes had here in the time of the king's predecessors till Henry VIII, they derived it all from the king's power, though they did not acknowledge it; and the kings connived at it, either not knowing their own right, or not daring to challenge it; till such time as the behaviour of the Roman clergy had undeceived the people, which otherwise would have sided with them. Nor was it unlawful for the king to take from them the authority he had given them, as being Pope enough in his own kingdom without depending on a foreign one.¹⁶⁶

Hobbes, then, would turn Bramhall's accusation of his disloyalty to the King on its head: Bramhall himself acted the devious subject in usurping authority by a 'divine right' to spiritual authority independent of the civil sovereign. Laud, Bramhall and their arminian colleagues had been the rebels, not Hobbes.

Hobbes does indicate an awareness of having spoken disrespectfully of Bramhall in the *Questions*. But he wishes the reader to believe that he has merely been provoked into incivility; that he is only paying Bramhall back in his own coin: 'And though the Bishop's modest entreaty had been no part of the cause of my yielding to it [the request to reply to the "Discourse"], yet certainly it would have been cause enough to some civil man, to have requited me with fairer language.'¹⁶⁷ In his critical review of Bramhall's dedicatory letter to Newcastle, Hobbes accuses the bishop of having written without civility. He says that in the *Defence* there is 'abundance' of 'passionate' and 'uncivil' words, including objections of 'blasphemy or atheism' against him.¹⁶⁸ And as we have noted already, in criticising Bramhall's epistle to the Christian reader, Hobbes complains of Bramhall's editorial finesse in the *Defence*: 'It is true that it was not my intention to publish any thing in this question. And the Bishop might have perceived, *by not leaving out those four passages*, that it was without my knowledge the book was printed: but it pleased him better to take this little advantage to accuse me of want of

¹⁶⁵ *Questions*, EW, v, 445–6.

¹⁶⁶ *Questions*, EW, v, 446–7.

¹⁶⁷ *Questions*, EW, v, 36.

¹⁶⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 22.

ingenuity.¹⁶⁹ In the conclusion he recognises the possibility that his reader may think that he has treated Bramhall rudely, gratuitously rudely. Perhaps he could have made his points more courteously.¹⁷⁰ This prompts Hobbes to offer a justification for writing so mordantly. He is, he protests, only responding to all the unfair assaults that have been made by Bramhall and other obtuse and unscrupulous critics. They have taken such umbrage and assaulted him only because (1) he has placed supremacy in religion solely in the civil sovereign; and (2) he has offered Christian doctrines that none of them has taught. For this they have reviled him, and attempted to make him odious for those things ‘for which, if they knew their own and public good, they ought to have given me thanks’.¹⁷¹ At the conclusion of the *Questions* Hobbes admits that in writing the scathing refutation of Bramhall he has tried to kill a few birds with one stone. The ferocity of his refutation of Bramhall owes something to his other adversaries whom he is also trying to silence. Lumping all the clergy together, the presbyterian Seth Ward with the Laudian Bramhall, Hobbes avails himself of the opportunity to administer a blow to the former:

Taking offence at me for blaming in part the discipline instituted heretofore, and regulated by the authority of the Pope, in the universities, [Ward] not only ranks me amongst those men that would have the revenue of the universities diminished, and says plainly I have no religion, but also thinks me so simple and ignorant of the world as to believe that our universities maintain Popery. And this is the author of the book called *Vindiciae Academicarum*. If either of the universities had thought itself injured, I believe it could have authorised or appointed some member of theirs, whereof there be many abler men than he, to have made their vindication. But this Vindex [Ward] (as little dogs to please their master use to bark, in token of their sedulity, indifferently at strangers, till they be rated off), unprovoked by me hath fallen upon me without bidding. I have been publicly injured by many of whom I took no notice, supposing that that humour would spend itself; but seeing it last, and grow higher in this writing I now answer, I thought it necessary at last to make of some of them, and first of this Bishop, an example.¹⁷²

Hobbes now feels it necessary to bare his fangs. In 1655 John Wallis, a presbyterian minister and the Savilian professor of geometry at Oxford, had published *Elenchus Geometriae Hobbianaë*, a refutation of the geometry in Hobbes’s *De Corpore*.¹⁷³ In 1656, Hobbes added an appendix to the English translation of *De Corpore*, in which he attacked not only Wallis, but also Ward, Savilian professor of astronomy at Oxford. Ward was the one Hobbes had in mind when he referred in the *Questions* to the author of *Vindiciae*

¹⁶⁹ *Questions*, EW, v, 25; emphasis added. ¹⁷⁰ *Questions*, EW, v, 453.

¹⁷¹ *Questions*, EW, v, 454. ¹⁷² *Questions*, EW, v, 453–5.

¹⁷³ Douglas Jesseph, *Squaring the Circle: The War between Hobbes and Wallis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 10–11. Wallis was a prominent presbyterian who had served as secretary to the Westminster Assembly in the years 1643–9.

Academiarium.¹⁷⁴ In this appendix, *Six Lessons*, composed and published in the same year as the *Questions*, Hobbes uses some of the same lines concerning religious authority that he uses in *Questions*. In *Six Lessons* Hobbes claims that Seth Ward ('you the astronomer') has sought to please Bramhall: 'For if you reject it, you will be cast out of all mathematic schools; and if you maintain it, from the society of all school-divines, and lose the thanks of the favour you have shown (you the astronomer) to Bishop Bramhall.'¹⁷⁵ This implies that Ward has gratified the bishop by upholding the latter's distinction of 'determinitive'/'definitive'—'circumscriptive', which Bramhall had employed in arguing against Hobbes in the 'Vindication'. Similarly, at the conclusion of 'Lesson IV', Hobbes accuses Wallis and Ward of trying to curry favour with certain divines: 'But your professorships, could not forbear to take occasion thereby, to commend your zeal against *Leviathan* to your doctorships of divinity, by censuring it.'¹⁷⁶ Certainly Hobbes here has in mind presbyterian or independent rather than Laudian divines. Two lessons later, Hobbes insists that only Roman catholics and subversive, self-aggrandising English protestant clergy have had reason to object to *De Cive*. 'The book itself translated into French, hath not only a great testimony from the translator Sorberius, but also from Gassendus, and Mersennus, who being both of the Roman religion had no cause to praise it, nor the divines of England have no cause to find fault with it. Besides, you know that the doctrine therein contained is generally received by all but those of the clergy, who think their interest concerned in being made subordinate to the civil power; whose testimonies therefore are invalid.'¹⁷⁷

Wallis promptly answered Hobbes with the derisive *Due Correction for Mr Hobbes; or School Discipline, for Not Saying his Lessons Right*.¹⁷⁸ In 1657, Hobbes again attacked Wallis with *Marks of the Absurd Geometry, Rural Language, Scottish Church Politics, and Barbarisms of John Wallis, Professor of Geometry and Doctor of Divinity*. In the 1660s and 1670s Hobbes was to write yet more against Wallis. But as the modern authority

¹⁷⁴ Ward published *Vindiciae Academiarium* anonymously, so in 1656 Hobbes could only suspect that 'Vindex' was Ward. Ward wrote *Vindiciae* primarily in answer to John Webster's *Academiarium Examen*, a critique of the universities. It was in the appendix to *Vindiciae* that Ward wrote against Hobbes. See Jesseph, *Squaring the Circle*, 67, and for Ward's dispute with Webster, see Allen Debus, *Science and Education in Seventeenth-Century England: The Webster–Ward Debate* (London: Macdonald; New York: American Elsevier, 1970).

¹⁷⁵ *Six Lessons*, EW, VII, 205. 'If you reject it' refers to Euclid's definition of figure, which allows no difference between definitive and circumscriptive, a distinction that 'theologers', including Bramhall, used to maintain that God is at the same time in no one place and somewhere.

¹⁷⁶ *Six Lessons*, EW, VII, 297. ¹⁷⁷ *Six Lessons*, EW, VII, 333.

¹⁷⁸ Published in 1656; in the same year, Ward published another attack on Hobbes, *In Thomae Hobbii Philosophiam Exercitatio Epistolica*, which was more a refutation of Hobbes's metaphysics than a critique of his mathematics. See Jesseph, *Squaring the Circle*, 11, 69.

on Hobbes's controversy with Wallis has noted: 'By the mid-1660s . . . Hobbes had lost essentially all credibility with the mathematical public and his works were largely disregarded.'¹⁷⁹ From 1656 onwards, Hobbes was to be more concerned with his mathematics dispute with Wallis than his long-standing quarrel with Bramhall. In any case, *Questions* was the last writing against Bramhall that Hobbes published. Soon Hobbes was battling not only Wallis but the chemist Robert Boyle as well. Hobbes was to begin his criticism of Boyle in 1661 with *Dialogus Physicus*, followed by the *Problemata Physica* of 1662.¹⁸⁰ But if Hobbes's intellectual and polemical focus shifted away from Bramhall after 1656, the latter's had been shifting towards Roman Catholics. Thus, some symmetry can be observed in the controversial endeavours of Bramhall and Hobbes in the mid- and late 1650s. While Hobbes duelled both Bramhall and his mathematical and scientific adversaries, Bramhall duelled both Hobbes and his Romanist adversaries. One might suppose that Hobbes wished to end his dispute with Bramhall with *Questions*, but this appears unlikely in view of how provocatively Hobbes had written. Hurling taunts such as the following, the philosopher cannot have expected to induce silence in the bishop: 'By this short passage . . . I have no reason to expect a very shrewd answer from him to my *Leviathan*.'¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Jesseph, *Squaring the Circle*, 10. For Hobbes's dispute with Wallis and Ward, see also Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 214–24.

¹⁸⁰ See Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

¹⁸¹ *Questions*, EW, v, 188.

Castigations of Hobbes's Animadversions
and The Catching of Leviathan,
1657–1658: *Hobbes as Leviathan
of Leviathans*

An exiled bishop of a now dubious confession and profession was obviously vulnerable to the kind of insults broadcast in England and sent across the North Sea by Hobbes in 1656. In the *Questions* one might say that Hobbes was acting according to the sound advice: 'Kick a man while he's down.' But in view of the broader concern to vindicate and preserve the Caroline–Laudian anglican church of the 1630s, Bramhall might well have considered the philosopher just one among many enemies. Not that Bramhall failed to perceive – or stress – Hobbes's eccentricity; rather, he might easily have placed Hobbes in the broad anti-anglican category that contained independents, presbyterians and Roman catholics. In the few years that preceded the Restoration of 1660, Bramhall was provoked to duel not only the maverick philosopher, but all the others that would divert the would-be king, Charles II, from an allegiance to the church for which his father had died. Hobbes was merely one among an array of those who might contaminate the souls of Charles II, his siblings and royalists in exile, or in England.

By 1656, the harvest of Bramhall's *Just Vindication* had already come in. Richard Smith, the English Roman catholic bishop of Chalcedon, and John Sergeant, a prolific controversialist of the same confession, had both written answers to it. Smith's book had been published in 1654 as *Brief Survey of the Lord of Derry his Treatise of Schism*.¹ Sergeant's reply, *Schism Disarmed of the Defensive Weapons Lent It by Dr. Hammond and the Bishop of Derry*, treated both Bramhall and Henry Hammond, but singled out the former for special attention in an appendix entitled, more playfully, *Down-Derry, or, Bishop Bramhall's Just Vindication of the Church of England Refuted*.² It

¹ Haddan notes that it is uncertain whether it was published in 1654 or 1655: *BW*, II, Preface. In either case it was published in Paris.

² Published in Paris, 1655. Curiously, Sergeant was a disciple of Thomas White, the English Roman catholic who had been an acquaintance of Hobbes while a member of the Mersenne circle in the 1640s. As we saw above, in 1642–3, Hobbes had written a massive critique of White's *De Mundo Dialogi Tres*. Probably Sergeant, White and Hobbes associated in

must have been Sergeant's book that Hobbes had in mind when he wrote the gibe in *Questions*: 'If the Bishop and Dr Hammond, when they did write in the defence of the Church of England against the imputation of schism, quitting their own pretences of jurisdiction and *ius divinum*, had gone upon these principles of mine, they had not been so shrewdly handled as they have been, by an English Papist that wrote against them.'³ Hobbes was obviously alluding to Bramhall's *Just Vindication* (1654) and Hammond's *Of Schism* (1653). And as Hobbes refers to Bramhall's 'pretences of jurisdiction and *ius divinum*', he might have been thinking of the last few pages of the ninth chapter of *Just Vindication*. There Bramhall affirmed that the episcopacy of the Britannic churches was of apostolical institution; that bishops did not draw their spiritual jurisdiction from the king; that only their right to exercise religious authority came from the king.⁴

Nothing daunted by the double onslaught from the Roman Catholics, in 1656 Bramhall published *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*, with an appendix in which he answered Sergeant.⁵ But Sergeant could not be silenced either. In 1657 he published a vindication of his *Down-Derry* appendix. That only provoked yet another long disquisition by Bramhall, *Schism Guarded, and Beaten Back upon the Right Owners*.⁶ Bramhall was embroiled in another skirmish with Romanists in 1657, while attending Charles at his court in Bruges.⁷ According to Bramhall, a slanderous rumour began to circulate that he had been humiliated in front of the king: 'that "Father T. and Father B. had so confuted the Bishop of Derry in the presence of the King, that he [Charles II] said he perceived his father [Charles I] had made me a Lord, but not a Bishop": and that afterwards, by my [Bramhall's] power, I had procured those two Jesuits to be prohibited that presence; so that,

London in the mid-1650s, precisely when Bramhall was writing from the continent against both Sergeant and Hobbes – two very different antagonists, certainly, but both enemies of Bramhall's episcopalian Anglican cause.

³ *Questions*, EW, v, 447.

⁴ BW, I, 271, 272. 'In sum, we [English clergy] hold our benefices from the king, but our offices from Christ; the king doth nominate us, but Bishops do ordain us.' BW, I, 272. For similar formulations, see *Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified*, BW, III, 172, and 'Protestants' Ordination Defended', BW, v, 232.

⁵ London, 1656. The book is reproduced by Haddan, in BW, II, 1–335. By a reference within the text, it is clear Bramhall wrote most or all of this book in 1655: see BW, II, 240.

⁶ First published at The Hague, in 1658, its sub-title reads: *That Our Great Controversy about Papal Power is not a Question of Faith but of Interest and Profit; not with the Church of Rome but with the Court of Rome; wherein the True Controversy doth consist; who were the First Innovators; when and where these Papal Innovations first began in England; with the Opposition that was made against them*: edited and amply annotated by Haddan in BW, II, 339–646.

⁷ Charles II moved from Cologne to Bruges in April 1657, after having made a treaty with Spain (which was now at war with the Protectorate), by way of Don Juan of Austria, son of Philip IV of Spain. Don Juan had just been appointed governor of Flanders. Charles II was to move from Bruges to Brussels in February 1658.

whereas Father Talbot used to be the interpreter in the Spanish treaties, now he was not admitted, and Don John would admit no other.⁸ These Jesuits had revived the scurrilous tale of the episcopal consecration at the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside – a story of a profane consecration of English bishops in the sixteenth century that cast doubt upon the validity and integrity of the apostolic succession of bishops in England.⁹ The Jesuits now claimed that the bishop of Durham, the elderly Thomas Morton (1564–1659), had admitted the truth of the tale in a session of the house of lords early in the meeting of the Long Parliament.¹⁰ This was the state of affairs that provoked Bramhall to write a long historical essay, *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified; The Bishop of Durham Vindicated; and that Infamous Fable of the Ordination at the Nag's Head clearly Confuted*.¹¹ Bramhall subjected the legend of the profane ceremony to meticulous scrutiny and produced a compilation of the documents that established the facts surrounding Archbishop Parker's consecration.¹²

All this toil to vindicate the episcopal church of England from sundry slanders and attacks of Roman catholics, and to demonstrate to Charles II that the latter could not refute its claims or authenticity, did not cause Bramhall to neglect his old determinist and absolutist adversary. In 1657 Bramhall composed a massive answer to Hobbes's *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance*. If, as is unlikely, Hobbes had hoped to nonplus Bramhall with that stinging repartee, he was to be disappointed. It is hard to believe that Hobbes could have expected anything less than a lively and robust answer from a bishop whose pugnacity he had experienced already. By 1656, Hobbes must have known Bramhall's temper well enough to expect something along the lines of the reply the bishop gave in

⁸ *Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified*, BW, III, 22–3.

⁹ Bramhall offered this account: 'Hearing that these two Fathers had spoken largely in the Court of the succession of our English Bishops, but never in my presence, I sought out Father B., and had private conference with him about it in the Jesuits' College at Bruges, and afterwards some discourse with Father T. and him together in mine own chamber. Whatsoever they did say, they put into writing; to which I returned them answer, shewing not only that there was not, but that it was morally impossible there should be, any such ordination at the Nag's Head.' *Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified*, BW, III, 23. The claim of the Jesuits was to be published in *A Treatise of the Nature of the Catholique Faith and of Heresy by N. N.* (Rouen, 1657).

¹⁰ Morton was bishop of Durham from 1632 to 1659.

¹¹ First published at The Hague, 1658. For a brief but adequate discussion of this work, see W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, *Archbishop Bramhall* (London: SPCK; New York and Toronto: Macmillan, 1927), 184–98. For another description of the circumstances surrounding Bramhall's book, see Peter Barwick, *Life of John Barwick*, 89–91. John Barwick, chaplain of Morton, was preparing to write a refutation when he learned that Bramhall had the work in hand. Barwick then sent Bramhall the materials he had collected.

¹² Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 65. Bramhall had briefly noted the falsity of the Nag's Head Tavern legend in *Just Vindication*, BW, I, 270–1.

the next year. Watching the bishop's fierce and voluminous battle against the Roman Catholics in the mid-1650s, Hobbes might still have supposed that the bishop had enough ammunition for an assault upon him. When Bramhall heard of Hobbes's *Questions* he was probably somewhere in the southern Netherlands, where he seems still to have been living a mobile existence. No doubt he was in fairly frequent contact with the king, or at least one of his principal counsellors, Ormonde. In July 1656, Bramhall was at Utrecht, and a letter penned in Flushing in December of the same year records that he was in Bruges.¹³ According to an unfriendly informant Bramhall was preaching infrequently but passionately at Bruges: 'He, who was bishop of Londonderry in Ireland, is now at Bruges; when he preacheth, which is but seldom, he thunders out cruel execrations against the lord protector, and the state of England.'¹⁴ Bramhall's reply to Hobbes's *Questions* was the exhaustive *Castigations of Mr Hobbes his Last Animadversions in the Case concerning Liberty and Universal Necessity; wherein all his exceptions about the controversy are fully satisfied*. But that was not all. Bramhall decided to collect and amplify his scattered criticisms of *De Cive* and *Leviathan*, and to mount a multi-dimensional assault upon Hobbes's entire philosophical, theological and political system. This critique took the form of an appendix to the *Castigations* entitled *The Catching of Leviathan, or the Great Whale*. *Castigations-Catching* was published in London in the first few months of 1658.¹⁵ In March of that year Bramhall wrote to his friend, and former colleague in Ireland, Nicholas Bernard, dean of Ardagh, then in London:

Yours of Jan. 10/20, 1658 came very lately to my hands by reason of my absence in Brabant upon some occasions of my own, where I was detained much longer than I expected by plundering soldiers upon land, who rendered the passage that way unsecure, and the huge quantities of ice in the rivers, which made them impassable. Now at my return, which was not before Friday last March the 8 *stylo loci*, I found seventeen sheets of my answer to Mr Hobbes printed, which I have since corrected and given him now the chief *errata*. I hope all the rest is printed before this and entreat you to hasten him to send them to me that I may return the *errata* therein

¹³ George Radcliffe ('De Colton') to Bramhall, 21 July 1656, *Rawdon Papers*, No. xl.

¹⁴ Letter of intelligence from J. Butler, Flushing, 2 December 1656 (N.S.), *Thurloe State Papers*, v, 645. In 1656, Hobbes's *Questions* was not the only news to vex Bramhall. His land in Ireland had been officially confiscated. BL Add. 33118 f. 364 records the grant of his forfeited estate of Castletown Moylagh in 1656. The heading reads: 'By his Highness the Lord Protector: his Council for the Affairs of Ireland'. The document is to legalise the granting of 'house and lands of Castletown Moylagh in the Barony of Moylonaugh and County of Meath (being lately parte of the possessions of Dr. John Bramhall late Bishop of Derry through his Delinquency forfeited to his highness of the Commonwealth)'; 'Dated at the Council Chamber in Dublin the four and twentieth of June 1656'.

¹⁵ Thus Bramhall must have written all or most of *Castigations* and *Catching* by the end of 1657 – or, rather, much earlier because he speaks in his letter to Bernard of 'so long delay'. From Haddan's edition I quote: *Castigations*, BW, iv, 197–506; *Catching of Leviathan*, BW, iv, 507–97.

by the first post, which I shall not fail to do, and then the book may be published after so long delay. With them also I received also [*sic*] Mr Serjeant's reply to Doctor Hammond and me, called *Schism Dispatched*, which I purpose, God willing, to fall in hand with to-morrow and despatch our despatcher with as much speed as I can. The chief impediment will be the want of some books, which I must make a shift to borrow or procure as well as I can. In your next do me the favour to let me know as you can learn what this Serjeant is, and particularly whether he be one of our apostates.¹⁶

Obviously, then, Bernard was acting as Bramhall's agent in London in these years. It is also clear that by March 1658, the publisher was in the middle of printing *Castigations-Catching*.¹⁷ From this letter we can also see Sergeant's latest book, *Schism Dispatched*, provoking another book to be published in 1658, *Schism Guarded*. In fact, in the first edition of *Castigations-Catching*, published early in 1658, the publisher included Bramhall's advertisement for what he was to publish under the title *Schism Guarded*. In this last book, Bramhall was to deny the papacy its divine right, just as Hobbes had denied episcopacy its divine right.¹⁸

Bramhall offered a glimpse into his motivation for answering Hobbes in a few pointed remarks: 'Did he think his answer [*Questions*] was so mathematical to compel or necessitate me to write? No, I confess I determined myself. And his answer was but a slender occasion; which would have had little weight with me, but for a wiser man's advice, to prevent his overweening opinion of his own abilities.'¹⁹ We can only guess who this 'wiser man' was. A royalist exile like Hyde would be a good candidate. But many of the other royalists could have urged Bramhall to write a book to cut Hobbes down to size. His clerical brethren in England or on the continent might also have pointed out the utility of slaying the 'monster of Malmesbury'. But Bramhall's own self-interest (and intellectual pride) could have been sufficient to justify the trouble of the undertaking to refute and humble Hobbes. The less merit the latter's views and arguments were seen to have, the less would they influence. Their influence could only prove harmful to the interests of Bramhall, upon whose views on many issues Hobbes had poured gallons

¹⁶ Bramhall to Nicholas Bernard, 1/11 March 1658, *HMC Hastings*, iv, 96. Elsewhere Bramhall refers to Bernard as 'my ancient friend'. *BW*, v, 74. Bramhall must have been fairly well acquainted with Bernard in the 1630s as the latter had been not only dean of Kilmore but chaplain to Ussher.

¹⁷ Sometime in 1658, Bramhall was briefly in Bruges. In that year, Joseph Jane wrote from there to Secretary Nicholas: 'We have a small congregation here, but expect its increase by the return of some from Brussels . . . The Bishop of Derry is now with us, but will not stay long. I wish one of the chaplains would help us.' Quoted in Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 60.

¹⁸ See, for example, Bramhall's address 'To the Christian Readers, especially the Roman Catholics of England', *BW*, II, 351, 353.

¹⁹ *Castigations*, *BW*, iv, 341.

of contempt. In the 1650s, Hobbes's popularity seems to have been considerable. In the prefatory epistle to his critique of the first few chapters of *Leviathan*, published in 1656, William Lucy (under the pseudonym 'William Pike') noted with alarm that: 'this book I find admired by *many* gentlemen of sharp wits, and lovers of learning'.²⁰ Hobbes's popularity in England in the 1650s has been well-documented by Jeffrey Collins.²¹ He points out the impressive fact that in a 1658 catalogue of the 'most vendible books in England' all of Hobbes's political treatises were listed.²² In writing and publishing against Hobbes once more, Bramhall certainly wished to counter the growing influence of Hobbes in England. In combating Hobbes's determinism/predestinarianism, the bishop was to be joined in 1658 by a fellow arminian back in England, Thomas Pierce. In that year the latter published an anti-predestinarian tract in which he asserted that Hobbes had lent support to calvinists, specifically their extreme position on God's decrees concerning the elect and reprobate.²³ More broadly, Bramhall was continuing, if not leading, the anti-Hobbes campaign of episcopalian anglican clergy.²⁴

²⁰ *Examinations, Censures and Confutations of Divers Errors in the Two First Chapters of Mr Hobbes His Leviathan* (London: Philip Wattleworth for William Hope, 1656), emphasis added; Wing L3452B. In the same epistle to the reader Lucy recorded his appreciation of Bramhall's recent effort: 'the Bishop of Derry, in his excellent and learned reply [*Defence*] to his [Hobbes's] Stoical piece, his preface, saith, that one of our own nation had ravell'd his *Leviathan*; I expected, but see it not; he would have spared me this labour; so the work be done, I care not by whom, but it ought to be done, and none else appearing, I fling my stone at this giant, and I hope hit him'. This establishes that Lucy was influenced by *Defence*; that he was not intimate or in correspondence with Bramhall; and that Bramhall could not have been referring to him in *Defence*.

²¹ Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 159–241. Collins, developing an observation of Tuck (*Philosophy and Government*, 336), argues that Hobbes was especially popular among independents and Cromwellians; but cf. J. P. Sommerville, 'Hobbes and Independency'. For the concern at this popularity on the part of another anti-Hobbes writer of the 1650s, George Lawson, see Jon Parkin, 'Taming the Leviathan: Reading Hobbes in Seventeenth-Century Europe', *International Archives of the History of Ideas* 186 (2003): 38; for Lawson's writings against Hobbes see Conal Condren, 'Confronting the Monster: George Lawson's Reactions to Hobbes's *Leviathan*', *Political Science* 40, 1 (1988): 67–83, and Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 209–13.

²² *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 163.

²³ *Self-Condemnation Exemplified* (1658), as quoted in Mintz, *Hunting of Leviathan*, 127. In the 1650s Pierce took up the polemical pen several times to attack calvinist predestinarianism and to vindicate arminianism. For the writings of Pierce and 'Arminian Anglicans' against predestinarian doctrine, see Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 122–6. For Pierce's criticism of Hobbes as an eccentric calvinist – and his attempt to embarrass calvinists by associating them with a philosopher who had acquired a reputation for atheism – see *ibid.*, 124. Much of Pierce's criticism of Hobbes's determinism was essentially the same as Bramhall's as published in *Defence* (e.g., that this determinism amounted to 'Stoic' fatalism and rendered God the author of sin).

²⁴ For an informative survey of the anti-Hobbes literature produced by these anglicans which concentrates on their criticism of the philosopher's ecclesiology (erastianism), see Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 242–70. Collins judges Thorndike the most important of

Bramhall's choice of epigraph for the *Castigations* suggests how intent he was to portray Hobbes as a deceitful man: 'The lip of truth shall be established for ever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment.'²⁵ The philosopher's dishonesty is also suggested in Bramhall's examination of Hobbes's account of the unauthorised publication of the 'Treatise', where the bishop scolds him for not lifting a finger to suppress the book:

I am well contented to believe, that the copy of T.H. his treatise was surreptitiously gained from him. Yet he acknowledgeth, that he showed it to two; and if my intelligence out of France did not fail, to many more. I am well pleased to believe, that he was not the author of that lewd Epistle, which was prefixed before it; but rather some young braggadocio, one of his disciples, who wanted all other means to requite his master for his new acquired light, but servile flattery: whom he styleth the 'great author – the repairer of our breaches – the assertor of our reputation, who hath performed more in a few sheets' than is comprehended 'in all the voluminous works of the priests and ministers' . . . Herein I cannot acquit Mr Hobbes, that being in London at the same time when this ridiculous Epistle was printed and published, he did not for his own cause, sooner or later, procure it to be suppressed.²⁶

In the preface to the appendix, *Catching of Leviathan*, Bramhall returned briefly to the subject: 'What passed between him and me in private had been buried in perpetual silence, if his flattering disciples (not without his own fault, whether it were connivance or neglect is not material to me) had not published it to the world to my prejudice.'²⁷ Thus, Bramhall still wished to lay some blame on Hobbes. Whatever his excuse, or whatever the extenuating circumstances, Hobbes had, at the very least, been guilty of unpardonable negligence; at most, in order to cast doubt upon Hobbes's integrity, Bramhall insinuates that the philosopher had been privy to the publication and has lied through his teeth about it.

In the *Castigations* Bramhall's concern is not only to vindicate free-will but also the old scholastic authorities whose teaching on the subject he has closely followed. In the course of pursuing the latter objective, Bramhall represents Hobbes as merely an ignorant and trouble-making innovator. As we saw in chapter 4, this was a theme he had already begun to develop in the 'Vindication', the paper written in 1646. Bramhall prefaces his argumentation in the *Castigations* with the observation that 'we agree not much better about the terms of the controversy, than the builders of Babel did understand one another's language'.²⁸ Thus, the bishop does seem to recognise that their debate on free-will has been almost entirely a fruitless talking-past-one-another. Yet this does not prevent him from resuming the *dialogue*

these anglicans. Much of Thorndike's criticism echoed Bramhall's – whether or not as a consequence of the former's reading of the latter's books.

²⁵ Proverbs xii:19. ²⁶ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 251–2.

²⁷ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 515. ²⁸ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 209.

des sourds. The *Castigations* responds to all the sections of ‘animadversions’ in Hobbes’s *Questions*. Bramhall answers (or attempts to answer) Hobbes point-by-point in sections entitled ‘Castigations of Animadversions’. Unsurprisingly, if not inevitably, the book is massive and repetitive. Like Hobbes had in *Questions*, the bishop in the *Castigations* for the most part just presses further the points he had already made in the ‘Discourse’ and ‘Vindication’. In departing from the scholastic way, Bramhall’s own conceptual framework, Hobbes has entered upon a devious path: ‘I desire to retain the proper terms of the Schools; Mr Hobbes flies to the common conceptions of the vulgar; a way seldom trodden but by false prophets and seditious orators. He preferreth their terms as more intelligible; I esteem them much more obscure and confused. In such intricate questions, vulgar brains are as incapable of the things, as of the terms. But thus it behoved him to prevaricate, that he might not seem to swim against an universal stream; nor directly to oppose the general current of the Christian world.’²⁹ Hobbes’s intellectual forbears, then, are false prophets and seditious orators. Moreover, Hobbes is guilty of intolerable arrogance in taking his own new way as superior to all the old ones. In reproach, Bramhall cannot resist a gibe at Hobbes’s obscure Wiltshire origins and undistinguished academic pedigree:

I cannot choose but wonder at his confidence; that a single person, who never took degree in schools that I have heard of (except it were by chance in Malmesbury), should so much slight, not only all the scholars of this present age, but all ‘the fathers, schoolmen, and old philosophers’, which I dare say he hath not studied much; and forget himself so far, as to deny all their authorities at once, if they give not him satisfaction; to make his private and crazy judgment to be the standard and seal of truth, and himself an universal dictator among scholars – to plant and to pull up, to reform and new modulate, or rather turn upside down, theology, philosophy, morality, and all other arts and sciences, which he is pleased to favour so much as not to eradicate them, or pluck them up root and branch. . . . He mentioneth the Scriptures indeed; but his meaning is, to be the sole interpreter of them himself, without any respect to the perpetual and universal tradition of the Catholic Church, or the sense of all ancient expositors.³⁰

As we will see below, the conception of Hobbes as a ‘universal dictator’ was to suggest to Bramhall the identification of Hobbes and Leviathan, the haughty, monstrous creature without equal upon earth.³¹ In the course of chiding Hobbes for his arrogance, Bramhall protests that he himself did not write uncivilly in the *Defence*. Rather, Hobbes alone has been guilty of writing intemperately and discourteously. For his part, the bishop has only slighted Hobbes’s newfangled notions, not his person.³²

²⁹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 209–10. ³⁰ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 227–8.

³¹ Job xli:34. ³² *Castigations*, BW, iv, 250, 266.

Bramhall was obviously deeply annoyed at Hobbes's insinuation in the *Questions* that the bishop had contributed to the rebellions and wars in the Stuart kingdoms. Hobbes had claimed that arminian churchmen like Bramhall had precipitated these by reintroducing 'popish' doctrines and ritual – alienating good (calvinist) protestants – and by undermining the authority of the civil sovereign with such teachings as episcopacy *jure divino*. Bramhall thinks it ludicrous to argue that 'arminianism', or any of its adherents, bears such responsibility. He retorts: 'It was not the speculative doctrine of Arminius, but the seditious tenets of Mr Hobbes, and such like, which opened a large window to our troubles.'³³ Bramhall also replies to Hobbes's charge that the bishop's notion of just laws as ordinances of right reason have cost many thousands of men their lives: 'His reason is, "If laws be erroneous shall they not be obeyed? shall we rather rebel?" I answer, neither the one nor the other. We are not to obey them actively, because "we ought to obey God rather than man." Yet may we not rebel; – "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake." Passive obedience is a mean between active obedience and rebellion. To "just laws", which are "the ordinances of right reason", active obedience is due. To unjust laws, which are "the ordinances of reason erring", passive obedience is due.'³⁴ Thus, Bramhall insists that his position could not possibly provoke or justify rebellion or civil war. Rather, it is Hobbes whose principles are so apt to incite and warrant rebellion and civil war. And so Bramhall observes in a later passage that Hobbes errs dangerously in his rule that 'if the fear be allowed, the action which it produceth is allowed also'.³⁵ But another error maintained in the *Questions*, a corollary of the first, is even more pernicious: that fear may suspend a law, and render it irrelevant: 'Take the larger exposition of this [principle], out of his book *De Cive*; – "No man is bound by any pacts or contracts whatsoever not to resist him who goeth about to kill him, or wound him, or to hurt his body." So a scholar may resist his master when he goeth about to whip him; so a company of traitors or other capital malefactors may lawfully resist the sovereign magistrate. This is seditious indeed, and openeth a large window to civil war. This is directly contrary to what he said in his book *De Cive*; – "In every perfect commonwealth, the right of the private sword is excluded, and no subject hath right to use his power to the preservation of himself at his own discretion." Judge, reader, whether we or he be better subjects; he, who holdeth that in case of extreme danger a subject hath no

³³ *Castigations, BW*, iv, 219.

³⁴ *Castigations, BW*, iv, 323–4; scriptural quotations are from Acts v:29 and 1 Peter ii:13. In the same section from which I have quoted, Bramhall offers a lengthy essentialist and constitutionalist discourse on law in which he insists that there is such a thing as unjust law and unjust ('tyrannical') rule. See *BW*, iv, 322, 325.

³⁵ *Castigations, BW*, iv, 392.

obligation to his sovereign, or we, who hold it is better to die innocents than to live nocents.³⁶ Whether or not Bramhall expected that Charles II would be reading these lines, he wished to make it plain to anyone who would listen that Hobbes and his ilk were the ones of whom sovereign princes and good subjects had to beware. Laudian anglicans like himself were the subjects that all wise Christian rulers would (or should) wish to have.

As we saw in the ‘Vindication’, Bramhall pointed out contradictions in Hobbes’s teaching concerning ecclesiastics between *De Cive* (1642) and the ‘Treatise’ (1645): in the former, the ecclesiastical doctors seemed to be judged infallible as successors of the apostles; in the latter, Hobbes denied these doctors such a character and authority. In the *Castigations*, Bramhall highlights the contradiction between *De Cive* and *Questions*. In the first, *De Cive*,

he made the ecclesiastical doctors to be infallible, here [*Questions*] he maketh them to be fallible. There he made their infallibility to be a peculiar privilege derived to them by imposition of hands from the Apostles, whom they succeeded, and from the promise of Christ; here he attributeth it wholly to that power which is committed to them by the civil magistrate. And what if the civil magistrate commit no power to them? Then, by his doctrine, Christ breaketh His promise, and this privilege ceaseth. . . . He answereth, that ‘the infallibility of ecclesiastical doctors . . . doth not consist in this, that they cannot be deceived, but that a subject cannot be deceived in obeying them, when they are lawfully constituted doctors.’ A pretty fancy. ‘If the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch’ doctor and subject together. If the doctors be deceived themselves, they must needs deceive the subjects, who trust to their interpretation. Secondly, he waiveth now the two grounds of their infallibility, that is, the promise of Christ and the privilege conferred by imposition of hands, and ascribeth all their infallibility to the constitution of the civil power; which may render their expositions legal, according to the municipal laws, but cannot render them infallible.³⁷

As Bramhall reasons, even if the gloss of the passage in *De Cive* offered by Hobbes in *Questions* is accepted, the philosopher still remains guilty of breaking his own rule of submission to the sovereign authority – if that sovereign was Charles I. For in *De Cive* Hobbes had not conformed to the teachings maintained by the king and his ecclesiastical ministers: ‘If ecclesiastical doctors lawfully constituted, be so far infallible that they cannot deceive the subject, why did he vary so much (notoriously) from their expositions at that time, as he hath done in his book *De Cive*, when they had both imposition of hands, and approbation from supreme authority?’³⁸ Furthermore, with no apparent justification, Hobbes has arrogated to himself authority to publish judgments on religious questions: ‘Why doth he now, wanting both the promise of Christ, and imposition of hands, take upon him

³⁶ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 392–3.

³⁷ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 386–7.

³⁸ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 387.

to be the tryer and examiner of the exposition, not only of single prophets, but of whole convocations?³⁹

That Bramhall should return several times to this issue shows how irritated he was to see Hobbes claiming that his (Bramhall's) notions of religious authority and obedience to God subverted the rule of the civil sovereign and engendered sedition and civil war. In the *Castigations* Bramhall responds directly to Hobbes's assertion that he is the one who 'makes it impossible for any nation in the world to preserve itself from civil wars'. The bishop reiterates that neither the 'arminian' anglican clergy generally, nor the Laudian episcopate in particular, had ever acted against the civil sovereign. In fact, Bramhall points out that there were critics of the Caroline-Laudian ecclesiastical regime that accused such clergy as Sibthorpe and Manwaring of 'blind obedience' to the sovereign.⁴⁰ And now Hobbes has charged them with the very opposite, 'seditious principles': so, they can't win. Bramhall contends that they are neither obedient without conscience (tyrant-sycophants) nor disobedient unto defiance (rebels):

We sail securely between this Scylla and Charybdis, by steering the ancient and direct course of passive obedience. We justify no defensive arms against a sovereign prince. We allow no civil wars for conscience' sake. When we are persecuted for not complying with the unlawful commands of a lawful sovereign, we know no other remedy but to suffer or to flee . . . They are T.H. his own principles (which make no difference between just and unjust power, between a sword given by God and a sword taken by man), which do serve to involve nations in civil wars.⁴¹

In the last section of *Castigations* the question of religious authority comes once again to exercise Bramhall a great deal.⁴² He returns to what Hobbes had written in the postscript to the 'Treatise', to wit: 'True religion consisteth in obedience to Christ's lieutenants, and in giving God such honour both in attributes and actions, as they in their several lieutenancies shall ordain.'⁴³ He calls this 'a rapping paradox indeed'. In other words, he is utterly appalled, and hopes his readers will find it just as deplorable. The bishop readily grants that sovereigns are God's lieutenants on earth; but this does not mean that they are *Christ's* lieutenants. Bramhall points out that Hobbes himself has taught that the kingdom of Christ is not to begin till the second coming.⁴⁴ So how, Bramhall wonders, could any sovereign be

³⁹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 387.

⁴⁰ '[W]e, who have formerly been accused to maintain blind obedience': *Castigations*, BW, iv, 390. For the association of arminianism and divine right absolutism, and the parliamentary attacks upon such arminian and divine-right absolutists as Sibthorpe and Manwaring, see Hillel Schwartz, 'Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624–1629', *JBS* 12, 2 (1973): 41–68.

⁴¹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 390–1. ⁴² BW, iv, 478–506.

