
Theses and Dissertations

2010

Finding Elizabeth: history, polemic, and the Laudian redefinition of conformity in seventeenth century England

Lewis Calvin Lane III
University of Iowa

Copyright 2010 Lewis Calvin Lane III

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/2924>

Recommended Citation

Lane, Lewis Calvin III. "Finding Elizabeth: history, polemic, and the Laudian redefinition of conformity in seventeenth century England." PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 2010.
<http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/2924>.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

FINDING ELIZABETH:
HISTORY, POLEMIC, AND THE LAUDIAN REDEFINITION OF CONFORMITY IN
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

by

Lewis Calvin Lane III

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree
in Religious Studies
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Associate Professor Ralph Keen

ABSTRACT

The “beauty of holiness,” the ceremonialist agenda of the Laudians during the Personal Rule of King I (r.1625-1649), was in many ways a serious shift from and challenge to the devotional and theological ethos that had dominated the Church of England since the 1570s. So stark was this shift that scholars today regularly cite the rigid enforcement of the “beauty of holiness” as one of the precipitating causes of the English Civil Wars that broke out in 1642. The rise of Laudianism, then, and its claim on the character of the nation’s established church, the church’s devotional life, and England’s confessional identity, was no small matter. Perhaps the most understudied aspect of the Laudian movement was the way this circle of clergy argued that their program for the church was neither a challenge nor, for that matter, innovative. Recent historians have described how the Laudians used various rhetorical strategies to present their vision as perfectly orthodox, a mere restatement of old-fashioned principles and practices long enjoyed since the happy reign of Queen Elizabeth (r.1558-1603). Developing arguments from scripture, from the practice of the early church, or simply the more obvious need to worship God with reverence, the Laudians shifted their apologetic strategies depending on the moment. This project considers in detail a particular Laudian strategy – the appeal to precedents from the Elizabethan church. In addition to reflecting on the malleable nature of history in the early modern period and on the character of what one might call the rhetoric of conservatism, this project reveals the power of the image of Elizabeth Tudor in seventeenth century religious polemics.

This dissertation is concerned not so much with Puritans, but rather with two groups who both claimed to be conformists and who both based that claim on adherence to Elizabethan principles. Both Laudians and, as one scholar describes them, “old style” conformists both claimed ownership of a legitimating Elizabethan past and thus ownership of a *normative* identity. At a broad level, my research seeks to understand a

moment of religious and social change and how that change was persistently negotiated by recourse to history. My goal is to consider the way the Laudians appropriated the image of Elizabeth for their own designs. This examination does not end with the reign of Charles, however. The Laudian claim of true conformity and denial of innovation did not end when civil war erupted in 1642 or even when the king was executed in 1649. One finds this historical claim in the mouth of Archbishop William Laud at his trial for treason. Likewise, one finds during the Cromwellian Protectorate in the 1650s the rise of full historical enterprises, not simply the invocation of history in polemic. When the monarchy was restored in 1660, works by the Laudian historian Peter Heylyn were ready for Royalist consumption and, as one might suspect, they offer an interpretation of the past that legitimates the Laudian program and brands its opponents as foreign and dangerous. This type of literature was polemic under the form of history. Yet we cannot casually dismiss such arguments as simple propaganda. We must understand them instead as alternative readings of the past, stories that contemporaries told themselves and which worked to confirm a particular vision of the world. My project, in sum, will offer an assessment of the way historical claims functioned within the discourse of religious and political legitimacy at a time of intense religious and political strife. My concluding argument is that the tradition known as Anglicanism, while it had a long gestation, was born not in the reign of Elizabeth or even in the early Stuart period, but rather at the Restoration in 1660 when Charles II came to the throne and a particular vision of what it meant to be a loyal conformist achieved canonical status.

Abstract Approved: _____

Thesis Supervisor

Title and Department

Date

FINDING ELIZABETH:
HISTORY, POLEMIC, AND THE LAUDIAN REDEFINITION OF CONFORMITY IN
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

by

Lewis Calvin Lane III

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree
in Religious Studies
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Associate Professor Ralph Keen

Copyright by
LEWIS CALVIN LANE III
2010
All Rights Reserved

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Lewis Calvin Lane III

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the
thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in
Religious Studies at the May 2010 graduation.

Thesis committee:

Ralph Keen, Thesis Supervisor

Raymond A. Mentzer

Michelene E. Pesantubbee

Constance H. Berman

Thomas F. Mayer

For my parents,
especially my mother,
Ann

Surrexerunt filii eius, et beatissimam praedicaverunt
Proverbs 31:28

There is no Learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awakt, his judgement sharpn'd, and the truth which he holds more firmly establish't.

John Milton, *Of True Religion*

It may be feared that God was neither in that great and terrible wind which threw down so many monasteries and religious houses in the reign of King Henry; nor in the earthquake which did so often shake the very foundations of the state in the time of King Edward; nor in the fire in which so many godly and religious persons were consumed to ashes in the days of Queen Mary; but that he shewed himself in that 'still small voice' which breathed so much comfort to the souls of his people, in the gracious and fortunate government of a virgin Queen.

Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first thanks go to my dissertation supervisor Professor Ralph Keen whose support for both this project and my professional development has been unsurpassed. Few graduate students are so fortunate to have an advisor as fluid, flexible, trusting, and in fact caring as Ralph Keen. Similarly, Professor Raymond Mentzer has taught me the importance of sharing serious research in the scholarly community and how the commerce of ideas is done well. The broader committee also is to be thanked for their participation. In particular I would like to thank Professors Thomas Mayer, Alvin Snider, and Kathleen Kamerick who have been thorough with advice and generous with direction. Scholars at a variety of conferences and academic venues have also been very good to help me clarify my arguments. Not least among these are Professors Anthony Milton, Brown Patterson, David Neelands, William Tighe, Gary Jenkins, and Scott McGinnis. I must also thank two other historians who had a major impact on the beginnings of this project. My work on Peter Smart began in a seminar with Professor Dwight Bozeman whose inimitable expertise in the field of Puritan studies was a great resource before his well-deserved retirement. The real genesis of this project, however, began even earlier when Professor Peter Kaufman, with great though characteristic liberality, allowed a senior undergraduate at the University of North Carolina to join one of his graduate seminars on early modern England. His generous admission in 2002 has resulted in this dissertation. These are but a few of the exceptional teachers who have left a mark on this project.

As one might imagine, this dissertation would not have been possible without the help of a number of librarians. I must thank the resourceful librarians and staff members at the University of Iowa libraries, as well as those at the Newberry Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the National Archives of the United Kingdom, the British Library, the Parliamentary Archives, the Lambeth Palace Library, the St. Paul's Cathedral

Library, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford University. A PhD dissertation is not written without considerable financial assistance, and therefore I would like to thank the Department of Religious Studies for its four-year award of a teaching assistantship and the Graduate College for its award of a Ballard-Seashore Dissertation Year Fellowship during my fifth year of study. Moreover, research in the United Kingdom was supported by a T. Anne Cleary Fellowship from the university and a grant from the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church. Research in the Folger was supported by assistance from the Mellon Foundation and greatly augmented by a paleography seminar.

The Department of Religious Studies' Graduate Student Organization has provided a spectacular environment for graduate training and my life and my research have been shaped immensely by a wide-range of conversations over both coffee and beer, on long car rides to conferences, and during lunch meetings on the third floor of Gilmore Hall. In particular I must highlight how grateful I am to have trained in early modern studies with a strong cohort of folks working in the same area. David Howlett, Doug Jones, Ezra Plank, Peter Yoder, and, of course, Denise Kettering have contributed to my scholarship in ways they may not even fully realize. Years from now I hope to see them all at conferences and recognize how providential it was to have worked so closely with them in my twenties – *ecce quam bonum, et quam iucundum habitare fratres in unum!*

Denise Kettering has been my colleague for five years and this summer she is to become my wife. My work and my life have been immeasurably blessed by her presence, more than words here can convey. Two of the best things I have done in my life have been this dissertation and proposing to her. While she has my life, this project is dedicated to my parents who have been a constant support. In particular, I want to honor my mother who has been my editor for years. With the author of Proverbs in mind, Ann Harvey deserves to have her son rise up and call her blessed.

LCL III

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
INTRODUCTION: LAUDIANISM, PRAYER BOOK CONFORMITY, AND THE IDEA OF HISTORY IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND.....	1
The Nature of Prayer Book Worship and Conformity, 1549-1620.....	7
The Concept and Writing of History in Early Modern England.....	18
The Climate of the Conversation: An Introductory Postscript.....	23
CHAPTER 1 PETER SMART AND OLD STYLE CONFORMITY.....	26
“A Most Froward, Fierce, and Unpeaceable Spirit.”.....	26
Smart's Argument.....	31
Old Style Conformists and the Smart Argument.....	44
Clipping Wings and Tearing Surplices.....	53
CHAPTER 2 SEMPER EADEM: THE JUNIOR LAUDIAN CLERGY AND HISTORICAL POLEMIC DURING THE PERSONAL RULE.....	58
Themes in Avant-Garde Conformist Literature on the eve of the Laudian Ascendency.....	59
The Frontline of Polemic and Apologia during the Laudian High Tide.....	76
The Junior Laudian Clergy and Strategies of Historical Rhetoric.....	110
CHAPTER 3 ARTICLES, SPEECHES, AND FALLEN BISHOPS: THE ARGUMENTS FROM THE HIGHER CLERGY DURING THE 1630s AND 1640s.....	114
Vox Episcopi: Articles, Injunctions, and Elizabethan Precedents.....	115
William Laud's Direct Apologia before the Long Parliament.....	129
Historical Claims in the early 1640s.....	146
No Arguments? The Higher Clergy's Apologia and the Historic/Normative Face of the Church.....	170
CHAPTER 4 "OUR REFORMATION": LAUDIAN HISTORICAL RHETORIC AND USE OF HISTORY DURING THE INTERREGNUM AND AT THE RESTORATION.....	173
Laudian Arguments prior to Charles' Execution.....	178
The Cult of King Charles the Martyr.....	189
Persistent Arguments in the 1650s and the Emergence of Anglicanism.....	196
The Restoration and the Cavalier Vision.....	207
Suffering, Surviving, and Remembering: Laudian Historical Rhetoric and Anglicanism.....	222
CHAPTER 5 PETER HEYLYN AND THE POLITICS OF HISTORY IN RESTORATION ENGLAND.....	227
Heylyn at the Close of the Interregnum.....	229
The Anglican Moment Revisited.....	237

<i>Ecclesia Restaurata</i>	238
<i>Cyprianus Anglicus</i>	244
<i>Aërius Redivivus</i>	251
The Immutable Church of England.....	267
CONCLUSION: HISTORY, POLEMIC, AND THE LAUDIAN REDEFINITION OF CONFORMITY.	271
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	280

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BL	British Library
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
<i>Catalogue</i>	Peter Smart, <i>A Catalogue of Superstitious Innovations in the Change of Services and Ceremonies; of presumptuous irregularities, and transgressions, against the Articles of Religion, Act of Parliament for uniformity, Canons, Advertisements, Injunctions, and Homilies</i> (London, 1640).
Heylyn, <i>Aërius</i>	Peter Heylyn, <i>Aërius Redivivus; or The History of the Presbyterians</i> (London, 1670).
Heylyn, <i>Cyprianus</i>	Peter Heylyn, <i>Cyprianus Anglicus: or, The History of The Life and Death, of The Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William By Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury</i> (London, 1668).
Heylyn, <i>Ecclesia</i>	Peter Heylyn, <i>Ecclesia Restaurata; or The History of the Reformation of the Church of England</i> (London, 1661).
LPL	Lambeth Palace Library
LW	William Laud, <i>The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.</i> ed. J. Bliss and W. Scott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1847-1860).
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> (available online at www.oxforddnb.com)
Sermon 1628	Peter Smart, <i>A Sermon Preached in the Cathedrall Church of Durham, Iuly, 7, 1628.</i> (London, 1640).
<i>Treatise of Altars</i>	Peter Smart, <i>A Short Treatise of Altars, Altar-cringing, and Musick of all the Quire, Singing-men and Choristers, when the holy Communion was administered in the Cathedrall Church of Durham, by the Prebendaries and Petty-Canons, in glorious Copes embroidered with Images</i> (London, 1629).
TNA	The National Archives (formerly Public Record Office)
<i>Way and Manner</i>	Peter Heylyn, <i>The Way and Manner of the Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified: Against the Clamors and Objections of the Opposite Parties</i> (London, 1657).

INTRODUCTION

LAUDIANISM, PRAYER BOOK CONFORMITY,
AND THE IDEA OF HISTORY IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

In the 1630s the churches of England got a facelift. The wooden communion table which, by rubric, was supposed to stand length-wise in either the chancel or nave during the administration of the Lord's Supper was repositioned along the eastern wall. Often raised on steps, the table became cordoned off by rails and in some churches was replaced with a stone altar. To some it seemed that the reformation of worship which had occurred in the sixteenth century was being systematically reversed. Images banished only a few generations earlier experienced a resurrection. Angels, the Virgin Mary, and Christ himself appeared in stained glass, carved in stone, and woven on vestments. Woodcarving had a minor renaissance (particularly in the north) as choir stalls grew more ornate and canopies appeared over baptismal fonts. Preachers were to give up extemporaneous prayers and newly delivered mothers were to wear veils at their churchings. While vestments, candles, and choral singing multiplied, novel consecration liturgies were used for new structures. This was the work of the Laudians, a circle of clergy who at the accession of King Charles I in 1625 occupied strategic offices in the Church of England. Their ceremonialist agenda, which many contemporaries interpreted as a step back into pre-Reformation "popery," was known as "the beauty of holiness," a phrase drawn from Psalms 29 and 96.¹

¹ Discussions of the Laudian "beauty of holiness" are not rare. The most recent analysis may be found in Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547- c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 176-273. See also Peter Lake, "The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity, and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s" in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 161-185; Idem, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy,' 'Heterodoxy,' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 298-311; David Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions: Tales of Discord and Dissension* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 186-212; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 106-124.

The beauty of holiness, the central concern of the Laudians, was in many ways a serious shift from and challenge to the theological ethos that had dominated the Church of England since the 1570s. So stark was this shift that scholars today regularly cite the rigid enforcement of the beauty of holiness as one of the precipitating causes of the English Civil Wars. The rise of Laudianism, then, and its claim on the character of the nation's established church, the church's devotional life, and England's confessional identity, was no small matter.² Perhaps the most recognized yet understudied aspect of the Laudian movement was the way this circle of clergy argued that their program for the church was neither a challenge nor, for that matter, innovative. Recent historians have described how the Laudians used various rhetorical strategies to present their vision as perfectly orthodox, a mere restatement of old-fashioned principles and practices long enjoyed since the happy reign of Queen Elizabeth. Developing arguments from scripture, from the practice of the early church, or simply the more obvious need to worship God with reverence, the Laudians shifted their apologetic strategies depending on the moment.³ This dissertation considers in detail a particular Laudian strategy – the appeal to precedents from the Elizabethan church. In addition to reflecting on the malleable nature of history in the early modern period and on the character of what one might call the rhetoric of conservatism, this project reveals the power of the image of Elizabeth Tudor in seventeenth century religious polemics.

² Peter Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I," in Linda Levy Peck, ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 113-33; Anthony Milton, "The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach," in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, eds., *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 162-84; Kenneth Fincham, "Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2000), 125-158.

³ Peter Lake, "The Laudians and the Argument from Authority," in Bonnelyn Young Kunze and Dwight D. Brautigam, eds., *Court, Country, and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1992), 145-179; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 384-447; Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 74-125.

This dissertation draws together a number of already existing discussions on religion, politics, and culture in early modern England: in recent years scholars have assessed the religious causes of the English Civil Wars, the construction, rhetoric, and power of history and memory, the phenomenon of Laudianism and its relationship to traditional conformism, the fashioning of confessional identity, and the character of sacred space and devotional practice. In bringing these varied issues into conversation, we can better witness the intensely rhetorical and polemic way a select group within the Church of England redefined what it meant to be a good conformist. Puritans have received a great deal of scholarly attention in recent decades, and their ideas about right belief and right practice will not be far from center here. However, to understand the nature of conformity and how it was changed, we should be more concerned with two other groups, broadly defined, who both claimed to be conformists and who both based that claim on adherence to Elizabethan principles.

By the 1630s Puritans had been criticizing the established Church of England for decades. For two generations they had despaired over certain ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer and (in varying degrees) called for the abolition of the office of bishop. It is certainly true that when the Laudians came to power, the Puritans were alarmed. But they had always been alarmed. What made things different in the early 1630s was that a large body of non-Puritan women and men felt just as alienated. Many loyal conformists recognized that the Laudians – because of their erection of stone altars, their proliferation of novel ceremonies, and their rigid discipline – were indeed making serious changes to the existing paradigm. These non-Laudian conformists have often been forgotten by historians who are easily captivated by the loud polar extremes. This is understandable: it has been difficult to see such women and men, what with Puritans calling all conformists closet Catholics and the Laudians pressing that they – and they alone – were the true conformists. Such women and men have been described by Judith Maltby as

“old style” conformists.⁴ Genuinely satisfied with the office of bishop and the non-Laudian ceremonies of the Book of Common Prayer, these “old style” conformists were routinely libeled as Puritans by Laudian prelates because the former would not fall in line with the Laudian program. These two groups – the Laudians and the “old style” conformists – both claimed ownership of a legitimating Elizabethan past and thus ownership of a *normative* identity. Similar to arguments about the meaning of “patriotism” in other times, this debate was built on the assumption that proving one’s legitimacy in the present entailed proving one’s harmony with past exemplars. At a broad level, this dissertation seeks to understand a moment of religious and social change and how that change was persistently negotiated by recourse to history.

In the 1620s, Durham Cathedral became one of the flashpoints of conflict between Laudianism and old style conformity. When Peter Smart, a local conformist clergyman and prebend, witnessed serious Laudian changes, including the erection of a marble altar, he recognized that these changes were not simply “popish,” as Puritans remonstrated, but represented a challenge to the old ethos. Smart saw “the beauty of holiness” as innovative; as a rupture with the practice of the established church. Preaching and writing against these changes, Smart was defending an older consensus, an older definition of conformity.⁵ My dissertation examines Laudian responses to this form of critique. At every turn the Laudians claimed to be the true heirs of the Elizabethan church and reviled old style conformists like Smart as Puritans. It becomes clear in the

⁴ Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Idem, “From *Temple* to *Synagogue*: ‘Old’ Conformity in the 1640s-1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey,” in Lake and Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy*, 88-120; Idem, “‘By this Book’: Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church,” in Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church*, 115-37.

⁵ John G. Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast: The Dispute Between John Cosin and Peter Smart,” *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 48 (1979), 279-301; Michael Tillbrook, “Arminianism and Society in County Durham, 1617-42,” in David Marcombe, ed., *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494-1660* (Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press, 1983), 202-226.

Smart episode at Durham that the mantle of the Elizabethan church was contested property in Stuart England. The same is true of the memory of Elizabeth herself. David Cressy has mapped the way the Stuart monarchs were haunted by the ghost of the Virgin Queen. Cressy portrays the memory of Elizabeth as a tool for criticizing King James in the early 1620s for his botched attempt to marry his son and heir to a Spanish Catholic princess. For instance, by ringing bells on November 17 (the anniversary of Elizabeth's accession) both Puritans and old style conformists voiced their rejection of entanglements with Catholic Spain. This reading casts James and his successor Charles as monarchs living and ruling under Elizabeth's shadow.⁶ But two could play that game.

The principal goal of this dissertation is to consider the way the Laudians appropriated not only the image of Elizabeth but also the whole mantle of conformity for their own designs. During the altar controversy, as most scholars simplify the "beauty of holiness" movement, men like John Pocklington, Edmund Reeve, and Giles Widdowes employed a number of arguments about the historical face of the established church since the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. Starting in the late 1620s, these arguments became standardized among Laudians and, as I argue below, provided a critical measure of coherence to a movement that, as Lake and others have observed, may have been organized around nothing more than the revision of worship patterns.⁷ The present examination, however, does not end with the reign of Charles I. The Laudian claim of true conformity and denial of innovation did not end when civil war erupted in the 1640s. One finds this historical claim in the mouth of Archbishop William Laud at his trial for treason. Likewise, one finds during the Protectorate in the 1650s the rise of full historical

⁶ David Cressy, *Bonfire and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989), 130-140. See also Julia M. Walker, ed., *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Susan Doran and Thomas Freeman, eds., *The Myth of Elizabeth* (New York: MacMillan, 2003); Jessica Martin, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the rise of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁷ Lake, "The Laudian Style."

enterprises, not simply the invocation of history in polemic. Conformists such as David Lloyd offered a particular read of the Tudor past in order to explain present-day circumstances. Peter Heylyn, arguably the most vitriolic of Laudian writers, penned histories of the English reformation and of international Calvinism. When the monarchy was restored in 1660, Heylyn's works were ready for Royalist consumption and, as one might suspect, they offer an interpretation of the past that legitimates the Laudian program and brands Calvinism as foreign and dangerous. This type of literature was polemic under the form of history. Yet as both Peter Lake and Heylyn's most recent biographer Anthony Milton have stressed, we cannot casually dismiss such arguments as simple propaganda. We must understand them instead as alternative readings of the past, stories that contemporaries told themselves and which worked to confirm a particular vision of the world.⁸

In sum, this dissertation offers a critical assessment of the way historical claims functioned within the discourse of religious and political legitimacy at a time of intense religious and political strife. My concluding argument, in line with the most current scholarship on the "Long English Reformation," is that the tradition known as Anglicanism, while it had a long gestation, was born not in the reign of Elizabeth or even in the early Stuart period, but rather at the Restoration in 1660 when Charles II came to the throne and a particular vision of what it meant to be a loyal conformist achieved canonical status.

⁸ Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007); Peter Lake, "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice," in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006), 80-97.

The Nature of Prayer Book Worship and Conformity, 1549 – 1620

The shape of Protestant worship formulated in England during the sixteenth century has been approached from several angles and for a number of purposes. During the nineteenth century when the Oxford Movement and, more broadly, Romanticism drove a segment of the population to develop certain novel claims about the Church of England's relationship to pre-reformation Christianity, particularly in the area of liturgical practice, acrimonious debates emerged about what the rubrics demanded and what the intent of the reformers really was. Visitors to Oxford today will find an impressive monument erected in 1843 to three Protestant martyrs burned at a spot nearby some three hundred years earlier, Thomas Cranmer, Hugh Latimer, and Nicholas Ridley. The spire, complete with statues of the three bishops, was intentionally placed in "Anglo-Catholic" Oxford by a group of evangelical Anglicans to remind all who passed it that England was a Protestant nation.⁹ As this Victorian controversy between "high church" and "low church" parties shaped much of the written history of the English reformation up even into the middle twentieth century, a large amount of material has appeared over the past three decades attempting to sober us from a fairly potent English exceptionalist reverie.¹⁰ In recent years, some have even recognized that competent historians have to avoid the swing-like character of the debate; in other words, the demolition of the exceptionalist "Anglo-Catholic" interpretation of the reformation is not meant to

⁹ For a survey of the Oxford Movement, see Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

¹⁰ Nicholas Tyacke, "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000), 5-33; Idem, "Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War," *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996), 139-167; Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Myth of the English Reformation," *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991), 1-19; Idem, "The Latitude of the Church of England," in Fincham and Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, 41-59. See also Peter Lake, "The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s," in Stephen Platten, ed., *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change, and the Search for Communion* (Norwich, Norfolk: Canterbury Press, 2003), 90-121.

vindicate evangelical aspirations.¹¹ Like women and men in addiction recovery, historians of early modern England now are vigilant for even the hint of a lapse into romantic indulgence. While some of this vigilance may be overly strident, possibly ignoring very real differences between the English church and other Reformed churches, the move spear-headed by scholars like Patrick Collinson and continued by others like Diarmaid MacCulloch has put us in a much better place. All of this is to say that any discussion of the nature of prayer book worship in Tudor-Stuart England is fraught; those familiar with the historiography and the apparently death-defying romantic “via media” model will instinctively look for lapses into exceptionalist interpretations. Notwithstanding this reasonable sensitivity, I continue to believe that prayer book liturgy was distinct from other examples of Reformed worship and that this cannot be underestimated.

That difference can be summed up succinctly by noting two general elements: the words themselves and the material context. Prayer book collects, prayers, exhortations, and thanksgivings are characteristically short and, for the most part, follow recognizable formulae. These may even be described as economic, although there are multiple texts to be read on any given occasion. On the other hand, Reformed liturgies developed elsewhere are characteristically hortatory and lengthy; prayers have a more didactic quality as the officiating minister whether in Scotland or Switzerland was to read texts that are more speech-like.¹² While this difference was very real, the material context of the performed liturgy in England elicited a much sharper response from other Reformed

¹¹ This is the critique raised against A. G. Dickens’ magisterial though problematic *The English Reformation* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1964; 1991). Consider the revisionist approach in Christopher Haigh, “The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation,” in Christopher Haigh, ed., *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 19-33, and then the post-revisionist approach in Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

¹² Consider the selection of Reformed liturgies in Bard Thompson, ed., *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Cleveland and New York: First Fortress Press, 1968).

Protestants. Likewise this difference has captured the attention of historians for, frankly, generations and it is the touchstone for this dissertation. Before going further, it must be understood that the purpose of this project is not to plot out the material context of worship or to continue arguing for one interpretation. That has been done by many historians, most recently (and admirably) by Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke in their very helpful *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547 – c1700*.¹³ The goal of the present dissertation is to consider the way history was employed to reorient the material context. Of course, therefore, one has to have a reasonably clear understanding of the presenting issue, that is, the material context, before she or he is able to appreciate the apologia and polemic under investigation.

With the purpose of this project clearly stated, the details of prayer worship, specifically the material context, may be outlined. The first edition of the Book of Common Prayer was issued in 1549 in the reign of Edward VI. Although Henry VIII severed England from Rome more than a decade earlier, the regime had only flirted with liturgical change, preferring a more medieval pattern of devotion. Now in the decidedly evangelical reign of “the boy king” real change was coming. Thomas Cranmer, who served both Henry and his son as archbishop of Canterbury headed the move for a uniform Protestant liturgy for the whole of England, a project adventurous not only for its use of the vernacular language but also for its sheer scope. The whole nation was to have common prayer, a seismic shift from the rich yet complicated world of the medieval mass with its multiple “uses.”¹⁴ Change, however, came incrementally. The rubrics in the

¹³ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*. See also Calvin Lane, “Before Hooker: The Material Context of Elizabethan Prayer Book Worship,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 74 (2005), 320-356.

¹⁴ The best review of the Edwardian reformation is Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (New York: Palgrave, 1999). For a helpful discussion of the nuances of religious change, see Peter Marshall, “Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the Semantics of Schism,” in Ethan Shagan, ed., *Catholics and the ‘Protestant Nation’: Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2005), 22-48. The pre-reformation liturgical “uses” include those of Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, and Lincoln.

1549 communion liturgy required the celebrant to vest in a plain, unadorned white alb with either a “vestment or cope.” “Vestment,” to be clear, would imply the chasuble and likely also the accompanying amice, stole, and maniple.¹⁵ In terms of clerical apparel, the only substantial difference between traditional practice and the new 1549 book was the option of the cope as an alternative to the “vestment.” Cranmer’s 1549 appendix to the prayer book directed the clergy to wear a surplice for matins, evensong, baptisms, and burials. Bishops were to wear the rochet, a vestment similar to the surplice but with gathered sleeves. The rochet was to be accompanied by a vestment or cope. A pastoral staff or crozier is provided, but the mitre goes unmentioned.¹⁶ Although the stone altar remained, devotional art was systematically purged. Within a year of his accession (1547), Edward issued a set of injunctions outlawing religious images and paintings. The goal was to remove “that most detestable offense of idolatry.” These “monuments of superstition” were to be eliminated “so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere.”¹⁷ As the reign moved forward, rood screens lost their devotional images, that is, the crucifix with the accompanying statues of Mary and John. These were replaced with the royal arms.

By 1552 a new edition of the prayer book was released, and the progress of evangelicalism was clear for all to see. Again, we can approach the nature of prayer book worship by considering the words themselves on the one hand and the material context on the other. Regarding the first category, the words, the stock-in-trade example of change is the priest’s administration sentence at communion. The 1549 prayer book retained a

¹⁵ J. R. Porter, ed., *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1952), 212, 293, 307, 317. See also W. K. L. Clarke and Charles Harris, eds., *Liturgy and Worship: A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion* (London: SPCK, 1981), 157.

¹⁶ Porter, ed., *The First and Second Prayer Books*, 288-289.

¹⁷ “Injunctions Given by Edward VI” in Edward Cardwell, ed., *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England: Being a Collection of Injunctions, declarations, Orders, Articles of Inquiry, &c. from the year 1547 to the year 1716* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1839), 7, 17.

traditional identification of the elements as the body and blood of Christ at the moment when the bread and wine are presented to the communicants. The succeeding 1552 liturgy replaced this sentence with one that commended thankful remembrance of Christ's one-time sacrifice. The tenor had shifted.¹⁸ As ties between Cranmer and continental reformers like Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli deepened, the second prayer book was more consistent theologically with the Swiss and South German Reformed tradition. Regarding the more pressing material context of worship, the 1552 prayer book reduced the prescribed clerical apparel to the surplice alone. Moreover, the stone altar was now eliminated. A moveable wooden table situated east-west in the middle of the chancel served for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The minister was to stand on the "north syde." Communicants knelt around the table to receive quotidian loaf bread and wine from a plain silver paten and a deep cup.¹⁹

Diarmaid MacCulloch has argued that, had Edward survived his teenage years, the established church would have witnessed further progress towards conformity with other Reformed churches, specifically those churches in the cities in the southern Rhine river valley.²⁰ Though helpful and illustrative, it is ultimately a counter-factual assessment. The boy king did die and Mary Tudor did lead a whole-sale reversal of the Edwardian reform of Christian worship. So thorough was her desire to see a return to the full apparatus of medieval Catholic liturgy that some physical elements, shrines for instances, had to be made cheaply and erected with deleterious haste.²¹ In late 1558, when Mary's reign ended as abruptly as had her brother's, the middle surviving child of

¹⁸ Porter, ed., *The First and Second Prayer Books*, 225, 389.

¹⁹ Ibid., 377; Charles Oman, *English Church Plate 597-1830* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), 129.

²⁰ MacCulloch, *The Boy King*, 99; Idem, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 501-503.

²¹ Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts Volume I: Laws against Images* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Henry VIII, Elizabeth, acceded to the crown and returned the established church to the Book of Common Prayer.

It is at this point that histories of the Church of England often make interesting turns. As will be discussed below in this dissertation, there has been since the seventeenth century a compelling desire to describe the first year of Elizabeth's reign (1558/9) as witnessing a "settlement of religion." What that exactly meant, however, varied. Sometimes, in earlier decades, historians were fixated on who principally brought the settlement about, whether it was Elizabeth herself, her privy council led by William Cecil, or the Parliament. They also tried to establish the role the clergy played, many of whom were returning from a continental exile. In other words, there was a question of agency. Still other authors were concerned with the substance of the settlement. Here the Latin tag *via media* often appears. Elizabeth, so the story runs, established a church of the middle way, one that was acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike and tempered by reason. The shape of this *via media*, however, seemed to change from historian to historian depending on taste. What seems to have been beyond dispute for many years was the underlying assumption that there was indeed a "settlement" in the first place, something located neatly at a fixed point in the past which could arbitrate between competing claims about legitimacy and orthodoxy. Part by part, this assumption has been deconstructed. The so-called dean of Puritan studies, Patrick Collinson came at the question from the "outside" to show that it was really the "inside," that is, he argued that Puritanism was a phenomenon which emerged squarely *within* the established church. Puritans were certainly not outsiders attacking a well settled Anglican church. Norman Jones expanded the location of the settlement, at least functionally, from one year to a decade, the 1560s.²² More and more though, historians have found so many

²² Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967); Idem, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983). Norman Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

exceptions, so many cracks and crevices to the substance and to the imposition of the settlement, that a settlement itself seems problematic. Nevertheless, no one to my knowledge has argued that Elizabeth and her government were quietists. That was obviously not the case. The regime did develop a number of policies regarding the established church while the queen, her counselors, her clergy, and the succeeding Parliaments were acutely interested in the shape of religious life in England. Instead of a neat settlement in 1559, policies, directives, and confessional positions were developed and set over time. The notion of an “Elizabethan Settlement of Religion,” therefore is distortive, and, as an historical idea, began among a select group of clerical writers in the seventeenth century who needed (for apologetic reasons) what the Lutherans had experienced in 1580, an historic moment of confessional definition to which they could turn to resolve disputes. This is a subject we will return to throughout this dissertation.

Having considered the Edwardian background as well as a very important caveat about facile descriptions of a “settlement,” the actual shape of Elizabethan prayer book worship can be surveyed. It should be obvious then, that this style of worship will certainly not be described as “Anglican” or with the phrase *via media*. Although far from perfectly consonant with the liturgical patterns emerging in the Reformed center of gravity along the Rhine, prayer book worship in the reign of Elizabeth Tudor was, in the broadest sense, Reformed. Parliament passed Elizabeth’s Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in April 1559. Henry VIII’s antipapal statutes were again in force and the queen was to be the supreme governor of the church. With minor alterations, the 1552 edition of the Book of Common Prayer was restored. Compulsory use of the liturgy began in June 1559.²³ Again, the description here will return to the words on the one

See also Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

²³ Henry Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion 1559-1564* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), xvii.

hand and the material context on the other. Considering the priest's words of administration at communion, in this third edition of the prayer book one finds the much-cited combination of the 1549 and 1552 sentences, a decision which resulted in the communicant hearing an identification of the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ *and* a commendation to eat and drink in thankful remembrance.²⁴

The issue of the material context was more complicated. The rubrics preceding the communion liturgy in the new 1559 prayer book directed that the wooden table should have a "fair white linen cloth upon it." It was to stand either in the nave, "the body of the church," or in the chancel "where Morning and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said."²⁵ The so-called ornaments rubric, a directive found within the Act of Uniformity and among the rubrics for Morning Prayer, prescribed that "such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained in use as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the sixth until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty."²⁶ This rubric alone has been the subject of interminable debate, particularly in the nineteenth century when members of the Oxford Movement reintroduced mass vestments. The question was what year did this rubric describe? Did it mean a return to the vestments allowed by the first prayer book, or did it mean the surplice only? Ultimately it was a moot point, as the government clarified things within a few months by releasing a set of 53 royal articles and injunctions.²⁷ 28 of the articles simply repeated Edward VI's injunctions of 1547, with minor alteration. The familiar laundry list of

²⁴ John E. Booty, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer 1559* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1976), 264.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 248.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 13.

²⁷ W. P. M. Kennedy, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration* (London: Mowbray, 1924), xli. In addition to the articles' function in a national visitation effort, the 53 points were to be read quarterly in every parish.

shrines, tabernacles, pyxes, paxes, and miracle-working relics were again proscribed.

Article XXX described clerical vesture.

...all archbishops, bishops, and all others that be admitted into any vocation ecclesiastical, or into any society of learning in either of the universities, or elsewhere, shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward VI; not there by meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St. Paul writeth: Omnia decenter et secundem fiant. 1 Cor. 14²⁸

So the Elizabethan clergy were to set aside mass vestments along with the pyxes and the paxes and use the surplice alone at both the daily office and Holy Communion.

The articles and injunctions also describe the wooden communion table. Clergy were to oversee the removal of stone altars so that “no riotous or disordered manner may prevail.”²⁹ Interestingly, these summer directives also established a unique arrangement for the table. During the communion liturgy, the moveable table was to be set in the chancel or in the nave and the minister was to read the service standing on the north side. This was the pattern found in Edward’s 1552 prayer book and it is repeated in the rubrics of the 1559 edition. However, the articles and injunctions specify that at all other offices, the table was to be set in the sanctuary at the east end of the chancel where the old altar had stood. In short, save for the actual service of the Eucharist, the table took up where the old altar left off, that is, along the eastern wall at the terminus of the church. There was, relatively speaking, a conservative though definitely Protestant accent coming from the crown. In 1560, Elizabeth issued a proclamation forbidding the defacement of monuments, in churches or otherwise. The queen’s ecclesiastical commissioners followed suit and published an order for chancels. Only the crucifix and the statues of Mary and

²⁸ Ibid., 432.

²⁹ “Royal Injunctions of 1559” in Henry Gee and W. J. Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London: MacMillan, 1896), 440.

John were to be excised from the rood.³⁰ The screen itself was to remain, as were the chancel steps. A silk frontal was provided for the communion table and Decalogue boards were to hang on the chancel wall. The queen told her new archbishop, Matthew Parker that the tablets displaying the Ten Commandments were not “only read for edification, but also to give some comely ornament and demonstration that the same is a place of prayer and religion.”³¹

While this description covers the basic elements prescribed for prayer book worship in the first year of Elizabeth’s reign, it is distortive to view this as a neatly sealed body of information which forms the “Elizabethan Settlement of Religion.” Within the first few years it became clear that very little was uniform among the churches of England, and that further directives were needed. The bishops seemed to be unclear in their diocesan articles, even producing a gloss of the royal articles and injunctions in the spring of 1561.³² By the middle of the decade Bishop Edmund Grindal surveyed the churches of the capitol at Archbishop Matthew Parker’s request. What he found was an alarming variety of practices jostling together.

The table standeth in the body of the church in some places, in others it standeth in the chancel; in some places the table standeth altarwise, distant from the wall a yard, in some others in the middle of the chancel, north and south; in some places the Table is joined, in others it standeth upon trestles; in some places the Table hath a carpet, in others it hath not; administration of communion is done by some with surplice and cap, some with surplice alone, others with none³³

³⁰ “Injunctions Given by Edward VI,” in Cardwell, ed., *Documentary Annals*, 257; Henry Gee, *The Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments* (London: MacMillan, 1902), 274.

³¹ Queen Elizabeth to Archbishop Parker and others, January 22, 1560/1 in John Bruce and Thomas T. Perowne, eds., *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker, DD Archbishop of Canterbury : Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A. D. 1535, to His Death, A. D. 1575* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), 133.

³² F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite* (London: Rivingtons, 1921), Vol. I, clxxi. The bishops’ interpretations were never authorized and have been printed in striking disorder, often as an appendix to the royal injunctions themselves. Bishop Richard Cox led their effort for clarification in 1561, chairing the conference of bishops that produced the interpretations.

³³ Reprinted in Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments*, 164.

Grindal wrote in January 1565 that some clergy omitted portions of the liturgy while some added material; some persisted in old ways while others pushed into areas not yet prescribed. By the middle of the decade, Archbishop Parker needed to step in. Clearly there had been no real settlement. Before detailing the ensuing orders, it is important to recognize that the nature of prayer book worship was something that emerged over time. It was certainly not neatly defined in any 1559 settlement.

In 1566, Parker released what has come to be known as his Advertisements. In this text the archbishop outlined that:

in the ministration of the Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayer to be said at the Communion Table, to use no copes but surplices.³⁴

He further noted that all rites would be performed in a “comely surplice with sleeves.” Moving to out-of-church apparel, the archbishop ordered all masters of colleges, deans, and archdeacons to wear the black gown, tippet, and square cap. “Poor parsons, vicars, and curates” were to do their best to meet this standard also.³⁵ The important element here is that Parker made a distinction between cathedral and collegiate church practice on the one hand and parish practice on the other. Copes without images would be used at cathedral / collegiate communions but at no other time.

Perhaps the word consolidation is more helpful than the word settlement. Over time, certainly by the beginning of Archbishop John Whitgift’s tenure at Canterbury (1583-1604), a definite shape to Elizabethan prayer book worship emerged. Images including the cross were out, but these had been excised through the disciplined reordering or liturgical space. The surplice was required for clergy at all offices, and a plain cope was to be added in the cathedrals for Holy Communion. The wooden table,

³⁴ Advertisements” in W. H. Frere and W. P. M. Kennedy, eds., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation* (London: Longmans, 1910), Vol. I, 175, 179.

³⁵ Ibid.

fitted with a white cloth and often a silk frontal, would stand along the eastern wall, save for during the actual communion liturgy when it was brought down into the chancel or even into the nave. Rood screens that divided the nave from the chancel were retained, but the traditional array of cross, Mary, and John were exchanged for the royal arms. This consolidation occurred over time and though it may have begun in 1559, it was surely not “settled” in that year. This general pattern continued through the reign of James with little exception. The nature of prayer book worship from c.1549 to c.1620 has here only been briefly described, and, as noted, it has been the topic of a number of important texts, captivating the attentions of historians for a host of reasons. While much more could be said about the consolidation of prayer book liturgy, particularly the material context, it is important to remember that this issue was the flash point for a broader discussion about confessional identity a generation later in the seventeenth century. The goal of this project is to consider the way history was employed to reorient the devotional life and confession of the Church of England in that period. It is vital, though, to have a firm grip on just what was established or, as I have preferred, what consolidated as the shape of prayer book liturgy from the 1550s to the accession of Charles Stuart in 1625.

The Concept and Writing of History in Early Modern England

There is an on-going discussion among historians about where to adequately draw the line between pre-modernity and modernity. If we do assent to this rather Hegelian periodization enterprise, the question becomes is the Reformation era of the sixteenth century the beginning of modernity, or should the start date be later with the Enlightenment that emerged at the close of the seventeenth century? As far as that conversation goes, particularly when one grasps the epistemological framework of each option, a better case can be made for 1700 as a general rupture date with the pre-modern world than can be made for 1500 or 1520. However, it cannot be missed that many in the

sixteenth century understood themselves to be embarking in a new direction in their philosophy, theology, religious practice, and in still other areas. They believed something had changed. They saw their goals, their arguments, their devotional practices as distinct from their immediate forbears. Each reformer believed he was retrieving something lost – the true, apostolic Christian faith. But when exactly that faith was lost was a matter of disagreement. Did the church fall prey to antichrist in 1200, 1100, or was it still earlier before the scholastics appeared? Was the true faith lost in 325? To that question of course both Protestants and Catholics gave different answers, even among themselves.³⁶ What should interest us here is not the disagreement, but rather the ubiquitous sense that something had indeed changed in the sixteenth century; that something lost was found.

All things considered, there was wide agreement that something had changed. The same is true of the seventeenth century. The great-grandchildren of those men and women who perceived themselves moving in a new direction (regardless of what that direction was or the historical accuracy of their sensibilities) also believed that their immediate forbears had done something new, that is, people in the seventeenth century understood the sixteenth century to be a point of rupture with the past; they understood the sixteenth century to be a time for reformation, to put it simply. Arguments about how Luther relied on medieval patterns of thought are to some extent moot. It certainly may be the case that Luther was indebted to nominalism.³⁷ It certainly may be the case that in epistemological terms the sixteenth century was no different from the fifteenth or the fourteenth and that the real beginning of “modern” ways of thinking was in the eighteenth

³⁶ For solid analysis of historicism among reformers, see Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Idem, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Anthony Grafton, *What was History?: The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

³⁷ Heiko A. Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992).

century. That is not our concern here. We have to be careful about what women and men in the seventeenth century actually believed about themselves and about their world without necessarily taking these narratives at face value. In short, they looked back at the sixteenth century as an axial moment, a time of reformation.

How, then, was history articulated? What were its purposes? How did perceptions of the past function within the national conscious? For that matter, was that conscious, in historical terms, fragmented? More to the point, how did perceptions of the reformation and of the sixteenth century function within the discourse of religious legitimacy in the middle Stuart period, specifically in regards to the question of the confessional face of the established Church of England? Clearly there was a serious interest in history. M. W. Brownley has noted that readers in the early seventeenth century consumed more editions of Sir Walter Raleigh's *The History of the World* than the collected plays of William Shakespeare. In 1599 all historical texts were to be licensed by the Privy Council. By 1637 this licensing was so important that the task was given over to one of two state secretaries.³⁸ D. R. Woolf has observed that historical texts were being distributed fairly easily from London and the two universities to more provincial locations, many of which were developing libraries. For the first time, printed texts could claim superiority over local memory in debates. It must be noted that the broad study of history-writing in the early modern period is much larger than the more narrow concerns of this dissertation. Nevertheless, one has to keep some of the major conclusions currently maintained in this field in mind. Foremost among these is the issue of an early modern revolution in the writing of history. Paulina Kewes explains that, although many scholars in the twentieth century argued that there was an historical

³⁸ M. W. Brownley, *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 2-4; Frank Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), 38. For more general discussions of history-writing in early modern England, see Thomas Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999); Bruce Gordon, ed., *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996).

revolution in the sixteenth century, that is, a shift towards modernistic factual accuracy and documentation as the result of Baconian empiricism, the situation was more complicated.³⁹

Without question, there was an overwhelming emphasis by the end of the sixteenth century on the importance of documentary sources in writing history. William Camden's description of himself sitting in the middle of "great piles and heaps of papers and writings of all sorts" gives us the image of the historian culling through manuscripts to thoroughly buttress his arguments with "facts."⁴⁰ But history had a purpose beyond sheer reportage. History was created from a web of those facts and an accompanying interpretation. That reality chips at the old theory of an a-political, modernistic historical revolution. As mentioned, printed texts now had a role in debate – one of the purposes of history. In the middle ages the reading and writing of history was limited to a small, predominantly monastic slice of the population. Now it was a major area of thought in which lawyers, courtiers, university students, and the average literate man or woman (possibly the illiterate also) regularly participated in some way. Moreover, history shifted from the monastic chronicle to a wide variety of literary genres – satire, memoir, biography and autobiography, apologia, and jeremiad. The early humanist conception was that history was for making better-informed political leaders and sovereigns. That was the view of Machiavelli, Bacon, and even Sir Edward Hyde. The latter, Brownley argues, believed that since history was to instruct statesmen, it needed to be written by men intimately familiar with statecraft.⁴¹ Certainly this was a change. But the principal

³⁹ Paulina Kewes, "History and Its Uses," in Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), 1-30.

⁴⁰ F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1967), 233.

⁴¹ Brownley, 18-21. Charles I, while at Oxford during the war, ordered the translation of a history of the French civil wars, claiming that had he read it earlier he might have avoided the outbreak of civil war in England. See also D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology and the "Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press,

purpose of history expanded beyond even this political conception. As history moved from the monastery to the court to be used for political instruction, the study of the past was changing for a second time. More and more, history was used to resolve conflict. The perception was that, in the face of a conflict, one needed merely to point back to a constitutional or classical moment and all would fall into place.

This brings us to a second major issue currently held within the field: polemics and objectivity. By the outbreak of civil war in 1642, history was widely used to establish precedent and to pinpoint blame. There was a measure of tension, however, between the conception and application of history. The writing of history was still regularly viewed as an act of reportage. At the same time, however, readers were suspicious of manipulation for polemical ends. Historians themselves were certainly aware of the use of history for polemical and apologetic purposes and (perhaps) the underlying subjective character of historical interpretation. Thomas Fuller insisted that his *Church History of Britain* (1655) was in no way designed “for pleasing parties.”⁴² The parliamentary historian Thomas May fulminated that even those high-minded historians who reject polemical applications still “seduce” readers with their “byas.”⁴³ The whole situation was not lost on the government either. King James and his advisors capitalized on the potential for historical polemic by establishing Chelsea College as a think-tank for this kind of literature and appointing Camden and Sir John Hayward as historiographers. Although little came of this project, it is further indication that people recognized the power – the authority – of historical texts. Paulina Kewes has highlighted that from the middle of the sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth, the use of

1990), 4, 253; D. R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 7.

⁴² Thomas Fuller, *The Appeal of Injured Innocence: Unto the Learned and Ingenuous Reader* (London, 1659), 1.

⁴³ Thomas May, *The History of the Parliament of England which began November 3, 1640* (London, 1647), xvi, xv.

analogue, that is, the correspondence of figures and events from the past with contemporary situations, not only increased but went from oblique allusions to transparent and at times exaggerated parallels.⁴⁴ Social, political, and religious pressures turned scholars who by most accounts were supposed to be disinterested intellectuals into terse polemicists. But even when bald polemic flooded the market in the 1640s, historians continued to argue that their works were not interpretive but were instead true accounts which could explain problems and judiciously assign culpability. In short, the phenomenon of early modern writers searching for facts to substantiate their claims is not evidence of modernistic critical enquiry, but rather, as Woolf puts it, “the requirements of polemic.”⁴⁵ Here again it is the case that we have to listen very carefully to the narratives contemporaries told themselves about their world and about who they were while at the same time not taking these narratives at face value.

The Climate of the Conversation: An Introductory Post-Script

This introduction would not be complete without very briefly acknowledging two recent publications – one an article and the other, strange to say, a footnote – which touch on a sometimes unspoken but deeply important factor in a project like this dissertation. The article is an engaging one composed by Peter Marshall. Appearing in the summer of 2009 in the *Journal British Studies* and titled “(Re)defining the English Reformation,” Marshall’s piece provides a very helpful diagnosis of where historians are in relationship to the phenomena variously described as the Reformation, the English Reformation, the Long English Reformation, and the English reformations.⁴⁶ He describes the benefits of the revisionist movement championed by Christopher Haigh and Eamon Duffy and the

⁴⁴ Kewes, “History and Its Uses,” 14-17.

⁴⁵ D. R. Woolf, *Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 4; Woolf, *Idea of History*, 255-256.

⁴⁶ Peter Marshall, “(Re)defining the English Reformation,” *Journal of British History* 48 (2008), 564-586.

post-revisionist movement that succeeded it, the broad outlines of which even those two eminent scholars have recognized as important. He covers what I have described here as exceptionalism, Protestant Whig interpretations, and the issue of the Calvinist consensus to come full circle. This piece is brought up here for its reflection on the current climate of historical discourse in English reformation studies, particularly the aforementioned vigilance against agenda-driven histories. Again, that sensitivity cannot be brushed away as paranoia. Nicholas Tyacke, Diarmaid MacCulloch, and Peter Lake have rightly roused us from the Anglican myth and shaken us free from romantic assumptions about the *via media* and English moderation.⁴⁷ These scholars warn that we must watch out for overly consensual narratives of the Elizabethan and Jacobean religious landscape, narratives that have more to do with modern Anglican sensibilities than the reality on the ground c.1560 to c.1660. Lake, in particular, has taken to task a cadre of scholars who happen to be Anglican for their willingness to accept uncritically what were ultimately polemical constructions of Puritanism and conformity. Ian Green, Norman Jones, Judith Maltby, Christopher Marsh, and Alexandra Walsham have thus received their share of accusation. Marshall argues that, in the final analysis, one can “remain fairly sanguine in the face of this brouhaha.” There is no evidence, he continues, that non-Anglicans, or for that matter non-theists are better equipped to write good history.

