POLITY AND LITURGY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JOHN WALLIS

by

Jason M. Rampelt*

Greystone Theological Institute, 505 Chestnut Street, Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108, USA

John Wallis, a founding member of the Royal Society, theologian and churchman, participated in the leading ecclesiastical conferences in England from the beginning of the English Civil War to the Restoration. His allegiance across governments, both civil and ecclesiastical, has provoked criticism. Close investigation into his position on key church issues, however, reveals a deeper philosophical unity binding together his natural philosophy, mathematics and views on church polity and liturgy.

Keywords: natural philosophy; scholasticism; Christianity; church; Presbyterian; theology; Interregnum; Restoration; toleration

JOHN WALLIS ACCORDING TO HIS CRITICS

Many contemporaries often introduced John Wallis's religion as evidence against him. Anthony Wood, the Oxford antiquarian, when rebuffed by Wallis, recorded these choice words in his diary.

> J[ohn] W[allis] bred under a noted Presbyterian in Emanuel Coll. Cambr. Instrumental in bringing off Laud's head, . . . Instr[umental] in bringing off [the] King's head by making him odious to his people. An trumpetter to rebellion while minister of St. Martin's Ironmonger lane and of Gabriel Fenchurch. A grand covenanteer, preached up the covenant, and angry with those that took it not. (Taker of all oathes, covenant, engagement. Faithful to Oliver, to Richard, to King Charles II, King James II, King William!)[1]

In Wood's mind, these facts reinforced his personal conclusion that Wallis was a conniving survivor without principles.[2]

   While Wood grumbled in private, Thomas Hobbes publicly associated Wallis's religion with a host of rational failures. He broadcasts his critiques in the title of his 1657 book, *Markes of the absurd geometry, rural language, Scottish church-politicks and barbarismes of J. Wallis*. Hobbes respects the universities as places of study, but rejects them 'in case the same means and the same wits should be imployed in the advancing of the Doctrines that tend to the weakening of the publick, and the strengthening of the

*j.rampelt@greystoneinstitute.org

power of any private ambitious party'. He clarifies just who that is, namely 'the Divines that held the same principles in Church Government with you [Wallis], have, contributed to our late troubles'.[3]

The reason that Hobbes rejects Wallis's religion, natural philosophy and mathematics is rooted in his epistemology. Hobbes, the political philosopher, sought to ground all knowledge on proper authority. Politics and geometry provide certain knowledge, working in top-down, deductive fashion.[4] Wallis's pragmatic inductive mathematics of *Arithmetica infinitorum* was more than the Euclidean-styled mathematician Hobbes could stomach.[5] The heuristic tack of Wallis's infinite fractions was lost on him.[6] Both Wallis and Hobbes produced their mathematics consistently with larger philosophical principles. For Hobbes, everything was to be reduced to first principles, namely matter and motion. One ought not devise 'empty names' for things—Hobbes' epithet for terms that even hinted at scholastic divinity.[7] The interesting question is whether or not Wallis's philosophy was 'empty names'. Understanding his theology helps us to answer that question. Hobbes rejected the legitimacy of a presbyterian form of church government for the same reason that he rejected the legitimacy of algebra as a method of mathematical proof. Mathematics that did not derive from true first principles was flawed, and so was church power that did not derive it from the state—the ultimate foundation of power. In contrast, Wallis adopted an instrumentalist stance towards natural philosophy and mathematics, resulting in his adoption of algebra as a system of signs, the use of multiple mathematical methods and assumptions, and both scholastic logic and natural philosophy by experience.[8] His theology of the church worked similarly. Multiple modes of worship could achieve the same ends of reverence and dignity. And a presbyterian form of church government embodies the principles of unity, plurality and parity *without* (contra Hobbes) central hierarchy. An exposition of Wallis's ecclesiology not only refutes a political rendition of it, but also lends insight into his intellectual life more broadly.

In the seventeenth century, public voices tended to read religion in political terms. As a rough approximation, this can be useful. The Long Parliament which opposed King Charles I was composed largely of anti-Episcopalian[9] men, as royalists were largely in support of the established church. The historical error is committed when it is then assumed that the *reason* particular individuals chose their religion was for chiefly political ends. Indeed, many did see changes in political power as a means to religious liberty, purity, unity or at least something more fitting to their conscience, but not all sought a political solution (especially not a violent one), and certainly had not devised their religion for political ends. The origin of their religion was theological, not political. It is necessary to grasp this historiographical point if we are to understand John Wallis.

Likewise, in order to sort through the mischaracterizations of Wallis's affiliations, we also need to understand the broader pattern of his intellectual career. There is a fundamental unity across his fields of study and teaching that penetrates his natural philosophy, mathematics and theology, including his views on and practice in the church. I shall briefly review some key points of his academic work and then move on to the evidence for his views on church polity and liturgy. The conclusion will bring these two parts of his work together.

WALLIS ON MATHEMATICS, PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

Wallis opened his first term of lectures in Oxford in 1649 in a radically new way.[10] Rather than begin with the standard text of Euclid's *Elements*, he chose instead to ground his students in arithmetic and the rudiments of algebra. After two years he then moved on to geometry, but now with the new tools of algebra at his disposal. This approach opened a new age of algebraic geometry as a formal part of university mathematical education. Unlike Hobbes, he was not bound by a single way of doing mathematics, based on either the ancient pattern or Hobbes' new foundation in physical bodies. Rather, Wallis viewed mathematical methods as multiple discourses, each serving legitimate purposes. He even mixed them, as in his seminal mathematical achievement, *Arithmetica Infinitorum* (1656). Here, one finds ancient conic sections studied according to the method of indivisibles of Cavalieri, inductions to the convergence of infinite series without rigorous proof and pragmatic manipulations of numbers on paper more reminiscent of his experimental trial and error methods of deciphering intercepted coded messages than of strict deduction. Hobbes was not the only one unconvinced by Wallis's merger of the disciplines. Pierre de Fermat also complained that an arithmetical answer to a geometrical problem was no answer at all.[11] Wallis's seemingly haphazard combination of methods was puzzling to many of his contemporaries, if not wholly unacceptable. Yet Wallis's approach made it possible to conceptualize imaginary numbers or rationalize the counter-intuitive challenge of the angle of contact.[12]

Wallis had also been an active participant in the meetings that would later form the nucleus of the Royal Society. He attended them in London in the 1640s at the same time that he was serving in the Westminster Assembly.[13] Here he experienced first-hand the inductive force of argument by observation and experiment in astronomy and medicine. Later, in the early days of the *Transactions of the Royal Society*, he was a faithful contributor, delivering over 60 contributions to the journal. Despite his modern methods of mathematics and natural philosophy, late in his life he published an ordinary logic textbook in the same year as Newton's *Principia* (1687), modelled on the traditional scholastic Aristotelian model. For Wallis, the new philosophy and the old were both legitimate modes of philosophical discourse. Of his most reprinted works, his *Logic* was second only to his *Grammar* (1653), in which he completely rewrote the way English grammar was understood and taught. His empiricist approach to English grammar took the language on its own terms, rather than force it into the mould of Latin, or some pretended rational meta-grammar. It was its own mode discourse (here literally) about the world. His rejection of any privileged manner of speech and knowing was also evident in his scepticism towards the universal language projects, however well-intentioned he took them to be.[14]

With such a variety of methods and modes of description, it is understandable why Wallis was criticized for what seemed an irrational inconsistency. However, from at least his university days, Wallis had adopted a rational tool from the Jesuit philosopher Francisco Suarez, most clearly explicated in *Metaphysical Disputation* VII. Wallis had read this book, quoted it in his MA thesis[15] and employed its language and concepts, sometimes explicitly, throughout his career. It is the unifying principle of his diverse ways of thinking sampled above, and ultimately draws together his views on church polity and liturgy.