⁴³ Quoted by Bramhall, *Castigations*, BW, iv, 491. ⁴⁴ See *Lev.*, XLII.

regarded as Christ's lieutenant?⁴⁵ After presenting several more objections to this teaching, Bramhall examines Hobbes's treatment of some related issues in *Leviathan*. He points out that Hobbes renders the sovereign 'the ground and pillar of truth'. The bishop objects that this is contrary to Scripture, and insists that the universal church – no individual ruler – must be regarded as that ground and pillar.⁴⁶ To demonstrate that the sovereign cannot be taken for the ground and pillar, Bramhall quotes Scripture: 'These things write I unto thee . . . that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth.'⁴⁷ Bramhall glosses the passage: 'What the Church signifieth in this place may be demonstratively collected, both from the words themselves, – wherein he calleth it "the house of God", which appellation cannot be applied to a single sovereign, much less to a heathen prince, as their sovereign then was, – and likewise by the things written, which were directions for the ordering of ecclesiastical persons.'⁴⁸ No single sovereign and no single church of any one commonwealth can be regarded as the pillar and ground of truth. Thus, we see again the fundamental disagreement between Hobbes and Bramhall in their conceptions of the Christian church(es). On Hobbes's view, there are as many Christian churches as Christian sovereigns, for 'church' was just a different way of referring to 'commonwealth': 'communicants' were 'subjects' (or 'citizens').⁴⁹ But on Bramhall's view, all of these separate (national) churches are members of one catholic church – which is not a commonwealth as Hobbes defined the latter.⁵⁰ This catholic church – not any single one, ruled by a civil sovereign – is the ground and pillar of the true faith.

In this same discussion, Bramhall reinforces the charge that Hobbes himself had failed to conform to his sovereign in religious matters:

The last argument used by me in this place was *ad hominem*, – 'why then is T.H. of a different mind from his sovereign and from the laws of the land concerning the attributes of God', and the religious worship which is to be given to Him? The canons and constitutions and Articles of the Church of England, and their discipline, and form of divine worship, were all confirmed by royal authority. And yet Mr Hobbes made no scruple to assume to himself, that which he denieth to all other subjects, 'the knowledge of good and evil',⁵¹ or of true and false religion, and a judgment of what is consonant to the law of nature and Scripture, different from the commands of his sovereign and the judgment of all his fellow-subjects; as appeareth by his book

⁴⁵ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 491. ⁴⁶ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 492–3.

⁴⁷ I Tim. III:14, 15. ⁴⁸ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 493. ⁴⁹ *Lev.*, xxxix.

⁵⁰ Bramhall's conception of the catholic church (and the church of England's relation to it) is expounded in several of his books, but the most systematic discussion is in *Just Vindication*, and the best way of seeing the contrast between his thinking and Hobbes's is by comparing that with *Lev.*, xxxix. For the origin of *Just Vindication*, see chapter 7, 185.

⁵¹ DC, XII.

De Cive, printed in the year 1642. Neither can he pretend, that he was then a local subject to another prince; for he differed more from him in religion, than from his own natural sovereign.⁵²

Bramhall suggests that Hobbes had, in effect, made *himself* ‘the ground and pillar of truth’. In this sense, Hobbes had appointed himself Leviathan, or sovereign, in 1642, for he was not then maintaining by mouth or pen approved doctrines of Charles I (Leviathan) and his ecclesiastical officers. The philosopher, the ordinary subject, had taken it upon himself to exercise the right supposed to be the sovereign’s alone, the right of determining good and evil, right and wrong. After this passage – which Bramhall himself calls *ad hominem* – he returns to a consideration of the problems that attend Hobbes’s maxim that true religion is nothing but obedience to the sovereign. Bramhall stresses that the commands of the sovereign may be contradictory of or inconsistent with Scripture, the moral law, the law of nature or the laws of the commonwealth.⁵³ According to Bramhall, on some occasions, true religion is *disobedience* to the sovereign.⁵⁴ But lest he be thought to diminish the rightful supremacy of the sovereign, Bramhall insists that he does not in the least deny the latter certain overarching (‘architectonical’) powers within his dominions. As *custos utriusque tabulae*, keeper of both tables of the law, the sovereign is to see that ‘God be duly served, and justice duly administered between man and man, and to punish such as transgress in either kind with civil punishment’.⁵⁵ Nor does the bishop wish to deny ‘that he hath an architectonical power, to see that each of his subjects do their duties in their several callings, ecclesiastics as well as seculars; that the care and charge of seeing, that no doctrine be taught his subjects but such as may consist with the general peace, and the authority to prohibit seditious practices and opinions, do reside in him’.⁵⁶ By such passages Bramhall would hope to allay fears of Charles II (and any of his *politique* counsellors) that bishops like himself would undermine or diminish his power in his own realm. That such bishops would *necessarily* subvert Charles (or any other sovereign) is precisely what Hobbes was all along so intent upon arguing in this quarrel with Bramhall.

As we saw in chapter 7, in *Questions* Hobbes had pointedly asked: ‘What has the Bishop to do with what God says to me when I read the Scriptures, more than I have to do with what God says to him when he reads them? unless he have authority given him by him whom Christ hath constituted His lieutenant.’ Bramhall concedes that Hobbes, by the latter’s teaching, might

⁵² *Castigations*, BW, IV, 493. ‘Another prince’ would refer to Louis XIII (1610–43) at the end of whose reign DC was printed in Paris. Hobbes’s religious opinions in that book deviated from Louis XIII’s even more than they did from Charles I’s.

⁵³ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 493–5. ⁵⁴ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 496.

⁵⁵ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 499. ⁵⁶ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 499.

have denied that he had such authority over him when writing in 1656. But how could Hobbes have denied that authority in the early 1640s? ‘He cannot deny but “the Bishop” *had* such authority, when he had not. And yet he doubted not even then to interpret the Scriptures contrary to both “the Bishop” and to “Christ’s lieutenant”.’⁵⁷ Furthermore, as Bramhall observes:

By his own confession there is a great difference between him and me in this particular: – ‘Our Saviour hath promised this infallibility (in those things which are necessary to salvation) to the Apostles, until the Day of Judgment; that is to say, to the Apostles, and to pastors to be consecrated by them by imposition of hands: therefore the sovereign magistrate, as he is a Christian, is obliged to interpret the Holy Scriptures, when there is question about the mysteries of faith, by ecclesiastical person rightly ordained.’ Unless he have such ‘ordination’ by ‘imposition of hands’, I am better qualified than he is for the interpretation of Scripture, by his own confession.⁵⁸

Far from discerning any validity or justice in Hobbes’s objection to episcopacy *jure divino*, Bramhall strongly re-affirms the doctrine in *Castigations*: ‘They [bishops] have their holy orders by succession from the Apostles, not from their civil sovereigns. They have the power of the keys by the concession of Christ; – “Whose sins ye remit they are remitted, whose sins ye retain they are retained.” None can give that to another, which they have not themselves. Where did Christ give the power of the keys, to the civil magistrate?’⁵⁹ Bramhall then examines Hobbes’s dissolution of the distinction between ‘spiritual’ and ‘temporal’ power. The latter has, in erastian, caesaro-papist fashion, removed all boundaries and distinct jurisdictions to render the civil sovereign omniscient. Thus, as the bishop complains, Hobbes has confounded ‘regal supremacy’ with ‘omnipotence’; the ‘external regiment of the Church’ with ‘the power of the keys and jurisdiction in the inner court of conscience’.⁶⁰ He objects that on Hobbes’s view the civil sovereign is a ruler possessed of all sacerdotal power – which is, again, not consistent with the limitation of royal supremacy in religion as enunciated in the thirty-seventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Returning again to the issue of episcopacy, Bramhall objects that Hobbes has endeavoured to make a bishop merely the analogue of a tutor, entirely dependent upon the pleasure of the head of the household. Bishops, the *bishop* insists, cannot be likened to ‘schoolmasters’, for they are ‘the successors of the Apostles in that part of their office which is of ordinary and perpetual necessity, and the king’s proper council in ecclesiastical affairs’.⁶¹ As such, they possess an attribute that the civil sovereign does not. No matter how supreme the civil sovereign

⁵⁷ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 500–1; ‘even then’: at the time of writing and publishing DC.

⁵⁸ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 501, quoting DC, xvii. ⁵⁹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 501–2.

⁶⁰ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 502. ⁶¹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 502.

may be in all other regards, he is not in possession of the unique spiritual authority that bishops inherit from the apostles.

Although originally conceived as merely an appendix to the *Castigations*, Bramhall's *Catching of Leviathan* was given its own title page, epistle to the Christian reader and preface.⁶² The sub-title indicates that *The Catching of Leviathan, or The Great Whale* demonstrates 'out of Mr Hobbes his own works, that no man, who is thoroughly a Hobbist, can be a good Christian or a good Commonwealth's man, or reconcile himself to himself; because his principles are not only destructive to all religion, but to all societies; extinguishing the relation between prince and subject, master and servant, parent and child, husband and wife; and abound with palpable contradictions'. Bramhall informs the reader that this short treatise was not designed to be a thorough refutation of Hobbes's religion and politics, but only to expose 'the vanity of his petulant scoffs and empty brags, and how open he doth lie to the lash, whensoever any one will vouchsafe to take him in hand to purpose'.⁶³ As we noted in chapter 7, in the *Questions*, Hobbes had indeed invited or, rather, dared, Bramhall's explicit reply to *Leviathan*: 'By this short passage of his concerning dominion and obedience, I have no reason to expect a very shrewd answer from him to my *Leviathan*.'⁶⁴ Near the conclusion of *Questions* Hobbes was already anticipating and taunting: 'I cannot imagine what he will say to this in his answer to my *Leviathan*.'⁶⁵ In fact, Hobbes thought that Bramhall had for a long while been itching to write and publish a refutation of *Leviathan*; so, at least, he suggested in *Questions*: 'to which [eternal torments after death] I have answered once before in this book [*Questions*], and spoken much more amply in another book [*Leviathan*], to which the Bishop hath inclination to make an answer, as appeareth by his epistle to the reader'.⁶⁶ Here Hobbes was referring to what Bramhall had promised to the reader of the *Defence*, namely, that he would write a critique of *Leviathan* if he deemed it necessary.⁶⁷ Evidently Bramhall now saw the need, or utility, and in the *Catching of Leviathan* at last delivered himself of a critique that had been gestating for some time. Nevertheless, in the preface, Bramhall denied any long-harboured plan for this project:

I never nourished within my breast the least thought of answering his *Leviathan*; as having seen a great part of it answered before ever I read it,⁶⁸ and having moreover received it from good hands that a Roman Catholic was about it: but being braved by

⁶² Bramhall notes that some of his friends 'prevailed with me to alter my design, and to make this small treatise independent upon the other'. 'To the Christian Reader', *BW*, iv, 513.

⁶³ *Castigations*, *BW*, iv, 513. ⁶⁴ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 188. ⁶⁵ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 444.

⁶⁶ *Questions*, *EW*, v, 237. ⁶⁷ *Defence*, *BW*, iv, 20–1.

⁶⁸ In the margin of the first edition Bramhall offered the initials D. R. C. here, and for 'a Roman Catholic' the initials P. I. S. One candidate for D. R. C., suggested but rejected by A. W. Haddan, Bramhall's nineteenth-century editor, is Dr Ralph Cudworth.

the author in print, as giving me a title for my answer – ‘Behemoth against Leviathan’ – and at other times being so solicitous for me, ‘what’ I ‘would say’ to such a passage in my ‘answer to’ his ‘*Leviathan*’, imagining his silly cavils to be irrefragable demonstrations; I will take the liberty (by his good leave) to throw on two or three spadefuls of earth towards the final interment of his pernicious principles and other mushroom errors.⁶⁹

Yet it is difficult to believe that Bramhall had not ‘the least thought of answering his *Leviathan*’. If that had been true, would Hobbes’s taunts have been enough to compel him?

In the preface to the *Catching of Leviathan* Bramhall stresses the ‘horrid consequences’ of Hobbes’s ‘blasphemous opinions’ that tend toward atheism. He suggests that the true significance or implication of Hobbes’s metaphysics and theology is atheism: ‘Many men fear the meaning of it is not good; – that God Himself must be gone for company, as being an “incorporeal substance”,⁷⁰ except men will vouchsafe by God to understand nature.’⁷¹ After mocking Hobbes’s concept of Leviathan – as nothing but some monstrosity of Hobbes’s imagination, not unlike Dagon, god of the Philistines – Bramhall suggests that the philosopher himself is most fit to impersonate Leviathan: ‘And for a metaphorical Leviathan, I know none so proper to personate that huge body as T.H. himself.’⁷² Hobbes possesses all the essential arrogance and impudence of the ‘mortal God’:

The Leviathan doth not ‘take his pastime’ in the deep with so much freedom, nor behave himself with so much height and insolence, as T.H. doth in the Schools; nor domineer over the lesser fishes with so much scorn and contempt, as he doth over all other authors; censuring, branding, contemning, proscribing, whatsoever is contrary to his humour; bustling, and bearing down before him whatsoever cometh in his way; creating truth and falsehood by the breath of his mouth, by his sole authority without other reason, a second Pythagoras at least. There have been self-conceited persons in all ages, but none that could ever ‘king’ it like him ‘over all the children of pride’.⁷³

After noting how the Greenland whalers snare their prey with harpoons, Bramhall concludes the preface with a short description of the three

⁶⁹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 515–16.

⁷⁰ In *Lev.*, xxxiv, Hobbes had stressed (and in *Elements of Law*, xi, he had pointed out) the absurdity of ‘incorporeal substance’, regarding it as a contradiction in terms. In *Lev.* he did not state that God (like everything else in existence) was corporeal, though that was implied. In the appendices attached to the Latin edition of *Lev.* (which was included in the collection of his works published in Amsterdam, 1668), Hobbes confirmed that God was corporeal – and went to some trouble to show that this was the opinion of the church father Tertullian. In his ‘Answer to Bishop Bramhall’ (see chapter 9), his reply to *Catching*, Hobbes made the same claim about Tertullian’s view of the corporeality of God.

⁷¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 516. ⁷² *Catching*, BW, iv, 517.

⁷³ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 517. Psalms civ:26: ‘God hath made [Leviathan] to take his pastime in the great and wide sea.’ Bramhall’s latter allusion is to Job xli:34.

'harpoon-irons' he has fashioned to pierce 'this phantastic Leviathan'.⁷⁴ The first 'dart' (chapter I), aimed at 'his heart', that is, the 'theological part', will show 'that his principles are not consistent either with Christianity or any other religion'.⁷⁵ The second dart (chapter II), aimed at 'the chine', or the political discourse of *Leviathan*, will show 'that his principles are pernicious to all forms of government, and all societies, and destroy all relations between man and man'.⁷⁶ The last harpoon (chapter III) aims at his head, or what Bramhall calls the 'rational part of his discourse', in order to demonstrate that Hobbes's principles are logically inconsistent and contradictory.⁷⁷ In the *Catching of Leviathan*, Bramhall has at last abandoned entirely the debate over free-will, the better to execute a wide-ranging and discursive attack upon all of Hobbes's most 'pernicious' teachings.

In the first chapter Bramhall attempts to expose Hobbes's principles as 'brimful of prodigious impiety'.⁷⁸ Hobbes makes atheism appear more reasonable than superstition; and Hobbes's God is not the God of Christians, or of any rational man.⁷⁹ For Hobbes's deity is (unworthily) divisible and compounded of matter, qualities and accidents.⁸⁰ The bishop goes even further to charge that, of God, Hobbes leaves nothing but the name: 'For by taking away all incorporeal substances he taketh away God Himself.'⁸¹ Bramhall reasons that God is either incorporeal substance ('spirit') or finite matter. As Hobbes has denied the existence of the former, God must be the latter. But, Bramhall argues, if God is merely finite matter – just another corporeal entity in the universe – then he is not really God at all.⁸² Concluding his examination of Hobbes's notion of God, Bramhall puts it this way: 'They who deny all incorporeal substances, can understand nothing by God, but either nature, as T.H. seemeth to intimate, or a fiction of the brain without real being, cherished for advantage and politic ends, as a profitable error, howsoever dignified with the glorious title of "the eternal cause of all things".'⁸³ Since Hobbes has strictly denied the existence of incorporeal substances, he is either a pantheist (*Deus sive Natura*) or an insincere, Machiavellian theist.⁸⁴ Bramhall also argues that on Hobbes's view the doctrine of the

⁷⁴ *Catching*, BW, iv, 518. ⁷⁵ *Catching*, BW, iv, 518. Chapter I occupies BW, iv, 519–47.

⁷⁶ *Catching*, BW, iv, 518. Chapter II occupies BW, iv, 547–75. But Bramhall's criticism is not confined to matter from *Lev*. Throughout the *Catching* Bramhall considers passages from *DC* as well. Thus we may suppose that many of those sixty exceptions to *DC* that Bramhall had given to Hobbes in 1645 (or slightly earlier) were now reiterated. For these exceptions, see chapter 3, 86.

⁷⁷ *Catching*, BW, iv, 518. Chapter III occupies BW, iv, 575–97. ⁷⁸ *Catching*, BW, iv, 521.

⁷⁹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 521, 523. In the course of criticising Hobbes's undivine deity, Bramhall exclaims in exasperation: 'Away with blasphemies.' BW, iv, 524.

⁸⁰ *Catching*, BW, iv, 524. ⁸¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 525.

⁸² *Catching*, BW, iv, 525; see also 584. ⁸³ *Catching*, BW, iv, 526.

⁸⁴ This point brings to mind Spinoza's famous *Deus sive Natura*, God and Nature as convertible. In later years Hobbes was to remark that he 'durst not write so boldly' as Spinoza had. For an

Trinity is made contemptible nonsense.⁸⁵ Hobbes is censured for several other irreligious and unchristian teachings, including those on prophecy, divine inspiration, Scripture, the sacraments, heaven and hell, the soul, Satan and devils.⁸⁶ The bishop also spends a considerable portion of chapter 1 criticising the philosopher's teaching concerning ecclesiology and religious authority. Bramhall points out that Hobbes has deviated much from the creed of the church of England:

We are taught in our Creed to believe the Catholic or universal Church. But T.H. teacheth us the contrary: – that ‘if there be more Christian Churches than one, all of them together are not one Church personally’;⁸⁷ and more plainly, – ‘Now if the whole number of Christians be not contained in one commonwealth, they are not one person, nor is there an universal Church, that hath any authority over them’;⁸⁸ and again, – ‘The universal Church is not one person, of which it can be said, that it hath done, or decreed, or ordained, or excommunicated, or absolved.’⁸⁹ This doth quite overthrow all the authority of General Councils.⁹⁰

Further scrutinising Hobbes's ecclesiology, Bramhall objects that whereas everyone else makes a distinction between church and commonwealth – on account of the fundamental (ontological) difference between ‘spiritual’ and ‘temporal’ – the philosopher maintains they are really one and the same.⁹¹ It is shortly after this point that the bishop turns to Hobbes's teaching on ecclesiastics within commonwealths. He repeats his observation of Hobbes's inconsistency between *De Cive* and later writings.⁹² What is so objectionable is that Hobbes has deprived bishops of their *jus divinum*, and transferred it, and all religious authority, to the civil sovereign. Bishops are not essentially different from judges or generals, JPs or lords lieutenant, or any other secular officers and lesser magistrates: the former, like the latter, derive their power solely from the civil sovereign, that is, *jure civili*.

Bramhall also objects to Hobbes's *politique*, caesaro-papist teaching that ‘the sharpest and most successful sword’ renders to the sovereign the power ‘to approve or reject all sorts of theological doctrines concerning the kingdom

extensive discussion of this remark see Edwin Curley, “I Durst Not Write So Boldly”: How to Read Hobbes's *Theological–Political Treatise* in *Hobbes e Spinoza: Scienza e Politica*, ed. Daniela Bostrenghi (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1992), 497–594. As J. R. Jacob, among others, has noted, Hobbes and Spinoza were often to be lumped together by their Christian critics. *Henry Stubbe*, 61.

⁸⁵ *Catching*, BW, iv, 526–31. ⁸⁶ For Bramhall's summary, see BW, iv, 547.

⁸⁷ DC, xvii.22. ⁸⁸ *Lev.*, xxxiii. ⁸⁹ DC, xvii.26.

⁹⁰ *Catching*, BW, iv, 531; ‘overthrow the authority of all General Councils’: the anglican confession affirmed the authority of the first four councils, Nicaea, 325; Constantinople, 381; Ephesus, 431; and Chalcedon, 451.

⁹¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 531–2. For Hobbes's argument, in *Lev.*, xxxix, upon which Bramhall comments in this chapter of *Catching*, see chapter 6, 165.

⁹² *Catching*, BW, iv, 533–4; for the observation of the inconsistency in *Castigations*, see above, 229.

of God; not according to their truth or falsehood, but according to that influence which they have upon political affairs'.⁹³ He protests that the philosopher makes the sovereign the sole authority on good and evil, justice and injustice, virtue and vice.⁹⁴ Bramhall suggests that Hobbes is the propagandist of some semi-divine despot of the East: 'Where are we? In Europe or Asia? where they ascribed a divinity to their kings, and, to use his own phrase, made them "mortal Gods"'.⁹⁵ What Bramhall calls the 'height of his flattery' (of tyrants) is Hobbes's doctrine that sovereigns make something just by the commanding it, or make something unjust by the forbidding it.⁹⁶ The philosopher's teaching concerning the powers of a sovereign are meant to flatter kings like Charles II and Louis XIV – or lord protectors like Cromwell. But the casualties of swallowing such flattery would be grievous. No wise prince, Bramhall suggests, would not banish a sycophant like Hobbes. The latter effectively renders goodness, justice, honesty, conscience and God Himself 'to be empty names without any reality, which signify nothing, further than they conduce to a man's interest'.⁹⁷ Ironically, a flattering theorist of tyranny like Hobbes does only harm to the sovereign. He sets him up for disaster by encouraging him to think of himself as *absolutely* sovereign, unaccountable to any on earth. Cleverly Bramhall presents the paradox that Hobbes is so much a 'friend' of sovereigns as to be their enemy:

I have thought sometimes that he [Hobbes] observed the method of some old cunning Parliament-men, who, when they had a mind to cross a bill, were always the highest for it in the House, and would insert so many and so great inconveniences into the Act, that they were sure it could never pass. So he maketh the power of kings to be so exorbitant, that no subject, who hath either conscience or discretion, ever did or can endure; so to render monarchy odious to mankind.⁹⁸

Charles II, or any other sovereign, would be foolish not to reject (and silence) such teachers. Lest, however, he be mistaken for some monarchomach or resistance-theorist, Bramhall promptly reiterates his precept of passive obedience. Unlike Hobbes, the bishop thinks that a sovereign may enact laws or carry out policy that subjects may call 'unjust'.⁹⁹ But even if the sovereign

⁹³ *Catching, BW*, iv, 540. Bramhall's basis for this representation of Hobbes is a solid one from *Lev.*: 'But because this doctrine . . . will appear to most men a novelty, I do but propound it, maintaining nothing in this or any other paradox of religion, *but attending the end of that dispute of the sword*, concerning the authority (not yet amongst my countrymen decided) by which all sorts of doctrine are to be approved or rejected'; 'for the points of doctrine concerning the kingdom of God have so great influence upon the kingdom of man, as not to be determined but by them that under God have the sovereign power'. *Lev.*, xxxviii; emphasis added by me, not Bramhall.

⁹⁴ *Catching, BW*, iv, 541–2. ⁹⁵ *Catching, BW*, iv, 542. ⁹⁶ *Catching, BW*, iv, 542.

⁹⁷ *Catching, BW*, iv, 543. ⁹⁸ *Catching, BW*, iv, 560.

⁹⁹ 'The laws or commands of a sovereign prince [may] be erroneous, or unjust, or injurious.' *Catching, BW*, iv, 543.

does so, the subject is ‘bound to acquiesce, and may not oppose or resist, otherwise than by prayers and tears, and at the most by flight’.¹⁰⁰ Bramhall then concludes the first chapter by listing twenty objectionable principles from both *Leviathan* and *De Cive*. Reviewing them all, Bramhall observes that: ‘His whole works are a heap of misshapen errors, and absurd paradoxes, vented with the confidence of a juggler, the brags of a mountebank, and the authority of some Pythagoras, or “third Cato”, lately “dropped down from heaven”.’¹⁰¹ Whether Bramhall had maintained civility in the *Castigations*, in the *Catching of Leviathan* he certainly abandons any pretence to politeness. In any case, he was now paying Hobbes back in the same coin that the latter had disbursed in the *Questions*.

Although the bishop had described his [first chapter](#) as a demonstration ‘That the Hobbian Principles are destructive to Christianity and all religion’, we have seen that he was not able to refrain from discussion of matters more political than theological. Bramhall’s criticism of Hobbes’s absolutism in the first chapter anticipates the fuller treatment in the second. Of course, in the case of the *Catching of Leviathan*, as in the case of all the other writings of Bramhall against Hobbes, it is not easy to determine where precisely he thinks religion (or philosophy or theology) ends, and where politics (‘policy’) begins. What we would call Bramhall’s primarily political criticism, as articulated in chapter II, is meant to show ‘that the Hobbian Principles do destroy all relations between man and man, and the whole frame of a commonwealth’.¹⁰² Bramhall argues that one of the most harmful principles of Hobbes is the latter’s foundational one, that obedience is only due where security is provided for. Bramhall translates the passage from the sixth chapter of *De Cive*:

Security is the end for which men make themselves subjects to others; which, if it be not enjoyed, no man is understood to have subjected himself to others, or to have lost his right to defend himself at his own discretion: neither is any man understood to have bound himself to any thing, or to have relinquished his right over all things, before his own security be provided for.¹⁰³

The bishop then invites his reader to consider how far this opens a ‘large window’ to ‘sedition and rebellion’.¹⁰⁴ If the subjects, not the sovereign, are permitted to exercise discretion in such matters, ‘there need no other bellows to kindle the fire of a civil war, and put a whole commonwealth into a combustion’.¹⁰⁵ Equally seditious is Hobbes’s teaching that: ‘No man

¹⁰⁰ *Catching*, BW, iv, 543. For Hobbes’s most emphatic rejection of the doctrine of passive obedience, see *Behemoth*, 50–1.

¹⁰¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 547. ¹⁰² *Catching*, BW, iv, 547.

¹⁰³ *Catching*, BW, iv, 554; DC, vi.3. ¹⁰⁴ *Catching*, BW, iv, 554.

¹⁰⁵ *Catching*, BW, iv, 554.

is bound by his pacts, whatsoever they be, not to resist him, who bringeth upon him death or wounds, or other bodily damage.¹⁰⁶ Bramhall notes in passing the alarming implication that this would warrant a student's seizing the rod of the master to beat him.¹⁰⁷ Perhaps Hobbes, a long-time tutor in the Cavendish family, was expected to be especially appreciative of this point. Bramhall identifies the same principle reiterated in a passage from *Leviathan*:

In case a great many men together have already resisted the sovereign power unjustly, or committed some capital crime, for which every one of them expecteth death, whether have they not the liberty to join together and assist and defend one another? certainly they have, for they do but defend their lives, which the guilty man may as well do as the innocent: there was indeed injustice in the first breach of their duty; their being of arms subsequent to it, though it be to maintain what they have done, is no new unjust act.¹⁰⁸

Bramhall delivers his objection in a rhetorical question: 'Why should we not change the name of *Leviathan* into the *Rebels' Catechism*?'¹⁰⁹ Hobbes justifies conspirators and rebels in their unlawful and violent schemes and actions – at least after they have begun them and can fear injury or death for such activity. Bramhall poses another rhetorical question of the same import: 'Was there ever such a trumpeter of rebellion heard of before?'¹¹⁰ In Bramhall's eyes – and, hopefully, in the eyes of all his readers – the last thing one could call Hobbes was a reactionary, royalist or architect and supporter of legitimate, stable monarchical government.

Bramhall censures Hobbes for his teaching on obligation to the sovereign during and after war. The bishop objects that in discussing what obligation a subject owes to an enemy who has prevailed, he omits all consideration of the difference between sovereignty *de jure* and sovereignty *de facto*, between possession of and right to power.¹¹¹ Bramhall cites Hobbes's teaching from *Leviathan* that a subject's obligation to a sovereign is understood to last only so long as the latter can offer protection.¹¹² To Bramhall, this is 'dogs' play', for it means that obligation is nothing but obedience to the man with the longest sword; obligation has nothing to do with right, and everything to do with force.¹¹³ Bramhall objects that Hobbes allows subjects to desert their lawful sovereign once he has suffered a military defeat and to submit to the usurping conqueror. Hobbes's teaching on the subject of obligation

¹⁰⁶ *Catching*, BW, iv, 555; Bramhall's translation of DC, II.18. ¹⁰⁷ *Catching*, BW, iv, 555.

¹⁰⁸ *Lev.*, XXI, as quoted by Bramhall, *Catching*, BW, iv, 555.

¹⁰⁹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 555. Presumably Bramhall knew that he was echoing the title of the royalist pamphlet, *The Rebels' Catechism*, published anonymously by Laud's chaplain Peter Heylyn in 1643.

¹¹⁰ *Catching*, BW, iv, 555. ¹¹¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 557.

¹¹² *Lev.*, XXI. ¹¹³ *Catching*, BW, iv, 557.

is a series of ‘disloyal paradoxes’, and where his teaching prevails ‘adieu honour, and honesty, and fidelity, and loyalty; all must give place to self-interest’.¹¹⁴ Thus, the legitimist Bramhall identifies the fundamental reason why so many royalists had such trouble accepting Hobbes as a colleague. Everything was reduced to self-interest at the expense of legitimacy (the legitimacy of Charles II, heir of the late Charles I): ‘It seemeth T.H. did “take” his sovereign “for better”, but not “for worse”.’¹¹⁵ It is a point worth stressing – to validate Bramhall’s charge – that in all his political treatises, Hobbes never once spoke of a sovereign’s having an indefeasible right to rule. Again, this made it impossible for legitimist (or most) royalists ever fully to accept Hobbes as an ally.¹¹⁶ But if the latter’s teaching on obligation is so hurtful to monarchs, particularly (a would-be sovereign like) Charles II, other principles of Hobbes are equally hurtful to *subjects*. By rendering the powers of sovereigns exorbitant, subjects are placed in a condition in which their lives depend upon the whim of a single man. In the *Castigations*, Bramhall had censured the absolutism of a passage from *De Cive*: “It is manifest therefore, that in every commonwealth, there is some one man or council which hath . . . a sovereign and absolute power, to be limited by the strength of the commonwealth and by no other thing.”¹¹⁷ What? Neither by the law of God, nor nature, nor nations, nor the municipal laws of the land, nor by any other things but his “power” and “strength”? Good doctrine! “Hunc tu Romane cavetto.”¹¹⁸ The revealing phrase is ‘municipal laws of the land’: the concept of a sovereign’s limitation by such law is a mark of a constitutional royalist position. In the *Catching of Leviathan*, Bramhall criticises Hobbes for teaching that a sovereign monarch does not bind himself in any way; and that covenants are but words and breath with no force to oblige

¹¹⁴ *Catching*, BW, iv, 558. ¹¹⁵ *Catching*, BW, iv, 558.

¹¹⁶ Jean Hampton argues for the validity of the mainstream royalist critique of Hobbes’s self-preservation doctrine. She may be the modern Hobbes commentator whose criticism of his political theory is closest to Bramhall’s. *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 197–207. Perhaps in the case of the 1640s and 1650s it would be worth confining the term ‘royalist writer’ (or ‘royalist theorist’) to *legitimists* – even if that would exclude some who were undoubtedly writing to support the Stuart cause. Only the latter’s teaching would demand loyalty to the Stuarts no matter the vicissitudes. While it is true that many mainstream royalist writers like Bramhall were to concede that monarchy was not the only legitimate or exclusively divinely sanctioned form of government, they, unlike Hobbes, were always to assert, very explicitly, that England was a monarchy, and the Stuarts the rightful rulers. For Bramhall’s argument that all three forms (monarchy, aristocracy, democracy) are valid, but that monarchy is superior, and most divine, see *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 319–20.

¹¹⁷ DC, vi.18.

¹¹⁸ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 318; quotation of Horace, *Satires*, I, iv. Bramhall’s very unHobbesian constitutionalism is also displayed in *Castigations* when he asserts that: ‘the commands of a sovereign prince may be repugnant not only to the moral law or the law of nature, but even to the *laws of the commonwealth*’. BW, iv, 495; emphasis added.

unless the author of those words wields a sword.¹¹⁹ Bramhall objects to the notion that the sovereign does not in any way limit or constrain himself by covenants, conditions, concessions, laws or oaths. His review of the philosopher's teaching prompts the constitutional royalist bishop to ask: 'What is now become of all our coronation oaths, and all our liberties and great Charters?'¹²⁰ Hobbes flouts Magna Carta and all other traditional and customary liberties and rights that subjects have enjoyed for centuries. Hobbes's sovereign is not bound to uphold any customs or laws, no matter how ancient and well-established. The coronation oath is rendered meaningless. Repeating his objection from the *Castigations*, Bramhall expresses his horror that Hobbes's sovereign is so absolute that he is limited neither by the law of God, nor the law of nature, nor the law of nations, nor the laws of the land.¹²¹ He also takes exception to Hobbes's teaching that a subject is obliged to obey whatever the sovereign commands, even before he knows what shall be commanded. For what if the sovereign demands action that is against the law of God or nature, or the laws of the commonwealth?¹²² Thus Bramhall insists on the observance of 'higher' and independent laws – laws that can trump the will of an individual sovereign.

Bramhall proceeds to describe what subjects would have to suffer at the hands of such a Hobbesian sovereign. This sovereign would have licence to kill at will. And such killing would be perfectly *lawful* by Hobbes's teaching. He may kill 'as many of them as he pleaseth, without any fault of theirs, without any examination on his part, merely upon suspicion . . . as freely as a man may pluck up a weed'.¹²³ No due process or formal procedure would be required. In the same way, the property of subjects could be confiscated at the mere impulse of this sovereign: 'He justifieth the taking away of men's estates . . . without precedent law, or precedent necessity, or subsequent satisfaction; and maintaineth, that not only the subject is bound to submit, but that the sovereign is just in doing it.'¹²⁴ Later Bramhall points out that

¹¹⁹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 560. ¹²⁰ *Catching*, BW, iv, 560.

¹²¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 561. In the next paragraph Bramhall displays his commitment to the institution of parliament by expressing his concern that the consequence of Hobbes's teaching would be its extinction: 'Parliaments may shut up their shops.' *BW*, iv, 561. In an anti-papal polemic published just two years earlier, Bramhall implied parliament's sharing of sovereignty with the monarch: 'Tell me, who are the supreme judges of the public dangers and necessities of England? Is not the prince? At least with his council and the representative body of the whole kingdom.' *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*, BW, II, 122.

¹²² *Catching*, BW, iv, 571. ¹²³ *Catching*, BW, iv, 562.

¹²⁴ *Catching*, BW, iv, 563. Bramhall implied this constitutionalist (or natural law) view that a subject may assert property rights against the sovereign in another publication of 1658, *Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified*, when he asked rhetorically whether a sovereign prince may *justly* take away from his subjects anything which they hold by human right. *BW*, III, 172. Whatever one calls this principle – constitutionalist or natural legalist – Hobbes the absolutist would claim that it was this mischievous principle

upon Hobbes's principles the sovereign could disregard marriage and take a man's wife to dispose of her however he pleased.¹²⁵ As a constitutionalist Bramhall cannot fully accept Hobbes's teaching that sovereignty is not divisible. He concedes that one cannot speak properly of 'divided' or 'mixed' monarchy, but he insists that 'temperated' or 'moderated' sovereignty is a perfectly valid concept. According to Bramhall, such 'temperated' or 'moderated' sovereignty can enjoy all the advantages of aristocracy and democracy without suffering their inconveniences.¹²⁶ In the bishop's scheme, the king is still sovereign, for the three estates (lords spiritual, lords temporal, commons) assembled in parliament are only 'suppliants', who request the king to enact certain laws.¹²⁷ However, the king's sovereignty is 'temperated' or 'moderated' inasmuch as he restrains himself by his coronation oath, which promises adherence to previously established statutes and such customary law and charters as Magna Carta.¹²⁸ Practically, this means that the sovereign will not govern his subjects by laws that have not yet been established, or new laws that have not obtained considerable assent.¹²⁹ But Bramhall hastens to add that this does not mean that parliament itself has any independent or autonomous legislative power. Instead, he styles parliament's power 'receptive' or 'preparative': 'without which no new laws ought to be imposed upon them; and as no new laws, so no new taxes or impositions, which are granted in England by statute law'.¹³⁰ That a constitutionalist and legitimist royalist like Bramhall regarded Hobbes in much the same way as he regarded various parliamentary and rebel propagandists of the 1640s – such as Henry Parker, his old polemical adversary – is betrayed by the fact that the bishop uses some of the same language in the *Catching of Leviathan* as he had in *Serpent-Salve* and *Fair Warning*. In the course of answering Parker in *Serpent-Salve* Bramhall used the phrase 'rebels' catechism'; now he was applying it to a book by Hobbes. As he now styled Hobbes, so he had once styled Parker, reproachfully, a 'third Cato dropped from Heaven'.¹³¹ But this is far from surprising. Hobbes's reasoning was in many points very similar, sometimes identical, to that of the author of *Observations upon some*

that many 'conscientious objectors' invoked against the king in such controversial episodes as the Forced Loan of the late 1620s and Ship Money of the 1630s. In Hobbes's teaching there is no such thing as property outside the disposal of the sovereign, for property is only established under a sovereign.

¹²⁵ *Catching*, BW, iv, 570.

¹²⁶ *Catching*, BW, iv, 564. For the English history of the concept of limited monarchy, see Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 18.

¹²⁷ *Catching*, BW, iv, 564. ¹²⁸ *Catching*, BW, iv, 564.

¹²⁹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 564. ¹³⁰ *Catching*, BW, iv, 565.

¹³¹ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 336, 382; see also 425 and 478. Criticising Hobbes for his confidence in his novel political theory: 'A new physician must have a new churchyard, wherein to bury those whom he killeth.' *Catching*, BW, iv, 548; compare this with *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 310.

of *His Majesty's Late Answers and Expresses*. The affinity between Hobbes and Parker is suggested by what has been called the latter's 'parliamentary absolutism'.¹³² Bramhall could have regarded Parker and Hobbes as merely two different specimens of the same absolutist genus. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes the de-factoist offered no argument to validate the concept of usurpation – a key concept for legitimist and constitutionalist royalists like Bramhall who held that one could have all the power in the world without being a 'rightful' or 'lawful' sovereign. The bishop had objected to Parker's view in precisely the same way he could object to Hobbes's – in *Serpent-Salve* he complained that Parker asserted that: 'power usurped and unlawful is as much from God as power hereditary and lawful'.¹³³ As a previous commentator noted: 'Both Parker and Hobbes, for all their differences, believed in a New Sovereignty, one which subsumed the total power of the community and consequently could claim total power over society as a whole, with no theoretical restraints on what it could do.'¹³⁴ Hobbes's most fundamental theoretical principle, self-preservation, was a central element in Parker's political thought as well. Parker wrote that: 'if he [the ruler] should turn his cannons on his own soldiers, they [subjects] were *ipso facto* absolved of all obedience and of all oaths and ties of allegiance whatsoever for that time, and bound by a higher duty to seek their own self-preservation by resistance and defence'.¹³⁵ Bramhall the legitimist objected to self-preservation as the paramount principle, whether asserted by Parker or Hobbes. He might also have perceived that Hobbes was in basic agreement with Parker in the conception of authority as ultimately derived from the people who, on Hobbes's view, transfer it (irrevocably) to a sovereign. Bramhall, then, had good reason to associate Hobbes with Parker.¹³⁶ To be sure, Bramhall does not explicitly link Parker and Hobbes by name. But that does not alter the fact that much of the bishop's writing against the one was quite similar to his writing against

¹³² A phrase borrowed from J. C. Davis, 'Political Thought during the English Revolution', 379. Michael Mendle, an authority on the thought of Parker, has called him an absolutist. *Henry Parker and the English Civil War*, xv.

¹³³ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 320.

¹³⁴ Daly, 'Bramhall and Royalist Moderation', 44. Perhaps nothing better illustrates Bramhall's 'constitutional', 'moderate' (or simply non-absolutist) royalism better than his frequent use of the term 'arbitrary power' as opprobrious. For a proper absolutist like Hobbes (or Henry Parker), 'arbitrary power' was mere pleonasm. For the evolution of the meaning of 'absolute', and its relationship to 'arbitrary', see Daly, 'The Idea of Absolute Monarchy', *HJ* 21 (1978): 227–50. Like Hobbes, Parker, as an absolutist, exhibited contempt for the constitutionalist notion of 'rule of law' and the 'common law mind'. Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War*, 73, 93, 182.

¹³⁵ Quoted by Bramhall, *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 344–5.