Suspicious about Anglican misinterpretation, though, continue. These concerns are always with us, and rightly so as the *via media* paradigm seems as strong as ever in certain quarters. The second item for this introductory postscript is a mere footnote, but it is one that caught the attention of a number of scholars. It even appeared in Marshall’s discussion. In a 2006 essay titled “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” Peter Lake argued in a footnote that historians should be forth-coming about their ideological

⁴⁷ Tyacke, “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism”; MacCulloch, “The Myth of the English Reformation”; Lake, “The ‘Anglican Moment’? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s.”

investments. “In calling for others to let their assumptions show rather more explicitly,” he wrote, “I should add that I am an adherent of the ideology known, in certain circles in the US, as ‘secular humanism’ and that, as the member of no ‘faith community,’ my aim is to produce an atheistically relativist account of the religious history of this period.”⁴⁸

This admission is very healthy for the conversation. Some, particularly persons who are religiously-inclined, may read that footnote and make the almost involuntary and dismissive assumption that Lake’s work must be reductionistic. That is simply not the case. It is clear in his writing that Lake takes very seriously the beliefs and religious motivations of the persons and groups under investigation. In short, his “secular humanism” does not result in reductionism, nor does it inhibit his ability to recognize the deep resonance of religion in human culture.

That door swings both ways. With Marshall’s far-reaching commentary and Lake’s invitation in mind, I will participate openly yet succinctly. Given the climate of the conversation, it would be irresponsible not to do so. I am an Anglican. My commitments do not inhibit my ability to recognize polemical constructions crafted in post-reformation England. On the contrary, such constructions are the very subject of this dissertation. My graduate training was phenomenological and, for good measure, in a public institution. Moreover, this project is not denominational history, although my archival research in the United Kingdom was partially funded by a grant from the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church. Frankly, I do hope it will be of service to anyone (Anglican, atheist, or otherwise) who wishes to better understand the ways in which a particular religious identity took shape in early modern England thanks to the efforts of a group of polemicist-historians.

⁴⁸ Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” fn. 86.

CHAPTER 1
PETER SMART AND OLD STYLE CONFORMITY

“A Most Froward, Fierce, and Unpeaceable Spirit.”⁴⁹

Mounting the pulpit of Durham Cathedral in July 1628, Peter Smart let loose a blistering critique of the changes he had witnessed in his cathedral church in recent years. Smart was incensed that, since the arrival of Bishop Richard Neile, a cadre of clergy had reoriented devotional patterns and thus the theological position of the established Church of England at Durham. Smart questioned the legality of this newly instituted ceremonialist program: a stone altar had been erected, copes with images were being worn, and the quire was surfeited with candles and statues. History, for the most part, has recorded Peter Smart as a Puritan when in reality, he was nothing of the sort. About a generation ago John G. Hoffman and Michael Tillbrook, in separate articles, demonstrated that this Durham prebend was, until the 1640s, a prayer book conformist and a loyal episcopalian.⁵⁰ In fact, his was the churchmanship that flourished in the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. Far from unique, this man and his argument clarify sharply the thesis advanced by scholars like Nicholas Tyacke, Kenneth Fincham, and Peter Lake: the Laudians were not run of the mill conformists, perhaps a bit over-zealous in pressing prayer book rituals, but rather a cluster (even a party) with an agenda for serious change. No Puritan, Smart pointed a damning finger at the new altar, at the carved cherubs, at the copes with images, at the dizzying number of candles, and declared a verdict: “innovation,” one of the worst crimes in the early modern world. Of course men like

⁴⁹ This is John Cosin’s description of Peter Smart. It is quoted in Thomas Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge and of Waltham Abbey, With the Appeal of Injured Innocence* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1840), 663.

⁵⁰ Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast”; Tillbrook, “Arminianism and Society in County Durham, 1617-42.”

William Laud and John Cosin, one of Smart's fellow Durham prebends, would in turn have a response to this historical critique: they maligned such "old style" conformists as Puritans, disobedient schismatics bent on the fall of the Church of England. It is the presence of this debate – a conflict *within* conformism – that exposes the Laudian project for what it really was: a new vision for the Church of England, one increasingly less Reformed and more focused on ceremonial patterns not found in the Book of Common Prayer. By examining Smart's critique we can see through the Laudians' self-promotion as conservative reasserters of an established tradition.

Peter Smart was born in 1569, the son of William Smart, vicar of Stratford upon Avon, Warwickshire. Educated first at Westminster School and then Broadgates Hall, Smart won a studentship at Christ Church, Oxford. There Smart met William James, the college dean and his future patron. Advancing to the BA in 1592 and then the MA in 1595, Smart followed his teacher north in 1596 when James took the deanery of Durham. Smart was made master of the grammar school and was thus able to exhibit his skills in classical languages. When James was elevated to the episcopate in 1606, Smart at last took holy orders, a chaplaincy, the vicarage of Aycliffe, County Durham, and a prebendal stall in the cathedral all from the generous hands of his old teacher.⁵¹

When Bishop James died in 1617, he was replaced by Richard Neile, a man at the center of the emerging circle of ceremonialists.⁵² That year, even before Neile's enthronement at Durham, the prebend Francis Burgoyne ordered the communion table to

⁵¹ ODNB: Smart; G. W. Kitchen, *Seven Sages of Durham* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911), 99-132; Hoffman, "The Arminian and the Iconoclast," 279-281. Smart knew Neile while both were students at Westminster.

⁵² This group, whose borders are fuzzy, has been known by a variety of labels. They have been called Anti-Calvinists, for their perceived soft-stance on predestination, as Arminians, after Jacobus Arminius, the Dutch theologian whose teachings were rejected at the Synod of Dort, and as Laudians, after their most prominent leader, William Laud. Peter Lake has called them avant-garde conformists because they hid their innovation under a screen of conservatism. See Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I"; Milton, "The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach."

be set altar-wise. Such a move did not go unnoticed by the more Calvinist prebends Smart and Robert Hutton. Time – more specifically the health of the prebends – was not on their side. Within a few years a number of prebends died and the bishop was able to place like-minded clergy in cathedral stalls. These included Augustine Lindsell, Eleazor Duncon, Gabriel Clarke, and, most notably, John Cosin. Nicholas Tyacke has noted that at around the same time that Burgoyne had the table at Durham moved, William Laud, then dean of Gloucester, ordered a similar arrangement at his cathedral. While it is hazardous to see this as evidence of a clear party position in that decade, as Tyacke argues, the fact that these two men both had a connection to Neile and that both rearranged their communion tables to the east end around the same time is not easily glossed over.⁵³ Wherever *certain men* were, *certain things* were happening. And these activities did not go unnoticed. When Neile was translated to the diocese of Winchester in early 1628, George Montaigne succeeded him, but only for three months.⁵⁴ That summer, Smart took the opportunity presented by the episcopal vacancy to preach an arguably acerbic sermon on July 17. Using as his text Psalm 31:7, “I hate them that hold of superstitious vanities,” the prebend opened his mind and let lose all those opinions that he had held back during Neile’s tenure at Durham. The pressing matter was worship: Smart observed that his cathedral had become swollen with “humane traditions, superstitious Ceremonies, which vndermine and ouerthrow both the Law and the Gospell.”⁵⁵ It was Bishop Neile, according to Smart, who initiated this new ceremonial

⁵³ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 117. See also Andrew Foster, “Richard Neile Revisited,” in Lake and Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy*, 159-178; Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 182.

⁵⁴ Patrick Musset, ed., *Lists of Deans and Major Canons of Durham, 1541-1900* (Durham: Durham University Press, 1974); Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 281. Laud got the vacant see of London when Montaigne was translated to Durham.

⁵⁵ The sermon text was printed in both London and Edinburgh in 1628 and reprinted in London in 1640. My analysis will use the 1640 printing. Sermon, 1628, 6.

program by packing the cathedral with “a Schismaticall crew of upstart reformers.”⁵⁶ As a result, the cathedral’s worship patterns were marked not by established prayer book norms, but rather “theatrical stage play.” Smart christened such rituals “foolish, hereticall, Papisticall, Paganicall, and Magicall.” The frustrated canon even advised the congregation to avoid the cathedral all together “till things bee amended.”⁵⁷ The most offensive change of course was the fashioning of a new marble altar, fixed to the floor with black polished pillars, set against the eastern wall, and adorned with white gold cherubs.⁵⁸ Although at this point Smart mentioned no violator by name, the sermon hit its target. Richard Hunt, the cathedral’s dean called a chapter meeting that very afternoon to address this serious challenge.⁵⁹

Along with prebends John Cosin, Marmaduke Blakeston (Smart’s father-in-law), and William James, son of Smart’s old patron Bishop James, Hunt convened the provincial High Commission. The morning sermon was declared seditious and its preacher was called to account. With a copy of the homily in hand to offer up for inspection, Smart dutifully appeared and announced that he was able to defend his every word. The offending prebend was dismissed but notified that he would have to reappear at a later date.⁶⁰ After consultation with the chapter, Hunt contacted Laud, then bishop of London. The dean accused Smart of attacking their work as well as the rituals of the chapel royal and asked the *de facto* leader of the Anti-Calvinist / ceremonialist movement

⁵⁶ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 89v; Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 281.

⁵⁷ Sermon 1628, 24, 37, 26.

⁵⁸ Smart’s description, couched in an accusation of Dean Richard Hunt, has been reprinted in Kitchen, *Seven Sages of Durham*, 110.

⁵⁹ Christopher Hunter, *An Illustration of Mr. Daniel Neal’s History of the Puritans in the Article of Peter Smart, A.M. Prebendary of Durham, Prosecuted for Preaching a Vile Sermon, in the Cathedral There, July 27, 1628* (Durham, 1736), 2-7; Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast”; ODNB: Smart.

⁶⁰ Durham Cathedral, Dean and Chapter Muniments: Chapter Act Book, 1619-38, fols. 73r, 74v; ODNB: Smart.

for his support.⁶¹ Two months elapsed before the case progressed to the stage of having official articles against Smart. In that time, however, he lobbed four indictments against Hunt and his fellow prebends at the August assizes. Consistent with his sermon, Smart accused them of violating the Act of Uniformity. Not surprisingly, nothing came of this case. Moreover, the judge, Sir James Whitelock, accused Smart of disgracing the church with such acrimony. With his counter-accusation rebuffed, another hit came on 21 August 1628: Smart lost the fruits of his cathedral stall.⁶² Without other recourse, the wounded clerk turned to parliament for help. Smart lashed out by attempting to get a bill in motion against his Durham colleagues. In October, however, the High Commission finally had articles prepared. Smart was able to maneuver skillfully until January 1629 when he wound up in a London jail. At his request, Smart was transferred to a cell in York – whereupon, adding insult to injury, the slow-moving High Commission penalized him with a censure. In 1630, although he suffered degradation and was moved yet again, this time to the King’s Bench, his supporters began raising money – £400 a year – to support his family.⁶³

For the next ten years Smart languished in jail until an opportunity to press his case came in 1640. Parliament, for the first time in eleven years, was again in session. As the war with Scotland required funding, Charles had to call parliament and thus the king’s so-called “Personal Rule” came to an end. And with the calling of the Long Parliament, the Laudian ascendancy derailed. That spring, in April, John Pym and John Hampden mounted Smart’s case. While the Commons decided in November that Smart

⁶¹ TNA: PRO SP 16/3/243; George Ornsby, ed., *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham* (Durham: Andrews and Co., 1869), Part I, 144-145, 165.

⁶² BL, Harleian MS 1219, fol. 427r; Durham Chapter Act Book, fols. 73r., 74v; Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 291-292.

⁶³ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 89v, 128r-139v; Cosin, *Correspondence*, I, 197-199; W. H. D. Longstaffe, ed., *The Acts of the High Commission Court within the Diocese of Durham* (Durham: Andrews and Co., 1858), 233-241; John Bruce, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I, 1625-26* (1858), Vol. 4, 321; ODNB: Smart.

should be released, bureaucratic procedures protracted matters and he did not gain his freedom until January 1641. His wounds still unhealed, the angry prebend made sure to testify in the trial of his old colleague John Cosin.⁶⁴ The tables were turned: the Long Parliament deprived Cosin, citing his contravention of the “Religion established.”⁶⁵ Parliament, likewise, returned Smart’s lost cathedral stall. Time had taken its toll, however. Like many others, Smart ended up signing the Solemn League and Covenant in the 1640s. Spending the remainder of his life trying to recover the income from his prebendal stall in arrears, he died in County Durham in 1652.

Smart’s Argument

When Peter Smart rose to preach at Durham Cathedral in the summer of 1628, it was the first time he had done so in seven years.⁶⁶ After outlining the Christian attitude to sin, condemning vice, and calling sinners to repentance, Smart described how Christ left liberty to his Church to devise worship that is orderly and conformable to sacred scripture. Then the prebend made his pivotal turn. Superfluous ceremonies, he railed, are only to awe simple people. Moreover, a fascination with ritual – and with stone altars – leads such folk to see again the Aaronical priesthood who sacrificed to God before Christ came as the consummation of all sacrifices. To indulge in “Jewish types and figures long since dead and buried” robs “Christ of his honour, and us of our salvation.”⁶⁷

⁶⁴ *Journal of the House of Lords* (London, 1802), Vol. IV, 325; Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 821, fol. 8v; Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 299; ODNB: Smart.

⁶⁵ Bodl., Egerton MS 2978, fol. 51r; Durham University Library, Mickleton and Spearman MS 30, fol. 8r; Simonds D’Ewes, *The Journal of Sir Simonds D’Ewes from the Beginning of the Long Parliament to the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Stratford*, Wallace Notestein, ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923), 21; *Journal of the House of Commons* (London, 1802), Vol. II, 71; Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 298.

⁶⁶ This is according to Cosin. Therefore, the number of years Smart absented himself from preaching is debatable. See Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge*, 663; Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 282.

⁶⁷ Sermon 1628, 9.

To build altars and rely on mass-priests instead of following the lead of ministers who serve at tables and preach the pure Word is a denial of the central soteriological ethic of the reformation – and indeed, as Smart would understand it, the central soteriological ethic of Christianity.

Smart preached that the whole notion of an altar disrupted and distorted the Gospel.

For if it be an altar there must needs be a sacrifice offered by a priest to God; but in communion nothing is offered to God but prayers, but praise and thanksgiving, which the hearts and lips of all the faithfull communicants offer to God by their Mediator Christ. They lay them not on a Table, they lay not their thanks, they lay not their prayers vpon an altar, either of wood or stone; as the Aaronicall Priests, laid their burnt offerings and incense...⁶⁸

As Smart here delineates, what one does liturgically speaks directly to one's doctrine and dogmatic confession. Intangible ideas were connected to tangible objects; a stone altar was linked to the work of mass-priests long banished from godly England. Yet Smart recounts clergy "ducking" to the altar, presbyters who "make a low legge."⁶⁹ This bowing is nothing short of idolatry according to the prebend. These are theological arguments – arguments many readers might consider *primary*. Indeed, the presenting discourse is about the particulars of devotion and the theology that undergirds different conceptions of right worship. Of equal importance in Smart's presentation, however, are historical precedents. Those precedents energized his arguments and rooted his claims in the language of legitimacy, making his position appear normative and conservative almost without regard to the theology.

Peter Smart saw himself as a loyal son of the church rightly established in the sixteenth century. When ordered to appear before the consistory court on Thursday, 19 August, 1630, Smart wrote in his own papers (with no small measure of sarcasm) that he

⁶⁸ Sermon 1628, 12.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 13.

was being asked to renounce “the faith of his mother, the Church of England.” Clearly feeling persecuted, Smart wrote that his opponents wanted him to admit “his great error in adhering so long to the Church of England.”⁷⁰ From the late 1620s on, Smart consistently argued that he was upholding the true conformist position, while his opponents were mangling that tradition. His ire about the situation at Durham has to be set in this context of historical identity. “The ministers of this sacrament in the cathedral church of Durham,” Smart wrote, “have presumed latly to alter in many things the administration thereof, not only from the practice of the primitive church, and the institution of the author Christ, but also from the Rubricks and Canons of the Church and the ancient and usual customs of the same.” He noted in his papers that the prayer book and Injunction 23 “forbids the decking of tables with costly coverings and crosses.” Considering the music and singing at Durham, Smart believed that the Elizabethan prayer book tradition required the service to be audible and distinct, not complicated by ostentatious melodies and harmonies. The rubrics, the injunctions, and the Book of Homilies, the prebend argued, are at odds with the pattern now found in his cathedral. At Durham, he wrote, the people can no better understand then if the service “were in Hebrew or Irish.”⁷¹

One of the most consistent features of Peter Smart’s argument was his invocation of legal precedents and the conformist mantle of the established church. Smart argued that his sermon was an “antidote, against the poison of malicious innovators,” men like Cosin, Burgoyne, Lindsell, and Neile who “scandalized the reformation of our church by calling it a deformation.” Insisting on his conformity and their non-conformity, Smart wanted to emphasize that he was not challenging the lawful liturgies of the church. He wanted to leave no doubt that he was not a Puritan. He exclaimed “no part of divine

⁷⁰ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 2.

⁷¹ Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 1364, fols. 11v, 15v-16v.

service set down in the Book of Common Prayer or any other church order which is established by law, and confirmed by custom and use is spoken against in the sermon, only superstitious innovations and unlawful alterations.” To be clear, he wrote in his papers that he did not even speak against “the service used in former times in Durham church, according to that which is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.”⁷² Smart tried his best to do three things simultaneously: own and showcase his conformity with recognized paradigms, localize the problem with Neile, Cosin, and the ceremonialists, and distance them from the accepted prayer book tradition. Arguing that the Laudian movement was distinct from the established Church of England, Smart wrote “the church is not charged with bringing them [i.e. innovations] in, but certain irregular and presumptuous canons bring idols into the church, and popish ceremonies, whereby way is made for the bringing in of the mass.”⁷³

Regarding his own efforts as a conformist, Smart contended in his papers “there is not a word in the sermon against decent vestments allowed by the Church of England, but all such which it forbids, as being defiled with superstition.” These, he continues, “are not church ornaments but church disgracements.” For good measure, he wrote in his papers, “I think the church of Rome would scorn some of them.” Even papists, Smart pressed, would find these vestments comical and perhaps blasphemous. The prayer book tradition clearly could not bear with such copes. He invoked the homilies, the injunctions, and the “canons made in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth” which “expressly forbid *omnes vestes superstition contaminates* to be used in the Church of England.”⁷⁴ Furthermore, Smart believed and argued that his efforts were simply a manifestation of his duty to the church. Smart wrote:

⁷² Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 4v-r.

⁷³ Ibid., fol. 17r.

⁷⁴ Ibid., fol. 15r.

I am no puny prebendarie (as Mr. Lindsell, and Mr Cosin were when this sermon was preached), no underling, nor a pragmaticall busie body, taking upon me to meddle with matters not appertaining to me and to control my superiors, my grave and reverend brethren of the church (as they did, the one calling the reformers of our church ignorant Calvinistical bishops...I preached as a governor, being the senior residentiariie of all the chapter save one: to whom the canons and statutes of the church give charge and authoritie to reprove and amend those unlawful innovations and disorders, which 2 or 3 young prebendaries, upstart reformers had presumptuously brought into the church of Durham.⁷⁵

Smart presented himself not only as a good conformist, but as a senior conformist charged with maintaining the historic confession and practice of the established church. He highlighting his responsibility “by the canons to see the Book of Common Prayer observed in every point.”⁷⁶ Moreover, he had to uphold his duty to the church even if it came at a cost. Smart wrote in his papers that it was more “uncharitable to sew pillows under mens elbows, to sooth them, to flatter them, to lull them to sleep in their sins, to winke at their open and apparent faults and to suffer them to run headlong to their own damnation and destruction.”⁷⁷ Preaching in season and out of season was his responsibility.

Smart tightly gripped his conformist identity. In his discussion of altars in the 1628 Sermon, he distinguished them from communion tables, the kind described in the rubrics, the injunctions, and other recognized directives. “But the Lord’s table is no Idoll...it be the Lord’s board, as the Communion book rightly names it.”⁷⁸ He then cited in his sermon a specific rubric from the prayer book: the table was to be set in the quire, lengthwise. Smart, one might imagine, then leaned toward the chancel behind him, gesturing to the arrangement that had developed under Bishop Neile. “Therefore our

⁷⁵ Ibid., fol. 8r.

⁷⁶ Ibid, fol. 23r. See also Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 1364, fol. 54v-55r. Smart provided the Latin charge in both manuscripts: “Decanus et residentiarii curabunt ne qua alia forma observetur in dicendis sacris precibus et canendis et administratione sacramentorum quam que proposita est et praescripta in libro publicarum precum.”

⁷⁷ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 6v.

⁷⁸ Sermon 1628, 29.

Communion table must stand as it had wont to doe,” he chided. In his notes for his trial, the prebend continued down this road:

the word altar is never used at all, not so much as once, in all the liturgy of the Church of England, nor in the New Testament for a communion table, nor yet in any church book, nor in the Articles of Religion, Injunctions, Advertisements, Latin or English canons, Book of Common Prayer, or Homilies.⁷⁹

Producing a sequence of logical arguments, Smart pushed that, as the Homilies (specifically the homily ‘Against Peril of Idolatry’) rejects altars as idols, and, as Article 35 of the Articles of Religion ratifies the Second Book of Homilies, and, as all “ecclesiastical persons” subscribe to the Articles, therefore, any one denying that altars are idolatrous, is no true member of the Church of England.⁸⁰ Working backwards, if one affirmed the use and presence of altars, he was denying his oath, the Articles of Religion, and the Homilies.

In the 1628 sermon Smart moved from the issue of the table – always couching his case in the framework of the law and the established ethos – to the use of copes. As discussed in the foregoing chapter, the cope was to be used only in cathedral churches and, then, only at communion. Moreover, this vestment was to be free of images. Although he continued to hold nothing but contempt for the misuse of the cope in this sermon, his line of reasoning is much clearer in his 1629 tract *A Short Treatise of Altars*. Smart articulated the substance of his dispute in the title: the cathedral canons were using “Copes embroidered with images.”⁸¹ While the prebend condemned the stone altar – even referring to it as an “abominable idol” – he developed his argument against images with a degree of sophistication. There is, in fact, a pairing of altars and images in his writing. Theologically, for Smart, the two go hand in hand; the one reinforces the other.

⁷⁹ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 19r-v.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ *Treatise of Altars*, title page.

The quire was not the only place at Durham where changes had been made. The other locus for Neile's artistic and ceremonial project was the baptismal font. According to Smart, the font was decked with "brave images."⁸² In the preface to the Edinburgh edition of his 1628 sermon, the frustrated prebend described "glittering Angels round about the quire of Durham Church, in long scarlet gowns, with golden wings and gilded heads; together with three other Images over the Byshop's Throne; one of them being the Image of Christ, with a golden beard and a glorious blew cap with rayes like the sunne beames."⁸³ Considering the details Smart provides about the revisions at Durham in his *Treatise of Altars*, especially given the legal or canonical lens through which he views these changes, it is worth examining an extended portion from that text.

The Communion-Table must not have superstitious ornaments, not allowed by the Book of Common Prayer, Injunctions and Canons, in which whatsoever Ceremony is not bidden, it is forbidden, it is unlawfull, it is superstitious... Leaving the Rubricks and direction of the Church, to use other ceremonies for devotions sake, that is superstitious. The Rubricks and Canon command, that the Communion-Table shall stand in the body of the Church or Chancell, where Morning and Evening prayer be appointed to be said: and it must stand covered with a carpet of silk, or other decent stuffe, with a faire linen cloth at the time of the Administration. And therein Cathedrall and Parish Churches must be alike, saith the Act of Vniformity. Therefore the Table (not Altar) must not be removed to the east end of the Quire or Chancell, as farre as can be from the congregation: it must not have a costly Velvet cloth with gold fringe and imbroydered images: much lesse may it have B. Neale's precious golden Pall to cover the Altar, having upon it the false story of the Assumption of our Lady, than which a more abominable Idol all Popery cannot shew. Neither must it be a sumptuous Altar of Stone, gilded, painted and polished bravely, fastened to the ground, having crosses, crucifixes, corporasses, basons, tapers, or candlesticks set upon it; which by name are forbidden in the 23. Injunction.⁸⁴

As described in the foregoing chapter, images were clearly outlawed in what we might call the prayer book constitution. Smart's argument, therefore, is resoundingly clear. The problem, according to the worried prebend, was that Neile and the ascendant party at

⁸² Ibid., 9-10.

⁸³ Peter Smart, *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of Durham...July 27, 1628* (Edinburgh, 1628), 2.

⁸⁴ *Treatise of Altars*, 1.

Durham “pretend[s] that Altars and Images are set up in Churches for ornament, but cursed be such ornaments, to which the peril of Idolatry is joined.”⁸⁵

To employ image-laden ornaments, Smart argued, was to open up a gate for idolatry. For this reason, such instruments *were* banned; they *had been* wiped away in the sixteenth century. These were not adiaphorous either. According to Smart, such icons were not in conformity with sacred scripture and not in conformity with established prayer book norms. He believed that the regime had been wise when it relieved England and its national church of such stumbling blocks and he argued that the establishment’s decisions are plainly accessible.⁸⁶ “Such glorious spectacles,” Smart contended, “draw away from God the minds of them that pray, they further not, but hinder entire affections and godly meditations.” Moreover, there is no “warrant of God’s Word, or direction of the Church, in the Book of Common-prayer, Canons or Injunctions. Nay it is contrary to the second Commandment, and forbidden by the Act of Uniformity.”⁸⁷ One ought to note how Smart seamlessly invoked both the Decalogue and precedents from the late sixteenth century. The prebend even relayed a direct assault on the Elizabethan theological canon itself: Augustine Lindsell, he claimed, was pushing for the removal of the Homily on Idolatry in the Book of Homilies.⁸⁸

Presenting himself as a loyal conformist, Smart refused to accept the caricature that his criticisms were mere Puritan bile. When brought to trial at the turn of the decade, Smart produced a curious set of notes on the articles against him. In manuscript, Smart made a parallel set of articles. On the left verso page are the articles against him. On the

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ It should be noted that distinctions have been made – by contemporaries and by historians of the period – between “secular” images and images which lead to idolatry. Tomb effigies and those of monarchs were resilient to assault. The stock example is the Neville screen at Yorkminster whose niches are populated with statues of English kings. See Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 299.

⁸⁷ *Treatise of Altars*, 19.

⁸⁸ Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 821, fol. 11; Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 139.

right, recto page, Smart produced articles against various members of the Durham chapter. Each of these recto articles is worded almost exactly as the corresponding verso article. Running back and forth for just under fifty manuscript pages, this is polemical rhetoric at its best. A good example is Article 21 and Smart's corresponding Article 21.

Item. We article and object unto you the said Peter Smart that having spent your venomous spleene against the ornaments, liturgy, and quire-service used in the said Cathedral Church of Durham, and other Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and some ecclesiastical persons who have or had governed them, then you make bold with the kings chapel.⁸⁹

Item. We article and object unto you John Cosin, Francis Burgoyne, Augustine Lindsell, that you having disgorged your venomous spleene against your elder brother Peter Smart and covertly against the Book of Common Prayer, injunctions, and homiles which defend him as he defends them, also against the godly princes and learned bishops which first reformed the Church of England.⁹⁰

As one might imagine, Smart goes on and on in his recto article until he produces the 'mirror' charge that Cosin and others have themselves made unfounded claims about the chapel royal. Smart matched his opponents, spleen for spleen, both claiming the high ground of 'conformity'.

The Durham prebend refused to accept his opponents' charge that he was a schismatic Puritan. Reflecting on Cosin's objections to Smart in his papers, the prebend wrote that he certainly did not reject "comely gestures." Cosin was misrepresenting him, Smart argued. He surely affirmed

kneeling down at all prayers, standing up at the saying of the Apostles Creed, and the Gospel, [the] standing of the minister at the North side of the table when he administers the communion, wearing hoods and surplices and other things prescribed by the rubrics. . . . I said nothing against decent copes, or comely gestures. That which I spake, was against massing, ridiculous and idolatrous copes and gestures and other superstitious vanities as lately brought into our church against both law and custom.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 441, fol. 65v.

⁹⁰ Ibid., fol. 66r.

⁹¹ Ibid., fol. 113r.

Smart wanted to be clear that he was not rejecting lawful ceremonies. Despite his consistent claim to the contrary, historians have for centuries regarded him as a schismatic, accepting at face-value his Laudian opponents' characterization. Smart had hit a nerve, and the avant-garde conformists who had the upper-hand in the established hierarchy were particularly concerned to bury this historically-minded prebend under a mountain of crippling labels.

Accepting Smart's deft use of precedents, the copes used by Neile and the other prebends were forbidden in the Church of England. The reason: these were "sumptuous copes imbroidered with images." Smart describes them at various points in the treatise as "ridiculous pie-bald vestments, used a long time by the youth of this towne, in their sports and may-games"; "paultry copes"; and as "golden copes." These "pie-bald vestments" were opposed to "decent copes," a term begging for explanation.⁹² In the flow of his argument, one richly informed by both history and law, Smart detailed what he meant by "decent copes." A definition can be found in Smart's description of receiving communion with King James at Durham on Easter Sunday, 1617.

Two Copes indeed were worne, both decent, as the Canons prescribe, not party-colored nor pibald, like ours at Durham, but plaine without any picture, or other imbroidring of Crosse, or Images, which the doctrine of the Church of England, in the book of Homilies, and Injunctions, straightly forbids in our Churches to be used at any part of God's service, especially at the Communion table, or in windowes above it.⁹³

A shift seems to have occurred, at least in Smart's mind, from decent and orderly prayer book worship to a devotional paradigm as much concerned with effecting piety through the use of liturgical icons as establishing civil propriety. This is a subtle though detectable change in the established ethos.

⁹² *Treatise of Altars*, 8, 10, 19.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 19-20.

Smart listed a number of other instances of rupture with the established prayer book rationale in both the 1628 sermon and the *Treatise on Altars*. His argument became even more explicit in *A Catalogue of Superstitious Innovations*, a tract he released “after his eleven years imprisonment.” It appears that the disinherited prebend grew increasingly litigious as his years of incarceration dragged on. He detailed how the marble altar was set on stone columns and how this violated the manifest establishment ethos found in the same recognizable list of documents.⁹⁴ He bemoaned the removal of the font to a different location and how this violated Archbishop Matthew Parker’s 1567 Advertisements and Canon 81.⁹⁵ Smart’s presentation had become more pointed, more list-oriented. It is effectively the same argument he made in the Durham pulpit years earlier; yet Smart had increased his specificity as well as his command of set laws.

In the 1628 sermon he cited “the Queens Injunctions,” the “advertisements,” and “the Communion booke.”⁹⁶ In the 1629 treatise he brought forward “the Book of Common Prayer,” the “Injunctions and Canons,” the “Rubricks” from the prayer book, and the “Act of Vniformity.” He specifically cited Injunction 23, the order describing the communion table.⁹⁷ In this later tract the prebend displayed a marked familiarity with – if not an internalization of – the Advertisements and the Canons, not to mention the prayer book, the rubrics, and the injunctions. In his *Catalogue*, Smart recounted the use of the cope instead of the academic hood while preaching, the division of Morning Prayer into two separate and uncanonical offices, the removal of the Decalogue boards, the

⁹⁴ *Catalogue*, 10.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁹⁶ Sermon 1628, 18-19, 20, 29.

⁹⁷ *Treatise of Altars*, 1, 4, 8, 9, 15, 19.

excessive use of candles, and unauthorized “piping and singing.” These instances piqued his ire and “offended against their mother, the Church of England.”⁹⁸

When Smart emerged from jail at the behest of the Long Parliament, he raised again the familiar argument that he was a conformist and, concomitantly, that the Laudians were innovators. It should come as no surprise, then, that his case still rested on a particular conception of the Church of England’s reformation in the sixteenth century. As noted, Smart did eventually come around to signing the Solemn League and Covenant.⁹⁹ It seems, however, that, even after a decade in jail, Smart was still not totally convinced of the presbyterian position. Among his papers is a manuscript speech given around 1644. In short, it is a careful examination of the nature of parliamentary church reforms, specifically the twin abolition of episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer. Certainly Parliament is right to quarantine “prelatical men” and their tyranny, the author admits. Parliament is right to rid England of innovation. But there are many good Christians, he continues, who reject the sweeping end to the office of bishop and to the set liturgies of the prayer book. “By no means,” he writes, would these women and men “have them utterly abolished, roote and branch.” Without qualification, such folks opposed the Laudian ‘beauty of holiness.’ Nevertheless, there are, the speaker insists, “many well minded Christians throughout the realm of England which cannot abide to hear that the book of common prayer and Bishops should be taken away.”¹⁰⁰ By signing the covenant, Smart effectively left this ‘old style’ conformist camp. But we should not hastily conclude that he raced to do so. Ultimately, while socio-confessional labels are

⁹⁸ *Catalogue*, 4, 12, 14, 15, 26.

⁹⁹ The Solemn League and Covenant, part of the union of the Scots and parliamentary forces, can be summarized in three points: (1) the reform and unification of religion in all three kingdoms; (2) the extirpation of prelacy, including episcopacy; (3) the removal of all who stand in the way, specifically those who have divided the people from their king. One notes that the Solemn League and Covenant assumes the continuance of monarchy, fixing blame on ‘evil counselors’ (a well-worn strategy in English history which allowed for both stability and substantial change).

¹⁰⁰ Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 821, fol. 9.

inevitable, it is almost equally inevitable that they are never static. Railing against the Laudians on his release, Smart lashed out against the idea that Laud, Cosin, and Neile were sincerely committed to the prayer book tradition. Point by point he again enumerated canons, injunctions, homilies, and rubrics to discredit his opponents. One of the more interesting arguments he made at this point was that the avant-garde conformists had rejected the Church of England because they distanced themselves from the Reformed churches of France, Scotland, and Switzerland.¹⁰¹ Peter Smart envisioned a Reformed communion of churches in which England was certainly a part. Whether and to what degree that was the case in the late 1630s and early 1640s is another matter. Nevertheless, Smart offered up a perception of the church grounded on recognized and legal documents, baptized by history and the mantle of Elizabeth Tudor.

Peter Smart's was a legal and historical argument, one founded on a recognized establishment ethos. Smart's question, as he articulated it in the *Treatise of Altars*, was this: are the activities at Durham "agreeable to the doctrine of the Church of England?" He went on to write that "the doctrine which the Church of England teacheth in sundry places in the Book of Homilies, in the Articles and Injunctions, [is] that Images and Altars, superstitious ornaments... beautifying of temples beyond all meane and measure, pollute and defile the house of God."¹⁰² One must note that this was not a statement of personal opinion – though Smart may have readily shared it. This was a statement calling on a legitimate and established authority. This was an invocation of history and precedent to indict innovation.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., fol. 10-11.

¹⁰² *Treatise on Altars*, 3-4.

Old Style Conformists and the Smart Argument

Peter Smart was far from alone in making an argument against the Laudian program on the basis of prayer book norms and established historical precedents. Even before Charles' accession, during the Spanish match controversy, Calvinist episcopalians and Puritans alike were extremely concerned about England's potential connection with Catholic Spain. David Cressy, as discussed in the foregoing chapter, has described the way the memory of Elizabeth was used as a tool for criticizing James' plans to marry Charles to the Infanta.¹⁰³ Cressy describes how Elizabeth grew in the nation's collective memory, how she became in effect a patron saint whose regnal anniversary, November 17, got more notice than the birthdays of Charles and Henrietta Maria (Charles's *Catholic* queen). Sermons on "88" – the Armada year – hyped the legacy of Elizabeth as the bar for great and truly English monarchs. In the early years of Charles' reign Thomas Gataker preached a sermon on the anniversary of "Englands Deliverance from the Spanish Invasion." In describing the "famous and never-dying memory" of the Virgin Queen, Gataker ranked the chief accomplishment of her reign as "the establishment of that truth of the Gospell and discipline of the Church." Gataker added that of course England now enjoys and can count on the same efforts in the future from "our dread Sovereign Lord King Charles (whom God long preserve a religious defender of this truth and peace among us)."¹⁰⁴ Continuity with the Tudor past was expected and Gataker, praising the passing of memory from generation to generation, spelled out that it was God who gave men and women the power to remember.

But who was Gataker, anyway? Was he a Puritan? For generations historians of Stuart England used to have difficulty seeing women and men who were neither Puritan nor Laudian: often times scholars would simply take trips around the old, familiar

¹⁰³ Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 130-140.

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Gataker, *An Anniversarie Memorial of Englands Delivery from the Spanish Invasion* (London, 1626), iii-vi.

Anglican-Puritan block, as Peter Lake has put it, interpreting the Laudians to be exactly what they and the Puritans claimed the Laudians were – that is, good conformists.¹⁰⁵ Anyone who challenged the Laudians could be written off without much thought as a Puritan. That was the identity that the Laudians fashioned for themselves through the 1620s and ‘30s. And Puritans, regardless of the wide variety of ideas and values under that umbrella term, for the most did not care to distinguish between conformists either. Historians who avoid listening carefully wind up with the view which both the Laudians and the Puritans were eager to sell, one that was and is a distortion of the real landscape. In this space I will describe how Peter Smart was not alone; how others made the “Smart argument,” an invocation of historical precedents, prayer book rubrics, canons and injunctions against the Laudian “beauty of holiness.” It is not my contention that Smart was the lead figure in rejecting Laudianism in favor of older theological patterns or that he was the master craftsman of the old style conformist position. His story, however, captures the situation best, I believe, and has served as a representative case study. It is necessary, though, to review a number of other instances where many English Protestants found themselves in the same position as Peter Smart and thus raised a case against Laudianism not along Puritan lines, but in defense of an older definition of prayer book conformity.

To begin this review, I will need to discuss the work of the historian who has, arguably, spent the most time on the subject of old style conformity, even coining the term – Judith Maltby. Historians, Maltby argues, have focused too much on disaffection

¹⁰⁵ Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” 80-97. For a different view, see Charles W. A. Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Peter White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). It should be noted, though, that neat party boundaries were not a reality. Nevertheless, regarding the Durham House group of ceremonialists, it was evident that wherever *certain men* were, *certain things* were happening. While the idea of clear party lines is distortive, it is unnecessary to devolve to the level of the individual. Responsibly, we can discuss trends, affinities, and sensibilities.

with the prayer book. For quite a long time, it seems, historians implicitly refused to believe that people in the early seventeenth century could have been sincerely attached to the devotional patterns pushed by the establishment in the reigns of Elizabeth and James. The assumption was that non-conformists took their faith more seriously and/or that conformists were either unconcerned with their spiritual life or merely the children of “church papists” – survivalist Catholics who conformed out of necessity but within time came to see elements of Eamon Duffy’s “traditional religion” in the devotions of the prayer book. Historians (she notes specifically Christopher Haigh) have implicitly allowed Geneva to define the shape of legitimate Protestantism. According to this train of thought, no one in the reigns of Elizabeth and James could have sincerely enjoyed worship according to the prayer book: folks were either closet Catholics who, if they squinted, could see the old mass in the prayer book rites or Genevan Protestants who, if they squinted, could see a good continental Reformed liturgy. Both, according to this model, did the best they could with what Elizabeth would allow. Maltby’s thesis points otherwise: she argues that there were English women and men committed to the prayer book and episcopacy and these were not simply survivalist Catholics (maybe in a second generation by the seventeenth century) or merely conforming Puritans. She parallels her effort here with those of the revisionists working on early Tudor England: “we should no more accept uncritically the assessment of the Reformers on the religious health of the early Tudor laity than we should swallow the grim assessment of ‘the godly’ on the spiritual state of their post-Reformation conforming neighbors.”¹⁰⁶

Maltby’s prime evidence for this interpretation is the conformist petitions which came to the Long Parliament between 1640 and 1642. Contrasting with the petition made the Rooters (those who wanted to abolish episcopacy *root and branch*), these petitions

¹⁰⁶ Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, 19. See also Idem, “Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the formation of ‘Anglicanism’, 1642-60,” in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006), 158-180; Idem, “From *Temple* to *Synagogue*, 88-120.

point to a non-Laudian though still conformist feeling existing among many throughout England. Moreover, such documents are historically driven: they continually refer to the “church of Elizabeth and James,” a church unfettered by Laudian alterations. With this evidence in mind, Maltby stresses that critiques of Laudianism do not necessarily signal Puritanism. Simply because one was at odds with Laudianism did not make one a Puritan. At the same time, expressions of anti-Puritanism do not necessarily point to Laudianism. All of this indicates instead a significant population of “old style” conformists. The petitioners, Maltby writes, felt that the “two great treasures of the English settlement had lost credibility due to the policies of the Personal Rule and now stood in danger from fellow protestants who could not distinguish the abuses of Laudianism and the essential soundness of lawful liturgy and episcopal government.”¹⁰⁷ Agreeing with Anthony Milton, Maltby writes that Laudians are often difficult to grapple with historically because they “differed from ‘Jacobean’ conformists at times more in degree than in substance.” Reacting to implicit assumptions in current historiography, Maltby’s critical argument is that non-Laudian conformist “expressions of religious belief were as legitimate as Puritanism, ‘godliness,’ open dissent, recusancy, church papistry, or folk religion in early modern England.” Thus she writes that we must “be more critical concerning the godly’s assessment of the quality of the religious lives of their conforming neighbors.”¹⁰⁸ In similar terms, we cannot blithely accept Laudian critiques of the same: “old style,” non-Laudian conformists were not Puritans simply because the Laudians said so.

Before moving forward, though, it is important to offer a small qualification regarding the pro-episcopal petitions in the early 1640s. Maltby argues that these texts

¹⁰⁷ Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, 84, 86. See also John Morrill, “The Church in England, 1642-9,” in John Morrill, ed., *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642-1649* (London: Macmillan, 1982), 89-114.

¹⁰⁸ Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, 227, 232. See also Peter Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice.”

evinced a non-Laudian prayer book party. While I agree that there was such a party, and that the petitions along with other sources help us to see this demographic, I believe it is possible that a number within that segment of the population could have been savvy Laudians. These saw clearly that things had changed by 1640 and were moving with care and caution. It is likely that a number of Maltby's non-Laudian conformists had in fact supported the Laudian program in the '30s, but, seeing the movement crashing, raced for the life-rafts. Certainly there were many old style conformists like Peter Smart out there. The evidence is plain enough. But there must have been a good number in their midst, even among the petitioners, who saw the way the wind was blowing. Ultimately, though, Maltby is right to suggest the active presence of non-Laudian episcopalians and our need to hear a variety of voices, rather than accepting the sweeping caricatures of both Laudians and radical Puritans.

Without this sobered attitude, we would miss a voice like that of Robert More. More, a prebend of Winchester Cathedral in the late 1620s, knew all too well that many of the leading bishops of the Church of England were making significant changes to established practice by turning communion tables altar-wise. When Richard Neile was translated to Winchester, More found himself playing the part of Peter Smart at that cathedral. More's exchange with Neile involved, as one might suspect, a serious discussion of existing rubrics, specifically what the prayer book and the Elizabethan Injunctions actually required. Reporting Neile to parliament in 1629, More joined Smart in a chorus against innovation.¹⁰⁹ Although he chose a different avenue for voicing his concern, one far less acrimonious, More was no less sure that prayer book norms were being supplanted with a different liturgical-theological ethos. This recognition was not limited to clergy who we might wrongly imagine knew the rubrics better than did their lay flocks. John Towers, one of the more aggressive Laudian bishops, issued a set of

¹⁰⁹ Wallace Notestein and Frances Relf, eds., *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1921), 44; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 215.

articles for his diocese of Peterborough in 1639 and this set, not surprisingly, drew the attention of a group of gentry meeting during the Northampton Assizes. As Kenneth Fincham has observed, these men were concerned that the articles went in a direction not “enjoyed by the rubrick and cannons of the Church of England.” They agreed that approaching their bishop was warranted: while they underscored that they were conformable to the law, they wanted Towers to reconsider some of his “unusuall” requirements.¹¹⁰ David Cressy has noted the case of Thomas Woolrych, a Suffolk gentlemen who refused to kneel at the newly built rails in the parish church at Cowling. No Puritan, Woolrych was ready to kneel to receive communion as that was mandated by the prayer book – but not at the rail.¹¹¹ Elizabethan precedents were also invoked in the case of the communion table at Ashwell in Hertfordshire. The rector, Thomas Rayment, was presented by his parishioners at the spring Assizes in 1629 for moving the table to an altar-wise position. Once again the problem was framed in historical terms: Rayment had changed the devotional patterns recognized as lawful “since the beginning of Queen Elizabeth her reigne.”¹¹²

Perhaps the most high-ranking (and enigmatic) conformist opponent of the Laudian movement was John Williams who, as bishop of Lincoln in the ‘20s and ‘30s, was one of the principal players in the Caroline altar controversy. In the summer of 1627 Peter Titley, the minister of Grantham, turned the communion table of his parish church altar-wise and engaged in dramatic bowing to it. When Grantham’s mayor challenged Titley the case was sent to Williams for his judgment. The bishop decided that the prayer book did not allow for a table set permanently altar-wise and ordered that Titley desist.

¹¹⁰ Kenneth Fincham, ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998), Vol. II, xxiv-v; Bedford County Record Office, St. John of Bletsoe MSS, J, 1361.

¹¹¹ Cressy, “The Battle of the Altars,” 199.

¹¹² Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 181.

The defeated minister complied and manuscript copies of Williams' judgment were widely distributed: Nicholas Tyacke and Kenneth Fincham note that twelve copies survive today, that the letter was cited in parliament in 1628–9 during a debate about Bishop Neile's innovations, and that it appeared at the famous St. Gregory's Case before King Charles in 1633.¹¹³ Anthony Milton points out that while it was never printed, Williams' Grantham Letter was sold among Drury Lane booksellers in written copies.

Through the 1630s both the Grantham Letter and Williams himself persistently challenged Laudian attempts to turn communion tables into altars. The situation already roiling at Durham, Winchester, and a few other places in the 1620s became a national concern in the following decade. In 1633 Richard Neile, by then elevated to archbishop of York, ordered a railed altar for all churches in the northern province. Laud did likewise for Canterbury province in 1635. Peter Heylyn, a Laudian prebend of Westminster Abbey and arguably the most vitriolic polemicist of the Stuart age, took on Williams' Grantham Letter in a 1637 pamphlet titled *A Coale from the Altar*. To this anonymous tract, Williams responded with *The Holy Table, Name and Thing*. Naming himself only as a Lincolnshire minister, the bishop invoked the established doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, reflecting the sense that Heylyn and others were changing patterns that had passed into established orthodox custom. Moreover, as Anthony Milton has observed, Williams jabbingly implied that the author of *A Coale from the Altar* was a "Dr Coale," the name of the Westminster prebend who preached at the burning of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in the reign of Mary Tudor. While the death of Cranmer and the other Marian "martyrs" had passed out of living memory and into hagiography by the 1630s, the sixteenth century was always present: events from that catalytic period could easily be superimposed on events in the present day. More to the

¹¹³ Notestein and Relf, eds., *Commons Debates for 1629*, 52; Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 178–181; Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, 56.

point, the “minister of Lincolnshire” was judging his opponent according to Tudor precedents.

Williams himself may be described as an *enigmatic* opponent of the altar policy because it appears that he maintained an east-end arrangement in his personal chapel. Nevertheless, the bishop opposed making this a nation-wide requirement. In his case for using the word *table* instead of *altar*, Williams drew from the Elizabethan Injunctions, the rubrics in the communion liturgy, and Canon 82. Arguing about the place of the table itself, Williams wrote “this very Injunction saith in the next words, that in the time of the Communion it shall be in the Chancell. The Rubrick saith, in the body of the Church or Chancell. The Canon (82) in force, in the Church or Chancell.”¹¹⁴ In the next chapter I will discuss the substance of Heylyn’s arguments against Williams in “A Coale from the Altar” and in “Antidotum Lincolnense,” his reply to the bishop’s “The Holy Table.” In addition to Heylyn’s response, Williams’ “Holy Table” also drew fire from John Pocklington in the second edition of his “Altare Christianum,” a text I will also discuss in the following chapter.¹¹⁵ For years Williams had cultivated bad relations with the Laudian cohort and Charles himself, resulting in a stint in the Tower at the close of the decade. When released in 1640 he wrote articles for his diocese that ask starkly about the use of ceremonies not warranted by established law. Williams, ever the opponent of Laudian innovation, was clear that prayer book principles were being manipulated.¹¹⁶

At both the Short and Long Parliaments in the early 1640s there are clear indications that the Smart position, the position of the worried non-Laudian conformist,

¹¹⁴ John Williams, *The holy table, name & thing, more anciently, properly, and literally used under the New Testament, then that of an altar* (London, 1637), 17, 20, 44.

¹¹⁵ The first edition of John Pocklington’s *Altare Christianum* targeted William’s Grantham Letter. See John Pocklington, *Altare Christianum, or The Dead Vicar’s Plea* (London, 1637).

¹¹⁶ Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, Vol. II, xxvii; S. Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2003), 240-241.

was held by many in England. In the Short Parliament held in April, 1640, the House of Commons expressed their concern about Laudian alterations by voting against the use of visitation articles based on episcopal authority instead of law.¹¹⁷ Later in the year, when the Long Parliament began, petitions hurdled into Westminster voicing what many constituencies felt that the body ought to do about the state of the church now that Laudian power was curtailed. Of course these petitions were far from uniform: Parliament received the Puritan Root and Branch Petition, the “old style” conformist petitions Judith Maltby has studied, and a number of petitions for the prayer book and episcopacy that even the Laudians supported. What needs to be observed here is that there was a cleavage between old style conformist petitions and the ones the Laudians could back. It is clear that simply because one supported the prayer book and episcopacy, this did not mean that one supported the innovative direction of the church in the 1630s. The authors of many of these petitions wanted to be clear about that. The old style conformist Robert Sanderson averred of Laudian designs, “it is not my business now to plead for them.”¹¹⁸ Thomas Warmstry preached to convocation that indeed the church had gone in a strange and novel direction, one, in a sense, not on any Elizabethan map.¹¹⁹ While Cressy has disagreed with Maltby about the purpose of these petitions and speeches on the eve of the war – whether they represent an enduring love of the prayer book tradition or simply, as Cressy writes, a clutching at straws when faced with a terrifying radicalism looming on the horizon – my purpose in reviewing this material is to

¹¹⁷ E. S. Cope and W. H. Coates, eds., *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640* (London: Royal Historical Society, University College London, 1977), 279; Fincham, *Visitation Articles*, Vol. II, xxvi.