Suarez's *Metaphysical Disputation* VII identifies several possible kinds of distinction.[16] The real distinction is between two things as one would ordinarily distinguish them: between you and me or two books on the table. Mental distinctions, the other basic class, falls into two divisions, and here is where our interest lies in natural philosophy. The first kind of mental distinction is of 'reason reasoning' (*ratio ratiocinantis*). The active form of the participle is important. This kind of mental distinction has no basis in reality, but is entirely a construct of the active mind. For example, Peter might be a subject of a sentence or its object. Whether we distinguish Peter as subject or object is purely intellectual; it is the same Peter really in either case. The second kind of mental distinction is of 'reason being reasoned' (*rationis ratiocinatae*). This is a mental distinction; however, in this case it has a foundation in reality. The intellect is not so much constructing the distinction, as the active sense of the former version suggests, but finding or discovering it, as the passive sense here indicates. There is a passive component as the mind receives certain constraints from the world in the formation of its concept. This latter mental distinction captures our sense in that when we seek to know the world we are, on the one hand, discerning things that really are in the world (not just fictions), and yet that knowledge is only had by an active selection or limitation of the mind. The distinction *rationis ratiocinatae* is a middle concept between real distinction and mental distinction. The concepts formed by the distinction *rationis ratiocinatae* are, he says, 'inadequate concepts'. This language reflects the way in which we describe or understand things by picking out certain features and not others. They are 'inadequate' because they do not contain the totality of a thing, but are only *ex parte rei*, a part, not the whole. They are based on reality, but do not speak of all of the reality of the thing. For Wallis, they become the foundation for an instrumentalist attitude towards mathematics, natural philosophy and theology. It provides a rational unity of his ideas, in contrast to either the duplicity accused by his critics, or even a less innocuous compromise or 'middle-way'.

The Suarezian distinctions are used explicitly in the course of Wallis's epistolary exchange in 1690–91 regarding the doctrine of the Trinity.[17] Arguing against the anti-Trinitarian Stephen Nye, Wallis tries to express the limitation of natural language in expressing the divine nature.[18] We make distinctions between the 'Persons of the Trinity', but these are only inadequate concepts. When arguing against Socinians, Wallis is less worried about a charge of modalism, and more concerned to make the case for a legitimate distinction in the Godhead. If anti-Trinitarians take issue with the word 'Person', it is not essential—call them 'three somewhats' if you like.[19] Wallis even employs his instrumental and non-essentialist use of language, comparing theology and natural philosophy side by side in several sermons on the Trinity:

> It must be confessed, that different Men, as well in the same as in different Ages, have very differently expressed themselves, according to their different Sentiments of *Personality*; and of the particular *Distinctions* of the three Persons among themselves . . .
>
> Can we never be said to agree in this, That *the Fire doth Burn and Consume the Wood*; till we be all agreed *what is the Figure of those Fiery Atoms* (and what their *Motion*, and from what *Impulse*) which *enter the Pores of the Wood*, and *separate its parts*, and convert some of them to *Smoak*, some to *Flame*, and some to *Ashes*; and *which to which*; and in what *manner* all this is done?
>
> What folly then is it to require that, in the things of God, we should all *so* agree as to express our thoughts *just in the same manner*; as is not possible to do in the most obvious things we meet with?

> And, such a case as wherein to express our Notions, we have no Words but *Figurative*,
> it is not to be thought strange, that one man should make use of *one Metaphor*, and
> another of *another*, according as their several Fansies serve.[20]

Wallis wrote on numerous loci of theology, but our focus in the remainder of this paper will be on two of the most socially-charged topics within ecclesiology: polity and liturgy.[21]

CHURCH POLITY

At this time in England, there were three basic views of Church government. Episcopalians ordain bishops, who hold an office of higher degree than that of other ministers. Among presbyterians, all ministers are of equal power, yet subject to the whole body, both regionally and nationally. Independents, who preferred the less pejorative 'dissenting brethren', held that each church ought to be self-governed, without the oversight of any other church, either hierarchically, as in the Roman Catholic or Episcopalian church, or democratically, as in the regional governing bodies of presbyterian churches.[22] Church polity was politically charged in seventeenth-century England, since, as James I so succinctly put it at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, 'No bishop, no king'. Intimately related to the question of church government was the manner of Christian worship. Many were concerned to guard against ceremonies, phrases and even modes of ecclesiastical dress that showed reverence to Roman Catholic practice, such as placing an altar in the east end of the church, protecting it with a railing, bowing at the name of Jesus, wearing a surplice, enforcing a prayer book or using candles, incense, and other cultic accoutrements. Others counted such differences of practice as *adiaphora*, or 'things indifferent'. Historians have become accustomed to using religion as a proxy for political affiliation, and this, as noted, is sometimes a reasonable shorthand, but such a historiography will not render a comprehensible analysis of Wallis's thoughts and actions. As this essay will demonstrate, Wallis maintained theological opinions about these issues that cut across the political categories employed then and now.[23]

In 1642, King Charles I was exiled from London and at war with Parliament. The Church of England, as then known, was abolished and Archbishop Laud was removed, tried and executed in 1645. Parliament called a congregation of ministers, roughly two from every county, to meet and decide what would be the new architecture of the church in England. The parliamentary ordinance of June 1643, which called together the meeting of ministers to reform the English church, noted in its title that their work would be 'for the setling of the Government and Litturgie of the Church of England and for vindicating and cleering the doctrine of the said church from false Aspersions and Interpretations'.[24] The Westminster Assembly began meeting in the summer of 1643, discussing revisions to the Thirty-nine Articles. John Wallis joined them as 'an amanuensis and assistant to the scribes' possibly as late as December 1643. He was the youngest member of the group, had no voting privileges and normally did not have a right to the floor. What he did have was access to the debates as they were happening, and the individuals who were among the leading theologians in England at the time.[25]

The Westminster Assembly delivered to posterity a *Confession of Faith*, connected with two catechisms, and a *Directory for Worship*. The form of church government was published as several ordinances of the House of Lords and Commons in 1645–46, with the advice of

the Assembly.[26] They clearly state that the terms elder, presbyter and bishop are all equivalent.[27] There is no difference in level of authority intended in the New Testament by any of those designations.

We know that Wallis did not merely acquiesce in his adoption of this view of church government, but was personally digesting the doctrine. An unpublished manuscript reveals his notes on a book by the New Englander John Cotton, *Keyes of the Kingdom*, published by two of the Assembly's independents, John Goodwin and Philip Nye.[28] Wallis's notes probably date from mid-1644 to mid-1645, motivated by current debates in the Assembly on the subject. As secretary to the Westminster Assembly, his attendance at their plenary sessions can be assumed, so the debates of the Assembly give us a sense of what he heard on a daily basis. The Assembly's first discussion of Matthew 16.18–19, where the expression 'keys of the kingdom' is found, transpired before Cotton's publication and before Wallis had joined the Assembly.[29]

Hunter Powell has explained that Cotton's work had become a unifying text for those in the Assembly who were striving to accommodate the Independent party.[30] English divines at the Assembly, on the whole, subscribed to some form of presbyterianism.[31] George Gillespie, one of the Scottish representatives at the Assembly, and the independents John Goodwin and Philip Nye, were able to take Cotton as a compromise solution, hoping a larger unity at the Assembly might be achieved. Cotton's views of church government constituted a middle position in that he conferred power to individual congregations and believers, satisfying congregationalists, while still granting authority to synods, satisfying presbyterians. Discussion of the central biblical text arose a second time, unsurprisingly in the midst of discussions on the power of ecumenical synods, with Wallis present and now after the publication of Cotton's book. On the first two days of October 1644, Gillespie debated with Nye, William Bridge and Goodwin over the relative power of presbyterial synods. Surprisingly, Cotton's book, which had been published by Nye and Goodwin four months earlier, was not offered as evidence by these independents, but by Gillespie. It is even more interesting to note that Gillespie does not argue against Cotton (and thus Nye and Goodwin), but wields it as a foil against them. The reason he is able to do so, as Gillespie says explicitly, is that 'the publisher' (i.e. Nye and Goodwin) had interpreted Cotton contrary to his own meaning in their preface to his book.[32] Cotton's compromise lent itself to adoption on one side or the other. This is what we find in Wallis's own interaction with the book.

