

(p. 153) by focusing on how well Charles ‘coped with his people’s expectations’ (p. 161), but never reconstructs those expectations or measures how well Charles met them. And when Cressy concludes that Charles ‘was the author of his own troubles’ (p. 312), I was uncertain just how this assessment was reached given how little space was devoted to Charles’s performance of kingship. The book, in short, conclusively shuts the door on a pernicious error but never substantiates its final judgment.

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

NOAH MILLSTONE

Richard Baxter’s ‘Reformed Liturgy’. A Puritan alternative to the Book of Common Prayer.

By Glen J. Segger. (Liturgy, Worship, and Society.) Pp. xii + 282 incl. frontispiece. Farnham–Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. £65. 978 1 4094 3694 2

JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046915003164

Puritan grievances against the Book of Common Prayer in post-Reformation England are well known: Elizabethan critics of Cranmer’s liturgy maintained that it was ‘picked out of that dung-hill, the Mass’ and so, not surprisingly, ‘stinketh in the nostrails of God’. What has been less explored by historians is the range of views about public worship contained under the broad umbrella of early modern Puritanism. It was not simply a matter of not liking the Book of Common Prayer but a range of views from wanting a ‘Prayer Book lite’, replacement by another set of liturgical texts such as the Reformed Book of Common Order, or the promotion of extempore prayer as the only authentic form of corporate prayer. In England the Prayer Book was suppressed and replaced by *The directory of public worship* (1645) which represented a victory for the extempore party as long as the person being extempore was the minister. In fact, Parliament’s suppression of the Prayer Book created a space between 1645 and 1662 for significant liturgical experimentation, which was taken advantage of by churchmen across the spectrum: from conservative High Churchman like Jeremy Taylor to radical Protestants.

This period of *de facto* liturgical deregulation also allowed moderate Presbyterians comfortable with the Reformed tradition of ‘set prayers’, like Richard Baxter, the opportunity to improve and reform the Prayer Book. As a result, when a conference of Presbyterians and episcopalians was called in 1661 at the Savoy to deliberate on matters of liturgy and ministry, Baxter was able to produce his *Reformed liturgy* in a fortnight (p. 213) as a way forward to establishing a restored national Church that could ‘comprehend’ both episcopalians and Presbyterians. It failed (or at least it did within the bounds of emerging Anglicanism), as did appeals for non-episcopally ordained ministers to remain in post without undergoing re-ordination by a bishop.

Glen Segger has produced the first modern edition of Baxter’s important liturgical ‘minority report’ as a lengthy appendix with detailed chapters preceding it analysing key elements such as Sabbath worship, the eucharist and baptism, and pastoral rites. Segger’s analysis is, at times, perhaps too uncritical of Baxter’s perspective. For example, his discussion of Baxter’s life and ministry is highly indebted to his autobiography – a remarkable seventeenth-century source – but surely the very portrayal of Baxter as an apostle of irenicism that he wished future generations to have. The assessment of the conflicts between episcopalians and Presbyterians

could have been more nuanced both in terms of the ecclesiastical politics as well as the shades of opinion about church polity in the period. None the less, it is very good indeed to have, in a careful modern edition, such a key text in the debates about the limits of comprehension which would dominate religious discourse after 1660.

CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE,
OXFORD

JUDITH MALTBY

The letterbooks of John Evelyn, I: British Library Add MS 78298; II: British Library Add MS 78299. Edited by Douglas D. C. Chambers and David Galbraith. Pp. lxiii + 610; xvii + 611–1,236 incl. 2 frontispieces, 18 plates and 11 figs + 3 colour plates. Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press, 2014. Canadian. \$195. 978 1 4426 4786 2
JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046915002687

John Evelyn was a savant, a horticulturalist and a man of affairs but it is as a diarist that he is best known. His reputation in that respect was long ago eclipsed by that of Samuel Pepys but extracts from Evelyn's diaries in works of popular as well as learned history have long since made his name familiar to general readers as well as to scholars.

But Evelyn deserves to have one other reputation: that of a writer of letters. His activity as a correspondent has until now been hard to assess because of the relative paucity of his letters which are in print. The 1857 edition of his diaries (edited by William Bray) contained 127 letters by Evelyn as well as a selection of those sent to him. The 1906 edition omitted twenty-four early pseudonymous letters sent to Sir Richard Browne, Evelyn's father-in-law. In more recent years Guy de la Bedoyere provided in *Particular friends* (Woodbridge 1997) an edition of the correspondence between Evelyn and Pepys, containing ninety-six letters by Evelyn of which only a fraction had been printed by Bray. But when Esmond de Beer, the editor of Evelyn's diaries in their one modern critical edition, completed his monumental task his attention turned not to Evelyn's correspondence but to that of John Locke.

It is only now, with the appearance of this edition of his letterbooks by Douglas Chambers and David Galbraith, that we can begin to have a clearer conception of Evelyn the correspondent. First, however, a caveat needs to be issued.

The editors note that the letterbooks (like the diary) 'have a complex textual history, having been assembled by Evelyn over a prolonged but discontinuous period' (i, p. xxi). Where copies as sent of Evelyn's letters survive along with the entries in the letterbooks (as is the case with twenty-two of the letters to Pepys here printed) differences between the two texts often appear (i, p. xix; cf *Particular friends*, 19). Much work on the letterbooks seems to have been done in the 1680s but the editors believe that it was started earlier, perhaps in the 1660s (i, pp. xxii–xxiv). Evelyn's own dating of some of the letters that he copied is confused (i, p. xxv). It is clear that an edition of the letterbooks is not the same as one of letters dispatched by Evelyn; we cannot always be sure that the text he entered was precisely the same as that of the letter that he sent. On the contrary we know that he was capable of altering those texts, either on purpose or by accident.