¹³⁶ Concluding her recent examination of Hobbes's political teaching in relation to various other contemporary ones, Eleanor Curran has asserted that 'on some issues . . . Hobbes took up positions or assumptions that were directly opposed to those of . . . other royalists and very close to the pronouncements of the parliamentarians and even the radical parliamentarians'. 'A Very Peculiar Royalist', 199. Parker must be placed in the latter camp.

the other. Whether he was conscious of it or not, in criticising Hobbes's political theory in the *Catching of Leviathan* Bramhall was echoing some of his criticism of Parker's as made in *Serpent-Salve*.¹³⁷

Just as Bramhall argues that parliament's constitutional role does not undermine the authority of the king, so he rejects Hobbes's teaching that spiritual (ecclesiastical) authority underived from the sovereign is subversive. For though the clergy derive their 'habitual power immediately from Christ' (*jure civili*), he grants that the civil sovereign has still an 'architectonical' power over all his subjects, including the clergy.¹³⁸ The latter, whatever spiritual authority they may have *jure divino*, are as subject to the civil sword as all their fellow subjects – who can claim, of course, no such special authority. Bramhall concludes this passage by scolding Hobbes for suggesting that those, like himself, who maintained constitutional monarchy or episcopacy *jure divino* contributed to the wars: 'Then the constitution of our English policy was not to be blamed; the exercise of the power of the keys, by the authority from Christ, was not to be blamed: but T.H. deserveth to be blamed, who presumeth to censure before he understands.'¹³⁹

The discursive and repetitive review of Hobbes's contradictions that makes up the final chapter of the *Catching of Leviathan* occasions Bramhall's observation that one cannot know when the philosopher speaks in earnest or when in jest. Like a gipsy, Hobbes tells a fortune in two ways so that 'if the one miss, the other may be sure to hit'.¹⁴⁰ But after his long list of Hobbes's absurdities and inconsistencies, Bramhall tellingly concludes his book by returning once more to that postscript to the 'Treatise' which Hobbes had written in the summer of 1645. One might argue that it was that short passage that had all along vexed Bramhall most. Hobbes had concluded that postscript with the striking aphorism: 'True religion consisteth in obedience to Christ's lieutenants, and in giving God such honour, both in attributes and actions, as they in their several lieutenancies shall ordain.' As we have seen, in the 'Vindication' Bramhall suffered an allergic reaction to this. In concluding the *Catching of Leviathan* he echoes that response. But this time he goes further. Bramhall maintains that by making civil sovereigns Christ's lieutenants the philosopher has effectively perverted the relationship between

¹³⁷ Further affinity between Hobbes and Parker may be seen in the fact that in the latter's *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* (1641), *The Question Concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacy* (1641), *The True Grounds of Ecclesiastical Regiment* (1641), and *Ius Regum* (1645), Laudian churchmen were accused of undermining royal supremacy by episcopacy *jure divino* claims. For Parker's erastianism and its proximity to Selden's and, by implication, Hobbes's, see J. W. Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603 to 1660* (London: Methuen, 1938), 339–45; for similarities between Hobbes and Parker see Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War*, 52, 183 ('quite as fierce an anti-clericalist as Hobbes'); see *ibid.*, 51–69, for a discussion of Parker's erastian writings.

¹³⁸ Here Bramhall repeated the formulation he offered in *Just Vindication*, BW, I, 272.

¹³⁹ *Catching*, BW, IV, 565. ¹⁴⁰ *Catching*, BW, IV, 592.

religion and politics. He has established politics as supreme and paramount. He has rendered religion nothing but an instrument or tool of Machiavellian politicians. Politics ('policy') is not to serve the interests of religion; religion is subordinated, to serve the interests of politics. Religion is to adapt and conform itself to political considerations, not vice versa. According to the bishop, Hobbes has made 'policy to be the building, and religion the hangings, which must be fashioned just according to the proportion of the policy; and not . . . making religion to be the building, and policy the hangings, which must be conformed to religion'.¹⁴¹ Bramhall perceived Hobbes to be a potent secularising force. Moreover, the bishop suggested that Hobbes himself was an atheist. Even if the philosopher were not, his books contributed to the 'increase of atheism'.¹⁴²

In the preface to the *Catching of Leviathan*, Bramhall proposed that no man was so fit to impersonate the sea-monster and 'mortal God' as Hobbes himself. By the late 1650s, when the bishop was writing this preface, the conception of Hobbes as monstrous, not unlike the biblical creature Leviathan, may have been a common one. In correspondence with Sir Justinian Isham, shortly after the publication of *Leviathan* in 1651, Brian Duppa, bishop of Salisbury (and Newcastle's former colleague as tutor to the prince of Wales before the civil wars), noted: 'How like [Hobbes is] to the Leviathan that Job speaks of.'¹⁴³ In the conclusion of the *Catching of Leviathan*, the bishop returns to the conceit of Hobbes-as-Leviathan. There, with more than a pinch of sneer, Bramhall recommends that:

T.H. should have sole privilege of setting up his form of government in America, as being calculated and fitted for that meridian; and if it prosper there, then to have the liberty to transplant it hither. Who knoweth (if there could but be some means devised to make them understand his language), whether the Americans might not choose him to be their sovereign? But all the fear is, that if he should put his principles in practice as magistrally as he doth dictate them, his supposed subjects might chance to tear their 'mortal God' in pieces with their teeth, and entomb his sovereignty in their bowels.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ *Catching*, BW, iv, 596–7. Rather surprisingly, Bramhall here uses the same metaphor deployed by 'the father of English presbyterianism', Thomas Cartwright. For the Whitgift–Cartwright argument about 'building' and 'hangings', in which the latter insisted that the structure of the state should conform to the structure of the church, see Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans*, 57–8. Further, Bramhall quoted the building–hangings passage from *Reply to Whitgift*, for very different purpose, in *Serpent-Salve*, BW, iii, 316.

¹⁴² 'To the Christian Reader', *Catching*, BW, iv, 514.

¹⁴³ Duppa to Isham, 14 July 1651, *The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham, 1650–1660*, ed. Sir Gyles Isham (Northampton: Northamptonshire Record Society, Publication No. 17, 1955), 41. As we saw above (note 20), William Lucy had likened Hobbes to another menacing figure, Goliath. In the epistle to the reader of the book he published against Hobbes in 1656, he announced: 'I fling my stone at this giant'.

¹⁴⁴ *Catching*, BW, iv, 597.

Hobbes always stressed subordination, conformity and obedience to the sovereign. But had his own conduct been consistent with such teaching? In Bramhall's eyes, Hobbes had been acting quite differently: much more 'magistrally' than submissively or humbly. The bishop thought that Hobbes had failed conspicuously to practise what he had preached. He had not followed his own rules. Shortly after the First English Civil War had broken out, Hobbes wrote, in his critique of White's *De Mundo Dialogi Tres*:

Since the natural law forbids you to attend an assembly unless summoned, it is a sign of a bad man to take thought for, i.e. to give counsel to, his country and citizens, *unless they summon him to that office*. This is evidenced in our land's present civil wars, the sole cause of which was that certain evil men who were not called to office thought that their own wisdom was less fairly valued [than it deserved] and advised the citizens to take up arms against the King. Before a righteous man can counsel citizens, then, he must be elected to office.¹⁴⁵

Bramhall found that Hobbes was just like this 'bad man' who had not been summoned to an office from which he should give counsel (by books) to his country, its governor or his fellow subjects.¹⁴⁶ Thus, in the *Catching of Leviathan*, after quoting some lines from *De Cive* Bramhall pointed out Hobbes's hypocrisy:

'It belongs to kings to discern what is good and evil', and 'private men, who take to themselves the knowledge of good and evil, do covet to be as kings, which consisteth not with the safety of the commonwealth'; which he calleth 'a seditious doctrine', and one of 'the diseases of the commonwealth'. Yet such is his forgetfulness, that he himself licenseth his own book for the press, and to be 'taught in the Universities', as containing 'nothing contrary to the Word of God or good manners, or to the disturbance of public tranquillity'. Is not this to 'take to himself the knowledge of good and evil'?¹⁴⁷

Hobbes was thus setting himself up as a sovereign, a Leviathan sitting above Leviathans, albeit trying to benefit them by his teaching, but in so doing tacitly usurping the power to declare 'good and evil'. In his writings of the 1640s and 1650s we can see Hobbes prosecuting the erastian and caesaropapist design of shifting all power in matters of religion to the civil sovereign. But in trying to accomplish this, the philosopher himself had, willy-nilly, to assume some authority. Hobbes scolded Bramhall for his notion of law as ordinance of 'right reason' (*recta ratio*). But by what other authority was Hobbes deciding questions of authority? It would seem that Hobbes's own

¹⁴⁵ *Anti-White*, xxxviii.16 (1976), 476; emphasis added.

¹⁴⁶ Bramhall had emphasised the presumptuousness of Hobbes's taking it upon himself to teach political principles: 'It is strange to hear a man dictate so magisterially in politics, who was never officer or counselor in his life, nor had any opportunity to know the intrigues of any one state.' *Catching*, BW, iv, 548.

¹⁴⁷ *Catching*, BW, iv, 580.

recta ratio dictated his thinking on issues of political and religious authority. Hobbes may be found employing ‘reason’ for his own purposes – namely to show the wisdom of *his* laws, as laid down in *Elements of Law*, *De Cive* and *Leviathan*. Since Hobbes himself was not the sovereign, how else could he commend his political principles, but by claiming their eminent *rationality*? Thus, when it came to *recta ratio*, Hobbes held that fickle trump card.¹⁴⁸ Thus, the true philosopher, the scientist of politics, had become the ultimate authority. For it was he alone who was competent (*scientifically* qualified) to locate, define and prescribe authority. In this way, Hobbes emerges as the sovereign of sovereigns, the Leviathan of Leviathans, inasmuch as he would be the *founder* or *architect* of the regimes of all rulers. Their regimes would be merely the execution of his design or practice of his system. Apparently, Hobbes did not much consider the fact that might have disturbed any royalist or king. Would not the man who had *founded* the science of politics be in some sense the sovereign? Would not the man who had taken it upon himself to explicate and teach government be the master of that government? It seems Bramhall perceived this implication of *lèse majesté*. In the ears of the bishop, all of the philosopher’s talk of obedience to authority rang hollow. For all Hobbes’s boasting of his orderly and wholesome principles of authority, protection and obedience, he himself was guilty of flagrant insubordination. A mere subject, possessed of no formal authority whatever, he had effectively deviated from (and indirectly censured) royal policy (e.g., arminian Christianity, episcopacy *jure divino*) and, instead, tried to dictate what was right in his own eyes – which happened to be very similar to what was right in the eyes of such puritan deviants as William Prynne. In the bishop’s view, Hobbes had spoken and written contrary to the interest of his sovereign, Charles I. In effect, Hobbes had been setting up his own rival authority. The philosopher was arrogating to himself the government of kings, the management of rulers. Although Hobbes had always contemned the political writings of Plato and Aristotle, it was in the case of Hobbes that the philosopher had truly become king. In a perverse ceremony, the ‘civil scientist’ had anointed himself. Hobbes, the monster of Malmesbury, was more than the author of *Leviathan*: he was *Leviathan* himself.

If one studies the face of the figure in the frontispiece of *Leviathan*, and then examines J. B. Gaspar’s contemporary portrait of its author, one can think that they are portraits of the same man. I am not the first to notice the striking resemblance between the faces of the *Leviathan* figure and Hobbes.¹⁴⁹ According to the logic of Bramhall’s criticism of Hobbes’s

¹⁴⁸ Here, it may be noticed, I reinforce the point first made in chapter 3, 76.

¹⁴⁹ Goldsmith, ‘Hobbes’s Ambiguous Politics’, 672, has pointed to this possibility: ‘There are notable similarities between the face of Hobbes and that of *Leviathan* in both the manuscript

usurpation of authority, we might say that in writing *Leviathan* – the book to teach all sovereigns and subjects – Hobbes had crowned himself Leviathan of Leviathans, the ‘philosopher-king’ and ‘mortal God’. One may view Bramhall’s portrait of Hobbes as the arrogant Leviathan of *Leviathan* as an attempt to dissuade Charles II (and royalist grandees) from countenancing its teaching or favouring its subversive author. As early as the ‘Vindication’, written in 1646, we saw that Bramhall was pointing out Hobbes’s insubordination and disloyalty to the Stuarts. He had not conformed to the religious policy of Charles I and Archbishop Laud. In a metaphorical sense he had cashiered king and bishops just as the Long Parliament had done – in a sense he had also endorsed judgments of its ecclesiastical organ, the Westminster Assembly. He had usurped the authority to declare good and evil. Ultimately, Hobbes had been guilty of defying the sovereign himself, Charles I. Hobbes’s books had not served to support the beleaguered king. In fact, as Bramhall suggests, they lent at least intellectual and moral support to various critics, enemies and rebels against his government. All considered, Bramhall’s writings against Hobbes served as a message to Charles II and all his royalist followers: Hobbes was a rebellious subject whose philosophy had hurt and would continue to hurt the Stuart cause. To Bramhall it did not matter how strenuously the philosopher might protest. All the writings of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury amounted to one short pamphlet, the ‘Rebels’ Catechism’.

and the engraved version: the high forehead, the pudgy nose, the hair to the shoulders, the small beard and moustache (although Hobbes’s moustache turns up while Leviathan’s is larger). It would have been an audacious stroke on Hobbes’s part to have put his own portrait on the figure of Leviathan. Could we suppose that Hobbes was underlining his point that sovereigns needed to understand his science of politics and that it should be publicly taught? Before him, Margery Corbett and Ronald Lightbrown also suggested that the face of Leviathan was Hobbes’s. *The Comely Frontispiece*, 229–30. For information on portraits of Hobbes, see Malcolm’s article in the *ODNB*.

The Restoration and death of Bramhall and Hobbes's last word, 1668

Bramhall spent the last few years of exile in the Low Countries. That he was in Bruges at least briefly in 1658 is indicated in a letter of Joseph Jane to Edward Nicholas: 'We have a small congregation here, but expect its increase by the return of some from Brussels . . . The Bishop of Derry is now with us, but will not stay long.'¹ In the summer of 1659 Bramhall was in Brussels.² In 1659, Bramhall seems to have been exhibiting serious physical frailty. In a letter to John Barwick, dated 14 September 1659, Hyde noted: 'The Bishop of Derry . . . is infirm and cannot live long.'³ Charles's exile court had recently moved to Brussels. Bramhall must have been in frequent contact with the king, or at least with some of his closest advisors, particularly Ormonde. As for Bramhall's polemical pen, it was still busy, but no longer scribbling against Hobbes.⁴ After writing the lengthy *Castigations* and *Catching of Leviathan*, he seems to have paid no more attention to the philosopher. As the Restoration began to unfold, the bishop had much other difficult business with which to occupy himself. Naturally he was highly concerned about restoring the church in a Laudian way.⁵ He returned to England in the summer of 1660. A letter written in July shows that he was in London, and

¹ Quoted in Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 60. At around May 1658, Jane, Edward Nicholas's son-in-law, conversed with Bramhall in Bruges. *CSPD, 1658–1659*, 21.

² 8 July 1659, according to Barwick, *Life of John Barwick*, 424.

³ Barwick, *Life of John Barwick*, 439. W. E. Collins, 'John Bramhall', 113, n.113, speculated that it was a paralytic stroke; another of which occurred in January 1663 (Vesey, AH); a third, in the summer of 1663, finished him off. For his infirmity at the Restoration, see also Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, 1, lxxi.

⁴ In late 1659 or early 1660, for example, Bramhall composed a reply to a book by Richard Baxter. However, this book was not published until years later, in 1672, nine years after Bramhall's death. In 1658 Baxter had published *Treatise of the Grotian Religion against Thomas Pierce*, in which he accused Bramhall (and others) of a scheme to bring in popery. Bramhall's writing was later published (and prefaced) by Samuel Parker as 'Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of himself, and the Episcopal Clergy, from the Presbyterian charge of Popery, as it is managed by Mr Baxter, in his treatise of the Grotian Religion' (London, 1672). For the context of Bramhall's writings against Baxter and the presbyterians in general see Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 11.

⁵ See Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, *passim*.

John Evelyn recorded his 'saluting his old friend, the Archbishop of Armagh, formerly of Londonderry', in the capital on 28 July 1660.⁶ By this time it was apparently known that Bramhall would be elevated to the primacy of Ireland, the archbishopric of Armagh.⁷ Surely no other churchman had the resumé to vie with Bramhall for this high office. In May 1661, Bramhall received another honour when he was elected speaker of the Irish house of lords. He was still exceedingly vigilant against determinism, howsoever it might rear its head. As speaker of the lords, Bramhall rebuked his counterpart in the commons, Sir Audley Mervyn, after the latter had delivered a speech in which he suggested 'a predetermination of events which could be understood by reading God's will in the natural world or astrologically through the stars'.⁸ As Bramhall listened to Mervyn he might well have been reminded of Hobbes. Of course, as Mervyn was a man against whom Bramhall fought nasty legal battles over properties in Ulster, it was certainly not determinism alone that aroused the arminian bishop. One should also recall the fact that in the spring of 1641 Mervyn had been the leader of the Irish commons' move to impeach the 'Irish Canterbury', the Irish version of Laud.⁹

Ireland at the Restoration was a thoroughly complicated puzzle. Not only was there the long-established fundamental Roman-catholic-protestant divide, but there were now also three distinct protestant interest groups: Ulster presbyterians, independents (both Cromwellian soldiers – 'adventurers' – and missionaries), and the not inconsiderable remnant of episcopalian anglicans.¹⁰ As Charles II's primate of Ireland, Bramhall endeavoured to reinvigorate the church that he and Strafford had strengthened so much in the 1630s. The vexing fact was that it was largely a matter of going all the way back to the drawing board, to re-do what had been undone in the previous decades.¹¹ Bramhall single-handedly ushered in most of the Irish Restoration episcopate in a grand ceremony in which he consecrated two new archbishops and ten new bishops.¹² The restoration of the church

⁶ Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, I, 358.

⁷ Rumour had it, however, that he would be named archbishop of York. As he was a native with many relatives and friends in that county, and as one who had spent a distinguished early clerical career in the northern province, Bramhall was a logical candidate. It is possible that Bramhall requested Armagh instead of York in order to be in position to recover all his property and uncollected rents. He was nominated archbishop of Armagh in August 1660 and was translated 18 January 1661. *BW*, I, xii.

⁸ Raymond Gillespie, 'The Religion of the first Duke of Ormond', in *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610–1745*, eds. Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), 104.

⁹ See chapter 1, n.¹.

¹⁰ Ian M. Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660–1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 17.

¹¹ McCafferty, 'Bramhall and the Church of Ireland', 110.

¹² Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, I, lxxi. Taylor himself was one of these ten bishops. For some correspondence between Taylor and Bramhall, mostly about church affairs, see William P.

in Ireland was, literally, by his own hand. With his close friend from exile, the Marquess of Ormonde, soon to be lord lieutenant, Bramhall selected the entire episcopal bench.¹³ As infirm as he was by the time he returned from the continent, he laboured hard to restore property and revenue to his clerical brethren.¹⁴ Nor was he remiss in attending to his family's interests.¹⁵ In fact, he spent the last active moments of his life pursuing a case in the court of claims against his old personal adversary, Mervyn. In the middle of the property dispute during June 1663 the last of the archbishop's strokes occurred, and he was carried out of the court unconscious.¹⁶ He remained comatose until he died on 26 June 1663. After one of his earlier strokes, Bramhall had made his will. Dated 5 January 1663, this document shows that the archbishop was a wealthy man whose surviving family might live comfortably: he would leave £5,200 ready money, as well as estates in Meath, Tyrone and Dublin.¹⁷ (By contrast, at the time of his death in 1679 Hobbes's estate was to be worth about £1,000.¹⁸) Archbishop Bramhall's first-born son John having died in 1660, at age forty, Thomas Bramhall, a lawyer, was to receive a substantial inheritance.¹⁹ The archbishop's wife Eleanor and their three daughters, Isabella, Jane and Anne, were well provided for as well.

Bramhall's *Castigations* and *Catching of Leviathan* had been published in London in 1658. It is possible that Hobbes was no longer there when they appeared. By the end of the decade, on the eve of the Restoration, Hobbes

Williams, 'Eight Unpublished Letters by Jeremy Taylor', *Anglican Theological Review* 58, 2 (1976): 179–93. One of the two archbishops consecrated by Bramhall was his brother-in-law, Samuel Pullein, married to his sister Elizabeth. See chapter 1, 28–9.

¹³ McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', *ODNB*. For more information on the appointment of these bishops, see James McGuire, 'Policy and Patronage: The Appointment of Bishops, 1660–1661' in *As By Law Established: The Irish Church since the Reformation*, eds. Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 112–19.

¹⁴ Taylor, 'Funeral Sermon', *BW*, 1, lxxii–lxxiv. Although physically debilitated on return from exile, Bramhall's activity at the Restoration led one modern commentator to remark upon his 'untriring zeal'. Bickley, *HMC Hastings*, iv, xxx. For the condition of the church in Ireland at the Restoration and Bramhall's energetic reconstruction efforts, see also J. G. Simms, 'The Restoration, 1660–1685' in *A New History of Ireland*, vol. III: *Early Modern Ireland, 1534–1691*, eds. T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 433.

¹⁵ Bramhall's pleading with the king to bestow favour upon his son-in-law, Sir James Graham, son of the Earl of Menteith and married to Bramhall's oldest daughter, Isabella, can be read in Bramhall to Charles II, ca. spring 1661, *Rawdon Papers*, No. LXXIV.

¹⁶ Sir George Lane to Joseph Williamson, written from Dublin Castle, 27 June 1663, in *CSPI*, Chas. II, 154.

¹⁷ McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', *ODNB*. A transcript of the will is printed by Berwick in *Rawdon Papers*, 4–11. In the will Bramhall referred to Mervyn's occupation of his property. Bramhall named Ormonde and Roger Boyle, first earl of Orrery, as supervisors of his will.

¹⁸ Malcolm, 'Thomas Hobbes', *ODNB*.

¹⁹ Thomas Bramhall was created a baronet on 31 May 1662. See Charles II to Ormonde, 7 June 1662. *HMC Hastings*, iv, 133.

seems to have been spending more time with the Devonshire Cavendishes in Derbyshire.²⁰ At all events, Hobbes claimed that it was only ten years after its publication, in 1668, that he learned of Bramhall's book. Aubrey reports that having spent the winter of 1659–60 in Derbyshire, Hobbes came to London in May 1660, where a few days after Charles's arrival, he and the king exchanged pleasantries along the Strand.²¹ And just a week later, while the king sat to be painted by Samuel Cooper, he and Hobbes conversed merrily: 'Here his Majesty's favours were redintegrated to him, and order was given that he should have free access to his majesty, who was always much delighted in his wit and smart repartees.'²² Aubrey also relates that at the Restoration the king purchased Cooper's portrait of Hobbes, which he kept in his closet at Whitehall.²³ Thus, we can only suppose that if the king thought that Hobbes had written *Leviathan* to support the Rump or Cromwell, he did not bear a durable grudge. Trusting Hobbes's memory, admittedly never the wisest thing, some years before 1660 he was receiving a pension of £80:

Twice forty pounds, a yearly pension, then
I from my own country receiv'd; and when
King Charles restored was, a hundred more
Was allow'd me out of his private store.²⁴

As we noted in chapter 6, Hobbes was probably given a pension of about £80 for tutoring the prince in Paris in the years 1646–8. (Bramhall, as we saw, might well have been involved in terminating it.) Hobbes's reception of a pension from the king shortly after the Restoration is mentioned in the former's letter to Aubrey of 7/17 September 1663, when Hobbes began to fear 'that my pension may cease as well as other men's'.²⁵ From Sorbière's *Relation d'Un Voyage en Angleterre*, published in 1664, Malcolm reports that in the summer of that year Hobbes was receiving a pension of more than £100.²⁶ A somewhat hostile source, Clarendon, confirmed that Hobbes was always warmly received at the court of Charles: 'After the King's return he came frequently to the Court, where he had too many disciples.'²⁷ Clarendon

²⁰ In Charles du Bosc's letter to Hobbes, 5/15 September 1659, he says that he heard from Andrew Crook that Hobbes has spent most of the last year in Derbyshire. *Corr.*, I, 504.

²¹ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 340. Having landed at Dover a few days before, the king entered London 29 May/8 June 1660.

²² Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 340.

²³ Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 338. This is confirmed by Sorbière, *Relation d'Un Voyage en Angleterre* (1664), 97, who saw the portrait himself in the king's study.

²⁴ Verse Life in *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 263–4. ²⁵ *Corr.*, II, 555.

²⁶ *Corr.*, 'Biographical Register', II, 819.

²⁷ *Brief View*, 9. In the same place Clarendon notes that Hobbes did visit him once: 'I receiv'd him very kindly, and invited him to see me often, but he heard from so many hands that I had no good opinion of his book, that he came to me only that one time.'

would probably have counted Henry Bennet, later first earl of Arlington, among such 'disciples'. In any case, for his good reception at court, and protection against some of his personal enemies, Hobbes had reason to thank Arlington. A powerful rival of Clarendon (and one 'a' of the later CABAL against him), and secretary of state from 1662 to 1674, Arlington had probably become acquainted with Hobbes when they were both in Paris together as exiles.²⁸ Hobbes's gratitude to Arlington for his protection and patronage took more than one form. Apart from referring in a letter to the noble's 'mediation', Hobbes dedicated *De principiis et ratiocinatione geometrarum* to him.²⁹ This book, published in 1666, bore a dedicatory epistle to Arlington, in which Hobbes recorded his debt: 'I owe the greatest comfort of my old age to your influence.'³⁰

But if Hobbes had a friend in the king, and benefactors in the form of some of his courtiers and ministers, he also had a host of enemies, some at the court, and many outside it.³¹ Indeed, what prompted Hobbes to make a reply to the *Catching of Leviathan* seems to have been his wish to avoid the persecution that might be initiated by such enemies. In the mid-1660s some members of the English parliament began to press for legislation to prosecute atheists, blasphemers and heretics, in any of which groups Hobbes might have been placed. In the mid- and late 1660s Hobbes took various precautions, including the burning of some of his private papers.³² He also wrote several essays on the history and nature of heresy, laws against heresy, and punishment of heresy.³³ The thrust of all these essays was that there was no law in England whereby heretics could be imprisoned and executed. Out of the same concern Hobbes took care to defend himself directly against

²⁸ *Corr.*, II, 693, n.2. Bennet arrived at the exiled court in St Germain in September 1647. Alan Marshall, *ODNB*.

²⁹ Hobbes to Joseph Williamson, 9/19 June 1667, *Corr.*, II, 692. Williamson was under-secretary to Arlington.

³⁰ Quoted and translated from the Latin by Malcolm, *Corr.*, II, 693, n.2. Malcolm suggests that for Hobbes to continue receiving his royal pension, Arlington's personal intervention might have been necessary. For Hobbes–Arlington, see Milton, 'Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington'. Hobbes also dedicated *Behemoth* to Arlington.

³¹ In the later prose autobiography Hobbes noted that his ideas were popular with noblemen and 'learned men amongst the laity' but 'condemned by almost all academics and ecclesiastics'. Prose Life, *Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 249–50.

³² 'There was a report (and surely true) that in parliament, not long after the king was settled, some of the bishops made a motion to have the good old gentleman burnt for a heretic. Which he hearing, feared that his papers might be searched by their order, and he told me he had burnt part of them.' Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 339; see also 394, n.14.

³³ As Philip Milton has noted, Hobbes wrote eight different works that discussed heresy and related matters. For some description and dating of these, see 'Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington', 542–6. The most important of these are 'An Historical Narration concerning Heresy'; an appendix (*De Haeresi*) to the Latin *Leviathan* (1668); and *A Dialogue between a Student in the Common Laws of England, and a Philosopher* (1682). The latter, like the others, was probably completed in the late 1660s.

accusations of heresy and atheism. Around 1668 Hobbes wrote that he only decided to answer Bramhall because the bishop had libelled him as a heretic and atheist. The answer was composed about two years after a bill was introduced into parliament to prosecute certain authors for atheism.³⁴ Thus, it is not hard to understand why Hobbes attached an historical account of heresy to his reply to the bishop's *Catching of Leviathan*.³⁵ The fact that there was any such parliamentary movement against Hobbes would suggest that Bramhall's crusade against Hobbes was bearing some fruit after all: Hobbes, like Socrates, was viewed, or could be portrayed, as the author of a philosophy that would corrupt and destroy society – if it had not already begun to do so. Bramhall's books against the philosopher made a good case for administering some poison.

As noted in passing already, it was, according to Hobbes, only ten years after its publication that he learned of the existence of Bramhall's *Castigations* and *Catching of Leviathan*. Whether or not we accept this claim, it is true that no reply was published during Bramhall's or Hobbes's lifetime.³⁶ In 1668 Hobbes seems to have composed something that was intended for public perusal.³⁷ In the preface to the reader of 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall and An Historical Narration concerning Heresy and the Punishment thereof', he wrote:

The late Lord Bishop of Derry³⁸ published a book called *The Catching of the Leviathan*, in which he hath put together divers sentences picked out of my *Leviathan*, which stand there plainly and firmly proved, and sets them down without their proofs, and without the order of their dependence one upon another; and calls them atheism, blasphemy, impiety, subversion of religion, and by other names of that kind . . . Because he does not so much as offer any refutation of any thing in my *Leviathan*

³⁴ In the weeks following the Great Fire (12–16 September), in October 1666, there was a motion in the house of commons to inspect Thomas White's *Middle State of Souls* and Hobbes's *Lev.*, for being books whose perniciousness was partially to blame for the disaster; but Arlington thwarted the order. *CJ*, VIII, 636; *CSPD*, 1666–7, 209; *The Diary of John Milward*, ed. Caroline Robbins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 25; Anthony Wood, *Life and Times*, II, 91. For detailed discussion of this parliamentary incident, see Milton, 'Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington', 515–16.

³⁵ In this 'Historical Narration concerning Heresy', Hobbes himself refers to parliamentary proceedings aimed at him. He relates that after Charles II restored the bishops and pardoned the presbyterians, 'both the one and the other accused in Parliament this book [*Lev.*] of heresy'. *EW*, IV, 407.

³⁶ Rogow, *Thomas Hobbes*, 182–6, conjectures that Hobbes knew of Bramhall's book long before 1668 (the year in which he first heard of it, according to himself), and that he only bothered to write a response (and only to the theological part) as a preventive measure against persecution as an atheist. But if Hobbes was spending much of his time in Derbyshire rather than London in the late 1650s, it would not be very hard to credit his claim of ignorance.

³⁷ That Hobbes did wish to publish this writing we can conclude from a letter he wrote to Joseph Williamson, dated London, 30 June/10 July 1668, *Corr.*, II, 699.

³⁸ Could Hobbes have been ignorant of Bramhall's elevation to archbishop of Armagh? If not, we could interpret this as a slight.

concluded, I needed not to have answered either of them. Yet to the first I here answer, because the words *atheism*, *impiety*, and the like, are words of the greatest defamation possible. And this I had done sooner, if I had sooner known that such a book was extant. He wrote it ten years since, and yet I never heard of it till about three months since; so little talk there was of his Lordship's writings.³⁹

Following this note to the reader, Hobbes concerns himself mainly with the vindication of his theological doctrines.⁴⁰ He endeavours to demonstrate that notwithstanding Bramhall's claims to the contrary they are neither impious nor atheistical. But Hobbes shows himself once again very eager to scold Bramhall for the latter's views concerning episcopacy and religious and political authority. He is still intent upon demonstrating to (or reminding) rulers and would-be rulers, such as Charles II, that it is the bishop's principles, not his own, that merit a title like 'rebels' catechism'. In answer to a passage from the *Catching of Leviathan* Hobbes insists upon the necessity of one supreme head and governor in points of Christian faith. Did not the controversies over arminianism and popish ceremonies, and all the violence of the wars which followed, demonstrate this?⁴¹ So who should be the final judge in such matters?

Shall Dr Bramhall be this judge? As profitable an office as it is, he was more modest than to say that. Shall a private layman have it? No man ever thought that. Shall it be given to a Presbyterian minister? No; it is unreasonable. Shall a synod of Presbyterians have it? No; for most of the Presbyters in the primitive church were undoubtedly subordinate to bishops, and the rest were bishops. Who then? A synod of bishops? Very well. His Lordship being too modest to undertake the whole power, would have been contented with the six-and-twentieth part. But, suppose it in a synod of bishops, who shall call them together? The king. What if he will not? Who should excommunicate him, or if he despise your excommunication, who shall send forth a writ of *significavit*? No; all this was far from his Lordship's thoughts. The power of the clergy, unless it be upheld legally by the king, or illegally by the multitude, amounts to nothing . . . I conclude therefore, that his Lordship could not possibly believe that the supreme judicature in matter of religion could anywhere be so well placed as in the head of the church, which is the king. And so his Lordship and I think the same thing; but because his Lordship knew not how to deduce it, he was angry with me because I did it.⁴²

³⁹ 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall', *EW*, iv, 281–2. And later Hobbes repeats that had Bramhall charged him merely with error, not atheism, he would not have written any answer whatever. *EW*, iv, 336. This 'Answer' had to wait till 1682 to be published. But the appendix, the 'Historical Narration concerning Heresy', appeared in print slightly earlier, in 1680. See Malcolm, *Corr.*, II, 699, n.1.

⁴⁰ He recites fifty-two different passages from the *Catching of Leviathan* and writes a reply to each. In Molesworth's edition, *EW*, iv, these passages and replies take up 102 pages, 283–384.

⁴¹ 'I think no man can deny it, that has seen the rebellion that followed the controversy here between Gomar and Arminius.' 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 329.

⁴² 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 329–30.

As we saw in our review of the *Catching of Leviathan*, Bramhall objected to Hobbes's collapse of the separation of church and commonwealth. In his answer, Hobbes takes the opportunity to reinforce his argument that there is no universal church on earth. There is, he insists, no person on earth possessed of a universal authority to govern all Christians; there is no 'universal sovereign prince or state on earth, that hath right to govern all mankind'.⁴³ Without such a sovereign to maintain unity, Christians are scattered among different confessions and live under conflicting authorities. The clergy in any Christian kingdom or commonwealth participate in a universal (supranational) church only as far as their civil sovereign permits.⁴⁴ Thus, they cannot meet together without the command or permission of this sovereign.⁴⁵ Thus, Hobbes not only fully recognises but embraces the 'horrid' consequence that Bramhall had drawn. The authority of general councils is of no effect in a commonwealth without the consent of the civil sovereign: 'Nor hath any general council at this day in this kingdom the force of a law, nor ever had, but by the authority of the king.'⁴⁶ The bishop's doctrine concerning the authority of such councils, on the other hand, undermines and diminishes that of the civil sovereign: 'the denial of this point tendeth in England towards the taking away of the king's supremacy in causes ecclesiastical'.⁴⁷

Hobbes then stresses the point that he had enunciated most clearly in *Leviathan*, that the civil sovereign, though laic, is yet supreme pastor (or priest). Bramhall had argued that by making the civil sovereign supreme cleric – the ultimate authority in all spiritual matters – Hobbes had contradicted his teaching from *De Cive*, that clergy had a certain authority that was not to be found in or derived from civil sovereigns. Episcopal spiritual authority was supposed to proceed uniquely from the apostles in an unbroken succession of many centuries' duration. The infallibility that the bishops possessed was a consequence of this special authority, and obliged the civil sovereign to consult them on religious questions. As he had in the *Questions*, Hobbes objects to this reading of the passage from *De Cive*: 'I never meant to flatter them so much.'⁴⁸ According to Hobbes, he wished to affirm that the ceremony of consecration and imposition of hands belonged to them; but this belonged to them only insofar as the civil sovereign and the laws of the commonwealth permitted.⁴⁹ Hobbes explains that a bishop

⁴³ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 337. ⁴⁴ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 337.

⁴⁵ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 337. ⁴⁶ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 338.

⁴⁷ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 337–8.

⁴⁸ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 344. Hobbes explains what he had meant by their 'infallibility': 'I deny that any pastor or any assembly of pastors in any particular church, or all the churches on earth though united, are infallible: yet I say, that pastors of a Christian church assembled are, in all such points as are necessary to salvation.' *EW*, iv, 345. This seems to be one of those cases in which an assertion is so heavily qualified as to become nothing.

⁴⁹ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 344–5.

may consecrate, 'but the king both makes him bishop and gives him authority'.⁵⁰ As the head of the church, the civil sovereign delegates the power of consecration, dedication and benediction. Furthermore, the king himself may exercise such sacerdotal powers. If the king should wish, he can perform all such spiritual functions: 'Solomon did it; and the book of canons says, that the King of England has all the right that any good king of Israel had; it might have added, that any other king or sovereign assembly had in their own dominions.'⁵¹ Responding directly to the bishop's complaint that only the civil sovereign's (not the ecclesiastic's) authority is *jure divino*, Hobbes once again asserts that the authority of the clergy is merely *jure civili*, wholly derived from the supreme pastor, the civil sovereign. Hobbes professes not to understand how Bramhall could deny this: 'How came any Bishop to have authority over me, but by letters patent from the king?'⁵² Without the king's delegation, neither Bramhall nor any other bishop would wield authority over a subject like Hobbes. As two sovereigns cannot exist in one state, so, Hobbes argues, 'two *jus divinum*s cannot stand together in one kingdom'.⁵³ He reproves the bishop for suggesting otherwise. He also emphatically denies the bishops and clergy any special status or gifts that would make them independent of the civil sovereign. He is concerned that bishops like Bramhall would pretend that the king was merely one lamb among their flock. Insofar as bishops and archbishops supervise all the lower clergy, they may be called, Hobbes concedes, 'pastors of pastors'. But, Hobbes stresses, they themselves are among the flock whose only shepherd is the civil sovereign: 'they are the sheep of him that is on earth their sovereign pastor, and he again a sheep of that supreme pastor which is in heaven'.⁵⁴ Characteristically, Hobbes cannot leave this subject without chiding the episcopate and slyly accusing Bramhall of dereliction, ambition and precipitating the rebellions and wars: 'And if they did their pastoral office, both by life and doctrine, as they *ought* to do, there could never arise any dangerous rebellion in the land. But the people see once any ambition in their teachers, they will sooner learn that, than any other doctrine; and from ambition proceeds rebellion.'⁵⁵ But lest Hobbes be thought a common puritan or presbyterian enemy of episcopacy, he asserts: 'For my own part, all that know me, know also it is my opinion, that the best government in religion is by episcopacy, but in the King's right, not in their own.'⁵⁶ Episcopacy, yes; *jure divino*, no.

⁵⁰ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 345.

⁵¹ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 345.

⁵² 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 345.

⁵³ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 346.

⁵⁴ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 346. Also see *Behemoth*, 14, where Hobbes writes of the king as bishop of all bishops. *Behemoth* was composed at around the same time as this answer to *Castigations*. Some more passages of *Behemoth* will be treated below.

⁵⁵ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 346.

⁵⁶ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 364.

We have seen that Hobbes constantly objected that Bramhall's view of religious authority, particularly his opinion of episcopacy *jure divino*, served to encroach upon the authority of the supreme head and governor, the civil sovereign, and in so doing, destabilise the commonwealth. Throughout his answer to the *Catching of Leviathan*, Hobbes reiterates this. Thus, at one point, Hobbes remarks: 'All that the Bishop does in this argument is but a heaving at the King's supremacy.'⁵⁷ Stuart monarchs, beware. In several places, Hobbes suggests that the bishop is only an ambitious and worldly man striving for self-aggrandisement – at the expense of the king. Hobbes implies that Bramhall's life had been one dedicated to the service of Mammon, that is, dominated by a desire for and pursuit of wealth and titles.⁵⁸ He points out that Bramhall's position serves the self-interest of himself, not that of the king: 'His Lordship's ignorance smells rankly . . . of his own interest.'⁵⁹ Elsewhere, in the same vein, Hobbes suggests that Bramhall's criticism implies that the bishop maintains doctrine 'that smells of ambition and encroachment of jurisdiction, or rump of the Roman tyranny'.⁶⁰ In this way Hobbes portrays Bramhall as a treasonous papist in everything but name. The bishop's divine-right episcopalianism – like his maintenance of free-will – makes him at least an ally of the Roman Catholics. Once again I would observe that in employing such rhetoric, Hobbes, inadvertently or not, associated himself with the likes of Prynne and Pym, who had used such argument against Laud and Arminians like Bramhall in the late 1620s, 1630s and 1640s. Inveighing against episcopacy *jure divino* in his 'Answer to Bishop Bramhall' Hobbes was once again echoing Prynne who, as an MP in the summer of 1660, is reported to have remarked in committee debate: 'I could not be for bishops, unless they would derive their power from the King, and not vaunt themselves to be *jure divino*.'⁶¹

Notably, Hobbes shows himself sensitive to Bramhall's complaint that he had usurped authority; but he strenuously denies having done so. For, as Hobbes insists, when he wrote *Leviathan* in Paris he was not forbidden

⁵⁷ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 340. ⁵⁸ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 378.