Wallis's manuscript comments on Cotton show that the presbyterian position that Wallis held during this time was probably established in his own mind before he came to the Assembly, or at least no later than his first year within the Assembly.[33] In his personal observations on Cotton's book, he makes numerous biblical arguments for a synodical presbyterianism, revealing that he has already given those questions some thought. He also makes every effort to find points of unity between Cotton and the presbyterian position, even bending Cotton's words to a more presbyterian reading, just as Gillespie did on the floor of the Assembly. We see this same conciliatory attitude in Wallis's career. As a rule, Wallis went to great lengths to mend divisions and accept a wide band of interpretations where he sensed that the other party was interested in the same. This manuscript also reveals that although the Independents are the primary opponent in view, Wallis's articulation of synodical power seems to leave no room for bishops. Not only does Wallis never mention the words 'bishop' or 'episcopacy', he invests all of church power and authority—the keys of the kingdom—in groups (presbyteries and synods), not

in individual persons. Even though he argues against congregationalists, who wish to diffuse church power, he does not take the opposite extreme and invest such power in prelates. Understanding Wallis's own position during the Assembly is crucial for interpreting his account of that Assembly half a century later.

From 1645 to 1647 Wallis served as rector of St Gabriel's Church in Fenchurch Street, London, and then at St Martin's in Ironmonger Lane from 1647 to 1649 alongside his duties as scribe to the Assembly. He acquired an even more significant responsibility, given his age, in being appointed a 'trier' in the fledgling Presbyterian Church in England in April 1647.[34] As a trier for the Ninth Classis of London, he was responsible for overseeing the initial election of elders within the parish churches of his classis until the time that presbyterial leadership was in place and such oversight was no longer needed.[35] However, presbyterianism as a formal ecclesiastical body in England became non-existent under Cromwell.

Wallis, with many others, was a direct beneficiary of the parliamentary removal of royalist professors and the insertion of their own men in their places. However, this does not mean that Wallis followed non-royalist governments at every turn. Wallis was likely a part of what Blair Worden calls the 'Wilkins circle', a group of reform-minded men working internally within Interregnum Oxford.[36] Parliament sent three visitations to Oxford between 1647 and 1658.[37] A draft letter in Wallis's hand to Richard Cromwell reveals sentiments among some faculty at that time desiring that the university at least have the independence granted to ordinary corporations.[38] Bishops had formerly played the role of visitors and, in their absence, this group had no desire for direct oversight from Parliament. They were not challenging oversight per se, but insisted that it should be local, not from Parliament. Wallis and the Oxford dons were resisting centralized oversight and the imposition of prescriptions from afar. Their attitude is more reminiscent of presbytery than prelacy.

During this period, Wallis was undaunted by the congregational powers in Oxford, John Owen (vice-chancellor) and Oliver Cromwell (chancellor). He publicly defended the presbyterian equality of all ministers. The second question posed to Wallis for his degree of Doctor of Theology in 1654 asked: 'Does the power of the Gospel minister extend to the members of only one particular church?' Wallis answered in the negative, much to the displeasure of the independent John Owen. Daniel Cawdrey reports second hand that,

> when the learned Doctor Wallis, had brought to him as Vice-chancellor, that Question to be defended *negativè*, in the vespers of the publick Act at Oxford, 1654 . . . this Reverend Doctor said thereupon, that Doctor Wallis had brought him a challenge, adding, that if he did dispute upon that Question, he must dispute *ex animo*.[39]

Wallis defended the question as stated and published it, thus clearly claiming the views given there as his own.[40] He worked within the system that was Interregnum Oxford, but did not cater to the Independents in power, either in the political sphere, in London, or the academic, in Oxford.

In his response to the question, Wallis argues not only that the authority of the minister extends beyond a local congregation, but that such authority does not even derive from that local congregation. Rather, that authority is given by Christ, and thereby applies to all of Christ's church. For Wallis, the Scriptures do not speak of many families in the way that the Congregationalists shape their rhetoric of husband-ministers in their local wife-churches. Instead, the Bible speaks explicitly of 'all the faithful' as pertaining to one

family of God, 'to the same congregation, the same dwelling, the same body, at last the same spouse of Christ'.[41] Wallis notes the particular functions for which pastors are responsible: preaching, administering the sacraments, church discipline and ordination.[42] A minister's service applies to the entire church: when he preaches, baptizes or even excommunicates.[43] The church is a whole (*integrum*) body of Christ, of which all the faithful are members. Thus Christ himself is 'the chief head over . . . this unity or family, or congregation, or body, and they sustain a relation to that whole congregation or whole family primarily, but to particular churches only secondarily, only parts of a whole; just as the eye in the body serves primarily to see for the whole; also for the hand, or the foot, only parts of the whole'.[44] Wallis argues strongly in public against a congregationalist view, with no obligation to Owen and Cromwell.

Even at the Restoration, Wallis stood for his principles contrary to prevailing ecclesiastical winds. On 14 April 1660, with England's government without proper leadership, the exiled King Charles II sent the *Declaration of Breda*, laying out the terms under which he would agree to return to England as their monarch. In it, he extends an olive branch to the presbyterians, stating, 'we do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion'.[45] During June he appointed nine or more chaplains from among the Presbyterian party, Wallis included. Almost all of them had been at the Westminster Assembly.

On 22 October 1660, this group met at the home of Lord Chancellor Edward Hyde, soon to be created Lord Clarendon.[46] Their aim was to read through a working document on church government, the king's 'declaration'. Each side would comment, and the king would make a final decision. The first point of contention was the veto power given to regular ministers over the decisions of bishops. The king himself was the one most opposed to it. Baxter does not record any other particular points of dispute, noting, 'I think neither Party doth value the rambling Discourses of that Day, so much, as to think them worthy the recording'.[47] Having finished working through the declaration, Lord Chancellor Hyde pulled out a new document, a petition from the Independents and Anabaptists, who desired an addition to the declaration: the clause, 'others also be permitted to meet for Religious Worship, so be it, they do it not to the disturbance of the Peace: and that no Justice of Peace or Officer disturb them'.[48] Everyone in the room immediately understood the implications of such an addition, and it had little to do with the Independents. Baxter says that the 'Presbyterians all perceived, as soon as they heard it, that it would secure the Liberty of the Papists: and one of them whispered me in the Ear, and intreated me to say nothing, for it was an odious Business, but let the Bishops speak to it'. A marginal note in Baxter's *Reliquiae* indicates that his friendly counsellor in this instance was Dr Wallis. But the bishops said nothing, and Baxter, whom Wallis had rightly urged to restrain himself, 'thought our very Silence would be charged on us a Consent to it, went on . . .'.[49] The meeting ended, and final revisions of the declaration were left to Bishops Morley and Hinchman, Edward Reynolds and Edmund Calamy. In the end, Baxter was thrilled to discover the document had retained some key elements of ministerial power among all presbyters.

The most significant of the Presbyterian chaplains' previously submitted proposals was their choice to offer Archbishop (of Armagh) Ussher's *Reduction of Episcopacie unto the Form of Synodical Government* as their architectural plan for England's church.[50] Ussher's system was not exactly what the Presbyterians wanted, but it predated the

dissolution of the Church of England. At least Ussher's plan contained the core element the Presbyterians most desired, which was that church power ultimately resided in synods, not in the bishops. Much could be compromised if this principle was kept. However, the bishops were not forthcoming, and were probably first waiting to see what the Presbyterians would produce before staking their own claim. It was a tactic designed to ensure disagreement. The king does not seem to have been bothered by the bishops' lack of participation, suggesting that he too was waiting to see if the Presbyterians would either bury themselves or concede all. Baxter reports that Charles 'was glad that we were for a Liturgy, and yielded to the *Essence* of Episcopacy'.[51] It shows that Charles did not perceive the significance of Ussher's plan. According to the final Worcester House Declaration of 25 October 1660, bishops would still exist, but with nothing of the powers they once enjoyed.

Moving ahead to the 1680s, James II abdicated the throne and William and Mary came to power. This required a new oath of allegiance, though some, the 'non-jurors', still believed James II to be the rightful monarch. Those who opposed the new government, such as the orientalist and scholar Thomas Smith (1638–1710), were in danger of losing their jobs— in Smith's case, his fellowship at Magdalen College. Wallis maintained close correspondence with Smith and urged him to reconsider: 'I do not apprehend that you can do God, or the Church or whom you would most gratify, in quitting the station wherein God hath set you, and wherein you may be serviceable to him and to the University.'[52] For Wallis, Smith's scholarly contributions were a greater good and more solid than political commitments to the ever-shifting affairs of state. In his later years, Wallis's principles remained consistent as both the church and state in England continued to change. What Wallis said to Smith applied equally to himself as he sought not merely to survive, but to contribute as much as possible to piety and learning.