¹¹⁸ Robert Sanderson, *Ad Clerum. A Sermon Preached... 8 October, 1641* (London, 1670), 19; David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 274-278; Judith Maltby, “Petitions for Episcopacy on the Eve of the Civil War 1641-1642,” in Stephen Taylor, ed., *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Church of England Miscellany* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1999), 153-155. See also the Root and Branch Petition of December 1640 in J. P. Kenyon, ed., *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 171-175.

¹¹⁹ Thomas Warmstry, *A Convocation Speech... Against Images, Altars, Crosses, the new Canons and the Oath, etc.* (London, 1641).

establish that (1) the Caroline church and state were regularly measured against the legacy of the Elizabethan church and state, (2) the Laudians were up to something new – something *innovative* – vis-à-vis that Tudor legacy, and (3) many old style conformists knew it and were quick to point out Laudian disharmony with Elizabethan precedents.

Clipping Wings and Tearing Surplices

Before moving to Laudian apologetics in the next chapter it is necessary to recognize briefly that old style conformity had a definite shelf-life, as Laudians in the 1630s and a variety of Puritans in the 1640s and 1650s pushed hard to redefine the normative face of Christianity in England. Nicholas Tyacke argues that the rise of Laudianism did not simply win converts to Puritanism but rather made those existing Puritans re-evaluate their relationship to the national church. One must remember here that Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism, for the most part, was a phenomenon *inside* the Church of England. Yet, with the rise of Laudianism, Puritans inside the church were pushed into presbyterianism or outright separatism, and many old style conformists were pushed to the fringe of conformity.¹²⁰ John Ley, vicar of Great Budworth in Cheshire and a prebend of Chester Cathedral wrote a letter to Bishop John Bridgeman voicing his opposition to a newly fashioned monument to St. Werburgh in the cathedral. Complaining about the illegitimacy of this altar, Ley sounded very much like Peter Smart. He published this piece in 1641 as “A Letter Against the erection of an Altar” and certainly delineated what was normative for the Church of England and what was not along historical terms.¹²¹ Nevertheless, by the 1640s Ley had become a solid presbyterian. He had been pushed to the edge and had fallen off. Ley was not the only

¹²⁰ For this fairly canonical narrative, see (among others) Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*; Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*; MacCulloch, “The Latitude of the Church of England”; Tyacke, “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism.”

¹²¹ John Ley, *A Letter (Against the erection of an Altar) Written Iune 29, 1635* (London, 1641).

one to react to the changing landscape in this way. William Prynne, Laud's great nemesis, moved from stage to stage: the lawyer moved from a moderate non-conformity to virtual presbyterianism. Anthony Milton has cautioned that we cannot fix all blame on the Laudians. Henry Burton, for instance, may have been on the road to radicalism before Peter Heylyn accused him of being no better than the Elizabethan fanatic William Hacket.¹²² Burton was, in short, no pacific irenicist. Notwithstanding Milton's sober admonition, the Laudians are still responsible for re-orienting the playing field of conformity. And for that matter we must resist the temptation to lump men like Ley and Smart with Henry Burton, at least not in the 1630s.

When Peter Smart stepped into the pulpit at Durham Cathedral in 1628, he invoked an established ethos. He understood the changes at Durham – changes that would become increasingly common across England in the next decade – to violate not only the letter but the spirit of the laws which governed the Church of England as reformed by Elizabeth Tudor. Likewise, in the tracts he published from jail, Smart consistently argued that the ceremonies being pushed by the Laudians were deviations from the familiar liturgical formulas that had shaped the established church's confessional identity. According to Michael Tillbrook the prebend was no Puritan, but rather “an orthodox and old-fashioned Calvinist episcopalian of the type which had flourished during the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. His attitudes were fundamentally conservative, even reactionary” – a far cry from John Cosin's perjorative description, a “most froward, fierce and unpeaceable spirit.” Smart himself claimed that he “taught the people to observe the old, confirmed and established” rites of the legally constituted Church of England. No Puritan, the Durham prebend upheld and endorsed the legally

¹²² Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, 97. For more on Heylyn's assault on Burton see the following chapter on Laudian historical polemics in the 1630s.

established church – its governorship by the monarch, its episcopacy, its prayer book, indeed, even its *prescribed* vestments.¹²³

What happened then to this demographic when Laudianism collapsed in the early 1640s? What happened when the “innovators” toppled from power? As described above, many had been pushed to the edge. And when the Long Parliament had the chance to make reforms, it was not satisfied with merely stripping out Laudian excess. William Laud and his party had pushed the definition of prayer book conformity to a different place in the 1630s, one many loyal daughters and sons of the Church of England – Peter Smart among them – had trouble recognizing. So stark had this shift apparently been that the Long Parliament felt a comprehensive purge was warranted. Michael Brydon has argued that “the Laudian-engendered hostility towards the church ensured that the desire for a radical religious reformation was dominant.”¹²⁴ Regarding a move to simply reduce the authority of the bishops, Thomas Wilson blanketly asserted “O think it not enough to clip their wings when Christ is against the being of a such a body.”¹²⁵ Parliament ultimately had little interest in simply returning the church to a pre-Laudian settlement. Thus the episcopacy, the prayer book, and the traditional function of the cathedrals were summarily abolished. With the *Directory of Public Worship* in place by 1646, Parliament felt it had reoriented England to godly prayer and presbyterian order. The church of the old style conformist was simply too suspicious. Tom Webster has pinpointed the Commons’ presentation of the Grand Remonstrance to Charles in 1641 as the end for any ‘Jacobethan’ golden mean. Regardless of exactly when that mean fell

¹²³ Hoffman, “The Arminian and the Iconoclast,” 282; Tillbrook, “Arminianism and Society in County Durham, 1617-42,” 207. See also Fincham, “Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud.”

¹²⁴ Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1600-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 60. For an example of pleas to moderate such a purge, see I. W., *Certain Reasons why the Booke of Common-Prayer Being Corrected Should Continue* (London, 1641). See also Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 536-537.

¹²⁵ Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker*, 60.

apart – whether it was with the Grand Remonstrance or later with the full abolition of the prayer book and episcopacy – it did indeed disintegrate. The time of Peter Smart – the time of “old style” conformity – had passed.¹²⁶ Regarding Smart himself, an extended quote from Tillbrook will be helpful here.

Parliament soon lost interest in its “proto-martyr” [i.e. Smart] after he had served his purpose in providing the ground for the destruction of the High Commission and his brand of episcopalian Calvinism looked increasingly anachronistic, for by the 1640s most of those who approved Smart’s strictures against Arminianism could no longer stomach a Royal Supremacy which since 1625 had actively succored its exponents, whereas most upholders of the Supremacy came almost naturally to associate Smart’s brand of Calvinism with Schismatical Puritanism.¹²⁷

By the time of his release, Smart was the proverbial “man without a country” and he ended up signing the Solemn League and Covenant. In the 1620s and ‘30s, however, Peter Smart was defending an old and accepted sense – one might arguably use the word ‘consensus’ – of what it meant to be a good conformist. It is hard to imagine a Laudian rebuttal to his outline of grievances, but that is the key question for the remainder of this dissertation. By outlining that rebuttal we can begin to see how the Laudian vision was at once an outgrowth of the old prayer book ethos as well as a reappraisal, a reorientation, and perhaps even an opponent of that same ethos. We can also see how discussions of the Church of England’s confessional identity were fueled by a certain rhetoric of conservatism; how the discourse of legitimacy was a market that traded in citations of the past. In other words we can see the power of historical precedent and the absolute sin of “innovation” in the socio-religious conscience of women and men in early modern England.

In this chapter, however, I have tried simply to identify that, despite the cloud of angry rhetoric, Smart and others like him affirmed an established ethos – one that had

¹²⁶ Tom Webster, “Religion in Early Stuart Britain,” in Barry Coward, ed., *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Malden, MA: Blackwells, 2003), 253-70. See also Maltby, “From *Temple* to *Synagogue*.”

¹²⁷ Tillbrook, “Arminianism and Society in County Durham, 1617-42,” 210.

been violated, they believed, by Neile, Hunt, Lindsell, Burgoyne, Cosin, and, indeed, by other Laudians in other places. Smart's call was not for further reform, the Puritan chestnut. He tried rather to draw attention to liturgical and therefore theological deviations from the legally constituted and historically recognized rationale of the English church. We are now well prepared, after hearing this legal and historically-oriented critique to examine the Laudian pitch back. The remainder of this dissertation, in short, is a discussion of Peter Lake's great label for the Laudians: avant-garde conformists, innovators who wished desperately to hide their innovation under a veil of conservative, traditional language and motifs.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I."

CHAPTER 2
SEMPER EADEM:
THE JUNIOR LAUDIAN CLERGY AND HISTORICAL POLEMIC
DURING THE PERSONAL RULE

Starting with his 1628 sermon at Durham Cathedral, Peter Smart argued that the Laudians had violated Elizabethan standards and perverted the prayer book tradition. While his efforts seemed to ring with a Puritan accent, Smart was in fact an old-fashioned conformist episcopalian. His challenge, one he articulated in the sermon and in a number of tracts he composed in the years following, was that “the beauty of holiness” was inconsistent with the Elizabethan prayer book ethos; that many of the Laudian program’s elements were novel and appeared to run contrary to recognized principles. With Smart’s legal and historical criticisms outlined in the preceding chapter, we are well-positioned to examine Laudian apologia, literature which, strikingly, operated in almost the exact same way as Smart’s. Works by Laudian clergy in the late 1620s and 1630s functioned within the same discourse of legitimacy, a market that traded in historical citations. Just as Peter Smart invoked the image of Elizabeth Tudor, so too did men like Peter Heylyn and John Pocklington. While this material is focused principally on contemporary concerns like east-end altars, the authors continually anchor their claims in the mid to late sixteenth century, a period widely perceived as classical and formative. The symbolic capital of Tudor churchmen like Matthew Parker, John Jewel, and John Whitgift was a valuable commodity. Aligning one’s vision for the established church with such well-regarded “champions” of the Reformation and of the Elizabethan regime could win the prized mantle of legitimacy. In short, as “innovation” was a grievous sin in the socio-religious conscience of women and men in early modern England, it was rare for a Laudian to justify change directly. Instead most apologists tried to veil innovation with conservative

language, interpretations of established rubrics and canons, and references to iconic figures from the Tudor church.

Anthony Milton has argued that it was principally the junior clergy who produced Laudian apologetics during Charles' reign. While I will attempt to qualify that characterization in a later chapter focused on the work of the higher clergy, this chapter examines texts written by the lower clergy from the late 1620s through the Personal Rule. Although these authors employed a variety of strategies ranging from scriptural exegesis to discussions of the Fathers, they all offer a unique reading of the Tudor church's legacy and, from there, they all argue how the Laudian program was consonant with it. Considering this near ubiquitous rhetoric in Laudian literature, Peter Lake's term for the Laudians, avant-garde conformists, innovators who wished to pass off their agenda as old-fashioned, seems undeniable.¹²⁹

Themes in Avant-Garde Conformist Literature on the eve of the Laudian Ascendancy

An examination of the junior clergy's work cannot immediately begin with the writing of the well-positioned Laudians during the Personal Rule. We have to begin earlier. One of the operating principles of this study (and one that has arguably gained a consensus among historians) is that avant-garde conformity did not manifest out of thin air, but rather, in the Laudians' *modus operandi* and *modus loquendi*, they had antecedents in earlier decades. One must quickly note that this historical recognition is not the same thing as assenting to the Laudians' self-presentation as conservative and old-fashioned. In short, certain ideas and themes were appearing in the 1620s that helped to plot out a grid for polemic and apologetics in the Personal Rule. By the time William Laud was translated to Canterbury in 1633, a number of the avant-garde conformists'

¹²⁹ Milton, "The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach," 162-184; Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I," 113-133.

major premises had been road-tested and had, at the same time, defined the very terms of debate. A consideration of the apologetic literature in the 1620s before Laud's rise to Canterbury is necessary for a full exploration of avant-garde conformist arguments.

A major issue in Laudian polemic – one might argue in all religious polemical literature in Stuart England – was the relationship between the Church of England and the Reformed communion of churches stretching from Scotland to Transylvania. Anthony Milton has argued that debates about the established church's relationship to Rome and the Reformed highlighted growing divisions among English women and men, as well as the somewhat confused issue of the Church of England's confessional identity.¹³⁰ While the avant-garde conformists certainly capitalized on this situation, by the 1620s this issue of the established church's relationship to other confessions was already a major topic in the literature before Laud's rise to Canterbury. In a sermon before the House of Commons published in 1623, Isaac Bargrave discussed the episcopal structure of the Church of England. Lifting up the established church in the days of Elizabeth as a model, Bargrave preached: “for this sixty years and upwards, we have felt such a blessed effect of it, as no other church nor nation in the Christian world can parallel.”¹³¹ Citing “sixty years,” Bargrave had fixed the start of this golden age – this period in which all churches should look to the Church of England as an exemplar – in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. Interestingly, at the core of this English exceptionalism was a discussion of the church's ceremonial life. According to Bargrave, in addition to the English church's polity, it was the church's ritual life that set England off as a distinct model for all nations and thus an exception among Reformed churches. He is very clear that ‘Holy Table’ is an acceptable word for English Christians. In terms of sacramental theology, Bargrave

¹³⁰ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, passim.

¹³¹ Isaac Bargrave, *A Sermon Preached before the lower house of Parliament* (London, 1623), 29-30.

preached without ambiguity, “as all Jewish sacrifices looked forward, so all ours look backward to the sacrifice of Christ.”¹³²

Bargrave, a prebend at Canterbury, not only had a hand in adding music and ceremony to cathedral worship (particularly after his elevation to the deanery in 1625), he was connected with two notable antiquarians of the period, Sir Henry Wotton, his father-in-law, and through him, Paulo Sarpi, author of the *History of the Council of Trent*. Bargrave claimed that the latter man told him that “the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England were the most primitive of any in the world.”¹³³ Although not close to William Laud, Bargrave was clearly a ceremonialist who made significant claims about the church’s historic confession and practice. In his 1623 sermon, Bargrave made a plea for unity, effectively drawing attention away from the issue at hand, that is, the place of the communion table. He argued that the dissension over what to call this piece of church furniture was a distraction, a tool of the papists in fact. Bargrave preached: “Away with these distracting names of Lutheran, Calvinist, Puritan, etc. We are all children of the same father.”¹³⁴ Interestingly, in the same sermon he sets the English church as a model for all churches and pushes that all Protestants should be united. While Bargrave seems to have supported the older conformist position, he continually uses the word “altar” throughout the sermon. Moreover, this tendency in language and sensibility to present the English church as distinct from the Reformed churches of Europe was framed with references to the normative face of the established church and citations from the reign of Elizabeth Tudor.

In another published sermon, “A Sermon Against Self-Policy” (1624), Bargrave made what may be called a *via media* argument. This concept long connected with the

¹³² Ibid., 33.

¹³³ BL, Lansdowne MS 985, fol. 9; ODNB: Isaac Bargrave.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 35.

Church of England and the resulting phenomenon called “Anglicanism” is in fact a creation of the seventeenth century, an idea projected back onto the sixteenth. Bargrave’s 1624 sermon is a perfect example of a Laudian creating facts on the ground, in this instance, the historical nature of the English church as a middle way between Rome and the Reformed, and concomitantly a way of comprehension. He preached “most happy is the temper of our Church, who as in the rest, so in this, is *medium contradictionis* partaking no more of either extreme, than conduceth to perfect verity.”¹³⁵ Making an interesting comment on both scripture and recent English history, Bargrave wrote that “Saint Paul’s faith and Saint James’ works... we join them both together; and this conjunction is like the sacred union of the houses of York and Lancaster.” Clearly England was the spot where peace came from comprehension and the *via media* provided an exemplary church. Later in the decade Bargrave extolled the machinery of the Church of England in a sermon before Charles. This text made it to print in 1627. The centerpiece here is loyalty to the crown as the king was invested as supreme governor of the church. But radiating out from that center are the devotional cycles of the church which draw England together in prayer.

As a queen in a vesture of gold wrought about with divers colours: here are the seats of justice; here are the schools of the prophets; here the temples of the living God; the offertories of our daily prayers and praises; the exercise whereof (beside our private soliloquies) we have in every parish church every week thrice; in every cathedral every day thrice. Nay so frequent are they in our great cities, that every hour of the day may be spent in public devotion.¹³⁶

Bargrave gives his readers the image of a church in constant motion, one in which the appointed liturgies of the prayer book established in the reign of the Elizabeth Tudor are used to praise God. This made the Church of England, Bargrave argued, the model for other churches, and one distinct from the Reformed churches of Europe.

¹³⁵ Isaac Bargrave, *A Sermon against Selfe-Policy* (London, 1624), 24.

¹³⁶ Idem., *A Sermon Preached before King Charles March 27, 1627* (London, 1627), 9.

The distinction of the Church of England from the Reformed churches in Laudian literature took on a variety of permutations ranging from presenting the Church of England as truly Reformed while others were deviations to presenting the established church as having parity with the Roman church in patristic terms. While this range will be discussed in detail below, particularly in texts from the Personal Rule when the Laudian movement gained real strength and momentum, there are other historically-oriented themes which appeared in the 1620s and which should be highlighted first. The theme of the crown's supremacy in the church could find articulation in an exegesis of Proverbs 24:21. Roger Maynwaring preached a set of two sermons on "Religion and Allegiance" in the summer of 1627, and these went to press the same year. Considering the passage from Proverbs, Maynwaring preached that one must fear God and the king, a pairing of authorities that conformists of all stripes presented as working in tandem and in harmony.¹³⁷ These were authorities that operated together, and, the preacher argued, English men and women should readily display their obedience to the divine-human hierarchy. Maynwaring, a royal chaplain since 1625, preached these sermons at the direction of William Laud, who saw the need to push obedience during the controversy over the forced loans. In the same year that Maynwaring published his duo of sermons, Matthew Wren preached a sermon on the same text at Whitehall before Charles himself. Wren, then Master of Peter House, Cambridge, stressed that God's church is governed by the sovereign.¹³⁸ In short, there was a concerted effort by men like Laud, Wren, and Maynwaring to push all power to their patron. This citation from Proverbs, "fear God and the king," could be joined with Isaiah 49:23, the trope of kings and queens as "nursing fathers" and "nursing mothers." With this framework in place, Maynwaring in his published work warned of the dangers of clipping "the wings of sacred kings," the

¹³⁷ Roger Maynwaring, *Religion and Allegiance* (London, 1627), 22.

¹³⁸ Matthew Wren, *Sermon before the King at Whitehall, Sunday 17 February 1627* (Cambridge, 1627), passim.

supreme governors of the English church since the sixteenth century.¹³⁹ Charles' supreme governorship of the English church became on this read a first principle and the church's confessional face somewhat secondary, perhaps open to change. This sermon in fact appeared to cross a boundary, setting religious loyalty to the crown beyond the common law, and Maynwaring came under parliamentary invective at the close of the 1620s. However, his connections with Laud and the emerging avant-garde conformist circle kept him in good stead; Maynwaring was made dean of Worcester in 1633 and bishop of St. David's in 1636.¹⁴⁰

At the center of any invocation of the authority of the crown was the legacy of the church governed by Elizabeth Tudor. Conventional language and appeals to the past naturally called on women and men to think about the classical founding of the Church of England; to ask when that occurred and what that classical moment looked like. Authors of course were more than happy to fill in the gaps. Within this rhetoric writers and preachers could conceal novel ideas. Samuel Page published a collection of sermons in 1630 and, like Maynwaring and Wren, announced that kings are nursing fathers and queens are nursing mothers. Within this conventional language about the role of the monarch as the supreme governor of the church, Page made the decidedly un-Reformed and somewhat Lutheran case for Christ's presence in the Eucharist as being like fire in a heated piece of iron (*sicut ignis in ferro*).¹⁴¹ By couching this idea in conventional terms – the historic nature of the English church as one governed by the monarch, the nursing father or nursing mother – writers like Page could appear old-fashioned. In the same year that Page published his collection of sermons, Giles Widdowes published a piece with the

¹³⁹ Maynwaring, *Religion and Allegiance*, 36, 46.

¹⁴⁰ ODNB: Roger Maynwaring.

¹⁴¹ Samuel Page, *Nine Sermons: preached upon speciall occassion* (London, 1630), 10, 33. Martin Luther used the simile *sicut ignis in ferro* in his *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520). The concept had a pedigree, however, going back to Cyril of Alexandria in the early fifth century.

sharp title, *The Schysmatical Puritan*. It should come as no surprise that Widdowes too used the trope of kings as nursing fathers and queens as nursing mothers.

Originally a sermon Widdowes preached at Whitney in 1630, the text is a diatribe against anyone who would challenge the hierarchy and order of the established church. The rector of St. Martin's, Carfax, Oxford, Giles Widdowes was often at odds with conformable Puritan dons, particularly those at Lincoln College.¹⁴² He began his invective by claiming that the established church is truly Reformed, while Puritans are wild schismatics. "In their doctrine and discipline," Widdowes preached, "they are the underminers of our True, Protestant, Reformed Church."¹⁴³ Here again one finds an interpretation of the Church of England's relationship to the Reformed tradition. Rejecting Puritan arguments that they were good Reformed Protestants, Widdowes claimed for the established church the mantle of "Reformed." From this point on, he frames his arguments by references to recognized authoritative sources, documents that could bathe his claims with historical legitimacy. Moreover, he continually uses the personal pronoun. With this staging, Widdowes himself was on the legitimate "our" side. Any who challenged his platform was on "their" radical side. He wrote:

This Puritan is a Non-Conformist. For he is oppositely set a contradiction to the scriptures' deducable sense in three things. The first is the 39 Articles of our church's Reformed faith. The second is our common prayer book. The third is the canons of our church.¹⁴⁴

Not only was Widdowes able to own the historic character of the established church by citing the articles, the prayer book, and the canons, he even pried from Puritan hands the name "Reformed."

¹⁴² ODNB: Giles Widdowes.

¹⁴³ Giles Widdowes, *The Schysmatical Puritan* (Oxford, 1630), A3.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, A4.

Widdowes then shifted to a specific discussion of the genesis of the Book of Common Prayer. His goal was to make very clear that no one should call the established liturgy ‘papist’ or only half Reformed. Those portions of the prayer book “being collected and translated out of the mass-book,” Widdowes wrote, have been “corrected, and purged from gross errors.”¹⁴⁵ In short, if one had a problem with elements of the prayer book, he was a radical Puritan. This line of thought was not, one should be clear, indicative of Laudianism. In fact, aggressive conformists in the late sixteenth century had made arguments not terribly different. What was different, however, was the way the Laudians changed certain elements in prayer book worship itself while continuing to make the same old conformist claim that all was settled and above reproach. In some respects, the situation could be described as a bait and switch. Widdowes was sure to frame his claims about orthodoxy and heterodoxy with reference to earlier “champions” of the established church. “Since the suppression of Puritans,” he wrote, “by Archbishops Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift, none will seem to be such irregular professors.” The preacher aligned himself with past exemplars, leaders of the Elizabethan church. The presence of Edmund Grindal in this list, the archbishop who drew Elizabeth’s ire by not suppressing the prophesyings, is virtually negligible. Grindal could be mute, while the symbolic capital of his name and office could be used to push a stark sense of what one might call neo-conformism, or, in Lake’s term, avant-garde conformism. The same was true of the images of Parker and Whitgift, although the incongruity of their legacies with Widdowes’ incipient Laudianism was not as pronounced. Widdowes’ opponents were cast in historical terms, as the opponents of Elizabeth’s archbishops.

The eye that beholds their daring oppositions in the church may very well believe that such rebellions are taught in their conventicles. What rebellions? Their teaching against the king’s supremacy, a rejecting of our Reformed faith, a refusing of God’s holy worship written, which is the common prayer book, a

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., A5.

despising of the canonical obedience, a repugning against our Reformed church.¹⁴⁶

Widdowes drew together his claims of conformity with historic precedents and the church's "Reformed" identity with a castigation of his opponents as being virulently disloyal to the prayer book tradition.

In his *Schysmatical Puritan*, Widdowes invoked images of past "champions" as well as images of historic opponents of conformism. We might call this the negative analogue strategy. Not only did Laudians like Widdowes align their work with earlier conformists, they blackened their opponents by matching them with earlier dissidents. Without question, the name that appears the most often in Laudian polemical literature as a place-holder for 'nasty dissident' is that of Thomas Cartwright, the Elizabethan presbyterian and perennial opponent of the model of conformism, Archbishop John Whitgift. In Widdowes' piece, as in many other texts, Cartwright appeared simply by his initials, "T.C."¹⁴⁷ The sermon oscillates back and forth between the positive and the negative in historical terms, invoking the image of Whitgift one moment and that of Cartwright the next. Widdowes rehashed the controversy between the two and it would seem from his description that Cartwright, whose name was a synecdoche of presbyterian discord, was alive and well, stirring up trouble even in the 1630s. The scriptural text for the sermon was 1 Corinthians 14:9, "let all things be done decently and according to good order," a passage Whitgift had used with mantra-like regularity. Widdowes preached "by 'all things' are understood the doctrine of the church; divine precepts; lawes for decencie, and order of the church; the churches rights and externall discipline." Widdowes was claiming the legacy of Whitgift to the point of being able to define it with greater clarity.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., B1.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., C2.

“To know all church discipline,” he continued, “I refer you to the Rubricke of the Common Praier-booke, to the canons of the church.”¹⁴⁸

A year later, Widdowes republished his work, revised this time and with a response to William Prynne who had taken issue with the first edition. With the electric title, *The Lawless, Kneelesse, Schismatical Puritan*, Widdowes worked his way through canons, the Articles of Religion, and models from England’s Tudor past to support ceremony and order in the Church of England. Once more one finds a commentary on the established church’s relationship to the Reformed churches abroad. The Church of England, Widdowes argued, was unique, distinct from other churches. There is no use in worrying about what people in Switzerland or South Germany think of the English church. That would be an insult to the sacrifice of the English martyrs.

If objection be made, that the most Reverend Archbishop Cranmer, the Right Reverend Bishop Ridley, Father Latimer, and other learned and Holy Martyrs were burned into ashes for their constant profession of the doctrine and discipline of this reformed church, Answer must be made that the Holy Mother Geneva hath better doctrine, and discipline than Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer ever knew.¹⁴⁹

In short, Widdowes and the hierarchy had claims to the legacy of the Marian martyrs who gave their lives for the right reformation of the church, and anyone who challenged the church’s leadership was also challenging the hallowed legacy of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley. Invoking Article 20, he pressed that the church can ordain rites and ceremonies it sees fit. Invoking Article 34, he pressed an almost blind loyalty to tradition. Invoking Canon 6, he pressed that all who decry the liturgies of the Church of England are wicked and are to be excommunicated.¹⁵⁰ When he came to Canon 18, a requirement to bow at the name of Jesus during time of divine worship, Widdowes chose to draft into service a

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., D5.

¹⁴⁹ Giles Widdowes, *The Lawless, Kneelesse Schismatical Puritan* (Oxford, 1631), 6-7.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 8.

number of transitional late Elizabethan and Jacobean figures: “judicious Bp Andrewes, Zanchius, Dr. Boyes, Mr. Hooker.”¹⁵¹

It was important for Widdowes to define the boundaries of legitimate practice and identity. This included even the word “Protestant.” To the argument that all Protestants reject bowing, he responded by considering the beginning of the reformation in England.

When Reformation of Religion in King Henry the 8ths Reigne was striving in the wombe, then Thomas Cantaurien, Iohannes London, Stephanus Wintonetc [sic], Edward Ebor, Cuthbertus Dunelmen, Robertus Carliolan, with all Arch-deacons, with the Professors of Divinity, and law did not write against bowing at the name of Jesus; but did magnifie Jesus vilified by the Jewes. This is written in their Exposition of the Apostles Creed entituled the Institution of a Christian man which King Henry the Eight commanded the two most Reverend Arch-Bishops of both Provinces to write, to supresse, remoove, and utterly take away all Errors, Doubts, Superstitions, and Abuses in the Church to the Honour of Almighty God.¹⁵²

Widdowes’ long view of reformation history was anchored by certain key figures, and these champions of the English church agreed with him on the issue of bowing at the name of Jesus.

Moreover, those great leaders of the Tudor church made a special point of eliminating popery. They were acutely concerned with the presence of superstition. Therefore, if those men left bowing in place and never wrote against the practice, why should it now be called superstitious?

Running through a narrative of the history of bowing, Widdowes next came to “Queen Elizabeth of ever blessed memory,” who ordered that every person in time of service show reverence to the name of Jesus by “uncovering of Heads of the mankind.”¹⁵³ Likewise, he continued, King James upheld this requirement for reverence and decency and was supported by

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 14.

¹⁵² Ibid., 23.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 24.

the vice chancellor, the Doctors, both the Proctors and other the Heads of Houses in the University of Oxford, agreeable undoubtedly to the Joynt, and uniform opinion of all Deanes and Chapters, and all other the Learned and obedient Cleargy in the Church of England, and confirmed by the express consent of the University of Cambridge.

In sum, Widdowes could array a grand cadre of luminaries from the English past, ranging from reformers, to monarch “of blessed memory,” to university theologians. All lined up in this narrative to support Widdowes claim: “Then ‘tis a manifest truth, that our church hath ever since her Reformation bowed at the name of Jesus.”¹⁵⁴ This method of operation was simple but powerful. One recruits a number of figures from the past who represent authority and legitimacy and have them enter present-day controversies. These figures bring credibility and sheer weight to one’s position while simultaneously painting opponents as rootless and without legitimate concerns.

In the same year Widdowes published his *Lawless, Kneelesse Schismatical Puritan*, Edmund Reeve published an explication of the prayer book liturgy, listing the precedents for the English rites and ceremonies of the established church. Reeve’s 1631 *The Christian Divinitie contained in the Divine Service of the Church of England* has a dedicatory epistle to King Charles, and in it Reeve argued that his father, James, “shewed most pious zeale,” by upholding the prayer book, by publishing the uniformity act for all to see, and by reprinting the Book of Homilies.¹⁵⁵ Framing those documents as historic sources for theology and confessional identity, Reeve argued in the epistle to the reader, “it is our bounden duty most diligently to heare, read, and meditate on every particular delivery in those fundamental books composed by the perfect wisdom of the church our mother.”¹⁵⁶ While the main thrust of this piece is to provide scriptural precedents for all parts of the prayer book, there is an undercurrent of what we might call establishment

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 24.

¹⁵⁵ Edmund Reeve, *The Christian Divinitie contained in the Divine Service of the Church of England* (London, 1631), vi.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., A4.

language, the rhetoric of the old-fashioned, the traditional, and the recognizably legitimate.

Edmund Reeve, vicar of Hayes, Middlesex, was an accomplished linguist, having published his first work – a commentary on the prayer book canticles – in Latin. Among the Laudians, he was an Arminian in theology, and was influenced early on by the ceremonialist Bishop John Overall.¹⁵⁷ If his positions on soteriology and devotion were unique, he presented himself nonetheless as a faithful son of the established church. In his explication of the prayer book, he wrote that the reformers of the sixteenth century were “endued with a certain measure of prophetic grace.” Not all reformers, however, were equal. Among them, Reeve wrote, the ones most graced by God were those “composers of the aforementioned books of the sacred liturgy of the Church of England.” He continued that, in the Book of Common Prayer, “the Church of England, our mother” teaches one “how to speake unto the great God of heaven and earth.”¹⁵⁸ On this view, the acme of the whole reformation was the production of the prayer book. There was, however, a catch to this peculiar view of the reformation. In a chapter on ceremonies in which Reeve discusses the preface to the Book of Common Prayer and the appended Act of Uniformity, he highlights Elizabeth’s assertion that the monarch has the authority to alter rites and ceremonies with the advice of her “commissioners and metropolitan.”¹⁵⁹ This is an interesting Laudian maneuver. First, the author praises the prayer book. Then, despite the fulsome praise, the liturgy ranks second in importance to the monarch’s power over the church as supreme governor. In this way, the Laudian author appears conventional, but subtly affirms whatever changes the monarch thinks best. Given Charles’ ceremonial predilections, such a paradigm would be wonderfully convenient for

¹⁵⁷ ODNB: Edmund Reeve.

¹⁵⁸ Reeve, *Christian Divinitie*, 92, 93, 96.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 98.

a man like Reeve. Later in the piece he examines the ordinal, particularly the service for consecrating bishops, and determines that the crown grants the bishops their power to correct disobedience.¹⁶⁰ A great deal was pushed into Charles' hands on this read, even the power to change existing patterns of devotion. However, the possibility of altering the prayer book tradition, as tantalizing as that could be, was not terribly useful for the Laudians. It was simply more important to demonstrate conformity with older sensibilities, or at the very least to sound conventional. Reeve's work, after all, was a defense and explication of the existing prayer book.

In a chapter on the surplice, Reeve begins by quoting the ornaments rubric, specifically that the minister during services is directed to use the ornaments ordered by Parliament "in the second year of the reign of Edward the sixth." Then he quotes Canon 74 that the church prescribes a "comely apparel" for clergy to be regarded "in outward reverence." He also reiterates that such ornaments have no intrinsic holiness, but are ordered for "decencie, gravity, and order." While he does mention this old style conformist catch that often tripped the Laudians, Reeve nonetheless asserts that such "gravity" must "pertaine unto every circumstance in God's worship."¹⁶¹ In this way Reeve was able to assert that the old order for comeliness and reverence has little leeway. It certainly could not be relaxed for conforming Puritans, but rather is in force without exception for every liturgical office. Citing the homily on fasting, Reeve insists that the church has the power to appoint holy days. Citing Canon 90 and Article 30, he insists that people must stay through the whole of the service and not come and go as they please. Citing Canon 46, he insists that all preachers need licenses and if a minister lacks one, he should content himself with reading from the Book of Homilies.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 184.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 101-103.

¹⁶² Ibid., 106, 110, 127.

This barrage of citations can easily hide the fact that Reeve was pushing a different vision for prayer book devotion. In his defense of the sign of the cross at baptism, Reeve writes that it is “a matter most necessary, required by the Gospel.” Generally speaking, conformists had not presented this ceremony as scripturally enjoined, but rather as a comely practice, not inconsistent with the scriptures, and useful for preserving decency in worship. This Laudian apologist made the sign of the cross a Gospel mandate. One might miss this incongruity, however, as Reeve wrapped his injunction with an invocation “of those reverend Fathers and great divines in the dayes of King Edward the sixth.”¹⁶³ Similarly, he cites the rubrics in the communion liturgy, the matrimony service, and the churching rite to claim that the Church of England celebrates the Lord’s Supper very often and in cathedrals every Sunday.¹⁶⁴ Citing the prayer book rubrics, Reeve writes that all communicants must receive kneeling, and he insisted that no one may alter this directive in the least. He made a decency argument reminiscent of John Whitgift to call for women to wear the veil at their churchings, a practice not enjoined by law. Citing the second communion exhortation in the prayer book and the rubrics for the visitation of the sick, Reeve argued for private confession, a practice not familiar to old-style conformists.¹⁶⁵

In Reeve’s closing chapter, an excursus on the evil of separatism, he writes that the doctrine of Almighty God is set by “the holy Fathers of the Church of England by the assent and consent of the Royal Majesty.” Once again one finds the Laudian need to push royal power, but here the authority of the crown is a bit down-graded from earlier in the text. In this closing chapter, the “Fathers” define right doctrine and the crown assents. Notwithstanding this ambiguity about royal power, Reeve finishes his text by

¹⁶³ Ibid., 153.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 163.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 168-169, 174, 180-181.

locating the Church of England's particular deposit of faith in the prayer book, the homilies, and the ordinal. The Thirty-Nine Articles, he writes, were added later to avoid misunderstandings. More than anything else, this piece is concerned with lining up sixteenth-century sources of authority. Men like Peter Smart, for instance, should not be allowed to think they alone could cite the classical texts of the English reformation. To keep "decency, order, and uniformity of Christian life through the whole Church," Reeve explains, the reformers "made constitutions and canons ecclesiastical."¹⁶⁶

These texts from the 1620s and early 1630s represent a heightened sense of the importance of ceremony and the distinction of the Church of England from the Reformed churches. A clear party line, however, is difficult to identify, and cataloguing preachers and clerical writers into neat categories is simply distortive. Nevertheless, themes were emerging that, in short, plotted out the grid for polemic and apologia in the 1630s. This was the case, it should be emphasized again, without regard to any clearly defined avant-garde conformist party. Barnaby Potter, who was made bishop of Carlisle in the spring of 1629, was certainly no Laudian. His relative Christopher Potter preached the sermon at his consecration held at Ely House that March. The sermon went to print later in the year, and in it Potter made a number of claims about the historic episcopate in the established church during the sixteenth century. Discussing Catholic challenges to the legitimacy of the Church of England, specifically the claim that "our bishops in the beginning of Queen Elizabeths reign consecrated themselves one another contrary to all canons of the ancient church," Christopher Potter argues that the English bishops who "beganne this glorious work of Reformation had the same ordinary vocation and succession whereof our adversaries vaunt so much." He willingly played against Catholics on Catholic terms, noting that the iconic reformers had the same holy orders as Catholic apologists. "Thus in our Church of England," Potter writes, "the consecration of

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 390-392.

every bishop hath beene still solemnly and canonically performed by three other bishops at the least.”¹⁶⁷ Instead of dismissing Catholic criticisms outright (i.e. why should one be concerned about apostolic succession if one has Gospel truth), he actually affirmed the concerns as legitimate and answered them in a way which, at least on the surface, should have been acceptable to a Catholic audience. Potter then makes the odd move of distancing the English church from contemporary Protestants, both Reformed and Lutheran. He does this, interestingly, by considering the history of reformation and post-reformation polemics. Describing conflicts between partisans attached to John Calvin and those attached to Philip Melancthon, Potter writes “their violent followers at this day are not more learned, but more uncharitable. And it appears by that which M. Fox hath recorded, that our own blessed martyrs in the daies of Quene Mary, in their very prisons freely disputed and dissented in these opinions.”¹⁶⁸ Disputes between Protestants, he argued, had since the sixteenth century become more intense in his own day. Absent were Christian love and forbearance.

Christopher Potter, like the other authors surveyed here, stressed that the Church of England was unique among churches – Reformed, Lutheran, or Catholic. Other recurring arguments include the idea that the Church of England was truly Reformed and, conversely, that the Puritans were simply radicals. One also witnesses in the literature from this period a positive and negative strategy of historical appeal. An apologist aligned his work with iconic conformists from recent English history, usually John Whitgift. At the same time, he pushed his opponents into a corner with equally iconic dissidents from the same history, usually Thomas Cartwright. The standard fare for these authors, moreover, was citations from recognized sources. Not unlike Peter Smart, they drew from the prayer book and its rubrics, the Book of Homilies, the Thirty Nine

¹⁶⁷ Christopher Potter, *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of Barnaby Potter as Bishop of Carlisle, Ely House March 15, 1628* (London, 1629), 41-43.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 69-70.

Articles, Elizabeth's injunctions, and indeed the official work of well-known bishops and archbishops like Matthew Parker and Whitgift. There is little difference in structure between these texts and those by Smart. In sum, there was a recognized body of material – the prayer book, the canons, various sets of articles and injunctions – which set the pace and tone for the devotion, polity, and confessional identity of the Church of England. Moreover, the iconic images of Elizabeth, Whitgift, John Jewel, and other conformists, as well those of Cartwright and other Puritans, were on hand to legitimize or delegitimize as needed. One had to wrap his agenda with references to these materials and these persons. Thus, in their mode of operation and in their mode of speaking, the Laudians who wrote during the Personal Rule moved within an accepted grid.

The Frontline of Apologia and Polemic during the Laudian High Tide

The major themes in avant-garde conformist literature produced between the translation of Laud to Canterbury in 1633 and the movement's collapse in 1640 with the calling of the Long Parliament were already in play by the late 1620s. The literature produced by the aggressive junior clergy – men like Edmund Reeve, Christopher Dow, John Pocklington, and Peter Heylyn – was, in some respects, an intensification of these arguments. Sometimes these texts contained naked claims about the Church of England not being Reformed or how obedience to bishops was a *sine qua non* of the Christian life. The image of Elizabeth Tudor and her counselors and bishops were vehicles for these ideas, lending credibility and indeed the aura of reliable conservatism. Of course the negative strategy was also in play. Robert Skinner, an anti-Calvinist rector in Oxfordshire, and in fact an informant for Laud at the university, preached before Charles at Whitehall in December 1634 both on the beauty of holiness (the Laudian shibboleth) and the evil of conventicles. Taking as his text Matthew 24:26, a moment in which Jesus warns of false messiahs in the desert or in hidden rooms, Skinner preached “I beseech you where hath beene the meeting place of our Anti-Canonical Canonists, and where

have they enacted their Antisynodicall sanctions, but *in deserto* or *in cubiculo*.”¹⁶⁹ The English church has long been plagued with conventicles, Skinner complained, and these were contrary to the best practices of Christ’s church. The image of the presbyterian classes movement born in the reign of Elizabeth was certainly alive and well.

Robert Skinner entered the 1630s as a royal chaplain and within a few years made it to the episcopal bench, being consecrated bishop of Bristol in 1637. His loyalty to the crown and to the hierarchal power of the established church lasted through the Interregnum and well into the Restoration. His efforts during the Personal Rule, as one can imagine, were part of a larger literary sweep that stressed the authority of church leadership and the sanctity of prayer book ceremony. A particularly interesting publication came in 1634, the same year Skinner printed his Whitehall Sermon. Back in 1607, Francis Mason, a zealous conformist known for his anti-Puritanism in the early days of King James, produced his *The Authority of the Church in Making Canons and Constitutions*. Ultimately, this text was Whitgiftian: Mason stressed uniformity as a near-sacred principle. His aggressive assertions, however, can hide this fact. It is no wonder, then, that the Laudian vice-chancellor of Oxford, Brian Duppa, ordered a reprinting in 1634 to the consternation of a number of conforming Calvinists.¹⁷⁰

Dedicated to Archbishop Richard Bancroft the great Puritan hunter, Mason’s work begins by identifying a problem: what does the great Whitgiftian mantra, “Let all things be done decently” really mean? He writes that some think it decent to wear the white surplice while others believe it is decent to wear the black academic gown. “Now in this variety of opinion, who shall be the judge?” Mason asked. The answer was clear,

¹⁶⁹ Robert Skinner, *Sermon before the King at Whitehall, 3 December 1634* (London, 1634), 42-43; ODNB: Robert Skinner.

¹⁷⁰ ODNB: Francis Mason. Mason died in 1621.

he felt: “Surely, they whom the Lord hath made church governors.”¹⁷¹ God put rulers like Elizabeth and Whitgift in place and they have determined that the surplice should be used. I would like to suggest that the principle which the Laudians wished to emphasize in this 1634 reprinting was authority, not simply that the surplice should be used. If church governors in the 1630s decided it was good to use copes more frequently, laymen and women should accept this practice in the same way they accepted the use of the surplice as the normative, uniform dress for clergy in divine worship. To Laudian delight were citations from the controversy between John Whitgift and Thomas Cartwright, the good old fight between conformist and wicked Puritan. No one needed a score-card to know who was who.

“T.C.,” also known as “the defender of the Admonition,” appears throughout the text, as does Whitgift, the model conformist. Mason also provided a review of the development of the Book of Common Prayer. After the first edition of 1549, “Martin Bucer gave his learned censure” and “in the fift and sixt yeere of K. Edward, the former booke was reformed and brought to such singular perfection.”¹⁷² Defended by Cranmer and Ridley in the days of Queen Mary, Mason wrote, the 1552 prayer book was even judged by John Calvin to be a tolerable liturgy. The Reformer of Geneva, he continued, would never call something impious tolerable. Then Mason reached the third edition of the Book of Common Prayer, the version produced in 1559.

But to come to the forme of Common praier, as it was established by Q. Elizabeth: O what blessings hath the Lord vouchsafed the people of this land, by means of that booke? How many millions of soules have received comfort by it? How many thousands of learned men have commended it and defended it¹⁷³

¹⁷¹ Francis Mason, *The Authority of the Church in Making Canons and Constitutions concerning Things Indifferent* (Oxford, 1634), 7.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 22.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

Jewel, he wrote, stands out among the great defenders of the book, and seventeenth century Christians should recognize the great gift that an earlier generation left to them.

This positive analogue strategy was followed by the negative analogue strategy. As much praise as Mason heaped on the prayer book and men like Cranmer and Jewel, he equally leveled scorn on their opponents. The church, Mason argued, had since the mid-Tudor period suffered from “turbulent spirits.”¹⁷⁴ After reviewing the Admonition Controversy as if it was still going on, the author argues that neither Elizabeth nor James dashed away the cross at baptism or the surplice. “Wisdom,” Mason determined, “requireth that a safe course be taken for prevention of evil.” No one should wince at the ceremonies of the church, he insisted. They have been vetted and approved by none other than “our late Queene of famous memory.”¹⁷⁵ That is certainly not to say, he continued, that she merely propped up Catholic superstition. Not in the least was that the case. Mason wrote in fulsome terms that Elizabeth unlocked the gospel. Like Hezekiah, she found idolatry “in every thicket.” The queen banished the cross, he continued, wherever it was misused beyond redemption.

In the sacrament of the supper the use of crossing was of shorter continuance and the papists doe use it rather like conjurers than Christians: and therefore there was no cause why there it should be continued. In Baptisme it was more ancient and more free from superstition and actual adoration; therefore Q Elizabeth retained the crosse in Baptisme as her godly brother did before her... So the cross continued all the reigne of Queene Elizabeth as it doth at this day, not blemished with the least spot or staine of superstition.¹⁷⁶

Mason waved off the accusation that surplices used by papists were still in use by Protestant clergy by noting that by now they were “worne away.” He turned this line of discussion around. Observing that when the prophets found idolatry they destroyed it, Mason noted “our accusers are of a contrary minde, for they grant that the golde of the

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 23.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 30, 40.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 40-41.

cope and the cloth of the surplesse may lawfully be taken for private purposes.”¹⁷⁷ The working theology of his Puritan opponents, he argued, was that these items are mere bits of cloth and precious metal. The Prophets saw real spiritual evil, however. While Mason did not really capture the Puritan view of idolatry – particularly their understanding of the taint of spiritual evil – the polemical landscape he constructed allowed him to ‘out-biblicize’ them.

Mason then shifts to the issue of the Church of England’s relationship to other churches. Directly addressing the Admonition’s critique that if a more thorough reformation is good for France, why is it not good for England, Mason countered by asking why the Church of England should be bound to foreign examples? He then observed that even Geneva retained “some Popish orders.” In the sixteenth century that church retained the “custome of Godfathers and Godmothers.” Moreover, the Genevan church used wafer bread in the Lord’s Supper, a much abused custom “in popery.” Mason’s ultimate argument here is that there is no need to follow Geneva’s pattern. “For there is great difference betweene a popular state and an absolute Kingdome: between small territories and ample dominions: between the schoole of Geneva, and the renowned Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.” One should note, however, that this is all a discussion of what happened in the sixteenth century, a time perceived as a classical period of formation for both Geneva and the Church of England. John Calvin provided Mason with a summative judgment on what a good Christian clergyman needs to do in England.

That learned blessed martyr M. Hooper being elected Bishop in King Edward’s time did vehemently deny wearing of his episcopall ornaments, but Calvin did counsell him not to stand so stiffely against the cap and the rochet... I wish that you which in no other things so magnify and admire the person of Calvin would in this point follow the sound judgment grave counsel and tractable disposition of Calvin.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 42-44.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 61.

In his conclusion, Francis Mason even tries to firmly own the Reformed mantle, discrediting his opponents as “Brownists.”¹⁷⁹ This particular approach to the relationship between the Church of England and other churches could be driven into service in the 1630s by the Laudians. Readers in 1634 when this text was reprinted at the behest of Brian Duppa would see that those in authority had a claim to the legacy of the Marian martyrs and the defenders of the Elizabethan church, men like Jewel and Whitgift.

Claims about the sixteenth century were in many respects the guard-rails for credibility in this literature. In his 1634 *Devotionis Augustinianae Flamma, or Certain Meditations*, William Austin used the *Magdeburg Centuries*, a Lutheran historical project overseen by Matthias Flacius. Completed in 1574, the *Centuries* was very much a part of the discourse of historical polemic between Lutherans and Catholics. Austin’s purpose roughly three generations later was to defend bowing to the east by citing historical precedents.¹⁸⁰ This was an interesting double use of history in polemic, as the appeal in the seventeenth century was to a sixteenth century debate that, in turn, doubled back on even earlier history. Even in a para-devotional work, an author benefited by framing his claims in historical terms. Edmund Reeve’s exposition of the prayer book, *The Christian Divinitie*, functioned in this way at the start of the decade, and his 1635 *Communion Booke Catechism Expounded* was no different. Kings, he wrote in the dedication, are nursing fathers to the church; queens are nursing mothers. This traditional theme which at bottom highlighted the applied governorship of the church by Elizabeth, James, and now Charles was followed in his discussion with a list of “the fundamentall books” of the Church of England.¹⁸¹ The prayer book, the homilies, the canons – these inform the

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 67.

¹⁸⁰ William Austin, *Devotionis Augustinianae Flamma, or Certain Meditations* (London, 1634).

¹⁸¹ Edmund Reeve, *Communion Booke Catechism Expounded* (London, 1634), epistle dedicatory, author to parishioners. See also 110 for another reference to kings and queens being nursing fathers and mothers.

religious identity of English women and men. Reeve's work existed on the same polemical grid as the sharp sermon of Peter Smart preached at Durham in 1628. Though the authors may have drawn different conclusions about the confessional face of the English church, both texts shared a similar sensibility about historic precedents.