⁵⁹ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 379. ⁶⁰ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 380.

⁶¹ Quoted in Boshier, *Restoration Settlement*, 169. Here let me qualify that the early Prynne, the Prynne of *Histriomastix*, was certainly a little too rabidly puritan, to suggest any affinity with Hobbes. But Prynne's strong anti-episcopacy *jure divino* position of the late 1630s and 1640s is hard to distinguish from Hobbes's. Like the latter (see Hobbes to Devonshire, 23 July/2 August 1641, *Corr.*, i, 120, as quoted in chapter 3, 78), Prynne was, at least at first, willing to tolerate the kind of moderate episcopalian position that had been associated with Joseph Hall and John Williams. But after 1641, as William Lamont has noted, Prynne went further. After Joseph Hall's vindication of divine-right episcopacy in 1641, Prynne proceeded to attack *all* bishops, not simply the Laudian (*jure divino*) ones, and ended up in an extreme, 'root-and-branch' position. Like Hobbes, as fierce an anti-presbyterian as anti-papist, Prynne, by the mid-1640s, came to see the enemy 'no longer as Laudian crypto-popery but Presbyterian theocracy'. Lamont, 'William Prynne', *ODNB*.

by any authority to offer his own peculiar theology and interpretations of Scripture. At the time, he asserts, there was no lawful church in England with authority over him: 'There was no bishop; and though there was preaching, such as it was, yet no common prayer . . . There was then no church in England, that any man living was bound to obey.'⁶² There were, at the time of *Leviathan*, no laws in force whereby he or anyone else was prohibited to preach or write any religious doctrine he pleased.⁶³ In an earlier book of the 1660s, Hobbes had written in the same vein. As noted earlier, shortly after the Restoration Hobbes dedicated the small treatise *Problemata Physica* to Charles II.⁶⁴ In the dedicatory epistle he offered a 'short apology' for *Leviathan*. There he says that his divinity was 'propounded with submission to those that have the power ecclesiastical' and that he 'did never after, either in writing or discourse maintain it [the divinity]'.⁶⁵ But who exactly were those with the 'power ecclesiastical' at the time? In England, that was entirely uncertain, as Hobbes himself recognised, and stated explicitly. But clearly Bramhall was not possessed of that power. So Hobbes did not consider himself bound to obey Bramhall or any other antebellum bishop so long as he was not in England under a civil sovereign from whom such a bishop could derive authority. That was the case of a bishop like Bramhall in exile. But what about when he wrote *De Cive*? It is telling that Hobbes does *not* deal with this question of his usurpation of authority in the case of *De Cive*. He does not answer Bramhall's charge that with that book in 1642 Hobbes had tacitly assumed authority to pronounce upon religious doctrine and political questions, and had not conformed to his sovereign and the latter's ecclesiastics in those pronouncements. Could Hobbes have vindicated himself against *this* charge? In his own defence, Hobbes stresses that though interpretation of Scripture is decided by the civil sovereign, where that sovereign has not established one interpretation as authoritative, a subject is permitted to follow his own, 'as well as any other man, bishop or not bishop'.⁶⁶

⁶² 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 355; see also 366. For another of Hobbes's descriptions of the religious chaos that he found upon returning to England at the end of 1651, see *Prose Life, Elements of Law*, ed. Gaskin, 249.

⁶³ Appendix to 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall', 'Historical Narration concerning Heresy', *EW*, iv, 407.

⁶⁴ *Problemata Physica*, *OL*, iv, 297–384; published in 1682 as 'Seven Philosophical Problems and Two Propositions of Geometry by Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, with an Apology for Himself and His Writings, dedicated to the King in the year 1662', *EW*, vii, 1–68.

⁶⁵ 'Seven Philosophical Problems', *EW*, vii, 5; 'dogma ibi quod theologorum sententiae communi contrarium sit, nullum directe affirmo: sed, ut diffusus, illorum decretis disertis verbis submitto, quorum est in Ecclesia regenda summa autoritas'. *Problemata Physica*, *OL*, iv, 301.

⁶⁶ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 364. And cf.: 'Whatsoever the church of England (the church, I say, not every doctor) shall forbid me to say in matter of faith, I shall abstain from saying it, excepting this point, *that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, died for my sins*. As for other doctrines, I think

Thus, Hobbes might have argued that whatever interpretations he offered in *De Cive* did not directly contradict interpretations *expressly* authorised by the civil sovereign, Charles I – or any of the latter's ecclesiastical officers. But Bramhall clearly thought, and said, as early as the 'Vindication' (1646), that Hobbes had indeed deviated from the interpretations that Charles I had expressly authorised. When *De Cive* appeared Charles was not yet defeated, so was not Hobbes obliged to conform to the arminian Christianity (and doctrine of episcopacy *jure divino*) that the king, Laud and Bramhall espoused, and maintained as the state religion?⁶⁷

Although Hobbes noted that in answering the *Catching of Leviathan* he would only bother to vindicate himself against charges of blasphemy and atheism, he ends up defending himself against some of the constitutionalist political objections of Bramhall. Whereas the bishop had protested that Hobbes had made the king's mere personal commands to be laws, Hobbes cannot conceive anything at all objectionable in such teaching. He argues that Bramhall's line of constitutionalist criticism is precisely what had caused Charles I so much trouble: 'Because the King has granted in divers cases not to make a law without the advice and assent of the lords and commons, therefore when there is no parliament in being, shall the Great Seal of England stand for nothing? What was more unjustly maintained during the Long Parliament, besides the resisting and murdering of the King, than this doctrine of his Lordship's [Bramhall's]?'⁶⁸ In reviewing the absolutist teaching of Hobbes, Bramhall had exclaimed, 'Where are we, in Europe or in Asia? Gross, palpable, pernicious flattery, poisoning of the commonwealth, poisoning the King's mind.' Hobbes retorts: 'But where was his Lordship when he wrote this? One would not think he was in France, nor that this doctrine was written in the year 1658, but rather in the year 1648, in some cabal of the King's enemies.'⁶⁹ The 'Answer to Bishop Bramhall' was not the only Restoration writing in which Hobbes suggested that constitutionalist royalists like Bramhall had hurt or even crippled the king's cause. Within the same few years that Hobbes was writing his reply to the *Catching of Leviathan*, he also wrote a history of the civil wars, *Behemoth*.⁷⁰ In this book, Hobbes

it unlawful, if the church define them, for any member of the church to contradict them.' *EW*, iv, 367.

⁶⁷ Below, I offer some suggestion of how Hobbes might have been able to answer in the negative.

⁶⁸ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 370–1. ⁶⁹ 'An Answer', *EW*, iv, 371.

⁷⁰ In a letter of June 1679 Hobbes related that Charles refused him permission to publish *Behemoth* (what Hobbes calls in the letter a 'Dialogue of the Civil Wars of England'): see *EW*, iv, 411–12. Aubrey later informed Locke that Charles II 'read and likes [*Behemoth*] extremely, but tells him there is so much truth in it he dares not license for fear of displeasing the Bishops'. Maurice Cranston, 'John Locke and John Aubrey', *Notes and Queries* 197 (1952): 383–4. Royce MacGillivray noted that in the St John's manuscript of *Behemoth* edited by Toennies, there is a deleted passage in which Hobbes criticised Caroline bishops

reproached constitutionalist and moderate counsellors and supporters of the king. These men, to whom Charles turned at the end of 1641, became the king's chief propagandists during the First English Civil War.⁷¹ Although Hobbes never names these men, there is no doubt that he had Culpepper, Falkland and Hyde in mind. But Hobbes could also have included Bramhall, author of the constitutional-royalist *Serpent-Salve*. Ultimately Hobbes levels the grave charge that these counsellors advised Charles into defeat and death. The royal cause was not destined to defeat; it was simply mishandled by counsellors who were unintelligent. They were like so many Neville Chamberlains who put their faith in negotiations, concessions, papers and the good will of the aggressor. Ultimately, Hobbes indirectly criticises the king himself, for the latter was the one who had accepted the advice of these counsellors. It was the king, after all, who decided to follow the advice.⁷² We may speculate that Hobbes particularly resented the fact that Charles had refused to be governed by the 'hardline' counsels of, say, Newcastle. In *Behemoth* Hobbes was suggesting that if only violent measures had been taken early on; if only the king had been wholly governed by the likes of hawks like Newcastle; he might have prevented full-scale civil war.

As Hobbes tells the story, moderation and constitutionalism prevailed; and thus crippled, the king and cavaliers lost.⁷³ A misconceived policy of appeasement was adopted, and counsellors like Culpepper, Falkland and Hyde maintained the foolish and self-destructive notion that the government of England was mixed monarchy.⁷⁴ 'B', one of the two speakers in the *Behemoth* dialogue, wonders: 'But what fault do you find in the King's counsellors, lords, and other persons of quality and experience?' 'A' answers:

for their 'arrogance and rigidity'. *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974), 75. In a passage he did not delete, Hobbes gently criticised some of Laud's conduct, including the bringing of 'squabblings about free-will' into state affairs. *Behemoth*, 73.

⁷¹ Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 325. Culpepper, Falkland and Hyde became the king's chief apologists and propagandists, and many of Charles's declarations from the end of 1641 onward were penned by Hyde. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 88.

⁷² Hobbes does not indicate any awareness of the possibility that Charles adopted constitutionalist or moderate policy in 1641–2 only to buy the time and opportunity to obtain greater military strength, wherewith he could then take 'absolutist' or 'hardline' measures. If that is what the king was indeed doing – if Charles was an insincere constitutionalist – then surely Hobbes could not have disapproved.

⁷³ Hobbes was certainly not alone in this view, as, in 1652, Sir Edward Walker, for instance, had been writing from The Hague that legalistic notions like those of Hyde, or 'the fond opinion that no law must be broken', had helped to ruin Charles's cause. *Historical Discourses* (London, 1705), 240–1.

⁷⁴ One can see 'appeasement' in the bridge appointments, that is, the attempt to mollify opposition leaders by appointing them to the privy council or other offices. On 19 February 1641, the Earls of Bedford, Essex, Hertford and Bristol, Viscount Saye and Sele, and Lords Saville and Mandeville (and shortly, Earl of Warwick) were all appointed privy counsellors.

Only that fault, which was generally in the whole nation, which was, that they thought the government of England was not an absolute, but a mixed monarchy; and that if the King should clearly subdue this Parliament, that his power would be what he pleased, and theirs as little as he pleased: which they counted tyranny. This opinion, though it did not lessen their endeavour to gain the victory for the King in a battle, when a battle could not be avoided, yet it weakened their endeavour to procure him an absolute victory in war. And for this cause, notwithstanding that they say that the Parliament was firmly resolved to take all kingly power whatsoever out of his hands, yet their counsel to the King was upon all occasion, to offer propositions to them of treaty and accommodation, and to make and publish declarations; which any man might easily have foreseen would be fruitless; and not only so, but also of great disadvantage to those actions by which the King was to recover his crown and preserve his life. For it took away the courage of the best and forwardest of his soldiers, that looked for great benefit by their service out of the estates of the rebels, in case they would subdue them; but none at all, if the business should be ended by treaty.

B: And they had reason: for a civil war never ends by treaty without the sacrifice of those who were on both sides the sharpest.⁷⁵

Like 'most men', Hobbes must have thought that constitutionalist and moderate royalists did the King 'more hurt than good'.⁷⁶ That Hobbes was a critic of Hyde and other constitutionalists and doves is not especially surprising when one considers the fact that he had been the client of a man whom Hyde considered a reckless hawk.⁷⁷ David Smith has noted that Hyde characterised

⁷⁵ *Behemoth*, 114–15. For more criticism along the same lines, and castigation of 'mixarchy lovers' like Hyde, see *Behemoth*, 116–17, 125, 131. In the two latter pages there is especially stinging *ad hominem* criticism of parliamentarian (constitutionalist) royalists like Hyde who changed sides in 1641. When Hobbes speaks of 'the sacrifice of those who were on both sides the sharpest' one can wonder whether, opposite the rebels, he had Newcastle the 'hardliner' and 'war party' royalist in mind. If Charles I had made a peace treaty in 1644, Newcastle would have been in serious danger. Did Newcastle flee after Marston Moor because he guessed (wrongly) that Charles would soon make a deal that would entail sacrificing him (and other hardliners) to the parliamentarians?

⁷⁶ *Behemoth*, 131. In *Considerations*, written just a few years earlier, and addressed to Wallis, Hobbes had reproached parliamentarians like Culpepper, Falkland and Hyde: 'How many were there in that [Long] Parliament at first that did indeed and voluntarily desert the King, in consenting to many of their unjust actions [e.g., attainder of Strafford]? Many of these afterwards, either upon better judgment, or because they pleased not the faction (for it was a hard matter for such as were not of Pym's cabal to please the Parliament), or for some other private ends deserted the Parliament, and did some of them more hurt to the King than if they had stayed where they were; for they had been so affrighted by such as you, with a panic fear of tyranny, that seeking to help them by way of composition and sharing, they abated the just and necessary indignation of his armies, by which only his right was to be recovered.' *EW*, iv, 417–18.

⁷⁷ Though they seem to have kept up mostly cordial relations as exiles, it is likely that Hyde and Newcastle were never on very friendly terms. As we saw in chapters 5 and 6, they advocated different policies for Charles II to pursue after the execution of his father. Their cordial relations in exile are shown in some surviving correspondence. See Hyde to Newcastle, 30 May 1653, and same to same, 30 November 1653, *CCSP*, ii, 209, 280. A little later, in 1655,

Newcastle as a zealous enemy of peace treaties.⁷⁸ Newcastle had been a counsellor and practitioner of forceful measures, and Hobbes, one might argue, the *theorist* of such measures: ‘By implication, his [Hobbes’s] attack on Constitutional Royalism in *Behemoth* offered a retrospective justification for Newcastle and Henrietta Maria’s hostility towards peace treaties.’⁷⁹ By extension, Hobbes’s attack on constitutional royalism in *Behemoth* was also an attack on the author of *Serpent-Salve*, Bishop Bramhall. He might have lumped the latter with those other confused mixed-monarchists by quoting directly from that book, where Bramhall had asserted that: ‘The end of Parliaments is to temper the violence of sovereign power . . . the cure of tyranny is the *mixture* of governments.’⁸⁰ Hobbes obviously understood that some of Bramhall’s animadversions in the *Catching of Leviathan* proceeded from a constitutional-royalist stance hard to distinguish from the one that had been taken by such men as Culpepper, Falkland and Hyde. And as the latter, so Bramhall had contributed to the defeat and destruction of the king. Hobbes impugned the concept of ‘constitutional royalist’ in roughly the same way he did that of ‘incorporeal substance’ – as a contradiction in terms.⁸¹ He would undoubtedly have criticised *Serpent-Salve* in the same way he had criticised the moderation of the *Answer to the XIX Propositions* penned by Culpepper and Falkland.⁸² And, incidentally, he would have criticised Charles during the early 1640s for not taking more forceful measures – for not being governed wholly by a counsellor like Newcastle, or less modestly, by a counsellor like himself.⁸³

In the short appendix to ‘Answer to Bishop Bramhall’, ‘An Historical Narration concerning Heresy’, Hobbes attempted yet one more time to vindicate himself against Bramhall and other clerical critics. He asserted that *Leviathan* was written only to defend the king’s ‘temporal and spiritual’ power, and not to discredit episcopacy or to attack the present bishops.⁸⁴ Hobbes also claimed that nothing he wrote was ‘against the public doctrine

however, there was at least a brief interruption of these cordial relations. See letters from Hyde to Lovinge, CCSP, III, 44, 51, 53.

⁷⁸ Smith points out that this attitude ‘helped to make Newcastle a close friend and ally of Henrietta Maria during the 1640s’. *Constitutional Royalism*, 252. See the several letters to Newcastle printed in *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. M. A. E. Green.

⁷⁹ Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, 253. ⁸⁰ *Serpent-Salve*, BW, III, 380.

⁸¹ See chapter 8, 235.

⁸² Smith styles the *Answer to the XIX Propositions* ‘a classic text in the history of Constitutional Royalism’. *Constitutional Royalism*, 90.

⁸³ For more discussion of Hobbes’s subtle criticism of Charles I in *Behemoth*, see Royce MacGillivray, ‘Thomas Hobbes’s History of the English Civil War’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31 (1970): 179–98, and *Restoration Historians*.

⁸⁴ ‘Historical Narration concerning Heresy’, EW, IV, 407. For a similar claim, see ‘Seven Philosophical Problems’, EW, VII, 5; *Problemata Physica*, OL, IV, 301.

of the church'.⁸⁵ Yet, he relates, both bishops and presbyterians in parliament have denounced *Leviathan* as heretical.⁸⁶ This Hobbes can only attribute to their selfish regard of their own interest:

So fierce are men, for the most part, in dispute, where either their learning or power is debated, that they never think of the laws, but as soon as they are offended, they cry out, *crucifige*; forgetting what St Paul (2 Tim. ii. 24, 25) saith, even in case of obstinate holding of an error: 'the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the truth': of which counsel, such fierceness as hath appeared in the disputation of divines, down from before the Council of Nice to this present time, is a violation.⁸⁷

Thus, to the last, Hobbes the layman harangued the clergy. Considering this and all the other sneering and scolding passages he had written against Bramhall in *Questions*, it is no surprise that the philosopher had to anticipate harassment at the Restoration.⁸⁸

We saw in the [previous chapter](#) how Bramhall was able to make a plausible if not persuasive case that, as the personification of Leviathan, Hobbes had been an arrogant and insolent subject of the Stuarts. But we have also seen, earlier in the present chapter, that Charles II does not seem to have borne him any grudge. How, then, can we reconcile these two facts? In the remainder of this chapter I shall offer some suggestions for composing the apparent discrepancy.

Bramhall thought that Hobbes owed a bishop like himself deference in religious questions because of his divinely ordained authority. As a successor of the apostles, he possessed authority *jure divino*. But Hobbes did not accept that there was any such authority that obliged him to submit to him. But Bramhall also thought and argued that, according to the philosopher's own teaching, Hobbes owed him deference as a minister appointed by the civil sovereign (*jure civili*), Charles I. Yet there is nothing conclusive to make us think that Hobbes considered Charles his civil sovereign from 1640 onwards.

⁸⁵ 'Historical Narration concerning Heresy', *EW*, iv, 407. Hobbes tried to substantiate this claim at length in another writing he was composing at around this time (mid-1660s): the three appendices to his Latin translation of *Lev.* (published at Amsterdam, 1668). For a translation and helpful commentary, see *Lev.*, ed. Curley, 498–548, or George Wright, 'Introduction and Translation of Latin Appendix of *Leviathan*', *Interpretation* 18 (1991): 323–413.

⁸⁶ For the presbyterian writings and actions taken against Hobbes and the printing and selling of *Leviathan* in the 1650s, see Collins, *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 207–41.

⁸⁷ 'Historical Narration concerning Heresy', *EW*, iv, 407–8.

⁸⁸ Further, as Franck Lessay has emphasised, in 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall' Hobbes even represented himself as the more faithful adherent to the doctrines of the church of England. Surely this kind of spite could not have been borne by most anglican clergy returning from exile or ejection. 'Hobbes's Protestantism' in *Leviathan after 350 Years*, eds. Tom Sorell and Luc Foisneau (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), 271.

Legitimists would have insisted that Charles was still Hobbes's sovereign, no matter how beleaguered that monarch was. But Hobbes, of course, was no legitimist. According to his teaching, the ultimate question was: Which had the power and which could provide security: king or parliament? That, however, was precisely what could not be determined while the battle was still raging. Accordingly, Hobbes could argue that there was no longer a civil sovereign established to which he owed obedience. In that case, Bramhall's authority had ceased and, thus, Hobbes had had no obligation whatever to defer to Bramhall in religious questions even as early as *De Cive*, printed in Paris in 1642. But this would have required of Hobbes the embarrassingly unroyalist admission that Charles was no longer his sovereign while he was writing *De Cive* in 1641. On the other hand, even if Hobbes had conceded to the legitimists that Charles was still the sovereign of the British Isles throughout the wars and until his execution in January 1649, he might have pointed out that as an *exile* (1640–51), he was no longer a subject of Charles and, thus, not obliged to defer to Bramhall, one of that sovereign's ecclesiastical officers (whose jurisdiction was in Ireland). Then again, Bramhall countered this particular attempt to justify Hobbes's conduct by pointing out that, in that case, the philosopher should have conformed to the religion of the civil sovereign of France, Louis XIII, then Louis XIV. The religious teaching of neither *De Cive* nor *Leviathan* conformed even remotely to Roman (or Gallican) catholicism. But even if Hobbes had claimed that he still considered Charles his sovereign during the 1640s, and that Bramhall, *qua* minister of Charles, was his superior, he might still have denied that he had been guilty of insubordination. For he could have argued that Bramhall was, in all the matters of their oral and epistolary debate (1645–6), acting without the express authority of the king – in which case Hobbes need not have deferred to him in all those controversial questions. Hobbes could have insisted on a distinction between *articles of public faith* (the law of the land, e.g., Thirty-Nine Articles, Act of Supremacy) as against *private theological opinions* (namely, Bramhall's 'arminian' or Laudian interpretations of the former). Hobbes might have claimed that he was only disagreeing with Bramhall in the latter.⁸⁹ Furthermore, Hobbes might have cited Charles I's sacrifice of Laud to parliament, the lack of effort to rescue that archbishop, and the king's appointment of enemies of Laud (or at least non-Laudians) in 1641.⁹⁰ In other words, Hobbes could have argued that in not conforming to the teaching of Laud (and Laudians like Bramhall) in *De Cive* and the 'Treatise' (1645)

⁸⁹ But, again, as I have already emphasised, Hobbes's assertion of the civil sovereign's sacerdotal competence appears impossible to reconcile with the thirty-seventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles. In light of that we would have to sustain Bramhall's objection.

⁹⁰ For the bishops appointed in 1641, see the list in Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, iv, 99, n. 3.

he was acting consistently with Charles I's will or public policy. For one could argue that Charles's policy was now shedding its 'arminian' and 'Laudian' skin.⁹¹ Insofar as Charles was no longer arminian or Laudian, Hobbes was not so anti-Caroline as Bramhall claimed in 'Vindication' and subsequent writings. One must also keep in mind that Hobbes had not *published* anything explicitly anti-arminian in the 1620s, 1630s, or early 1640s.⁹² Hobbes might therefore have excused himself by saying that though he disagreed with the bishop in 1645, it was merely in private (*viva voce* and by private correspondence).⁹³ Tellingly, it was only in the next decade that Hobbes argued vigorously (and derisively) against arminian doctrine in print. But that was precisely when Hobbes could have said that he was unobliged (by his own teaching) to maintain (or not contradict) arminian doctrine, since Charles I, that former sovereign patron of arminians, was dead, and therefore no longer his, or anyone else's, sovereign. It was not certain what kind of anglican his son was; and as a merely notional or pretender sovereign, it was not entirely clear whether that was of any relevance.

As Hobbes had written in the postscript to the 'Treatise' (1645), true religion was conforming to the religion espoused by the civil sovereign. Assuming that Hobbes considered Charles I his sovereign during the civil wars, the question for the philosopher, up to 1649, had been: what was the religion of Charles I? Assuming (unsafely) that Hobbes considered Charles II his sovereign from 1649 onwards, the question became: what was the religion of Charles II? Whereas an answer to the former was relatively easy – that religion was far more arminian than Hobbes would have cared to admit – that of the latter was (and still is) very difficult to determine.⁹⁴ Actually, and as I suggested earlier, Hobbes seems to have tried to influence that determination. If not surreptitiously while his tutor in Paris, at least through *Leviathan* Hobbes hoped to groom Charles to be no Laudian, clericalist Christian sovereign. And prior to that, one could argue, it was Hobbes's like-minded patron, Newcastle, who, as governor of the prince from 1638 to 1641, endeavoured to steer the religious sensibility of Charles in a

⁹¹ As John Morrill has observed: 'he [Charles I] pointedly and heartlessly abandoned Laud and his policies and promoted to the episcopate moderate men, or at any rate men who were Laud's enemies. And he publicly associated himself with the slogans and values of non-Laudian Anglicanism.' *Nature of the English Revolution*, 63; see also *ibid.*, 158–9. It would be even easier to excuse Hobbes's anti-arminian-*ergo*-anti-Caroline rebellious conduct if one were to accept Peter White's view that Charles I was *never* an arminian. See chapter 4, n. 111. According to White, even Laud has been mischaracterised as an arminian. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 276–312.

⁹² At least not in English or in England: as noted earlier, in *DC*, v.8, vi.11 and ix.9, Hobbes articulated his determinist position.

⁹³ Yet Hobbes, as he himself freely admitted, did circulate his letter ('Treatise') among some of his friends in Paris.

⁹⁴ This problem is discussed in the Conclusion, 287ff.

politique direction. At the very least it seems fairly obvious that Newcastle had been intent upon preserving the young prince from clericalism.⁹⁵ The important point is that the identity of Charles II's faith was – or seemed – uncertain when Hobbes was writing *Leviathan*. All appearance indicated that he was an anglican of some kind: he did his daily devotions and attended services performed by anglican divines abroad, and had resisted presbyterian concessions to the Scots – only taking the covenant in a desperate situation in the summer of 1650.⁹⁶ But not much could be concluded from that. In any case, one could have argued that the young king's religion was not yet settled or mature: it was still in the balance. He was served by such émigré clergy as Bramhall, whom his father had preferred to high office. But he inherited such clergy; he himself had not chosen and preferred all of them. Thus, Hobbes, in his own defence, might still have insisted that he could not possibly have contradicted what had not even been established: Charles II's religion (or churchmanship). Hobbes was to be denounced by Bramhall (and many others) for his unprincipled, unlegitimist and Machiavellian religious politics. But perhaps such chameleonism or trimmerism was the necessity of serving a throneless king who had to be amenable to any alliance in order to restore his family's rule. The would-be sovereign's religion and politics had to be somewhat nebulous in order to make compromises with a range of prospective allies, whether in England, Scotland, Ireland or on the continent.⁹⁷ He had to remain vague for inconsistent (or even contradictory) promises to appear credible to the various prospective allies and backers.⁹⁸ The point that deserves stressing here is that Hobbes's chameleonism may be regarded as a function of Charles's proteanism. One could argue that Hobbes was, in this way, the most loyal and submissive of all – he, at least, seems to have thought so. For in *Leviathan*, Hobbes was effectively giving Charles (the would-be sovereign) *carte blanche* in religion. In effect, he was urging him to take the path of least resistance: 'Choose the religion that will provide for your restoration, and contrive whatever church settlement will ensure the stability of your state.' Whereas Bramhall, Laudians and 'old royalists' would insist on Charles's adhering to a particular episcopalian (if not arminian) churchmanship, Hobbes was insisting that the young king need not scruple. He had pointed out near the end of *Leviathan* that a sovereign

⁹⁵ On the eve of the Restoration Newcastle penned an essay of advice for Charles that touched upon religious policy. He was not yet ready to give up the fight to control the successor of Charles I. See above, chapter 2, 60–1, for a discussion of that essay.

⁹⁶ See chapter 5, 139.

⁹⁷ And yet, Charles was careful never openly to disavow the anglicanism that was being maintained by Bramhall and the rest of the exile clergy. As we saw in chapter 7, Charles seems to have encouraged if not commissioned the production of Bramhall's *Answer to Milletière* in late 1651 or early 1652.

⁹⁸ This is a point stressed by Hutton, 'Religion of Charles II'.

might consult his convenience alone in choosing between 'Paul, Cephas or Apollos'.⁹⁹

Further to excuse Hobbes of insubordination or injury to Charles II, one might also stress the point that it was not at all apparent in what sense the latter was a *king* during the Interregnum or in what sense he could have been Hobbes's (or anyone else's) sovereign. In what sense could he have subjects (loyal or disloyal) if he had no real dominion? Clarendon himself, a man not lacking in legitimist credentials, spoke of Charles having only 'the *empty* title of king'.¹⁰⁰ He did not sit on a throne, and possessed none of the resources of other European monarchs. He was greatly dependent upon such monarchs – the French, and then Spanish – for financial support. In the same way, Bramhall was only a bishop in name: he was not sitting on any episcopal throne, and was not ruling any diocese. Certainly Charles understood the plight of his would-be subjects in the 1650s. No matter how much the most ultra-royalist of would-be subjects would have preferred to have a Stuart swaying the sceptre somewhere, the simple, ugly and undeniable fact was that there was no realm in which such would-be subjects could live and serve. In this way, Charles might have forgiven (and apparently did forgive) Hobbes, along with many other royalists, for taking what could be regarded simply as survival measures. As John Wallace noted: 'If Charles II had not at his Restoration maintained a gentleman's memory he would have had very few people to serve him.'¹⁰¹ Charles was not blind to the fact that many who wished him well had to make compromises if they were to preserve themselves long enough to bring about his restoration. As it turned out, the only unpardonables were the regicides. Hobbes, however much the author of a 'rebels' catechism', was at least far from being one of those. He, too, could lay hold of the grace of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.

In vindicating himself against charges (and insinuations) of disloyalty and insubordination, Hobbes might also have pointed out that throughout his life he had acted simply as the obedient servant of noble employers. In this way, he might have protested that he could only be found guilty of misbehaviour if his *masters*, the nobles, were first found guilty; and even then, in that case he might have employed the defence 'just following orders'. In light of such a consideration, in censuring Hobbes Bramhall was, willy-nilly, indirectly censuring the Cavendishes. It was chiefly the latter who had

⁹⁹ See the passage in *Lev.*, XLVII, quoted in full in chapter 6, 165.

¹⁰⁰ *History of Rebellion*, v, 109 (xii.125); emphasis added. In 1656 the governor of Ostend, upon a request for a pass by one of Charles's agents, referred to him as 'the King of I cannot tell what'. Hester W. Chapman, *The Tragedy of Charles II in the Years 1630–1660* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964), 313.

¹⁰¹ John M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalty of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 42.

maintained Hobbes all along. Indeed, it was Newcastle who commissioned the *Elements of Law*; and it was to Devonshire that Hobbes had dedicated *De Cive* – and later (albeit, less political) books.¹⁰² And in making his peace with the authorities in England in the winter of 1651–2, Hobbes was merely echoing the behaviour of Devonshire, who had returned to England by the end of 1645 to strike a deal with the parliamentarians – who would otherwise have confiscated all his property. And, as we saw in chapter 6, it was Devonshire’s cousin, the brother of Newcastle, Sir Charles Cavendish, who had returned to submit to the Rump near the end of 1651.¹⁰³ If, as Bramhall claimed, Hobbes had served to undermine authority, political and religious, it was nobles like Newcastle and Devonshire who had served to undermine such authority by *patronising* an iconoclastic philosopher, a ‘third Cato’ like Hobbes. Indeed, one might suppose that Hobbes was accorded some modicum of respect by such powerful men as Bramhall precisely because the philosopher was associated with and, thus, under some protection from, grantees like Newcastle and Devonshire. Surely Bramhall had no wish to pick a fight with the latter. As Hobbes subsisted by the money paid him by the Cavendishes, it would not be unreasonable to consider Hobbes in some sense the philosopher or even the spokesman of the Cavendishes.¹⁰⁴ Again, without the support of the latter, Hobbes could not have maintained himself. If he had not maintained himself, he could never have written a book full of ideas that might, according to Bramhall, destroy society. As the Cavendishes were, in this sense, responsible for the life and work of Hobbes, any disapproval of Hobbes could have been construed as indirect censure of the Cavendishes. If, as Bramhall (and Clarendon, and a host of others) averred, Hobbes was a menace to society; if he was a pollutant, then what would

¹⁰² But, according to this logic, one could make much of the fact that *Lev.* was not dedicated to either of them.

¹⁰³ Was Newcastle, the Cavalier general, himself a solid royalist? At least if one dwells upon his resignation on the occasion of Marston Moor, there is room for question. One might argue that his royalism was not thorough inasmuch as he decided not to stay to bleed and die fighting for the cause. (Perhaps, on this view, his was not quite the ‘spirit and affection of that soldier’, commended to him by Bramhall in the latter’s sermon at York, in January 1644, who ‘having his legs cut off in fight for his country, yet desired to be cast into the breach, that he might dull the edge of one sword more’. See chapter 2, 65.) But, then, one can always excuse such action as Newcastle took after Marston Moor according to the principle of ‘run away to fight another day’. And there is no question that in the years after Marston Moor he was eager to fight again for the Stuarts – and himself.

¹⁰⁴ As Lisa Sarasohn has recently observed: ‘Newcastle had heard Hobbes’s ideas before [*Elements of Law*, 1640], in private conversation, and had apparently countenanced them and encouraged their publication. Hobbes was using Newcastle as the authority who legitimized his work and who then would serve as its prophet. Whether Newcastle recognized Hobbes as the discoverer of “the true and only foundation of such science” may be open to question, but he certainly permitted his client to use his name to legitimize his book.’ ‘Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle’, 725.

that make his supporters, the Cavendishes?¹⁰⁵ The financiers, the *chemists* of such pollution? They would be implicated, as patrons of a destructive social agent. If Hobbes was an intellectual revolutionary, a promethean warrior of 'reason' and 'science' and 'progress' against 'faith' and 'superstition', a secularising solvent of 'traditional' authorities and society, what should we call the nobles who enabled him?¹⁰⁶ Although Hobbes had been only a tutor and sometime secretary, he was still a client and friend of nobles. In dealing with Hobbes, Bramhall might well have understood that he was dealing indirectly with Hobbes's patrons. This would help to explain why, at least in the mid-1640s, Bramhall acted markedly civilly towards Hobbes – no matter how much he would have loved to see Hobbes, the 'saucy' tutor from Malmesbury, whipped.¹⁰⁷ In disputing Hobbes, Bramhall had spoken menacingly – and more than once – of the need for a rod rather than another argument: 'He that denies liberty is fitter to be refuted with rods than with arguments'; 'an opinion which deserves not to be confuted with reason but with rods'; 'such errors . . . deserve another manner of refutation'.¹⁰⁸ But after the Restoration, not even Devonshire, or so well-positioned a noble as Arlington, could prevent parliamentary attempts to discipline Hobbes.

Bramhall claimed that Hobbes had played the hypocrite by failing to practise what he had preached in his political treatises. But in the final analysis it would have been very easy for Hobbes to justify (that is, rationalise) any of his conduct by his own sovereign principle of self-preservation. Whatever he did, he did for safety. That was his principle, and he never swerved from it. There is no contradiction there. As he lived to ninety-one, a seventeenth-century Methuselah, Hobbes certainly practised his rule well. He preserved himself amidst all the violence of his country's internecine wars and all the battles and rebellions of the continent while he was in exile. Of course, Bramhall, and any other legitimist, could, and did, object to the paramountcy of self-interest – the 'dogs' play' of taking one's sovereign for better, but not for worse – but there was no hypocrisy or self-contradiction in Hobbes's tight adherence to that self-interest. The bishop might still have objected to the philosopher's lack of royalist integrity or fidelity; but he could not accuse him of absurdity or hypocrisy. Insofar as Charles II favoured or indulged Hobbes at the Restoration, the king esteemed plucky intelligence just as much as pure legitimist loyalty. To the extent that the king himself was a plucky survivor,

¹⁰⁵ For the 'host of others', see Mintz, *Hunting of Leviathan*.

¹⁰⁶ This is to echo a point made by Sarasohn: 'The protection of patronage gave Hobbes the resources – financial, intellectual, and social – to assault the assumptions of his times.' 'Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle', 717.

¹⁰⁷ Conversely, Hobbes was obliged to accord some respect to Bramhall because the latter was a client and friend of such nobles as Ormonde – if not of Newcastle as well.

¹⁰⁸ 'Treatise', *BW*, iv, 82; 'Vindication', *BW*, iv, 83; *Castigations*, *BW*, iv, 490. Bramhall was echoing Cicero's phrase from *Ad Pisonem*, 'non opus est verbis sed fustibus'.

and had been a chameleon-survivalist as an exile-king, perhaps Charles II was, in the end, much more the *politique* Leviathan of Hobbes than the anointed anglican king of Bramhall – much more another Henry IV than another Charles I, the ‘martyr king’.¹⁰⁹ To counter Bramhall, to turn the tables, Hobbes might have argued that the bishop’s legitimist royalism was nothing but a virtue born of necessity. It is much easier to praise Bramhall’s loyalty to Charles when one ignores or denies the necessity of his exile – or discounts his own personal interest in the restoration of the Stuarts. As a *persona non grata* and permanent public enemy of the Interregnum regimes, it would seem that Bramhall had no choice but to remain on the continent until the storm passed. For presumably the leaders of such powers as parliament and army would not have entertained peace overtures from a ‘prelate’ who had been ‘the most unsound man in Ireland’.¹¹⁰ He was in the same category of unpardonable delinquents as the cavalier ‘firebrand of the north’ Newcastle. If Bramhall had no choice but to remain in exile, then we would take the following remark with a heavy grain of salt: ‘My conscience would not give me leave to serve the times, as many others did.’¹¹¹ From his non-negotiable exile plight, it was not difficult for Bramhall to censure all those who would compromise and compound – whether Hobbes or his patrons. Whereas Hobbes was allowed to make his peace in 1651–2, Bramhall had no such option. In view of this, how could Bramhall not have resented Hobbes’s theoretical justification (*Leviathan*) of and personal submission to a non-Stuart and non-episcopal regime – a regime that had nothing but hostility to offer him? As Bramhall probably calculated, submission to such a regime would mean strengthening precisely those who could ensure his own permanent exile. Exile was especially bitter for Bramhall as it entailed separation from his wife, two sons and three daughters. (For Hobbes, the bachelor and sometime member of Mersenne’s circle, on the other hand, exile had been somewhat more like a long, productive sabbatical – or at least like one of his earlier visits to France as tutor and *cicerone* of the Cavendishes.) How could Bramhall not have resented a man who had not only made his own private peace but had also justified and encouraged ‘men of quality’ to do so by his public teaching? Bramhall had every reason to be incensed at Hobbes for rationalising compounding and Engagement-taking, for if too many royalists did so, Bramhall and other unpardonables would be left a small and isolated party with no prospect of returning. If all the other royalists compounded and engaged, there was a good chance that this party would expire in the wilderness of exile. Bearing these points in mind, Charles need not to

¹⁰⁹ Whether Charles II turned out to be more Hobbesian than Bramhallian is a question taken up in the Conclusion.

¹¹⁰ See chapter 1, n.1. ¹¹¹ *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, BW, III, 543.

have felt so grateful to Laudian bishops like Bramhall who, one could argue, had no choice but to cast their lot with him – which is not to say that no solidarity developed in their common exile. The question to consider is how much Bramhall had to sacrifice to remain loyal to Charles II. If very little, we would not suppose that the latter's gratitude to Bramhall was appreciably more than that to his old mathematics tutor.