Wallis's last known words on the subject of church government appear in a letter to George Keith, written in response to several newly published sermons sent by him.[53] Keith had recently abandoned the Quakers and decided to join the Church of England as a minister. Wallis praises his decision, but adds some qualifications to Keith's comments on those whom he names in his sermons as 'dissenters'.[54] Wallis observes that many of those who are formally outside the communion of the Church of England ought not to be considered dissenters, since their views are so close to the English church.

> If some of them (called Presbyterians) do not think Bishops so necessary, but that they may be spared, where they cannot conveniently be had; yet few of them think all Episcopacy unlawfull, but can live quietly under that of the Church of England; and can admit of as much difference between Presbyter and Bishop, as we do between Bishop and Archbishop, or Patriarch: Which though we look upon as different *Dignities* (from that of a Bishop;) yet not as different *Orders*, and therefore not to need a new *Consecration*.[55]

Wallis is expressing his own view, which is a presbyterian reading of the difference between presbyter and bishop. Wallis says gently, but clearly, that bishops are not essential to church government. If bishops are present, a presbyterian would be content to join such a church as long as they were not regarded as a higher office—certainly not how the offices were regarded in the Church of England at that time. Forty years after the Restoration, Wallis is still proposing 'limited episcopacy' as the best solution towards Comprehension because his core position on church government is presbyterian.

A few years before this letter, John Wallis wrote his autobiography, devoting one-fifth of it to describing the Westminster Assembly's debates on church government.[56] Wallis emphasizes the episcopal nature of the Assembly's overall direction: 'The Divines of this Assembly were, for the Generality of them, Conformable, Episcopal Men'. Besides the seven Independents:

> I do not know of any Non-Conformist among them ... many of them were professedly Episcopal; and (I think) all of them so far Episcopal as to account a well-regulated Episcopacy to be at least allowable, if not advisable; yet so as they thought the present Constitution capable of Reformation for the better.[57]

And in clarifying the sense in which the divines were called Presbyterian, 'it was not in the Sense of Anti-Episcopal, but Anti-Independants'.[58] This is consistent with his position seen earlier during the 1640s to the 1660s. Wallis is also careful to note that the *Solemn League and Covenant*, sent from Scotland to the Parliament, was not initially signed by Parliament since it rejected 'prelacy' outright. The compromise adopted reinterpreted such an abolition only to include the *present* system of prelacy in the English church and not all possible forms of hierarchy.[59] This meant that some form of modified episcopacy was a real possibility in the minds of enough divines or members of Parliament to require the alteration.

The form of church government recommended by the Assembly to Parliament was presbyterian. Why, then, did Wallis give such an episcopalian description of the Westminster Assembly in his autobiography? The critical answer is, of course, that he was giving a post-Restoration spin to the Assembly's history. It would be spin if it were manifestly untrue. Wallis's emphasis on episcopacy is a result of his desire to reject the views of Wood, Hobbes and polemicists like Peter Heylyn, who identified the Presbyterians with radical dissenters. The group formed a *compromise* in presbyterianism, which was also, in fact, Wallis's personal conviction. (Recall the debates over Cotton during the Assembly, described above.) Wood read Wallis's many oaths to political powers as a matter of convenience and thus a lack of character. However, a reading more consistent with the evidence presented so far is to take his actions as a mode of ecclesiastical irenicism, extended equally to episcopalians and the dissenting brethren.

CHURCH LITURGY

Anthony Wood had noted that Wallis was 'Instrumental in bringing off Laud's head'.[60] Wood makes it sound like Wallis was wielding the axe. In Laud's trial, Wallis gave evidence to Laud's high-church practices, having been summoned by the House of Lords in late January or February of 1644/5, to testify to what he observed in Cambridge while a student there, so he was 'instrumental' only in the technical sense.[61] What he testified might have come from anyone around the university at that time. As for Wood's claim that Wallis was also instrumental in taking off the king's head, he is entirely mistaken. Wallis signed the declaration opposing the king's execution, alongside many other members of the Westminster Assembly.[62] Wood contradicts himself, accusing Wallis both for his compliance and for his rebellion.

The Assembly did produce a *Directory for Worship* in 1645 as a replacement for the *Book of Common Prayer*.[63] Although there is no extant commentary by Wallis on the document,

indirect evidence, given below, suggests Wallis preferred its manner of worship to what had become normal in the Church of England. Wallis's approval of the work of the Assembly in general is seen not only in the favourable comments about it in his autobiography, but also in his republishing an annotated version of its *Shorter Catechism* in 1648.[64]

In 1660, the presbyterians had walked away from the Worcester House meeting hopeful for compromise. Matters of church government were not ideal, but heading in a positive direction. There remained the matter of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Would it be enforced, revised or emended? Former bishops, ministers and members of Parliament were on all sides. The Worcester House Declaration had promised a representative conference of divines to resolve key questions of worship. The king made good on that promise and such a meeting began in Savoy on 25 March 1661, setting aside four months to complete the work.

Clarendon, who had such a central role, did not always have his way, and it appears that the king was more for conciliation than his chief officer. Green explains that this strategy was to prevent any single party from ruling England's church, leaving Charles in control.[65] However, between the time of the Worcester House Declaration and the beginning of the Savoy Conference, political motions caused a significant shift in power that frustrated both Charles' plans and the Presbyterians' early hopes. Parliamentary elections took control out of the hands of the Presbyterian political wing. Further, Charles had begun appointing bishops in an attempt to diversify the church, but in the process prejudiced the outcome for both church government and worship.

The Savoy Conference was, therefore, off to a rocky start. Immediately, the bishops required that the Presbyterians prepare 'Exceptions' to the *Book of Common Prayer*. This highly prejudiced the whole conference because the prayer book was the assumed starting point.[66] Wallis was among the ministers present on the first day of the conference and, according to Baxter, one of their 'chief Actors' in writing up the exceptions.[67] They were completed and submitted to the bishops on 4 May 1661.[68] Baxter says that 'Dr. Wallis was desired to draw up the Prayer for the King, which is his Work (being after some what altered by us.)'.[69] The bishops did not provide their answers until June. Meanwhile, Parliament was in session on 8 May and 17 May and burned the *Solemn League and Covenant*. The House of Commons celebrated the Eucharist on 24 May according to the 1604 edition of the Prayer Book.[70] The proposal for conciliation was becoming more and more moot as the Parliament advanced with its own agenda of an ecclesiastical status quo. Actual face-to-face discussion at the conference did not begin until around 15 July, and only at the urging of the Presbyterians, with the whole affair scheduled to end on the 25th.[71] Wallis was back in Oxford as early as 23 June, offering William Brouncker his latest refutation of Hobbes' geometry—a battle he knew he had better chances of winning—and there is no evidence that he returned to London.[72] Baxter and others stayed until the bitter end. The bishops argued that it had not been proven that any alteration to the liturgy was necessary. The Presbyterians noted that the King's declaration demanded it, yet Baxter said sadly, 'we spoke to the Deaf'.[73]

Wallis returned to Oxford disgusted and frustrated with the harsh and unjust treatment the bishops had given the Presbyterians.[74] His feelings are evident in his public lecture at Oxford at the start of the university term following the Savoy Conference. The lecture, *De Foedere Evangelico*, takes Galatians (Gal.) 3.17 as its text.[75] The main point of Gal. 3.17 is that the Christian faith is distinctly marked by its departure from the rule-governed oppression of the Mosaic economy to a new state devoid of ceremonial trappings, yet no less a part of the

tradition of faith which had preceded it. For the Christian, communion with God no longer requires a priest and his sacrifices, the temple and its furniture, and the feast days and holy-days which marked the life of Israel from the time of their wilderness wandering to the birth of the Christian church in the first century. Wallis's aim in bringing out this Pauline point was crystal clear: the Church of England, under the imminent authority of the bishops, wished to continue imposing this burden through their hierarchy of priestcraft and their ceremonial instrument, the *Book of Common Prayer*.