Reeve's *Communion Booke Catechism Expounded* pushed a number of Laudian themes but did so within a generally conformist rhetoric. Citing the homilies, he argued that reverence in worship is due to Christ at every liturgical office. Therefore it is simply unacceptable for laywomen and men to come late or leave early according to their personal predilections.¹⁸² Even John Whitgift was willing to wink at certain omissions. For years some conforming Puritans had developed the habit of coming only for the sermon. The Laudians believed this had to stop. "It is the will of the church, that every person should on Sunday be thus devoted, until the full end of all publike divine worship for the day."¹⁸³ Regarding various interpretations of the established church's theology, Reeve argued that all the documents worked in harmony and that the king had specifically prohibited private interpretation. No one, he wrote, may put "his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but take it in the literal and grammaticall sense." In the printed marginal notes, Reeve wrote regarding double predestination, "such a predestination the Church of England in no wise professeth."¹⁸⁴

Edmund Reeve wove together old style conformist principles and Laudian innovations. He praised the king –the traditional supreme governor – for resurrecting old feasts. "Blessed forever be our Kings most excellent majesty for thus restoring the feasts of the Lord which have been prescribed by his Apostolic Church."¹⁸⁵ Reeve blended old

¹⁸² Ibid., 29-30.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 97.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 65-67.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 129.

fashioned sensibilities and historic precedents with Laudian innovations to such a degree that the shift from one ethos to another was veiled. In his apparatus he discussed the Act of Uniformity as published in the prayer book, the rubrics in the communion service, and, seamlessly, that idea that a church after being consecrated by a bishop contains God's presence.¹⁸⁶ The last of these, of course, has no canonical support. There was no article or injunction for consecrating churches. There was no rite in the Book of Common Prayer for such an event. One had to string together certain interpretations of the prayer book's liturgies to assert that the Church of England upheld the notion of sacred space. Here in Reeve's work, though, the full novel proposition that consecration engenders the divine presence is listed with the very conventional Uniformity Act and the prayer book rubrics. Later in the text, he cites the homilies to insist on honoring churches, being reverent in them, and not walking and talking during worship. In one deft move from citing recognizable documents like the homilies, he rejects seats "above God's seat or board" set at the east end arranged north and south.¹⁸⁷

In the same year Reeve published his *Communion Booke Catechism Expounded*, Thomas Lawrence published two sermons he had preached the previous year, 1634. A royal chaplain and successor to George Herbert as rector of Bemerton with Fugglestone, Wiltshire, Lawrence had a reputation since the Oxford Act of July 1629 for holding that only churchmen in synod may determine Christian doctrine and that property after consecration is inalienable.¹⁸⁸ The two sermons – the first at St. Mary's, Oxford and the second at Salisbury Cathedral during Laud's metropolitanical visit – presented this sacerdotal vision of the clergy and sacred space. Lawrence based his view that consecration changes the nature of liturgical space on the unique functions of different

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 134.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 136-137, 141, 142.

¹⁸⁸ ODNB: Thomas Lawrence.

parts of churches in the set liturgies. “As anciently in the church,” he writes, “the chancel as appropriated to the clergy, the rest to the people.”¹⁸⁹ From this, Laurence determined that the chancel is more sacred than the nave. In a sermon Laurence published later in 1637 he made the same argument again, claiming that the chancel was sacred because it was set apart for the purpose of celebrating the Lord’s Supper.

Notwithstanding the distribution of the sacrament might be in other parts, the consecration was in one; where our Liturgy also hath enjoyed the second service to bee read; and after Childe-birth, the presentation of thanksgivings.¹⁹⁰

This was the way things were arranged at the time of the reformation, Laurence argued, and they are therefore worthy of sincere conformity. In his 1635 work, Laurence determined that, as there was a hierarchy of space, there was a hierarchy of persons. God appointed the clergy for specific, sacred functions. This line of logic whose root was in the established prayer book used since the happy reign of Elizabeth could extend to justify the increased use of vestments. Copes, for instance, mark off their wearers as sacred officers, men set apart for a purpose. God, Laurence argued, appointed certain ones “to doe the service of the Tabernacle of the Lord.”¹⁹¹ Alexander Read pushed a similar line of thought at the 1635 visitation of Brentwood, Essex. His sermon, published the following year, considered the passage, 1 Corinthians 14:40, the Whitgiftian mantra, “Let all things be done decently and in order.” Not only did he vilify those who walk and talk during worship, Read preached: “It seems to me an undecent thing that parishioners should teach the minister another method of care of souls than the canons doe.” Like Laurence, Read saw a hierarchy of authority made sacred by God’s appointments and

¹⁸⁹ Thomas Laurence, *Two Sermons: First at S. Maries Oxford July 13, 1634 being Act Sunday. The Second in Salisbury Cathedral at the Visitation of Archbishop Laud May 23 1634* (Oxford, 1635), 12.

¹⁹⁰ Thomas Laurence, *Sermon Preached before the King’s Majestie at Whitehall, February 7 1636* (London, 1637), 17.

¹⁹¹ Laurence, *Two Sermons*, 23.

confirmed by a simple interpretation of the standard source texts of the Church of England – the prayer book, the homilies, the Articles of Religion.¹⁹²

In 1636 Jasper Fisher, a clergyman who in fact wrote very little in his career, published the sermon he preached at the triennial visitation at Amphill. *The Priests Duty and Dignity* posited a high view of clerical authority, a sacerdotalist interpretation not unlike the ideas found in works by Laurence and Read. Fisher arrayed a somewhat unique list of sources of authority in his text, and these are overlain with a certain antiquarianism, a sense that one has to continually check decisions against past experience. He wrote: “the counsel and exemplar of our learned prelates for studying of Ecclesiastical Histories, councils, Fathers, canon-law, Schoolmen, and Publick liturgies.”¹⁹³ This scaffolding of authorities is a bit different from the normal laundry list of the prayer book, homilies, articles and injunctions, etc. It is in fact reminiscent, I would like to suggest, of the scholastic method whose order of authorities was first scripture, then the Fathers, then canon law, then the scholastics, followed by reason, and then experience.¹⁹⁴

At the center of church life in Fisher’s text, however, is the power of the clergy to lead. Clearly, he writes, problems always come when clerical authority – an extension of Christ’s ministry – is weakened.

Having vilified the power of Priesthood and Christ Episcopal Crozier (as his regal scepter) in the laws Divine and Ecclesiastical, in the sacraments and sacramentals, as Confirmation, Confession, Penance, Orders, Extreme Visitation, and particular Absolution: We then fondly wonder at the profaneness of the times, and marvell

¹⁹² Alexander Read, *A Sermon preached April 8 1635 at a Visitation in Brentwood in Essex* (London, 1636), 17.

¹⁹³ Jasper Fisher, *The priest's duty and dignity, preached at the triennial visitation in Amphill 1635. 18 Aug.* (London, 1636), 35.

¹⁹⁴ For a similar discussion of earlier reformers and scholastic hierarchies of sources, see D. V. N. Bagchi, “Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism,” in Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 1999), 3-15.

that preaching does no good; as if the flock could be fed, cured, and governed only by the Shepard's whistle.¹⁹⁵

With the colorful images of crozier (ceremony) and whistle (preaching) as dual instruments for ministry, Fisher elevates the prayer book offices of confirmation, ordination, the visitation of the sick, and, by an interpretation of the communion exhortations, “particular Absolution” to the level of “sacramentals,” a novel concept for the Church of England. While those offices had long been in the prayer book and indeed observed by good conformists, they did not have this curious status. Fisher’s scholastic authority list and his discussion of “sacramentals” are not the only instances of clearly Catholic rhetoric. He actually claims that priests are the highest of seven orders in the church militant, a way of understanding Christian ministry foreign to the prayer book tradition. The root for all of this Catholic language and his entry point for discussing these ideas within the Church of England was the notion of different functions for different people, a concept which was part of the established prayer book ethos. “I only observe,” Fisher wrote, “there must bee in God’s Church, an order of Priest and people, of clergy and laitie.”¹⁹⁶

Samuel Hoard, a clergyman who openly and unabashedly embraced Arminianism, published a sermon in 1637 in which he advocated near-blind obedience to the church’s authority, particularly when he came to the issue of uniform ceremonies. Preached in March 1636 at Chelmsford, Essex during Laud’s metropolitanical visitation, *The Churches Authority Asserted* had for its scripture passage the great Whitgiftian text 1 Corinthians 14:40, “Let all things be done decently and in order.” In his explication of the church’s power to establish worship patterns, he dragoons a number of continental theologians into service including John Calvin and Jerome Zanchius.¹⁹⁷ “Calvin,” Hoard wrote, “whom

¹⁹⁵ Fisher, *The priest’s duty and dignity*, 36.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 41, 39.

¹⁹⁷ Samuel Hoard, *The Churches Authority Asserted* (London, 1637), 3-6.

all sectaries make their oracle in their plea against ceremonies” did not take away all external rites. Looking back on the sixteenth century, Hoard offered an explanation of how the great Genevan reformer situated ceremony in relation to the broader Protestant movement.

Calvin tells Farell, that as for himself, he was somewhat sparing of ceremonies, Luther liberall, Bucer indifferent; yet they all maintained very good correspondency, and judged those differences in external rites to be no just cause why they should break amity.¹⁹⁸

This must be judged as a romantic interpretation of things. Calvin and Luther had no real correspondence, the latter continually blocking the efforts of the former, among others, to achieve union between the Reformed and the German evangelicals. On one well known occasion toward the end of Luther’s life, Philip Melanchthon famously decided not to show “Pericles” (as he called Luther) a letter from Calvin, fearing that the aged and dyspeptic Reformer would react violently. “Amity” was simply not the order of the day. Moreover, John Calvin had a very well defined sense of right worship, one deeply informed by his theological anthropology and certainly incapable of brushing off images, for instance, as adiaphorous. While Calvin did think whether one used red or white wine in the Lord’s Supper was a matter indifferent, this category was far from expansive. Samuel Hoard, preaching in the 1630s, was using figures from the classical era of reform for his own ends.

Considering Article 20 of the Thirty Nine Articles, Hoard reminds his readers that the Church of England has for many decades asserted that it “hath power to decree rites and ceremonies”¹⁹⁹ He goes on to say that it is up to the church’s properly constituted leaders to determine the way churches are to be consecrated, “what habit the priest, when he cometh to minister before the Lord, should be clothed... the times when this or that

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 36.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 4.

particular gesture of kneeling, standing, sitting, or bowing may be used with most comeliness... what tables, what chalices, what other ornaments.”²⁰⁰ After making claims like this for the church, and that indifferent matters should not divide us (just as they presumably did not divide Protestant champions in the sixteenth century), Hoard closes the door on the concept of adiaphora. He argues that issues of adiaphora, once they are decided upon, are no longer matters of conscience or taste. As they are commanded by superior authorities, the “surplesse, hood, standing up at the creed, kneeling at communion, the crosse in baptisme, and bowing at the name of Jesus” are “no arbitrary and indifferent thing.”²⁰¹ Hoard insists that private persons must follow the dictates of the established church on these matters. With a measure of exasperation, he declares that clergy who have subscribed to the Thirty-Nine Articles have an obligation to maintain and in fact propagate the full measure of prayer book worship. “If we now after our often subscription to these things shall refuse or omit the use of them in our practices, will not there be a grosse inconsistency between our judgment and behaviours?”²⁰²

Hoard’s vision for the Church of England was wrapped in traditional language. William Quelch published a set of two sermons in 1636 that followed the same ideological trajectory and, indeed, the same method of apologia. Like Hoard, Quelch insisted that the church ought to have established customs and rites. He grounded his arguments in historical sensibilities, drawing for himself the aura of old-fashioned conformity. Quelch also employed the negative strategy in historical appeal. Naturally he went straight for the place-holder for all villainous dissidents, Thomas Cartwright. Quelch referred to him as “the great scourge of all our customs.” If anyone challenges the church’s authority in this regard, they are nothing short of “peevisish novelists” who

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 6.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 57.

²⁰² Ibid., 67.

bring shame on their mother, the Church of England.²⁰³ John Pocklington moved in the same way in his anti-sabbatarian work, *Sunday No Sabbath*. Perhaps better known for his 1637 text on altars, *Altare Christianum*, Pocklington preceded that work with this piece, one set on using the image of Cartwright and other figures still very much alive in the English imagination. In this text, originally a sermon preached during Bishop John Williams' 1635 visitation of Lincoln diocese, he complained that Puritans observing the Sabbath do not use the lawful liturgy. "Now you see the Common Prayer booke which the Kings Majesties authority in causes Ecclesiastical with the Convocation house, have appointed, and the Parliament thereunto assented is clean cast out of their Sabbath."²⁰⁴ Recognized and long established authorities were being overturned by these brazen Puritans, he argued, and they were no different than their forebears in the sixteenth century. Noting that Cartwright's legacy was still vibrant among Puritans, Pocklington claimed that these dissidents were siding with him over the Fathers. He asked, "will you condemn them [i.e. the Fathers], their doctrine and Canons, to deifie T.C.?" Thomas Cartwright, though dead since 1603, was definitely a major factor in polemical discourse in Caroline England.

As a bogeyman, Cartwright gave the Laudians a favorite foil in recent history and in polemical discourse. The image of Calvin and the Reformed, however, was a bit more varied. Sometimes, as noted above, an apologist would try to "own" the Reformed mantle and disconnect his opponents from other Reformed Protestants. On this read, the Church of England was truly Reformed, maybe even the best Reformed church, and any who challenged the strictures of the established church was a radical opponent of the real Reformed tradition. On the other hand, more aggressive Laudians (some openly Arminian) would to varying degrees reject the Reformed tradition outright, claiming that

²⁰³ William Quelch, *Church Customes Vindicated in Two Sermons* (London, 1636), 38, 41, 56.

²⁰⁴ John Pocklington, *Sunday No Sabbath: A Sermon* (London, 1636), 7-8; ODNB: John Pocklington.

the Church of England was totally independent from the Scylla that was Rome and the Charybdis that was the Reformed. John Featley, nephew of the more well-known Daniel Featley, was like his uncle a zealous critic of non-conformity. Unlike his uncle, however, the younger Featley had moved into Laudian circles and by the mid-1630s was actively defending their new ceremonial ethos.²⁰⁵ His *Obedience and Submission*, published in 1636, had first been a sermon he preached at St. Saviour's the preceding December. Rattling against Brownists, Separatists, and Anabaptists, John Featley dismissed his opponents in great swaths. Here one finds an example of the more aggressive Laudian attitude to Reformed churches elsewhere. In acerbic and disparaging tones, he contrasted the English church's hierarchy made stable and healthy by the reformers' retention of episcopacy with foreign structures like the novel polity developed in Geneva.²⁰⁶

The negative strategy and positive strategy of historical appeal were common in Laudian polemic as they give writers and preachers the opportunity to identify with recognizably legitimate and indeed honored figures from England's recent past while simultaneously aligning their opponents with figures regularly perceived as troublesome and perhaps villainous. While Thomas Cartwright was the standard negative figure and Whitgift the standard positive figure for appeals, there were others to be mentioned in both categories. What makes this phenomenon even more interesting is that these figures, whether positive or negative, could be quite distinct. Laudian polemic, however, often polarized the many and various religious issues on the English landscape from c.1550 to c.1630 and effectively eliminated the whole notion of historical change. On one side one found Thomas Cranmer, Matthew Parker, John Jewel, John Whitgift, Richard Hooker, Richard Bancroft, Lancelot Andrewes, and the contemporary ranks of Laudian bishops. The plain fact of the matter was that each of these men was distinct and

²⁰⁵ ODNB: John Featley.

²⁰⁶ John Featley, *A sermon of obedience and submission: preached at St. Saviour's-church in South-warke, at a visitation, on Tuesday, the eighth day of December, anno Dom. 1635* (London, 1636), 11.

they faced different issues, had recognizably different theological orientations, and had different visions for the Church of England. Likewise, on the other side one found John Hooper, Thomas Sampson, Laurence Humphrey, John Field, Thomas Wilcox, Thomas Cartwright, “Martin Marprelate,” William Hackett and Edmund Coppinger, the Millenary Petitioners, the Separatists in New England, and William Prynne. These men were hardly all of the same “party.”

While Christopher Dow in his 1636 *Discourse of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day* aligned himself with Richard Hooker to highlight the authority of the church to decree ceremonies, the Somerset vicar Humphrey Sydenham brought up Martin Marprelate in his 1637 *Sermons Upon Solemn Occasions* to warn his readers where the Puritan road leads. In his dedicatory epistle to William Laud, Sydenham rejects the critiques of “The Legend of Ipswich.” Reflecting on the arguments in this Puritan pamphlet, he argued that the church was standing on the edge of a slippery slope. Critiquing the prelates, he wrote, leads to Puritanism. Puritanism in turn leads to presbyterianism. And presbyterianism leads to anabaptist radicalism. In colorful language Sydenham worriedly asked “If schismaticall hands be catching at the mytre and the rochet, how will they rend the contemptable hood and surplice?”²⁰⁷ The Church of England, on this view, was a precious institution desperately in need of defense. This is a fear-full piece of literature. If any element is taken away from the full Laudian vision of the church, England will descend into sectarian chaos. If one was not fully behind the avant-garde conformist agenda, he was an enemy of the Church of England. As we might expect, this was played out with regard to issues relating to the material context of devotion. Sydenham decries the one who would deface monuments and knock out windows; the one who “razes out a crucifix and sets up a scutchion; pulls down an organ and advances an Hour-glasse.” Here Sydenham tries to sound like an old-style conformist, rejecting the gross iconoclasm

²⁰⁷ Humphrey Sydenham, *Sermons Upon Solemn Occasions* (London, 1637), Dedication to Laud. For his references to Marprelate, see 270.

of Puritans. However, crosses were at last purged from the Church of England in the 1560s. Moreover, the royal arms had long ago replaced the traditional arrangement of crucifix, Mary, and John on rood screens. “Scutchions,” therefore, were not terribly out of place. Crucifixes, on the other hand, certainly would have been unusual and in fact novel. At the same time, however, Sydenham insists that one has to fully back the Laudian program or else he is a “hermaphrodite divine.” These “mere Centaures in Religion” have “a tongue for Geneva, and a heart for Amsterdam; their pretense for Old England, and their project for New.”²⁰⁸ Could Sydenham be referring here to old-style conformists like Peter Smart, clergy he felt were only half-hearted for the Church of England? Regardless of his actual target, it is clear that Sydenham was shifting the substance of prayer book conformism while retaining its language.

Richard Tedder also used the image of Richard Hooker to insulate his calls for more ceremony. Having preached at Matthew Wren’s primary visitation of Norwich, Tedder published his sermon in 1637. Drawing from “ecclesiastical histories,” Tedder argued for consecration rituals, and wrote that those who opposed such ceremonies “cast durt into the face of all holy Antiquity.”²⁰⁹ In the same year, the Chichester Cathedral prebend Joseph Henshaw likewise argued in his *Meditations Miscellaneous, Holy and Humane* that one should always defer to established, old-fashioned opinions. Built into this argument for antiquity, however, was also an argument for deference to established channels of power. The two claims were interleaved. In his preface to the reader, Henshaw wrote “it were to be wish’d that inferiors would employ their time rather in a holy meditation of those truths which are already receiv’d in the church.” His claims for both antiquity and hierarchy become increasingly clear later in the text. “In Religion,” Henshaw wrote, “examine, but not broach opinions; ever incline to Antiquity, and

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 271.

²⁰⁹ Richard Tedder, *Sermon at the Primary Visitation of Matthew Wren as Bishop of Norwich* (London, 1637), 6, 8, 25.

suspect novelty; in middle things ever submit to the Authority thou livest under, and let the Churches opinion be thine.”²¹⁰ This former chaplain to the royal favorite, the Duke of Buckingham deftly owned the rhetoric of conformism, using language that sounded conservative and old-fashioned. Whether the substance of Henshaw’s claims was old-fashioned was an entirely different matter, however.

Henshaw’s was not the only devotional text that made Laudian arguments couched in historical terms. In his 1637 *A Treatise of the Beatitudes*, James Buck linked “bare dead statutes” with their reformation-era authors’ living successors. In this way, the Laudian episcopate appeared consistent with their Tudor predecessors while effecting noticeable change.

The Faith of England is not in the sole dead letter of our Articles and Church books, etc, but in the living spirit and content of the Fathers of the Church as proper Iudges in Spiritualities; determining the sense of the Articles, and declaring to us the opinion of our Mother, the Holy Church of England.²¹¹

Complete with references to “T.C,” Buck’s work employs both the positive and the negative analogue strategies. Not surprisingly, he crowds together the contemporary Laudian leadership with Tudor bishops. The current members of the episcopal bench, Buck argues, have the same spirit as Ridley, Cranmer, and Jewel. They and those obedient to them are “children of our good mother, the holy and ancient Church of England.” All others are “New Englanders” and “Amsterdammities.”²¹²

John Pocklington whose *Sunday No Sabbath* made hay with the image of Thomas Cartwright to co-opt an aura of conservatism, made an entry in the infamous Caroline altar debate in 1637 with his *Altare Christianum*. Pocklington had years of experience riling established sensibilities, and he likely knew how to maneuver in this debate in the

²¹⁰ Joseph Henshaw, *Meditations Miscellaneous, Holy and Humane* (London, 1637), To the Reader, 10; ODNB: Joseph Henshaw.

²¹¹ James Buck, *A Treatise of the Beatitudes* (London, 1637), 285.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 288.

1630s. In the middle 1610s, while a fellow at Pembroke College, Cambridge, he made arguments for Rome as a true church and for the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Although he effectively challenged the dominant and recognized sensibilities of many within the Church of England, including many on the episcopal bench, Pocklington was able to clear himself in the consistory court. By the middle 1630s he had been chaplain to John Williams, bishop of Lincoln for some years, but their relationship was souring. While Williams was no friend to Laud and the crown-backed circle of avant-garde conformists, Pocklington was fast becoming an outspoken proponent of the movement and the “beauty of holiness.” In his *Altare Christianum or The Dead Vicar’s Plea*, Pocklington made sensational claims about the chancel, specifically that only the clergy could enter the space around the altar beyond the rails to receive Holy Communion. His sacerdotalism was unsurpassed among Laudian apologists.

Pocklington’s claims in *Altare Christianum*, however, were insulated with conservative language. Old-fashioned concepts of conformity, familiar scripture passages that had been interpreted for decades to support the polity and worship of the Church of England, citations from the prayer book, the homilies, and sundry articles and injunctions, and historical exemplars who could lend credibility – all of these could make Pocklington’s arguments seem innocuous. The goal was to make the new altar policy appear consonant with the aims and accents of old-style conformity. At times, Pocklington did not dodge citations of the rubrics, but rather faced into old-style conformist criticisms and provided novel interpretations of source materials for the position of the altar. A whole chapter in this text is given over to an interpretation of the prayer book rubric that ordered the table to be set altar-wise during the daily offices, but length-wise during the ministration of the Lord’s Supper. The problem, as discussed above in this dissertation, was that the Laudians were only reading the first part of the rubric, ignoring the second. “It is fit,” Pocklington writes, “we expound one Rubricke by another, and what is briefly and obscurely set downe in one, to supply and expound out of

another.” The apologist was here opening the possibility of seeking the prayer book editors’ intent by a particular hermeneutical strategy. He proposed interpreting the prayer book by the prayer book itself, a method similar to one often applied to the Bible (*scriptura scripturam interpretatur*). While he affirmed the words of the rubric at the beginning of the communion liturgy that described how the table should be set, he noted that the rubric before Morning Prayer also had something to say.

The Rubricke before Morning Prayer, seems to put in a double exception or caution. I. Except it shall be otherwise determined by the Ordinary of the place. 2. And the Chancels shall remaine as they have done in times past.

There is a caveat, Pocklington notes, in the Book of Common Prayer itself. That is, that while certain measures may be put in place, the ordinary should make a decision in light of how things were “in times past.” It should be clear, though, Pocklington writes, that from the middle sixteenth century on, every ordinary is not at liberty to create a diversity of arrangements, but rather he is to preserve older patterns. The order in the rubric does not, he contends, limit itself to the walls and the windows in the phrase, “shall remaine as in times past.” Those words also imply “the fixing of the Lord’s Table, which is the main part of the chancel considerable in the service of God.”²¹³ Far from dodging the criticisms of old-style conformists like Peter Smart, Pocklington claimed for himself the prayer book rubrics and provided an interpretation of them that not only allowed for an east-end altar, but straightly called for one.

The context for this piece, the Caroline altar controversy, had a unique angle for Pocklington. John Williams, the bishop of Lincoln, had taken up the cause of the lengthwise communion table against Laud and, as will be discussed below, Peter Heylyn. Pocklington, whose relationship with the bishop had chilled in recent years, took aim at his former patron. Not only did he paint Williams as a hypocrite for having an east-end altar in his own episcopal chapel and an image of a “fair crucifix,” Pocklington

²¹³ Pocklington, *Altare Christianum*, 85-87.

neutralized the bishop's invocations of John Jewel, the Elizabethan apologist for the Church of England. To do this, though, he would have to affirm Jewel to continue appearing conservative while simultaneously negating the long dead bishop's authority in the current controversy. Pocklington writes, "for Bishop Jewel, I never knew any man that hath written or spoken otherwise than to his honour. His writings are received in our Church as the Master of the Sentences is among the Romanists." Here the Elizabethan apologist is positioned as a canonical authority, one comparable to the role Peter Lombard played in Catholic thought. To neutralize Williams' invocation of Jewel, however, Pocklington writes that, like Bernard, Jewel's works are not Gospel. No matter how highly esteemed, he argued, "*Bernardus non vidit omnia.*" Then, with more precision, Pocklington states "How communion tables have stood in the body of the church, I do not find in Bishop Jewel." Invocations of Jewel are, in the first place, not an end to discussion. His works are not Gospel. And in the second place, it seems that Jewel had little to say about the topic at hand.²¹⁴ This argument allows Pocklington to neutralize Jewel without dismissing the Elizabethan bishop's importance as a source for conformist thought.

Pocklington also made an *abusus non tollit usum* argument, and he worked historical precedents into his claims in an interesting way. In arguing for the continued use of a number of elements that had been abused in time of popery, he claimed that if the church does away with these, then it should also reject its heritage since the middle sixteenth century.

Priests, sacrifices, oblations, altars, the sacrament of the altar is not abolished. He that will cast out these out of the Christian Church must with them cast out Edward the Sixth, with diverse of M. Foxes Martyrs and some acts of Parliament in force.²¹⁵

²¹⁴ Ibid., 87-90.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 135.

This turns the arguments of old-style conformists like Peter Smart on their head. To be truly faithful to the English reformation and its champions, one had to retain elements that had been abused but which are now cleansed from idolatry. Then, in an almost systematic fashion, Pocklington rounds out his arguments with the negative strategy of historical appeal. He writes: “Cartwright and his apprentices have been hammering their heads more than a good while about throwing these things out.”²¹⁶ This nails the whole matter shut: if one argued against retaining (or resurrecting) some elements suspected of popish taint, then he is an “apprentice” of Cartwright, a devious Puritan hammering his head against the church and its good ceremonies. If one cannot get on board with an *abusus non tollit usum* attitude toward altars, then one effectively rejects Edward VI and the Marian martyrs and embraces Thomas Cartwright.

Pocklington then turns his attention to describing how the unbroken presence of altars in the English church and how these had not, as some were claiming, crept in at night. Of course he makes great hay with the fact that Elizabeth retained an altar-wise arrangement and that she had a silver cross on it. Even Edward VI, he claims, called it *sacrosanctum altare*.²¹⁷ If one argues that altars crept in, Pocklington writes, then he may say the say thing about the episcopate, and the orders of priest and deacon, “with their several office and degrees, with their attire, habits, vestments, together with oblations, tythes, glebe lands, and maintenance.” All of these had been part of the English church since the reformation. If one found discomfort with this reality, Pocklington argues, then he likely was a fellow traveler with Thomas Cartwright. What will such a pseudo-conformist do when he sees “the kings most sacred majesty, and the honorable Lords of the most noble Order of the Garter, performe most low and humble reverence to Almighty God before the most holy Altar?” Indeed, half-conformists, he

²¹⁶ Ibid., 136.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 140, 142, 143.

wrote, are no better than “Cartwright with his heavy volumes, Martin with his virulent tongue, Wigginton [i.e. Arthington] and Hacket with their extraordinary spirit.”²¹⁸

Pocklington presented a polarized situation in both space and time. On the one side were a succession of faithful monarchs and good bishops and on the other the radical presbyterian Cartwright, the derisive pamphleteer Martin Marprelate, and the lunatic prophet William Hackett. Images of these men had fueled conformist scare tactics in the 1590s, and now they were being put to good use by avant-garde conformists in the 1630s.

Pocklington’s arguments in 1637 – sometimes considered the real peak year for Laudianism – were detailed, and he took into account his opponents’ claims. Some avant-garde conformists were not so precise in their approach. Thomas Drant in his *The Royal Guest* (1637) simply brushed off all who criticized ceremonies as “brainsick.”²¹⁹ Nevertheless, historical appeals to establish legitimacy and the aura of old-fashioned conservatism were the main fare for Laudian apologists. Sometimes these appeals were specific; sometimes not. Anthony Sparrow in his *Sermon concerning Confession* (1637) made historically-oriented claims, but they were broad strokes. Arguing for priestly absolution, Sparrow wrote “He that assents to the Church of England, or believes the scriptures, or gives credit to the ancient Fathers, cannot deny the priest the power of remitting sins.”²²⁰ Sparrow’s piece was certainly not as specific as Pocklington’s *Altare Christianum*, or for that matter works by Peter Smart.

The altar controversy of the 1630s drew a number of authors into polemical exchange. John Pocklington’s work, *Altare Christianum*, was one of two major Laudian entries, the other being Peter Heylyn’s *A Coale from the Altar*. Before moving to a

²¹⁸ Ibid., 144, 153, 159, 183.

²¹⁹ Thomas Drant, *The Royall Guest: or, A sermon preached at Lent Assises* (London, 1637), 30.

²²⁰ Anthony Sparrow, *Sermon concerning Confession* (London, 1637), 17. Peter McCullough has argued that although Sparrow did not cite Lancelot Andrewes in this piece, the text owed a debt to a similar sermon Andrewes preached in 1600. Peter McCullough, “Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-1642,” *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998) 418-419.

discussion of that text and others by Heylyn published during the Personal Rule, it is important to recognize an element in Laudian literature heretofore not fully examined, an element at the center of a piece by John Squire. Squire's 1637 published sermon, a thanksgiving sermon for the decreasing of the plague, presented the monarchy as an unchanging institution, one whose hand in the church as supreme governor had been consistent since the days of Elizabeth Tudor. This was a key Laudian strategy since King Charles was supportive of "the beauty of holiness" movement. While the Laudians stressed their conformity with prayer book rubrics and other directives either by simply invocation or detailed interpretation, they also portrayed a succession of Christian monarchs who fought for ornamental ceremony, a sacerdotalist conception of the clergy, and a high view of the sacraments. As discussed above, the Laudian collapsed the idea of historical progression. Whitgift and Laud could be viewed as operating in abstraction, and therefore in complete agreement. The same was done with the succession of Elizabeth, James, and Charles. The symbolic capitol of Elizabeth Tudor, a queen whose image had been deftly used to criticize both James and Charles, could also be co-opted by the crown and its clergy to make the regime and its ecclesiastical agenda appear old-fashioned, conservative, and legitimate.

A true gem was found in Elizabeth's motto, *Semper Eadem*, always the same. The virtue of constancy was invaluable at this moment. John Squire, vicar of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, wrote in his sermon, "the Church of England under Queen Elizabeth was like Queen Elizabeth, *Semper Eadem*." This steady hand was inherited by Elizabeth's Stuart successors, he argued. To prove the point Squire deferred to Francis White, bishop of Ely, "whome," he wrote, "I feare not to call, one of the best read, this day alive, the Church Histories." History would prove Charles's fidelity to the Elizabethan prayer book tradition, and by extension the fidelity of the Laudian clergy to the same. Squire argued "the judgement of the Church of England, perpetuated from King Edward, by Queen Elizabeth, and King James to our honoured King Charles is

conteyned in the Booke of Articles.”²²¹ In sum, Edward, Elizabeth, James, Charles: *always the same*. If one challenged Charles, one was challenging Elizabeth, and moreover, he was simply a Puritan, the same as Cartwright or worse, Hackett, Coppinger, and Marprelate. Interestingly, as the monarch and the conformist clergy were presented as *always the same*, so too were the Puritans. It is important to recognize that John Squire invoked the image of a consistent monarchy for a purpose. It was strategy to present ceremonialist concerns as old-fashioned and innocuous. At the close of his sermon, Squire was calling for more ornaments and more ceremony. He called for English churches to be ordered in such a way that they might rival St. John Lateran in Rome or Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, two churches Squire mentions specifically. Squire even calls on increased ceremony and ornament to quell the papists’ challenge that “Pater Noster did build up churches, and Our Father doth pluck them down.”²²²

Peter Heylyn, arguably the most acerbic of Laudian polemical authors, made use of many of the historical strategies described above in his *A Coale from the Altar*, including Squire’s trope of Charles’ constancy in defending the Elizabethan prayer book tradition. Heylyn, thanks to his relationship with William Laud, had been chaplain-in-ordinary to the king since 1630. In the following year he pleased Charles, a zealous supporter of the Order of the Garter, with a *History of St. George*. After receiving a prebendal stall at Westminster Abbey, Heylyn cemented his relationship with the crown and the Laudian prelacy in 1632 by providing a biting review of William Prynne’s *Histriomastix* for the prosecution at the Puritan barrister’s trial.²²³ Among this prolific writer’s works during the Personal Rule, three texts stand out for close examination. The first is Heylyn’s 1636 *A Coale from the Altar*. This is an anonymous response to Bishop

²²¹ John Squire, *A Thanksgiving for the Decreasing and Hope of Removing of the Plague* (London, 1637), 6-9.

²²² *Ibid.*, 40-41.

²²³ ODNB: Heylyn. See also Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, *passim*.

John Williams' anonymously published letter to the vicar of Grantham, Peter Titley who had constructed an east-end altar in his parish church. A discussion of Heylyn's history-based polemic in the 1630s has to also include his 1637 *Antidotum Lincolniense*, a response to Williams' anonymous *Holy Table, Name and Thing*, and his *A Brief and Moderate Answer*, a text published in the same year against the criticisms of the Puritan Henry Burton.

Early in his *A Coale from the Altar*, Heylyn, like his opponent Williams, made use of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* to justify his position on the use of altars. The tone was set and the rhetoric would be historical. This was the arena for debate; and one had to play by the accepted rules of historical appeal. Heylyn writes, "I shall keepe myself unto my patterne, and to the business which is chiefly there insisted on: grounding myself especially on the selfe same Authors and Authorities, which are there laid down." Later in the piece, he argues that in Foxe's work, martyrs who died rejecting "the grosse and carnall doctrine of transubstantiation" still referred to the Lord's Supper as the Sacrament of the altar, and he offered John Frith as an example. "Bishop Latimer plainely granteth, that the Lord's Table may be called an Altar," Heylyn continued. Not only Latimer, but Nicholas Ridley also affirmed both the word altar and the actual use of them in Protestant England.²²⁴ This was a particularly daring move considering that Ridley, when bishop of London, had to be restrained by the Privy Council in Edward's reign from pulling down all altars in the capitol. As will be discussed in a later chapter, this issue resurfaces in Heylyn's Restoration texts.

The text itself considers three issues, each one supported by Titley, the vicar of Grantham but contested by "the epistoler" (Williams). These three are: (1) the altar should be at the upper end of the choir; (2) it should be placed altar-wise; and (3) it should be fixed so that it may not be moved. Heylyn begins by noting that the epistoler

²²⁴ Peter Heylyn, *A Coale from the Altar* (London, 1636), 4, 14, 16.

himself admits that Cranmer worshipped at an altar. He argues that in Elizabeth's reign, many altars continued in place, while the queen urged caution in removing them. Moreover, Heylyn, ever the clericalist, rejects the novel "vestry-doctrine" that gives lay wardens the power over liturgical arrangements.²²⁵ Such a pattern – liturgical or ecclesiastical – cannot be established from the history of the Church of England. "In the first project of the Reformation neither the Queene nor her Commisioners disallowed of Altars or thought them any way unserviceable in a Church Reformed." In addition to taking possession, we might say, of the Marian martyrs and the symbolic capitol they could offer, Heylyn also conveniently lays a claim on the idea of being "Reformed." This is particularly interesting given his deep antipathy to not only English Puritans, but also to John Calvin and other continental Reformed Protestants from the sixteenth century. Later in the text Heylyn blames Calvin for the disappearance of the word altar in the second edition of the Book of Common Prayer (1552). Heylyn claims that the foreign reformer had too much influence over the regime, particularly the duke of Somerset.²²⁶ This polemicist was following tried and true tactics: he distinguished the Church of England from other Reformed churches while claiming for his own party harmony with the recognized champions of the English reformation. Heylyn also employed the conventional tactic of pushing his opponent into league with other dissidents. He accuses "the epistoler" of being a source for William Prynne in his diatribe against the Laudian writer Giles Widdowes, *Lame Giles his halting*.²²⁷

Heylyn also made an interesting argument for an east-end altar, one that was repeated by other authors including Bishop Matthew Wren. He observed that the 1559 Injunctions and Parker's 1567 Advertisements call for the table to be decently covered at

²²⁵ Ibid., 9, 10, 13.

²²⁶ Ibid., 29.

²²⁷ Ibid., 20.

the time of ministration and for placards of the Ten Commandments to be placed on the east wall over the table. Reading these orders together, Heylyn reasoned that if the implication is for the table to stand against the east wall during ministration – only then would the 10 Commandments be over the table.²²⁸ While this argument may or may not have been very convincing, it nevertheless operated by appealing to sixteenth century precedents, the steady diet of polemicists in the seventeenth century. He concludes *A Coale from the Altar* by making the flexible claim that altars have existed in pace-setting spaces (the chapel royal, cathedrals) and, moreover, that Elizabeth left power to her successors to change things if people over time misuse the established patterns of the prayer book. Since, as the traditional Laudian argument goes, churches were being profaned by simple folk doffing their hats on the communion table and dogs pissing in the chancel, Charles could and should take advantage of this power to change things.²²⁹ On this view, paradoxically, changing things would mean staying true to Elizabeth's legacy of decent worship. To seal up this argument, Heylyn points to the St. Gregory's Case in which Charles, using this Elizabethan power, had ruled on the matter. He even appended a copy of the decision for good measure.²³⁰

Many of the same historically-oriented arguments and rhetorical strategies appear again in Heylyn's 1637 *Antidotum Lincolniense*, yet another attack on Bishop John Williams. Once more he uses his unique Decalogue board argument for east-end altars as well as the argument that Elizabeth, knowing that people might misuse the good orders she established, left power to her successors to change things in order to stay the same. Once again he attaches the St. Gregory's Case decision for good measure.²³¹ *The Semper*

²²⁸ Ibid., 22.

²²⁹ Ibid., 51, 58-61.

²³⁰ Ibid., 64-66.

²³¹ Peter Heylyn, *Antidotum Lincolniense, or An Answer to a Booke entituled The Holy Table, Name and Thing* (London, 1637), 31-32, 46, 55-56, 62.

Eadem argument, that is, the charge that if one challenged Charles one was also challenging Elizabeth, appears also. Heylyn writes, “Having been bold (as never any man was more) with his Majesties Chappell, you cannot leave off so but you must fling at Qu: Elizabeth, and hers.”²³² Heylyn again makes a claim on the legacy of key figures from the mid-sixteenth century to energize his arguments. “Touching Archbishop Cranmer,” he asked, “can you shew us anywhere that at the terme or phrase of sacrament of the altar he did take offence?”²³³ Once more Heylyn blames John Calvin for the loss of many altars in the early 1550s, a clear instance, in his view, of foreign interference. “It had been been happy for this Church,” Heylyn writes, “if hee and Beza could have kept themselves to their meditations, and not been *curiosi in aliena republica*, as they were too much.” Later in the text he tries to out-Reform his opponent by observing that Johannes Oecolampadius, the reformer of Basel in the 1520s, “doth allow the Eucharist to be called the sacrament of the altar.”²³⁴ Even in discussing the Church of England’s relationship to the Reformed tradition, Heylyn and others went back to an agreed upon classical and formative period, the sixteenth century. All of these historical citations and references serve a purpose, however. They are meant to establish that it is “lawfull now, under the Reformation to call the Holy Table by the name of Altar.” Moreover, Heylyn writes, it is licit “to use an altar also in ministration.”²³⁵

The third of Heylyn’s texts for examination is his 1637 *Brief and Moderate Answer*, a text written in response to the challenges posed by Henry Burton, a Puritan clergyman who claimed to have been forced into non-conformity by the polarizing practices of the Laudian episcopate. In his preaching in the 1630s, he went so far as to tie

²³² Ibid., 41.

²³³ Ibid., 89-90. See 130 for a discussion of the Marian martyrs and the phrase, “sacrament of the altar.”

²³⁴ Ibid., 110, 131. See also 116-117.

²³⁵ Ibid., 130.

all bishops to Roman tyranny. A collaborator with William Prynne on the tract *A Divine Tragedy*, Burton appeared with the barrister and John Bastwick before the Star Chamber on 14 June 1637 where the trio was punished for sedition and libel. Heylyn's tract piles on, denouncing Burton for his attack on the Laudian leadership with a "stilo novo," that is, his calling them innovators.²³⁶ As one might expect, Heylyn's work functioned within a decidedly historical discourse. Once more he asserted that some liturgical changes in fact aided in consistency, however paradoxical that might seem. As Elizabeth left power to her successors to maintain decency, Charles needed to make some adjustments so that the Church of England could keep up its distinctive ethos.²³⁷ Heylyn again made the familiar claims about the Laudian movement being consonant with the Tudor church's legacy, and that all dissidents are cut from the same cloth. This is the same de-historicizing strategy found in other texts, the tactic of blurring together all conformists on the one hand and, on the other, dissidents across time, place, and ideological position. While he argued that the bishops since the middle sixteenth century have not violated any law, Heylyn pressed that all critics of the church are of the same ilk. Calvinist episcopalians, moderate Puritans, presbyterians, anabaptists, and lunatics like Hackett and Coppinger are all pushed together. Heylyn argues that Burton's works are consistent with that of past dissidents, though perhaps more aggressive. Burton, Heylyn writes, would likely condemn "all marr-prelates" as "poore spirited fellows."²³⁸ This Laudian polemicist also drew Calvin into this devilish cadre.

You are I see of Calvins mind... that it was unadvisedly done, to give kings such authority in spiritual matters. But sir I hope you may afford the king that, which you take yourselves, or which your brethren at the least have tooke before you: who in Queene Elizabeths time had their classical meetings without leave or

²³⁶ Peter Heylyn, *Brief and Moderate Answer to the seditious and scandalous Challenge of H. Burton* (London, 1637), 9; ODNB: Henry Burton.

²³⁷ Heylyn, *Brief and Moderate Answer*, 35.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 89, 95.

license, and there in did ordeine new rites, new canons, and new forms of service.²³⁹

The negative strategy was certainly at work in this piece, as Heylyn banded together critics of varying stripes in the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline church. Dismissing Burton's claim that he and others had been oppressed, the Laudian polemicist sarcastically writes:

such innocent people, as yourselfe, that runne point-blanck against the orders of the church, cannot be censured and proceeded with in a legall way; but instantly you cry out, a persecution. But thus did your Fore-Fathers in Queene Elizabeths time: et nil mirum est si patrizent filii.²⁴⁰

Not only did Heylyn not take seriously Burton's self-pitying claims, diagnosing the preacher with a persecution complex, he writes that it should not surprise us, as Burton's predecessors did the same thing in the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. In short, little had changed – *Semper Eadem*.

Peter Heylyn's three texts written in 1636 and 1637, along with Pocklington's *Altare Christianum* arguably represent the apogee of the Laudian movement and its push for a new, ceremonialist piety. The year 1637 – described in different circles as *annus mirabilis* and *annus terribilis* – has often been considered the high-point of “the beauty of holiness” agenda. The St. Gregory's Case had been wrapped up and Laud was at the zenith of his influence as primate, privy counselor, and chancellor of Oxford. Nevertheless, the Laudians still had work to do, particularly given their hope for actual canonical change, not simply the *de facto* change they had to defend via the literature here examined. In the waning years of the Personal Rule there were still more texts being published to justify east-end altars and the expansion of ceremonies. As one might imagine, these texts operated by citing historical precedents, offering interpretations of

²³⁹ Ibid., 35.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 115.

long-revered rubrics, and drafting iconic figures – conformists and dissidents – into rhetorical and ideological service.

The 1638 text *De Templis* by “R.T.” is a winding discussion of how churches should be best ordered, and the author (to this day anonymous) critiques the sloth that seems to interminably creep into the English church. What is particularly interesting in this piece is the way “R.T.” is able to challenge some of the basic patterns established in the sixteenth century while operating within a decidedly conformist arena. Focusing on the material context of devotion, the author at one point attempts to take the sting out of the iconoclastic entry in the Book of Homilies, “Against Peril of Idolatry and Superfluous Decking of Churches.” In doing so, he actually raises a critique of an element directly mandated by Elizabeth’s regime.

Those who whilst they seem to adorne Churches, doe vilely deface them with painting Lions, Unicorns, etc. in such uncivill and unseemly sort, that chast and modet eyes, dare scarcely looke on them: mehaps the Homily that speakes against outrageous decking of Churches meanes this.²⁴¹

In addition to insinuating that the homily is unclear and up for interpretation, “R.T.” seems to be castigating the royal arms! Like her brother Edward, Elizabeth mandated the exchange of the traditional rood loft arrangement of crucifix, Mary, and John for the royal arms with its lion and unicorn. Why, though, would a Laudian highlight (somewhat obliquely) this image as troublesome? The royal arms had stood just above the rood screen in churches for several generations. I would like to suggest that this was a jab at Reformed Christians who permitted no figurative art in churches save for magisterial arms. This was generally the case throughout the Reformed world. Huguenot Temples in France, for instance, were constructed without images with the notable exception of

²⁴¹ R. T., *De Templis: A Treatise of Temples* (London, 1638), 202. The homily in question is from the second Book of Homilies (1571).

the magistrate's arms.²⁴² Thus the critique of the visual arts could be turned around and thrown against iconoclasts themselves, using, in fact, the very homily that Reformed Christians in England cited to attack devotional images. That "R.T." describes lions and unicorns – symbols from the arms of the civil magistrate – as *uncivil* should be particularly striking. Another possibility could be that "R.T." was simply criticizing the mid-Tudor exchange of the rood tableau for the royal arms. Whether he was challenging iconoclasts, mid-Tudor policies, or both, it is clear that "R.T." was trying to neutralize a weapon used and used often by old style conformists like Peter Smart to decry Laudian innovation.

Other texts by Laudian authors at the close of the 1630s made similar pitches for more decorous worship and a piety informed by images, and like "R.T.," Heylyn, and others, they argued from historical precedents. The Cambridgeshire curate John Swan, in one of his published sermons, lambasted those who, in their haste to purify the church, neglect to study the past. In this text, a sermon preached the preceding September at the archdeacon's visitation, Swan seems to contend that every ill in the church can be cured by looking back to the formative sixteenth century.

From the ignorance of Antiquitie proceeds that needless suspicion of a Popish Reformation. Whereas on the contrarie, if things be well lookt into, the worst of Vipers (after all their digging and delving into their Mothers bowels) may find enough to confesse their follies.²⁴³

²⁴² William Dyrness, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1-15; Raymond Mentzer, "The Reformed Churches of France and the Visual Arts," in P. Corby Finney, ed., *Seeing beyond the Word: Visual Arts and the Calvinist Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 199-230; Carlos M. N. Eire, *War against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 54-165, 195-233; Lee Palmer Wandel, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), passim; Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, "Introduction: the dimensions of sacred space in Reformation Europe," in Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, eds., *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1-16.

²⁴³ John Swan, *A Sermon Pointing out the Chief Causes and Cures of such unruly stirres as are not seldom found in the Church of God* (London, 1639), 15; ODNB: John Swan.

If only they would read history, Swan lamented, critics of the Caroline Church of England would know full well that the Laudian program was consistent with the Tudor church of blessed memory. In his 1639 *Profanomastix*, Swan supplements his rhetoric with references to “the incomparable Hooker” as well as Elizabeth’s injunctions.²⁴⁴

In the final year of the 1630s, the Norwich Cathedral prebend Foulke Robartes published a text whose argument and circumstance quite neatly draws this chapter to its conclusion. Although Robartes had been a prebend since 1616, it was not until Matthew Wren’s arrival as bishop that he endorsed the Laudian program. When he did, however, Robartes became a phenomenally clear-eyed zealot for the cause, fully supporting Wren’s efforts to erect altars and rails. When the bishop was translated to Ely three years later, Robartes pleaded for him to stay on at Norwich to continue their project.²⁴⁵ The prebend knew that much had been accomplished, but much was left to be done. The Laudian overhaul was not finished. In this context Robartes published his *God’s Holy House and Service*. While the author engages the long dead Cartwright in typical polemical fashion, and reminds his readers that Henry VIII did not totally condemn all feasts of the church, he also makes a telling concession. He admits that things in the Caroline Church of England are changing. Nevertheless, these changes are being implemented to retain the best principles of the English reformation that seem to have suffered neglect in recent decades²⁴⁶. We might call this strategy the Abbott Thesis, and it is one discussed in detail later in this dissertation. In short, James’ long-lived archbishop of Canterbury George Abbott let slip all the gains made by his truly conformist predecessors Richard Bancroft and John Whitgift. While this argument is far more explicit in other pieces (particularly

²⁴⁴ John Swan, *Profanomastix* (London, 1639), 48, 52-53.

²⁴⁵ ODNB: Foulke Robartes.

²⁴⁶ Foulke Robartes, *Gods holy house and service, according to the primitive and most Christian forme thereof, described by Foulke Robarts, Batchelor of Divinity, and prebendary of Norvvich*. (London, 1639), 22-23, 33-34, 39.

texts examined in chapter 3), it is subtly at work in Robartes' piece. The Norwich prebend argued that while there was no obvious canonical requirement to call the communion table an altar, it was consistent with the best practices of the English church established in the sixteenth century. He made the same argument about bowing to the table.²⁴⁷ In this way, Robartes, like so many other Laudian apologists, wrapped his agenda in historical terms, making "the beauty of holiness" seem consistent with the legacy of the Tudor church.