Hobbes was not alone in claiming that royalist compounding and engaging with the Interregnum regimes would not, in fact, strengthen them. So he might have argued that nothing he had done served to extend Bramhall's – or Charles II's – exile. While Bramhall (or Clarendon) could have complained that submission and compounding was a selfish pursuit of private interest at the expense of Charles II (and his devout followers), Hobbes maintained that it was actually in the interest of Charles II for some of his royalist followers to compound. For the non-Stuart government would be weakened if royalists played along with it – temporising – in order to recover some of their property and revenue. If no royalists went back to compound – as did Devonshire in 1645 and Sir Charles Cavendish in 1651 – then that government would have been able to confiscate all their property, and raise large sums of money to pay the army – and perhaps even reduce some of the onerous taxes that contributed to the unpopularity of Interregnum regimes. Moreover, as Hobbes might have pointed out, if enough royalists were to succeed in returning, they could eventually all be on the spot to overthrow the usurpers and restore the Stuarts. Stressing how ill-defined royalism was after 1650, Eleanor Curran has observed that those who considered themselves royalists could, after all, easily differ in their thinking about the most effective means of restoring the Stuarts: 'Royalists could argue for any number of strategies that might include serving under Cromwell in order to be in a strong position to help restore the throne to Charles II at a later date.'¹¹²

As has been stressed throughout this book, Hobbes certainly did not write like a royalist polemicist. He did not write any explicit or legitimist propaganda for the Stuarts. But this does not change the fact that the author of the de-factoist political treatises was in all likelihood more royalist than not. For Hobbes's personal ties were much more with royalists than non-royalists. Most of his patrons, friends and associates were royalist – albeit, not all of the same brand. Thus, though Hobbes did not write like most royalists (e.g., Bramhall of *Serpent-Salve*), we cannot but think that he hoped that the Stuarts would eventually prevail. As most of his acquaintances stood to gain from the victory of the royalist cause, so he himself stood to gain from such a victory. As Newcastle once pointed out: 'The nobility cannot fall if the King be victorious, nor can they keep up their dignities, if the King

¹¹² Curran, 'A Very Peculiar Royalist', 177.

be overcome.¹¹³ In turn, the clients (Hobbes) of this nobility (Cavendishes) could not fall if the king were to be victorious, nor could these clients ‘keep up their dignities’, if the king were to be overcome. In other words, if in serving the king, Newcastle served himself, in the same way, Hobbes would have been serving himself by serving Newcastle and the king. As noted earlier, shortly after the Restoration Hobbes dedicated a small treatise, *Problemata Physica*, to Charles II. In the dedicatory epistle he offered a ‘short apology’ for *Leviathan*. After vindicating himself in various points, Hobbes concluded with a request: ‘I most humbly beseech your sacred Majesty not to believe so ill of me upon reports, that proceed often, and may do so now, from the displeasure which commonly ariseth from difference of opinion; nor think the worse of me, if snatching up all the weapons to fight against your enemies, I lighted upon one that had a double edge.’¹¹⁴ The last clause seems to me enormously revealing. Would we not be warranted in thinking that in this double-edged weapon Hobbes was referring to his principle of submission to sovereigns? The double-edged nature of the weapon lay in the fact that the sovereign could have been Charles II or Cromwell in 1650–1. Thus, we have here Hobbes’s admission that his de-factoism could be used to justify submission to Cromwell. But we do not here have Hobbes’s admission that he preferred Cromwell to Charles. Nor would his admission that he had forged a double-edged sword permit us to reject out of hand the possibility that Hobbes hoped that by the compounding of royalists, justified by *Leviathan*, Charles would eventually become sovereign *de facto*. After 3 September 1651 (Worcester), the double-edged sword cut for Cromwell; but within ten years it was cleaving for Charles II – and it would cleave in this way for another twenty-five years. However, none of this alters the fact that the more Hobbes’s critics and enemies, especially Hyde and Bramhall, came to dominate Charles during the 1650s, the less he might have hoped for an unqualified royalist restoration. For that would be, to some extent, Bramhall’s restoration – the re-empowerment of Hobbes’s old personal adversary, the émigré bishop of Derry. To a considerable degree, indeed, Bramhall contributed to the preservation of the union of the cause of the antebellum anglican church and the cause of the Stuart monarchy that returned to England in 1660. As Charles was crowned king of England, so Bramhall was consecrated primate of Ireland. So, Hobbes must have had some very mixed feelings in 1660. Not insignificantly, Hobbes seems to have suffered much more persecution (or threat of persecution) after the

¹¹³ Quoted by Margaret Cavendish in *Life of Cavendish*, 120.

¹¹⁴ ‘Seven Philosophical Problems’, *EW*, vii, 5–6; ‘Quae cum ita sint, lectores meos monitos hic vellem, ne malevolorum convitiis temere credentes aliter de me quam aequum est sentire velint: nec vitio vertant, si contra hostes tuos pugnans, et quaecunque potui tela corripuens, gladio uno usus sum ancipite.’ *Problemata Physica*, *OL*, iv, 303. See chapter 6, 170.

Restoration than during the Interregnum.¹¹⁵ However strong a royalist he really was at heart – whatever affection he had for his former pupil – Hobbes had every reason to be apprehensive that the Restoration would cause him trouble. It is possible that he feared the ‘Cavalier’ more than the ‘Long’ Parliament. Among other things, this study of Hobbes’s quarrel with Bramhall has suggested why the philosopher’s fear of the former was more warranted than that of the latter.

¹¹⁵ According to Thomas Burton, *Leviathan* was presented to a committee of the House of Commons as ‘a most poisonous piece of atheism’ in January 1657. *Diary of Thomas Burton*, ed. John T. Rutt (London, 1824; 4 vols.), I, 349. That may have been the only real scare for Hobbes during the 1650s.

CONCLUSION

A principal aim of this book has been to show that the quarrel of Hobbes and Bramhall should not be considered merely philosophical or theological. Apart from the obvious fact that it was not confined to the issue of free-will, even that philosophical–theological issue was a matter of controversy in the realm of politics. The issue of free-will, the distinctive doctrine of ‘arminianism’, was a source of discord in that sphere. There was too much baggage attached to ‘free-will’ for it to be an entirely academic question; the debate over that issue was not without serious ‘ideological’ purchase. This is not to say, however, that one cannot extract the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel over the issue of free-will from the unique political and personal contexts upon which I have concentrated. One may also read their peculiar debate as another round of a centuries-long philosophical–theological debate on that issue.¹ Three-and-a-half centuries later one can still find, *mutatis mutandis*, philosophers and theologians fighting the same war.² The combat has lasted so long that one can consider the subject of free-will a perennial one – one of those ‘central problems

¹ See, for example, M. W. F. Stone and Thomas Pink, eds. *The Will and Human Action: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (London: Routledge, 2004). There is some historical treatment of determinism to be found in the first section of Roy Weatherford’s *The Implications of Determinism* (London: Routledge, 1991), where Hobbes is considered a major figure in the genealogy. Thomas Pink’s *Free Will: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004) contains some good summaries of periods within the long history of the ‘free will problem’. Especially useful are his observations on the way this problem has changed over the centuries. In chapter 4 Pink portrays Hobbes as a revolutionary figure in this intellectual history, and asserts (66) that he may be regarded as ‘the inventor of the *modern* free will problem’; emphasis added.

² As Vere Chappell recently reported, in concluding the introduction to his abridgement of the Hobbes–Bramhall debate: ‘the free-will problem . . . is one of the most actively debated topics among contemporary philosophers, both in classrooms and in professional journals’. *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity*, xxiii. For current views of professional philosophers see Robert Kane, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); also worth consulting is the recently issued second edition of an older collection of articles gathered by Gary Watson, *Free Will* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003; first pub. 1982).

of philosophy’, timeless inasmuch as it appears to be a ‘question that all reflective people must find pressing, regardless of historical and geographical circumstance’.³

Similarly, taking a broader and long-term perspective, one may read their debate as yet another round in a decades-long fight over the theology and ecclesiology of the church of England which erupted when Henry VIII opened Pandora’s box in the 1530s. It is not especially difficult to read the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel as one incident in what Peter Lake and Michael Questier have described as a battle between conflicting versions of what the church of England was or should be.⁴ John Spurr has observed that from the Henrician Reformation onward, the church of England had been marked by ‘ecclesiological ambiguities’.⁵ It was precisely such ‘ambiguities’ that furnished space in which Hobbes and Bramhall could quarrel about episcopacy and, more fundamentally, the nature of religious authority, particularly such authority among Christians in England. Such ambiguities consisted of contradictory elements of ‘erastianism’ (or caesaro-papism) and ‘clericalism’ (dualist, ‘high’ episcopalianism). Further, one could also speak of theological or doctrinal, as opposed to ecclesiological, ‘ambiguities’. Such ambiguities as those found in the Thirty-Nine Articles, for example, are what allowed space in which Hobbes and Bramhall could argue about free-will and predestination – that is, their ‘arminian’ and ‘calvinist’ positions. If the church of England from the Elizabethan settlement of the early 1560s was a *via media* between Rome and Geneva, then Bramhall and Hobbes may be viewed, however crudely, as two participants in a giant tug of war, the bishop pulling the church (his fellow Christians of the British Isles) towards Rome and the philosopher pulling it (them) towards Geneva; or as two forces within a broad ‘anglicanism’, the bishop acting as an ‘arminianising’ agent, the philosopher as a ‘calvinising’ (or ‘puritanising’) agent. As we observed in chapter 3, in the beginning of the *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance*, Hobbes himself framed the context of their debate as an arminian–calvinist one.⁶ That was to indicate that their quarrel was, in part, a custody battle for the anglican church.

I would like to conclude this book with a brief consideration of the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel within these two contexts: first, within the broad

³ James A. Harris, *Of Liberty and Necessity: The Free Will Debate in Eighteenth-Century Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), vii. Harris’s book is a good guide to Hobbes’s ‘necessitarian’ and Bramhall’s libertarian influence on eighteenth-century philosophy. Among other things he shows (41–63) how the Anthony Collins–Samuel Clark debate was an echo of the Hobbes–Bramhall debate. I thank Gordon Schochet for referring me to Harris’s book.

⁴ Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), xviii–xix.

⁵ *Restoration Church*, 106. ⁶ Chapter 3, 90–1; *Questions*, EW, v, 1–2.

context of the battle for the identity of the Christian church in England and, second, within the even broader (and more ‘intellectual’) context of Western civilisation’s debate over – or, obsession with – free-will.

HOBBS, BRAMHALL AND THE THEOLOGY AND
ECCLESIOLOGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Peter White has noted that argument over free-will and predestination is among those ‘as old as Christian theology’.⁷ Indeed, one might say that the debate or tension is built into Christianity itself. Protestant Christians in England, like those on the continent, felt compelled to discuss free-will. Hobbes and Bramhall were participating in a debate that had become especially prominent from the rise of Luther and Calvin onwards. Both of those giants of Reformation theology had attacked the notion of free-will as corrupt, unscriptural doctrine. Free-will was a doctrine that supported the ‘popish’ soteriological focus on works and ritual (ceremonies) at the expense of justification by faith and grace. In England in the sixteenth century, both Luther and Calvin were influential – though the extent of that influence has for a long time been disputed by scholars. In the reign of Elizabeth (1558–1603), the question of influence in England of Luther’s and Calvin’s teaching concerning free-will is complicated by the fact that there came to be, among their followers, on the continent, and, in turn, in England, contention about their teachings. In the first decades of Elizabeth’s reign, there were ‘lutherans’ in England – following the Danish lutheran Neils Hemmingsen – whose position was not the strictly predestinarian one that had been associated with the Luther of *De Servo Arbitrio*; and whose position was not the predestinarian position that was still closely associated with Calvin.⁸ But in the last two decades of Elizabeth’s reign, according to Nicholas Tyacke, that more strictly predestinarian teaching came to dominate.⁹ But the decades that preceded the rebellions and civil wars of the 1640s saw the end of this calvinist predestinarian ascendancy. In the reign of Charles I (1625–49), as

⁷ *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 39.

⁸ As Tyacke observes, those in England who did not fully accept Calvin’s teaching on predestination were known as ‘Lutherans’. The ‘Lutherans’ on the continent were ‘the second-generation followers of Luther who had rejected Calvinist predestinarian teaching’. *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 142. For disagreements among protestants on the continent, and subsequent disagreements in England, see Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 34–6.

⁹ *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 178. And according to Peter Lake, *calvinist* predestinarianism was ‘the dominant strain of theological opinion in the Elizabethan church’. *Anglicans and Puritans*, 187. In the 1590s at Cambridge there was, however, some notable anti-strict-predestinarian reaction. See H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 315–90.

Hobbes himself noted, arminians like Laud and Bramhall came to dominate the church.¹⁰

In their famous debate on free-will in the sixteenth century, Luther had argued a predestinarian and Erasmus a libertarian (or, *avant la lettre*, arminian) position. As I noted in passing in chapter 4, the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel can be viewed as something of a seventeenth-century version of this debate, in which Hobbes played Luther to Bramhall’s Erasmus. Leopold Damrosch noted that Hobbes’s predestinarianism provoked in Bramhall ‘the same outrage, the same humanist assertion of human dignity and moral responsibility, that writers since Erasmus had directed at the Reformers [Luther and Calvin]’.¹¹ Hobbes himself suggested this role-playing. Against Bramhall, he cited and explicated texts that Luther had employed against Erasmus. In several passages of *Questions* he not only referred by name to the German reformer but also quoted him in establishing the Christian orthodoxy of his anti-arminian and anti-scholastic orientation. He protested that if Bramhall objected to his predestinarianism and contempt for Thomism, then he must also object (unpatriotically, that is, ‘popishly’, Hobbes implies) to that of ‘the first beginner of our deliverance from the servitude of the Romish clergy’.¹² In the same passage Hobbes mentions Philip Melancthon as a righteous scourge of the scholastic philosophy and theology that Bramhall purveys. Implicitly Hobbes rues the rise and ascendancy of arminianism in the

¹⁰ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*. Arminius was influenced by Luther’s follower Philip Melancthon and the latter’s Danish follower Hemmingsen: ‘what comes to be called Arminianism is virtually indistinguishable from the Melancthonian brand of Lutheranism’. Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 156. As for the calvinist lineage: ‘Beza’s teaching became normative for late sixteenth-century Calvinists, and Arminianism was conceived as a direct response to Beza’s doctrine.’ *Ibid.*, 13. For Beza’s teaching on predestination, see White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 13–22. White argues (37) that one should not without some qualification label Arminius ‘anti-Calvinist’. It was in the first decade of the seventeenth century that Arminius’s teachings were being read on the continent, principally in the Netherlands; early in the next decade his works were circulating (on a small scale) in England. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 65–7. For the origins of arminianism, see A. W. Harrison, *The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort* (London: University of London Press, 1926).

¹¹ ‘Hobbes as Reformation Theologian: Implications of the Freewill Controversy’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40 (1979): 343. Although he shows how the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel can be regarded as a sort of continuation or resumption of the Luther–Erasmus debate, Damrosch is also careful to point out in what ways the former cannot be seen merely as another Reformation theological debate. Damrosch notes differences between Luther and Calvin, on the one hand, and Hobbes on the other, ultimately suggesting that Hobbes may be called a ‘radical behaviorist’ (346, 348) with just as much aptness as ‘Lutheran’ or ‘Calvinist’. For the proto-behaviourism of Hobbes, see below. Hobbes quoted from Luther’s polemic against Erasmus, *De Servo Arbitrio*, in *Questions*, *EW*, v, 298–9.

¹² *Questions*, *EW*, v, 64. Hobbes spoke equally glowingly of Luther in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *OL*, v, 392, 406–7. This verse history was completed about 1671, but only published posthumously.

church of England when he remarks that Melancthon was ‘a divine *once* much esteemed in our Church’.¹³ In *Castigations* Bramhall reacted strongly to Hobbes’s Reformation name dropping. Firstly, he cast doubt on the accuracy of Hobbes’s representation of the reformers’ teaching on free-will. The philosopher misinformed his readers, for, the bishop claims, although Luther and Melancthon once held an opinion similar or identical to that of Hobbes, in their maturity they retracted it.¹⁴ Moreover, Bramhall contends that these authorities might have taught a form of theological determinism (predestinarianism) but did not teach Hobbes’s philosophical determinism (‘fatal necessity’): ‘Zanchy, Bucer, Calvin, Moulin, speak of a necessity of sinning in respect of our original corruption. This concerneth not the liberty of the will, whether it be free or not free, but the power of free will, whether it can without grace avoid sin and determine itself to moral or supernatural good; which is nothing to the question between him and me.’¹⁵

Indeed, throughout the debate, Bramhall refused to treat Hobbes as merely a lutheran or calvinist predestinarian. Rather, the bishop systematically represented him as nothing more orthodox than a heathen determinist, an extreme Stoic ‘fatalist’. He frequently called him a Stoic, or worse: ‘The Stoics themselves came short of T. H. his universal necessity.’¹⁶ We saw in chapter 4 that in the ‘Vindication’ Bramhall had claimed that Hobbes was resurrecting ancient stoicism unmodified: ‘T. H. maketh boldly, without distinctions . . . upon the grossest destiny of all others, that is, that of the Stoics. . . . He himself is the first who bears the name of a Christian that I have read, that hath raised this sleeping ghost out of its grave, and set it out in its true colours.’¹⁷ Associating him with a pagan philosophical school, Bramhall

¹³ *Questions*, EW, v, 64; emphasis added. For Hobbes’s use of Melancthon, see Overhoff, *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 166, n.135. Later in *Questions* Hobbes also associates himself with Zanchius, Bucer, Calvin, Pierre Du Moulin, the Synod of Dort and William Perkins. The latter was the most widely read English predestinarian theologian of the early seventeenth century – for whose teaching see Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 59–61, and White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 98–9; and for whose massive popularity see Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 29, 66, where he is called ‘the leading English Calvinist writer’ in England. These ‘doctors’ he cites, as against Suarez and Johns Duns Scotus, Hobbes professes to have ‘very much revered and admired’. *Questions*, EW, v, 266.

¹⁴ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 218. A modern authority on the intellectual relationship of Hobbes and Luther has judged Bramhall’s claim of Luther’s recantation of *De Servo Arbitrio* (1525) unpersuasive. For this recantation Bramhall cited *Visitatio Saxonica* (1528). But, firstly, it was Melancthon who composed the latter. Secondly, in the late 1530s Luther was still commending *De Servo*. Overhoff, *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 175, n.285. Bramhall would have been on much stronger ground if he had claimed, not that Hobbes’s determinism/predestinarianism would have been disagreeable to Luther, but that it would have been disagreeable to many Lutherans. For in the second half of the sixteenth century many of the latter took a decidedly more liberal position on predestination. Along with their teaching concerning the Eucharist, this more liberal predestinarianism served to divide the Lutherans from Calvinists on the continent. See Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 34–5.

¹⁵ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 398. ¹⁶ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 374. ¹⁷ BW, iv, 119.

endeavoured to place Hobbes beyond the pale of Christian respectability – his determinism was even worse than the perverse and pernicious predestinarianism of the puritan ‘elect’. It must be observed that the association made by arminians of determinism/predestinarianism with Stoicism (or ‘fatalism’) was something of a commonplace by the time Bramhall was reproving Hobbes. More than a decade earlier Samuel Hoard had published a book, *God’s Love to Mankind* (1633), that charged Calvin and Beza with complicity in Stoic (and manichean) error.¹⁸ David Allan has noted that Calvin was not infrequently subjected to criticism in which it was claimed that his predestinarianism and providentialism could not be distinguished from pagan fatalism.¹⁹ For all of Bramhall’s efforts to Stoic-stigmatise him, however, Hobbes steadfastly and confidently maintained that the bishop had not been able to demonstrate that what he disliked as ‘fatalism’ was unscriptural or unchristian.²⁰

In keeping with his attempt to deprive Hobbes of Christian credentials Bramhall also argued that the philosopher’s biblical quotations were irrelevant to the question of determinism: they only pertained to the theological question – conundrum – of predestination, grace and free-will: ‘[N]ot one of them [is] pertinent to the present question; they concern not true liberty from extrinsecal necessity, but the power of free will *in moral and supernatural acts*, wherein we acknowledge, that the will of man hath not power to determine it self aright, without the assistance of grace.’²¹ Thus, we see Bramhall, a traditional dualist, positing, against the materialist Hobbes, two orders of reality: a ‘moral and supernatural’ (spiritual); and a ‘physical and natural’ (material). All along assuming this ontological position, the bishop insisted that his dispute with Hobbes was philosophical (‘physical’ and ‘natural’) not theological (‘moral’ and ‘supernatural’). But for the materialist Hobbes, reality could not be differentiated in any such manner. Thus, his theological (predestinarian or calvinist) and philosophical (determinist or necessitarian) positions were indistinguishable; or, rather, more

¹⁸ White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 297. Furthermore, almost all the arguments (and rhetoric) deployed by Hoard in this book against calvinist predestinarianism can be found in Bramhall’s writings against Hobbes. Dewey Wallace summarises these arguments in *Puritans and Predestination*, 91–2.

¹⁹ “‘An Ancient Sage Philosopher’: Alexander Ross and the Defence of Philosophy’, *Seventeenth Century* 16, 1 (2001): 92, n.69. Inconveniently for arminians concerned not to be labelled ‘popish’, it was long a Roman catholic polemical commonplace that protestant predestinarianism was a fatalism of immoral consequence. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 31.

²⁰ Although he made some effort to dissociate himself from the Stoics in his controversy with Bramhall, in *Anti-White*, on the other hand, Hobbes had equated necessity with the ‘destiny’ of those ancient determinists: ‘necessity, or (as the Stoics called it) fate’ (*‘necessitas, sive, ut Stoici appellabant, fatum’*). *Anti-White*, xxxv.6 (1976), 424.

²¹ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 229; emphasis added.

precisely, ‘predestination’ was merely one aspect of the divine determination of all events in the world. God’s eternal decrees were ultimately the cause of all phenomena. For Hobbes the predestination of humans to salvation, or reprobation to damnation, was simply one part of the divine ordering of the world – God wills the salvation and damnation of humans as he wills all other events in the universe. Thus, Hobbes (the monist) invariably denied the warrant for Bramhall’s (dualist) distinction of theological (moral, spiritual) and philosophical (physical, material) determinism in the same way that he argued, as a materialist, that ‘incorporeal substance’ was nonsense – and in the same way that he argued that the distinction between ‘spiritual’ and ‘temporal’ government was hocus-pocus ‘to make men see double’ and trouble the commonwealth.²² Bramhall considered Hobbes much more a ‘Stoic fatalist’ than lutheran or calvinist because he did not think that those seminal protestant thinkers were materialists who denied the traditional (if not orthodox) dualist reality of spirit and body. Hobbes disqualified himself by declining to make any of the distinctions that those theological determinists had made. But Linwood Urban’s characterisation of Luther as an arrant determinist would suggest that Hobbes was perfectly justified in considering himself just as much lutheran as Stoic.²³ More recently, though, Jurgen Overhoff has considered the question of Hobbes’s intellectual kinship with Luther and Calvin.²⁴ His judgment is that the reformers were not precisely the determinists that Hobbes was:

Our analyses of Luther’s *De servo arbitrio* and Calvin’s *Institutio Christianae Religionis* have provided us with good evidence allowing us to conclude that Hobbes’s claim to be in accord with orthodox Reformed doctrines was by no means ill-founded. As a matter of fact, most of the theological doctrines developed by Hobbes in his letter *Of Liberty and Necessity* clearly corresponded with Luther’s and Calvin’s own doctrines on these themes. . . . Yet it is also important to note that, despite the many congruities of their teachings, an important aspect of Luther’s and Calvin’s doctrines of liberty and necessity was entirely left out of consideration by the English philosopher. Hobbes took no heed whatsoever of their spiritualism. Whereas the two Reformers laid great emphasis on the fact that only the Spirit of God could necessitate the will of man to see what was due for his salvation, Hobbes did not speak about the workings of the Spirit at all, contenting himself instead with the knowledge of the divine necessitation of all events by secondary causes.²⁵

²² *Lev.*, xxxix, 316.

²³ ‘Was Luther a Thoroughgoing Determinist?’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1971): 113. A more libertarian Luther was presented by Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther in Mid-Career, 1521–1530* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

²⁴ *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 141–59. His earlier treatment of the subject may be found in ‘The Lutheranism of Thomas Hobbes’, *HPT* 18, 4 (1997): 604–23, and ‘The Theology of Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan*’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51, 3 (2000): 527–55.

²⁵ *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 155. Cf. Noel Malcolm’s similar point: ‘Calvinists regarded divine Providence as utterly different from causal determination. However, in his [Hobbes’s]

It was this lack of ‘spiritualism’ that Bramhall saw as Hobbes’s lutheran-calvinist (or Christian) disqualification and, conversely, his Stoical identification.

As observed above, in response to Hobbes’s orthodoxy self-credentialling by citation of continental reformers, Bramhall also argued that the philosopher was too ignorant of the theological and historical literature to make any pronouncements about them: ‘a man may see by his citing these testimonies, that he hath taken them up upon trust, without ever perusing them in the authors themselves’.²⁶ Not only did he not know his Luther and Melancthon, he was also much too ignorant of the writings of Arminius to make any claims about the ‘arminianising’ of the church of England: ‘I do not think that ever he read one word of Arminius in his life, or knoweth distinctly one opinion that Arminius held. It was such deep controvertists as himself that accused the church of England of Arminianism, for holding those truths which they ever professed before Arminius was born.’²⁷ Furthermore, Bramhall questions the authority of Hobbes’s authorities. In response to Hobbes’s citation of the continental reformers (and Perkins), he retorts: ‘it were an easy thing to overwhelm and smother him, and his cause, with testimonies of Councils, Fathers, doctors, of all ages and communions, and all sorts of classic authors’. The philosopher’s ‘authorities’ are merely

writings he chose to give no sign of recognizing this fact, apparently taking the view that if Calvinism was a doctrine of necessity then it must be a doctrine of causal determinism.’ ‘Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology’, 204, n.9. Malcolm also observed that Calvin had an ‘eagerness to defend the notion of God’s omnipotence from what he took to be the encroachment of pagan philosophers’ ideas of natural necessity’ which omnipotence ‘in effect denied the operation of secondary causes’. *Ibid.*, 89. To challenge both Overhoff and Malcolm – that is, to lend some credit to Hobbes’s view of himself as a good calvinist in his determinism – one might ask whether Hobbes’s formulations can be distinguished from Calvin’s dictum: ‘For his [God’s] will is . . . the cause of all things that are.’ *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III.xxiii.2, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, ed. John T. McNeill (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960; 2 vols.), II, 949. Later in the chapter Calvin reveals his debt to St Augustine in reinforcing this point: ‘I shall not hesitate, then, simply to confess with Augustine that “the will of God is the necessity of things”, and that what he has willed will of necessity come to pass, as those things which he has foreseen will truly come to pass.’ III.xxiii.8; II, 956. Perhaps no one in recent years has devoted more effort to arguing Hobbes’s calvinist orthodoxy than A. P. Martinich, *The Two Gods of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes on Religion and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) and *Hobbes: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Edwin Curley has attacked Martinich’s view in ‘Calvin and Hobbes, or Hobbes as an Orthodox Christian’, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 34 (1996): 257–71 (published with a rebuttal by Martinich and rejoinder by Curley).

²⁶ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 397.

²⁷ *Castigations*, BW, IV, 218–19. In an essay composed (but not published) about the same time as *Castigations*, Bramhall emphasised that what contemporaries like Hobbes were calling ‘arminianism’ was no new thing. In answering Richard Baxter, the bishop observed that: ‘we [Laudian clergy] were prosecuted and decied as Pelagians and enemies of grace, because we maintained some old innocent truths, which the Church of England and the Catholic Church ever taught her sons before Arminius was born’. *Vindication of Episcopal Clergy*, BW, III, 507.

‘a few neoteric writers’. And ‘why’, the bishop wonders, ‘may he use the testimony of Calvin against me in this cause, and I may not make use of the testimonies of all the ancients, Greek and Latin, against him?’²⁸ Not many decades earlier Richard Hooker had complained in the same fashion about the puritan/presbyterian obsession with conformity to foreigners like Calvin: ‘Do we not daily see that men are accused of heresy for holding that which the fathers held and that they are never clear till they find somewhat in Calvin to justify themselves?’²⁹ Bramhall rejected Hobbes’s premise that anglicanism, that is, the theology of the church of England, consisted of a synthesis of the teachings of such theologians cited by the philosopher – namely Luther, Calvin, Zanchius, Bucer, Pierre Du Moulin and William Perkins. Hobbes has neglected theologians and sources much more authoritative. The dispute over authorities in the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel reminds us of the larger problem of the disagreement within the Church of England over the identity of its authorities. The Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel can obviously be read as a discourse within that longer and wider one. For arminian churchmen like Bramhall, Calvin was not the authority that church fathers and medieval (even late-medieval) theologians were.³⁰ And divines of Bramhall’s stamp took pride in the church of England – the *Anglican* or *Britannic* church – as a church with its own traditions, its own distinctive identity, not to be considered merely an imperfect, second-rate lutheran, calvinist or Roman catholic one. With such others as Dr Isaac Basire, a fellow clerical exile, Bramhall maintained that ‘the Church of England was neither a reformed section of the Roman church nor a conservative branch of the reformed church. It had its own identity, going back to the earliest days of Christianity in Britain; it was part of the true Catholic church, based on the scripture, the creeds, the threefold ministry, and the first four general councils of the church; and free of the corruptions of Rome.’³¹ Returning to the point: no consensus – no agreement on the rules of the game – had been established on the question of how much Luther and Calvin and others were official guides for the English church. So when Hobbes confidently played what he

²⁸ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 397.

²⁹ Quoted in Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans*, 188.

³⁰ Outside the confines of his quarrel with Hobbes Bramhall indicated that the English church had very little to do with Calvin: ‘we honour Calvin for his excellent parts, but we do not pin our religion either in doctrine or discipline or liturgy to Calvin’s sleeve’. *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*, BW, ii, 62. This book was published in London, 1656.

³¹ Colin Brennan, ‘Isaac Basire’, *ODNB*. For a succinct account of Bramhall’s conception of the church of England before and after Henry VIII (same garden: one unweeded, the other weeded; same vine: unpruned, pruned), in contrast with Hobbes’s as given in *Lev.* and elsewhere, see *Just Vindication*, BW, i, 113. Along with other anglican anti-papal polemicists of the 1650s, Bramhall in *Just Vindication* (BW, i, 129–52, 196–7) argued that Henry VIII had not innovated, but had only *restored* the church to autonomy, whereas Hobbes portrayed the king as *revolutionary*.

considered a high card (the Luther–Calvin ace), Bramhall declared it to be no trump.

To reiterate, in the several decades before the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel, no consensus had been reached about where, between Rome and Geneva, the church of England was and should be. If there was no consensus about how authoritative the teaching of Luther and Calvin concerning free-will was or should be, there was also much disagreement about what ecclesiology or ‘ecclesiastical polity’, that is, structure of church governance, was most biblical and divinely sanctioned – and legal and constitutional. From Elizabeth I to Charles I (and Charles II), there was much and often noisy disagreement about the organisation of the church, including the nature and relationship between civil and ecclesiastical authority, the nature and extent of clerical and episcopal authority and the king’s and parliament’s competence in matters considered ‘spiritual’. Certainly some of the arguments made by Hobbes and Bramhall may be read as echoes of the debates of the Jacobean era so well expounded recently by Charles Prior.³² We saw in previous chapters how much Hobbes and Bramhall contested points concerning religious authority and, most particularly, the issue of episcopacy. Much of their contention about episcopacy can be viewed simply as a direct descendant or continuation of the argument about that issue as it was undertaken in the Jacobean (and early Caroline) period.³³ Hobbes and Bramhall were, thus, in some sense fighting a custody battle over the church of England, just as they were, more personally, as I suggested in the introduction, fighting a custody battle over the would-be king and royal governor of that church, Charles II. In the introduction I asserted that on one level at least one could interpret the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel as a contest for the soul of a would-be king – that is, a struggle to influence Charles II and the power-brokers (royalists in exile) that might (and, as it turned out, did) one day rule the British Isles, and its church(es). Bramhall wished to groom the prince and young king to be a monarch like his father, the ‘Anglican martyr’, whereas Hobbes hoped to persuade the son to be a great deal less clericalist, and much more *politique* – a king like Charles II’s grandfather Henry IV of France. Did Charles II turn out to be more Hobbesian or Bramhallian? Having arrived at the conclusion, I am now obliged to offer an answer.

One way of deciding this would be to determine what Christianity Charles personally adopted and attempted to establish publicly after 1660. No soul

³² *Defining the Jacobean Church*.

³³ Meticulous explication of the argument over episcopacy during the reign of James is provided by Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 113–57. There one will also find information about controversies about it in the late sixteenth century. In some passages the Hobbes–Bramhall paralleled the Cartwright–Whitgift quarrel, with Hobbes playing Cartwright to Bramhall’s Whitgift. For the late-sixteenth-century quarrel see Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans*.

has been without its mystery, and Stuart historians and biographers have found Charles II's to be no exception to the rule. In fact, they have found it an especially difficult conundrum. One way of penetrating the enigma might be to interpret the Restoration church settlement as some reflection of that soul. In some sense, that is, the character of that church should shed some light on the religious sensibility of its governor. To be sure, Charles was far from being the sole architect of this church, but certainly it was for him to have the most say in the matter. However, unsurprisingly, argument about Charles and the Restoration church does not appear yet to have concluded. It was over fifty years ago that Robert Bosher argued persuasively that the Restoration saw a 'triumph of a militant High Anglicanism' and a 'vindication of the religious programme of Archbishop Laud'. The policy of Clarendon, who was, next to Charles, principal architect of the Restoration settlement, was indistinguishable from that of the Laudian clergy.³⁴ Clarendon and Charles II, according to Bosher, had been thoroughly Laudianised in exile. On their return, the two men saw to a restoration of a church of England that was not substantially different from the one established by Laud and Charles I in the 1630s. While the king might have treated presbyterians graciously enough, 'his favour was showered on the Laudians' and 'without exception the vacant bishoprics of importance were bestowed on leaders of the Laudian party'. Charles II, therefore, preferred churchmen very similar to those whom his father had preferred. And in some cases he preferred the very same men. By Bosher's account, the Restoration church was a notably Laudian one, and thus, by implication, Charles himself was more Laudian, that is, Bramhallian, than Hobbesian.³⁵

But Bosher's view has undergone formidable criticism. Ian Green has argued that the Laudians were actually denied key posts and did not dominate the church of the Restoration.³⁶ While Bosher claimed that by influencing Charles and Hyde during exile the Laudians were able to shape the government's re-establishment of the Church, Green has argued that only Clarendon, not Charles, favoured a strong and little-compromising Laudian church: 'at no stage was the king submissive to "Laudian" advice or committed to a "Laudian" strategy'.³⁷ Green argues that it is not correct to say

³⁴ It should be noted that Bramhall's influence upon Clarendon was at least *thought* to be considerable. See Elizabeth Strafford to Bramhall, 1 August 1660, *Rawdon Papers*, No. XLVI.

³⁵ Bosher, *Restoration Settlement*, quotations at: xiii, 137, 159–60, 155, 183. It must be said that the more loosely 'Laudian' is construed, the better Bosher's thesis works. Some of those labelled Laudians would have disagreed with Laud on some far from trivial issues.

³⁶ Green, *Re-establishment of the Church*; for Green's most explicit criticism of Bosher, see 22–4.

³⁷ *Re-establishment of the Church*, 24. In chapter x, Green argues that Clarendon's will was quite firmly for a Laudian church, with little indulgence towards presbyterians and Roman

that Charles and his ministers from the very beginning strove for a strict and 'high' episcopalian settlement along the 1630s lines. Rather, in the first year after his return the king did everything in his power to effect a compromise settlement of the church.³⁸ Thus, according to Green, an extremely Laudian settlement was *imposed upon* Charles, as the Cavalier Parliament 'forced a series of intolerant measures upon the king'.³⁹ The king was only interested in a moderate or 'primitive' episcopacy, like the episcopal–presbyterian compromise that Ussher had tried to devise in the early 1640s.⁴⁰ As Green has remarked: 'Charles's efforts to introduce a form of modified episcopacy into England in the first year of his Restoration suggest that he had inherited his grandfather's political opportunism and dislike of prelacy, rather than his father's rigid principles and devout churchmanship'.⁴¹ On Green's view, then, Charles was not much more Laudian or Bramhallian than Hobbesian. The king did not confine himself in some narrow Laudian orthodoxy. In fact, insofar as Charles was uncommitted to and aloof from all the different religious factions, he was not the clericalist but the *politique* sovereign that Hobbes would have wished – and Newcastle had recommended. This, at least, is the Charles that emerges from Green, who thought it most likely that the nineteen men nominated to the episcopate in 1660 signified a 'politique' and 'erastian' attempt by Charles 'to balance different interests within the episcopate and to reconcile as many people as possible to the emerging settlement'.⁴²

But since Green's study, Robert Beddard has lent Bosher some support, noting the 'thoroughness with which the Episcopalians recaptured the establishment'.⁴³ Similarly, Justin Champion has noted that: 'With the restoration of king and bishop in 1660 came a full-blown reassertion of *de jure*

catholics, but that he felt forced at various times to acquiesce in the king's much more liberal designs. There arose several occasions of acute tension between the chancellor and Charles, and Clarendon's opposition to the indulgence bill in 1663 deeply upset the king.

³⁸ *Re-establishment of the Church*, 1. ³⁹ *Re-establishment of the Church*, 2.

⁴⁰ 'Moderate', 'modified' or 'primitive' episcopacy schemes boiled down to taking significant power away from bishops and making them share more of it with non-episcopal clergy – in other words, an attempt to reduce ministerial imparity. A non-'prelatical' episcopacy would, for example, take away the bishops' ability to dictate most of the personnel decisions. And none of those moderate schemes insisted on *jure divino*. See James C. Spalding and Maynard F. Brass, 'Reduction of Episcopacy as a Means to Unity in England, 1640–1662', *Church History* 30, 4 (1961): 414–32; and William M. Abbott, 'James Ussher and "Ussherian" Episcopacy, 1640–1656: the Primate and his Reduction Manuscript', *Albion* 22 (1990): 237–59.

⁴¹ *Re-establishment of the Church*, 36.

⁴² *Re-establishment of the Church*, 90. In chapter iv, Green emphasises that the clergy most closely associated with Laud were notably neglected and unpromoted at the Restoration. One might from this extrapolate that Bramhall was elevated in Ireland only to keep him out of England.

⁴³ Beddard, 'The Restoration Church' in *The Restored Monarchy, 1660–1688*, ed. J. R. Jones (Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), 155.

divino theories of authority in both church and state.⁴⁴ This would seem to contradict the assertion of J. R. Jones who had, in the same volume in which Beddard's essay appeared, observed that the episcopate of Charles II was not to have divine-right pretensions: 'As the tactical offer of bishoprics to the presbyterians Calamy and Baxter showed, there was no question in official minds of *jure divino* episcopacy in and after 1660'; and 'there was to be no attempt to revive Laud's provocative attempts to make the Anglican Church independent of the temporal authorities'.⁴⁵ More recently than Jones – and in contradiction of a view like Champion's – Paul Seaward has offered a view of Charles, Clarendon and the Restoration church much closer to Green's than Boshers's. By his account, Clarendon endeavoured to establish a church much like the one before the wars, but was quite willing to make the concessions that would induce moderate presbyterians to conform.⁴⁶ The king's position, on the other hand, was decidedly more liberal, wavering between Clarendon's moderate Laudian one and a very tolerant churchmanship that would allow for a greater degree of freedom of conscience, with less severe penalties for both protestant dissenters and Roman Catholics.⁴⁷

While no consensus appears, perhaps most experts on the religious settlement of the Restoration would agree that the church that emerged within a few years of Charles's return was a markedly Laudian one – that is, one of which Laud could have approved. Insofar as it was indeed so, it might be considered a triumph of Bramhall over Hobbes. However, it is far from clear that the church really bore the king's stamp, or that it reflected some of his fundamental convictions – assuming, for the moment, that he had some of those. As Seaward has observed: 'While the king was far from passive in the discussions which surrounded the religious settlement, both his precise role, and his own opinions, remain hard to assess.'⁴⁸ Few would deny that the Restoration church was not simply Charles's personal creation. The Restoration church – no matter how Laudian, or Bramhallian – still represented a compromise of at least a few different groups. The king, even if he had

⁴⁴ 'Political Thinking between Restoration and Hanoverian Succession' in *Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 479.

⁴⁵ 'Introduction', *Restored Monarchy*, 14.

⁴⁶ Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 162.

⁴⁷ John Spurr's view of Charles in relation to the Restoration settlement is closer to Green's than Boshers's. *Restoration Church*, 29–104, esp. 35. Jeffrey Collins's view of Charles is similar to Seaward's, as he holds that the king's commitment to Laudianism was a matter of expedience, and that he was always 'willing to placate Low Church opinion in order to secure his throne'. 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy', *Church History* 68, 3 (1999): 572. Collins also argues (574–8) that Clarendon was much more erastian than Laudian.

⁴⁸ *Cavalier Parliament*, 32.

wanted to, could not have afforded to exclude all but the purest Laudians. As for the theology (as opposed to ecclesiology) of the Restoration church, it appears that we could award Bramhall the victory over Hobbes inasmuch as the former's arminianism for the most part triumphed over the latter's calvinism. Dewey Wallace has described the general decline of calvinist, predestinarian theology after 1660.⁴⁹ He was able to observe that: 'A style of rational and moral piety based on more or less Arminian and even Pelagian assumptions thrived among Anglicans, often presented by its exponents as a distinct contrast to the "fanatical" piety of Calvinists, whom they considered responsible for the horrible excesses of the Interregnum years.'⁵⁰ Surveying the decades that followed the Restoration in 1660, Tyacke has similarly noted the 'supremacy' of arminianism over calvinism (despite some robust maintenance of the latter at Oxford): 'During the 1660s an aggressive brand of anti-Calvinism had rapidly become established at Cambridge University and Archbishop Sheldon increasingly lent his authority to such views in the English Church more generally . . . The apotheosis of this long-term development was achieved in the 1690s with the triumph of a religious "Latitudinarianism" which was clearly Arminian in its theological emphases.'⁵¹ All this followed a decade, the 1650s, in which at both Oxford and Cambridge 'Calvinism had been the official orthodoxy'.⁵² But supposing the church and universities of the Restoration era were much more arminian (Bramhallian) than calvinist (Hobbesian), we need not assume that this was because of Charles II's more arminian convictions.