The bishops are, in the subtext of Wallis's lecture, the 'imposters' subject to Paul's biting criticisms. The bishops were standing before the church, claiming Paul and the other Apostles as the justification for their higher office, requiring a second ordination above that of a priest, yet they are nothing like the example that Paul set. In a somewhat less guarded remark, Wallis spoke directly to such bishops:

> Although, in fact, when the Apostle [Paul] was present, he would have been able to speak by Apostolic authority. Nevertheless, since he considered the Apostolate for service, not merely to give orders, but to preach the Gospel law; he did not so much judge, or even decree with a curse, but was seen to persuade with arguments what he had appointed.[76]

This is the exact opposite kind of behaviour the Presbyterians had observed to come from the bishops at the Savoy Conference a few months earlier.

Surviving correspondence between John Wallis and Archbishop Thomas Tenison reveals Wallis's views still had not changed significantly from his time at the Westminster Assembly. On 4 April 1699, Archbishop Tenison sent out a circular letter to the bishops speaking out against public vice and the need for ministers to correct it. The beginning of all such public reform starts with the example of such ministers.[77] Wallis noted that he had not yet seen it when he wrote to Tenison on 22 May 1699. The two had been in correspondence already, even as early as 1680.[78] Here, Wallis extends his criticisms of the clergy, which it seems he had already voiced in previous correspondence (no longer extant). He begins his letter with a qualification, which was to reject the Independents' complete lack of distinction between the minister and regular members of the church. However, Wallis does not think that a low view of the ministerial office is to be solved by dressing up the minister:

> I am far from thinking there is any thing of internal Holyness in a long Gown and Cossock; scarce than in their short silk clock, with Lace and Fringes, and broad laced Boat-hose tops, with trimmings of Points and Ribbands on their clothes. But certainly there is a Decrease, both in habit, and much more in conversation, sutable to several ranks of men, according to the several stations wherein they are. . . . I have observed in my former days, when a grave sober Divine, by his prudent and pious deportment, hath obtained a just observation and esteem from the best of the Gentry round about; and gained an authority to advise their advise and exhortations for the promoting of real Piety; which too much of Levity and Gayety would have much diminished.[79]

Tenison had long been in support of efforts to bring dissenters into the church, despite opposition from the majority of bishops. Like Wallis, he had even attempted revisions of the *Book of Common Prayer*, for similar reasons, and, also like Wallis, had felt the sting of rejection from the bishops.[80] Wallis's overarching criticism is that ministers are substituting external frills in the place of substantial religious leadership. This extends to preaching as well, where the 'Plain, Familiar, and Practical way of Preaching' has been

abandoned and is replaced with rhetorical flourish.[81] Wallis explains: 'It may perhaps have been then cryed down as Puritanical Preaching; and 'tis possible some men might press some points too far: But 'tis safest erring on that hand. For let our Rule be made never so Lax, the Practise will yet be Looser.'[82]

For the Puritans of Laudian times, one of the most egregious impositions was not so much the content of the prayer book, but that they had no liberty to work beyond its bounds. In Wallis's view, it seems, the answer to the moral ills of their time is not to be found merely in stricter adherence of ministers to the accepted forms, but in the liberty and even encouragement to move beyond them.

> Your Grace may also remember, that, beside the lost Forms of our Church, our Divines were wont to make use of Occasional Affectionate Prayers, Before and After Sermons: Which, though not wholly layd aside, are much short of what they were wont to be. Which I do not speak to disparage those of our Liturgy; (which are very good, and, if attended with due Intenseness of Mind, very Pious; and which I would not have omitted:) But, because I think these other might be of good use allso. Some Variation of Forms, even though perhaps much to the same purpose, is apt to excite more vivid Affections; which, without this, are apt to be more languid. We find Variation in Sermons, is of good use: not withstanding the stated Homilies of the Church: And, why not in Prayers allso? And, if a man may exercise his Parts and Gifts in Penning Sermons; why not in Composing Prayers?[83]

The argument here is much like Wallis's justification for the use of a variety of theological terms and expressions to articulate Christian doctrines.[84] This variation of forms deepens our understanding of the Christian faith. A similarly liberal application within the liturgy would do for the heart what such a theology does for the mind.

Wallis also expressed his views publicly. In a sermon at the university church preached on 30 December 1688, he made clear what he thought essential to Christian worship.

> Now I do not apprehend, why there should be thought so much Hurt (for Instance) in a Surplice, as to spoil a Prayer otherwise good: Nor yet is there so great Necessity of it, but that a Prayer may be good without it, if our Governours had so thought fit: And, I hope, our College Prayers, without it on other days, may have as much Devotion, though not so much Pomp, as with it on Holy-days, and Holy-day Eves.[85] These disagreements are really only petty differences. . . . If any do unduly Dissent or Differ from us; let us endeavour to Inform them, and Reclaim them; but not to hate them, nor break Communion with them.[86]

Wallis expresses here the old Elizabethan Puritan position that 'things indifferent' (*adiaphora*) ought not to be imposed as necessary. Evidently, his position had not moved in this show of support for Comprehension.

Wallis's conformity to the Church of England was less onerous for one of his convictions in part because of his post within the university. First, Peter Turner, who was ejected from the Savilian chair prior to Wallis's appointment, died in 1652, and thus was not a hindrance to Wallis retaining his seat at the Restoration. Second, Wallis had been ordained by a bishop in 1640, thus avoiding the problem of reordination faced by many Presbyterian divines who had been ordained by other means and were required at the Restoration to be ordained again under a bishop. Third, as a professor of geometry, Wallis was not forced to use the prayer book on a regular basis as even a common priest would be required.[87] As Wallis indicates in the quotation above, worship services in college were conducted more loosely. Thus,

Wallis was able to avoid many of the scruples that plagued other men who shared his convictions.

On the question of conformity, it is also worth noting that Wallis never accepted any preferment within the church. The Savilian statutes barred either of its professors from holding any post concurrent with the professorship. Certainly, a bishop's pay would be an improvement over the irregular endowment coming from the rents of the Savilian estates. By the time of the Restoration, Wallis had already added to his professorship the role of university archivist, and even petitioned Charles II in 1661 for the prebendary of Christ Church, Oxford.[88] That never materialized. Wallis was offered the deanery of Hereford in 1692, but turned it down. This could have been for a variety of reasons besides ecclesiological scruple, so perhaps the better question is, did John Wallis *desire* preferment in the church? While two letters in 1689 and 1691 seem to suggest it, Wallis denies it explicitly. His service to the government had come at a cost and his concern appears solely financial.[89]

If Wallis had wanted a bishopric with any amount of zeal, he missed his chance three decades earlier when he was in the presence of King Charles II. As Baxter relates, Clarendon had extended the offer to Reynolds, Calamy and Baxter. Wallis could have made his move then, but remained on the more presbyterian side of the moderates. Further, to accept a bishopric then meant joining a rather militant episcopalian party, not the sort of peace-loving colleagues Wallis preferred. But the situation in 1689 was much different. A more solidly Protestant monarch was on the throne and a more Calvinistic and tolerant archbishop was in Canterbury (though Tenison was soon to lose relevance to a high-church majority). At that moment at least, it appeared to Wallis that the Church of England had indeed come around once again to a moment of decision, and the events of the recent change of power signalled hope for a man of his inclinations. But it must also have been clear to him that while the church was making a turn for the better, in England, episcopacy (understood as more robust than the 'primitive episcopacy' advocated by the Presbyterians decades earlier) was there to stay. The closest Wallis ever came to being a bishop was ironically during the brief life of legal English presbyterianism in the late 1640s, when Wallis was appointed as a 'trier' of the ninth classis in London. Though the triers were never called bishops, their role reflects the kind of responsibility a bishop might have held under a 'primitive episcopacy'.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the best way to characterize John Wallis, with respect to ecclesiastical matters, is as a 'conforming reformer'.[90] Though Wallis was in favour of mediation and compromise, it was not by way of cutting a path through the middle, as in the 'middle-way' adopted by other divines such as Richard Baxter.[91] In fact, Wallis was critical of Baxter in his attempt to find a middle way in his treatment of the doctrine of justification. In a long letter to Baxter, criticizing his *Aphorisms of justification* (1649),[92] Wallis shows that for him there are limits to what can be given up.[93] In ecclesiology, Wallis's solution was not a give-and-take compromise, but a rational instrumental system that made opposites legitimate companions.