The Junior Laudian Clergy and Strategies of Historical Rhetoric

The discourse of legitimacy in the seventeenth century dealt in historical citations. This was of course not limited to Laudian authors. Peter Smart and a number of figures discussed in chapter 1 clearly saw themselves as the rightful heirs of the Elizabethan church. Though the Cambridge Hebraist Joseph Mede was no Laudian, he was willing to lend his support to the movement publicly, and he did so by appealing to the past. In his 1638 piece *Churches, That is Appropriate Places for Christian Worship*, Mede moved century by century to ascertain the right ordering of "*domus dei*."²⁴⁸ Laudian authors played on the field that was already established, one that was certainly in place by the 1620s. Their read, however, was unique among conformists in that their conclusions about the face of the English church were markedly different from those of old-style conformists.

A summary of Laudian historical strategies will be helpful here. First there is the persistent issue of the Church of England's relationship to the Reformed churches of Europe. Some Laudian authors presented the English church as unique among its sister churches, even awarding it an exemplary status. In this way the Church of England was

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 86.

²⁴⁸ Joseph Mede, *Churches, That is Appropriate Places for Christian Worship* (London, 1638), 54.

the best Reformed church, the church that got it right. Anyone who critiqued the Laudian establishment was revealing that he opposed the best of the Reformed tradition. This also allowed avant-garde conformists to lay claim to the legacy of Calvin and other foreign divines. Ironically, some Laudians were trying to “out-Reform” their opponents. Other authors, however, disconnected England from the Reformed, arguing that the Church of England, at its founding, was a third manifestation of magisterial Protestantism in addition to the Reformed and the Lutherans. This strategy often entailed blackening the name of Calvin, usually portraying the Genevan reformer and others like his successor Theodore Beza as busy-bodies intent of infecting other nations with their foreign ideas.

Another strategy was to offer an interpretation of the rubrics, canons, and injunctions. These recognized laws were set down in the sixteenth century and marked the perimeters of belief and devotion in the English church. The Laudians simply argued that these directives had been misread by many. For example, perhaps the call for Decalogue boards over the table meant that the altar should be set along the eastern wall. Some Laudians refused to dodge the criticisms of old-style conformists like Peter Smart whose work turned on citations of the rubrics. Such avant-garde conformists insisted that the prayer book rubrics were theirs and these authors thus provided an interpretation of the directives that not only allowed for an east-end altar, but demanded one. In short, Peter Smart was not the only one could cite the laws crafted in the golden age of the English church.

The third strategy and perhaps the most common was the use of iconic figures from England’s Tudor past to achieve legitimacy in historical terms. These champions of the Reformation, some of whom gave their lives in the reign of Mary, could provide the Laudians with legitimacy and the aura of old-fashioned conservatism. This strategy, however, could manifest in a few different ways. In the most basic way, a Laudian author might simply make reference to the efforts of John Jewel or John Whitgift with the implication that such figures were doing the same thing in their day that William Laud

and Richard Neile were doing in the 1630s. A more complicated approach was necessary if an old-style conformist interlocutor, John Williams for instance, produced a detailed examination of the writings of one of these iconic figures. In Williams' case, this was Jewel. A Laudian polemicist then had to respond with an interpretation of the same works to prove his opponent wrong or he could neutralize the arguments by isolating the references as an aberration or 'hiccup' in the Reformation, and certainly not the iron-clad gospel of the Church of England.

The third manifestation of this strategy is the parallel use of positive and negative analogues. While references to honored figures from England's recent past lent currency to the Laudian movement, avant-garde conformist authors also aligned their opponents with dissidents perceived as villainous. The name Thomas Cartwright or "T.C." appears all over Laudian literature. Though dead since 1603, this presbyterian was alive and well in Laudian imagination. As argued above, what makes this phenomenon most interesting is that these iconic figures, both the "good" and the "bad," were in reality quite distinct. Each was, more or less, his own man. In a sweeping manner, however, Laudian polemic polarized the landscape from c.1550 to c.1640, effectively eliminating the whole notion of historical change and ignoring the possibility (and indeed reality) of individual opinion. Cranmer, Parker, Jewel, Whitgift, Hooker, Bancroft, and the Laudian bishops faced off against Hooper, Sampson, Humphrey, Field and Wilcox, Cartwright, "Martin Marprelate," Hackett and Coppinger, the Millenary Petitioners, the New England Separatists, Prynne, and of course Peter Smart in an epic struggle. What is lost here is that these men, on both sides, hardly represented two "parties." The goal, though, was to brand opponents, regardless of their particular concerns, as dissidents, radical schismatics no different from their forebears in the Elizabethan church.

The fourth discernable strategy, and one related to the third, is the appropriation of Elizabeth herself. The queen of blessed memory was alive and well in the minds of seventeenth century women and men. Winning her approval could be a major coup, as

Elizabeth was widely perceived as the godly monarch who uprooted papist superstition, established peace and national integrity, and settled the Church of England after years of religious confusion. The Laudian goal in this climate was to link Charles with Elizabeth, portraying the regimes as coterminous. If one challenged Charles, he was also challenging Elizabeth. If one criticized the patterns of Charles' chapel royal, one was challenging the arrangements of Elizabeth's. On a more complicated level, Laudian authors made a commentary on the power structures of the church established in the sixteenth century. In general they wanted to reduce lay influence, for instance the role of Parliament or the power of lay wardens. Clerical authority, usually articulated in sacerdotal language, was at issue, and Elizabeth was presented as affirming that authority. Later in this dissertation we will find Peter Heylyn in his Restoration texts arguing that, in the sixteenth century, the crown confirmed the theological and practical decisions of the clergy gathered in convocation. Parliament's role in the Reformation was drastically reduced on this read. It seems clear that the ground work for this interpretation was laid in the Personal Rule, a period which witnessed Laudian authors justifying their agenda via historical appeal. In the end, all of these approaches and rhetorical strategies were aimed at blurring distinctions between the near-hallowed reign of Elizabeth Tudor and that of Charles Stuart. Nothing, the Laudians argued, had changed. Conformists were conformists and dissidents were dissidents. *Semper Eadem.*

CHAPTER 3

ARTICLES, SPEECHES, AND FALLEN BISHOPS:
THE ARGUMENTS FROM THE HIGHER CLERGY
IN THE 1630s AND 1640s

On trial for treason in the early 1640s, Archbishop William Laud argued “I kept strictly to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England established by law.”²⁴⁹ Countering accusation after accusation that he was an innovator, a traitor to the religion rightly established in the sixteenth century, Laud maintained that he was a conservative defender of the Church of England and indeed of the legacy of Elizabeth Tudor. In the early 1640s, the archbishop was following a pattern, a strategy employed by both the junior clergy (as discussed in the preceding chapter) and the bishops themselves. Anthony Milton has argued that it was the junior Laudian clergy who were on the front lines of apologia, that it was polemicists like Peter Heylyn and John Pocklington who were out producing critical defenses – sometimes comprehensive, sometime not – for the Laudian program. In this chapter I will analyze what the higher clergy, specifically Laud and the bishops, did to justify their actions. I will argue that it was not left to the junior clergy alone to produce apologia. In fact, not only did the higher clergy make an argument, they made the same argument as the junior clergy. Both higher clergy and junior made the claim that the Laudian agenda was consistent with earlier, Elizabethan church practice. One can even argue that this reading of the recent past was one of the few consistent elements of Laudian polemical literature across the board. How has this been missed? In simple terms, historians have operated with a narrow definition of apology / polemic, sometimes missing that arguments and defensive strategies could be articulated through a variety of media. The difference between the junior clergy and the senior was effectively the way they pitched what was effectively the same argument

²⁴⁹ LW, IV, 407.

about the legitimacy of the movement. While the junior clergy engaged in direct essays, the bishops made the same claims in a more indirect fashion. In addition to the archbishop's well-known published speech against Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick in their 1637 Star Chamber trial and his own trial defense in the 1640s, the Laudian bishops spoke principally through their articles and in their actions. Despite Milton's argument that it was left to the junior clergy to do the dirty work, not only did the bishops make a defense, they made the same defense as the junior clergy. They did this through articles, injunctions, and the normative claims built into episcopal orders.²⁵⁰ This chapter, which covers the bishops' arguments (both indirect and direct), will also transition from the 1630s – the Laudian high tide – to the civil, political, and religious collapse of the 1640s. Thus I will examine what the higher clergy had to say during the high tide and how those same churchmen reacted to a more serious demand to answer for their “innovations” in the 1640s, a time when the junior Laudian clergy were reported to Parliament for delinquency, had their mouths shut, and their resources clipped.

Vox Episcopi: Articles, Injunctions, and Elizabethan Precedents

In the 1630s and '40s, the bishops did not totally rely on the junior clergy for defenses of the Laudian program. When one widens the scope of what can be considered apologia, it becomes clear that the higher clergy were also pitching an argument – and, as it turns out, it was the same argument that the junior clergy were offering. The bishops spoke through their episcopal orders, their articles, their injunctions, and their commands to their deputies and visitors. Their focused directives contained a clear vision of how the Church of England ought to be rightly ordered and, more importantly, *how it had always been rightly ordered*. Some background is necessary here to properly understand how

²⁵⁰ Milton, “The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach,” 162-184. See discussions of this approach in the Introduction and chapter 2 of this dissertation. I would like to thank Professor Milton for discussing his arguments with me and appreciating my contention.

such directives functioned and how they were a subtle vehicle for the bishops to voice apologetic claims. Visitation articles were questions put to wardens to ascertain whether parish life was up to code. Every ordinary (bishops and the other higher clergy who had jurisdiction) was free to make his own set of questions, or he had the option of using an older set. For the most part, the Jacobean ordinaries drew on the 141 canons passed by the 1604 southern convocation (i.e. Canterbury province as opposed to York province). As Kenneth Fincham and Roland Usher have noted, the 1604 canons were principally the work of Archbishop Richard Bancroft.²⁵¹ They were mostly reprisals of Elizabethan injunctions and canons, but they also provided a fair number of changes. It is important to recognize that canons are provincial and national codes, not simply diocesan orders. Visitation articles, however, are another matter. Ultimately – and this is the case for the Laudian bishops – visitation articles were the creation of their authors and not simply the 1604 canons in question form. Some authors were more sensitive to providing the basis for their questions, that is, they worked into their articles why a given question itself was being posed. The most obvious example, and one that will be examined below, is a set produced by Peter Heylyn in 1640, a collection that could be used nationally (so it was hoped) to at last establish that much-wanted Laudian uniformity from Cornwall to Durham. In fulsome language, Heylyn cited preceding orders and injunctions to indicate that the demands were far from innovative, but were instead conservative and therefore innocuous. But before Heylyn produced his 1640 articles, Laudian ordinaries were at work in their own sets.

Bishop John Overall's 1619 articles for Norwich diocese stand out among Jacobean sets. Perhaps the less studied of the two grandfathers of Laudianism (the other being Lancelot Andrewes), Overall stepped outside the standard patterns of the established church in his emphasis on ceremonial devotion. But he moved in ways that

²⁵¹ Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, Vol. I, xvi.

did not draw excessive attention.²⁵² Composed just after the Synod of Dort's conclusion, Overall's subtle articles provided the emerging English Anti-Calvinist movement with a format for liturgical change. This set was often repeated by later ordinaries who shared Overall's vision for the Church of England. It should be noted, however, that while many ritualists did adopt his 1619 articles for their jurisdictions, a good number – including Laud himself – did not. Overall's set had a discernible influence on the articles used and developed by Samuel Harsnett, Richard Corbet, John Howson, Richard Montagu, Augustine Lindsell (one of Smart's opponents at Durham who made it onto the episcopal bench), and Matthew Wren. Fincham observes that while it is true that the Calvinist Bishop John Davenant used Overall's format, in this case it was probably because Overall's articles were so clear and accessible. At any rate, Davenant suppressed the heavy emphasis on ritual. What does one make, though, of those Laudian ordinaries who opted not to use the 1619 Overall set? Fincham explains that although Archbishop Laud used his predecessor George Abbott's articles, he made some significant changes. The best example here is the article on the communion table. Where Abbott asked if the table was set in the "chancell or church [i.e. the nave]," Laud simply asked if it was in the "chancell."²⁵³ In short, while the use of Overall's articles does signal the *likelihood* of avant-garde activity, the presence or absence of the 1619 set is not a universal gauge for membership in the movement: while Davenant (who did use the Overall set) deemphasized the latent ritualism of Overall's articles, Laud (who did not use the set) was able to modify Abbott's decidedly less ritualistic articles instead.

William Laud was not the only avant-garde conformist ordinary to use more conventional articles instead of John Overall's 1619 set. Richard Neile at York, Walter

²⁵² Anthony Milton, "Anglicanism by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall," in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006), 159-176.

²⁵³ Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, Vol. I, xx, xxi.

Curle at Winchester, and William Juxon at London used older, less conspicuous sets in the 1630s. This brings us, though perhaps not obviously, to the persistent question of legitimacy. When flesh and sinew are attached to the articles used by Laud and others – when we see the actual practice and the subtle alterations – it becomes clear that these Laudian bishops were intentionally using older language to appear conventional and familiar. There was a reason why bishops like Neile used older, less suspicious sets. They did this to veil their purpose and to seem less innovative. While Bishop Matthew Wren used a conspicuously novel set of visitation articles, and thus encountered challenge after challenge for his aggressive campaign in Norwich diocese, Laud, Neile, Curle, and Juxon veiled their rigorous campaigns by couching their demands in conventional language and conventional articles. When one reads Laud's articles, for instance, they appear somewhat old-fashioned. However, if one scans the same material along with the archbishop's orders to his vicar-general, the questions take on that needed flesh and sinew. If one reads the same articles with this lens, the curtain is drawn back and the severity of Laudian designs is exposed.²⁵⁴

Kenneth Fincham has observed that articles could be more than practical questions. With built-in justifications, they often could be outlets – platforms, even – for defending the practices they enjoin.²⁵⁵ The earliest example of an ordinary mandating a railed, east-end altar was in 1630 in the archdeaconry of Derby in the diocese of Peterborough. The archdeacon, Samuel Clerke, laid the ground for Bishop Francis Dee who in his 1634 primary visitation of the same diocese required the new arrangement. These efforts were going to need justification. That came, however, with the deputies who issued the articles. Charges or other special directions that accompanied sets of articles (like the directions Laud gave his vicar-general) bring the same material to life.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., Vol. II, xix.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., Vol. I, xxiii.

Episcopal deputies who actually carried out visitations in the Stuart church were to highlight the important elements in a given set. When one gives a set of articles a bare, dry reading (then or today), such elements may not be obvious. Bishop Robert Skinner, for instance, provided a lengthy charge to the clergy of Bristol diocese at his first (or primary) visitation of 1637. Dr. Arthur Duck, the bishop of London's chancellor in the middle 1630s, and Sir Nathaniel Brent, the vicar general of Canterbury, gave diocesan and metropolitan instructions encouraging a firm attitude to the erection of rails.²⁵⁶ Laud's memorandum to Brent indicates that the vicar general was to take parish wardens and others aside and stress that churches are to be treated with reverence.²⁵⁷

Clearly, some Laudian ordinaries were sensitive to the novel nature of their agenda and moved therefore with caution. Fincham has noted that the majority of articles in the 1630s reference a set of royal instructions Charles issued back in 1629, and that the articles often highlight within the royal instructions the king's declaration against controversial preaching.²⁵⁸ At the very least, it is clear that a good number of ordinaries perceived a need to back up potentially conspicuous questions with references to legitimate and usually historical sources. In early 1634, William Piers, bishop of Bath and Wells even prepared a concise list of seven reasons why the communion table should be set against the east wall, and, not surprisingly, it begins with an appeal to history. Dated March 9, the manuscript starts by stating bluntly, "It was ordered in Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions that the communion table should stand where the altar did." From there Piers noted that there should be a difference between the arrangement of the Lord's Table and "the placing of a mans table in his house," that it is not good for the people to sit above the table or the priest "when he consecrateth," and that if the table is

²⁵⁶ Bodl., Rawlinson MS D 158, fol. 46v; Cressy, "The Battle of the Altars," 193.

²⁵⁷ TNA: PRO SP 16/260/90. See also TNA: PRO SP 16/474/90 for a copy of injunctions copied by Sir John Lambe.

²⁵⁸ Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, Vol. II, xviii.

not against the east wall and railed in, it will be subject to egregious profanation (e.g. school boys sitting on it, dogs defiling it, and workmen driving nails into it). Rounding out his these arguments, Piers added that the table is “fairer” in this position and that more communicants can approach it, that the priest can be seen and heard better from this position, and finally that, as “daughters should be like their mothers,” parish churches should match the practice of the cathedrals.²⁵⁹

Richard Neile, who with his prebends had made major alterations at Durham in the late 1620s, was translated to Winchester and then to York in the 1630s. It is evident that the bishop was concerned to present his work through an Elizabethan lens. In 1629 Neile made a list of “observations” on Elizabeth’s 1559 Injunctions. At the outset of the manuscript he makes the assertion that some reformist elements were necessary in the mid-sixteenth century, but these are not really needed any more as superstition has been quelled. This, as we have seen, was a standard Laudian trope for reintroducing ceremonial elements. Commenting on Injunction 23 from 1559, Neile wrote “the taking away and abolishing [of] things superstitious was very necessary at the reformation in 1 Elizabeth, though not so now; because now (God be thanked) all such superstitious and idolatrous trash is well abolished out of [the] church.” Regarding Injunction 47, an order for parishes to report their possession of “vestments, coapes, ornaments, plate, books, grayles, coucsiers [sic], legends, processions,” and any other trappings of Catholic devotion, the bishop simply said this measure was no longer needed. Considering Injunction 55, the prescription for the communion table, Neile compared this injunction with Canon 82. His assessment was that Charles should make “some declaration to take away the scruple which some nowadays make of the placing of the Communion

²⁵⁹ LPL MS 943, 475-476.

Table.”²⁶⁰ Neile was working diligently to present his movement – one supported by Charles, one cannot forget – as consistent with an Elizabethan paradigm. This took work.

Although there was variation, the efforts of Neile, Laud, and other ordinaries were similar; they shared a number of patterns of thought, particularly their historical rhetoric. I would like to suggest that it was their application that differed. Matthew Wren stands out as one of the more aggressive Laudian ordinaries and, as observed above, he drew freely from John Overall’s 1619 set of visitation articles. Though arguably the most incautious Laudian bishop (so much so that the Long Parliament actually considered banishing him to the American colonies), even Wren adopted some seemingly conservative language to accomplish his goals. Matthew Wren was consecrated bishop and then translated twice in the space of five years: therefore he made three primary visitations in short order (Hereford, Norwich, and Ely). At his first see, Wren used a set left to him by his predecessor, Augustine Lindsell. Then he devised new sets for Norwich and Ely. But in all three instances Overall’s 1619 pattern was insulated with familiar and ostensibly inoffensive material, some of which dated back to 1570. The Bodleian Library at Oxford possesses a printed copy of Wren’s 1636 Articles for Norwich with the bishop’s own annotations.²⁶¹ Here one gets a real sense of Wren’s litigious, even neurotic need to buttress his work by reference to older directives, orders that could be recognized as legitimate and inoffensive.

On the first folio page of his 1636 articles, just under an oath to be given to the wardens, Wren made a table of 22 ordinaries and orders made by the same. These appear later in the text, in the margins, as initials. Wren went question by question noting that other ordinaries had already laid a foundation for his efforts. The marginal notes are also peppered with references to Elizabethan canons and prayer book rubrics. Of the

²⁶⁰ Bodl., Rawlinson MS A 127, fols. 127, 69r-73v, specifically 69r, 71r-v, 73r.

²⁶¹ Bodl., Tanner MS 68, fols. 68-72.

episcopal and metropolitan orders, the oldest material he employed was “M. C.” standing for Archbishop Matthew Parker’s 1567 Advertisements. His list of sources then included two sets from the 1570s, three from the 1580s, four from the first decade of the seventeenth century, two from the 1610s, and then six from the 1630s. A variety of ordinaries are present in the list, ranging from the old-style conformist George Abbott to the ritualist Lancelot Andrewes. Save for Edmund Grindal’s short stint as primate, all archbishops of Canterbury from Parker to Laud are present. In the margin by the critical article about the communion table’s position, specifically whether it is to stand at the east terminus of the chancel with its ends north and south, Wren noted Parker’s Advertisements, but no other materials. Clearly Wren was hunting about, trying to find as many legal sources as he could to wrap his efforts with historic precedents. Is it possible that this marginal material was conveyed to Wren’s deputies in the Norwich visitation to ensure that they could quickly assure parish wardens that these questions were completely legitimate? These marginal notes were made carefully and it took some time to gather sources and mark up this printed text. Considering the effort involved, it is somewhat difficult to believe that Wren made these notes simply for his own personal reference.

Wren’s annotated articles, like Piers’ list of reasons for the east-end altar and Neile’s reflections on the 1559 Elizabethan Injunctions, reflect a persistent need to couch their new vision of devotion, polity, and weekly parish life in old-fashioned, even conservative terms. Sometimes even these ordinaries wrestled with how to move forward in the 1630s, and there is at least one instance of disagreement over the legitimacy of new ceremonial patterns among the Laudian bishops themselves. When Wren was translated to Ely, Richard Montagu succeeded him at Norwich. Reporting to Laud in 1638, Montague described the diocese as he found it. The bishop puzzled over the practice of rail reception, that is (as he relayed it) that successive groups of communicants knelt at the rail until all had received. Montagu felt that this procedure was “troublesome” as

there was no canon or law for it: “I know of no law, articles, advertisements, canons, injunctions that require it. He related, however, that he would work for peace in the diocese as best he could.”²⁶² Seeing this report, Wren responded that there was no cause for concern. Regarding rail reception, the bishop argued that “the service book enjoins it by requiring all to draw near.” What is more, Wren continued, is that “the king himself does it [i.e. receive at the rail], and his whole household in effect.”²⁶³ A disagreement like this – among avant-garde conformist bishops no less – highlights the struggle to legitimate Laudian designs, and how that struggle in the 1630s was usually played out in historical terms. Laud himself reported to Charles at Christmas 1636 that, though a number of ministers were requiring rail reception, there really was no canon for it. The archbishop suggested that “the people will be best won by the decency of the thing itself.” Charles wrote in the margin, “try your way for some time.”²⁶⁴ Two years later, in January 1639, Laud again reported to the king on the issue of rail reception and this time specifically discussed the practice in Norwich diocese. He noted though, “upon my knowledge, it [i.e. rail reception] hath been long used in St. Giles his church without Criplegate, London, with marvelous decency and ease, and yet in that parish there are not so few as 2,000 communicants, more than within any in the Norwich diocese.”²⁶⁵ Historic precedent – what had slipped into recognized custom – was always a factor.

Though 1637 is usually considered the high-water mark for Laudianism, their great opportunity came in 1640 when a chance to change the canons opened before them. Peter Heylyn, as described above, was instrumental in designing the enigmatic canons of 1640 and he was, likewise, the principal author of a set of articles uniquely written for the

²⁶² LPL MS 943, fols. 625-630, specifically 625, 627.

²⁶³ TNA: PRO SP 16/406/99.

²⁶⁴ LPL MS 943, fol. 270.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 290.

whole nation. Although Charles dissolved the Short Parliament on 5 May 1640 after only three weeks in session, he ordered Laud to keep the clergy convocation open. Convocation, the clerical legislative body, was traditionally called with Parliament and, likewise, was traditionally dissolved with Parliament. The two bodies thus met concurrently. Charles' and Laud's violation of procedure did not go unnoticed in the fall when Parliament returned. In the spring, however, the dominant Laudian voices wanted new canons to confirm the legitimacy of their liturgical policies. Responding to this need, the convocation produced seventeen canons: the gathered clergy confirmed the eastern position of the table preserved from profanation by a rail, reaffirmed the royal supremacy, and devised the infamous *et cetera* oath. This latter item, by asserting the government of the church by "archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc," appeared to open the door to any Laudian innovation imaginable. That summer worried Protestants anxiously wondered if this ambiguous "etc" could include the pope himself. All clergy and university graduates were to swear the new oath by November 2. The clergy, moreover, were ordered to promote the new canons once a quarter from their pulpits.²⁶⁶ With canons in place, the natural next step for an ordinary would be to devise articles in tune with the new canons. Peter Heylyn got to work producing just such a set. Though he was not an ordinary himself, he had an intimate hand in producing the 1640 canons and was therefore well suited to the task of developing a generic set for the whole nation. On the heels of the spring convocation, Heylyn's questions were intended to foster uniform practice across all dioceses in both provinces. The Laudians, it should be remembered, prized *uniform* worship as much as they prized *ceremonious* worship. Obviously this set calls for a number of items strikingly different from established patterns. Yet the most interesting aspect is the repeated invocation of a broad array of

²⁶⁶ "The Canons of 1640," in Gerald Bray, ed., *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998), 553-578. See also Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 851-857; Fincham, "The Restoration of Altars in the 1630s," 919-940.

sources, including the 1559 Elizabethan Injunctions. Heylyn's questions mention the Uniformity Act, the 1563 Articles of Religion, the prayer book's rubrics, Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, Archbishop Parker's advertisements together with the canons of 1571, 1604, and (most controversially) the recent canons of 1640.²⁶⁷

Among Heylyn's novel articles one finds questions about churchings near the communion table with the newly delivered mother veiled, about the need for confirmation preceding admission to communion, about reception of communion by churching women and newlyweds, about the use of confession, about standing at various parts of the liturgy, and, as one might guess, whether there was a rail around the communion table. The length of Heylyn's set can be explained by the author's need to include sources. He knew well enough – particularly after the convocation of 1640 – that these questions needed to be draped with historical precedents. Not only did he draw on canons made between 1571 and 1640, the prayer book's rubrics, and Charles' 1629 royal instructions to preachers, Heylyn invoked Elizabeth's injunctions, those directions that provided for the table to be set altar-wise. More important is the framing strategy itself. Heylyn was, one should remember, not an ordinary; he wrote these questions, in short, to be helpful. Someone who actually had jurisdiction would need to pick the ball up from there. The only ordinary who had a chance to do so before the Long Parliament began that fall was William Juxon, bishop of London. He implemented Heylyn's articles just months before the House of Commons declaring them illegal. Juxon (with Heylyn's help one might say) made a number of claims about the normative confessional trends in the established church through these articles. One section unabashedly brings Elizabeth Tudor into service. The articles ask about the communion table: "have you in the chancell of your church or chappell a decent and convenient table for the celebration of the holy communion?" One immediately observes that the table is now to be in the

²⁶⁷ Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, Vol. II, xviii.

“chancel,” not in the “chancell or church [i.e. the nave].” An historical and therefore respectable framework is built into the question. Juxon continued: “Is it [i.e. the table] as is directed in the Queenes injunctions, and appointed by the canon made in the synod held at London, anno 1640?”²⁶⁸ This is a subtle yet striking claim. The controversial canons of 1640 – specifically the most controversial canon in fact, the one about establishing a railed altar – are here elided with Elizabeth’s 1559 Injunctions. Elizabeth’s currency and the power of her legacy were appropriated here to validate the novel altar policy. This seamless presentation masks the fact that Elizabeth’s Injunctions *do not* call for a railed altar while Canon 7 of 1640 explicitly does establish such an arrangement.

This is not the only instance of historical claims in the Juxon / Heylyn set. An earlier question in the same set asks “if chancels remane as they have done in times past.” Juxon and Heylyn front-loaded an historical claim: are your chancels the same as always? Then, to make sure that the wardens or sidemen of a given parish are clear and make no mistakes, the same sentence defines what is meant by “as they have done in times past.” Juxon and Heylyn spell it out: “that is to say, in the convenient situation of the seates, and in the ascent and steps unto the place appointed anciently for the standing of the holy table?”²⁶⁹ The question asks if patterns are the same *as they have always been* and then takes the trouble to tell the wardens what exactly always has been: an elevated altar set in its ancient position. Juxon and Heylyn were establishing a new pattern but framing their orders in such a way as to appear old-fashioned, even *ancient*. Considering Juxon’s built-in arguments about England’s past, David Cressy writes “history was once again deployed to legitimate as traditional a practice that would otherwise appear to be

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 225.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

innovation.”²⁷⁰ The bishop was making an apologetic claim, justifying the Laudian program for east-end altars.

Two qualifications are necessary to round out this chapter’s sub-section on the way the higher clergy made arguments for the Laudian program. While the bishops often did speak through their directives, the higher clergy did not always build into their articles historical claims or, for that matter, justifications of any sort. Laud’s injunctions to parochial clergy during his metropolitical visitation (1634-7), for which we have only four records from four dioceses, have rather naked demands for east-end altars. The first, for Lincoln diocese, does not mention the east-end position, but the June 1635 injunctions for Gloucester, the injunctions given at Chichester the following month, and the March 1637 set for London all call for a railed altar at the “upper end.” These short records give no historical justification or precedent. The injunctions for Gloucester and Chichester merely indicate that the rail is to prevent “annoyance” (Gloucester) and to “keepe of dogs, and to free it from all other pollutions” (Chichester).²⁷¹ Laud’s silence, however, and the silence of others in writing more economic articles should not prevent us from recognizing that such orders were often avenues for the ordinaries to supply justifications, specifically apologia founded on historical claims.

My second qualification is that the Laudian higher clergy could at times speak directly about their agenda. While, as I have argued here, their apologetics are found principally in their articles and injunctions, the bishops could make cogent and open justifications for their program. Moreover, these justifications are, as we might expect, historically oriented. An example is *A Treatise of the Authority of the Church* (1637) by Henry Leslie, bishop of Down and Connor in Ireland. Leslie stressed that the established Articles of Religion affirm the church’s power to decree rites and ceremonies (Articles 20

²⁷⁰ Cressy, “The Battle of the Altars,” 198.

²⁷¹ Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, Vol. II, 106-9.

and 34). Not surprisingly, he adds that these articles were set forth “in the days of Queene Elizabeth.” Worried about foreign influence, the bishop reminds his readers that they should take caution not to be like disobedient Bishop Hooper who, back in the days of Edward VI, rejected the lawful ceremonies of the church. That reign, Leslie adds, was surfeited with greedy courtiers who pushed foreign ideas “hoping by that meanes to prey upon Bishoprickes and Cathedral Churches, as they had done before upon the Abbeyes.” In Leslie’s text one finds a trope often employed in Catholic rhetoric, that is, that advanced Protestants, first under Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell and then under Edward VI, were infected with rapacious greed, and that the top clergy in those years were virulently disobedient even to their Protestant masters. Hooper and other radicals, the Irish bishop continues, were too ready to listen to the advice of Bucer, Vermigli, and Calvin.²⁷² They therefore betrayed their native Reformation. The Elizabethan clergy knew better, Leslie continued: they did not object to using chalices and surplices, even those used in the days of Queen Mary. “When the abuse thereof is removed,” he wrote, such elements can be rightly used. The bishop was arguing the *abusus non tollit usum* principle common to almost all Laudian apologists: abuse does not take away use; ornaments and ceremonies abused by Catholics can be rightly used by good Protestants without compunction. After all, he writes, “take away one gesture upon that ground, that it hath beene used in Idol-worship; then take away all.”²⁷³ Having been advanced by Charles’ Lord Deputy in Ireland, Thomas Wentworth, Leslie strategically claimed that the Laudian vision of the church was consistent with the Elizabethan church. This was his justification: the Laudian program was not innovative because the elements in question had historical precedents. Not surprisingly, Leslie’s direct arguments were consistent with the indirect arguments made many of his episcopal colleagues, not to

²⁷² Henry Leslie, *A Treatise of Authority of the Church* (Dublin, 1637), 7, 77, 103.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 137, 147.

mention the arguments made by the junior clergy. In sum, while the higher clergy principally spoke through their articles, they were not above making direct apologia.

William Laud's Direct Apologia before the Long Parliament

A consistent feature of Laudian apologetics – whether one considers direct arguments or indirect arguments, arguments made by the junior clergy, the higher clergy, or Laud himself – is their particular read of the Tudor past. While the junior clergy made such claims through pamphlets and the higher clergy mainly through injunctions, William Laud himself made a number of direct apologetic claims in the 1620s and 1630s that should be considered closely. Before his rise to Canterbury on the death of Archbishop George Abbot in 1633, the energetic Laud had worked diligently to alter the devotional life of the Church of England wherever he had influence, and he regularly made the argument that his changes were consistent with Elizabethan patterns. Arguably, Laud seems to have been convinced that he had the support of the Church of England's history and normative confessional identity. Therefore, to flesh out his use of history in his direct apologia and how this shaped his approach to church life, one has to step back beyond the year 1633. At Oxford, Laud served as president of St. John's College for over a decade (1611-1622), building up the college's financial base, expanding the library collection and establishing the post of librarian, and building additional quarters for the growing number of fellows.²⁷⁴ Obviously, his alterations in the college chapel attract the eyes of historians. He painted the ceiling, built a new organ loft, and installed stained

²⁷⁴ W. H. Hutton, *S. John Baptist College* (London: Robinson, 1898), 95-104; Paul Morgan, "Donations of Manuscripts to St. John's College, Oxford, during the Presidency of William Laud, 1611-21," *Studies in the Book Trade* 13 (1937), 71-90. Laud continued as a benefactor in later years also, his most obvious contribution being the Canterbury Quadrangle, an architectural achievement complete with statues of Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria along with the archbishop's arms prominently displayed at every opportunity. As chancellor of Oxford, Laud was instrumental in establishing a chair in Arabic and acquiring books in that language for the university. At his trial, the archbishop neutralized the argument that he was a secret Catholic on the grounds that a missal was found in his library by noting the presence of a Qur'an in the same library but there was no accusation of his being a secret Muslim. A project on Arabic and Islamic studies in early modern England – a timely subject – awaits its researcher.

glass windows recounting the life of John the Baptist, the college's namesake.²⁷⁵ The president, it appears, never saw such changes as innovative. During these years also Laud began his life at court: King James, thanks to the influence of Richard Neile, made him a royal chaplain. The deanery of Gloucester fell to Laud in late 1616, a post he held in addition to his place at St. John's, visiting the cathedral usually once every six months.²⁷⁶ It is no surprise to find that the first two measures he proposed to the chapter concerned the repair of the cathedral's fabric and the removal of the communion table to the east end. Keeping with his litigious and ceremonious character, the new dean ordered that the cathedral clergy resume reading morning prayers at five o'clock, a custom that had slipped into abeyance years earlier.²⁷⁷ A few years later he was awarded a prebendal stall at Westminster Abbey, another advancement thanks to Neile. Preferment, however, came slowly. According Bishop John Williams' chaplain, John Hacket, King James felt Laud was too contentious to promote.²⁷⁸ He did at last rise to the episcopate in Charles' reign – only it was St. David's in west Wales. Consecrated on 17 November 1621 by the bishops of London, Worcester, Chichester, Landaff, and Oxford, Laud at last resigned his post at St. John's College. William Juxon, Laud's perpetual successor, followed him as president.²⁷⁹

In the last years of James' reign, Laud became a client of the enigmatic royal favorite, George Villiers, duke of Buckingham. This relationship afforded Laud the

²⁷⁵ LW, III, 136; J. F. Fuggles, "A History of the Library of St. John's College, Oxford," (Oxford, B.Litt. Thesis, 1975), 106.

²⁷⁶ LW, III, 135; Charles Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 22-23. Neile was also able to pick up the archdeaconry of Huntingdon for Laud.

²⁷⁷ LW, VI, 240; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 25.

²⁷⁸ John Hacket, *Scrinia reserata: a Memorial offered to the great Deservings of John Williams, D.D.* (London, 1693), 64. It is difficult, though, to accept Hacket's assessment without some qualification, considering the antipathy between Laud and Williams.

²⁷⁹ LW, III, 136-137.

chance to serve as an apologist for the Church of England, a role, according to Timothy Watkins, that advanced the whole Arminian movement at court. Positioned in the right place and at the right time, Laud found himself in a formal controversy with John Percy, a Jesuit missionary to England who had established contacts with Buckingham's mother. Distressing the regime, she had made a public conversion to Catholicism in early 1622. Born in County Durham and trained at the English College in Rome, Percy (alias "Mr. Fisher, the Jesuit") returned to England in 1596 and became fairly successful both in converting a number of Peers and getting his apologetic tracts published. Targeting the aristocratic classes, "Fisher" rehashed arguments made famous by Robert Bellarmine, especially the "pedigree" challenge (i.e., "where was your church before Luther?"). In the early 1620s, James was negotiating the Spanish Match and trying his best to keep his Protestant population satisfied that such Catholic political entanglements did not threaten their true faith or the established Church of England. On the one hand the king could not crack down on Catholics, lest he botch the Match. On the other, he could not allow this rash of aristocratic conversions to get out of hand, lest he give credence to the Protestant perception that, with the Spanish Match, a dark wave of popery was coming to overtake England. James and Buckingham orchestrated a three day conference with Fisher, the news of which could be carefully finessed for public consumption. Held May 24-26, 1622, Fisher debated successively with Francis White, then dean of Carlisle, James himself, and then, on the last day, with William Laud, then bishop of St. Davids'. In 1624 White and Laud published their arguments, but the latter passed off his work as the writing of his chaplain Robert Baillie. In the next decade Laud owned his arguments and, in 1639, published an expanded account of the debate titled *Relation of a Conference between William Laud and Fisher the Jesuit*.²⁸⁰

²⁸⁰ Timothy Wadkins, "The Percy-"Fisher" Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622-1625," *Church History* 57 (1988), 153-169.

Although the bishop was fairly uncreative in these debates, he used an array of patristic sources, ecclesiastical history, and arguments developed in earlier years by Andrewes, Bancroft, and even John Jewel.²⁸¹ Those arguments were to be expected, much like Fisher's use of arguments employed earlier by Bellarmine. What is interesting, however, is Laud's appeal to the established church's moment of reformation and his presentation of that moment in history. Within the conference with Fisher, Laud proffered a particular reading of the sixteenth century, one that provided space for more ceremony at the expense of preaching and caste instances of iconoclasm as the result of foreign interference. Obviously, one of the principal issues in the debate was the nature of the English reformation and whether the Church of England was a legitimate church. Laud needed to refute Catholic claims and affirm the break with Rome. At the same time, however, he did not want to affirm the zealous iconoclasm of Edward's reign. Thus he needed to construct an account of the sixteenth century distinct from the well-worn Foxian narrative, one that could make the work of, say, Lancelot Andrewes or Richard Neile appear fairly mundane and innocuous. To do this he first needed to establish the correct roles in the process of right reformation. "In the Reformation," Laud argued, "our princes had their parts, and the clergy theirs; and to these two principally the power and direction for reformation belongs." The crown, he continued, called the clergy together and permitted them to reform the church. The bishops and clergy in convocation thus did their job in turn. In other words, the actual work of determining the shape of the church's life and thought would be in clerical hands.²⁸²

Strikingly, Laud then argued that "reformation, especially in cases of religion, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many pretensions, that it is almost impossible but the reformers should step too far, or fall too short." If the reformers went too far in their

²⁸¹ LW, II, passim, III, 138-148.

²⁸² Ibid., II, 172.

zealous drive to eradicate superstition, “that is the crime of the reformers, not of the reformation.” In other words, England’s break with Rome was affirmed in his narrative, but Laud still left room for himself to qualify some of the reformers’ evangelical activities. He could then define certain decisions as either excessive or only necessary for those times when minds were still locked in superstition. With the hard work of reformation done and minds sobered in the seventeenth century, those time-sensitive actions could be reversed. Ceremony, figurative art, and reverent gestures could now find affirmation. This was vital for Laud’s apologia. He needed to refute Catholic claims without condoning, for instance, Nicholas Ridley’s purge of London in Edward’s reign. Perhaps a purge was needed *at that moment*, Laud argued. At the same time, however, he argued that perhaps Ridley and others went too far. If that were the case, then certain zealous reformers were acting on their own and not according to the principles of England’s reformation. What can be easily missed in this narrative is that Laud himself is the one deciding which elements were normative to the reformation and which were merely individual reformers going too far.

By framing the mid-sixteenth century in this way, Laud was able to make a concurrent argument central to his vision of the established church. While he hammered the legitimacy of the reformation, he also needed to explain why his east-end altars looked new. He used what we might call the “Abbot thesis,” although in his 1639 *Conference with Fisher* it is very subtle. Laud’s predecessor, George Abbot, so the narrative runs, had a long tenure at Canterbury and was lax in pressing conformity. His indifference to the cherished principles of the established church bolstered the Puritans. This explains why Laudian practices *appeared* innovative. The thesis runs that Abbot allowed things to get out of hand, while Laud, Neile, and others pushed old-fashioned conformist aims. Abbot’s term at Canterbury was an interlude, so the thesis goes, and this view can historically justify Laudian practices while explaining why they *seem* novel. Interestingly, generations of historians up into the twentieth century took the

Abbot thesis for granted. In recent decades scholars have come to recognize the Jacobean episcopate as much more diverse and not divided simply between proto-Laudians and lazy time-servers. Kenneth Fincham, in particular, has exposed the polemical nature of this well-worn thesis.²⁸³ In Laud's arguments with Fisher the Jesuit, the Abbot thesis hides just under the surface at one point. Practices deemed acceptable in the formal reformation of the church are not being fully observed, Laud argued. English women and men are now "afraid to testify their duty to God, even in His own house, by any outward gesture at all." The bishop argued that he could locate the source of the problem and it was not in the reformation itself. "Those very ceremonies which, by the judgment of godly and learned men, have now long continued in the practice of this church" are now (i.e. after Abbot's long tenure) rarely seen for fear of popish superstition. The implication is that, by the 1620s and '30s, the established church's leaders had skirked the hard work of upholding the principles of the English reformation.²⁸⁴ The bishop of St. David's wanted to change that.

Laud's star was on the rise in the late 1620s. He attended Charles at his coronation and ran through appointments to the sees of Bath and Wells and London, the deanery of the Chapel Royal, and the chancellor's post at Oxford all by 1630.²⁸⁵ On 4 August 1633 Laud wrote in his diary "news came to Court of the Lord Archbishop of Cant.'s death; and the King resolved presently to give it to me."²⁸⁶ His tenure at Canterbury was laced with invocations of historical, particularly Tudor precedents.

²⁸³ Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I," in K. Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 23-49; Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1990), passim.

²⁸⁴ LW, II, 312.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 176-182, 193, 194, 196, 208, 211.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 218-219. He next recorded that he was secretly offered a cardinal's hat on not one, but two occasions. In the journal Laud wrote that he rejected the offer and judiciously reported the incidents to Charles.

Clearly Laud felt or at the very least wished to appear as one upholding the Church of England's normative identity as worked out in the sixteenth century – history was never far from the new archbishop's mind. Laud's study at Lambeth was evidently cluttered with papers on the Elizabethan church: he was concerned to understand his forebears' work and the church that was shaped in that reign through articles, injunctions, and episcopal orders. Moreover, the notes he made on the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity reveal a careful reflection on the nature of the establishment's ethos and the constitution of prayer book worship. "Without some ceremonies," Laud wrote in 1635, "'tis not possible to keep any order or quiet discipline."²⁸⁷ Not only was he concerned with the character of the late Tudor church, the archbishop inherited a commitment to national uniformity from his Elizabethan predecessors, men like John Whitgift. Peter Lake is right to argue that many Laudian principles were not unfamiliar in the 1630s. Yet this conservative fog should not blind us to the reality of real change in those years.

A copy of the Book of Common Prayer produced in 1638 currently held by the Lambeth Palace Library affords a unique window onto Laud's fashioning of a legitimating past.²⁸⁸ Highly annotated, the prayer book reflects that its owner, the archbishop, was wrestling with the issue of the Scots liturgy in the last years of the so-called Personal Rule. The marginalia throughout evinces an avant-garde conformist interpretation of the established liturgy with a particular eye to the reception of the new prayer book in Charles' northern kingdom. This printing of the Book of Common Prayer was fitted with additional pages for such notes, space for the owner to expand on the exhortations, the collects, and the rubrics. The most exciting element of this prayer book, however, is not the marginalia, but the 154 pages that precede the actual printed liturgy.

²⁸⁷ TNA: PRO SP 16/308/38; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 144, 328.

²⁸⁸ LPL MS 731. I would like to thank both Professor Anthony Milton and Professor John Hintermaier for discussing this text with me. Milton was kind enough to share his examination of the hands in the document.

In these pages, someone – possibly Laud himself – wrote an entire history of the English church since the reformation. With the hand-written title “A brief survey of the tymes and manner of reformation in religion of the churches of England and Scotland. And of the Liturgie, Rites, Ceremonies, and Discipline therein used or controverted. And how far the present agrees with the former,” this manuscript history presents the English reformation as a movement consonant with the Laudian agenda. One has to admit, though, that it is not nearly as aggressive as later Laudian histories, texts discussed in a later chapter in this dissertation. Nevertheless, the image is of a national Protestant Church independent of both the Church of Rome and the Reformed on the continent. In 1709, the high-church clergyman William Nichols published his *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer* and he included a printed transcription of the manuscript history. Nichols understood the piece to have been by Laud and, in his 1711 *A Supplement to the Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, argued that both the marginalia and the preface / history have the same “exactitude” as the rest of Laud’s writings.²⁸⁹

When one does a paleographic examination of the manuscript, though, it is doubtful that Laud himself wrote the preface / history. Regardless of its author, Laud kept this history close at hand. Its recurring themes, particularly its plodding, static vision of a church facing opponents from all sides, are foundational for Laudian polemic. The author presents the 1530s, ‘40s, and ‘50s, as a period of formation but not of final establishment. That came, so the narrative goes, in the reign of Elizabeth when things were settled. One has to observe, as noted before, that this history is not as critical of Reformed Protestants as later Laudian works would be (notably pieces by Heylyn). Calvin himself is presented as “learned” and “godly.” Nevertheless, a sweeping list of Puritan “exceptions” taken against the church’s polity and liturgy are outlined and

²⁸⁹ William Nicholls, *A Supplement to the Commentary on the Book of Common-Prayer* (London, 1711), iii; Idem, *The Book of Common-Prayer, And Administration of the Sacraments* (London, 1709).

“answered.” The telling conclusion of this history is Laud’s Star Chamber speech against Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick. This was a moment when the whole enterprise of the English Reformation (from the Laudian vantage at least) was extolled and vindicated.²⁹⁰

The preface / history in Laud’s prayer book reflects years of re-envisioning the Elizabethan church and how things ought to be in the Caroline. In other words, Laud did not dream up this vision in the later years of the Personal Rule. We might argue that this preface was the codification of historical arguments that had been used separately for years. Earlier in the same decade, November 1636, Laud informed the vice chancellor of Oxford that Latin should be used in the college chapels – in sermons and in prayers – as that was the intent of Elizabeth in providing the *Liber Precum Publicarum* of 1560. The archbishop noted, however, that “in the universities such prayers, unto which none but they which were learned did resort, should be in Latin.” These services were compatible with that *sine qua non* of all protestant movements, that all participants in worship should understand the language in use, because all members of the university community were in fact Latinate. Here Laud understood his efforts to mirror those of his Elizabethan predecessors. Moreover, in this letter to the vice chancellor, he discussed his scouring of statutes and canons to ensure that his decision had a precedent.²⁹¹ Laud presented his vision wrapped in historical claims – this was apologia in action.

It is difficult to deny that the new archbishop proceeded cautiously. Charles had discussed with him a thorough revival of the Elizabethan royal injunctions back in 1629 and Laud, then bishop of London, actually had some reservations. He preferred to have

²⁹⁰ LPL MS 731, fol. 35, 65-86, 134.

²⁹¹ LW, V, 156-158. For the Latin version of the Elizabethan prayer book, see William Keating Clay, ed., *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847), 299-434. See also LW, IV, 221.

judges review the various points.²⁹² Some, not all, of Elizabeth's injunctions had been picked up by James and made canonical in 1604 and, given this mixed evaluation, Laud was hesitant to consider the 1559 Injunctions fully binding on a national level. Many of these Elizabethan policies had made their way into individual episcopal visitation articles, including Laud's own articles for the diocese of London in 1628.²⁹³ Of the Elizabethan principles he chose to invoke, the virtue of good order topped the archbishop's list. As Whitgift in 1583 had argued "*Nomen ecclesiae nomen unitatis et pacis*," so Laud in 1628 preached "he that divides the unity of the church practises against the unity of the spirit."²⁹⁴ Laud's aligning himself with Whitgift was repeated by Peter Heylyn in his 1668 biography of the dead archbishop. Both Laud and Whitgift, moreover, identified themselves personally with the third century bishop Cyprian of Carthage. The Caroline archbishop understood his struggles in light of the struggles faced by his Tudor predecessor and, to complete the picture, in the context of imminently "orthodox" bishops like Cyprian.²⁹⁵ This rhetoric was designed to couch the archbishop's goals in such a way that they appeared conservative, traditional, and old-fashioned.

Laud proceeded in exactly the same way at the trial of William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton. In 1637, this Puritan trio – a lawyer who had already had his ears cropped for his acidly critical writing, a clergyman who preached sermons declared seditious, and a physician who also had the penchant for publishing bitter

²⁹² LW, VII, 33-34. Charles likewise discussed with Wren and Juxon the character of the Elizabethan Chapel Royal, the model he wanted to use for his own chapel. S. Wren, ed., *Parentalia: or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens* (London, 1750), 89.

²⁹³ LW, V, 405. See also LW, V, 381-554. See also Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 26-27.

²⁹⁴ LW, I, 163; "Sermon on the Queen's Accession Day," in John Ayre, ed., *The Works of John Whitgift*, D.D. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853) Vol. III, 595. See also Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1990), 180-181, 191-192. Whitgift was quoting Augustine.