Charles II's personal religious convictions have not been treated to quite so much debate as the church under his supervision. Some have argued, and would argue, that he (like Hobbes) did not really have any. According to Beddard, Charles II's faith was 'dubious or none', and throughout his essay on the Restoration church he describes a conflict between 'the *politique* King' on the one hand and 'the zealous upholders of the Anglican establishment' on the other.⁵³ Likewise, according to Seaward, the king's 'theological indifference' prevented him from sharing the Laudian concern for the doctrinal purity of the Church of England.⁵⁴ More recently this same expert on Charles and the Restoration has written:

Charles himself did not possess the depth of commitment to the Church of England of his father or some of his advisers: indeed, a number of contemporaries detected negligible signs of religion in him at all: 'both at prayers and at sacrament he, as it were, took care to satisfy people that he was in no sort concerned in that about which

⁴⁹ *Puritans and Predestination*, 158–90.

⁵⁰ *Puritans and Predestination*, 183.

⁵¹ *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 307.

⁵² *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 324.

⁵³ 'Restoration Church', 167, 170.

⁵⁴ *Cavalier Parliament*, 162. Similarly, Collins has observed: 'Charles II was not half as deferential to the bishops as his father had been.' *Allegiance of Hobbes*, 274.

he was employed'. . . [But] even if the king's affections to the Church of England were not as solidly based as its hierarchy would have liked and were vulnerable to the demands of political expediency, it was clear that the king accepted, for the moment, that Anglicanism represented the most reliable basis for his rule.⁵⁵

The authoritative judgment of a recent biographer, Ronald Hutton, does not much differ: 'Charles showed no sign of deep interest in any religion.'⁵⁶ In a yet more recent treatment of this subject, Hutton appears to revise the portrait slightly: 'It is certainly true that he was debauched and cynical, but he was not indifferent to religion. He enjoyed the sacral trappings of monarchy, and in particular the touching for the king's evil. In exile he heard services twice a day and enjoyed a good sermon.'⁵⁷ But Hutton's conclusion reinforces his earlier judgment: 'Charles was, in common with the overwhelming majority of the seventeenth-century European rulers, somebody who saw religious questions primarily in terms of *raison d'état*, of their applicability to the preservation and furtherance of his power at home and abroad.'⁵⁸

Reading such authorities as Beddard, Seaward and Hutton, one might say of Charles what Clarendon said of General Monck, the unlikely agent of the Restoration: that 'no fumes of religion turned his head' and no men 'swayed by those trances' could yet sway him.⁵⁹ Taking Charles for some Laodicean *realpolitiker* one might think of him as one of those 'sensible men' defined in a conversation in Disraeli's *Endymion*: 'Sensible men are all of the same religion.' 'And pray, what is that?' inquired the Prince. 'Sensible men never tell.'⁶⁰ Nevertheless, there are some that might well object that Charles's religion, along with his whole personality, has suffered considerable distortion at the hands of his contemporaries and their uncritical posterity. Boshier, for one, suggested that Charles's anglican convictions were much more sincere and firm – less *politique* and superficial – than is generally believed. Indeed, it is often underemphasised how stubbornly Charles resisted presbyterian terms in the negotiations of both 1649 and 1650, and how much he desired to honour his father by preserving the religion for which the latter had, in part, died. Nevertheless, taken all together Charles II's words and actions do not suggest that his religious sensibility was very similar to his

⁵⁵ Seaward, 'Charles II', *ODNB*; Gilbert Burnet is the source quoted. ⁵⁶ *Charles II*, 20.

⁵⁷ 'Religion of Charles II', 240. For a fascinating first-hand view of the challenges of a biographer of Charles II, see the same author's *Debates in Stuart History* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 132–70.

⁵⁸ 'Religion of Charles II', 245. John Spurr's view of Charles appears close to Hutton's and Seaward's, based on his comment that, when it came to religion, Charles was 'uncomprehending of theological zealotry and temperamentally reluctant to adopt extremes'. *Restoration Church*, 30.

⁵⁹ *History of Rebellion*, vi, 154 (xvi.98). ⁶⁰ Benjamin Disraeli, *Endymion*, Bk. 1, ch. 81.

father's.⁶¹ His personal life and the character of his court contrasted starkly with those of Charles I. In view of his prolific wenching – ‘restless he rolls about from whore to whore’ – he could certainly have laid just claim to the title libertine king.⁶² The depravity of many of his chosen companions rendered his court quite unlike his father's prim one; Charles II's court was much more like his grandfather's than his father's.⁶³ If Charles I had lived long enough to see his eldest son disporting himself as an adult he might have had cause to repeat a command he once made upon arriving at Hyde Park to view a race. Noticing the lecherous Henry Marten, ‘a great lover of pretty girls’, he petulantly snapped: ‘Let that ugly rascal, that whoremaster, be gone out of the park, or else I will not see the sport.’⁶⁴

Of course, no matter what Charles really believed and thought – and no matter how licentious he was – one might object that neither Hobbes nor Bramhall individually had an especially deep influence on him. The philosopher and bishop were, after all, only two among a host of influences who had a chance to shape the character of Charles II – and of those kingdoms that came under his rule. However powerful or imposing their personalities or their opinions, and however intimate they were with him at various times, there is warrant for saying that those were merely a few among many elements that shaped Charles. On this view, one cannot attribute all that much to either. If, for example, Charles was *politique*, it is not necessary to impute this to Hobbes – or even chiefly to Hobbes. As his governor in the late 1630s, for instance, Newcastle must have influenced him – perhaps even deeply influenced him.⁶⁵ During the same antebellum years Laud's protégé Brian Duppa may have had some considerable effect as well.⁶⁶ And even if, as Burnet claimed, Hobbes was teaching the prince more than mathematics in the years 1646–8, Dr John Earle, the anglican divine, was at the same time filling his head with notions that cannot have been very ‘Hobbist’.⁶⁷ Much more importantly, the political and religious intrigues, trials, tribulations and frustrations of exile served the young king as a school of hard knocks. Quite plausibly, historians and biographers have held that all these experiences

⁶¹ Probably none would challenge the judgment of a recent biographer, Michael Young, that Charles I was an ‘intensely religious man’. *Charles I*, 109.

⁶² ‘A Satyre on Charles II’, John Wilmot, second earl of Rochester.

⁶³ For Hobbes's being blamed for the libertinism of that court and for that of the Restoration period more generally, see Mintz, *Hunting of Leviathan*, ch. vii. It was later claimed that the spawn of unbelievers and ‘scoffers’ was begotten by Hobbes, for ‘not one English infidel in a hundred is any other than a Hobbist’. Quoted in Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 260.

⁶⁴ *Aubrey's Brief Lives*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957), 193. For some detailed treatment of differences between Charles I and II, see Richard Ollard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II* (New York: Atheneum, 1979).

⁶⁵ However, I believe Chapman, *Tragedy of Charles II*, overestimated this influence.

⁶⁶ Or, were one sufficiently Freudian, one could attribute much to old Mrs Wyndham, his nurse.

⁶⁷ For Burnet's claim, see chapter 6, n.13.

produced a rather blasé, cold, cynical and unreligious man. But, again, it would be difficult to believe that this was the result of the conversation, tutelage and books of his old tutor, Hobbes. Conversely, if one takes the (uncommon) view that the king's Laudianism was less superficial (and *politique*) than is usually estimated, one need not attribute this to the individual influence of Bramhall. It seems to me that ultimately neither Hobbes nor Bramhall achieved an outright victory in the war for the soul of Charles I's successor and the church under the latter's supervision. As we saw in chapter 9, at the Restoration, Hobbes was favoured somewhat: he was granted a pension and enjoyed the privilege of audiences with the king. Bramhall was made archbishop of Armagh, primate of Ireland, and permitted to restore the church in a decidedly Laudian (or, indeed, Bramhallian) way. In the last analysis, Charles's continued ambivalence provided the occasion for these adversaries to articulate their positions and expose some of the key divisions of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms and Interregnum. As during their exiles, so at the Restoration, they were forced, with the rest of those holding grudges from the 1640s and 1650s, to live peaceably as personal enemies. However, this may not have been especially difficult, for the Irish Sea separated them in the 1660s as the North Sea and Channel had separated them in the 1650s.

HOBBS, BRAMHALL AND THE LONGUE DURÉE OF THE
DEBATE OVER FREE-WILL

As noted earlier, human free-will and divine omnipotence has been an irresolvable paradox or conundrum apparently inherent in Christianity. Since the context, or early context, of that religion was the Mediterranean and European world, it is not especially surprising that the free-will question has an even longer history in the West outside the confines of Christian theology. We have seen how Hobbes framed the debate over free-will as an arminian-calvinist one. But he also situated it within the larger context of Western philosophy. In the introduction to the *Questions* he noted that the topics of necessity, freedom and chance had 'perplexed the minds of curious men' 'in all ages' and that whether things come to pass 'proceed from necessity, or some things from chance, has been a question disputed amongst the old philosophers long time before the incarnation of our Saviour'.⁶⁸ More than a decade earlier, in *Elements of Law*, Hobbes had made a similar observation: '[T]his whole controversy concerning the predestination of God, and the free-will, is not peculiar to Christian men. For we have huge volumes of this subject, under the name of fate and contingency, disputed between the

⁶⁸ *Questions*, EW, v, 'Address to the Reader' and 1.

Epicureans and the Stoics.⁶⁹ Bramhall's claim that Hobbes's determinism was actually ancient, Stoical fatalism also suggested the fact that the free-will debate had a long history before the bishop and philosopher enacted it in Paris in the summer of 1645. Why has the free-will issue been such a perennial, if not timeless, problem – and one that has been of interest to more than just philosophers?

While one can imagine more than one plausible explanation, I would submit that much of its interest derives from the fact that it is a surrogate for, or an indirect way of asking, the question: what is man? (Presumably, allowing some narcissism, the latter is self-evidently interesting.) Or, to pose it less traditionally, what is a human and how, if at all, is this being different from the rest of the world in which it is found? In other words, I would suggest that to debate free-will is to engage in not only a 'philosophical' but an 'anthropological' debate. Thus, it is not surprising that in the course of their quarrel both Hobbes and Bramhall explicitly declared their 'anthropological' views. Bramhall frequently complained that in robbing man of free-will Hobbes had, in effect, brutalised humans (or humanised beasts); that he had meanly and disgracefully discarded the (time-honoured) *qualitative* difference between humans and other animals.⁷⁰ In *Leviathan*, for example, Hobbes had written: 'This alternate succession appetites, aversions, hopes and fears is no less in other living creatures than in man; and therefore beasts also deliberate . . . In deliberation, the last appetite or aversion immediately adhering to the action, or to the omission thereof, is that we call the will. And beasts that have deliberation must necessarily also have will.'⁷¹ Years earlier, in 1642–3, in the critique of Thomas White's *De Mundo Dialogi Tres*, he had irreverently remarked: 'he [White] says that this dignity of man has its foundation in free-will, overlooking the fact that all animals possess the same freedom of decision-making as man does'.⁷² In *De Corpore*, published just a year before he published *Questions* against Bramhall, Hobbes had subjected humans and animals to the same naturalistic scrutiny – not privileging man in asserting: 'Neither is the freedom of willing or not willing, greater in man, than in other living creatures. For where there is appetite, the entire cause of appetite hath preceded; and, consequently, the act of appetite could not choose but follow, that is, hath of necessity followed. And therefore such a liberty as is free from necessity, is not to be found in the will either of men or beasts.'⁷³ In *Questions*, Hobbes wrote sardonically:

⁶⁹ *Elements of Law*, xxv.9, ed. Gaskin, 149.

⁷⁰ E.g., *Castigations*, BW, IV, 435–6. ⁷¹ *Lev.*, VI, 33–4.

⁷² *Anti-White*, xxxvii.2 (1976), 446. See also chapter xxx of *Anti-White*, where Hobbes observes several ways in which the behaviour of beasts cannot be distinguished from that of humans.

⁷³ *De Corpore* (1655), as translated by J. C. A. Gaskin in his edition of the *Elements of Law*, 228. In *Questions* Hobbes's longest discussion of the differences between humans and animals is presented at EW, v, 185–8.

For my part, I am too dull to perceive the difference between those rewards used to brute beasts, and those that are used to men. If they be not properly called rewards and punishments, let him [Bramhall] give them their proper name . . . The means whereby setting-dogs, and coy-ducks, and parrots, are taught to do what they do, is by their backs, and by their bellies, by the rod, or by the morsel. Does not the Bishop know that the belly hath taught poets, and historians, and divines, and philosophers, and artificers, their several arts, as well as parrots? Do not men do their duty with regard to their backs, to their necks, and to their morsels, as well as setting-dogs, coy-ducks, and parrots?⁷⁴

Clearly, then, Hobbes regarded humans as just another type of animal whose behaviour was determined in fundamentally the same way as that of other organisms. In sharp contrast, Bramhall thought that one of the principal things that distinguished humans from animals was free-will. Hobbes was committing anthropological *lèse majesté* by rejecting its existence. For Bramhall, the existence of free-will seems to have been wrapped up in the notion of the existence of the soul as ontologically separate from the body. And one might argue that the bishop's objections to the determinism of Hobbes were at the same time objections to a materialism that denied the soul (or spirit) to be ontologically different. One might argue that Bramhall's objections to the determinism of Hobbes proceeded from the bishop's clinging to the notion of man as by very nature (or, rather, creation) unpredictable – as somehow 'above' other animals, or somehow 'divine', endowed with a 'soul' or 'spirit' lacking in (other) animals: it was the exercise of free-will by that soul that elevated man. By depriving man of free-will Hobbes was undermining that soul (or the traditional, dualist conception of it), whose existence was manifested in the exercise of that free-will. In reply to Hobbes's point about man being no different from dogs, ducks and parrots, Bramhall protested:

I have heard of some who held an opinion, that the soul of man was but like the winding up of a watch, and when the string was run out, the man died, and there the soul determined; but I had not thought before this, that any man had made the body also to be like a clock, or a jack, or a puppet in a play, to have the original of his motion from without itself, so as to make a man in his animal motion to be as mere a passive instrument as the sword in his hand.⁷⁵

In asserting free-will Bramhall was also asserting the immaterial (incorporeal) soul – something beyond perception of the five senses, something that makes man somehow 'beyond' nature; something that renders him spiritual

⁷⁴ *Questions*, EW, v, 195–6; see also 365, where Hobbes remarks that 'wise men' do not differently from beasts.

⁷⁵ *Castigations*, BW, iv, 268–9. Similarly, in the 'Vindication' he had complained that Hobbes's determinism 'dishonours the nature of man. It makes the second causes and outward objects to be the rackets, and men to be but the tennis-balls, of destiny.' BW, iv, 65.

or divine in a way the rest of the world is not. Accordingly, the will and soul were not amenable to the kind of analysis to which the rest of the world could be subjected by a ‘natural philosopher’ – the seventeenth-century term most closely approximating our ‘scientist’. In the interest of science, ‘natural philosophy’, Hobbes treated the ‘will’ like any other phenomenon to be analysed within the Galilean, materialist–mechanistic scheme: ‘will’, like ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’, was not to be distinguished *qualitatively* (ontologically) from anything else *de rerum naturae*. Bramhall the dualist, on the other hand, fought to keep ‘will’ (‘spirit’, ‘soul’) separate from the ‘corporeal’, from the merely ‘physical’, natural world. One might observe that the materialist–dualist disagreement between Hobbes and Bramhall is still with us in just about the same way as the determinist–libertarian disagreement is. Some (latter-day Hobbesians) hold that ‘soul’ or ‘spirit’ (or ‘mind’) is *not* of an ontological order separate from ‘matter’ (or ‘energy’) or ‘body’. Many others (Bramhallians) maintain that it is.

Hobbes argued that there is no such thing as free-will. There is only free *action*, situations in which an agent (man) is able to execute an action following the will to do that action – in other words, situations in which the willed (or ‘desired’) action is not thwarted by exterior forces, that is, things outside the disposing of the agent.⁷⁶ Hobbes accepted that one could speak of a free agent in the latter sense; but the will preceding the free action (that ‘will’ being merely the last appetite or aversion – the ‘election’ or ‘choice’ – not a faculty) could not be said to be free in the sense of not determined by antecedent causes. Against Hobbes Bramhall asserted that there is a faculty called the will and that its willing (its exercise) is free in the sense that the willing is not determined by antecedent causes (things outside of the faculty of the will and not in man’s disposing). Furthermore, he strenuously objected to Hobbes’s conception of free action: if the will that preceded the action were not free (that is, not undetermined by antecedent causes) then Hobbes could not call the *action* free. In other words, Bramhall insisted that if Hobbes would not allow freedom of will, then he could not maintain freedom of action.

Hobbes considered Bramhall’s view of the will irrational; were he living today, he might say that the bishop’s view was ‘unscientific’. He maintained that a will (a ‘choice’ or ‘decision’) is determined by prior causes, though we are often unable to specify these. He thought that if the determination of a will (choice, decision) were denied – if it were denied that prior events necessitated that will – then all *explanation* of a will was, *ipso facto*, impossible.

⁷⁶ Hobbes wrote succinctly in *Anti-White*: ‘That of which the motion is unobstructed is free; liberty is the absence of impediments to motion.’ xxxvii.3 (1976), 446; and see *DC*, ix.9, for an almost identical formulation.

For Hobbes held that to explain was to identify causes and effects, that is, to explicate causation. But Bramhall, he felt, was asserting that there was no causation in the case of the will – it was ‘free’ of, that is, exempt from, causation (determination) in a way that the rest of the world, the non-human and physical world, was not.⁷⁷ So, Hobbes thought, the bishop was rendering any explanation of human behaviour fundamentally and in principle impossible. Whereas the philosopher argued that deliberation (the decision-making process) involved appetite (the perception of what will bring pleasure) and aversion (the perception of what will bring pain), and that a will was, thus, the result of something outside the man, Bramhall argued that things outside the faculty of the will did not determine it – but rather, that it determined itself. The will in some sense moved itself. Hobbes condemned this as outrageously circular nonsense, explanatory vacuity, for to say that the ‘will determines itself’ was tantamount to stating, entirely uninformatively, that the ‘will wills the will’; and if one could say that the ‘will wills the will’, why couldn’t one say that the ‘will wills the will which wills the will’ *ad infinitum*? When Bramhall asserted that the will determined itself, Hobbes pointed out that this told us nothing and just begged the question: ‘if a man determine himself, the question will still remain, what determined him to determine himself in *that* manner’.⁷⁸ Hobbes thought that he, as a competent natural philosopher (scientist), was offering explanation of human action where Bramhall was only offering obfuscating pseudo-explanation, scholastic-libertarian hocus-pocus (‘tohu and bohu’). For, again, Hobbes thought that to maintain, as the bishop did, that the ‘will wills itself’ was no different from asserting, say, that the ‘cause causes itself’ or ‘I made I’; it was like responding to the question ‘what caused the rain?’ by saying ‘the rain caused the rain’, or to the question ‘what caused the explosion?’ by saying ‘the explosion caused itself’. In other words, it was to ‘explain’ an effect by re-naming it the cause. Since Hobbes thought that Bramhall was not identifying a cause, the philosopher accordingly concluded that the bishop was, by default, offering ‘chance’ or ‘fortune’ as the determinant of the will. And if ‘chance’ or ‘fortune’ determined the will, Hobbes pointed out, then the interesting corollary was that God did not. So, the philosopher asked, did the bishop wish to deify ‘chance’ or ‘fortune’ at the expense of God’s omnipotence? Bramhall’s libertarianism was irrational and heretical at the same time.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Technically, Bramhall allowed some degree of causation of the will inasmuch as he argued that it could be ‘influenced’; he said it could be determined ‘morally’. Not surprisingly, the materialist Hobbes rejected Bramhall’s distinction of ‘natural’ and ‘moral’ (non-physical) causation.

⁷⁸ *Questions, EW*, v, 34–5, emphasis added.

⁷⁹ Thus, we can observe that Hobbes’s strategy to discredit free-will was ultimately twofold: 1) it is ‘popish’, that is, heretical theology; and 2) it is absurd, that is, unsound philosophy. Or as

‘Chance’ or ‘fortune’ (or ‘luck’) as explanations are not usually considered especially scientific. In fact, one might argue that ‘chance’ or ‘fortune’ have only been ways of conveying the fact that explanation is lacking: we are at a loss in our attempt to specify the causation. ‘Chance’ may be regarded as a way of saying ‘I don’t know’; accordingly, chance can be seen as coterminous with ignorance. Determinism has been closely associated with modern science, or at least the philosophy (or metaphysics) of modern science.⁸⁰ As I asserted earlier, in reviewing the first papers of Bramhall and Hobbes in chapter 4, neither the determinist nor the libertarian view can be demonstrated or proven to be true. Inasmuch as they can be said to be beyond scientific validation, they are metaphysical (or ‘metascientific’) faiths or assumptions. However, I (and, doubtless, many others) would assert that modern science has been much more determinist (thus, Hobbesian) than libertarian (Bramhallian) in its assumptions or metaphysics. Granting this, in the Hobbes–Bramhall dispute about human will and action Hobbes cannot but appear the more scientific. B. F. Skinner, one of the most widely read scientific-methodological thinkers of the twentieth century,⁸¹ argued that a scientific conception of man required the determinism that Hobbes propounded and Bramhall combated – that is, that human behaviour (including ‘willing’) was determined by things in the environment (in combination with genetic endowment) – not in man’s disposing – not, that is, determined within the Bramhallian, autonomous, self-determining faculty of the will. Skinner argued that ‘science insists that action is initiated by forces impinging upon the individual and that caprice [chance] is only another name for behavior for which we have not yet found a cause’.⁸² According to this Skinnerian view, Hobbes must appear the scientist and Bramhall, as a libertarian, the anti-scientist. Incidentally, perhaps the twentieth-century thinker most like Hobbes was Skinner. The latter was a determinist castigated by libertarians

he had put it in *Anti-White*, those who reject the libertarian view ‘do so because they consider not only that for the celestial and eternal chain of causation to be broken is an affront to the Divine Majesty; but also that [it] is against natural reason’. *Anti-White*, xxxvii.14 (1976), 458. Hobbes himself, however, implied that ‘God’ was really just a synonym for ‘chance’ when he reasoned that in our cosmological ignorance we postulate God as the universe’s first and eternal cause. *Lev.*, xii, 64; and see also *DC*, xv.14, and *Elements of Law*, xi.2, ed. Gaskin, 64–5.

⁸⁰ In view of the fact that some have suggested that modern quantum physics proved indeterminism (or the existence of ‘chance’ or randomness at the subatomic level), this statement may provoke objection. But I am not the first to reject such a suggestion. Quantum physics has not proved indeterminism (or libertarianism) or determinism, for these are assumptions that do not, as assumptions, admit of proof.

⁸¹ One measure of the impact of Skinner was taken in a recent survey that concluded that he was ‘the most eminent psychologist of the twentieth century’. Steven J. Haggblom, Renee Warnick, et al., ‘The 100 Most Eminent Psychologists of the 20th Century’, *Review of General Psychology* 6, 2 (2002): 139–52.

⁸² ‘Freedom and the Control of Men’ in *Cumulative Record, Definitive Edition* (Acton: Copley, 1999), 9.

and humanists in much the same way that Bramhall and other contemporaries excoriated Hobbes.⁸³ In accounting for this hostility to the determinism that he (and Hobbes) maintained, Skinner remarked: 'It is opposed to a tradition of long standing which regards man as a free agent, whose behavior is the product, not of specifiable antecedent conditions, but of spontaneous inner changes of course. Prevailing philosophies of human nature recognize an internal "will" which has the power of interfering with causal relationships and which makes the prediction and control of behavior impossible.'⁸⁴ In a sense, Skinner was complaining of the fact that Bramhall's libertarianism was (at least among non-scientists) still triumphing over Hobbes's determinism as late as the mid-twentieth century. Hobbes would probably have had no difficulty accepting that Skinner's 'operant behaviorist' experimentation with pigeons might lead to better understanding of human behaviour. The same behavioural phenomena (e.g., types of 'reinforcement') could be observed in humans the same way that they could be observed in other animals. Hobbes made this point in the passage we quoted above about setting-dogs, coy-ducks, and parrots.⁸⁵ Curiously, Skinner himself referred disapprovingly to 'Arminian' theologians in a popular exposition of his philosophy of 'radical behaviorism': 'Some theologians have been concerned for the freedom needed in order to hold a person responsible . . . so-called Arminian doctrine held that a person acts freely only if he has chosen to act and *only if the choosing to act was brought about by another instance of choosing*.'⁸⁶ In the same book, Skinner betrayed his debt to Hobbes, quoting from

⁸³ For some specimens of the unfavourable reaction to Skinner's best-selling *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, see *Beyond the Punitive Society: Operant Conditioning: Social and Political Aspects*, ed. Harvey Wheeler (San Francisco: Freeman, 1973).

⁸⁴ *Science and Human Behavior* (New York: Macmillan, 1953), 6–7.

⁸⁵ *Questions*, EW, v, 195–6. Shapin and Schaffer have pointed out that Hobbes was not quite the anti-experimentalist that some have assumed on account of his fighting with members of the Royal Society: 'The point to be made is not that Hobbes "despised" experiment, nor that he argued that experiments had no significant place in a properly constituted philosophy of nature. What Hobbes was claiming, however, was that the systematic doing of experiments was not to be equated with philosophy: going on in the way Boyle recommended for experimentalists was not the same thing as philosophical practice. It was not the case that one could ground philosophy in experimentally generated matters of fact.' *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*, 129; see also the discussion at 7–13. Before then Noel Malcolm had written in a similar vein: 'his science can be accused of being anti-empirical only if empiricism is thought to consist in the mere collection of data in a vacuum of theory'. 'Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology', 122. Furthermore, it has rarely been sufficiently emphasised how much Hobbes was engaged in and contributed to the cutting-edge field of seventeenth-century optics. Malcolm has even asserted that he was 'one of the founders of the modern science of optics', for he was 'the first scientist to give the correct dynamic explanation of refraction'. *Ibid.*, 117, 119–20. For a recent summary of Hobbes's contribution to optics, see Tom Sorell, 'Thomas Hobbes' in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 323–6.

⁸⁶ *About Behaviorism* (New York: Vintage, 1976), 59–60.

Of Liberty and Necessity in the eighth chapter in the section on ‘Impulse and Deliberation’: “I conceive,” said Hobbes, “that when a man deliberates whether he shall do a thing or not do it, he does nothing else but consider whether it be better for himself to do it or not to do it.”⁸⁷

Hobbes can be viewed as a precursor of others besides B. F. Skinner – or, to avoid the anachronism, one may observe that scientists and thinkers prior to Skinner can be styled ‘Hobbesian’. The affinities of Hobbes with such figures as La Mettrie and Darwin are not difficult to discern. The former’s materialist and naturalistic approach to the subject of man was practically the same as that taken by the latter. Hobbes was an intellectual ancestor of such thinkers as La Mettrie, Darwin and Skinner in the sense that he analysed man as merely one animal among others, an animal whose behaviour is not determined by some inaccessible, mysterious and elusive thing called free-will (or an autonomous, non-physical thing called the soul) but merely by an interaction of genes and environment. Hobbes’s portrait of man as painted in his debate with Bramhall was a contribution towards what we may call the modern scientific or evolutionary view of man as an organism no more ‘above nature’ or ‘divine’ than others – a complex organism, not a ‘creature’; an animal not created and endowed with a soul but evolved from other, simpler organisms. Hobbes was advancing an anthropological view which presupposes that the species *homo sapiens*, like any other subject matter of biology, does not possess a ‘freedom’ or ‘dignity’ or any other such element that would exempt it from the kind of analysis routinely applied to other animals. Hobbes, like perhaps most twenty-first century biologists, regarded man as just another animal whose behaviour was determined in fundamentally the same way as that of other organisms.

In quarrel with Bramhall, Hobbes was not only contributing to the modern scientific view of man but also, more broadly, to the constitution of modern science. As Richard Tuck has remarked: ‘Hobbes’s philosophy is closer to the assumptions on which modern science rests than any of the competing philosophies on offer in the seventeenth century.’⁸⁸ We can view the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel as an episode in the rise of modern science. One

⁸⁷ *About Behaviorism*, 147; quoting *OLN, EW*, iv, 273.

⁸⁸ *Hobbes*, 50. This reinforced Robert Kargon’s older judgment: ‘Hobbes was one of the three most important mechanical philosophers of the mid-seventeenth century, along with Descartes and Gassendi.’ *Atomism in England from Harriot to Newton* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), 54. More recently Brian Baigrie has observed that Hobbes was among those natural philosophers who collaborated in the creation of ‘a methodological template for the mechanistic style of explanation that is so characteristic of modern science’. ‘The New Science: Kepler, Galileo, Mersenne’ in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 52; emphasis added. A similar judgment of Hobbes’s importance has been rendered by Daniel Garber, John Henry, Lynn Joy and Alan Gabbey, ‘New Doctrines of Body and Its Powers, Place, and Space’ in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers, 553.

could, if crudely, describe the battle as one between Hobbes-the-scientific-revolutionary and Bramhall-the-Aristotelian-medieval-reactionary – or as a battle between Hobbes’s ‘forward-looking’ determinism and mechanico-materialism and Bramhall’s ‘backward-looking’ scholastic libertarianism and dualism.⁸⁹ What, then, was the wider setting of this battle? When Hobbes and Bramhall were still in their youth, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Aristotelian-scholastic philosophy was still in the ascendant, as it had been for a few centuries. It was during their lifetimes, however, that there arose a ‘mechanistic’ or ‘corpuscularian’ paradigm that came to rival and then prevail over the Aristotelian-scholastic.⁹⁰ The Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel may be read as an episode in this history – in which Hobbes, representing the Galilean, mechanistic-corpuscularian side, assumes the role of a major contributor to the triumph of the new paradigm.⁹¹ We have seen how ferociously and contemptuously Hobbes attacked ‘Aristotelity’ and the ‘schoolmen’ in the course of his clash with Bramhall. For Hobbes, the would-be champion of the new scientific *Weltanschauung*, the bishop was the embodiment of benighted Aristotelian scholasticism, ‘that convenient bugbear of science and progress’.⁹² To be sure, Hobbes was only contributing a current to the stream of anti-scholastic invective that had been flowing strongly enough since the end of the sixteenth century – when he and Bramhall were just boys. Indeed, one could argue that Hobbes was doing little more than echoing such ‘neo-scholastic’ scourges as Montaigne, Lipsius and Pierre Charron.⁹³ Jurgen Overhoff has pointed out that what united Hobbes with Mersenne, Gassendi and Descartes was the desideratum ‘to replace the old Aristotelian philosophy by a new scientific theory of the processes and phenomena of the natural world’.⁹⁴ As he argued

⁸⁹ If Hobbes may be considered a pioneer of modern science, or at least a pioneer *philosopher* or *metaphysician* of modern science, then it is quite easy to regard him, rather than Bramhall, as the ultimate, long-term winner of their intellectual battle. In other words, the mechanico-materialist philosophy of Hobbes has prevailed over the neo-scholastic, dualist philosophy of Bramhall. Hobbes was certainly not the great scientist that Galileo was; but his materialist philosophy may be regarded as the metaphysical foundation of modern science.

⁹⁰ Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers, *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, 2–3. They point out that the mechanistic-corpuscularian philosophy was ‘a descendant of ancient atomism and the ancestor of present-day physics’. For the diverse elements of this ‘mechanical philosophy’ see also Menn, ‘The Intellectual Setting’, 73–4.

⁹¹ ‘Galilean’: in *Anti-White* Hobbes had praised Galileo as ‘the greatest scientist, not only of our own, but of all time’. Quoting this in a recent essay, Douglas Jesseph has stressed how important Galileo was as a source for Hobbes’s methodology and natural philosophy and how strongly the *Anti-White* ‘defended the fundamental claims of Galilean science’. ‘Hobbes, Galileo’, 192, 198. See also above, chapter 3, 80.

⁹² Jacob, *Henry Stubbe*, 4.

⁹³ Tuck, *Hobbes*, 9. For the pre-seventeenth-century anti-Aristotelity discourse that Hobbes echoed in his debate with Bramhall (not to mention, in *Lev.*), see Menn, ‘The Intellectual Setting’, 38–67.

⁹⁴ *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will*, 53. For Hobbes and his fellow mechanists, their way of explaining phenomena had the virtue of producing ‘greater predictive power and more fruitful

with Bramhall, Hobbes was pursuing this agenda, endeavouring to expose the intellectual poverty and fraudulence of a kind of thinking that served to block the progress of the ‘new scientific theory’. That Hobbes was not indulging in overkill is suggested by the fact that even well into the Restoration period, ‘neo-Thomism still formed the backbone of Protestant academic education’.⁹⁵ To repeat, for Hobbes the fight with Bramhall was a fight against the neo-Thomist obscurantist forces that were trying to impede the progress of the promising new science in which he had been engaging so vigorously in the 1640s. Here it is worth emphasising that as a member of the Mersenne circle in that decade, Hobbes was occupying a place along the cutting-edge of the new scientific enterprise in Europe.⁹⁶ Mersenne’s cell in the Minim monastery must be considered a leading candidate for the title ‘capital of European science’ in the 1640s.⁹⁷ The European academies that appeared in the second half of the seventeenth century may be considered the successors of Mersenne’s small establishment.⁹⁸ Incidentally, Hobbes was not jesting in commending *Leviathan* or in urging that his entire philosophical system, informed by the ‘new science’, be taught at Oxford and Cambridge in lieu of the kind of Aristotelian-scholastic thought propounded by Bramhall. Thus, yet another way of viewing the Hobbes–Bramhall quarrel is as, indirectly, a debate about university curriculum.⁹⁹

While I have been pointing out the way in which Hobbes was contributing to the victory of the new mechanico-materialist science in his quarrel with Bramhall, we might also, in conclusion, observe that he was simultaneously contributing to the even larger (and longer) early-modern process that saw the diminution of clerical authority, that is, the aggrandisement of the authority of the ‘scientific’ and ‘secular’ at the expense of the ‘religious’ and ‘spiritual’; the empowerment of the laity at the expense of the clergy. It would not be difficult to argue that Hobbes was the most powerful

conjectures regarding imperceptible causes’. Steven Nadler, ‘Doctrines of Explanation in Late Scholasticism and in the Mechanical Philosophy’ in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 522.

⁹⁵ Goldie, ‘Reception of Hobbes’, 594; in the same place Goldie notes the corollary that the ‘polemic against Hobbes might be summarised as the last gasp of scholastic Aristotelianism’.

⁹⁶ For Mersenne’s function and agenda, see Dear, *Mersenne and the Learning of the Schools*, 7.

⁹⁷ Another candidate would be the ‘Invisible College’ of London that began meeting in the middle of that decade.

⁹⁸ The more conventional view has been that these scientific organisations were successors of the periodic meetings at Oxford in the 1650s of such figures as John Wilkins, John Wallis, Seth Ward and Robert Boyle; this Oxford community was the immediate predecessor of the Royal Society of London. Debus, *Science and Education*, 43.

⁹⁹ The qualification ‘indirectly’ is motivated by the well-known fact that Hobbes’s universities- and curriculum-squabbles were much more with the Oxford dons he provoked, particularly Seth Ward and John Wallis. For these, see chapter 7, 217.

ant clerical warrior of the entire seventeenth century.¹⁰⁰ Of interest in this regard is Nicholas Jolley's suggestion that: 'Perhaps no philosopher was more concerned than Hobbes to safeguard the new philosophy from the encroachments of theology.'¹⁰¹ One of the points to which I have recurred throughout this book is that in implicitly assuming (or usurping) authority to pronounce on key and controversial issues of Christianity and government, Hobbes was, in spite of all his 'absolutism' (or quietism), performing a colossal act of self-authorisation. In writing and publishing as he did, in tacitly making the case that his own reason was superior to that of Bramhall and others, Hobbes was setting himself up as a Leviathan of Leviathans.¹⁰² In the 'declericalising' operation in which he was, in effect, shifting authority from a bishop, Hobbes was investing himself, a layman and scientist ('natural philosopher'), with considerable authority. We cannot know whether most of his contemporaries thought that Hobbes had won the quarrel; perhaps most of them thought that Bramhall had done so. But one might suppose that many of these contemporaries thought they were watching a layman ably, if not victoriously, battle a bishop on the latter's own turf – theology and scriptural interpretation. I would assert that in this way the public quarrel served to lessen the credibility and authority of anglican (if not, by extension, all) clergy. The quarrel might well have suggested to some that such clergy did not possess any more insight or wisdom than other men – even on such issues as the nature of God and the salvation of man. Bramhall argued that Hobbes was in error to the point of heresy or atheism; but did many of the bishop's contemporaries think so, or did they think, instead, that the layman, the philosopher, had exposed the absurdity and heresy ('popery') of the bishop's views? Hobbes argued in the debate itself (as well as in other published writings) that the clergy had no authority except that which was conferred on them by a civil sovereign. By displaying his prowess in the public duel did he show that the claim to some other authority – one from God or theological training at Oxbridge – was rather dubious or meaningless? If Bramhall had such an authority – say, a power *jure divino*, a supernatural gift *qua* apostolic successor – why couldn't he win the debate?

To some degree the authors of the anticlerical (anti-'priestcraft') diatribes and satire of the Restoration era were indebted to Hobbes for the pains

¹⁰⁰ Jeffrey Collins's *Allegiance of Hobbes* contains most or all of the elements that would appear in such a demonstration. See also Paul D. Cooke, *Hobbes and Christianity: Reassessing the Bible in Leviathan* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996), to which Collins and myself are somewhat indebted.

¹⁰¹ 'The Relation between Theology and Philosophy' in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 366.

¹⁰² See chapter 8.

(and pleasure) he took in confuting Bramhall.¹⁰³ In addition to *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes's *Of Liberty and Necessity* (1654) and *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance* (1656) showed the wits the way. The stinging harangues to which Hobbes subjected the 'lord bishop of Derry' in *Questions* were especially exemplary in this regard. In the Restoration era it was these latter books, the fruits, the succulently venomous fruits, of the quarrel with Bramhall, that seem to have inspired or guided the 'Hobbist' wits in their irreverent and irreligious essays and poems. It appears certain that Hobbes was a popular author in the 1660s, but for the philosopher's would-be readers the task of obtaining a copy of *Leviathan* was a hard and prohibitively expensive one.¹⁰⁴ In September 1668, for instance, Samuel Pepys complained that the price of second-hand copies of the book – it being 'mightily called for . . . [since] the Bishops will not let [it] be printed again' – was three times what it had been for a copy of the book at its original publication in 1651.¹⁰⁵ Amidst such scarcity, the philosopher's books against Bramhall were decent alternatives. In the case of the pamphlet-length *Of Liberty and Necessity*, as compared with *Leviathan*, there was also the convenience of smallness and portability.¹⁰⁶ Mark Goldie has very plausibly suggested that *Questions* may have been read more widely than Hobbes's major works.¹⁰⁷ When his contemporary and fellow political theorist James Harrington penned his high praise of Hobbes he referred specifically to the excellence of the latter's argument in debate with Bramhall – argument which he must have read in *Of Liberty and Necessity* and/or *Questions*.¹⁰⁸ If, as Clarendon

¹⁰³ For a brief description of this literature, see Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 219–28, and for the less satirical Hobbesian anticlerical discourse, Justin A. I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), esp. 133–7, 160–1, 173–86.

¹⁰⁴ It is true that the popularity of Hobbes (and similar authors) has been somewhat exaggerated in the past. While Spurr has noted that Hobbes's writings were 'in vogue', he also points out that those and similar philosophical writings (e.g., those of Descartes) 'did not crowd out works by clerical authors or on religious subjects'. *Restoration Church*, 229. Some of Bramhall's writings of the 1650s, for example, were re-published in the 1660s and in 1676 an edition of his complete works was published in Dublin.

¹⁰⁵ 3 September 1668, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews (London: Bell and Hyman, 1970–83; 11 vols.), ix, 298.