As a presbyterian, Wallis was concerned to balance the two poles of independency and episcopacy. For him, neither reflects the biblical position. One view invests all power in

individual congregations, the other in the office of the bishop. Wallis's language in his *Theological Questions* of 1654 is illuminating, where he emphasizes the 'whole' body of the church. Against the Independents, who invest power in each congregation, Wallis argues that the only real whole in the church is the regional or national body, or even the universal church. The distinction of one congregation from that whole is only from a part of a thing (*ex parte rei*, as Suarez says it), a limitation of circumstance (i.e. the local congregation). The distinction of one congregation from another is not a real distinction, nor only a mental one, since there are actual local congregations. The distinction of particular congregations is *rationis ratiocinatae*, the distinction that incorporates both the real and the mental.

Against the episcopalians, Wallis argues from the other side. It is an error to take congregational distinctions as real distinctions of powers in the church, but it is also incorrect to say that there are no distinctions within the church and place all powers centrally in that of bishops. It is like the error of the anti-Trinitarians whom Wallis opposed in 1690–91. They held one God and no distinction of Persons. Church power is both distributed among all ministers, and yet unified in the whole body of the church. The episcopalian position, to elaborate the analogy, views congregational divisions as more like mental distinctions. They are visibly distinct, but share in none of the real power. Presbyterianism encompasses the features of both sides, but not merely as a means of compromise, but because it is the only way to solve the basic philosophical problem of unity, plurality and parity in the church.

Wallis's instrumentalist position is equally evident in his attitude towards worship and liturgy. The prayer book was a legitimate mode of Christian worship, but not exclusive, merely a limited or 'inadequate' tool. Ministers might just as well devise other prayers, as they devise their own sermons. Here they expound the text of God's Word in their own words, just as natural philosophers expound the book of God's works 'according as their several Fansies serve'. This does not allow just any form of expression, since such modes of worship must answer to the Scriptures as much as one's theory of fire or motion in natural philosophy must answer to the world.

Wallis appreciated the finite human capacity for reading nature, a world so complex it was virtually as incomprehensible as the nature of God. That limitation requires our acceptance of a balance of imperfect laws and inadequate concepts of things. The ecclesiological debates of seventeenth-century England were no less affected by the limitations of theological language in biblical interpretation. The differing concepts of church government call for both hierarchy *and* plurality and parity. The differing concepts of forms of worship call for both order and unity *and* liberty. Motivated by Suarez's theory of distinctions, Wallis found a rational means of holding such concepts from both sides together as complements by employing those concepts instrumentally. Wallis's stance on church matters was not an epiphenomenon of political expediency, but rationally grounded on his philosophy of nature.

NOTES

1   Anthony Wood, *The life and times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632–1695, described by himself collected from his diaries and other papers*, 5 vols (ed. Andrew Clark) (Oxford Historical Society, Oxford, 1891), vol. 3, p. 308.

2   The popular murder-mystery and historical fiction author Iain Pears developed Wood's particular view of Wallis into an entire fictional persona. Iain Pears, *An instance of the fingerpost* (Berkley Publishing Co., New York, 1999).

3   Thomas Hobbes, Στίγμαι Ἀγεωμετρίας, Ἀγροικίας, Ἀντιπολιτείας, *or markes of the absurd geometry, rural language, Scottish church-politicks and barbarisms of J. Wallis* (London, Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1657), p. 19.

4   Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002), p. 155.

5   Douglas Jesseph, *Squaring the circle: the war between Hobbes and Wallis* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1999), pp. 244–245.

6   *Ibid.*, pp. 176–178.

7   Simon Schaffer, 'Wallifaction: Thomas Hobbes on school divinity and experimental pneumatics', *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci.* **19**, pp. 275–298 (1988), at p. 278. Such terms could be literally 'empty' as in the case of 'void'.

8   This thesis is explained in more detail in Jason M. Rampelt, 'Distinctions of reason and reasonable distinctions: the academic life of John Wallis (1616–1703)', PhD thesis, Cambridge University (2005).

9   'Anti-Episcopal' here means the form of episcopacy that included bishops as officers of higher order and strict conformity to liturgical forms. Many of the 'Presbyterian party' did not reject all episcopal forms. This is discussed further below.

10   These were later published as *Mathesis universalis* in 1657, and again in John Wallis, *Opera mathematica*, 3 vols (E Theatro Sheldoniano, Oxford, 1693–99), hereafter, '*OM*'.

11   Pierre de Fermat to Kenelm Digby, '[10]/20 April 1657. John Wallis', in *Correspondence of John Wallis (1616–1703)* (ed. Philip Beeley & Christoph J. Scriba), no. 101, 4 vols (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003–14), vol. 1, p. 283, hereafter, '*CJW*'.

12   These issues are addressed in greater depth in Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 8.

13   For a detailed look at the London meetings, and Wallis's participation in them, see Jason M. Rampelt, 'The last word: John Wallis on the origin of the Royal Society', *Hist. Sci.* **46**, 177–201 (2008).

14   Further argument on the matter of Wallis's appropriation of scholastic logic and work on grammar can be found in Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 9.

15   His MA thesis was appended to his first publication: John Wallis, *Truth tried: Or, animadversions on a treatise published by the Right Honorable Robert Lord Brook, entituled 'The Nature of Truth, its union and unity with the soule,' which (saith he) is one in its essence, faculties, acts; one with truth* (Samuel Gellibrand, London, 1642), and again in *OM*, vol. 3.

16   For an English translation, see Francisco Suarez, *On the various kinds of distinctions* (tr. Cyril Vollert) (Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, WI, 1947).

17   For more in-depth discussion of Wallis on the Trinity, see Jason M. Rampelt, 'Three Persons in one man: John Wallis on the Trinity', ThM thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia (2002); Philip Beeley and Siegmund Probst, 'John Wallis (1616–1703): mathematician and divine', in *Mathematics and the divine: a historical study* (ed. T. Koetsier and L. Bergmans), pp. 450–52 (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2004); Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 6.

18   John Wallis, *A seventh letter, concerning the Sacred Trinity; occasioned by a second letter from W.J.* (Thomas Parkhurst, London, 1691), p. 20.

19   John Wallis, *The doctrine of the Blessed Trinity briefly explained in a letter to a friend* (Printed for Tho. Parkhurst, London, 1690), p. 9.

20   John Wallis, *Three sermons concerning the Sacred Trinity. 1691* (Thomas Parkhurst, London, 1692), pp. 65–66.

21   Wallis also wrote on baptism and the Sabbath: *A defense of infant-baptism. In answer to a letter (here recited) from an anti-paedo-baptist* (Printed by L. Litchfield for H. Clements, Oxford, 1697); *A defense of the Christian sabbath. In answer to a treatis of Mr. Tho. Bampfield pleading for Saturday-sabbath* (L. Litchfield for C. Comingsby, London, 1692).

22   Each of these general positions had many variations, ones that might even merge with one another, which is a topic beyond the scope of this essay.

23   In this paper, 'presbyterian', with a lowercase 'p' indicates a term of ecclesiological (i.e. theological) significance. This distinguishes it from 'Presbyterian', the term used in the seventeenth century, and by historians today, to refer to a social body that functioned in the political space (e.g. 'Presbyterian party') and overlapped with some who may have had genuine presbyterian ecclesiological convictions, but not necessarily, nor even in the majority. See, for example, Mark Goldie, *Roger Morrice and the puritan Whigs: the Entring Book, 1677–1691* (Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 153–154.

24   Chad Van Dixhoorn (ed.), *The minutes and papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643–1652*, 5 vols (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012), vol. 1, p. 165, hereafter, '*MPWA*'.

25   For further information on the members of the Westminster Assembly and a general outline of their work, see Chad Van Dixhoorn, 'Westminster Assembly', *Oxford dictionary of national biography* (2007). For further details about Wallis's work at the Westminster Assembly, see Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 4.

26   An early draft on church government was submitted to Parliament on 11 December 1644. *MPWA* vol. 5, pp. 127–138 (Document 45).