²⁹⁵ Peter Heylyn, *Aërius Redivivus; or The History of the Presbyterians* (London, 1670), 275-276; BL MS Sloane 1008, Fol. 266.

pamphlets – had run afoul of the archbishop, and he was able to get their trial into the Star Chamber. In March, the three were tried together for texts published the previous year: Bastwick's *Apologeticus, Newes from Ipswich* which was likely written by Prynne, and *A Divine Tragedy*, a collaborative effort by Prynne and Burton. Though some fifteen other names were mentioned in the bill for their various degrees of involvement, it appears that only the three ringleaders were actually brought to trial. By June these three men were declared guilty of seditious libel, fined, and sentenced to the pillory.²⁹⁶ In addition to losing what was left of his ears and his Oxford degree, Prynne was branded on his face with the letters "S" and "L" (seditious libel). He famously translated these initials as "stigmata Laudis." It seems that Prynne had a reason for claiming he had the "sign of Laud." Although the archbishop recused himself from voting on the sentence, Laud did offer the court his "hearty thanks" for the verdict and, at their censure in the Star Chamber on June 14, delivered a speech.²⁹⁷

Within a month the text of Laud's speech went to press with a dedication to King Charles. The archbishop defended fourteen "innovations" that had been laid at his feet, half of which came from *Newes from Ipswich*. He responded to the accusation that he had ordered fasts without sermons, that he ordered these sermon-less fasts to be held on Wednesdays specifically to prevent regular mid-week lectures, that he had abolished prayers for seasonable weather at the fasts, that he left out a collect, that he omitted a key theological passage in the fast-book that stated that fasts do not gain a person merit with God, that he omitted prayers for Elizabeth of Bohemia (Charles' sister and wife of the Winter King Frederick), that he had changed the collect for the royal family, that he had toyed with the prepositions relating to bowing (i.e. "at" or "in" the name of Jesus), that he had altered the prayers for November 5 commemorations, that he had omitted prayers for

²⁹⁶ ODNB: John Bastwick.

²⁹⁷ William Prynne, *Histriomastix* (London, 1633); LW, VI, 47; William Lamont, *Marginal Prynne 1600-1669* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 11-48.

the navy in the fast-book, that he ordered the ante-communion liturgy read at the table not at the prayer desk, that he had ordered all tables set altar-wise, and that he had forged a change in the twentieth of the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion. His argument was, as we might expect, that these instances were not innovations at all, and he built a case on citations from historical precedents.

At the center of his Star Chamber speech was the new altar policy. The archbishop exclaimed that the altar was “the greatest place of God’s residence on Earth... yea, greater than the pulpit.” Not only was the table central physically, it was central theologically. At the trial, Laud maintained that on the altar “’tis *Hoc est corpus meum*, ‘This is My body;’ but in the pulpit ‘tis at most but *Hoc est verbum meum*, ‘This is my word.’ And a greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the body than to the word of our Lord.”²⁹⁸ In the competition for primacy, then, between the word rightly preached and the sacraments rightly administered, the latter had clearly won for William Laud. The foundation for his beliefs about right practice aired in the Star Chamber speech, however, was his interpretation of Tudor history. At the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, Laud justified his agenda by arguing that it was consistent with the ethos of the Elizabethan church. From the publication of his speech to the end of his life, Laud maintained that interpretation. Years later in the Tower, he wrote with bitterness that in Elizabeth’s reign John “Penry was hanged and [John] Udal condemned and died in prison for less than is contained in Mr. Burton’s book, as will be evident to any man who compares their writings together.” Laud castigated the trio as Brownists, radicals set on destroying what he and men like Whitgift and Bancroft had built up. In his mind, not only were the three outside of the church established by the queen “of famous memory,”

²⁹⁸ William Laud, *A Speech delivered in the Starr-Chamber* (1637) in LW, VI, 57. For recent discussions of this incident and the published texts relating to it, see Towers, *Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 217-218; Randy Roberston, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 66-69.

they evaded the discipline her just laws would have prescribed.²⁹⁹ In short, if one had a good memory, the neo-Brownists Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick got off relatively easy; and Laud was no more severe in his campaign for orthodoxy than Whitgift had been in his. We have seen this negative strategy before in the work of the junior clergy who wrote apologies for the movement. It was not enough for a given Laudian to match himself with an earlier conformist like Whitgift. He also wanted to cast his opponent as the heir of earlier dissidents, some fairly radical. Forget the serious differences between Prynne and, say, the Brownists – they both challenged the good order of the established church and were tarred, therefore, with the same brush. Prynne himself provides a fascinating example of a man who shifted positions but, strikingly like Laud, always felt the urge to base his decisions on historical precedent. Making a case somewhat like that of Peter Smart, the lawyer contrasted Laud with Whitgift whose status as exemplar was recognized by both moderate episcopalians and Laudians. William Lamont explains that, as Laud pitched his historical claims, Prynne did likewise.³⁰⁰

“I have done nothing,” the archbishop argued at the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, but work “with a single heart, and with a sincere intention for the good government and honour of the Church, and the maintenance of the orthodox truth and religion of Christ, professed, established, and maintained in this Church of England.” Laud situated his program – the program the three had maligned – within the “orthodox” stream of the established church. He claimed his critics attacked him “for my care of the Church, the reducing of it into order, the uplifting of the external worship of God in it, and the settling of it to the rules of its first reformation.” What loyal English Protestant could argue with such goals when framed in this light? According to Laud, the real innovators were the three men under sentence, the three opponents of England’s “first

²⁹⁹ LW, III, 391.

³⁰⁰ ODNB: William Prynne. Prynne shifted between episcopalian and presbyterian camps, never totally comfortable in either.

reformation.” These three were “the chief innovators of the Christian world,” who “having nothing to say, accuse us of innovation.” The archbishop carefully reviewed the arguments leveled against him in order to systematically prove that there was no “show of cause to fear a change of religion.” According to Laud, his program for the church was in no way novel, and he was anxious to prove as much.³⁰¹

When accused of omitting a prayer for the monarch’s children in *News from Ipswich*, the archbishop responded that the prayer itself was an innovation: “this collect could not be very old, for it had no being in the Common Prayer-book all Queen Elizabeth’s time, she having no issue.” *News from Ipswich* also highlighted the difference between the pronouns “in” and “at” in relation to a hotly contested gesture. The rubrics had ordered worshippers to bow “in” the name of Jesus; it was now revised to read “at” his name. Changing this language constituted an over-turning of the “Act of Parliament,” the pamphlet insisted. Tilting back, Laud pointed out that this English pronoun was changed in the Authorized Version of the Bible and in orders left by Elizabeth.

...this I find in the Queen’s Injunctions, without either word ‘in’ or ‘at’ ‘whensoever the name Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise pronounced in the church,’ tis enjoined, ‘that due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowliness of courtesy...’ So here is necessity laid upon it, and custom for it, and both expressed by authority in the very beginning of the Reformation, and is therefore no innovation now.

Likewise, when Burton pointed out changes in the prayers for the anniversary of the gunpowder plot, Laud worked into his response that Elizabeth had altered the litany developed by her predecessors: she omitted the petition to be spared from “the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome.”

Burton also accused Laud of changing worship patterns with “the reading of the second service at the communion-table, or the altar.” In the early modern Church of

³⁰¹ LW, VI, 42, 46.

England, the minister read the office of Morning Prayer at the prayer desk. It was followed by the “second service” or ante-communion (the portion of the Lord’s Supper up to the offertory). The Laudian clergy had the habit of physically moving from the desk to the communion table for the “second service.” Laud responded to Burton’s accusation with sarcasm.

With this [practice] the Rubrics of the Common Prayer-book agree; for the first Rubric after the Communion tells us, that upon holidays, though there be no communion, yet all else that’s appointed at the Communion shall be read. Shall be read? That’s true; but where? Why, the last Rubric before the Communion tells us, ‘that the priest, standing at the north side of the holy table, shall say the Lord’s prayer, with that which follows.’ So that not only the Communion, but the prayers which accompany the Communion (which are commonly called the Second Service), are to be read at the communion-table. Therefore, if this be an innovation, ‘tis made by the Rubric, not by the prelates.³⁰²

The archbishop turned the accusation around: Laud and the clergy were not the innovators; the problem was instead with those who objected to the bishops’ enforcing the rubrics. Not above striking a rather smug tone, Laud used the allegation about reverencing the communion table to spout that hall-mark hyperbolic line so often connected with this prelate: “But this is the misery, ‘tis more superstitious now-a-days for any man to come with more reverence into a church, than a tinker and his bitch come into an alehouse.”³⁰³ In his fulmination, Laud argued that the table was to be revered because on it one could find the body and blood of Christ.

After making this argument, he shifted, as usual, into citing precedents. Well aware that the rituals used by the Order of the Garter included bowing to the table, the archbishop argued: “Idolatry it is not to worship God towards His holy table; for if it had been idolatry, I presume Queen Elizabeth and King James would not have practised it,

³⁰² LW, VI, 50, 51-53, 55. Canon 55 of 1604 provided for the prayers for James’ family. See Bray, ed., *Anglican Canons*, 343.

³⁰³ The archbishop was later taken to task for this comment at his trial. See TNA: PRO SP 16/499/72.

no, not in those solemnities.”³⁰⁴ Laud even drafted into service John Jewel, the bishop of Salisbury who in the 1560s contended with Catholics about the legitimacy of the English church.

Jewel “approves all, both the kneeling and the bowing, and the standing up at the Gospel (which as ancient as it is in the Church, and a common custom, is yet fondly made another of their innovations;) and further, the Bishop adds, ‘that they are all commendable gestures, and tokens of devotion, so long as the people understand what they mean, and apply them unto God.’”³⁰⁵

Again, one witnesses Laud citing precedents and employing the axiom *abusus non tollit usum*. Invoking Jewel, the author of *Apologia pro ecclesia Anglicana* (1562), Laud extolled the use of medieval customs as long as the common people understood that these are to bring about piety and not give credence to superstition. He made a similar claim at the 1632 censure of Henry Sherfield. The defendant, the recorder of Salisbury, had taken it upon himself to smash a stained glass window in St. Edmund’s, Salisbury. Kindling iconoclastic ire, the offending window had depicted God as an old man creating the world and the vestry decided to have it removed on the grounds that it was idolatrous. However, John Davenant, bishop of Salisbury, was not convinced and ordered that the window remain untouched. Not willing to compromise with idols, Sherfield did what had to be done with zeal. Brought before Star Chamber in February 1633 by Davenant’s chancellor (as the bishop himself was reluctant to exercise discipline in the matter), the recorder was fined £500, imprisoned, and ordered to replace the window and apologize to Davenant.³⁰⁶ At the Sherfield censure Laud declared in full Protestant vigor that the Catholic distinction between *dulia* (the honor paid to the saints, their relics, and perhaps also images) and *latria* (the honor paid to God alone) is absurd. No, Laud was not going to use the papist argument. At the same time, though, Laud was far from pushing out all

³⁰⁴ LW, VI, 57.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 58.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 13-21; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 78.

those things *abused* by the papists simply because those things in question had been abused. “Yet this I say, there is a great deal of difference between an image and an idol; but then, if men give worship to them as to the other, it is unlawful.” Invoking the “Injunctions in the Queen’s time,” Laud continued:

And touching the matter in question, I do not think it is lawful to make a picture of God the Father; but ‘tis lawful to make the picture of Christ, and Christ is called the express image of His Father. I don’t mean to say that the picture of Christ as God the Son can be made; for the deity cannot be portrayed or pictured, though the humanity may.

Although one might argue that Laud was playing fast and loose, this statement appears consistent with that Calvinist axiom *finitum non est capax infiniti*, the finite (an image) cannot contain the infinite (God). But as Christ had indeed been a man in space and time, Laud argued, an image of him could be made without committing idolatry.³⁰⁷

Not only did Laud weave his arguments in traditional language, he made the well-noted argument that even the Calvinist Bishop Davenant of Salisbury could accept an east-end communion table. Davenant had ordered the parish of Aldbourne to orient their table to the east, and the archbishop capitalized on this directive from a recognized Calvinist. Among the State Papers there is a revealing manuscript copy of the bishop’s letter to this Wiltshire parish dated May 17, 1637. The copyist interlaced the letter with material from Laud’s Star Chamber speech given the very next month (June 14). He seems to have gathered these two pieces together to tabulate information, and it is apparent that he was reading the archbishop’s published speech alongside. What is really interesting, though, are the elements he highlighted – Elizabethan precedents that appeared in both Davenant’s letter and Laud’s speech. Historians have noted that Laud cited Davenant; there is nothing new there. However, what has been missed is that Laud was not simply arguing that the Calvinist Davenant has tables this way. Rather, what he was saying was that even the Calvinist Davenant sees that the canons, rubrics,

³⁰⁷ LW, VI, 16-17; Eire, *War Against the Idols*, 1-7, 195-233.

injunctions, and legacy of the Elizabethan church call for an east-end altar. Ultimately, the reference really is not to Davenant, but rather through Davenant to the church of Elizabeth Tudor.³⁰⁸

Before and during his tenure as archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud argued that his vision for the church was consistent with long-approved Elizabethan principles. His use of the Abbott Thesis as early as his *Conference with Fisher the Jesuit* and his way of quarantining Edwardian evangelicalism in his presentation of the English reformation in the same text evinces Laud's concern for legitimacy in historical terms. In his diocesan articles and in his speech at the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, Laud couched his turning of communion tables, among other changes, in conservative language. Like the junior clergy, his arguments had a positive and negative side. As discussed above, not only did he frame his objectives in conservative and historical terms, he painted his opponents as the heirs of earlier dissidents. Whether it was Prynne, Sherfield, or the relatively faceless English women and men who slothfully came to church with no more reverence than "a tinker and his bitch," they were all unruly, dyspeptic, radicals. In short, Prynne and the others were no better than and, more importantly, no different from the radicals Whitgift had to put down. It was this interpretation of the present in light of the recent past that animated and, in Laud's mind, justified his agenda in the 1620s and '30s.

Historical Claims in the early 1640s

It goes without saying that the rise of the Long Parliament in late 1640 sounded the death-knell of the Laudian high tide.³⁰⁹ In the early years of the decade bishop after bishop found himself in jail, the rails they had built ripped out, their altars pulled down,

³⁰⁸ TNA: PRO SP 16/356/122.

³⁰⁹ A recent critical study of this restless period at the end of the Personal Rule is Cressy, *England on Edge*.

and the junior clergy branded as “delinquents” and ejected from their livings across the country. All of this did not, however, bring Laudian voices to heel. They continued to make a case for their vision of the Church of England and it was still predicated on a distinct reading of the English reformation itself, a phenomenon they located in the second and third quarters of the sixteenth century. In their trials before a largely hostile Parliament, bishops like Laud and Wren defended their program with allusions to the past. They made the same resoundingly conservative claims about duty and the same staunch appeals to legitimacy that had generally worked for them in the 1630s. While the substance of their claims may have been innovative, the tone of their rhetoric is always conservative.

Perhaps the most aggressive and incautious of Laudian ordinaries, Matthew Wren ended up spending the whole of the war years and the Interregnum in the Tower, only being released at the Restoration. The 1641 articles of impeachment against the bishop – indictments framed with references to established traditions – chide Wren for “unlawful innovation” and highlight, in addition, his heavy-handed enforcement of canons. As one might expect, these articles list Wren’s demand for raised, railed, east-end altars, his enforcing reception at the rail, his bowing and other “superstitious” gestures, and even his use of a crucifix on his episcopal seal. According to the indictment, Wren had claimed that he was merely observing “the duty of his place... the duty of a good and loyall subject.”³¹⁰ The bishop continued this conservative tactic when he found himself on trial. To start with, he claimed that most churches had already changed their table arrangements before he arrived as bishop. He conveniently follows this assertion with the argument that an east-end pattern was called for in Queen Elizabeth’s Injunctions and by “the Queens advertisements,” an interesting expression considering Archbishop Parker’s 1566 advertisements never won royal approval and always rested on his

³¹⁰ *Articles of Impeachment against Matthew Wren* (London, 1641), 10, 11.

authority as primate and metropolitan. This expression is doubly suspicious in that Wren then mention's Laud's metropolitical order to set up rails. That Parker's metropolitical advertisements are here called "the Queen's Advertisements" leads one to suspect that Laud's metropolitical rail order was to carry a similar weight, perhaps even the weight of the supreme governor's imprimatur. The 'buck' was passed from Wren to Parker and thus Elizabeth and, consequently, to Laud and thus Charles. This kind of rhetoric is continually marked by trump cards of legitimacy.³¹¹ If these invocations were insufficient, Wren provided an interpretation of the advertisements. While most Laudian arguments are simply variations on each other, this interpretation is, as far as I have found, unique. I have yet to see it elsewhere in my survey of Laudian literature. Wren observed that the 1559 Injunctions and Parker's Advertisements call for the table to be decently covered at the time of ministration and for placards of the Ten Commandments to be placed on the east wall over the table. Reading these orders together, the bishop reasoned that if the implication is for the table to stand against the east wall during ministration – only then would the 10 Commandments be over the table.³¹²

Regarding the construction of rails, Wren argued that Laud's vicar general made the order, and he was just following suit. Besides, he continued, rails prevent a number of profanations. Here Wren trotted out the familiar stories about naughty school boys using it as a writing board and the seemingly popular story of the dog who snatched the communion bread away on Christmas Day. To round this out, he insists again that a number of parishes already had rails, and he lists a few for good measure. Regarding his tally of the parish churches that had rails, Wren was drawing from information provided by both William Allanson and Edward Mapletoft. A letter from Allanson to Wren survives, and the former wrote that a number of churches years earlier were requiring rail

³¹¹ Bodl., Tanner MS 314, fols. 162v-163r.

³¹² Ibid., fol. 163r.

reception, including St. Martin's-in-the-fields, London. Therefore, Allanson argued, it is a wonder anyone should call the practice an innovation.³¹³

Responding to the charge that he ordered the second service read at the communion table, Wren made another unique argument. He appealed to the prayer book's directions in other services, specifically how it prescribes different parts of the church for different activities. Baptisms are to be at the font. Matrimony begins in the body of the church but ends at the Lord's Table. Burials begin at the church stile and proceed to the church yard. The churching of women is to be at the table. It is not much of a jump, then, for the priest to read the second service in a different place after reading Morning Prayer at the desk.³¹⁴ Wren was also accused of banning extemporary prayers in the pulpit. He responded that, as Edward and Elizabeth made injunctions for uniform worship, no minister should devise his own prayers. Wren handily invoked other exemplars from the sixteenth century: Latimer and Jewel, he continued, used the set prayers.

Wren also used the negative strategy so common in Laudian apologetics, that is, not only did he align his work with earlier conformists, he blackened his opponents by matching them with earlier dissidents. It was Thomas Cartwright, he argued, who advocated extemporary prayers, not the classical defenders of the established church.³¹⁵ This was not the only instance in Wren's arguments where the bishop employed the negative historical strategy. For that matter, it is not even the only instance where he brings up Cartwright. In an earlier set of responses to objections, Wren addressed the accusation that he spent a great deal of money reorienting seats. He has historical evidence that seats were in this position in the days of Elizabeth – the critiques of

³¹³ Ibid., fol. 110.

³¹⁴ Ibid., fol. 164v, 168v-169r. See also fol. 152r.

³¹⁵ Ibid., fols. 168v-169r. See also fol. 152r.

Cartwright. Not only is Wren here able to show that the church was as he wanted, he simultaneously aligns opponents of this paradigm with Thomas Cartwright. If we accept Wren's claims, the whole situation comes off as a can of worms opened by Wren's opponents in that they walked backwards into this characterization. It must have been effective, because Wren pulled out the same strategy again in a discussion of churching. The domino effect worked backwards: Wren wanted churchings at the table; his opponents decried this as novel; Wren pointed out that Cartwright said the same thing about the good old church of Elizabeth Tudor. This time he included counters by John Whitgift and Richard Hooker to complete the model of good conformists and noxious dissidents.³¹⁶ These were well-worn 'types' in the hands of apologists like Matthew Wren.

The bishop made a sweeping argument about the Church of England and its historical identity when, at his trial, he responded to the blanket charge that he had brought in many innovations. First, he writes, one needs to be clear about the location for appeal, that is, *when* exactly was the church rightly reformed. He reflected that if one makes a claim about the historic and therefore correct practice of the church, one needs to mark out the period against which the church is to be measured. Wren submitted that that classical period is

by one and all consent to be the blessed times of Reformation in the first and sixth of King Edward VI, but chiefly in 1 Elizabeth and the times there next ensuing, so that whatsoever shall appear to have been then in use in this church, (though perhaps it have been since in some part discontinued yet) the taking up of that again cannot properly be termed innovation, but is (at the utmost) a renovation, and hath no sin in it.

Wren says that some rites and rituals have been discarded recently that were not part of the Reformation's purge of superstition. Therefore these elements should be taken up again without offense. He further posited that "it is well known that soon after Queen

³¹⁶ Ibid., fol. 161r.

Elizabeth's death, the outward ceremonies and the practical part of God's worship began to grow into neglect." Charles and his bishops, Wren continued, picked up where Elizabeth and Whitgift left off. East-end altars, churchings at the table, and reverent gestures are in this vision old-fashioned elements of church life neglected since the death of the last Tudor sovereign. Wren argues, quite simply, that such elements cannot be called innovative. The bishop firmly rejected the accusation of "innovator" and he says he can, point by point, prove his conformity "either by the special rule of the rubrics and canons or by the general rule of devotion, decency, and uniformity guiding him in point of his discretion; unto which the preface in the Book of Common Prayer doth for many things refer us."³¹⁷ In one sense, Matthew Wren was not going to justify innovation – he instead simply denied that any such thing had occurred.

In the next year Wren joined the ranks of petitioners in favor of episcopacy and here one finds the jailed prelate changing strategy somewhat, but still throwing the accusation of change back on his opponents. "Although they have externally denied (all innovayions) [sic] (as they call them) in their common appellations: yet principally they have and do make daily more innovations themselves." What is interesting in this text is that Wren implicitly admits that he and others were making some alterations, but, he argued, unlike his opponents, his alterations "tended only to the honor and glory of God, the decency of the Church, and the credit of the King and Kingdome." Wren doubled back and argued that all he and the other Laudians wanted to do was "reduce" ceremonies "to their primitive practice."³¹⁸

While Wren petitioned Parliament from the Tower, the main event in the 1640s, as far as the Laudian episcopate was concerned, was the trial of the archbishop himself, a trial that dragged for years and ended with Laud's execution in January 1645. Opening

³¹⁷ Ibid., fol. 158r, 171v.

³¹⁸ Matthew Wren, *Bishop Wren's Petition to the Parliament in defence of Episcopacie* (London, 1642), A2, A4.

on November 3, the Long Parliament marks a critical turn in the reign of Charles I: tensions between factions reared up while the monarch lost control of the body. Petitions flooded Parliament calling for the abolition of episcopacy, root and branch. A cadre of political prisoners was released: Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick were in their number as was Peter Smart. It is not necessary here to recount in detail the outbreak of the first Civil War, a conflict which did not formally begin until the king raised his standard at Nottingham in 1642.³¹⁹ However, it was in this milieu – this moment of intense religious and civil unrest – that Parliament arrested Archbishop William Laud, charging him with treason. And it was at this moment that he argued that his program was in no way innovative.

By December 1640, the Commons had already arrested Laud's trusted ally, Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford and formerly Charles' absolutist Lord Deputy for Ireland. Strafford's execution came relatively swiftly compared to Laud's. On December 16 the lower house repealed the spring canons and a committee on religion was formed to discuss what to do with their presumed author, Laud. Denzil Holles clamored for the archbishop's impeachment; Harbottle Grimstone condemned him as the "panderer of the whore of Babylon"; John Pym, perhaps the most influential member of the Commons, moved for Laud's arrest. Holles was dispatched from the Commons to the House of Lords to take the archbishop into custody. In typical fashion, Laud bitterly wrote in his diary that no particular charge had been laid against him: all who opposed him were, in his mind, part of a radical fringe – the same old radical party that challenged Elizabeth and Whitgift. The archbishop was committed to James Maxwell, Black Rod

³¹⁹ See the Root and Branch Petition of December 1640 in Kenyon, ed., *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688*, 171-175; D'Ewes, *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, 101-102, 154-158; Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (New York: Longman, 2005), 244-358; Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns against Scotland, 1638-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), passim; Sharpe, 914-921; Conrad Russell, "Why did Charles I call the Long Parliament?" *History* 69 (1984), 375-383; David Cressy, "Revolutionary England, 1640-1642" *Past and Present* 181 (2003), 35-71.

and then allowed to gather his papers at Lambeth. His first cell was not the Tower, but Maxwell's house at Charring Cross.³²⁰

On 26 February 1641, Pym reported the committee's recommendations: Laud should be impeached on 14 counts. Sir Henry Vane handed the charges to the Lords and the archbishop was thus ordered to be taken from Black Rod's house to the Commons' bar. He heard the indictment, declared his innocence, and was handed back to Maxwell. On March 1 Laud was moved from Charring Cross to the Tower. That spring the Laudian program bottomed out: Charles formally rescinded their prized canons of 1640 while Parliament ordered the removal of altar rails, communion tables to be placed in the middle of the church, and the abolition of High Commission.³²¹ Laud had fallen and his movement did likewise. As the archbishop resigned his position as chancellor of Oxford, public opinion of episcopacy became rather mixed: Parliament got requests in the early 1640s to keep the office, some to abolish the office, and still others for the modification of the office as a compromise with the presbyterians. Although mobs prevented the bishops' participation in the Lords, it was not until 1646 – after the first civil war – that Parliament abolished the episcopate.

In more than one study, Judith Maltby has examined the petitions to Parliament regarding the episcopate. Her analysis is strong, although her characterization of “old style conformists” – non-Laudian episcopalians – distancing themselves from avant-garde conformists while affirming the prayer book and the office of bishop may miss the possibility that the petitioners (or at least some of them) were simply navigating hostile waters.³²² Could it be that such conformists had supported the Laudian program but,

³²⁰ D'Ewes, *The Journal of Simonds D'Ewes*, 185-186, 269-70; LW, III, 238-240; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 200-201.

³²¹ D'Ewes, *The Journal of Simonds D'Ewes*, 395-397; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 202.

³²² Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, passim; Idem, “Petitions for Episcopacy on the Eve of the Civil War 1641-1642,” 153-155. See also the Root and Branch Petition of December 1640 in Kenyon, ed., *The Stuart*

seeing the movement crashing on the rocks of the Long Parliament, opted to jump ship? Certainly there were many old style conformists like Peter Smart out there, but there must have been a good number in their midst, even among the petitioners, who saw the way the wind was blowing. Laud's most recent biographer, Charles Carlton, presented the archbishop as an impotent scapegoat after his arrest in 1640 and, moreover, he argues that after the outbreak of the war the bogeyman of Canterbury took a step back in parliamentary minds. This does fit the timeline of the rather slow-moving proceedings against Laud. Indeed, Sir John Coke assessed in 1641 that "the processes against the Archbishop are asleep."³²³

Although a prisoner, Laud had not been stripped of office and therefore retained the right to make appointments to clerical livings. The House of Lords in fact approved several of his nominations in the early years of his imprisonment.³²⁴ On 17 May 1643 Laud at last had his jurisdiction suspended. After Parliament confiscated his property the following month, there was talk of exiling him and Matthew Wren to New England. The preparations for the trial, however, continued. That spring, at the command of the Lords, William Prynne with ten soldiers searched the archbishop's cell and took 22 bundles of papers, Laud's private devotions, and his diary. That October the Commons sent the Lords a second set of impeachment articles – charges not terribly different from the ones devised in 1641 – after spending much of the year on more pressing matters than the archbishop who languished behind bars.³²⁵ Laud now had counsel appointed: John Herne of Lincoln's Inn and Chaloner Chute of the Middle Temple. The Lords added Matthew Hale, like Herne, of Lincoln's Inn. Curiously, Herne had served as defense counsel in the

Constitution, 1603-1688, 171-175; William Abbot, "The issue of episcopacy in the Long Parliament: the reasons for abolition" (Oxford University DPhil Dissertation, 1981).

³²³ TNA: HMC Cowper, II, 284; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 202-208.

³²⁴ TNA: PRO SP 18/298.

³²⁵ LW, III, 248-251; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 208-210.

cases of both Prynne and Henry Sherfield, trials which brought Laud so much opprobrium.³²⁶ Early on Pym had tried to get Bishop Juxon and Bishop Williams to admit that Laud had discussed reconciliation with Rome, evidence that would have cinched what proved to be a rather tenuous charge of treason. As this strategy failed, Pym's health did likewise. Before his death in December 1643, the great MP handed the case over to Oliver St. John.³²⁷

By the end of that year Laud appeared again before the Lords and again declared his innocence. Both sides stalled the proceedings by gathering papers, reviewing evidence, and adding Richard Gerrard of Gray's Inn as a fourth member of the defense team. Led by John Maynard who had also served in the trial of the earl of Strafford, the prosecution was composed of John Wilde, Sam Browne, and Robert Nichols.³²⁸ Roger Hill, helped by Laud's implacable opponent William Prynne, assisted the team by gathering hostile (and perhaps some unreliable) witnesses against the archbishop. After plodding investigations, Laud was finally brought to trial in 1644. The archbishop sat in the middle of the Lords' chamber with peers in front and on either side. The commons sat behind him while an audience gathered to their rear. At his table sat Black Rod, the Lieutenant of the Tower, and the defense counsel.³²⁹

Carlton argues that the trial of this now impotent symbol was an opportunity to reveal "to the world the odiousness of his policies, and how he plotted to subvert church

³²⁶ 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* (London, 1646), 42; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 217.

³²⁷ Sheila Lambert, "The Opening of the Long Parliament," *Historical Journal* 27 (1984), 265-269.

³²⁸ Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, 47-48.

³²⁹ LW, IV, 1-420; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 218-220; H. R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645* (London: Macmillan, 1962), 398-436. Reproduced in volumes III and IV of his collected works, Laud's account of the trial (which he recorded while in the tower) is quite thorough. He stopped writing only after receiving news of his death sentence on 4 January 1645. See the inset of Prynne's *Canterburies Doome* for an illustration of the court's physical arrangement.

and state and deliver them tied hand and foot to Rome.” It was a show trial, Carlton argues, that was also intended to demonstrate how necessary Parliament’s overhaul of the church really was. One has to remember here that Parliament enacted sweeping changes that not only over-ruled Laudian innovations but also removed elements that had really had always been part of prayer book worship (e.g. Parliament leveled steps in the chancel). The goal was to condemn Laud and Laudianism and to justify Parliament’s new program for the church. It was, in the estimation of Laud’s most recent biographer, a public relations campaign. Carlton argues that by all accounts the fallen prelate should have wasted away in the Tower.³³⁰ But now Laud had a chance to defend himself and his whole program to boot. As has been remarked about the multiple trials of William Prynne, mustering a trial defense was a unique way to participate in public discourse when the normal channels were shut off. Putting the archbishop on trial was ultimately a gamble, even if, as it turned out, his opponents succeeded in getting him executed. In other words, Laud was given the chance to make justifications not only before his immediate prosecutors, but before all who needed to know what to make of recent changes in the English church.³³¹ He did so; and, as we might imagine, the archbishop employed the familiar historical strategy.

Before detailing Laud’s arguments in full, one should note a few of the trial’s major characteristics. First, as the archbishop’s treason was not all that obvious, the trial was not the “show” that his enemies wanted. Working with the evidence available, the prosecution pursued a case of “cumulative treason,” as Carlton explains. When this strategy became apparent, the defense counselor Herne remarked, “I never understood

³³⁰ Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 215. See also W. G. Palmer, “Invitation to a Beheading: Factions in Parliament, the Scots and the Execution of Archbishop William Laud in 1645,” *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 52 (1983), 17-27.

³³¹ Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*, 30-69. One may wish to consider here Habermas’ definition of “public sphere” as regularly construed (by Robertson and others) in early modern England. See Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, eds., *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2008).

before this time that two hundred black rabbits would make a black horse.”³³² Moreover, *treason* was now interpreted as an act against the realm as well as against the king, the traditional definition since the reign of Edward III in the fourteenth century. This understanding – that treason could be an act against the nation – would be in full force at the trial of Charles Stuart a few years ahead. Second, Laud was rather fast on his feet. Even Prynne admitted as much: the archbishop’s arguments according to his old opponent were “as full, as gallant and as pretty a defense of so bad a case as was possible for the wit of man to invent.”³³³ Third, it seems that after a time the trial became sparsely attended. The prosecution took the morning hours while the defense had the afternoon, the latter being even less attended than the former.³³⁴ Only a few heard the prosecution’s arguments; even fewer heard Laud’s defense.

In addition to these points of character, we should consider what sources we have for analysis. One should keep in mind that Laud’s account of his arguments – an account he composed when back in his Tower cell – was likely more systematic and better organized than the actual arguments he made in the chamber. Nevertheless, most scholars are convinced that Laud’s account is reasonably accurate given a comparison with the notes of John Browne, clerk of the Parliament. At the very least Laud’s account is probably more reliable than Prynne’s *Canterburies Doome*, a text he published the year after Laud’s execution to quash any conception of the archbishop as a martyr. Prynne presented the bulk of the trial as concerned with the accusation of popery, a portrayal fairly different from the accounts left by Browne and Laud himself.³³⁵

³³² J. B. Williams, *Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings of Sir Matthew Hale* (London: Jackson and Walford, 1835), 22.

³³³ Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, 426.

³³⁴ LW, IV, 153, 168; David Laing, ed., *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662* (Oxford, 1841-1842), Vol. II, 139. For Laud’s marginal notes on Prynne’s *Breviate*, see LW, III, 257-272.

³³⁵ William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, passim; Laud’s “The History of the Troubles and Tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury” begins at LW, III, 473 and

When the charges were first read to him in 1641, Laud carefully reviewed the arguments. To the seventh article leveled against him – that he had altered the religion established and endeavored to introduce popish superstition – Laud answered that he had merely attempted to correct a lack of decorum he sincerely perceived in the church’s devotional life in order to preserve piety and orthodox belief: “I found that with the contempt of the outward worship of God, the inward fell away apace, and profaneness began boldly to show itself.” The archbishop was also intent to display the historical and legal precedents for his work.

As for ceremonies; all that I enjoined, were according to law. And if any were superstitious, I enjoined them not. As for those which are so called by some men, they are no innovations, but restorations of the ancient approved ceremonies, in, and from the beginning of the Reformation, and settled either by law or custom.³³⁶

It was critical, Laud believed, to argue that what he had done was consonant with the best practices and first principles of the Church of England. He located this in the middle sixteenth century, specifically in the early reign of Elizabeth Tudor. This was a shared perception: if one wished to be old-fashioned and therefore innocuous, one had to invoke Elizabeth and her church. In a manuscript collection of notes for his defense, the idea that the bishops are sworn to uphold a Tudor patrimony was central. Laud’s team even took into their arsenal the image of Edwardian churchmen, specifically Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, and the martyrologist John Foxe.³³⁷

At the trial, the archbishop specifically invoked Elizabeth when accused in Article 12 of fostering division between the Church of England and other Reformed churches. The prosecutors charged the archbishop with abrogating the rights and privileges of the

concludes at IV, 419. Laud left this work incomplete: he stopped writing when informed that he was sentenced to death on 4 January, 1645. For Browne see House of Lords Record Office Braye MS, Vol 8; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 218.

³³⁶ LW, III, 408.

³³⁷ TNA: PRO SP 16/499/5.

stranger churches. Since the sixteenth century London had hosted a number of foreign Reformed Protestants, mostly from the Netherlands and France. These groups were allowed enclaves of their own in England. Laud deplored this backdoor for presbyterianism, seeing the resident aliens as an inexcusable threat. Moreover, he felt that as these women and men were now two or three generations removed from the first “strangers” they should be folded into the official and legally established parish church system. Measures to bring about their conformity were introduced in the metropolitical visitation in the middle 1630s and enforced in subsequent years.³³⁸ In his defense, Laud was able to produce correspondence from Elizabeth to her Lord Treasurer, the Marquis of Winchester. “For the Queen in these letters” he argued “allows them [i.e. the strangers] nothing contrary to her laws; and therefore nothing but our liturgy in their language, not another form of Divine service and discipline.”³³⁹ When this charge reappeared on July 17, 1644, he again argued that Elizabeth wished the strangers to “conform themselves to the English liturgy, and have that translated in their own language.”³⁴⁰

In his account of the trial in 1641, Laud recorded his response to Article 13, the charge that he had introduced popery in the Scots Kirk. At the beginning of Charles’ reign, episcopacy in Scotland amounted to a handful of figure-head bishops, a somewhat mixed polity engineered by King James. Charles, however, asked his Scots bishops in 1634 to produce a book of canons and their own edition of the Book of Common Prayer.³⁴¹ By 1637 the liturgy was complete. Seen as the connivance of Laud, filled with

³³⁸ John Bulteel, *A Relation of the Troubles of the 3 Foreign Churches in Kent, Caused by the Injunctions of Wm. Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1645), 5-11; LW, VI, 24-27; LPL MS 943, fols. 257, 261. See also the discussion in Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 348-351.

³³⁹ LW, III, 424-425.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 314-315.

³⁴¹ S. R. Gardiner, *History of England from the accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642* (London: Longman, Green and Co., 1894), Vol. VII, 307; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 783.

popery, and, indeed, a harbinger of Anti-Christ, the new prayer book was doomed before its release. While Laud did not edit the text, the increasingly alienated Calvinist Scots were convinced he was behind it all. This suspicion was not without warrant: Laud attended Charles at his Scottish coronation in 1633 (eight years after James' death), was appointed a privy councilor for the northern kingdom, had a healthy correspondence with the Scots bishops regarding matters of clerical dress and the proper conduct of public worship, and, indeed, was given the task of reviewing the new Scots prayer book. However, as Kevin Sharpe argues, not only was the liturgy not Laud's creation, the archbishop wanted simply to introduce the *English* prayer book and avoid multiplying rites.³⁴² Laud wanted uniformity of religious practice wherever Charles held dominion: England, Scotland, Ireland, English settlements in the new world, and even the troops on the continent were to fall in line. There is a measure of irony here. Although the word "priest" was judiciously omitted, the new Scots book followed more closely King Edward VI's first (and rather conservative) 1549 liturgy while the book used in England – essentially the Elizabethan prayer book of 1559 – was *more* Reformed in accent and character. Although uniformity was his real motivation, Laud ultimately wanted a more Reformed liturgy for Scotland than the Scots bishops produced.³⁴³

On trial in the 1640s, the archbishop recounted in detail the events which led to the changes in Scotland and argued that he was working with the king, other advisors, and, most importantly, the Scots bishops themselves to create a uniform, decent liturgy for the Kirk. Laud emphasized that from the start he preferred simply to import the English prayer book than to multiply rites, "which I did then, and still do think, would have been a great happiness to this State, and a great honour and safety to religion." The

³⁴² "The True Narrative Concerning the Scottish Service Book," in LPL MS 943, 659-667; Walter Makey, *The Church of the Covenant, 1637-1651: Revolution and Social Change in Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979), 17; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 783-787.

³⁴³ LW, III, 356, 426-429; Gordon Donaldson, *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954), 52-59, 78, 80; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 785.

archbishop was confident that he was but one of many advisors in the king's Scottish affairs and that the proposal of a book of canons and a uniform liturgy was not beyond Charles' authority: James, Laud argued, had done the same thing at the Assembly of Perth in 1618.³⁴⁴ Here, Laud was arguing about the right to make changes at all, and he built his argument on historical precedents.

From his tower cell Laud also responded to a speech given by the great Puritan noble, Viscount Saye and Seale concerning the archbishop's liturgical designs. Laud responded in 1641 that the rails erected around communion tables were there to keep them from profanation. Moreover, the archbishop observed that there was no law forbidding such a development. To the critique that "the communion-table must not stand north and south," he responded "the Queen's Injunctions commanded it to be set just in that place in which the altar stood. So they innovate themselves, and then cry out innovation."³⁴⁵ Laud was attempting to turn the accusation around against his detractors. He had done exactly the same thing, as we have seen, at the censure of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick. Moreover, it was standard protocol in the Laudians' history-based apologetics: it was not enough to defend the ceremonial program as old-fashioned; opponents had to be tarred as unimaginative, warmed-over radicals, dissidents no different from the ones Whitgift and Bancroft put down a generation before.

Saye and Seale's speech also gave the archbishop the opportunity to extol the virtues of a uniform church. Laud saw danger in multiple rites and what he perceived to be a confusion of confessions. Similarly, in his denunciation of extemporary prayers, Laud announced,

Let them in due time and place 'conceive prayer' on God's name: but let them not make public abortion in the Church. 'Tis an over-hasty mother, that brings forth so soon as she has conceived: and yet, extemporary men outrun these mothers; and conceive and bring forth their unnatural monsters, both at once.

³⁴⁴ LW, III, 425-432.

³⁴⁵ LW, VI, 108.

For the archbishop, the prayer book ethos provided carefully crafted corporate prayers and shunned individual devotional expression. The individual was to absorb the ideas of the established liturgy, not the other way around.³⁴⁶

Shifting from negative to positive, the archbishop tried to explain his method and, concomitantly, his approach to adiaphora.

In the Gospel, though Christ settled his doctrine and sacraments, yet when, and how, with other ceremonial things, were left at large to the ordering of the Apostles, and the Church after them, always providing for decency and order.³⁴⁷

With yet another invocation of the Whitgiftian mantra drawn from 1 Corinthians 14 (“let all things be done decently and according to good order”), one wonders if this Elizabethan phrase should replace the passage from Psalm 96, “the beauty of holiness,” as the real Laudian shibboleth. This, one imagines, would have delighted the archbishop. The implication would be that Laud’s agenda was a mere restatement of Whitgift’s. At the very least, one can again clearly see Laud adopting the language of his predecessors, presenting himself as not only the ecclesiastical successor of John Whitgift as archbishop of Canterbury, but also as his ideological heir. Unyielding, Laud boldly declared in his response to Say and Seale that the law and accessible history was on his side.

I can legally prove, if need be, I have not commanded or enjoined any one thing, ceremonial or other, upon any parochial congregation in England, much less upon all, to be either practiced or suffered, but that which is directly commanded by law.³⁴⁸

The archbishop had to do just that in 1644 as his trial at last picked up steam. On Friday, March 22, Laud had to answer for his censure of a number of individuals from the parish of Beckington in Somerset. These had refused the order of William Piers, bishop

³⁴⁶ Ibid., 108, 116.

³⁴⁷ Ibid., 108, 111.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 126.

of Bath and Wells, to move their communion table to the east end. One witness argued that they felt it was against the law to do so. Laud strenuously denied this assertion.

And that it is no innovation against law, appears by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, where it is commanded expressly to be set there. The words are: ‘The holy table in every church’ (not cathedrals only) ‘shall be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood.’ Now all men know, that with us in England the altar stood north and south, at the upper end of the chancel; and to set it east and west had been cross the place where the altar stood, and not in it. And this being law in the beginning of the Reformation, cannot now be innovation.³⁴⁹

Again citing the Injunctions of 1559, Laud interpreted the mandate to require the table to be set permanently altar-wise. As he had done in the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, he ignored the second part of the requirement, that is, that the table should be brought out during the sacrament’s celebration. At a tense moment, the prosecution brought up Laud’s own speech at the trial of the Puritan trio. They asked how could he hold that the table was a thing indifferent, as he had said in 1637, but still proceed with heavy sentences on the people of Beckington? Laud countered that by the sheer fact of the arrangement being indifferent, it was their brazen inability to accept well-ordered authority that was being punished. They should have had no qualms, he continued, in obeying the orders of their bishop as Piers simply wished them to mirror the practice of Elizabeth’s chapel royal, the devotional home of that queen who had banished popery.³⁵⁰

On May 16 a number of charges were brought before Laud, the most enigmatic of which concerned his own chapel at Lambeth Palace. After conveniently sidestepping the second half of the requirement to move the table at time of administration, the archbishop was called to account for his subtle reading of the Injunctions.

Here Mr. Browne, in his last reply in the House of Commons, said, that I cut the injunction short, because in the words immediately following, ‘tis ordered, ‘that this place of standing shall be altered when the communion is administered.’ But first, the charge against me is only about the place of it: of which that injunction is so careful, that it commands, ‘that when the communion is done, it be placed

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 121.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 124.

where it stood before.’ Second, it was never charged against me, that I did not remove it at the time of communion; nor doth the reason expressed in the injunction require it; ‘which is when the number of communicants is great, and that the minister may be better heard of them.’ Neither of which was necessary in my chapel, where my number was not great, and all might easily hear.

Laud adopted a practical tone: the requirement to move the table was, he believed, to allow communicants to better hear the minister read the communion liturgy. That was the operating principle, the archbishop construed. He totally ignored the apprehension of his predecessors who so obviously felt that a north-south altar pushed against the east wall implied the Roman mass. Laud waved off this critique: his chapel was small enough that all could hear the celebrant from the east end and there was no need to go to the trouble of moving the table.³⁵¹

The archbishop then had to contend with the accusation that he violated the statutes of Edward VI against images, an injunction revived by Elizabeth. Laud simply denied that the statute addressed glass windows.

First, that the statute of Ed. VI. spoke of other images; and that images in glass-windows were neither mentioned nor meant in law: the words of the statute are, ‘Any images of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth; graven, carved, or painted, taken out of any church, &c., shall be destroyed,’ &c., and not reserved to any superstitious use. So here’s not a word of glass-windows, nor the images that are in them.³⁵²

In this instance Laud either did not have a correct copy of the statutes or was being critically selective in his read. The boy king’s injunctions, while admonishing that acceptable images only remind us of the past, expressly forbid “all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition: so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches or houses.”³⁵³

³⁵¹ LW, IV, 198.

³⁵² Ibid., 199.

³⁵³ “Injunctions Given by Edward VI” in Edward Cardwell, ed., *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England: Being a Collection of Injunctions, declarations, Orders, Articles of Inquiry, &c. from the year 1547 to the year 1716* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1839), 7, 17.

The prosecution then cited the 1571 Book of Homilies in which the sermon “against peril of Idolatry” clearly forbade images in windows.³⁵⁴ The archbishop did agree that the homilies were generally good in doctrine but suggested that certain aspects were “necessary for those [Reformation years], when people were newly weaned from the worship of images: afterwards, neither the danger, nor the scandal alike.” Laud’s strategy was to marginalize the homily, to argue that this long and uncompromising sermon was necessary because of the severity of the moment. That severity, however, had past. This position echoes Canon VII of 1640 which described the destruction of stone altars as necessary to root out superstitions so virulent in unreformed England at that time, but now that time was past and the danger gone. If one couples this sentiment with the axiom “abuse does not abolish use” – an axiom which Laud employed in the preface to his account of the conference with Fisher the Jesuit and at the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick – one can accommodate the resurrection of any medieval practice so long as the “weaker brethren” are sufficiently instructed. Theoretically, then, if one teased out the component parts of Laud’s liturgical theology, one could go so far as to erect a stone altar, the very innovation Peter Smart had bemoaned at Durham Cathedral. Images, Laud continued, could be used for instruction – *in docendo et admonendo* – and therefore have a good purpose.³⁵⁵

The prosecution then turned their attention to the practice of bowing to the table in Laud’s chapel. The archbishop countered that this was common among the Jews and in the Patristic church. More pointedly, however, he stated that “this was usual in Queen Elizabeth’s time.” Laud even noted that one of his opponents, when writing against the Canons of 1640 (which only recommend the practice, not require it), had admitted that “it

³⁵⁴ John Griffiths, ed., *The Two Books of Homilies to be Read in Churches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859), 168.

³⁵⁵ LW, IV, 200-201.

was usual in the Queen's time."³⁵⁶ The prosecutors, not finished with Laud's chapel, shifted to the presence of "organs, candlesticks, a picture of a history at the back of the altar, and copes at communions and consecrations." The archbishop responded that these have been in the English church since the Reformation. He even got the witness, a chaplain to Archbishop George Abbot, to admit that the image in question had been in the Lambeth Palace chapel during the tenure of Laud's more Calvinist predecessor. Yet the Lambeth chapel was not alone on this count.

And it is not to be thought, that Queen Elizabeth and King James would have endured them all their time in their own chapel, had they been introductions for Popery. And for copes, they are allowed at times of communion, by the Canons of the Church. So that these, all or any, are very poor motives, from whence to argue an 'alteration of religion.'³⁵⁷

According to Laud, the prosecution's laundry list of innovations could be found in the chapels royal of Elizabeth and James and therefore these elements were not innovative. Moreover, copes had never been abolished. Rather, they were "allowed" for communion. As Parker's Advertisements ordered copes in cathedrals and collegiate churches, Laud must have understood his chapel to be one of the latter.

Another witness then testified that Laud had consecrated the chapel's communion vessels. Drawing from precedents established much earlier than the reign of Elizabeth, he responded that since the time of Constantine

...there have been consecrations of sacred vessels, as well as of churches themselves... So then, if there be no dedication of these things to God, no separation of them from common use, there's neither 'thing' nor 'place' holy. And then no 'sacrilege'; no difference between churches and common houses; between 'holy-tables' (so the injunction calls them and ordinary tables).³⁵⁸

³⁵⁶ Ibid.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., 202.

Laud's argument was to reexamine the whole concept of the sacred and the profane. Sacrilege, he argues, cannot exist if the sacred – that which is set apart from the profane – were never established as sacred in the first instance.

On May 27 the prosecution returned to the subject of Laud's chapel at Lambeth. William Prynne had prepared an inventory of the windows and it was argued that their images were taken from the Roman missal. Laud responded that he had not constructed them, that Archbishop John Morton had them installed during his tenure at the end of the fifteenth century. When it was then pointed out that Laud had a copy of the missal and that he had studied it diligently, the archbishop responded, "How else should I be able really to confute what is amiss in it?" Aside from this rather biting response, Laud always seems to have had an example or precedent to support his work. When he was accused of having a credence table at Lambeth, he quickly cited Lancelot Andrewes' chapel and, brushing off the accusation, asked "Where's the offense?" His strategy on that day also included drawing on the axiom *abusus non tollit usum*. A witness testified "that there were copes used in some [Oxford] colleges, and that a traveler should say, upon the sight of them, that he saw just such a thing upon the Pope's back." Laud critically responded "This wise man might have said as much of a gown: He saw a gown on the Pope's back; therefore a Protestant may not wear one: or, entering into S. Paul's, he may cry, Down with it; for I saw the Pope in just such another church in Rome." Laud argued that papist abuse – the wearing of the cope for example – ought not discount Protestant use.³⁵⁹ Later in the day Laud had to respond to the charge that the clergy at Winchester Cathedral wore copes and once more he invoked the Elizabethan injunctions and the same theological axiom. This time, he tried to extend the logic behind the injunction permitting the use of the cope.

But for the copes in cathedrals, Mr. Browne in his last reply was not satisfied. For he said, 'the Canon mentioned but the wearing of one cope.' Be it so... And

³⁵⁹ Ibid. 209-211, 221.

if the Canon enjoin the wearing of one, my injunction might require the providing and use of one. Besides, if there be no Popery, no introduction to superstition in the having or using of one; then certainly, there can be none in the having of more for the same use: the superstition being lodged in the misuse, not in the number.