¹⁰⁶ See Macdonald and Hargreaves, *Hobbes Bibliography*, for description of editions of *OLN* and *Questions*.

¹⁰⁷ 'Reception of Hobbes', 607. Suggestive in this regard is the fact that in a book published in 1680, *The Character of a Town Gallant*, it was remarked that the common 'Hobbist' frequenting the coffee-houses had never read *Lev*. Quoted in Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 260.

¹⁰⁸ 'Nevertheless in most other things I firmly believe that Mr Hobbes is, and will in future ages be accounted the best writer, at this day, in the world. And for his treatises of human nature, and of liberty and necessity, they are the greatest of new lights, and those which I have followed, and shall follow.' *Prerogative of Popular Government*, Bk. 1, ch. 7, in *Political Works of James Harrington*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 423; emphasis added.

claimed, Hobbes had ‘too many disciples’ at the court of Charles II, some of them might have been converted not by *Leviathan* but by those other, Bramhall-induced, books.¹⁰⁹ At all events, if the 1660s and 1670s saw the growth of a ‘cult of “wit”, of intellectual scepticism and fashionable scoffing at religion’, Hobbes’s polemic against the bishop may be regarded as some of its richest soil.¹¹⁰ Meanwhile, as the latter was now resting in his grave, Bramhall’s clerical colleagues would have to weed the garden without him.

¹⁰⁹ *Brief View*, 9. ¹¹⁰ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 68–9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

MANUSCRIPTS AND UNPUBLISHED TRANSCRIPTS

- BL Additional 4274, f. 137. Bramhall to Richard Browne, 4 Jan. 1648 (N.S.).
- BL Additional 33118, f. 364. Grant of Bramhall's forfeited estate of Castletown Moylagh [1656].
- BL Egerton 1910. Hobbes, *Leviathan* fair copy.
- BL Harleian 6207, ff. 71–101v. Hobbes, 'Treatise' [20 Aug. 1645].
- BL Harleian 6942. Correspondence of Sheldon, Payne, Hammond, Bramhall, et al.
- BL Sloane 1012, ff. 1–16. Bramhall, 'Discourse' [1645].
- BL Sloane 1012, ff. 117–164. Bramhall, 'Vindication' [ca. 1646].
- Ripon Cathedral Registers, North Yorkshire County Record Office (Northallerton), Transcript.

PRINTED

- Aubrey, John. *Brief Lives, Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, Between the Years 1669 & 1696*, ed. Andrew Clark. Oxford, 1898. 2 vols.
- . *Aubrey's Brief Lives*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick. Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Baillie, Robert. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, ed. David Laing. Edinburgh: R. Ogle, 1841–2. 3 vols.
- Barwick, Peter. *The Life of Dr John Barwick, Dean of St Paul's*, trans. Hilkieah Bedford; ed. G. F. Barwick. London: E. E. Robinson & Co., 1903.
- Berwick, Edward, ed. *The Rawdon Papers, consisting of Letters on Various Subjects, Literary, Political, and Ecclesiastical, to and from Dr John Bramhall, Primate of Ireland, including the Correspondence of Several Most Eminent Men During the Greater Part of the Seventeenth Century*. London and Dublin: John Nichols and Son and R. Milliken, 1819.
- Birch, Thomas, ed. *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*. London, 1742. 7 vols.
- Bramhall, John. *A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of York before Hi[s] Excellence the Earle of Newcastle and many of the prime nobility and gentry of the northerne counties : at the publick thanksgiving to Almighty God for the late great victory upon Fryday, June 30, 1643, and the reducement of the west parts of Yorkeshire to obedience*. York: Stephen Bulkley, 1643. Wing B 4233.

- . *A sermon preached in Yorke Minster, before his Excellence the Marques of Newcastle, being then ready to meet the Scotch Army, January 28. 1643. By the Bishop of Derry. Published by special command.* York: Stephen Bulkeley, 1643 [1644]. Wing B 4234.
- . *The serpent-salve, or, A remedie for the biting of an aspe wherein the observatores grounds are discussed and plainly discovered to be unsound, seditious, not warranted by the laws of God, of nature, or of nations, and most repugnant to the known laws and customs of this realm : for the reducing of such of His Majesties well-meaning subjects into the right way who have been mis-led by that ignis fatuus.* [S.l. : s.n.], 1643 [1644]. Wing B 4236.
- . *A Defence of True Liberty from Antecedent and Extrinsic Necessity, being an answer to a late book of Mr. Thomas Hobbs of Malmsbury, intituled, A Treatise of Liberty and Necessity.* London, for John Crook, 1655. Reprint of the copy in Lincoln Cathedral Library, with a note by Gamini Salgado. West Germany: Gregg International Publishers, 1971.
- . *Castigations of Mr Hobbes his last Animadversions, in the Case concerning Liberty, and Universal Necessity.* London, 1657 [1658]. Wing B 4214.
- . *The Catching of Leviathan, or the Great Whale.* London, 1658. Wing B 4215.
- . *Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D. D., late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland,* ed. John Vesey. Dublin, 1676.
- . *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall,* ed. A. W. Haddan. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842–5. 5 vols.
- Burnet, Gilbert. *History of His Own Time,* ed. Martin Joseph Routh. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833. (First pub. 1723, 1734)
- Burton, Thomas. *Diary of Thomas Burton,* ed. John T. Rutt. London: 1824. 4 vols.
- Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library,* eds. O. Ogle, W. H. Bliss, W. D. Macray and F. J. Routledge. Oxford: Clarendon, 1869–1970. 5 vols.
- Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding,* ed. Mary Anne Everett Green. London, 1889–92. 5 vols.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1640–1675,* ed. M. A. E. Green. London, 1875–86.
- Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1603–1675,* eds. C. W. Russell, J. P. Prendergast and R. P. Mahaffy. London, 1870–1910.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* trans. Ford Lewis Battles, ed. John T. McNeill. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960. 2 vols.
- Carte, Thomas, ed. *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers, concerning the Affairs of England, from the Year 1641 to 1660, found among the Duke of Ormonde's Papers.* London: James Bettenham, 1739. 2 vols.
- Cavendish, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle. *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, to which is added the True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life.* London: A. Maxwell, 1667; ed. Charles H. Firth: 2nd rev. edn: London: Routledge and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton, n.d.
- . *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions.* London: J. Martin and J. Allestrye, 1655.
- Cavendish, William, Duke of Newcastle. *An Answer of the Right Honourable the Earle of Newcastle His Excellency; to the six groundlesse aspersions cast upon him by the Lord Faifax, in his late Warrant bearing Date Feb. 2 1642 [1643].* York; repr. Oxford: H. H. 1642 [1643].

- , *Ideology and Politics on the Eve of Restoration: Newcastle's Advice to Charles II*, ed. Thomas P. Slaughter. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984.
- Charles I. *Charles I in 1646: Letters of King Charles the First to Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. John Bruce. Camden Society, vol. LXIII. London: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1856.
- , *The Letters, Speeches, and Proclamations of King Charles I*, ed. Charles Petrie. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1935, 1968.
- Charles II. *The Letters, Speeches, and Declarations of Charles II*, ed. Arthur Bryant. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968.
- Commons Debates for 1629*, eds. Wallace Notestein and Francis Relf. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921.
- Cooper, J. P., eds. *The Wentworth Papers, 1597–1628*. Camden Society, 4th ser., XII, 1973.
- Descartes, René. *Oeuvres de Descartes*, eds. Charles Adam and Paul Tannery. Paris: J. Vrin, 1996. 11 vols.
- , *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, eds. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. 2 vols.
- Duppa, Brian, and Sir Justinian Isham. *The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham, 1650–1660*, ed. Sir Gyles Isham. Northampton: Northamptonshire Record Society, Publication No. 17, 1955.
- Ellis, Henry, ed. *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*. London: Harding and Lepard, 1827. 4 vols.
- Evelyn, John. *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S., to which is subjoined The Private Correspondence between King Charles I and Sir Edward Nicholas and between Sir Edward Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon and Sir Richard Browne*, ed. William Bray. London: George Bell and Sons, 1906. 4 vols.
- Fanshawe, Ann. *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*, ed. John Loftis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*. Suffolk: Boydell, 1994. 2 vols.
- Fowler, J. T., ed. *Memorials of the Church SS. Peter and Wilfrid, Ripon*. Surtees Society, Vols. LXXIV, LXXVIII, LXXXI, CXV. Durham: Andrews and Co., 1882–1908.
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, ed. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- Harrington, James. *The Political Works of James Harrington*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Henrietta Maria. *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green. London: Richard Bentley, 1857.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K. P., preserved at Kilkenny Castle*, New Series, vol. I, ed. C. Litton Falkiner. London: Mackie and Co., 1902.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (12), Appendix, Part II, on the Manuscripts of Earl Couper, K. G., preserved at Melbourne Hall, Derbyshire*, vol. II. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (13) on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, vol. III, ed. Richard Ward. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894.

- Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (14), Appendix, Part VII: The Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, preserved at the Castle, Kilkenny*, vol. 1, ed. John T. Gilbert. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission Report (78) on the Manuscripts of the late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, Esq., of the Manor House, Ashby de la Zouch*, vol. IV, ed. Francis Bickley. London: HMSO, 1947.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission Report on the Pepys Manuscripts, preserved at Magdalene College, Cambridge*, ed. E. K. Purnell. London: HMSO, 1911.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *A Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student, of the Common Laws of England*, ed. Joseph Cropsey. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, ed. Ferdinand Toennies (1889); intro. Stephen Holmes. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- *Critique du 'De Mundo' de Thomas White*, ed. Jean Jacquot and H. W. Jones. Paris: Vrin, 1973.
- *De Cive: The English Version*, ed. Howard Warrender. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.
- *De Cive: The Latin Version*, ed. Howard Warrender. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.
- *De Cive: On the Citizen*, trans. Michael Silverthorne, ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- *Leviathan*, ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- *Leviathan*, ed. Edwin Curley. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994.
- *Of Libertie and Necessitie: A Treatise, Wherein All Controversy Concerning Predestination, Election, Free-Will, Grace, Merits, Reprobation, &c is fully decided and cleared; in answer to a treatise written by the Bishop of Londonderry, on the same subject*. London, 1654. Wing 942:19.
- *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Noel Malcolm. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994. 2 vols.
- *The Elements of Law: Natural and Politic*, ed. J. C. A. Gaskin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*, ed. William Molesworth. London: J. Bohn, 1839–45. 11 vols.
- *Thomae Hobbes Malmesburiensis Opera Philosophica quae Latine scripsit omnia*, ed. William Molesworth. London: J. Bohn, 1839–45. 5 vols.
- *Thomas White's 'De Mundo' Examined*, trans. by H. W. Jones. London: Bradford University Press, 1976.
- Huygens, Loedwijk. *The English Journal, 1651–1652*, eds. and trans. A. G. H. Bachrach and R. G. Collmer. Publications of the Sir Thomas Browne Institute. Leiden: E. J. Brill/Leiden University Press, 1992.
- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon. *A Brief View and Survey of the Dangerous and Pernicious Errors to Church and State, in Mr Hobbes's Book Entitled Leviathan*. Oxford, 1676. Wing C 4420.
- *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. D. Macray. Oxford: Clarendon, 1888. 6 vols.
- James, Montague Rhodes, ed. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.
- Kenyon, J. P., ed. *The Stuart Constitution*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Laud, William. *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud*, eds. J. Bliss and W. Scott. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847–60. 7 vols.

- Leslie, John, sixth Earl of Rothes. *A Relation of Proceedings concerning the Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland, from August 1637 to July 1638*, ed. David Laing. Edinburgh: Ballantyne, 1830.
- Livingstone, John. *A Brief Historical Relation of the Life of Mr John Livingstone, Minister of the Gospel*, ed. Thomas Houston. London: J. Johnstone, 1848.
- Loftus, Dudley. *Oratio Funebris Habita Post Exuvias Nuperi Reverendissimi in Christo Patris Johannis Archiepiscopi Armachani, Totius Hiberniae Primatis & Metropolitanani, terrae mandatas xvi Die Julii 1663*. Dublin: John Crook, 1663.
- Milward, John. *The Diary of John Milward*, ed. Caroline Robbins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Nicholas, Sir Edward. *The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State*, ed. G. F. Warner. Camden Society, 1886–1920. 4 vols.
- Pell, John, and Sir Charles Cavendish. *John Pell (1611–1685) and His Correspondence with Sir Charles Cavendish: The Mental World of an Early Modern Mathematician*, eds. Noel Malcolm and Jacqueline Stedall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews. London: Bell and Hyman, 1970–83. 11 vols.
- Pope, Walter. *The Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, Seth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury*. London, 1697.
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections*. London, 1659–1701. 7 vols.
- Selden, John. *The Table Talk of John Selden*, ed. Frederick Pollock. London: Quaritch, 1927.
- Skaife, Robert H., ed. ‘The Register of Burials in York Minster, Accompanied by Monumental Inscriptions, and Illustrated with Biographical Notices’, *The Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* I (1870): 226–330.
- Sorbière, Samuel. *Relation d’Un Voyage en Angleterre, où sont touchées plusieurs choses, qui regardent l’estat des sciences, et de la religion, et autres matières curieuses*. Paris, 1664.
- Taylor, Jeremy. *A Sermon preached in Christ’s Church, Dublin, July 16, 1663; At the funeral of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland*, xxxix–lxxvi in BW, I.
- Thornton, Alice. *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton, of East Newton, Co. York*. Surtees Society, vol. LXII. Durham: Andrews and Co., 1875.
- Vesey, John. ‘Athanasius Hibernicus: or, The Life of the Most Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland’, i–xliv in *Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D., late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland*. Dublin, 1676.
- Walker, Edward. *Historical Discourses*. London, 1705.
- Wandesford, Christopher. *A Book of Instructions, written by the Right Honourable Sir Christopher Wandesforde, Knt. . . . to his son and heir, George Wandesforde, Esq; in order to the regulating the conduct of his whole life*, ed. Thomas Comber. Cambridge, 1777.
- Wentworth, Thomas, Earl of Strafford. *The Earl of Strafforde’s Letters and Dispatches*, ed. William Knowler. London: W. Bowyer, 1739. 2 vols.
- Williams, William P. ‘Eight unpublished letters by Jeremy Taylor’, *Anglican Theological Review* 58, 2 (1976): 179–93.

- Wing, Donald, ed. *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England . . . 1641–1700*, 2nd edn. New York: Index Committee of the Modern Language Association of America, 1972–88.
- Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses (1691–1693)*, ed. Philip Bliss. London: 1813–20. 4 vols.
- . *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. Andrew Clark. Oxford: Clarendon, 1891–1900. 5 vols.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbott, William M. 'The Issue of Episcopacy in the Long Parliament, 1640–1648: The Reasons for Abolition.' PhD thesis, Oxford University, 1981.
- . 'James Ussher and "Ussherian" Episcopacy, 1640–1656: the Primate and his Reduction Manuscript', *Albion* 22 (1990): 237–59.
- Allan, David. "'An Ancient Sage Philosopher": Alexander Ross and the Defence of Philosophy', *Seventeenth Century* 16, 1 (Apr. 2001): 68–94.
- Allen, J. W. *English Political Thought: 1603 to 1660, vol. 1, 1603–1644*. London: Methuen, 1938.
- Ariew, Roger, and Marjorie Grene, eds. *Descartes and His Contemporaries: Meditations, Objections, and Replies*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Armstrong, Robert. 'Protestant Churchmen and the Confederate Wars' in *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 230–51.
- Atherton, Ian. *Ambition and Failure in Stuart England: The Career of John, First Viscount Scudamore*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Aylmer, Gerald E. *The King's Servants: The Civil Service of Charles I, 1625–1642*. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
- Aylmer, Gerald E., ed. *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646–1660*. London: Macmillan, 1972.
- Bagwell, Richard. *Ireland under the Stuarts and during the Interregnum*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909–16. 3 vols.
- Baigrie, Brian. 'The New Science: Kepler, Galileo, Mersenne' in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, 45–59.
- Barnard, Toby, and Jane Fenlon, eds. *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610–1745*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.
- Baumgold, Deborah. 'The Composition of Hobbes's *Elements of Law*', *History of Political Thought* 25, 1 (2004): 16–43.
- Beats, Lynn. 'Politics and Government in Derbyshire, 1640–1660.' PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1978.
- Beaulieu, Armand. 'Les Relations de Hobbes et de Mersenne' in *Thomas Hobbes: Philosophie Première, Théorie de la Science et Politique*, eds. Yves-Charles Zarka and Jean Bernhardt. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990.
- Beckett, J. C. *The Cavalier Duke: A Life of James Butler, 1st Duke of Ormond*. Belfast: Pretani, 1990.

- Beddard, Robert A. 'The Restoration Church' in *The Restored Monarchy, 1660–1688*, ed. J. R. Jones. Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979, 155–75.
- Bennett, Martyn. *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638–1651*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Bickley, Francis. *The Cavendish Family*. London: Constable and Co., 1911.
- Bornkamm, Heinrich. *Luther in Mid-Career, 1521–1530*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Bosher, Robert S. *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649–1662*. London: Dacre, 1951.
- Bostrenghi, Daniela, ed. *Hobbes e Spinoza: Scienza e Politica*. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1992.
- Bowle, John. *Hobbes and His Critics: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Constitutionalism*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1951.
- Brady, Ciaran, and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds. *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Brandt, Frithiof. *Hobbes's Mechanical Conception of Nature*. Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1928.
- Burgess, Glenn. 'Contexts for the Writing and Publication of Hobbes's *Leviathan*', *History of Political Thought* 11, 4 (Winter 1990): 675–702.
- . *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Burns, J. H., ed., with the assistance of Mark Goldie. *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Canny, Nicholas. *Making Ireland British, 1580–1650*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Capern, Amanda L. 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension', *Historical Journal* 39, 1 (1996): 57–85.
- Carte, Thomas. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormond*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon, 1851. 6 vols.
- Champion, Justin A. I. *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660–1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . 'Political Thinking between Restoration and Hanoverian Succession' in *Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003, 474–91.
- Chapman, Hester W. *The Tragedy of Charles II in the Years 1630–1660*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.
- Chappell, Vere, ed. *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Clarke, Aidan. 'The 1641 Rebellion and Anti-Popery in Ireland' in *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, ed. Brian Mac Cuarta. Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1997, 139–57.
- Cliffe, John Trevor. *The Yorkshire Gentry: From the Reformation to the Civil War*. London: University of London Press/Athlone Press, 1969.
- Clucas, Stephen. 'The Atomism of the Cavendish Circle: A Reappraisal', *Seventeenth Century* 9, 2 (1994): 247–73.
- Collins, Jeffrey R. 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy', *Church History* 68, 3 (Sept. 1999): 549–80.
- . 'Christian Ecclesiology and the Composition of *Leviathan*: A Newly Discovered Letter to Thomas Hobbes', *Historical Journal* 43, 1 (2000): 217–31.
- . *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Collins, W. E. 'John Bramhall, 1594–1663' in *Typical English Churchmen from Parker to Maurice*, ed. W. E. Collins. London: SPCK, 1902, 81–119.
- Comber, Thomas. *Memoirs of the Life and Death of the Right Honourable The Lord Deputy Wandesforde, by his great grandson, Thomas Comber*. Cambridge, 1778.
- Condren, Conal. 'Confronting the Monster: George Lawson's Reactions to Hobbes's *Leviathan*', *Political Science* 40, 1 (July 1988): 67–83.
- Cooke, Paul D. *Hobbes and Christianity: Reassessing the Bible in Leviathan*. Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996.
- Corbett, Margery, and Ronald Lightbrown. *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-page in England, 1550–1660*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Costello, William T. *The Scholastic Curriculum in Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Cotton, Henry. *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae: The Succession of the Prelates and Members of the Cathedral Bodies in Ireland*. Dublin: Hodges, 1848–78. 6 vols.
- Coward, Barry, ed. *A Companion to Stuart Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Cranston, Maurice. 'John Locke and John Aubrey', *Notes and Queries* 197 (1952): 383–4.
- Cranston, Maurice, and Richard S. Peters, eds. *Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Garden City: Anchor, 1972.
- Cregan, Donal F. 'Daniel O'Neill, a Royalist Agent in Ireland, 1644–1650', *Irish Historical Studies* 2, 8 (Sept. 1941).
- . 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', *Studia Hibernica* 3 (1963): 60–100.
- . 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in Exile and Restoration, 1651–1664', *Studia Hibernica* 5 (1965): 42–76.
- . 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in the Civil Wars, 1642–51', *Studia Hibernica* 4 (1965): 104–33.
- Cross, Claire. *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church*. London: Allen and Unwin; New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969.
- . 'The Church in England, 1646–1660' in *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646–1660*, ed. G. E. Aylmer. London: Macmillan, 1972, 99–120.
- . 'Churchmen and the Royal Supremacy' in *Church and Society in England: Henry VIII–James I*, eds. Felicity Heal and Rosemary O'Day. Hamden: Archon, 1977, 15–34.
- Curley, Edwin. "'I Durst Not Write So Boldly": How to Read Hobbes's *Theological-Political Treatise*' in *Hobbes e Spinoza: Scienza e Politica*, ed. Daniela Bostrenghi. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1992, 497–594.
- . 'Calvin and Hobbes, or Hobbes as an Orthodox Christian', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 34 (1996): 257–71.
- Curran, Eleanor. 'A Very Peculiar Royalist: Hobbes in the Context of His Political Contemporaries', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 10, 2 (2002): 167–208.
- Daly, James W. 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation', *Journal of British Studies* 11 (1971): 26–44.
- . 'The Idea of Absolute Monarchy', *Historical Journal* 21 (1978): 227–50.
- . *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- . 'The Implications of Royalist Politics, 1642–1646', *Historical Journal* 27, 3 (Sept. 1984): 745–55.

- Damrosch, Leopold, Jr. 'Hobbes as Reformation Theologian: Implications of the Freewill Controversy', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40 (1979): 339–52.
- Davies, E. T. *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1950.
- Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Davis, J. C. 'Political Thought during the English Revolution' in *Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003, 374–96.
- Dear, Peter. *Mersenne and the Learning of the Schools*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Debus, Allen G. *Science and Education in Seventeenth-Century England: The Webster-Ward Debate*. London: Macdonald; New York: American Elsevier, 1970.
- Dictionary of National Biography*, eds. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 63 vols. London, 1885–1900.
- Doyle, William. *Jansenism: Catholic Resistance to Authority from the Reformation to the French Revolution*. New York: St Martin's, 2000.
- Dzelzainis, Martin. 'Edward Hyde and Thomas Hobbes's *Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*', *Historical Journal* 32, 2 (1989): 303–17.
- Feingold, Mordechai. 'A Friend of Hobbes and an Early Translator of Galileo: Robert Payne of Oxford' in *The Light of Nature: Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science presented to A. C. Crombie*, eds. J. D. North and J. J. Roche. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985, 265–80.
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake. 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I' in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993, 23–49.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *The Outbreak of the English Civil War*. New York and London: New York University Press, 1981.
- Ford, Alan. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590–1641*. Frankfurt, 1985.
- . 'Dependent or Independent? The Church of Ireland and Its Colonial Context, 1536–1649', *Seventeenth Century* 10, 2 (1995): 163–87.
- Ford, Alan, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne, eds. *As By Law Established: The Irish Church since the Reformation*. Dublin: Lilliput, 1995.
- . 'The Church of Ireland, 1558–1634: A Puritan Church?' in *As By Law Established: The Irish Church since the Reformation*, eds. Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne. Dublin: Lilliput, 1995, 52–68.
- . '"That Bugbear Arminianism": Archbishop Laud and Trinity College, Dublin' in *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 135–60.
- Garber, Daniel, and Michael Ayers, eds. *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 2 vols.
- Garber, Daniel, John Henry, Lynn Joy and Alan Gabbey. 'New Doctrines of Body and its Powers, Place, and Space' in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 553–623.
- Geyl, Pieter. *Orange and Stuart, 1641–1672*, trans. Arnold Pomerans. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

- Gillespie, Raymond. 'The Religion of the first Duke of Ormond' in *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610–1745*, eds. Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000, 101–13.
- Goldie, Mark. 'The Reception of Hobbes' in *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 589–615.
- Goldsmith, M. M. 'Hobbes's Ambiguous Politics', *History of Political Thought* 11, 4 (Winter 1990): 639–73.
- Green, Ian M. *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660–1663*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Greengrass, Mark, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor, eds. *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Greer, D. S., and N. M. Dawson, eds. *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History: Irish Legal History Society Discourses and Other Papers, 1996–1999*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2001.
- Groenveld, Simon. 'The House of Orange and the House of Stuart, 1639–1650: A Revision', *Historical Journal* 34, 4 (1991): 955–72.
- Haggbloom, Steven J., Renee Warnick, et al. 'The 100 Most Eminent Psychologists of the 20th Century', *Review of General Psychology* 6, 2 (2002): 139–52.
- Hampton, Jean. *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Hardacre, Paul H. *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956.
- Harris, James A. *Of Liberty and Necessity: The Free Will Debate in Eighteenth-Century Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.
- Harrison, A. W. *The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort*. London: University of London Press, 1926.
- Hayward, J. C. 'New Directions in Studies of the Falkland Circle', *Seventeenth Century* 2 (1987): 19–48.
- Head, R. E. *Royal Supremacy and the Trials of Bishops, 1558–1725*. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Heal, Felicity. 'Economic Problems of the Clergy' in *Church and Society in England, Henry VIII–James I*, eds. Felicity Heal and Rosemary O'Day. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1977, 99–118.
- . *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Heal, Felicity, and Rosemary O'Day, eds. *Church and Society in England, Henry VIII–James I*. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1977.
- Hervey, Helen. 'Hobbes and Descartes in the Light of Some Unpublished Letters of the Correspondence between Sir Charles Cavendish and Dr John Pell', *Osiris* 10 (1952): 67–90.
- Hill, Christopher. *Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.
- Hoekstra, Kinch. 'The De Facto Turn in Hobbes's Political Philosophy' in *Leviathan after 350 Years*, eds. Tom Sorell and Luc Foisneau. Oxford: Clarendon, 2004, 33–73.
- Hook, David. 'John Davies of Kidwelly: A Neglected Literary Figure of the Seventeenth Century', *Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 11 (1975): 104–24.

- Howell, Roger, Jr. *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution: A Study of the Civil War in North England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Hunter, Michael, and David Wooton, eds. *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Hutton, Ronald. *The Royalist War Effort, 1642–1646*. London and New York: Longman, 1982.
- . *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658–1667*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- . *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.
- . 'The Religion of Charles II' in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 228–46.
- . *Debates in Stuart History*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Jackson, Nicholas D. 'Hobbes vs Bramhall: An Uncivil War, 1645–1668', PhD thesis, Syracuse University, 2005.
- Jacob, James R. *Henry Stubbe: Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Jacob, James R., and Timothy Taylor. 'Opera and Obedience: Thomas Hobbes and A Proposition for Advancement of Moralitie by Sir William Davenant', *Seventeenth Century* 6 (1991): 215–25.
- Jacquot, Jean. 'Sir Charles Cavendish and His Learned Friends: Before the Civil War', *Annals of Science* 8, 1 (1952): 13–27.
- . 'Sir Charles Cavendish and His Learned Friends: The Years of Exile', *Annals of Science* 8, 2 (1952): 175–91.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.
- Jesseph, Douglas M. *Squaring the Circle: The War between Hobbes and Wallis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- . 'Galileo, Hobbes, and the Book of Nature', *Perspectives on Science* 12, 2 (2004): 191–211.
- Jolley, Nicholas. 'The Relation between Theology and Philosophy' in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 363–92.
- Jones, J. R. *Britain and Europe in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1966.
- Jones, J. R., ed. *The Restored Monarchy, 1660–1688*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979.
- Kane, Robert, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Kargon, Robert Hugh. *Atomism in England from Harriot to Newton*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- Kearney, Hugh F. *Strafford in Ireland, 1633–1641: A Study in Absolutism*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Kilroy, Phil. 'Protestantism in Ulster, 1610–1641' in *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, ed. Brian Mac Cuarta. Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1997, 25–36.
- Knox, R. Buick. *James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967.

- Lake, Peter. 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635', *Past and Present* 114 (Feb. 1987): 32–76.
- . 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s' in *The Early Stuart Church*, ed. Kenneth Fincham. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993, 161–85.
- Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier, eds. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.
- Lessay, Franck. 'Hobbes's Protestantism' in *Leviathan after 350 Years*, eds. Tom Sorell and Luc Foisneau. Oxford: Clarendon, 2004, 265–94.
- Little, Patrick. 'The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645–1647' in *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610–1745*, eds. Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000, 83–99.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Mac Cuarta, Brian, ed. *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, rev. edn. Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1997.
- Macdonald, Hugh, and Mary Hargreaves, eds. *Thomas Hobbes: A Bibliography*. London: Bibliographical Society, 1952.
- MacGillivray, Royce. 'Thomas Hobbes's History of the English Civil War: A Study of *Behemoth*', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31 (1970): 179–98.
- . *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974.
- Macinnes, Allan I., and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds. *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2002.
- Malcolm, Noel. 'Hobbes, Sandys, and the Virginia Company', *Historical Journal* 24, 2 (1981): 297–321.
- . 'Thomas Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology.' PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1982.
- . 'Hobbes and Spinoza' in *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 530–57.
- . 'A Summary Biography of Hobbes' in *Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. Tom Sorell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 13–44.
- . 'Charles Cotton, Translator of Hobbes's *De Cive*', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61, 2 (1998/2000): 259–87.
- . *Aspects of Hobbes*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- . '*Behemoth Latinus*: Adam Ebert, Tacitism, and Hobbes', *Filozofski vestnik* 24, 2 (2003): 85–120.
- Marchant, Ronald A. *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560–1642*. London: Longmans, 1960.
- Martinich, A. P. *The Two Gods of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes on Religion and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . *Hobbes: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Matthew, H. C. G., and B. H. Harrison, eds. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 60 vols.
- McCafferty, John. 'John Bramhall and the Church of Ireland in the 1630s' in *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, eds. Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne. Dublin: Lilliput, 1995, 100–11.
- . 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland, 1633–1641.' PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1996.

- . “‘God bless your free Church of Ireland’: Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall and the Irish Convocation of 1634’ in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641*, ed. Julia F. Merritt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 187–208.
- . “‘To follow the late precedents of England’: The Irish Impeachment Proceedings of 1641’ in *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History: Irish Legal History Society Discourses and Other Papers, 1996–1999*, eds. D. S. Greer and N. M. Dawson. Dublin: Four Courts, 2001, 51–72.
- . ‘When Reformations Collide’ in *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century*, eds. Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer. Dublin: Four Courts, 2002, 186–203.
- McGuire, James. ‘Policy and Patronage: The Appointment of Bishops, 1660–1661’ in *As By Law Established: The Irish Church Since the Reformation*, eds. Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne. Dublin: Lilliput, 1995, 112–19.
- Mendle, Michael. *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions*. University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1985.
- . *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public’s ‘Privado’*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Menn, Stephen. ‘The Intellectual Setting’ in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 33–86.
- Merritt, Julia F., ed. *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Metzger, Hans-Dieter. *Thomas Hobbes und die Englische Revolution, 1640–1660*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1991.
- Miller, Leo. *John Milton and the Oldenburg Safeguard: New Light on Milton and His Friends in the Commonwealth from the Diaries and Letters of Hermann Mylius, Agonist in the Early History of Modern Diplomacy*. New York: Loewenthal, 1985.
- Milton, Philip. ‘Hobbes, Heresy, and Lord Arlington’, *History of Political Thought* 14, 4 (Winter 1993): 501–46.
- Mintz, Samuel I. *The Hunting of Leviathan: Seventeenth-Century Reactions to the Materialism and Moral Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Moody, T. W., F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne, eds. *A New History of Ireland*, vol. III: *Early Modern Ireland, 1534–1691*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Morrill, John. *The Nature of the English Revolution*. London: Longman, 1993.
- Nadler, Steven. ‘Doctrines of Explanation in Late Scholasticism and in the Mechanical Philosophy’ in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 513–52.
- Nadler, Steven, ed. *A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Nauta, Lodi. ‘Hobbes on Religion and the Church between *The Elements of Law* and *Leviathan*: A Dramatic Change of Direction?’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63, 4 (2002): 577–98.
- Newman, P. R. *The Old Service: Royalist Regimental Colonels and the Civil War, 1642–1646*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

- North, J. D., and J. J. Roche, eds. *The Light of Nature: Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science presented to A. C. Crombie*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985.
- Ohlmeyer, Jane. *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell, Marquis of Antrim, 1609–1683*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . ‘The Irish Peers, Political Power and Parliament, 1640–1641’ in *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 161–85.
- Ollard, Richard. *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II*. New York: Atheneum, 1979.
- . *Clarendon and His Friends*. New York: Atheneum, 1988.
- Orr, D. Alan. ‘Sovereignty, Supremacy and the Origins of the English Civil War’, *History* 87, 288 (2002): 474–90.
- Overhoff, Jurgen. ‘The Lutheranism of Thomas Hobbes’, *History of Political Thought* 18, 4 (1997): 604–23.
- . ‘The Theology of Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan*’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51, 3 (July 2000): 527–55.
- . *Hobbes’s Theory of the Will: Ideological Reasons and Historical Circumstances*. Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.
- Parkin, Jon. ‘Taming the Leviathan: Reading Hobbes in Seventeenth-Century Europe’, *International Archives of the History of Ideas* 186 (2003): 31–52.
- Parry, J. P., and Stephen Taylor, eds. *Parliament and the Church, 1529–1960*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- Peacey, Jason T. ‘Order and Disorder in Europe: Parliamentary Agents and Royalist Thugs, 1649–1650’, *Historical Journal* 40, 4 (1997): 953–76.
- . ‘Nibbling at *Leviathan*: Politics and Theory in England in the 1650s’, *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61, 2 (1998/2000): 241–57.
- . *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- Pearson, John. *Stags and Serpents: The Story of the House of Cavendish and the Dukes of Devonshire*. London: Macmillan, 1983.
- Pebworth, Ted-Larry, and Claude J. Summers, eds. *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2000.
- Perceval-Maxwell, Michael. *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- . *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University, 1994.
- Pink, Thomas. *Free Will: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . ‘Suarez, Hobbes and the Scholastic Tradition in Action Theory’ in *The Will and Human Action: from Antiquity to the Present Day*, eds. M. W. F. Stone and Thomas Pink. London: Routledge, 2004, 127–53.
- Pocock, J. G. A., and Gordon J. Schochet. ‘Interregnum and Restoration’ in *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800*, eds. J. G. A. Pocock, Gordon Schochet and Lois Schwoerer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 146–79.
- Pocock, J. G. A., Gordon Schochet and Lois Schwoerer, eds. *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Porter, H. C. *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- Prior, Charles W. A. *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603–1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Pullein, Catharine. *The Pulleyns of Yorkshire*. Leeds: J. Whitehead and Son, 1915.
- Questier, Michael C. *Conversion, Politics, and Religion in England, 1580–1621*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Raylor, Timothy. 'Newcastle's Ghosts: Robert Payne, Ben Jonson, and the "Cavendish Circle"' in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*, eds. Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000, 92–114.
- . 'Thomas Hobbes and "The Mathematical Demonstration of the Sword"', *Seventeenth Century* 15, 2 (2000): 175–98.
- . 'Hobbes, Payne, and A *Short Tract on First Principles*', *Historical Journal* 44, 1 (March 2001): 29–58.
- Robertson, George Croom. *Hobbes*. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood, 1886.
- Rogow, Arnold A. *Thomas Hobbes: Radical in the Service of Reaction*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1986.
- Russell, Conrad. 'The First Army Plot of 1641', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 38 (1988): 85–106.
- . *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- . 'Whose Supremacy? King, Parliament, and the Church, 1530–1640,' *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 4, 21 (July 1997): 700–8.
- . 'Parliament, the Royal Supremacy and the Church' in *Parliament and the Church, 1529–1960*, eds. J. P. Parry and Stephen Taylor. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000, 27–37.
- Salmon, J. H. M. 'Catholic Resistance Theory, Ultramontaniam, and the Royalist Response, 1580–1620' in *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700*, ed. J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 219–53.
- Sanderson, John. 'Serpent-Salve, 1643: The Royalism of John Bramhall', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 25 (1974): 1–14.
- . *But the People's Creatures': The Philosophical Basis of the English Civil War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Sarasohn, Lisa T. 'Motion and Morality: Pierre Gassendi, Thomas Hobbes and the Mechanical World-View', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985): 363–80.
- . 'Thomas Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle: A Study in the Mutuality of Patronage before the Establishment of the Royal Society', *Isis* 90, 4 (1999): 715–37.
- . 'Was *Leviathan* a Patronage Artifact?' *History of Political Thought* 21, 4 (Winter 2000): 606–31.
- Schochet, Gordon J. *The Authoritarian Family and Political Attitudes in Seventeenth-Century England: Patriarchalism in Political Thought*. New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction, 1988.
- Schuhmann, Karl. *Hobbes: Une Chronique: cheminement de sa pensée et de sa vie*. Paris: Vrin, 1998.
- Schwartz, Hillel. 'Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624–1629', *Journal of British Studies* 12, 2 (1973): 41–68.
- Seaward, Paul. *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- . 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism', *Historical Journal* 40, 1 (1997): 227–39.
- Sedgwick, Alexander. *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France: Voices from the Wilderness*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1977.
- Shapin, Steven, and Simon Schaffer. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. Yale and London: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Shaw, William A. *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640–1660*. London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., 1900. 2 vols.
- Simms, J. G. 'The Restoration, 1660–1685' in *New History of Ireland*, vol. III: *Early Modern Ireland, 1534–1691*, eds. T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976, 420–53.
- Skinner, B. F. *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- . *About Behaviorism*. New York: Vintage, 1976.
- . *Cumulative Record, Definitive Edition*. Acton, MA: Copley, 1999.
- Skinner, Quentin. 'The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought', *Historical Journal* 9, 3 (1966): 286–317.
- . 'Thomas Hobbes and His Disciples in France and England', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 8 (1966): 153–67.
- . 'Thomas Hobbes and the Nature of the Early Royal Society', *Historical Journal* 12 (1969): 217–39.
- . 'The Context of Hobbes's Theory of Political Obligation' in *Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essays*, eds. Maurice Cranston and Richard S. Peters. New York: Doubleday, 1972, 109–42.
- . 'Conquest and Consent: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement Controversy' in *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646–1660*, ed. G. E. Aylmer. London: Macmillan, 1972, 79–98.
- . 'Thomas Hobbes: Rhetoric and the Construction of Morality', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 76 (1991): 1–61.
- . *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . *Visions of Politics*, vol III: *Hobbes and Civil Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Sleigh, Robert, Jr, Vere Chappell and Michael Della Rocca. 'Determinism and Human Freedom' in *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, eds. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 1195–278.
- Smith, David L. *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640–1649*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Smith, Geoffrey. *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Smuts, R. Malcolm, ed. *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sommerville, Johann P. 'The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy "Jure Divino", 1603–1640', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34, 4 (Oct. 1983): 548–58.
- . *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640*. London and New York: Longman, 1986.

- . *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context*. New York: St Martin's, 1992.
- . 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism', *Journal of British Studies* 35, 2 (1996): 168–94.
- . 'Lofty Science and Local Politics' in *Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. Tom Sorell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 246–73.
- . 'Hobbes and Independency', *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* 59, 1 (2004): 155–73.
- Sorell, Tom. 'Thomas Hobbes' in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, 320–37.
- Sorell, Tom, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sorell, Tom, and Luc Foisneau, eds. *Leviathan after 350 Years*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2004.
- Southgate, Beverley C. *'Covetous of Truth': The Life and Work of Thomas White, 1593–1676*. Dordrecht, Boston and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.
- Spalding, James C., and Maynard F. Brass. 'Reduction of Episcopacy as a Means to Unity in England, 1640–1662', *Church History* 30, 4 (1961): 414–32.
- Sparrow-Simpson, William John. *Archbishop Bramhall*. London: SPCK; New York and Toronto: Macmillan, 1927.
- Spinks, Brian D. *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland, 1603–1662*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.
- Springborg, Patricia. 'Hobbes, Heresy, and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 55, 4 (Oct. 1994): 553–71.
- Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646–1689*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- . 'Religion in Restoration England' in *Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003, 416–35.
- Stone, M. W. F. 'Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy' in *Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, 7–24.
- Stone, M. W. F., and Thomas Pink, eds. *The Will and Human Action: from Antiquity to the Present Day*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Trease, Geoffrey. *Portrait of a Cavalier: William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle*. New York: Taplinger, 1979.
- Trevor-Roper, H. R. *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays*. London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Tuck, Richard. *Hobbes*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- . 'The "Christian Atheism" of Thomas Hobbes' in *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, eds. Michael Hunter and David Wooton. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992, 111–30.
- . *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Tucker, Joseph E. 'John Davies of Kidwelly (1627?–1693), Translator from the French, with an Annotated Bibliography of His Translations', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 44 (1950): 119–52.
- Turberville, A. S. *A History of Welbeck Abbey and Its Owners*, vol. 1: 1539–1755. London: Faber and Faber, 1938.

- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590–1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- . ‘The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered’, *Past and Present* 115 (May 1987): 201–16.
- . *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530–1700*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Underdown, David. *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649–1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Urban, Linwood. ‘Was Luther a Thoroughgoing Determinist?’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (Apr. 1971): 113–39.
- Vallance, Edward. ‘Oaths, Casuistry and Equivocation: Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy’, *Historical Journal* 44, 1 (2001): 59–77.
- Van de Schoor, R. J. M. *The Irenical Theology of Théophile Brachet de la Milletière (1588–1665)*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Wallace, Dewey D., Jr. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Wallace, John M. *Destiny His Choice: The Loyatism of Andrew Marvell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Watson, Gary, ed. *Free Will*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Weatherford, Roy. *The Implications of Determinism*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Wedgwood, C. V. *Strafford: A Revaluation*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1961.
- Wheeler, Harvey, ed. *Beyond the Punitive Society: Operant Conditioning: Social and Political Aspects*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1973.
- Wheeler, James Scott. *The Irish and British Wars, 1637–1654: Triumph, Tragedy, and Failure*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- White, Peter. ‘The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered’, *Past and Present* 101 (Nov. 1983): 34–54.
- . ‘The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: A Rejoinder’, *Past and Present* 115 (May 1987): 217–29.
- . *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Wikelund, Philip R. ‘“Thus I passe my time in this place”: An unpublished letter of Thomas Hobbes’, *English Language Notes* 4 (1968–9): 263–8.
- Wright, George. ‘Introduction and Translation of Latin Appendix of *Leviathan*’, *Interpretation* 18 (1991): 323–413.
- Wright, William Ball. *A Great Yorkshire Divine of the xviith Century: A Sketch of the Life and Work of John Bramhall, D. D., Archbishop of Armagh*. York: John Sampson, 1899.
- Young, Michael B. *Charles I*. New York: St Martin’s, 1997.
- Zagorin, Perez. ‘Thomas Hobbes’s Departure from England in 1640: An Unpublished Letter’, *Historical Journal* 21 (1978): 157–60.
- . ‘Clarendon and Hobbes’, *Journal of Modern History* 57 (Dec. 1985): 593–616.

INDEX

- Aachen (Aix-la-Chappelle), 195
 Adam, 102, 164
 Adwalton Moor, 45
 Amsterdam, 72, 82, 123, 146, 148, 153, 235, 265
 Amyraut, Moise, 98, 181
 anglicanism, 15, 75, 144, 177, 178, 195, 267, 268, 277, 284, 286, 290
 Anglo-Dutch War (1652–1654), 187
 Anne of Austria, 109
 Anselm, Saint, 101
Answer to the XIX Propositions, 62, 63, 264
 Antwerp, 82, 85, 100, 125, 126, 142, 144, 152, 169, 171, 173, 178, 187, 190
 Apollos, 165, 269
 apostolic succession, 14, 54, 74, 78, 166, 196, 222, 257
 Aquinas, Saint Thomas, 101, 114, 204
 Aristotelianism (*see also* scholasticism), 91, 300, 301
 Aristotle, 53, 248
 arminianism, 2, 20, 24, 26, 29, 32, 34, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 115, 122, 137, 138, 210, 225, 228, 230, 256, 276, 279, 283, 289
 Arminius, Jacobus, 91, 92, 98, 228, 256, 279, 283
 Arnauld, Antoine, 97
 Ascham, Anthony, 174
 Ashburnham, John, 135
 atomism, 300
 Aubrey, John, 13, 69, 87, 88, 189, 192, 253, 261
 Augsburg, Peace of, 165
 Augustine, Saint, 97, 283

 Bacon, Francis, 204
 Baillie, Robert, 32, 134, 137, 138, 148
 A Review of Fair Warning, 32, 134, 138, 139, 148

 Banez, Domingo, 46
 Barwick, John, 127, 196, 222, 250
 Basire, Isaac, 284
 Bates, Henry, 50
 Baxter, Richard, 3, 133, 165, 250, 283
 Beara, O'Sullivan, 187
 Bedlam, 208
 behaviourism, 279, 298
 Bellarmine, Cardinal Robert, 101, 204
 Bellasis, Thomas, first viscount Fauconberg, 66
 Bennet, Henry, first earl of Arlington, 186, 254, 271
 Bernard, Nicholas, 128, 223, 224
 Beza, Theodore, 64, 92, 279, 281
 Bishops' Wars, 40, 66, 129
 'Black Oath', 33
 Bolsover, 48, 49
 Bolton, Richard, 36, 37, 39
 Bosc, Charles du, 253
 Boswell, William, 129
 Boulogne, 188
 Boyle, Richard, second earl of Cork, 43
 Boyle, Robert, 80, 219, 298, 301
 Boyle, Roger, first earl of Orrery, 133, 252
 Brabant, 223
 Bradford, 45
 Bramhall, Anne, 66, 252
 Bramhall, Eleanor, 37, 40, 66, 252, 272
 Bramhall, Isabella, 66, 252
 Bramhall, Jane, 66, 252
 Bramhall, John, Bishop of Derry, Archbishop of Armagh
 Answer to Milletière, 140, 180, 182, 184, 185, 186, 268
 Castigations, 20, 102, 111, 112, 113, 115, 223, 224, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 237, 239, 241, 242, 250, 252, 255, 258, 271, 280, 283, 293, 294

- Bramhall, John (*cont.*)
Catching of Leviathan, 19, 113, 179, 223, 224, 226, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 245, 246, 247, 250, 252, 254, 255, 257, 259, 261, 264
Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops, 128, 221, 222, 242
Defence of True Liberty, 86, 101, 112, 122, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 204, 216, 225, 227, 234
 'Discourse' (against Hobbes), 84, 85, 86, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 111, 120, 190, 196, 198, 205, 216, 227, 271
Fair Warning, 113, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 148, 180, 243
Just Vindication, 6, 7, 98, 182, 184, 185, 190, 196, 220, 221, 222, 231, 245, 284
 'Protestants' Ordination Defended', 221
Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon, 7, 36, 184, 221, 242, 284
Schism Guarded, 3, 98, 128, 189, 221, 224
Serpent-Salve, 7, 17, 46, 47, 62, 63, 64, 65, 70, 79, 86, 113, 118, 128, 241, 243, 245, 246, 262, 264, 273
 'Vindication' (against Hobbes), 12, 19, 84, 86, 89, 100, 101, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 137, 150, 190, 196, 198, 202, 205, 209, 211, 218, 226, 229, 245, 249, 261, 267, 271, 280
Vindication of Episcopal Clergy, 3, 7, 22, 126, 132, 182, 272, 283
- Bramhall, John, son of Bishop Bramhall, 66, 186, 252
- Bramhall, Thomas, 66, 252
- Bramhall, William, 40
- Breda, 142, 143, 145, 153, 169
- Breton, William, 189
- Brighton, 169
- Britanny, 133
- Brooke, Samuel, 2
- Browne, Richard, 110–11, 126, 127, 129, 140, 141, 150, 170
- Browne, Samuel, 128
- Browne, Thomas, 128
- Bruges, 221, 223, 224, 250
- Brussels, 82, 85, 100, 125, 141, 144, 150, 176, 187, 189, 190, 224, 250
- Bucer, Martin, 280, 284
- Burke, Ullick, Marquess of Clanricarde, 132
- Burnet, Gilbert, 148, 291
- Burton, Thomas, 275
- Butler, James, Marquess, Duke of Ormonde, 29, 126, 129, 130, 131, 133, 138, 140, 142, 144, 145, 172, 173, 175, 177, 178, 182, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189, 223, 250, 252, 271
- Byron, John, 134, 142
- Caen, 130, 131
- caesaro-papism (*see also* erastianism), 9, 277
- Calais, 182, 184, 187
- Calvin, John, 64, 91, 92, 97, 98, 102, 105, 106, 115, 117, 205, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 284
- calvinism, 13, 20, 23, 25, 27, 283, 289
- Cambrai, 82
- Cambridge University, 2, 9, 22, 23, 25, 26, 42, 289, 301
- Carnaby, Francis, 66
- Carnaby, William, 66
- Cartwright, Thomas, 4, 246, 285
- Cary, Lucius, Viscount Falkland, 46, 48, 49, 59, 262, 263, 264
- Castletown Moylaugh, 223
- Cavalier Parliament, 275, 287
- Cavendish, Charles, brother of Newcastle, 46, 49, 50, 51, 66, 80, 82, 84, 86, 89, 98, 129, 141, 147, 152, 161, 162, 169, 171, 178, 189, 270, 273
- Cavendish, Charles, brother of third earl of Devonshire, 77
- Cavendish, Charles, Viscount Mansfield, son of Newcastle, 66
- Cavendish, Henry, earl of Ogle, son of Newcastle, 66, 145
- Cavendish, Margaret, 40, 49, 61, 66, 87, 88, 140, 141, 143, 145, 152, 161
- Cavendish, William, Earl, Marquess, Duke of Newcastle, 1, 16, 17, 20, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 70, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 103, 108, 109, 111, 113, 132, 135, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 151, 152, 161, 162, 168, 171, 176, 177, 178, 180, 189, 190, 192, 193, 196, 202, 216, 246, 262, 264, 267, 268, 270, 273, 287, 291
Advice to Charles II, 60, 61, 268
- Cavendish, William, second earl of Devonshire, 48, 49, 50, 77, 203
- Cavendish, William, third earl of Devonshire, 3, 48, 49, 51, 70, 71, 77, 78, 79, 84, 87, 90, 103, 151, 161, 163, 168, 177, 189, 270, 271, 273
- Cephas, 165, 269
- Channel Islands, 133

- Charenton, 181
 Charles I, King, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 19, 25, 27, 29, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 78, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 107, 108, 109, 110, 122, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 141, 153, 157, 158, 181, 183, 210, 220, 221, 229, 232, 241, 248, 249, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 272, 278, 285, 286, 289, 290, 292
 Charles II, King, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 41, 49, 59, 60, 61, 82, 125, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 188, 195, 210, 211, 214, 220, 221, 222, 229, 232, 238, 241, 246, 249, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 259, 260, 261, 263, 265, 267, 268, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 304
 Charron, Pierre, 300
 Chatsworth, 48, 50, 70, 189
 Cheshire, 40
 Chester, 40
 Chillingworth, William, 59
 Christ Church, Oxford, 49
 Cicero, 271
 Clare, County, 132
 Clarendon, Earl of: *see* Hyde, Edward
 Clark, Samuel, 277
 clericalism, 268, 277
 Clifton, Gervase, 43, 50
 Clotworthy, John, 79
 Coke, John, 35
 Collins, Anthony, 277
 Cologne, 221
 compounding, 161, 163, 189, 272, 273, 274
 Conn, George, 60
 constitutionalism/constitutional royalism, 17, 48, 63, 228, 241, 244, 261, 262, 264
 Cooper, Samuel, 253
 Cooper, Walter, 125
 Copernicus, Nicolaus, 204
 Corbet, John, 33, 138
 Cork, 21, 131, 132, 133
 Cornworth, Lord, 66
 Cosin, John, 24, 25, 62, 126, 127, 150, 186
 Cottington, Francis, 142
 Cotton, Charles, 49, 153
 Council of Trent, 2, 7, 205
 Cowley, Abraham, 189
 Cromwell, Oliver, 18, 21, 78, 95, 132, 133, 140, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 174, 179, 188, 195, 199, 211, 215, 223, 238, 253, 273, 274
 Crook, Andrew, 193, 253
 Crowther, Joseph, 182, 186
 Cudworth, Ralph, 234
 Culpepper, John, 46, 135, 142, 178, 262, 263, 264
 Dagon, 235
 Darwin, Charles, 299
 Davenant, William, 147, 189
 Davies, John, 192, 193
 'De auxiliis' controversy, 46
de-facto-ism, 18, 274
 Delft, 134, 137, 138
 Denmark, 144
 Derby, 48
 Derbyshire, 43, 48, 50, 78, 189, 253, 255
 Derry, bishopric of, 28, 29
 Descartes, René, 50, 80, 81, 88, 299, 300, 303
 determinism (*see also* predestinarianism), 1, 2, 12, 13, 90, 91, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 114, 115, 116, 117, 120, 205, 225, 251, 276, 280, 281, 282, 283, 293, 294, 297, 298, 300
 Devereux, Robert, third earl of Essex, 46, 158, 262
 Digby, George, second earl of Bristol, 142, 158
 Digby, John, first earl of Bristol, 262
 Digby, Kenelm, 49, 81
 Dillon, James, third earl of Roscommon, 132
 Dionysius of Sicily, 197
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 290
 Doddington, William, 142
 Don Juan of Austria, 221, 222
 Dorislaus, Isaac, 174
 Dover, 253
 Dowel, John, 160
 Downname, George, 5
 Du Moulin, Pierre, 181, 280, 284
 dualism, 294, 300
 Dublin, 28, 37, 39, 67, 223, 252, 303
 Dunbar, Battle of, 168, 170
 Duns Scotus, John, 204, 280
 Duppa, Brian, 62, 146, 246, 291
 Durham, 41, 43

- Earle, John, 127, 146, 149, 150, 177, 291
 Edgell, Battle of, 77
 Edinburgh, 135, 188
 Elizabeth I, Queen of England, 55, 165, 278, 285
 Elizabeth of Bohemia, 138
 Elizabethan settlement, 277
 Elzevir, 72, 123, 146, 149, 150
 Engagement, 18, 156, 160, 161, 162, 189, 272
 Enniskillen, 28
 Epicureans, 293
 episcopacy, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 18, 26, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 94, 110, 137, 153, 154, 165, 167, 200, 206, 211, 214, 221, 224, 228, 233, 245, 248, 258, 259, 261, 264, 277, 285, 287, 288
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 105, 279
 erastianism, 4, 9, 122, 225, 245, 277
 Euclid, 218
 Evelyn, John, 126, 169, 251

 Fairfax, Thomas, 44, 158
 Fanshawe, Ann, 132
 Fanshawe, Richard, 132
 Fermanagh, 28
 Fermat, Pierre, 80
 Ferne, Henry, 185
 Fiennes, William, first viscount Saye and Sele, 116, 262
 Filmer, Robert, 63, 161
 First Army Plot, 41
 First English Civil War, 14, 39, 40, 43, 46, 63, 77, 89, 91, 95, 96, 99, 128, 132, 147, 154, 247, 262
 Flanders, 141, 171, 175, 221
 Flushing, 129, 187, 188, 190, 195, 223
 Forced Loan, 69, 243
 Forward, Abigail née Bramhall, 29
 Forward, Robert, 29
 Fraizer, Alexander, 175
 France, 16, 69, 70, 74, 78, 97, 98, 111, 126, 127, 130, 146, 168, 173, 174, 175, 176, 180, 182, 186, 187, 189, 192, 193, 194, 203, 226, 261, 266, 285
 free-will (*see also* liberty), 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 26, 46, 72, 82, 87, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114, 115, 120, 123, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 226, 259, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 285, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 299
 Fronde, 168, 181

 Gainsborough, 78
 Galilei, Galileo, 49, 50, 51, 81, 204, 300
 Della Scienza Mecanica, 51
 Dialogue concerning the Two Chief World Systems, 50, 81
 Galloway, James, Baron Dunkeld, 186
 Galway, 131, 132
 Gaspar, J. B., 248
 Gassendi, Pierre, 80, 81, 88, 168, 218, 299, 300
 Geneva, 64, 182, 277, 285
 Gerard, Charles, 142
 Ghent, 185, 187
 Gilbert, William, 204
 Glasgow, 138
 Glenham, Thomas, 141
 Godolphin, Francis, 154, 158
 Godolphin, Sidney, 154
 Goliath, 246
 Gomar, Franciscus, 256
 Graham, James, first marquess of Montrose, 140
 Graham, James, son-in-law of Bramhall, 252
 Graham, William, seventh earl of Menteith, 252
 Grand Remonstrance, 94, 128
 'Great Chain of Being', 119
 'Great Sesse', 44
 'Great Tew' circle, 48, 49, 59, 127, 146, 154, 176
 Grenville, Richard, 142, 188
 Guisborough, 45

 Habert, Isaac, 97
 Hague, The, 128, 129, 134, 136, 137, 138, 140, 172, 182, 186, 187, 221, 222, 262
 Hall, Joseph, 259
 Hall, Robert, 188
 Hamburg, 66, 82, 83, 85
 Hamilton, William, second duke of Hamilton, 142
 Hammond, Henry, 128, 177, 185, 220, 221, 224
 Hampton Court, 130, 136
 Hardwick Hall, 48, 50, 189
 Harrington, James, 303
 Harsnett, Samuel, 23
 Hartlib, Samuel, 80, 157
 Harvey, William, 189, 204
 Hatton, Christopher, 175
 Hemmingsen, Neils, 278
 Henderson, Alexander, 148

- Henrician reformation, 9, 277
- Henrietta Maria, Queen, 56, 60, 83, 125, 126, 127, 130, 133, 140, 146, 147, 161, 172, 173, 180, 264
- Henry IV, King of France, 181, 272, 285
- Henry VIII, King of England, 183, 185, 216, 277, 284
- Heylyn, Peter, 240
- Hoard, Samuel, 281
- Hobbes, Thomas
- 'An Answer to Bishop Bramhall', 153, 235, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 264, 265
 - Anti-White*, 81, 82, 86, 90, 105, 108, 207, 220, 247, 281, 293, 295, 297, 300
 - Behemoth*, 11, 36, 54, 194, 205, 239, 258, 261, 262, 264
 - Considerations*, 48, 53, 69, 110, 160, 161, 163, 174, 175, 263
 - De Cive*, 7, 14, 17, 19, 49, 59, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 86, 90, 103, 109, 110, 117, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 146, 149, 150, 153, 155, 156, 169, 173, 176, 178, 179, 180, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 213, 218, 223, 228, 229, 232, 233, 236, 237, 239, 241, 247, 248, 257, 260, 261, 266, 270, 295, 297
 - De Corpore*, 82, 84, 146, 152, 217, 293
 - De Homine*, 74
 - De principiis et ratiocinatione geometrarum*, 254
 - Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student*, 77, 254
 - Dialogus Physicus*, 219
 - Elements of Law*, 7, 14, 17, 48, 49, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 68–9, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 82, 86, 90, 109, 120, 150, 152, 154, 155, 156, 169, 176, 179, 180, 194, 200, 235, 248, 270, 292, 297
 - Historia Ecclesiastica*, 192, 279
 - 'An Historical Narration concerning Heresy', 254, 255, 256, 260, 264, 265
 - Leviathan*, 3, 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 59, 60, 73, 75, 88, 109, 117, 124, 137, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 184, 192, 195, 196, 197, 199, 209, 211, 218, 219, 223, 225, 231, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 244, 246, 248, 249, 253, 254, 255, 257, 259, 260, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 272, 274, 282, 284, 293, 297, 300, 301, 303, 304
 - Of Liberty and Necessity*, 109, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 199, 202, 225, 282, 299, 303
 - Marks of an Absurd Geometry*, 211, 218
 - 'A Minute or First Draught of the Optiques', 90, 151
 - Problemata Physica*, 3, 170, 219, 260, 264, 274
 - Questions*, 25, 76, 89, 101, 103, 111, 190, 194, 195, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 228, 229, 232, 234, 239, 257, 265, 277, 279, 292, 293, 296, 298, 303
 - Six Lessons*, 160, 218
 - Tractatus Opticus*, 151
 - 'Treatise' (against Bramhall), 84, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 126, 150, 180, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 201, 202, 207, 213, 226, 229, 230, 245, 266, 267
- Holden, Henry, 185
- Holland, 84, 140, 141, 151, 158
- Honywood, Michael, 128, 196
- Hooker, Richard, 284
- Hopton, Ralph, 142, 162
- Horace, 13, 241
- Hotham, John, 41, 158
- Howlett, Richard, 29
- Hull, 41, 158
- Hutchinson, John, 60
- Huygens, Loedwijk, 189
- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, 49, 66, 127, 142, 146, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 185, 187, 188, 189, 224, 250, 253, 262, 263, 264, 269, 270, 273, 274, 286, 288, 290, 303
- Brief View of Leviathan*, 147, 154, 155, 158, 159, 160, 170, 171, 172, 173, 253, 304
- Icarus, 113
- Index Librorum Prohibitorum, 173
- Interregnum, 145, 269, 272, 273, 275, 289, 292
- Ireton, Henry, 133
- Irish high commission, 32, 34, 36
- Isham, Justinian, 246
- Isle of Wight, 134, 136, 141

- Jacob, Henry, 7
 James, Duke of York, 172, 182, 186, 187
 James I, King, 8, 14, 25, 56, 57, 136, 205, 285, 291
 Jane, Joseph, 224, 250
 Jansen, Cornelius, 97, 98
 Jansenist controversy, 97, 98, 99
 Jansenists, 97, 98
 Jenkins, David, 142
 Jermyn, Henry, Earl of St Albans, 135, 147, 178
 Jeroboam, 183
 Jersey, 127, 140, 146
 Jesuits, 92, 94, 97, 98, 191, 205, 221
 Job, 106, 227, 235, 246
 Jonson, Ben, 50
jure civili, 3, 5, 9, 57, 58, 166, 237, 245, 258, 265
jure divino, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 26, 54, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 65, 75, 76, 137, 165, 166, 167, 200, 206, 211, 212, 214, 216, 221, 224, 228, 233, 237, 245, 248, 258, 259, 261, 265, 287–8, 302
 Juvenal, 113
 Juxon, William, 11, 29
- Kennedy, John, sixth earl of Cassillis, 137
 Kepler, Johannes, 204
 Kidwelly (Wales), 192
 Kilcolgan, 131, 132
 Kilkenny, 132
 King, James, Lord Eythin, 66
 Kirton, Edward, 93
 Knott, Edward, 185
 Korah's rebellion, 120
- La Mettrie, Julien Offray de, 299
 Lane, George, 252
 Langdale, Marmaduke, 142
 Languedoc, 146, 147
 latitudinarianism, 289
 Laud, William, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 67, 71, 76, 92, 94, 96, 107, 116, 133, 137, 138, 167, 188, 210, 212, 216, 240, 249, 251, 259, 261, 262, 266, 279, 286, 288, 291
 Lawson, George, 198, 225
 legitimism (*see also* royalism), 18, 157
 Le Havre, 131
 Leicestershire, 78
 Leiden, 128, 149
 Leighton, Alexander, 92
 Leslie, Henry, 32
 Leslie, John, sixth earl of Rothes, 21, 33
 liberty (*see also* free-will), 1, 46, 84, 100, 101, 102, 104, 120, 123, 192, 207, 280, 281, 293, 303
 Liège, 126
 Limerick, 132
 Lipsius, Justus, 300
 Lisbon, 131
 Livingstone, John, 144
 Locke, John, 261
 Lockey, Thomas, 49
 Lombard, Peter, 101, 114, 204
 London, 40, 41, 47, 49, 50, 58, 97, 109, 110, 112, 137, 153, 154, 160, 168, 171, 172, 175, 184, 185, 189, 190, 192, 193, 195, 199, 221, 223, 224, 226, 250, 252, 255
 Londonderry, 21, 22, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40
 Long, Robert, 142, 178
 Long Parliament, 7, 41, 43, 61, 68, 69, 70, 71, 79, 129, 188, 199, 222, 249, 261, 263, 275
 Louis XIII, King of France, 232, 266
 Louis XIV, King of France, 109, 180, 238, 266
 Louvain, 97
 Louvre, 83, 175, 178
 Low Countries: *see* Netherlands
 Lowther, Gerard, 37, 39
 Lucy, William, 198, 225, 246
 Luther, Martin, 91, 105, 106, 205, 278, 279, 282, 283, 284
- MacDonnell, Randal, Marquess of Antrim, 131
 Machiavelli, Niccolò, 60
 Madrid, 142
 Magdalen Hall, Oxford, 48
 Magna Carta, 62, 242, 243
 Manwaring, Roger, 24, 69, 230
 Marston Moor, 64, 66, 67, 99, 141, 147, 263, 270
 Martel, Thomas de, 146
 Marten, Henry, 291
 Martinus, Matthias, 26
 Mary I, Queen of England, 9
 Mary Stuart, Princess of Orange, 138
 materialism, 294, 300
 Matthew, Tobie, 22, 23, 25
 Maxwell, John, 138
 Mazarin, Cardinal Jules, 109, 181
 Meath, 28, 223, 252
 Melancthon, Philip, 279, 283
 Mersenne, Marin, 50, 71, 72, 80, 81, 82, 88, 141, 149, 151, 168, 173, 218, 220, 272, 300

- Mervyn, Audley, 37, 251, 252
 Methuselah, 271
 Michael, David, 33, 113
 Milletière, 160, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186
 'Victory of Truth', 160, 181, 182
 Mirandola, Gianfrancesco Pico della, 206
 Molina, Luis, 46, 98, 101
 Molinists, 97, 98, 108
 Monck, George, 290
 Montagu, Edward, Viscount Mandeville, 262
 Montagu, Richard, 25
 Montagu, Walter, 172
 Montaigne, Michel de, 300
 Montpellier, 158
 Moody, Miles, 43
 Morley, George, 127, 185
 Morton, Thomas, 27, 222
 Mountauban, 146, 147
 Murray, William, 148
- Nag's Head Tavern, Cheapside, 222
 Nantes, 187
 Naseby, Battle of, 91, 96, 122
 Naudé, Gabriel, 181
 necessity, 1, 83, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 110, 114, 120, 123, 192, 201, 280, 281, 283, 292, 293, 303
 Nedham, Marchamont, 53
 Neile, Richard, 11, 23, 25, 36
 Nero, 137
 Netherlands, 97, 100, 125, 133, 144, 150, 168, 186, 203, 223, 250, 279
 New Model Army, 110, 122
 Newcastle, Earl, Marquess, Duke of: *see* Cavendish, William
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 41, 44, 132
 Nicholas, Edward, 141, 142, 162, 172, 173, 175, 177, 178, 187, 188, 224, 250
 Normandy, 130
 Northumberland, 41, 43
 Nottingham, 44
 Nottinghamshire, 78, 79, 87
- O'Brien, Murrough, first earl of Inchiquin, 131, 133
 Ockham, William of, 105, 106, 205
 O'Neill, Brian, 37
 O'Neill, Daniel, 126, 129, 130, 175
 O'Neill, Phelim, 21, 22
 Orange, House of, 128, 138
 Ormonde, Marquess, Duke of: *see* Butler, James
 Ostend, 269
 Owen, John, 165
- Oxford University, 9, 40, 47, 48, 49, 77, 110, 217, 289, 301
- Paris, 16, 19, 20, 46, 50, 67, 69, 71, 72, 77, 78, 80, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 111, 120, 125, 126, 129, 130, 133, 140, 141, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 158, 161, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 181, 182, 185, 186, 187, 190, 193, 195, 197, 202, 220, 232, 253, 254, 259, 267, 293
 Parker, Henry, 17, 46, 47, 64, 65, 243, 244
 Parker, Matthew, 222
 Parker, Samuel, 250
 parliament, 2, 9, 10, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 52, 53, 54, 58, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 72, 93, 94, 110, 122, 131, 132, 141, 157, 216, 230, 238, 242, 243, 245, 254, 255, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 272, 285
 Pascal, Blaise, 80
 Patin, Guy, 169
 Paul, Saint, 14, 60, 91, 105, 114, 165, 265, 269
 Epistle to the Romans, 14, 73, 105, 114, 115, 116
 Payne, Robert, 49, 51, 168, 176, 177
 Peiresc, Nicholas-Claude Fabri de, 80
 pelagianism, 98, 283, 289
 Pell, John, 82, 83, 85, 89, 129, 147, 152, 169, 189
 Pepys, Samuel, 303
 Percy, Algernon, tenth earl of Northumberland, 142, 148, 172, 178
 Perkins, William, 25, 280, 283, 284
 Peronne, 82
 Perose, 133
 Petition of Right, 24
 Petty, William, 90
 Philip iv, King of Spain, 221
 Pierce, Thomas, 198, 225, 250
 Plato, 248
 Plutarch, 207
 Pontefract, 28, 29, 36
 popery, 2, 4, 7, 32, 34, 92, 93, 94, 96, 135, 138, 183, 205, 206, 210, 217, 250, 259, 302
 Portugal, 131, 143
 Portumna, 132
 Poyning's Law, 39
 predestinarianism (*see also* determinism), 12, 13, 26, 116, 225, 279, 280, 281
 predestination, 2, 13, 31, 46, 94, 98, 115, 122, 277, 278, 282
 presbyterianism, 15, 134, 135, 139, 246

- Prometheus, 113
Provence, 168
Prynne, William, 8, 92, 96, 205, 210, 212, 248, 259
Pullein, Elizabeth née Bramhall, 28, 252
Pullein, Samuel, brother-in-law of Bramhall, 28, 29, 252
Pullein, Thomas, 29
puritanism, 2, 26, 134
Pym, John, 8, 52, 57, 58, 68, 158, 259, 263
Pythagoras, 235, 239

Quin, 132

Radcliffe, George, 29, 37, 47, 128, 141, 186, 188, 223
Rand, William, 157
recta ratio, 77, 247
Restoration, 16, 29, 60, 138, 160, 178, 189, 196, 250, 251, 252, 253, 260, 261, 265, 268, 269, 271, 274, 275, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 301, 302, 303
Rhineland, 126
Rich, Robert, second earl of Warwick, 262
Ripon, 23, 28, 36, 43, 186
Roberval, Gilles de, 80
Rolleston, John, 45
Roman catholicism (*see also* popery), 15, 173, 181, 182, 266
Roman Empire, 137
Rome, 135, 165, 277, 284, 285
‘Root and Branch’ bill, 79
‘Root and Branch’ petition, 57–8, 78, 94
Rosario, Domingo de, 131
Rotterdam, 82, 141, 142, 187
Rouen, 84, 85, 90, 103, 108, 109, 190, 193, 222
Rous, Francis, 93
Royal Society of London, 298, 301
royal supremacy, 6, 7, 56, 167, 184, 214, 216, 233, 245, 257, 259
royalism, 17, 61, 63, 70, 73, 122, 157, 270, 272, 273
Royston, Richard, 47
Rubens, Peter Paul, 144
Rump Parliament, 16, 53, 132, 133, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163, 167, 170, 175, 179, 253, 270
Rupert, Prince, 66, 77, 131, 141, 142, 151
Russell, Francis, fourth earl of Bedford, 262
Russia, 143
Ruthven, Patrick, Earl of Forth and Earl of Brentford, 142

sacerdotalism (*see also* clericalism), 13, 215, 258
Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 83, 126, 130, 142, 146, 148, 150, 152, 254
Sancroft, William, 128
Sanderson, Robert, 128
Savile, Thomas, first earl of Sussex, 262
Scarborough, 44, 66
scholasticism (*see also* Aristotelianism), 81, 101, 107, 113, 204, 205, 279, 300
Scilly Islands, 154
Scottish National Covenant, 33, 130, 134, 138, 139, 268
Scudamore, John, Viscount, 49, 68, 128
Second English Civil War, 136, 141, 151
Selden, John, 3, 189
Sergeant, John, 3, 220, 221, 224
Seymour, William, first marquess of Hertford, 262
Sheldon, Gilbert, 49, 127, 168, 176, 177, 289
Ship Money, 243
Short Parliament, 48, 49, 52, 57, 69, 188
Sibthorpe, Robert, 24, 69, 230
Sidney Sussex, Cambridge, 23, 25, 26, 29, 42, 87, 93, 95, 198
Skinner, B. F., 297, 298, 299
Slingsby, Guilford, 45
Smith, John, brother-in-law of Bramhall, 28
Smith, Katheryn née Bramhall, 28
Smith, Richard, 190, 220
Socrates, 255
Solemn League and Covenant, 65, 139
Solomon, King, 258
Sorbrière, Samuel, 84, 123, 146, 148, 150, 153, 173, 218, 253
Spain, 110, 126, 131, 158, 178, 186, 221
Spang, William, 139
Spanish Inquisition, 126, 186
Spinoza, Benedict de, 236
Spottiswoode, John, 34
St John’s, Cambridge, 42, 68
Steward, Richard, 126
Stoics, 103, 115, 280, 281, 293
Strafford, Earl of: *see* Wentworth, Thomas
Suarez, Francisco, 101, 204, 205, 280
Synod of Dort, 26, 92, 280

Talbot, Peter, 222
Tanny, Philip, 199
Taylor, Jeremy, 21, 23, 34, 37, 39, 40, 44, 128, 250, 251
Tertullian, 235
Thames, 141, 188

- 'third Cato', 19, 113, 120, 145, 207, 239, 243, 270
- Thirty-Nine Articles, 31, 55, 154, 184, 231, 233, 266, 277
- Thirty-seventh, 55, 154, 184, 233, 266
- Thirty Years' War, 129
- Thomism (*see also* scholasticism), 279, 301
- Thorndike, Herbert, 19, 225
- Twisse, William, 105
- Twysden, Roger, 185
- Tyrone, 252
- Ulster, 22, 30, 32, 33, 35, 79, 130, 132, 134, 251
- Ulster Rising, 21, 32, 39
- Urban VIII, Pope, 97
- Ussher, James, 28, 29, 31, 38, 47, 128, 224, 287
- Utrecht, 128, 189, 196, 223
- Uxbridge Convention, 96, 132
- Vaughan, John, 189
- Verdus, Francois du, 80
- Vesey, John, 32, 34, 38, 43, 45, 125, 137, 186
- Vic, Henry de, 85, 125
- Villiers, George, second duke of Buckingham, 142, 143, 145, 148, 162
- Virgil, 198
- Virginia Company, 203
- voluntarism, 117, 120
- Wales, 192
- Walker, Edward, 262
- Waller, Edmund, 13, 84, 88, 90, 189
- Wallis, John, 110, 160, 161, 211, 217, 218, 263, 301
- Wandesford, Christopher, 10, 22, 23, 24, 33, 36, 38, 129
- Ward, Samuel, 25, 26, 93, 95
- Ward, Seth, 178, 198, 217, 218, 301
- Webster, John, 218
- Welbeck, 41, 48, 50, 51
- Wensham, Colonel, 188
- Wentworth, Thomas, Earl of Strafford, 10, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 45, 54, 67, 68, 71, 78, 79, 129, 130, 132, 134, 188, 203, 209, 251, 263
- Wentworth, Thomas, fifth baron Wentworth, 142
- Westminster Assembly, 105, 217, 249
- White, Thomas, 81, 82, 86, 105, 108, 162, 189, 220, 247, 255, 293
- Whitehall, John, 160
- Whitgift, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 246, 285
- Widdrington, William, 66, 142
- Wilkins, John, 301
- William II, Prince of Orange, 138, 143
- Williams, John, 25, 259
- Williamson, Joseph, 252, 254
- Willoughby, Francis, fifth baron Willoughby of Parham, 142
- Wilmot, Henry, first earl of Rochester, 142, 178
- Wilmot, John, second earl of Rochester, 291
- Wilson, John, 25
- Wiltshire, 43, 227
- Winraham, George, 137
- Wood, Anthony, 172, 192
- Wood, James, 137
- Worcester, Battle of, 168, 169, 170, 171, 179, 181, 274
- Wren, Matthew, 128, 177
- Wyndham, Mrs Christabella, 291
- York, 22, 27, 28, 36, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 65, 78, 126, 185, 251, 270
- Yorkshire, 25, 28, 29, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 62, 86, 89, 91, 98, 132, 186
- Ypres, 97, 98
- Zanchius, Jerome, 280, 284
- Zeeland, 190
- Zumel, Francisco, 46
- Zwingli, Ulrich, 106

Titles in the series

*The Common Peace: Participation and the Criminal Law in Seventeenth-Century England**

CYNTHIA B. HERRUP

Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620–1660

ANN HUGHES

*London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis**

TIM HARRIS

*Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I**

KEVIN SHARPE

Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire, 1649–1689

ANDREW COLEBY

John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s

GREG WALKER

Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623–1677

JONATHAN SCOTT

Thomas Starkey and the Commonweal: Humanist Politics and Religion in the Reign of Henry VIII

THOMAS F. MAYER

*The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation**

ROBERT WHITING

The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667

PAUL SEAWARD

The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624

THOMAS COGSWELL

Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule

L. J. REEVE

George Lawson's 'Politica' and the English Revolution

CONAL CONDREN

Puritans and Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the Civil War

JACQUELINE EALES

An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles, 1637–1641

PETER DONALD

*Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640**

TESSA WATT

Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650–1668

STEVEN C. A. PINCUS

Gender in Mystical and Occult Thought: Behmenism and its Development in England

B. J. GIBBONS

William III and the Godly Revolution

TONY CLAYDON

Law-Making and Society in Late Elizabethan England: The Parliament of England, 1584–1601

DAVID DEAN

Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580–1625

MICHAEL C. QUESTIER

Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford

JOHN COFFEY

*King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom**

W. B. PATTERSON

The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540–1580

CAROLINE LITZENBERGER

Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c. 1620–1643

TOM WEBSTER

*Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England**

JUDITH MALTBY

Sermons at Court, 1559–1629: Religion and Politics in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching

PETER E. MCCULLOUGH

Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England's Towns, 1650–1730

PAUL D. HALLIDAY

Women Waging Law in Elizabethan England

TIMOTHY STRETTON

The Early Elizabethan Policy: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–1569

STEPHEN ALFORD

The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex

PAUL J. HAMMER

The Politics of Social Conflict: The Peak Country, 1520–1770

ANDY WOOD

Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England

MALCOLM GASKILL

The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London

IAN W. ARCHER

Prosecution and Punishment: Petty Crime and the Law in London and Rural Middlesex, c. 1660–1725

ROBERT B. SHOEMAKER

Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677–1683

JONATHAN SCOTT

Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America

AVIHU ZAKAI

The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660–1730

J. A. I. CHAMPION

Steward, Lords and People: The Estate Steward and his World in Later Stuart England

D. R. HAINSWORTH

Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell, Marquis of Antrim, 1609–1683

JANE H. OHLMEYER

The Family of Love in English Society, 1550–1630

CHRISTOPHER W. MARSH

*The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns against Scotland, 1638–1640**

MARK FISSEL

John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility

JOHN MARSHALL

Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640–1649

DAVID L. SMITH

Intelligence and Espionage in the Reign of Charles II, 1660–1685

ALAN MARSHALL

The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536–1588

CIARAN BRADY

*Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678–1881**

MARK KNIGHTS

Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640

ANTHONY MILTON

Sir Matthew Hale, 1609–1676: Law, Religion and Natural Philosophy

ALAN CROMARTIE

Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public's 'Privado'

MICHAEL MENDLE

The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660–1740

DONALD A. SPAETH

*Reading History in Early Modern England**

D. R. WOOLF

The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603–1660

ALASTAIR BELLANY

The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary, Queen of Scots: The Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland

JANE E. A. DAWSON

Treason and the State: Law, Politics, and Ideology in the English Civil War

D. ALAN ORR

Preaching during the English Reformation

SUSAN WABUDA

*Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain**

JOAD RAYMOND

Patterns of Piety: Women, Gender and Religion in Late Medieval and Reformation England

CHRISTINE PETERS

*Popular Politics and the English Reformation**

ETHAN SHAGAN

Unquiet Lives: Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660–1800

JOANNE BAILEY

The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation

ALEC RYRIE

Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State

K. J. KESSELRING

Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England

GARTHINE WALKER

Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England: Justice and Political Power, 1558–1660

PAUL RAFFIELD

Print Culture and the Early Quakers

KATE PETERS

Ireland and the English Reformation: State Reform and Clerical Resistance in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534–1590

JAMES MURRAY

London and the Restoration, 1659–1683

GARY S. DE KREY

Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603–1625

CHARLES W. A. PRIOR

Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms

NATALIE MEARS

John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture

JOHN MARSHALL

The Devil in Early Modern England

NATHAN JOHNSTONE

Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714–1760

HANNAH SMITH

Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, 1550–1640

MICHAEL C. QUESTIER

The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland

JOHN MCCAFFERTY

Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity: A Quarrel of the Civil Wars and Interregnum

NICHOLAS D. JACKSON

**Also published as a paperback*