27   *An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament. After advice had with the Assembly of Divines, for the ordination of ministers pro tempore, according to the Directory for Ordination, and Rules for Examination, therein expressed* (Printed for Ralph Smith, London, 1644); *An ordinance of the Lords and Common assembled in Parliament for giving power to all the classical presbyteries within their respective bounds to examine, approve, and ordaine ministers for severall congregations* (Printed for John Wright at the Kings head in the old Bayley, London, 1645).

28   John Cotton, *The keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, and power thereof, according to the Word of God . . . Published by John Goodwin and Philip Nye* (Henry Overton, London, 1644). Wallis's commentary on the text is in MS D. 105, ff. 146–153, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

29   *MPWA* vol. 2.5–6, pp. 231–249.

30   Hunter Powell, *The crisis of British Protestantism: church power in the Puritan revolution, 1638–44* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2015), p. 200.

31   Chad B. Van Dixhoorn, 'Presbyterian ecclesiologies at the Westminster Assembly', in *The keys of the kingdom of heaven: church polity in the English speaking world, ca 1636–1689* (ed. H. Powell and E. Vernon) (Manchester University Press, Manchester, forthcoming). Special thanks to Dr Van Dixhoorn for sharing his pre-print essay.

32   *MPWA* vol. 3, p. 362.

33   See Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 3 for Wallis's early life and education.

34   *Journals of the House of Commons*, vol. 5, p. 146.

35   William A. Shaw, *A history of the English Church during the civil wars and under the Commonwealth*, 2 vols (Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1900), vol. 2, pp. 25–27.

36   Blair Worden, 'Cromwellian Oxford', in *The history of the University of Oxford* (ed. Nicholas Tyacke), pp. 733–772 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997), 738ff. The circle was named after John Wilkins, later bishop and Fellow of the Royal Society.

37   Montagu Burrows (ed.), *The register of the visitors of the University of Oxford, from AD 1647 to AD 1658* (Camden Society, London, 1881).

38   *CJW* vol. 1, pp. 559–62.

39   Daniel Cawdrey, *Independency further proved to be a schism, or, a survey of Dr Owens review of his tract of schism* (John Wright, London, 1658), p. 129.

40   Cawdrey also adds that when the theses were subsequently printed, Owen turned to Henry Stubbe to refute it, but later judged Stubbe's literary taste would cause embarrassment to the Independent party; *ibid.*, pp. 129–130. Jesseph takes Cawdrey's account as evidence for a very sharp division between Wallis and Owen. Jesseph, *op. cit.* (note 5), p. 302. However,

Wallis and Owen continued to work together as allies on other university matters. In one instance, the orientalist Edward Pococke, who had not taken the Engagement, was charged by Berkshire commissioners for use of the prayer book. Owen, Wallis, Wilkins and Seth Ward ran to his defence. L. Twells *et al.*, *The lives of Dr. Edward Pococke, The celebrated orientalist, By Dr. Twells; of Dr. Zachary Pearce, Bishop of Rochester, and of Dr. Thomas Newton, Bishop of Bristol, by themselves; and of the Rev. Philip Skelton, by Mr. Burdy*, 2 vols (F. C. and J. Rivington, London, 1816), vol. 1, pp. 173–74.

41 '*Sed ad unam omnes familiam pertinent fideles, sive ex Judaeis sive Gentibus; ad eundem omnes gregem, idem domicisium, idem corpus; eandem denique sponsam Christi; prout ex innumeris Scripturae testimoniis abunde patet*'. *OM* 3(Misc).246.

42 *OM* 3(Misc).245.

43 *OM* 3(Misc).247.

44 '*Atque huic uni sive familiae, sive gregi, sive corpori, sicut ipse Christus primario praeest, et particularibus sive Ecclesiis, sive Christianis, non nisi ut membris totius; ita et ipsius sive Oeconomi, sive delegati, ad totum illum gregem, totamve familiam primario, ad ecclesias autem particulares non nisi secundario, relationem sustinent, tanquam partes totius; sicut et Oculus in corpore, primario, toti quidem prospiciendo inservit; manui autem, vel pedi, tanquam parti totius*'. *OM* 3(Misc).247.

45 *King Charls II. His declaration to all his loving subjects of the Kingdome of England. Dated from his court at Breda in Holland the 4/14 of Aprill 1660. And read in Parliament, May 1. 1660. Together with His Maiesties letter of the same date: To His Excellence the Ld. Gen. Monck, to be communicated to the L. President of the Council of State, and to the officers of the army under his command* (John Playford, London, 1660).

46 His title was given the following April. R. W. Harris, *Clarendon and the English revolution* (Chatto & Windus, London, 1983), p. 304.

47 Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxter's narrative of the most memorable passages of his life and times* (ed. Matthew Sylvester) (Printed for T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence, and J. Dunton, London, 1696), part 2, p. 277.

48 Baxter, *ibid.*, part 2, p. 277.

49 Baxter, *ibid.*, part 2, p. 277.

50 James Ussher, *The reduction of episcopacie unto the form of synodical government received in the ancient church: Proposed in the year 1641. as an expedient for the prevention of those troubles, which afterwards did arise about the matter of church-government* (Printed by T.N. for G.B. and T.C., London, 1656).

51 Baxter, *op. cit.* (note 47), part 2, p. 241.

52 John Wallis, Letter to Thomas Smith, 14 July 1692, MS Smith 54, f. 37, Bodleian Library, Oxford. Smith lost his place 11 days later.

53 John Wallis, Letter to George Keith, 3 June 1700, MS D.105, f. 118, Bodleian Library, Oxford. (Also published in John Wallis, *Sermons; now first printed from the original manuscripts of John Wallis, D.D. to which are prefixed memoirs of the author, with some original anecdotes* (ed. William Wallis) (J. Nichols, London, 1791), pp. cix–cxiii.) Wallis names the particular sermons published at the beginning of his letter, 'which I have read with good approbation'. George Keith, *A sermon preach'd at the Turners-Hall, the 5th. of May 1700. By George Keith. In which he gave an account of his joyning in communion with the Church of England. With some additions and enlargements made by himself.* (Brab. Aylmer, London, 1700); *Two sermons preach'd at the parish-church of St. George Botolph-Lane, London, May the 12th. 1700* (Brab. Aylmer, London, 1700). Wallis continues: 'I hope (and pray) that the good pains you have taken (for some years past) in discovering the Errors of common Quakers; and instructing others formerly seduced by them; and your good Example in imbracing the Communion of the Church of England; may be of good use (through Gods blessing) for opening the Eys of some others who are yet blinded.'

54 Keith does not use the term in any belligerent way, but only as a general term for all those outside the Church of England. See Keith, *op. cit.* (note 53) (*A sermon preach'd*), pp. 17–19, 25–27, 32, and (*Two sermons preach'd*), pp. 30–31.

55 John Wallis, Letter to George Keith, 3 June 1700, MS D.105, f. 118, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

56 For a deeper exploration of the themes and provenance of Wallis's autobiography, see Rampelt, *op. cit.* (note 13), pp. 185–189.

57 Christoph J. Scriba, 'The autobiography of John Wallis', *Notes Rec. R. Soc. Lond.* **25**, 17–46 (1970), at p. 33. Baxter concurs, though he was not present at the Assembly himself: 'Moreover who knoweth not that most of the Godly able Ministers of England since the Reformation, did judge Episcopacy some of them Lawful, and some of them most fit (for the Non-conformists were but few:) and that even before this late trouble and war, the most, even almost all, of those that were of the late Assembly at Westminster, and most through the land, did subscribe and conform to Episcopal Government, as a thing not contrary to the word of God: so that it is evident that it is very consistent with a Godly life to judge Episcopacy lawful and fit; or else we should not have had so many hundred learned and godly men of that mind.' Richard Baxter, *Five disputations of church-government and worship* (Nevil Simmons, London, 1659), p. 4.

58 Scriba, *op. cit.* (note 57), p. 35.

59 Wallis was not actually present for this debate and is careful to note that his information comes from others. Scriba, *ibid.*, p. 36. There is, though, no discrepancy on this particular point between Wallis's account and that of others. Robert S. Paul, *The assembly of the Lord: politics and religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Grand Debate'* (T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1985), pp. 87–93. The modified *Solemn League and Covenant* of 1643 is clear enough in itself. After the word prelacy in §2 it adds parenthetically, 'that is, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy'.