Laud's logic was that if one cope was not superstitious, then multiple copes were not superstitious. Before the session closed that day, the prosecution brought up the St. Gregory's Case from 1633. The archbishop again argued that the arrangement of an east end altar was not contrary to the word of God. Laud continued: "there I maintained the Queen's injunction, about placing the communion-table... In all this, here's nothing charged upon me, but maintenance of the injunction." Likewise, on June 6, when accused of rearranging the table at Gloucester Cathedral more than twenty years earlier, Laud cited the Injunctions of 1559.³⁶⁰

On the final day of his formal hearing, July 29, Laud reviewed the history of the reformation as it concluded in the reign of Elizabeth. He argued that the visitations came first, then the injunctions, and then, in 1562, the formal doctrinal statement of the established church, the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. Hence, according to the archbishop, set forms of liturgy and directions for the material context of worship predated clear statements of belief. This model of the Church of England's reformation insists that liturgy shaped belief and not the other way around.³⁶¹ Presenting his agenda as consonant with Elizabethan formularies and precedents and proclaiming his innocence of the charge of innovation, William Laud obviously felt that he swam in the same ideological stream as his predecessor at Canterbury, John Whitgift. He dragged out arguments about *adiaphora* – that is, things indifferent, a critical part of Whitgift's argument against the presbyterian Thomas Cartwright – and the familiar language of conformity and propriety. His trial arguments, therefore, proved to be largely historical

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 224-225, 233-234.

³⁶¹ Caroline Litzenberger, "Defining the Church of England: Religious Change in the 1570s," in Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger, eds., *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from his Students* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 137-153, specifically 151.

and legal in character. When allowed to review his case before the court on November 1, Laud proclaimed

In all my proceedings, both in the High-Commision and elsewhere, I kept strictly to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England established by law, against both Papist and other sectaries. And under this government, and doctrine of this Church, it hath pleased God, now for above four-score years together, to bless this kingdom and people above other nations.³⁶²

In short, Laud wanted Parliament to believe that there was no story here. *Omnia bene*. They were not convinced.

When he arrived in the chamber on 14 September 1644, Laud saw the court members poring over blue covered pamphlets. Prynne had masterly edited Laud's confiscated diary and produced *A Breviate of the Life of Archbishop William Laud*. While this was certainly a damning piece of evidence, a lawyer attending the trial was over-heard to say "the Archbishop is a stranger to me, but Mr. Pryn's tampering about the witnesses is so palpable and foul that I cannot but pity him and cry shame of it."³⁶³ The trial ended on 11 October and a petition to attain Laud of treason was put before the lower house on the 28th. On 11 November the bill of attainder passed with only one dissenting vote. The Lords, however, took some time reviewing the evidence. That December the members of the upper house were clear that although they did not question Laud's guilt, they were not convinced of the tenuous charge of treason against him. A joint committee was then composed and on 2 January 1645 Laud was declared a traitor. Two days later the House of Lords, with only nineteen peers in attendance, passed the bill of attainder. Quite tellingly, the next business before Parliament was the abolition of the prayer book.³⁶⁴

³⁶² LW, IV, 407.

³⁶³ *Ibid.*, 51, 369; Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, 422-426; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 222-223.

³⁶⁴ LW, IV, 426-429; *Journal of the House of Lords*, Vol. VII, 102, 128-32; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, 223.

Laud spent his last days in prayer, making a confession to his chaplain, and receiving communion. Standing on the scaffold on 10 January, Laud preached to a crowd of hecklers that he was about to die as one committed to the Protestant Church of England. He used the well-worn strategy of appealing to history to the very end. The archbishop refused to admit that he was guilty of innovation, always proclaiming that his work was consonant with the prayer book ethos established in the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. A little past noon, Laud was executed. Buried first in All Hallows, Barking, Laud's body was moved in the 1660s to the chapel at St. John's College, Oxford. The archbishop was interred, as he requested, near the altar.³⁶⁵

No Arguments? The Higher Clergy's Apologia and the Historic/Normative Face of the Church

When William Laud died in 1645 he had spent years – in good times and in bad – making the claim that his program for the church was in no way innovative, but was instead consonant with the patterns established in the sixteenth century. The bishops and higher clergy had made this argument from the late 1620s through the 1640s. While moving in the same direction, they sometimes disagreed. Wren and Montagu were not of the same mind when it came to rail reception in Norwich diocese. Their disagreement, however, was principally about finding and propagating an historical justification. This was the situation with many Laudian ordinaries. While Montagu pressed forward as best he could, Piers devised a list of arguments for the east-end altar. It should not surprise us that this “schedule” was topped by a reference to Elizabeth's injunctions. Richard Neile, having faced the critiques of Peter Smart, produced a minute commentary on the same material. Clearly the higher clergy were busy building a case.

Anthony Milton is right to say that junior clergy like Peter Heylyn and John Pocklington wrote the bulk of the literature defending the Laudian agenda. It is true that

³⁶⁵ Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 531-542; LW, IV, 430-440, 442.

the higher clergy did not write controversial texts like *A Coale from the Altar* or *Altare Christianum*. Nevertheless, the higher clergy were not silent in this critical period. They did make claims about the legitimacy of their movement. Some, like the Irish bishop Henry Leslie, made claims directly in published essays. Laud himself published both his speech at the censure of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick and his arguments with Fisher the Jesuit. While some made claims directly, many more spoke through their articles and injunctions. Ordinaries could build apologia into their directives. Articles like those based on John Overall's 1619 set certainly included historical justifications. Matthew Wren's annotated Norwich articles evince that the bishop was hunting for sources, possibly to 'arm' his deputies as they worked through the diocese in 1636. His references to articles going all the way back to Parker's 1567 Advertisements reveal the bishop's litigious need to wrap his articles in precedents. Peter Heylyn's 1640 set had built-in historical claims about the normative face of the English church. Used by Juxon in the diocese of London, these questions drew from an array of earlier canons and injunctions and came fitted with an historical interpretation. In short, not only did the higher clergy raise a defense of the Laudian program, they made claims similar to the arguments being made by the junior clergy: the Laudians – both the junior clergy and the higher clergy – provided a particular reading of the English reformation to portray their activities as normative, innocuous, and frankly old-fashioned.

The label Peter Lake has given them, avant-garde conformists, can be applied to clergy at all levels, not simply hot-headed junior clergy who sought promotion by defending a bald reordering of the church at the hands of the higher clergy. William Laud's trial defense in the early 1640s is, of course, the centerpiece of this apologetic. The archbishop, against the wall, so to speak, and pressed to provide a rationale for his work under hostile circumstances, declared that he had done nothing new, but rather labored to defend the church as he inherited it. The Abbott thesis, a phenomenon we have seen in the writings of the junior clergy and one which will be present in later

Interregnum and Restoration texts, was used to explain why Laudian elements *seemed* innovative. Laud and his associates – both the bishops and the junior clergy – pitched themselves as the heirs of John Whitgift, solid conformist defenders of an old-fashioned Elizabethan legacy.

CHAPTER 4

“OUR REFORMATION”: LAUDIAN RHETORIC AND USE OF HISTORY
DURING THE INTERREGNUM AND AT THE RESTORATION

Through the Personal Rule of Charles Stuart in the 1630s, the Laudians had pushed the definition of prayer book conformity to a different place, one many old style conformists in the Church of England – Peter Smart among them – had trouble recognizing. So serious had this shift apparently been that the Long Parliament, called at last in 1640, felt a comprehensive purge was warranted. As Michael Brydon has argued, the Laudian leadership had drawn such hostility towards the established church, that this climate “ensured that the desire for a radical religious reformation was dominant.”³⁶⁶ While no one knew exactly where established religion was heading in the early 1640s, the power relationships had certainly changed, even before the outbreak of war in 1642. In short, possibilities were opening. Clearly there was a desire among a significant segment in Parliament and in the population in general to overhaul everything in church and state. Regarding a move to simply reduce the authority of the bishops, Thomas Wilson, the Puritan minister of Otham, Kent asserted in sweeping and colorful language, “O think it not enough to clip their wings when Christ is against the being of a such a body.”³⁶⁷ Wilson, like Smart, had spent time in jail in the 1630s. Having his cause taken up by Sir Edward Dering in the knight’s very first speech in the Long Parliament in November 1640, Wilson was not atypical at this moment. England, many lamented, needed reformation, not modification. Indeed the Jacobean presbyterian David Calderwood, bemoaning the prayer book liturgy for baptism, had averred “admit once the

³⁶⁶ Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker*, 60. See also Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 536-537. For an example of a more moderate plea at this moment, see I. W., *Certain Reasons why the Booke of Common-Prayer Being Corrected Should Continue*.

³⁶⁷ Quoted in W. M. Lamont, *Puritanism and the English Revolution* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1991), Vol. 2, 87. See also Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker*, 60.

aerial cross in baptism... ye cannot refuse to set up the material cross and rood in the kirk, nor the wooden or stone crosses in the highways.”³⁶⁸ In other words, one cross led to another, and the prayer book, Calderwood and others believed, would lead the nation back to popery. The dominant voices in Parliament now perceived that the Church of England had too many slippery slopes, too much potential for idolatry and superstition. Thus episcopacy, the traditional function of the cathedrals, and the prayer book were summarily abolished by the middle of the decade. With the *Directory of Public Worship* in place in 1646, Parliament felt it had reoriented England to Godly prayer and presbyterian order.

The reforms enacted through the 1640s and 1650s were, it must be understood, piece-meal. Those calling for Godly change were far from monolithic, despite Laudian claims to their ultimate unanimity, and the measures developed in Parliament and at the Westminster Assembly reflected that diversity. The *Directory* itself was a compromise document crafted by presbyterians and Independents. Despite their differences, what was clear to them was that the church of the moderate Calvinist episcopalian was simply too suspicious. Those in power not only targeted Laudians and their “beauty of holiness” agenda, but all prayer book loyalists. While the statistics are far from exact, between two and three thousand clergy were ejected during the interregnum for loyalty to the prayer book, continued use of the festal Kalendar, or sheer royalism. That accounts for roughly one quarter of the English clergy.³⁶⁹ While prayer book worship in the late 1640s and through the 1650s was spotty at best, there were a number of instances of the liturgy’s use in England. The diarist John Evelyn recorded the now well-cited instance of attending a prayer book service on Christmas Day, 1657. Troops discovered this illegal

³⁶⁸ David Calderwood, *The Altare of Damascus or the Patern of the English Hierarchie* (London, 1621), 206.

³⁶⁹ Maltby, “Suffering and surviving,” 158-180; Ian Green, “The Persecution of “Scandalous” and “Malignant” Parish Clergy during the English Civil War,” *English Historical Review* 94 (1979), 507-531.

ritual and trained their muskets on the communicants as they received the bread and wine of Holy Communion.³⁷⁰ In addition to experiences like these, a number of young clergymen sought out the bishops who had remained in England for what they understood to be a properly episcopal ordination.³⁷¹

Generally speaking, the lowest common denominator of a commitment to the prayer book and episcopacy closed the gap between conformists who had been at variance, and this was evident at the Restoration. Sir Edward Hyde (later the earl of Clarendon), who had reacted stridently against both perceived Laudian innovations and Puritan dissent, was pushed into close ideological quarters with the ousted ceremonialists. It should therefore come as no surprise to find Hyde and others like him absorbing many positions at which they would have earlier looked askance.³⁷² This is not to argue that Laudianism overwhelmed the more moderate conformists. Nevertheless, the landscape did change, and so did the act of arguing for episcopacy and for prayer book worship. Judith Maltby has argued that the tradition known as Anglicanism, a term studiously avoided to this point, emerged during the interregnum and decisively at the Restoration because the essential elements of prayer book worship and episcopacy had been suppressed. A self-conscious tradition came into sight, she argues, through persecution.³⁷³ Among several related arguments in this chapter, I would like to suggest

³⁷⁰ E.S. de Beer, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), Vol. 3, 203-204.

³⁷¹ John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 141-143; Clare Cross, "The Church in England, 1646-1660," in G. E. Alymer, ed., *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London: Macmillan, 1972), 114. The prevalent use of the Book of Common Prayer in Virginia during the Interregnum may also be noted, as well as the number of royalist clergy who made the trip across the Atlantic to take up appointments in the colonial church there. Edward L. Bond, "Religion in Seventeenth-Century Anglican Virginia: Myth, Persuasion, and the Creation of an American Identity" (Louisiana State University PhD Dissertation, 1995), 182-222.

³⁷² The attitude of the moderate Great Tew Circle led by Lord Falkland is perhaps another example. See Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker*, 70-71, 80; Brian Wormald, *Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion 1640-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), *passim*.

³⁷³ Maltby, "Suffering and surviving," 158-180.

that this self-conscious Anglicanism emerged not only because of the climate of persecution, but also because Laudian authors continued to promote a particular historical narrative, one that divided prayer book loyalists from other Reformed Protestants and provided them with the iconic blessing of Elizabeth Tudor on their plight.

This chapter considers Laudian literature from roughly 1640 through the Restoration of the early 1660s. At the very outset, there is the problem of the movement's coherence. Can we talk about "Laudianism" when the principal players in the movement had fallen from power and could no longer build their altars and rails? A more pointed and frankly simple question is how can we talk about Laudianism when William Laud himself was executed in 1645? These concerns – the end of Laudian hegemony and the death of Laud – are important factors, but they were not essential to the movement's existence. In short, Laudianism did continue through the wars and the Interregnum because the element that first gave the movement coherence during the Personal Rule were not dissolved with its proponents fall from power or even the death of its most iconic figure. In the literature composed by the very same men through the middle decades of the seventeenth century, some of the same familiar arguments persisted. We still find arguments about altars, ceremony, and the power of bishops. These arguments were made, as one might imagine, by appeals to recent English history. The legacy of the Elizabethan church was still being pressed into service. One might even argue that little changed in the Laudian approach, despite the complete reordering of ecclesiastical and civil power, worship and devotion, and the whole notion of church itself. David Cressy has argued that, "whether contested or consensual, history became a convenient and reassuring fiction and a justification for present action."³⁷⁴ From 1640 to the Restoration, he continues, apologists from all angles looked to establish causes for the

³⁷⁴ David Cressy, "Remembrancers of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographers of the 1640s," in Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), 253-264.

war, turning point moments in recent national history, or even spots along a timeline where opportunities were lost. Laudian apologists continued to offer a particular vision of the sixteenth century and of the Church of England to buttress their agenda. In other words, the element that drove avant-garde conformity and gave the movement coherence in the first instance was not the power they had achieved during the Personal Rule. Nor was it the energizing leadership of the archbishop. Laudianism's coherence, rather, was found in the avant-garde conformists' carefully constructed historically-informed identity. That self-perception did not evaporate with the calling of the Long Parliament, the legal abolition of episcopacy and the prayer book, or the public execution of William Laud. These moments only strengthened the coherence of the movement as Laudian authors could now view their fall – their martyrdom – as the victory of Elizabethan dissidents against good conformists like John Whitgift. Their fall from power, I argue, did not end Laudianism, but rather calcified its core element.

As we will see in the literature examined below, the same men who wrote in support of the “beauty of holiness” movement during the Personal Rule now argued in a sweeping fashion that the Puritans had overcome the right ordering of things established by Elizabeth. Moreover, the execution or “martyrdom” of Charles Stuart could be put to good apologetic use. The cult of King Charles the Martyr, a phenomenon born almost immediately after the monarch's execution in 1649, produced a host of liturgical and devotional materials. Likewise, at the Restoration, the Laudians could capitalize on certain fears of religious chaos. These men had argued in the 1630s that all opponents of the “beauty of holiness” were cut from the same cloth. Peter Smart, Thomas Cartwright, and “Martin Marprelate,” they had claimed, were all the same. At the Restoration these Laudian apologists felt a certain sense of confirmation. They argued, did not the abolition of episcopacy lead to presbyterianism, which in turn led to separatism, which in turn opened the doors to anabaptists and other forms of radicals? I would like to suggest that Laudianism, whether in the 1630s, during Interregnum, or at the Restoration derived

its coherence from a particular rhetoric of conservatism. Therefore, as avant-garde conformity operated by appealing to certain sensibilities about tradition and the Tudor patrimony, the movement itself did not end with the calling of the Long Parliament, the collapse of Laudian power, the outbreak of war, the abolition of the episcopate and prayer book, or even the execution Archbishop William Laud. This movement, the coherence of which had always been achieved by the rhetoric of conservatism, outlived the Personal Rule and the archbishop himself.

Laudian Arguments prior to Charles' Execution

With the calling of the Long Parliament and the arrest of the archbishop of Canterbury, the writing was on the wall: power was shifting, and the Laudian ascendancy derailed. Nevertheless, Laudian authors continued to approach their agenda by appealing to historical sensibilities and by offering their own construal of Elizabethan precedents. They continued to argue that they were the heirs of Whitgift and the great lights of the Elizabethan church. As the political and religious climate changed, these avant-garde conformists addressed themselves to issues as they arose. The Queen's College, Oxford tutor Gerard Langbaine entered the national debate about the place of bishops in England in his 1641 *Episcopall Inheritance*. Langbaine had a deeply historical perspective, having spent almost as much time as any in Oxford's libraries. Later in the decade he was chosen Camden lecturer in history, though he turned down the offer. He even traded with academics in Cologne to expand the Bodleian's manuscript collection. This was a man who placed a high priority on historical situation. In his pro-episcopal text, Langbaine responded to the Commons push to exclude bishops from Parliament. For centuries, he argued, bishops had been the equivalent of earls; to pull them out of power would naturally lead to further break-downs in government. Of course his work was not simply a reflection of his medieval interests. Langbaine rooted himself in the sixteenth

century. Hugh Latimer, he wrote, criticized Edward VI's government for its reduction of episcopal authority. Likewise, John Jewel affirmed that bishops have a role in secular affairs.³⁷⁵

Gerard Langbaine of course was not alone in his argument for the bishops in 1641. George Morley, a more moderate conformist episcopalian and member of the Great Tew Circle of Lord Falkland also published a text, *A Modest Advertisement concerning the Present Controversies about Church-Government*. Despite his moderation, Morley's royalism led him ultimately to follow Charles II to the continent; thus if we consider the place of moderates after the middle 1640s, and use the Solemn League and Covenant as a dividing line, Morley falls down on the royalist-Laudian side of things. Despite that categorization, these labels cannot be considered completely airtight. All of this is to say that Morley's moderation up to this moment ought not exclude his 1641 work from this survey of Laudian literature. Like other writers during the Personal Rule, Morley framed his arguments in reference to the sixteenth century as a classical period for the Church of England. He asked, would not Parliament, by rejecting bishops also reject the iconic champions of the Tudor past? If Parliament limited the authority of the bishops or even abolished them, that would mean "those great Lights of our Reformation have been in darknesse; and those our Episcopal Martyrs [i.e. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley] who have laid down their lives for the love of Truth, have been exceedingly miserable."³⁷⁶ This is a fascinating interpretation of the death of the Oxford martyrs. On this read, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley died for the Church of England in all its particulars, especially, it seems, the episcopate, and not simply the doctrinal tenets of Reformed Protestantism.

³⁷⁵ Gerard Langbaine, *Episcopall Inheritance* (Oxford, 1641), 3, 5, 33; ODNB: Gerard Langbaine.

³⁷⁶ George Morley, *A Modest Advertisement concerning the Present Controversies about Church-Government* (London, 1641), 3; ODNB: George Morley.

Morley's work also has the familiar ring of the negative analogue strategy. While episcopacy has an ancient history and lineage as a church polity, one preserved in the English reformation, the presbyterian discipline has an obvious and well-known origin in more recent years. "The time, for ought we can finde, was within this last age; the Place, Geneva; the Person, John Calvin." Morley, in a more Whitgiftian vein than most Laudians, vacillated on this point by admitting that such a novel polity may work well for the city-state of Geneva. Notwithstanding its success there, a presbyterian arrangement was certainly not a workable option for the expansive kingdom of England. "Episcopacy," he insisted, "has so long agreed with the constitutions of this monarchy."³⁷⁷ The ancient order of bishops was necessary. Morley also rejects the common linking of prelacy and popery. The one, he argues, does not lead to the other. His assessment was, not suprisingly, fixed on an historical perspective. "Those who have read histories with judgment," he wrote, will remember, "that the abasing of Episcopacie, has been a great and constant designe of the papacie; and that it was so in the Trent Councell." Playing off papist against presbyterian, Morley neatly situates the Church of England as well positioned between the universal aspirations of Rome and the equally problematic pretensions of puritan preachers. He exclaimed that the Roman collaring of bishops and the presbyterian elimination of the same "produce the greatest confusion, anarchy, and schism that ever was yet in the Church of Christ."³⁷⁸

In the same year Langbaine and Morley released their pro-episcopal works, Thomas Cheshire published a sermon he preached at St. Paul's the previous October. In the autumn of 1640, he had denounced dissenting opinions from the reign of Elizabeth through that of Charles as of a whole, and, in colorful language, claimed that the "doctrine of devils" was ringing from puritan pulpits. From such seditious fonts, he

³⁷⁷ Morley, *A Modest Advertisement*, 6, 10.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 9-10.

wrote, one could hear defenses of the assassination of the duke of Buckingham, arguments that popery was born when the apostles ordained bishops, and the claim that the prayer book's rubric for bowing at Jesus' name is idolatry. Much of this, though certainly frenzied, is nevertheless standard conformist rhetoric. Including a Protestant *bona fide*, Cheshire goes on to describe the prayer book as "compiled and cleansed from Popery by godly Martyrs, and sealed with their dearest blood."³⁷⁹ However, this conformist rhetoric encases other claims, hiding them within familiar language. The most obvious example is his push for altar rails. These, he comments, "have stood in many churches time out of mind," and are very helpful in preventing profanation. He adds here a variation on the standard Laudian trope of a dog urinating in the chancel. In this piece the fear-inducing 'evidence' is a woman dandling her child along the top of the communion table while liquid, presumably urine, runs down the toddler's legs onto the altar's surface. At the close of this sermon Cheshire produces the remarkable comparison of the biblical story of Elijah hiding in a cave waiting for God (1 Kings 19) with experiences in England in recent generations. All of this is to elevate Elizabeth, James, and a succession of bishops to, frankly, biblical proportions. And the implication is, of course, that Charles, his clergy, and Cheshire himself were the rightful heirs of that legacy – a legacy, according to the biblical rhetoric, in which God himself is present.

I cannot better compare our times in England, then to the apparition to Elias on Mount Horeb: first there was a great wind and tempest, which tare the Rocks, and rent the Mountaines, but God was not in the wind; after that there was an earth-quake, but God was not in the earth-quake; after that there was a fire, but God was in not in the fire; but at last there was a small still voice, and God was in that voice. Our Ancestors endured a great storme and tempest, when the differences were betwixt those two potent houses, Yorke and Lancaster, but God was not in that tempest; afterward there was an earth-quake, ye know in whose Kings raigne, and such an earth-quake that shooke down all the Monasteries and Abbies, and that was a great blessing to this Nation, for which we are ever bound to magnifie and praise the Name of our God. But for the revenews, that's a matter of another consideration, when as in some places of this Land, the impropiator goeth away with five or six hundred pounds per annum, and the poor Vicar, who hath the

³⁷⁹ Thomas Cheshire, *A True Copy of that Sermon which was preached at S. Paul's the tenth day of October Last* (London, 1641), 12, 14.

Cure of souls, scarcely forty pounds. Afterward (with a small intermission) there was a fire, I am sure God was not in that fire, in those Marian times, Queen Maries raigne, when as many of our protestant Martyrs like Elias himselfe who saw the vision, were carried up to Heaven in Chariots of fire. After that, in the second Deborah's daies, famous Queen Elizabeth, and in that second Salomons daies King James of sweet and blessed memory; and in the raigne of our second Iosiah, our present gracious Sovereigne; whom God Almighty long preserve; we have had the small and still voice of the Gospell of Christ.³⁸⁰

Thomas Cheshire's broad view and interpretation of English history from the Wars of the Roses in the fifteenth century through the reign of Charles was at once an affirmation of Elizabeth's reign as one divinely blessed, an identification of Charles with the queen of happy memory, and a challenge to those who would cross a regime graced by the "still small voyce" of Almighty God. This was a form of the rhetorical strategy discussed in an earlier chapter of this dissertation as the *Semper Eadem* strategy, only here there is the added power of the divine. One ought to also observe how Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries is considered a good thing but nevertheless problematic. Some laymen made a great profit, while the clergy scraped by. The implication is that God was not in the Henrician "earth-quake," the declaration clearly missing from the sequence. Equally interesting is Edward VI's almost complete absence from the narrative. Aside from the curious reference to a "small intermission," the Church of England's evangelical acme is simply excised. Cheshire was not alone in using the story of Elijah in 1 Kings 19 to rhapsodize about recent English history. The Westminster prebend and acerbic Laudian apologist Peter Heylyn made a similar comparison (with some variation of course) in a 1642 court sermon and in one of his Restoration tracts.³⁸¹

From a Bristol publisher in 1644, another pro-episcopal text appeared by a Laudian author, this time a Scot. John Maxwell had been an ally of Laud's in the northern kingdom since their first meeting in 1629 when the Scots minister was sent to

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 18.

³⁸¹ Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata; or The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1661), 224-5; Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, 200-201.

Charles' court in London. A clergyman with a turbulent background, Maxwell had been bishop of Ross in Scotland during the Personal Rule until he fled the covenanters in 1639. He then became bishop of Killala and Achonry in Ireland until an uprising in 1641, a revolt that included Maxwell being stripped naked and beaten. Though he fled to England, the prelate returned to Ireland later in the decade as archbishop of Tuam, a post he died holding in 1647. In 1644, however, the year he released his *Answer by Letter to a Worthy Gentlemen who desired of a Divine some reason by which it might appear how inconsistent Presbyteriall Government is with Monarchy*, Maxwell was a chaplain at Charles' court at Oxford.³⁸² In this text one finds the sort of virulently polemic tone that makes sense, to some extent, of his episodic career. He proclaimed "A Scottish Presbyterie, as well agreeth with a monarchie, as God with the Divell." Moreover, he insisted, it was plain to see that presbyterianism exacerbated characteristically Scottish feuds. James was wise, Maxwell argued, to resurrect the episcopate, a sure cure for such a "nursery of feuds." This terse language was joined by references to the past, citations that could lend currency to Maxwell's argument for bishops. He employs the time-honed negative strategy at one point, mentioning "Martin Junior" and his "brotherhood." The image of the over-reaching presbyterian minister could certainly be used at this point; fearful references to the Marprelate tracts from the 1590 did not disappear simply because puritans had gained a good deal of power by 1644. Martin Marprelate could still inspire fear and concern, in addition to the image of Elizabeth and James rejecting puritan designs.³⁸³

Maxwell's piece is deeply concerned with the record of the presbyterians and, for that matter, all puritans who dissent from the regime. This text exhibits the same historical concerns – perhaps anxieties – which one finds in Laudian literature during the

³⁸² ODNB: John Maxwell.

³⁸³ John Maxwell, *Answer by Letter to a Worthy Gentlemen who desired of a Divine some reason by which it might appear how inconsistent Presbyteriall Government is with Monarchy* (Bristol, 1644), 10, 18, 33.

Personal Rule, the element of their rhetoric, I suggest, that helped define the “beauty of holiness” movement. With the sixteenth century in plain view as a classical age, Maxwell argued that John Knox was the “grand-father” of wicked presbyterianism, a fundamentally subversive ideology that hacked at properly constituted monarchal and episcopal authority. This disobedience, he noted, could manifest itself in resistance to well-appointed devotional patterns. After a sermon by Knox in 1559, Maxwell continued, the people were whipped into such a frenzy of iconoclasm that it infected the whole of Scotland. “Here were many goodly and Rich Churches spoyled, robbed, and cast downe.”³⁸⁴ At last in 1560, he writes, Knox and his disciples reached “the highest pitch of rebellion” and dispatched the queen regnant. Here a reader in the 1640s may have paused. Was she not a papist? Seeing this wrinkle in his narrative, Maxwell stops and declares his Protestant credentials and addresses his audience directly.

Sir, you will now say, that I speake too hardly of our first Reformers and Reformation, and would know what is my opinion of them and it. To deale clearly, God is my witsse I am no Papist, but doe abhorre Popery as much as any, and that I am no Puritane the other party will witsse for me.³⁸⁵

Maxwell wants to reassure his readers that though he disdains Knox and his successors, he is nevertheless no papist. He argues that he and others since the sixteenth century have labored for a middle way between popery and puritanism. Maxwell, a Laudian ceremonialist, of course rejected iconoclasm. Interestingly, though, aside from Knox, he blames the second generation of reformers in Britain for the crime of church vandalism, not the first generation.

I daily heartily bewaile that that too too much Idolised reformation in an excessive hatred against Popery, did runn too much to the other extreame, that the goodly order and government necessary of the church was shouldered out; the publick service and worship of God with it’s decency, reverence and comlinesse was much defaced, disgraced; That goodly, stately and rich Churches, were abused, robbed and equaled to the ground; and that the Church Patrimonie was

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 33-35, 38.

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 40.

dilapidated: and yet this was not so much done by the first Reformers, as by their Disciples, *Aetas parentum pejor avis.*³⁸⁶

Maxwell continues his narrative of the reformation with the 1560s: Knox and his followers, the ousted bishop writes, proceeded to reform “with the sword in one hand and the Bible in another.” James calmed this frenzy, Maxwell argued, by instituting bishops in the Scots church. Presbyterian radicalism reared its head again, however, in the 1630s. Maxwell recounts how on 23 July 1637 during worship at the cathedral in Edinburgh – a prayer book liturgy led by bishops in fact – “the serving-women rose barbarously within the church,” and “did throw their stooles at the bishop of the place.” This was not all though. Maxwell continued: “the worst and basest people, who were without, did throw in great stones at the glasse windows.”³⁸⁷ The seeds planted by Knox could not help but spring to life according to this narrative.

Before the uprising at the close of the 1630s, the church in Scotland had been increasingly reorganized to match Charles’ southern kingdom. Maxwell of course praised the implementation of “Archbishops, Bishops, Deanes, and Chapters,” elements which Scotland had shuffled off in the sixteenth century. These brought the kirk into conformity with England even as that conformity was persistently challenged, Maxwell continues, by men like Andrew Melville, a presbyterian “full of the Genevan Talmud.” Such men have been meeting secretly in England for years, particularly in London. These quarrelsome men, he continues, had troubled the church since the days of Elizabeth, although the queen of blessed memory kept them at bay. Maxwell mentions James Gibson who at the close of Elizabeth’s reign “was an oracle consulted and gave his answer in Coppinger, Arthington, and Hacket’s extraordinary motion, which story you know better than I.”³⁸⁸ This is the same negative analogue strategy we have seen over

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 41.

³⁸⁷ Ibid., 40.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 54.

and over again in Laudian polemic. Here Maxwell dredges up a trio of sixteenth century radicals – in this case three men who were roundly rejected by the presbyterians for their “prophetic” claims to be the returned Christ and his helpmates – to blacken all dissidents and collapse them into one indistinguishable mass of chaotic radicalism. In this literature, the sixteenth century is very much alive and helps to make sense of contemporary issues. Maxwell fashions a landscape that pits his own party as legitimate, and all who challenge that party as wicked, disruptive, and radical in historic terms. In a sweeping manner, he wrote “All seditions almost and Rebellions in that kingdom [i.e. Scotland], have been set a foot or fomented by this Government Presbyterian.”³⁸⁹ It is this language – this rhetoric of conservatism that made the avant-garde conformists into old-fashioned proponents of the status quo – that gave Laudianism its coherence in the 1630s and after. The archbishop’s death did not put a halt to this apologetic style.

In 1645, the year of Laud’s execution, Edward Boughen published a text in response to the liturgical orders released by Parliament, specifically the new Directory developed by the Westminster Assembly. His particular concern was the ordination of ministers and the related issue of polity. Boughen, a man in his mid-60s, had a long commitment both to the established church and high ceremony. In 1619 he had preached at Bishop John Howson’s primary visitation of Oxford diocese, and his main contention was the importance of confirmation, a rite many bishops neglected. Parliament declared Boughen a delinquent in 1641, depriving him of his parish in Kent.³⁹⁰ His piece on the Westminster Directory appeared just before he joined the king at Oxford in 1646. Boughen asserts early in the piece that assemblies of clergy – including bishops – historically have the power to make rites. Princes then affirm the clergy’s decisions. “Thus it was in the daies of K. Edward the sixth, of Q. Elizabeth, and K. James.” This

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 74.

³⁹⁰ Edward Boughen, *A Sermon of Confirmation* (London, 1620); ODNB: Edward Boughen.

citation from England's recent past is meant of course to reject Parliament's role in religion in the 1640s. Laudians like Boughen argued that Parliament's decisions were over-reaching and novel. Proponents of the Directory though could respond that the Westminster Assembly was in fact a properly constituted clerical body. Countering such a claim, the Laudians insisted that, if one studies the manner in which England was reformed in the sixteenth century, the prince still has a role to play in concert with synods. Boughen argued that only the king, advised by the archbishop of Canterbury, has the legal power to publish rites. The Westminster Assembly may have been a gathering of clergy, but they did not win the support of the crown for their Directory. Later in the text, he shifts to using a well-worn Laudian rhetorical strategy, that of owning the Reformed tradition itself and attempting to "out-Reform" opponents. Observing that not only are the Apostles, Nicene, and Athanasian creeds absent in the Directory, so is the "the Reformed Religion in the 39 Articles."³⁹¹

Within three years Boughen published another text focused on polity. A reply to a work titled *Mr. Gere's Case of Conscience*, Boughen's 1648 *Master Geres Case of Conscience Sifted* addressed the question of whether the king can accept the abrogation of episcopacy. He argues, first, that the clergy are mostly independent of the crown, at least as far as their orders are concerned. This is so "because Christ ever lives from whom the priest has his commission." All other "subordinate powers" rely on the prince. As we might imagine, Boughen has a paradigm from history to support the claim. When Elizabeth died, her Parliament dissolved. Her clergy, though, remained just as they were. All of this is to imply that, while the king is the supreme governor, he is not, strictly speaking, *over* the bishops. The king is more, as Boughen argues, a nursing father, an image that had appeared frequently in conformist literature in the 1620s and 1630s, and

³⁹¹ Edward Boughen, *Observations upon the Ordinance of the Lords and Commons at Westminster after advice had with their Assembly of Divines for the Ordination of Ministers pro tempore according to their Directory* (Oxford, 1645), 2, 31.

one drawn from scripture (Isaiah 49:23). As such, Charles is obligated to support the church and its bishops. After all, Boughen argued, had not the king's father, King James, stated plainly, no bishop, no king? To the accusation that Charles would be sinning to block the abolition of the episcopate, Boughen responded that such a notion was absurd in light of English church history. "Sin it shall be now, that was none heretofore. That shall be sin in King Charles, which was vertue in Queen Elizabeth." In other words, if Parliament wants to reject bishops and the status quo, they also reject the hallowed legacy of Elizabeth Tudor.³⁹²

In a similar fashion, Edward Symmons argued in his 1647 *A Vindication of King Charles: or a Loyal Subjects Duty* that the true heirs of the English reformation and the church of Elizabeth had stood with the king, the prayer book, and the bishops. Within months of the release of Boughen's *Master Gerees Case of Conscience Sifted*, Symmons argued that the legacy of Cranmer and the great lights of the later sixteenth century was being trampled by upstart radicals. Symmons had been rector of Rayne, Essex but was declared a delinquent by the parliamentary committee for scandalous ministers in 1642. During the war he served as chaplain to the Prince of Wales' guards. This text was written in the wake of Charles' fatal defeat at the Battle of Naseby (14 June 1645) and, though at last printed in England, was completed in France.³⁹³ The title page itself draws a comparison between the suffering Christ and the suffering Charles. Symmons identifies himself on the same page as "A Minister, not of the late confused New, but of the Ancient, Orderly, and True Church of England."³⁹⁴ This author wanted to be clear that Charles and his party had upheld the best of the English reformation, and that the voices in Parliament represented "confused" radicals. Symmons also employed the

³⁹² Edward Boughen, *Master Gerees Case of Conscience Sifted* (London, 1648), 52-53, 86, 123-124.

³⁹³ ODNB: Edward Symmons.

³⁹⁴ Edward Symmons, *A Vindication of King Charles: or a Loyal Subjects Duty* (London, 1647), title page.

language of *via media*, the middle way. In the 1550s, he wrote, Mary's popish bishops persecuted "Reverend Bishops and Ministers, who opposed their sinnefull ways, and sealed with their bloud that Doctrine and Liturgy, which is now a pulling down in this kingdom."³⁹⁵ In other words, Symmons' party rejected both popery and puritanism. The latter, however, now had the upper hand and were overturning the work of those blessed martyrs of the 1550s. Charles, like them, suffered for his loyalty and fidelity.

This vision of recent English history, a narrative which collapsed historical change in order to polarize the church into two parties, was at the core of Laudianism. This representation of things provided coherence to a movement that really did survive both the end of the Personal Rule and the death of William Laud himself. The rhetoric of conservatism was able to react to events in the 1640s and 1650s in roughly the same manner as it had construed the political and religious landscape in the 1630s. The best example of this ability to frame and interpret contemporary events in historical terms in those two decades came in the wake of Charles' "martyrdom" in 1649.

The Cult of King Charles the Martyr

On January 30, 1649, Charles Stuart climbed out of one of the windows of the banqueting hall in London onto a scaffold specially built for his public execution. This event, strategically planned by a group later designated "regicides," was engineered as an entry in a public discourse of legitimacy.³⁹⁶ Not to be overly reductive of a very real and bloody moment in the life of one man, the beheading of Charles I was nevertheless a pivotal moment in the life of the nation: the argument here was that the king was a tyrant and that his executioners were England's good and true defenders. Within ten days, however, another entry in that public discourse of legitimacy appeared. *Eikon Basilike*

³⁹⁵ Ibid., B3.

³⁹⁶ For a discussion of the psychological effects of the execution on the nation, see Spurr, 20-21.

(the Image of the King) appeared on February 9 and proved so popular that it went through 36 editions in the same year. The text is presented as Charles' personal diary and it was clearly designed to frame the king as a martyr – one comparable to Christ himself – and a loyal son of the Church of England. Charles was clear-eyed in the narrative, and the only real mistake he made was acquiescing to the execution of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford. Parliament found *Eikon Basilike* disturbing enough to commission a response from none other than John Milton: *Eikonoklastes* (the Image-breaker) countered the image of Charles as martyr and embodiment of legitimate government with another image, that of a capricious king who worshipped his own power as an idol.³⁹⁷ While the authorship of Charles' pious diary has been in question since the 1650s, *Eikon Basilike* nevertheless shaped a growing cult devotion to Charles as martyr-king. John Cosin, dean of Charles II's chapel royal on the continent, marked every Tuesday (the day of the execution) with special prayers. At the Restoration, January 30 was added to the new prayer book's calendar as a day of special commemoration.³⁹⁸

In his study of the cult of Charles the Martyr, Andrew Lacey argues that John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* served as a model for the arguments the royalists and Laudians made about the king and his ecclesiastical policies. This is a helpful thesis, as it highlights the needed intersection of the study of late Tudor literature with the study of similar texts from the mid-Stuart period. Images of the Marian martyrs and, in particular, the image of Elizabeth as Constantine at the close of Foxe's pace-setting work of English Protestant self-reflection were very much alive and well in Caroline England some two to

³⁹⁷ Charles Stuart, *Eikon basilike the pourtraicture of His sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings* (London, 1649); John Milton, *Eikonoklastes in answer to a book intitl'd Eikon basilike, the portrature of his Sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings* (London, 1649).

³⁹⁸ Maltby, "Suffering and Surviving," 172; Durham University Archives, Cosin Library B.IV.4, *A Forme of Prayers, used in the King's Chapel upon Tuesdayes, in these Times of Trouble and Disstresse* (Paris, 1649). January 30 was a day of special observance until Queen Victoria removed it in the nineteenth century.

three generations later.³⁹⁹ The blueprints, in other words, were already available.

Charles or his advocates had at hand the language and images necessary to present the king as consonant with the best of the established English Protestant tradition. To Lacey's argument, I would like to add to that, in addition to Foxe, the Laudian historical rhetoric that was used through the Personal Rule in polemic and apologia – the rhetoric that, as I have argued, provided the Laudian movement with coherence even after the execution of the archbishop – formed the background for *Eikon Basilike*. The Laudian clergy who enjoyed Charles' patronage had great experience with presenting themselves as legitimate in historical terms, and Charles' diary, a text which turned on the idea of the king upholding a particular status quo, was in that same stream of literature.

Lacey's analysis, moreover, confirms the diary's position among avant-garde conformist material. He argues that there were four fronts for royalist propaganda: (1) personal loyalty to the crown; (2) fear of anarchy in the absence of the king; (3) a sense of constitutionalism in which Charles represented old laws; (4) a belief in divine right monarchy.⁴⁰⁰ Perhaps paradoxically, the last two could be held by some without contradiction, as a segment of the population interpreted the nation's constitution as requiring a certain patriarchy and the presence of a divinely appointed and anointed sovereign. All of these avenues could be utilized by a king who was busy crafting his public image in the 1630s and 1640s, a king who desired to appear as the rightful heir of his predecessors and consistent defender of the good, old Church of England. In the three and a half years between the disastrous battle of Naseby and Charles' execution, a multi-lateral discussion commenced about what could be done with the king. Even William Prynne and many presbyterians, despite their deep disagreements with the regime, denounced the idea that the monarch could be tried for his life. Royalist authors,

³⁹⁹ Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, Suffolk.: The Boydell Press, 2003), 9, 13.

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 19-21.

particularly clergy in their pulpits, played up the element of the suffering king. Charles was identified with both the nation suffering during the war and Christ himself rejected by his own people. One example of this material is the same sermon discussed above by Edward Symmons. The preacher made fourteen parallels between Charles and Christ.⁴⁰¹ This epideictic technique was meant to portray the king as being persecuted for protecting established right religion, old ways, and his people – from whom, we should be clear, this literature was intended to elicit pathos.

This strategy continued even after Charles' death, only now royalists and Laudians had the advantage of being able to draw sympathy for a man who not only suffered but died for the good, old ways. William Juxon, Laud's successor both as president of St. John's College and as bishop of London, had dodged much of the parliamentary ire endured by his colleagues. Because he never actually took up arms with the king or joined him at Oxford, Juxon continued to live at Fulham in the 1640s. When the palace was sold, the bishop split his time between houses in Sussex and Gloucestershire, living quietly, conducting prayer book services somewhat inconspicuously, and hunting as often as he could. Despite his retiring ways, Juxon did, at Charles' request, attend the king at the scaffold and oversee his burial at St. George's Chapel, Windsor (being denied interment in Henry VII's chapel at Westminster Abbey). He also published a sermon within two months of Charles' death, *The Subjects Sorrow: or Lamentations Upon the Death of Britaines Iosiah, King Charles*. The frontispiece shows Charles lying on his hearse, seeing Mount Calvary in the distance. Two cherubs hover nearby, holding a heavenly crown. In addition to describing a king in his kingdom as "*solo deo minor, inferior unto God onely,*" Juxon argues that Charles was wrongly executed; that he suffered for defending the established, recognized status quo.⁴⁰²

⁴⁰¹ Symmons, *A vindication of King Charles*; Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, 31.

⁴⁰² William Juxon, *The Subjects Sorrow: or Lamentations Upon the Death of Britaines Iosiah, King Charles* (London, 1649), 7; ODNB: William Juxon.

In a more impressive piece, the bishop collected materials relating to Charles' last years, ostensibly documents written by the king himself. In *A Perfect Copie of Prayers used by His Majestie in the time of His Sufferings delivered to Doctor Iuxon, Bishop of London, Immediatly before his Death*, a text released in 1649, Juxon presents a collection of prayers by Charles, a series of papers exchanged between the king and a presbyterian, and assortment of letters. Also included was a copy of Charles' speech at his trial at Westminster Hall. In it the king argued that the people will not accept changes in church and government because "they will remember how happy they have been of late, under the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the king my Father, and myself, until the beginning of these unhappy troubles."⁴⁰³ The claim here is that Charles' reign had been a mere extension of the iconic reign of Elizabeth Tudor; that the two monarchs, along with James, were consonant in their practices and goals. This was the same strategy the Laudians had been using since the late 1620s: Charles' idiomatic ideas about church and state – to say only a little about the new concept of divine right monarchy and absolutism – were wrapped with the image of Elizabeth, the bastion of conservatism and national pride. The symbolic capitol of her name was put on the scale as Charles' crown and his life hung in the balance.

In the papers exchanged between Charles and the presbyterian Alexander Henderson, one of the principal points of contention was the historical face – the inherited face – of the established church. Charles even parries a bit about what really happened in the sixteenth century, and how to interpret the "perfection" of the reformation. "No man who truly understands the English reformation," he argued, "will derive it from Henry the Eighth, for he only gave the occasion; it was his son who began, and Queen Eliz. that perfect it." The idea is that Edward VI began the real reformation in England, and that, more importantly, Elizabeth brought the reformation to its conclusion.

⁴⁰³ Charles Stuart, *A Perfect Copie of Prayers used by His Majestie in the time of His Sufferings delivered to Doctor Iuxon, Bishop of London, Immediatly before his Death* (London, 1649), 148.

In her reign, to extrapolate, one finds the classical definition of the Church of England's confessional and devotional identity. There is an implied hinge, though, and it is vital. Charles' arguments were built on the premise that there was a continuity between his reign and that of Elizabeth. When Henderson suggests an opportunity for change, Charles responded, "I find no reasons... for a Reformation or change (I mean since Queen Elizabeths time)." ⁴⁰⁴ The idea is simply that Charles was maintaining the status quo, and that nothing had changed. It was, rather, all of Charles' opponents who wanted to upset the status quo. His presbyterian interlocutor actually helped with this argument. Henderson argued in classical puritan style that the reformation had begun in England in the sixteenth century but was certainly not yet finished: "whether it was begun or not in King Henry the eighths time, it was not finished by Queen Elizabeth." ⁴⁰⁵ What is interesting here is that one finds only two parties, Charles and the Laudians on the one hand and the presbyterians on the other. Both Henderson and Charles seem to agree that Charles was upholding a certain Elizabethan settlement. What then of old-style conformists, non-Laudian episcopalians devoted to the Book of Common Prayer? In short their existence is not even recognized. Likewise, the two ignore the serious changes engineered by William Laud and the avant-garde conformists. The argument between Henderson and Charles really seems to be whether the reformation was rightly concluded, and not whether the king and the bishops were faithful to an Elizabethan patrimony. Quite interestingly, that Charles was faithful to that patrimony seems to be a point of agreement. This was the same rhetorical strategy used by the Laudians in their efforts to revise prayer book worship according to "the beauty of holiness."

Charles and the Laudians had insisted that their vision of the English church was conformable to the prayer book rubrics and all the classical constitutive documents of the

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 160, 162.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 162-163.

Church of England composed in the mid to late sixteenth century. In the back and forth between Charles and Henderson, Laudian royalists welcomed with open arms the old Puritan critique that things were the same as they had been in the days of Elizabeth, that everything was still frozen in time. Whether the Puritans thought that a bad thing was immaterial. What was essential was the idea that Charles and the Laudians were upholding a recognized settlement. Peter Smart would have never made such a claim. In Juxon's collection, Charles sealed this picture of conformity with his scaffold speech. The king said, "I die a Christian according to the confession of the Church of England, as I found it left to me by my father." For good measure, Juxon ended his collection with ominous verses which played on the memory of iconic crises – the Gowrie conspiracy (1600), the Gunpowder plot (1605), and the assassination of France's Henry IV by François Ravallac (1610). Juxon opined: "November's plot are brewed and broach'd in worse / And January now compleats the Curse... Ravillacks was but undergraduate sin / And Gowry here a Pupil assassin." All good Englishmen and women should beware, the bishop wrote, for "*sic cecidis Carolus, sic universa simul Britannia.*"⁴⁰⁶

Charles' death in 1649 did not end the use of historical rhetoric, but rather broadened possibilities and the ends to which this highly useful polemical strategy could be directed. The language of martyrdom and the pathos such images were to elicit turned on historical sensibilities of legitimate government, both civic and ecclesiastical. The king and his bishops were regularly presented as the rightful heirs of the grand reign of Elizabeth Tudor. To depart from that patrimony was to invite chaos and, perhaps worse, novelty.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 318, 308.

Persistent Arguments in the 1650s and the Emergence of Anglicanism

The cult of Charles the Martyr enabled Laudian authors to cast dire shadows over parliamentary and protectorate religious policies.⁴⁰⁷ But something else was happening within Laudian rhetoric during the interregnum, and it happened, like much of avant-garde thinking and writing, against the backdrop of historical sensibilities. Edward Boughen, who had been with Charles at Oxford during the war, spent the 1650s in Kent. Having published arguments for increased catechizing and confirmation along with his case against the validity of presbyterianism (arguments examined above), Boughen produced his last text in 1653, the year of his death. *An Account of the Church Catholic* is directed, ostensibly, at someone wavering between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. This was an avenue for Boughen to make a pitch for the prayer book and the now abolished episcopal church. It was also an opportunity for Boughen to clarify that there was and is a real distinction between his faith and practice and the faith and practice of Rome. Even with the episcopate abolished and the prayer book forbidden, this author still looked to the sixteenth century as an anchor point for his apology; he continued to reach back to this classical period to make arguments for non-Roman Catholic episcopacy and for the Book of Common Prayer.

“Our reformation,” Boughen insisted, “is not after any new or lately invented model.” This vision rests on the idea that England’s reformation was independent of continental reform movements and, in typical *via media* fashion, he argued that England’s reformation preserved the best of the medieval inheritance, shearing off only foreign popery and gross superstition. Developing an acutely autocephalic ecclesiology, that is, a vision of the Christian church existing as several national churches, equal and

⁴⁰⁷ For a discussion of such policies, see Ann Hughes, “‘The public profession of these nations’: the national Church in interregnum England,” in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006), 93-114. See also, in the same collection of essays, John Coffey, “The toleration controversy during the English revolution,” 42-68.

relatively independent, Boughen argued that the English church has always recognized the Roman church as a legitimate church, however flawed. “We have never declared her to be no church; neither have our articles.”⁴⁰⁸ This assertion requires one to ignore the litany in the Edwardian prayer books (1549 and 1552) which pleaded for God’s protection against the “the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities.”⁴⁰⁹ As this petition was removed in Elizabeth’s 1559 edition, it may be that Boughen dated “our reformation” to the queen’s accession and “settlement.” In short, his emphatic insistence that his church has always respected the Roman church as a church effectively wedges the Edwardian church and its legacy out of the picture.