60 Wood, *op. cit.* (note 1), vol. 3, p. 308.

61 According to Prynne, Wallis stated: 'That Altars, Pictures, Crucifixes were there of late set up in most Colledge Chappells, and in some Churches; particularly, that in Peter house Chappel there was a glorious new Altar set up, and mounted on steps, to which the Master, Fellowes, Schollers bowed, and were enjoyned to bow by Doctor Cosens the Master, who set it up; that there were Basons, Candlestickes, Tapers standing on it, and a great Crucifix hanging over it. That in the University Church of St. Maries there was an Altar railed in, to which the stickes, Tapers, and bowing Altars, continued till after this Parliament, and were brought in since the Archbishops time by meanes of Bishop Wren, Doctor Cosens, Dr. Martin and others, all Canterburies great favorites.' William Prynne, *Canterburies doome. Or the first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of William Laud late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* (John Macock for Michael Spark, London, 1646), pp. 73–74.

62 *A vindication of the ministers of the Gospel in, and about London, from the unjust aspersions cast upon their former actings for the Parliament, as if they had promoted the bringing of the King to capitall punishment with a short exhortation to their people to keep close to their Covenant-ingagement* (Thomas Underhill, London, 1648/49), p. 9.

63 *A Directory for the Publique Worship of God, throughout the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, together with an ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common-Prayer: And for establishing and observing of this present Directory throughout the Kingdom of England, and Dominion of Wales.* (Printed for Evan Tyler, Alexander Fifield, Ralph Smith, and John Field, London, 1645).

64 Attendance on the committee, *MPWA* vol. 4, p. 703. John Wallis, *A brief and easie explanation of the Shorter Catechism: Presented by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, to both Houses of Parliament, and by them approved: Wherein the meanest capacities may in a speedy and easie way be brought to understand the principles of religion: In imitation of a catechisme formerly*

published by *Mr. Herbert Palmer* (Printed by A. Miller, for Tho. Underhill, London, 1648). It was reprinted in London several more times: 1655, 1657 and 1662. The final draft copy of the *Shorter Catechism* is in Wallis's hand. Wallis was also responsible for assisting with the Scripture proofs requested by Parliament for the *Confession of Faith*, *MPWA* vol. 4, p. 504.

65   I. M. Green, *The re-establishment of the Church of England 1660–1663* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1978), p. 30.

66   Colin Buchanan, *The Savoy Conference revisited: the proceedings taken from the Grand Debate of 1661 and the works of Richard Baxter* (Grove Books, Cambridge, 2002), p. 5, n. 7.

67   Baxter, *op. cit.* (note 47), 305, 307. This is consistent with the postscript of Wallis's letter to Dillingham, 16/26 March 1660/1 from Oxford directing subsequent mail to him at an address in London, *CJW* vol. 3, pp. 34–35.

68   The exchanges between the Presbyterians and the bishops at the Savoy Conference were originally published in *The Grand Debate between the most revered the Bishops, and the presbyterian divines, appointed by His Sacred Majesty, as commissioners for the review and alteration of The Book Of Common Prayer, &c. being an exact account of their whole proceedings. the most perfect copy* (London, 1661) and in Richard Baxter (ed.), *An accompt of all the proceedings of the commissioners of both perswasions, appointed by His Sacred Majesty, according to letter patents, for the review of the Book of Common Prayer, Etc.* (London, 1661). A modern parallel edition with notes has been provided in Buchanan, *op. cit.* (note 66).

69   Baxter, *op. cit.* (note 47), p. 334. Thus, Wallis is primarily responsible for the text of the prayer, printed in *A petition for peace: With the reformation of the liturgy. As it was presented to the Right Reverend Bishops, by the divines appointed by His Majesties Commission to treat with them about the alteration of it.* (London, 1661), pp. 36–37.

70   Buchanan, *op. cit.* (note 66), p. 8.

71   Baxter, *op. cit.* (note 47), pp. 335.

72   *CJW* vol. 3, p. 41–44.

73   Baxter, *op. cit.* (note 47), p. 336.

74   Of course, from the perspective of the bishops, real churchmanship did prevail, but of an episcopalian kind, based on hierarchical authority, not a presbyterian kind, based on conference. Further, as Alexandra Walsham argues, intolerance was sometimes conceived as a pious act in defence of the faith. Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable hatred: tolerance and intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2006).

75   'This is what I mean: the law, which came 430 years afterwards, does not annul a covenant previously ratified by God, so as to make the promise void', Gal. 3:17 (ESV).

76   '*Quamquam enim, Apostolus cum fuerit, pro authoritate Apostolica dictare potuisset: Cum tamen ad munus Apostolicum spectaret, non modo jubere, sed et praedicare, legem Evangelicam; non jubet tantam, aut etiam sancit anathemate; sed etiam Argumentis visum est, quod jusserat, persuadere*', *OM* 3(Misc).252.

77   Edward Cardwell (ed.), *Documentary annals of the Reformed Church of England*, 2 vols (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1839), vol. 2, p. 348.

78   Gibson Papers, MS 930, f. 55, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

79   Gibson Papers, MS 930, f. 51, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

80   William Marshall, 'Thomas Tenison (1636–1715)', *Oxford dictionary of national biography* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004).

81   This is reminiscent of his admonitions to students almost a half century earlier. Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 7, pp. 129–134.

82   Wallis to Tenison, 22 May 1699. Gibson Papers, MS 930, f. 51, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

83   *Ibid.*

84   Rampelt, *op cit.* (note 8), ch. 6.

85   John Wallis, 'The difficulty of unfeigned repentence: Set forth to the University of Oxford, at St. Maries Church there; Decemb. 30. 1688. In the interval; after the departure of K. James II. and before the meeting of the CONVENTION, which established King William and Queen Mary', in *Theological discourses and sermons on several occasions: Part II* (Thomas Parkhurst, London, 1688), p. 181.

86   Wallis, *ibid.*, p. 183.

87   Before his arrival in Oxford, Wallis was granted a cure in 'Glimpton' (Glympton), Oxfordshire. For 11 January 1648/9, 'Ordered, That Dr. Aylett give Institution [installation] and Induction unto John Wallis Master of Arts, to the Rectory of Glimpton, in Com. Oxon, void by Resignation; salvo Jure cuiscunque: William Wheate Esquire, Patron', *Journals of the House of Lords*, vol. 10, p. 645. To what degree Wallis filled this post, and for how long, is not known, but my speculation is that he abandoned it soon after it was granted, especially as the demands of his professorship increased. Wood notes that Wallis was 'at length for a time Rector of Glimpton in com. Oxon', *Historia et antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis* (E Theatro Sheldoniano, Oxford, 1674), vol. 3, p. 866.

88   *CJW* vol. 2, p. 35.

89   Wallis to Nottingham, 12 Nov. 1689, quoted in David Eugene Smith, 'John Wallis as a cryptographer', *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* **24**, 82–96 (1917–18), at p. 88; Wallis to Harbord, 15 Aug. 1691, quoted in Smith, *ibid.*, p. 92.

90   Mark E. Dever, 'Moderation and deprivation: a reappraisal of Richard Sibbes', *J. Ecclesias. Hist.* **43**, 396–413 (1992); Jonathan Moore, '"Christ is dead for him": John Preston (1587–1628) and English hypothetical universalism', PhD thesis, Cambridge University (2000).

91   See, for example, ch. 6, 'Middle-Way Religion' in Goldie, *op. cit.* (note 23).

92   For a thorough assessment of Baxter's views on justification, see Hans Boersma, *A hot pepper corn: Richard Baxter's doctrine of justification in its seventeenth-century context of controversy* (Uitgeverij Boekencentrum, Zoetermeer, 1993), which includes some discussion of Wallis's answer to Baxter.

93   Wallis to Baxter, 28 June/8 July 1652, *CJW* vol. 1, pp. 42–109. In a subsequent letter in this exchange, Wallis is clear about theological boundaries that may not be transgressed: 'Those few things wherein, you say, wee differ, I suppose will be easyly cleared, I hope, if you please but to observe the difference between Sanctification & Justification; the differences (so far as at present I remember) arising principally from hence that you presse those things as belonging to Justification which do indeed appartaine to Sanctification', Wallis to Baxter, 14/24 October 1652, *CJW* vol. 1, p. 111.