Somewhat parenthetically, one notes that this autocephalic model worked on the Roman front for some Laudians, but they certainly did not uphold this principle consistently. When dealing with the church in Scotland and in Ireland, the Laudians wanted an undiluted uniformity. It simply will not do to claim that these hyper-conformists left liberty for each national church to order itself, even if Laudian authors claimed as much. On the Roman front, the autocephalic model allowed the Laudians to dial back the heat of sixteenth century invective against popery, that is, the Protestant critique of Roman Catholicism as a confession, as a style of piety, and as an institution with an unbroken, historical legacy. Anthony Milton’s work on this subject is particularly illuminating, as he traces a shift in answers to the ubiquitous question posed to Protestants, “where was your church before Luther?” The Foxian tradition of tracing one’s predecessors in the true, apostolic faith through Hus, Wycliffe, and other medieval heretics, had shifted – at least in Laudian literature – to recognizing the authority of the institutional church in earlier generations. That had been studiously avoided by

⁴⁰⁸ Edward Boughen, *An Account of the Church Catholic* (London, 1653), 17, 20-21.

⁴⁰⁹ *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, 362; Booty, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559*, 69.

Protestants for obvious reasons.⁴¹⁰ While perceptions of the medieval church in reformation and post-reformation England (and, concomitantly, the relationship of this perception to confessional identity) is not the subject of this dissertation, it is important to bear in mind the burden of apologists for the complex and unique hierarchy of the Protestant Church of England – particularly Laudian apologists – to answer the critique that their vision was a half-way house for Rome.

To return to Boughen's 1653 text, I would like to suggest that, given its date, the piece presumes a *confessional* tradition rather than an *institutional* one. In his *An Account of the Church Catholic*, Edward Boughen was not arguing for an established institution. That would have been impossible, as that established church did not exist in Interregnum England. He argued, rather, for a particular confessional identity, that is, a particular style of piety and a perception among the adherents of that piety that they were distinct from other Protestant Christians. Having defined what I mean by "confessional identity," it should be clear that I am not entering a discussion of the confessionalization thesis made by historians of the reformation on the continent. Unlike Heinz Schilling, Bodo Nischan, and other scholars of early modern Germany, historians of Tudor-Stuart England have been leery of this notion of a top-down process in which the machinery of church and state, specifically the instruments of social discipline, worked to inculcate one expression of faith and religious identity in a geographical territory. Peter Marshall, reflecting on recent trends in the scholarship, notes the persistent belief that this continental model simply does not work for England. Instead there was a slow and messy process at the popular level in which religious identities were shaped and reshaped. As Ethan Shagan puts it, the reformation must be seen as a "dynamic process of engagement" in which various priorities and beliefs about authority and order were molded over time. We have come to accept, Marshall argues, "evolutionary

⁴¹⁰ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 128-321.

abnormalities and spiritual amphibians,” as there were negotiations and anomalies in every decade, Calvinist consensus or not.⁴¹¹ In short, the Church of England between roughly 1570 and roughly 1640 was an institutional church with a dominate (Calvinist) ideology, but it never really had a moment like the Evangelical Lutherans had in 1580 when the Book of Concord provided a more fixed sense of Lutheran identity.⁴¹²

What then of Edward Boughen and “our reformation,” as he put it, during the Interregnum? Reading Boughen’s *Account*, one gets the impression that his faith tradition (an admittedly clumsy term) no longer needed the fixities of law and government. It was now a confessional tradition, that is, a style of piety and religious identity. In 1653, Boughen’s tradition, while shaped by earlier laws, was no longer *established* in the real world. Bishops and cathedral chapters had been displaced by Cromwell’s Triers. The prayer book was contraband. Charles and Laud were dead. While Boughen looked to the sixteenth century to justify the shape of prayer book worship and an episcopal ecclesiology, he seems to be arguing for a *confessional* tradition rather than an *institutional* church. Here we may actually use the word Anglicanism, a term freighted with a good deal of baggage and one studiously avoided to this point. Given this critical shift in language, one fraught with personal pronouns (e.g. “our reformation”), it seems responsible to go ahead and use the term and apply it to Boughen. He was an Anglican. While I am certainly not christening this moderately obscure Laudian author as the first Anglican, it is evident that his thinking about his own faith tradition as something that can exist independent of legal realities points to an emerging confessional tradition. What needs to be recognized, though, is his persistent

⁴¹¹ Marshall, “(Re)defining the English Reformation,” 564-586; Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*, 25.

⁴¹² While I realize that one may argue that the Synod of Dort represents such a moment, I am not fully convinced that the decisions made at Dort were widely absorbed as an ‘official’ confessional statement in England as others may be. For a fuller discussion of Dort and the Church of England, see Anthony Milton, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2005).

use of sixteenth century history. The rhetoric developed by the avant-garde conformists – that is, the material heretofore considered for its apologetic use against both puritans and old-style conformists – shaped the displaced prayer book loyalists’ identity in historical terms. The paradox is that Boughen, similar to earlier Laudian apologists, did not see himself as doing anything particularly new. Furthermore, I would like to suggest that the Anglicanism that did appear on the scene at the Restoration pivoted on the Laudian narrative of constancy and conservatism. In sum, because Boughen saw his tradition – Anglicanism – as a body of ideas, practices, and devotional patterns existing outside of legal realities (at that moment, Cromwell’s Triers), a shift had occurred from *institution* to *confession*. What is important for this dissertation is that it occurred largely due to historical sensibilities, specifically a perception of the sixteenth century in which Elizabeth Tudor and her prelates fashioned a church neither Roman nor Reformed.

In the 1650s, Edward Boughen argued that Rome was in error, but that the Church of England does “acknowledge her to be a church.” He presents the accession of Elizabeth Tudor as a moment in which a particular settlement was achieved, and, like so many facile descriptions of the “Elizabethan Settlement of Religion,” Boughen describes it as a way of making the most people as possible happy – Protestant and Catholic. “Bonner and Gardiner,” he wrote, “communicated with us [i.e. received the Eucharist]... and so did most of the Romane Catholicks of this Nation for ten years under Queen Elizabeth till that terrible bull of Pius Quintus came thundering out.”⁴¹³ Grounding himself in a particular vision of the sixteenth century, Boughen was arguing for a church that was acceptable to both Reformed and Catholic sensibilities. Even with episcopacy disbanded and the prayer book abolished, the reign of Elizabeth Tudor was still a litmus test for legitimacy. This historical rhetoric had given coherence to the Laudian movement in the 1640s, even after Laud’s death. Now in the 1650s, the prayer book

⁴¹³ Boughen, *An Account of the Church Catholic*, 57.

tradition, one existing as a confession outside of institutional channels, was still being defended by recourse to an Elizabethan history. In other words, Laudian authors like Edward Boughen continued to defend the prayer book (with its “beauty of holiness” gloss) in the same way aggressive polemicists in the Personal Rule had – only now the tradition was more confessional than institutional. Emboldened by images of Elizabeth Tudor and Charles the Martyr, the prayer book tradition achieved a more stable, fixed identity as Anglicanism because it at last existed outside legal structures and because its adherents viewed the religious landscape according to Laudian historical sensibilities. While it is true, as Judith Maltby argues, that a self-conscious Anglicanism emerged because the guard-rails of government were taken away in the 1650s, I would like to augment that thesis, critically, to include the self-perception of prayer book loyalists as the heirs of an Elizabethan orthodoxy. It is that formula that created Anglicanism in the middle of the seventeenth century. Laudian rhetoric always looked back to the Elizabethan church (mythic or not) as the classical age for, as Edward Boughen would put it, “our reformation.”⁴¹⁴ Anglicanism emerged not simply because the guard-rails were removed, but additionally because these people had a Laudian historical narrative that satisfied their need to make sense of the world around them.

Boughen of course was not the only deprived Laudian making claims about “our reformation,” evincing a fidelity to a tradition that existed outside legal, institutional parameters. He was also not the only one to do so by recourse to a typically Laudian interpretation of Tudor history. Meric Casaubon, son of the Jacobean historian Isaac Casaubon and a major author of historical works in his own right, published a sermon he preached back in 1644 at Canterbury Cathedral. Casaubon, who had lost his prebendall stall at the cathedral, along with his two livings in Kent, was publically committed to the prayer book tradition and to Charles the Martyr in the 1650s. In the sermon, he continued

⁴¹⁴ Maltby, “Suffering and surviving: the civil wars, the Commonwealth and the formation of ‘Anglicanism’, 1642-60,” 158-180.

to raise the familiar Laudian argument about the beauty of holiness, rejecting the claim that ceremonial practices were novel.⁴¹⁵ This narrative of the English reformation was at the core of Anglican sensibilities.

In a similar vein and in the same decade, Anthony Sparrow defended the prayer book (with a Laudian gloss of course). Sparrow had been at Queen's College, Cambridge until a parliamentary purge in April 1644 when he was ejected from his fellowship. He was able to achieve the rectory of Hawkedon in 1647, but he lost it in less than two months for using the banned Book of Common Prayer. By the 1650s, Sparrow can certainly be classed with Boughen as one committed to a particular confessional tradition (Anglicanism) that existed outside the confines of legal realities. Moreover, he made a case for this tradition via historical appeal. In 1655, just after Cromwell's proclamation upholding the prohibition of prayer book worship, Sparrow published his *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England*. An anonymous text, Sparrow nevertheless went to the trouble of listing the compilers of the 1549 prayer book, highlighting the contribution of iconic figures from the middle sixteenth century. At the close of this list, he quotes from Charles I's reflections on Parliament's ordinance against the Book of Common Prayer: "Hardly can the pride of those men that study Novelties allow former times any share or degree of Wisdom or Godliness."⁴¹⁶ At one stroke, Sparrow linked Charles the Martyr with the Tudor church, arrayed these sixteenth century reformers against the efforts of both Parliament in the 1640s and Cromwell in the 1650s, and painted the dominant powers as disciples of novelty, men ignorant of history. He later invokes John Jewel, and through him and citations of various canons Sparrow makes a rather old-fashioned sounding case for prayer book ceremony and the use of

⁴¹⁵ Meric Casaubon, *King and His Subjects Unhappily Fallen Out* (London, 1660), 12; ODNB: Meric Casaubon. So respected was Casaubon's historical acumen that in 1652 then General Oliver Cromwell offered the deprived clergyman £500 to write a history of the civil wars. Casaubon declined.

⁴¹⁶ Anthony Sparrow, *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England* (London, 1655), A3.

ornaments.⁴¹⁷ Anthony Sparrow, however, was no old-style conformist. His inflammatory work on confession and priestly absolution (a text published in 1637 and examined in a previous chapter) had placed him not only in the Laudian party, but at its Arminian extreme. Considering Sparrow's arguments in the 1650s, it seems clear that at the heart of the emerging Anglican tradition – one that did not necessarily rely on legal endorsement – was the idea that the Laudian movement was a faithful reiteration of the principles and priorities of the English reformation. That narrative and the symbolic capital of Elizabeth and bishops like Jewel were as important to the tradition taking shape as the sheer survival of prayer book worship during the interregnum detailed by Judith Maltby.

At the close of the 1650s, just as talks with Charles II were moving in the direction of his return to England, a collection of documents by Charles I appeared in print under the heading *Bibliotheca Regia*. The cult of Charles the Martyr was now in the service of sustaining a pietistic, confessional tradition via invocation of historical sensibilities. Similar to *Eikon Basilike*, this collection presents Charles Stuart upholding a particular religious settlement crafted in the middle sixteenth century – nothing terribly new. But after a decade in exile, advocates of prayer book worship and episcopacy participated in a tradition that existed outside legal realities. Charles, therefore, is presented in the preface to the reader not simply as a proponent of old ways, but as a defender of English religion “according to the true and proper constitution” made in the sixteenth century.⁴¹⁸ Without question, this is a subtle interpretation. However, one cannot underestimate the effect of losing official, government sponsorship for the prayer book and episcopacy on the Laudians and, for that matter, the remaining old-style conformists. I would like to venture to describe *Bibliotheca Regia* as a fully Anglican

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., 105, 121.

⁴¹⁸ Charles Stuart, *Bibliotheca Regia* (London, 1659), 13.

text in that its focus is on Charles the Martyr upholding not simply a legal reality, but a confessional tradition.

An excellent example of this shift to an extra-legal, confessional tradition via historical invocation in the *Bibliotheca Regia* is Charles' speech given in Christ Church, Oxford just before he received Holy Communion. A short preface describes the king, just before the moment of reception, signaling to the archbishop of Armagh to give him a moment to speak to others present. Because it is brief and captures my argument, I include the speech in full.

My Lord, I espy here are many resolved Protestants who may declare to the world the resolution I now do make. I have to the utmost of my power prepared my soul to be a worthy receiver, and may I so receive comfort by the blessed Sacrament, as I do intend the establishment of the true reformed Protestant Religion, as it stood in its beauty in the happy days of Queen Elizabeth, without any connivance at Popery. I bless God that in the midst of these publick distractions I have still liberty to communicate [i.e. receive the Eucharist]; and may this sacrament be my damnation if my Heart doe not joyn with my Lips in this protestation.⁴¹⁹

There are a number of elements to note in this short speech given before the altar at Christ Church. First, Charles, whose “martyrdom” was surely in the mind of anyone reading this collection in 1659, invoked his efforts to remain faithful to an inherited “religion.” He lays a claim to the Reformed tradition, a strategy used by some avant-garde conformists in the 1620s and 1630s to disinherit Puritans and old-style conformists. Most importantly, though, is his identification of this true faith with Elizabeth Tudor. Historical sensibilities were at the core of this confessional tradition in the 1650s, but in a slightly different way. Charles' coreligionists believed that they were the heirs of an Elizabethan confessional tradition, not simply a fixed institution.

This sense of a confessional tradition existing without the help of the government is clarified sharply in the king's words: “I bless God that in the midst of these publick distractions I have still liberty to communicate.” As war raged in the 1640s, the

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., 58. *Bibliotheca Regia* also includes an extensive discussion of the liturgy in Scotland and a copy of Charles' decision in the St Gregory's case concerning the position of the communion table.

established Church of England was collapsing. Episcopacy was replaced first by presbyterianism and then, in the 1650s, by Oliver Cromwell's loose system of Triers and Ejectors. While "publick distractions," narrowly construed meant the civil war, to the reader in the 1650s, it meant the Cromwellian settlement of religion. Prayer book loyalists could see themselves with Charles standing before the altar at Christ Church Cathedral in Oxford about to receive the Eucharist according to a banned rite, that of the Book of Common Prayer. They could see themselves, in the midst of their own "publick distractions," maintaining a particular devotional pattern. They perceived themselves to be like Charles the Martyr: outnumbered, oppressed by a hostile government, yet ultimately loyal to a tradition developed by Elizabeth of blessed memory.

Before we move to a discussion of the Restoration and how appeals to history continued to shape and reshape the prayer book tradition – a tradition described here as confessional and with the label Anglicanism – it is important to review the theories and interpretations advanced thus far in this chapter. There are, in sum, three arguments to bear in mind before progressing to the 1660s. First, Laudianism derived its coherence not simply by virtue of its goal, "the beauty of holiness," but rather by the avant-garde conformists' application of a particular historical narrative to argue for that goal. The lowest common denominator approach to the phenomenon of Laudianism, a thesis developed about two decades ago, has not been unhelpful. In fact it has been a very useful corrective to the more theological interpretations of the period which drew sharp lines between Calvinists and Arminians, interpretations which simply could not account for aggressive Laudians who had more sympathy, theologically, with the broad strokes of solidly Reformed doctrines.⁴²⁰ Nevertheless, I have suggested here that it was the appeal to Elizabethan history – more precisely, a particular construction of Elizabethan history – that gave the avant-garde conformist movement its coherence. Whether during the

⁴²⁰ Lake, "The Laudian Style," 161-186; Idem, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I," 113-33.

Personal Rule or during the Interregnum, Laudianism derived its coherence by a particular rhetoric of conservatism. Therefore, as avant-garde conformity operated by appealing to certain sensibilities about the Tudor patrimony, the movement itself did not end with the calling of the Long Parliament, the collapse of Laudian hegemony, the outbreak of war, the abolition of the episcopate and prayer book, or even the executions of Laud and King Charles.

Second, the cult of Charles the Martyr, a phenomenon that emerged almost immediately after the king's death, enabled Laudians like Bishop William Juxon to foster the ominous sense among prayer book loyalists that the designs of all dissidents since the sixteenth century had at last come to pass in the regicide of 1649. Charles' sufferings and execution were likened to the passion of Jesus Christ himself – both kings persecuted for the truth, both rejected by their respective peoples. This literature, however, turned on the notion that Charles was in fact in the right and, more than that, in the right in historical terms. Charles was presented as the defender of an unaltered tradition, one established by Elizabeth Tudor. In Juxon's collection *A Perfect Copie of Prayers used by His Majestie*, Charles declared on the scaffold: "I die a Christian according to the confession of the Church of England, as I found it left to me by my father."⁴²¹ The message is that Charles had upheld the status quo against the innovations of men who were no different than those puritans who had challenged the Jacobean and Elizabethan regimes.

Third, in the late 1640s and through the 1650s prayer book loyalists could interpret their situation as a sign of historical fidelity. Judith Maltby tells us that the experience of suffering helped to create the Restoration phenomenon we call Anglicanism. I have suggested here that, in addition to suffering, the combination of the experience of being an adherent of an extra-legal confessional tradition (instead of an institutional one) and

⁴²¹ Charles Stuart, *A Perfect Copie of Prayers used by His Majestie*, 318.

the sense that Elizabeth Tudor crafted that tradition caused the emergence of a self-conscious Anglicanism. Prayer book loyalists could read *Bibliotheca Regia* and see themselves with Charles at Christ Church, persecuted, driven underground, but still using the Book of Common Prayer. The guardrails of government were not necessary for their continued participation in a particular religious tradition, one we can now call Anglicanism and one whose adherents understood themselves to be the co-religionists of Elizabeth Tudor. While Maltby has observed the persistence of prayer book worship without government support as a critical factor in the emergence of Anglicanism, I have suggested here that, additionally, the endorsement of a particular historical narrative – one developed first by the Laudians during the Personal Rule – was also essential for the rise of this distinct confessional tradition.

The Restoration and the Cavalier Vision

Charles II in his Declaration of Breda (1660) set a tone for reconciliation. The past, for the most part, would be but the past.⁴²² Conformable presbyterians need not fear their king, but rather rejoice and welcome his homecoming. At the Restoration, the prayer book party did have a fault-line between Laudians and more moderate users of the prayer book. Yet that line was harder to discern than in previous years. Important for this study is the recognition that both groups, generally speaking, maintained a profile in the apologetic market. More moderate episcopalians like Robert Sanderson did find room on the bench of bishops in fact as the avant-garde conformists continued to present their vision of the established church as the normative one. The presbyterian divine Richard Baxter, a man who had a history of brokering resolution between different groups, could identify two parties within the episcopalian camp. The issue dividing the prayer book men, however, was not so much the old question about normative worship

⁴²² “Declaration of Breda, 1660” in Gerald Bray, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 544-545.

styles but rather the question of what to do with Baxter and his coreligionists. This however doubled back on the older question, perhaps simply giving it a new face. There was on the one hand, according to Baxter, the moderate camp which included men like Sanderson who hoped to find a way to “comprehend” the presbyterians in the established church. By the summer of 1660, the presbyterians dissolved the last *classes* in a good faith effort to work with the restored crown. Such tractable presbyterians were even offered bishoprics as a way to bring them on board. All save one of these offers, however, were turned down. Baxter himself refused the see of Hereford. Less friendly to the cause of comprehension were, according to this Puritan, “the New Prelatical Divines.”⁴²³ This latter group included the new bishop of London, Gilbert Sheldon, and Henry Hammond who, like Heylyn, epitomized the attitude of the resurgent and often vindictive Cavaliers. Though the latter man died in the early years of the Restoration, Sheldon was elevated to Canterbury in 1663 after the short tenure of William Juxon, Laud’s old lieutenant and one last time his natural successor.

As they entered their see cities, the returning bishops were often met by cheering crowds. Certain chapters and deans – without orders to do so – picked up where they had left off back in the early 1640s. Diocesans were overwhelmed with requests for ordination. Robert Sanderson, on the same day he was consecrated to the see of Lincoln,

⁴²³ Bodl., Clarendon MS 72, fols. 284, 199-200, 288; John Gauden, *Slight Healings of Publique Hurts* (London, 1660), 78-79; John Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1969), 137; Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 143, 145, 171-172; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 29-31; Maltby, “Suffering and Surviving,” 158-180; G. R. Abernathy, *The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965), 44; J. H. Pruett, *The Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: The Leicestershire Experience* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 17-18. See also W. M. Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1993), 33-53. It should be admitted that although Baxter is traditionally and aptly labeled a presbyterian, he felt that polity was secondary. On certain occasions he indicated his willingness to accept a modified or reduced episcopacy.

had to contend with 67 applicants for holy orders.⁴²⁴ The country gentry were largely convinced episcopalians. It was this group that welcomed back the old church and, more importantly, provided for its well being in the newly elected Parliament. These Cavaliers, it is now recognized, shaped the Restoration settlement far more decisively than the new king. Older scholarship used to see Charles II as crafty. The argument ran that from the very start he never had any intention of reconciling the various religious groups in England. Robert Bosher's work was perhaps the last and best articulation of this view. It was replaced in the latter half of the twentieth century with Ian Green's presentation of the Restoration-era Commons being filled with vocal and uncompromising Cavalier Anglicans.⁴²⁵ These frustrated even royal attempts for reconciliation. N. H. Keeble maintains that most members of the Cavalier Parliament elected in the spring of 1661 understood toleration as a slippery slope to disorder. They believed that the Puritans – even the most tractable presbyterians – were just waiting to start another revolution.⁴²⁶

Three options for moving forward, according to Paul Seaward, were being discussed in the early 1660s. First, the government could proceed with a rigorous conformity campaign. Wedding national unity with religious uniformity, such a move would seem to pick up where William Laud left off in the late 1630s. The second option would be to relax ecclesiastical formulae in order to “comprehend” the large yet

⁴²⁴ P. B. G., Binnall, “Bishop Sanderson's Ordination Book,” *Transactions of the Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society* IX (1965); Ian Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 127-131; Hutton, *The Restoration*, 174.

⁴²⁵ Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662* (London: Dacre Press, 1951); Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 36-37; R. A. Beddard, “The Restoration Church,” in J. R. Jones, ed., *The Restored Monarchy, 1660-1689* (London: Macmillan, 1979), 161-162. Spurr argues that these provincial episcopalians were not necessarily acting out of *religious* conviction so much as their desire to reestablish their sense of the ancient and right order of things. While this is perhaps accurate, such a judgment presupposes an interior, spiritual definition of religion.

⁴²⁶ N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwells, 2002), 155-116.

moderate presbyterian block of the population. The third discernable proposal was to abandon national religious unity and allow for non-conformist worship outside the established Church of England. One might argue, oddly enough, that the first and third options could in theory assume a ceremonious episcopal church.⁴²⁷ The second option – the move for “comprehension” – opened up for discussion the nature of the Church of England. It is unrealistic, however, to imagine that these three options were neatly delineated. These were, rather, options gradually emerging in a steady stream of discussion in Charles II’s court. Although he argued for the resurrection of episcopacy and the prayer book, Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon after 1661, saw the value of working with the moderate presbyterians. A meeting at Worcester House in October 1660 had placated these conformable Puritans. On the 25th the king declared that a synod would be called to review the prayer book and the presbyterians would be included. Their perceptive request to have the Worcester House Declaration put in a statute, however, was denied.⁴²⁸

The Convention Parliament was dissolved on 24 December 1660. When the Cavalier Parliament convened the following May, the members turned out to be less than sympathetic to “comprehension” – the result likely of the Anglican sentiment among the provincial gentry. Although they were calculating enough to soften certain edges (evidence of Clarendon’s guidance), the members were led by a coterie of young, aggressive Anglicans. While there were some presbyterians left in Parliament, the handwriting was on the wall. The Savoy Conference, the promised synod which was to gather presbyterians and episcopalians for the revision of the prayer book, collapsed. A

⁴²⁷ Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 162.

⁴²⁸ Hutton, *The Restoration*, 150, 154; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 35-36. Hyde’s earldom was one of Charles’ coronation honors. He shrewdly turned down the elevation to duke of Clarendon, fearing the jealousy of other courtiers. His daughter Anne was already married to James, duke of York and heir apparent, and she had borne him a son, third in line for the crown.

riot of dissidents, the Fifth-Monarchy Men, had broken out in London that January. The Cavaliers were consequently in no mood to compromise. It is no surprise, then, to find a dejected Richard Baxter describing the Savoy Conference as a meeting of the deaf. Charles' coronation in Westminster Abbey on 9 April 1661, the prayer book feast of St. George, had made an ostentatious show of the relationship between royal and episcopal power, the ancient authorities of England. While Clarendon encouraged the spirit of Breda in his speech at the opening of the Cavalier Parliament that May, the young, newly-elected Anglicans had other ideas.⁴²⁹

The reforms of 1641-1654 came under assault almost immediately. Parliament decided to publicly burn the Solemn League and Covenant, order all its members to receive communion according to the prayer book rite, and restore the bishops to the House of Lords. The Commons committee for the review of ecclesiastical laws came together on 25 June. They ignored a peculiar though understandable instruction from Clarendon to use as their guiding model the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, the liturgy used at the Church of England's Reformed acme. Such a return to Edwardian worship – the liturgy of the episcopal Church of England at its evangelical zenith – might draw in those moderate presbyterians. Nothing came of this suggestion. Convocation was by now in session and on 10 October the king handed over the revision of the prayer book, originally the task of the botched Savoy Conference, to the assembled clergy. The promise of presbyterian involvement had withered on the vine as this body was even more Anglican in sentiment than the Cavalier Parliament. A new liturgy was ready for

⁴²⁹ Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times* (London, 1696), 303-368; Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, 163-166; Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, 185-189, 195-199; Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*, 210-211; Hutton, *The Restoration*, 151-154; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 38-39; G. J. Cuming, *The Godly Order: Texts and Studies Relating to the Book of Common Prayer* (London: SPCK, 1983), 144, 149-150. The bishops had been excluded from the upper house by statute in 1642. Thomas Venner led the Fifth Monarchist rebellion on 6 January 1661, the feast of the Epiphany. The rebels only numbered around thirty-five in all. The fear which this relatively small number was able to engender highlights the tension of the moment.

inspection on 20 December 1661. After 600 changes, the revised Book of Common Prayer was far from satisfying or comprehending the presbyterians.⁴³⁰

With Breda in mind, Clarendon, perhaps at the prodding of Charles, scrambled to add certain clauses to the emerging Act of Uniformity. These would have empowered the king to offer some relief for “tender consciences.” Some clergy, he proposed, ought to have the right to omit certain parts of the liturgy. The Commons rejected the notion outright. Prayer book worship would be undiluted. Passed on 19 May 1662, the Act of Uniformity ordered all clergy to publicly accept the new liturgy and denounce the Solemn League and Covenant by St. Bartholomew’s Day (24 August). Deprivations came swiftly. Close to a tenth of all clergy in England and Wales were ejected.⁴³¹ A number of church courts were also revived and put back to work. This, however, was not a wholesale return to the days of the Personal Rule. Two of the most important elements from the Laudian high tide did not return. Laud’s sharpest weapon, the dread Court of High Commission, and his greatest victory, the Canons of 1640, stayed in the tomb with him. Nevertheless, the Act of Uniformity was enforced, the new Prayer Book was mandated, and ejections did come. The Conventicles Act of 1664 ended any lingering

⁴³⁰ Edward Cardwell, ed., *Synodalia: A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons, and Proceedings of Convocations* (Oxford, 1842), 631-673; Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, 167, 171-172; Hutton, *The Restoration*, 154, 175; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 40-41. Regarding Laudian influence on the composition of the 1662 prayer book, Spurr and Hutton disagree. Spurr argues that only the Ordinal has a Laudian accent while the rest of the book evinces the work of moderates like Sanderson. Hutton on the other hand emphasizes that the new liturgy “enjoined all the ceremonies to which they [i.e. the presbyterians] took exception.”

⁴³¹ “The Act of Uniformity, 1662,” in Bray, ed. *Documents of the English Reformation*, 546-559; Hutton, *The Restoration*, 154; Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, 167, 171-172. In certain circles 24 August came to be known as “Black Bartholomew” or “Fatal Bartholomew.” As one might suspect, in the Reformed imagination, the ejection of non-conformist clergy on St. Bartholomew’s Day, 1662 was often elided with the more infamous massacre of French Calvinists on 24 August 1572. David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew’s Day: Preaching, Polemic, and Restoration Non-Conformity* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007), 3-5.

hope of comprehension. Parliament habitually rejected calls for leniency while crushing dissent.⁴³²

No friend to the presbyterians, Sir Job Charlton told a meeting of the Lords in April 1661 that England could not abide a church within a church: comprehension was an invitation to schism and revolt.⁴³³ Strangely enough, many moderate Puritans of the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean church had adopted that very approach, being an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*. By the 1590s and certainly after the Hampton Court conference, most moderate Puritans had given up on reforming the English church as a whole and made instead what Dwight Bozeman describes as the pietist turn inward. The result was an affectionate, practical divinity. Such Puritans were pests in the eyes of the regime to be sure, but not necessarily seen as inciters of bloody rebellion. Men like Charlton on the other side of civil war and regicide thought otherwise. Such anxieties notwithstanding, the Restoration was not a thorough retrieval of Laud's pre-war church. Matthew Wren, one of a small handful of Laud's associates still serving on the episcopal bench, was evidently the only bishop to agitate for communion rails. It is surprising, also, that most of Charles II's early appointments to the episcopate were moderates like Sanderson.⁴³⁴ As observed, neither the High Commission nor the Canons of 1640 were reactivated. A ceremonious episcopal church, one outfitted with a new edition of the prayer book, did nevertheless take root. The push for this resurrection is found less with the king and more with the Cavaliers in Parliament, a supportive provincial gentry, and a thoroughly Anglican Convocation.

⁴³² Boshier, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, 228; Hutton, *The Restoration*, 154; Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, 180, 184, 189; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 39-42.

⁴³³ *Journal of the House of Lords*, Vol. IX, 446-450. See also Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*, 193-195.

⁴³⁴ Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 64-74; Hutton, *The Restoration*, 155; Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 35.

I would like to suggest that at the core of this Anglican push was a particular historical sensibility, the Laudian vision of the Elizabethan prayer book tradition. Prayer book loyalists during the interregnum understood themselves to be faithful adherents of a confessional tradition founded by Elizabeth Tudor and for which Charles the Martyr suffered and died. The Laudians had in fact succeeded in one of their central goals: to make the Caroline church coterminous with the Elizabeth church in popular imagination. The literature canvassed and examined in this dissertation, material from the 1620s and '30s and text produced during the war years and the Interregnum, had a particular reading of the past that made the beauty of holiness movement seem innocuous and in fact conservative. Charles and the Laudian clergy are portrayed as the heirs of Elizabeth, Archbishop Whitgift, and the iconic reformers of the sixteenth century. Those who challenge them are summarily cast as dissidents, the heirs of Cartwright, Martin Marprelate, and a range of undifferentiated radicals. Considering that this rhetoric did not disappear with the end of the Personal Rule or at the death of Laud, it should come as no surprise to find the persistence of these arguments and historical interpretations at the Restoration.

David Lloyd, a representative example of the young and frankly aggressive Anglican clergy in the 1660s, released two texts that played on these historical sensibilities. His was the same rhetoric developed first by the Laudians during the Personal Rule and continuously used by prayer book loyalists during the interregnum to stabilize an extra-legal confessional tradition. *Cabala: or the Mystery of Conventicles Unvaild* (1664) is a fascinating dialogue between two principal characters – a conformist and a non-conformist – before a judge. An iteration of a classically reformation-era genre of literature and one published under the pseudonym Oliver Foulis, Lloyd's *Cabala* is a highly readable narrative about the history of the English church delivered in a forensic style. In dramatic fashion, colorful witnesses from recent history appear along the way to support or rebut the claims of the two principals. At the outset, the non-

conformist admits that his predecessors in the middle sixteenth century have been gravely upset with the condition of the English church.⁴³⁵ Calvin is portrayed here as rejecting England's "moderate course," that is "neither keeping too neer, nor going too far from Rome." The Genevan reformer is also described as a tamperer, one who encouraged "non-conformity against our Law, order and peace." Calvin himself then appears on the scene and confirms these descriptions. Richard Hooker enters the courtroom and tells Calvin that he is highly esteemed in England and a testimony to the French people. Yet, Hooker continues, he was wrong to "abtrude" in the English church. Archbishop Richard Bancroft shows up to point another damning finger at Calvin, but observes that he had help in his unwelcome tampering. John a Lasko, Bancroft announces, organized a congregation in England that was distinct in its discipline and worship from the established church, and therefore a source of confusion for English Christians.⁴³⁶

The court then moves to challenge Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli for their interferences (despite the fact that, like a Lasko, these men had been invited guests). "We are sorry to hear," says the judge, "that you Dr. Bucer refused some Ceremonies at Cambridge." The court then cites the letters of Vermigli in which he admits to refusing to wear the surplice though a canon of Christ Church, Oxford. At this point in the "trial" all three – a Lasko, Bucer, and Vermigli – say they are sorry to see the seeds they planted blossom into regicidal radicalism. In this apology, the three foreign reformers plot out three stages of Puritanism: Edwardian scruples about vestments; Elizabethan exceptions against canons and articles; and finally, "those who since have laid the Axe to the Root of the Tree, and destroyed Government itself." In short, the political and religious tragedy that was the Interregnum was their fault; they planted the seeds. Returning to the seminal

⁴³⁵ Oliver Foulis, *Cabala: or the Mystery of Conventicles Unvaild: in an Historical Account of the Principles and Practices of the Non-Conformists, against Church and State: From the First Reformation under King Edward the VI Anno 1550 to this present Year, 1664* (London, 1664), 5.

⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, 6-9.

days of Puritanism, the court then hears from Bishop Hooper. He appears on the scene to argue for doing away with vestments, to which the court responds that such ornaments are decent and useful for winning over papists. Hooper, a Lasko, Bucer, and Vermigli are portrayed as disruptive individuals who egotistically put their own vision ahead of what is best for the established church. These instances are all gathered together when Lloyd writes, “Alas! to what sad times are we resolved, when a few mens fancies and opinions shall controule the whole church.”⁴³⁷

The discussion in the courtroom then moves from the Edwardian church to the reign of Queen Mary. Lloyd’s presentation of the middle 1550s focuses on the troubles among the continental exiles. He only barely discusses the Marian martyrs. The verdict thrown at non-conformists is that they “layed the foundation of the most dangerous Schism that ever was in the World.” The implication is that loyal prayer book conformists have always faced the intemperate and frankly volatile Puritanism that reared its head at Frankfort in the 1550s and took the head of Charles in 1640s.⁴³⁸ This is the same Laudian rhetoric examined in texts from the Personal Rule and interregnum: nothing, according to this construct of English history, had changed. There were conformists faithful to the true prayer book tradition and there were Puritans whose motley designs only led to chaos. *Semper Eadem*.

The court discussion in *Cabala* then moves to the reign of Elizabeth. Men like Sampson and Humphries “began to defame the Queen... endeavoring to battle Ecclesiastical authority by overthrowing the fountaine of it.”⁴³⁹ These succeeded in getting Edmund Grindal to the see of Canterbury, a bishop described here as “a little inclined to their way.” To Puritan delight, Grindal “encouraged private Conventicles

⁴³⁷ Ibid., 10-13.

⁴³⁸ Ibid., 18-19.

⁴³⁹ Ibid., 21-22.

under the name of Propheycings.” Propheycings were basically regional sermon workshops – continuing education for clergy. These very public meetings in which three or four ministers preached and then discussed their efforts had been going on in England since the 1560s; they were modeled on the Zurich *Prophezei*, a similar phenomenon many of the Marian exiles had encountered while guests of Heinrich Bullinger. According to a survey Grindal conducted many bishops liked the workshop meetings, feeling that they did improve clergy standards. Seeing in these meetings a potential for subversive activity, Elizabeth ordered all propheycings to cease in Canterbury province. It is interesting to note this was not done in the north as residual Catholicism was such a force to be dealt with that the propheycings were frankly indispensable. In late 1576, Grindal and Elizabeth came to loggerheads on this issue, resulting in the archbishop’s house arrest. A mercifully quick physical death followed the archbishop’s political death. Lloyd, in the 1660s, has his characters proclaim that, had the propheycings been allowed to spread, the church would have faced ruinous schism.

Notwithstanding Elizabeth’s efforts to restrain dissent, the church faced the insidious classes movement in the 1570s and 1580s. The court discussion here portrays Puritanism as a movement with a number of instantiations, but ultimately trained on the downfall of “church and commonwealth.”⁴⁴⁰ The message is, do not be fooled by differences among the Puritans, for they all ultimately want the same thing: chaos. The waning of the sixteenth century in England, particularly in the wake of the defeat of the Spanish Armada (an event widely perceived as indicative of God’s approval of Elizabeth, the regime, and the church), has been described as a conformist high-tide. In treating the last decade of the century, Lloyd’s characters race through the issues which, as Patrick Collinson has argued, reveal Puritan panic and hysteria: the Marprelate tracts (books “altogether unbecoming a pious spirit”), Cartwright’s fall in the early 1590s, and the

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., 23-26.

Hackett and Coppinger affair. For good measure, Lloyd describes Hackett stabbing a portrait of the queen.⁴⁴¹

Moving to James' reign, Lloyd's conformist protagonist in the courtroom pitches that the new king "knew that a Presbytery as well agreeth with Monarchy as God and the Devil; they are his own words: He knew no Bishop, no King." The court hears evidence that James meant to uphold the church "of the late Queen as she left it settled" and how he protected it at the Hampton Court conference.⁴⁴² Moving to Charles' reign, Lloyd's court proceedings indict the gentry in Parliament for being seduced by the puritans. These non-conformists had to find an entry point in the Commons as they knew that "the king was well settled and resolved against all Innovations." This is a direct argument that the Caroline-Laudian church was committed to an Elizabethan orthodoxy while the puritans and all who resisted established authority were the real innovators. Lloyd accounts for the appearance of Laudian novelty by using what I have described in previous chapters as the Abbott thesis. James' archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbott, is described as "over-indulgent" to the Puritans, lax in his duty to maintain conformity. According to the Abbott thesis, Laud's succession to Canterbury in 1633 was simply a correction. The fact that so many felt pain at his efforts was because Abbott's long tenure had lulled the nation away from the true prayer book tradition of Bancroft and Whitgift.⁴⁴³ This was a rhetorical strategy in use since the 1630s, and one that turned on that typically Laudian sense that the avant-garde conformists had been faithful to the church of Elizabeth Tudor. On the other hand, so clear are the innovations of the Puritans that all "the world may see." When they got the upper hand in Parliament, this writer

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., 30-34; Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 385-402.

⁴⁴² Foulis, *Cabala*, 35-39.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 40-43.

continues, they persecuted all good conformists and “intended to destroy all Law, Order, Civility, and Pure Religion.”⁴⁴⁴

Lloyd’s courtroom drama concludes with a discussion of England and the state of “conventicles” in the 1660s. It was God’s work that Charles II returned to his kingdom, according to the protagonist, and it was likewise a divine mandate that the episcopacy, the prayer book, and the old ways re-emerge as the nation’s legally established tradition. At one point he discusses the Savoy Conference meant to assuage presbyterian scruples, arguing that it was ultimately a futile engagement. “It was not very likely that a day or two’s conference should persuade them [i.e. the presbyterians] out of that way, out of which the last hundred years law, power, and reason could not force them.” Lloyd set contemporary affairs against the backdrop of history. His conclusion was that the fixed personae and parties were, without question, just going to be at loggerheads. Reflecting on over a century of puritanism, he argued that “at first all the lesser factions were hid in Presbytery, till time and military success discovering to ever one his own advantage, invited them to part into several parties, as Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers, Fifth Monarchy men.” The one who rightly appreciated the socio-religious landscape of England since the days of Elizabeth Tudor would well know that to give the presbyterians an inch was to give every imaginable radical a mile. The uncompromisingly Cavalier Restoration settlement was not simply a good thing; it was the only thing keeping the church and state from slipping into another dark commonwealth winter. “Blood, rapine, violence, malice, animosities, and plots have been attendant” to Puritanism “since it was in the cradle.” The judgment in Lloyd’s fictional courtroom, a scene populated with figures from every decade of English church history since the middle sixteenth century, is

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., 43, 45-48.

that Charles II has only two options before him: firmly uphold prayer book Anglicanism or return to his continental exile, leaving England in chaos.⁴⁴⁵

In the following year, 1665, Lloyd published another text in a similar historical vein. Once more this young Cavalier Anglican clergyman expounded the virtues of conformity (i.e. Laudianism) and the wickedness of Puritanism. Lloyd's *State-Worthies or, the Statesmen of England Since the Reformation* is a collection of short biographical entries on important figures in national history since the reign of Henry VIII. It is, in one sense, an early modern version of the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Three entries stand out for examination here. Lloyd's description of William Laud begins with his education at St. John's, Oxford, noting that Laud's studies were "not prepossessed with partial systems of Geneva, but freely conversant with the impartial volumes of the Church Catholicke." Not only was Laud very early in his career distanced from Reformed sensibilities, his care for the Church of England was very different from that of his predecessor at Canterbury. George Abbott's "yield" to the puritans is described as "a great miscarriage." Once more the Abbott thesis made sense of the appearance of novel during the Personal Rule. So vigilant was Laud for the Church of England and conformity that

he did not think fit any private new Masters whatsoever should obtrude any Foreign or Domestick Dictates to her, or force her to take her copy of Religion from so petty a place as Geneva was, or Frankfort, or Amserdam, or Wittenberg, or Edenborough, no not from Augsburg, or Arnheim, nor any foreign City or Town, any more than from Trent or Rome; none of which had any Dictatorian Authority over this great and famous Nation or Church of England.

Lloyd's assessment of Laud is that he pursued a well-established and long-recognized pattern of conformity in the English church. Therefore, "posterity shall engrave him in

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., 49, 64.

the Albe of the most excellent Prelacy, the most indulgent Fathers of the Church, and the most injured Martyrs.”⁴⁴⁶

Lloyd’s entry for Abbott repeats the same presentation of James’ archbishop of Canterbury heard over and over again in Laudian literature: Abbott had been lax in his responsibilities and had allowed Puritanism to spread, winking at their conventicles and insidious plots against conformity. “His extraordinary remisness in not exacting strict conformity to the prescribed Orders of the Church in point of ceremony” allowed “inconformity” to flourish. Had Laud or a man like him followed Richard Bancroft at Canterbury instead of George Abbott, Lloyd argues, England would have been made into a Jerusalem.⁴⁴⁷ The entry for William Juxon in *State-Worthies* describes his fidelity to conformity and his aim to persevere as a prayer book loyalist during the interregnum. Charles II had made the right choice in tapping Juxon for Canterbury when the king returned to England. After all, “amongst the many worthy Bishops of our Land, King Charles the first selected him for his Confessor at his Martyrdom.”⁴⁴⁸ The choice of Juxon for Canterbury was, Lloyd intimated, a sign of continuity between father and son, and, as an extension, between the Restoration settlement, the Caroline-Laudian church, and the prayer book tradition that sprang up in the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. The Anglicanism that emerged in the 1660s, thanks largely to the Laudian rhetoric about history and confessional identity, was deeply convinced of its conformity to the living prayer book tradition of the later sixteenth century.

⁴⁴⁶ David Lloyd, *State-Worthies or, the Statesmen of England Since the Reformation* (London, 1665), 992-1002.

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 747, 749.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 1039.

Suffering, Surviving, and Remembering: Laudian Historical Rhetoric and Anglicanism

A collection of Restoration-era notes concerning the prayer book liturgy, many of which were likely drawn from still earlier notes by Lancelot Andrewes, exists in manuscript in the Bodleian Library. These observations, clarifications, and interpretations bring the thinking of the dominant Anglican party in the 1660s into focus. Generally, the notes' objective is to provide a Laudian gloss for the prayer book. There is a good deal of discussion on altars, kneeling, the position of the priest at various moments – all familiar concerns. What is also familiar is the apologetic approach. It is historical, and the clear anchor point for legitimacy in these notes is the later sixteenth century. The note-taker (possibly Archbishop William Sancroft) argued that when there was

pulling down of altars and setting up of Geneva Tables at the beginning of 2 Eliz, she [i.e. Elizabeth] was faine to make an injunction to restrain such ungodly fury..... and appointed comely and decent tables... to be sett up again in the same place where the altars stood thereby giving an interpretation of this clause in the Communion book. For the word [table] here stands not exclusively, as if it might not be called an altar, but to show the indifferency, and liberty of the name, as of old it was called *Mensa Domini* as well as *Altare Domini*.⁴⁴⁹

The interpretation in these notes rests on certain assertions about recent English history, and these assertions framed “the beauty of holiness” as faithful to an Elizabethan orthodoxy. This sensibility had been the very warp and woof of Laudian rhetoric during the Personal Rule. The same can be said of Laudian literature during the 1640s and 1650s. Moreover, works by authors like David Lloyd evince the continued use of this vital historical strategy when Charles II returned to England. It was this rhetoric that shaped Anglican identity at the Restoration: Cavaliers, like their Laudian clergy, believed and argued that they were the heirs of an Elizabethan prayer book tradition.

⁴⁴⁹ Bodl., Sancroft MS 11, 64.

I have made several related claims in this chapter and, for the sake of clarity, these arguments need to be repeated in conclusion. First, while Peter Lake and other scholars have deftly shown that Laudianism as a religious phenomenon cannot be defined strictly according to doctrinal theology (i.e. Arminianism versus Calvinism) and have demonstrated the importance of “the beauty of holiness” as the Laudians’ over-riding concern, I have argued here that it was their historical rhetoric that gave the movement coherence.⁴⁵⁰ In the 1640s, Laudian power collapsed. Episcopacy was abolished. The prayer book was outlawed. King Charles and William Laud were executed. Despite this upheaval, Laudian apologia continued to run along the same historical tracks. Certainly the displaced Laudians reacted to different circumstances, for example the pro-episcopal texts written early in the 1640s when Parliament was considering ejecting the bishops from the House of Lords. Their arguments, however, still made reference to a particular construction of Elizabethan history. It was this rhetoric that gave the avant-garde conformist movement its coherence, and the persistent consumption of this narrative of the pace-setting sixteenth century explains the survival of Laudianism despite the abolition of their power and the violent death of Laud himself. These authors continued to use what I have described as the positive and negative strategy of historical appeal, aligning themselves with iconic figures from the late sixteenth century while dismissing their opponents as the heirs of Tudor dissidents. They continued to deploy what I have called the Abbott thesis to account for the appearance of novelty in the 1630s. They continued to de-historicize and polarize the landscape from c.1550 to c.1640, pushing all conformists together in one party and all who challenged the established church and successive regimes into another. Such “parties,” as discussed in an earlier chapter, were both fictive and distortive. They also continued to use what I have described as the

⁴⁵⁰ Lake, “The Laudian Style”; Idem, “Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity.” It must be admitted, of course, that my argument about Laudian historical rhetoric builds on Lake’s notion of avant-garde conformism. The critical difference is that I here suggest that this particular element of their rhetoric can account for far more than Lake seems to consider.

Semper Eadem strategy, pitching the Caroline regime as consonant with the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. This rhetorical move took on new meaning, of course, after the execution or “martyrdom” of Charles Stuart.

This brings us to my second argument in this chapter. Laudians like Bishop William Juxon used Charles’ death – an event which was as much an entry into the public discussion of legitimacy and authority as it was the bloody death of one man – to explain to prayer book loyalists that they and their king were the victims of plots laid almost a century earlier. The regicide was simply the fruition of plans fashioned by men like Thomas Cartwright. *Eikon Basilike*, ostensibly the pious diary of the king, highlighted Charles’ sufferings in the defense of established, old-fashioned ways. This literature pushed the notion that Charles was not simply in the right, but in the right in historical terms. Charles the Martyr died for his defense of a tradition established by Elizabeth Tudor, the nursing mother of the church in its classical moment. The cult of Charles the Martyr, a phenomenon deftly studied by Andrew Lacey, needs to be set against the backdrop of Laudian historical rhetoric, as the devotional material that grew out of the cult was effectively no different from the Laudian literature examined here. *Eikon Basilike* and the phenomenon of the cult of Charles the Martyr, therefore, need to be placed in the context of Laudian historical rhetoric.

According to this rhetoric, Charles had suffered and died for the cause of the prayer book and an Elizabethan inheritance. During the Interregnum, prayer book loyalists could interpret their situation as a sign of historical fidelity. Judith Maltby has examined the persistent use of the prayer book and the adherence to a particular spirituality despite government opposition. Her conclusion is that the phenomenon known as Anglicanism emerged as a self-conscious tradition because it existed outside the frame work of government patronage. My third general argument in this chapter is that in addition to the experience of being adherents of an extra-legal confessional tradition (instead of an institutional one), Anglicanism owed its origin to the mid-

seventeenth century perception of fidelity to an Elizabethan religious patrimony. Essential for the rise of this distinct confessional tradition we today call Anglicanism were the ideas found in texts like *Bibliotheca Regia*, texts which present adherents of an extra-legal, pietistic tradition as simply faithful to the religion of Elizabeth Tudor. During the Interregnum, Laudian narratives of the sixteenth century supplied prayer book loyalists (women and men we can now responsibly describe as Anglican) with a satisfying confessional identity, one deeply informed by a perception of conservatism.

At the Restoration, hopes for comprehension were crushed by the Cavaliers in Parliament, a largely episcopalian gentry in the country, and an aggressively Anglican clergy in convocation. The spirit of the Declaration of Breda was ignored; the Savoy conference was a dead end. While the canons of 1640 were not reactivated, a ceremonious episcopal church equipped with a frankly Laudian spirituality emerged. The Restoration settlement, symbolized by the 1662 prayer book and the ejection of all non-conformists by 24 August (“Black Bartholomew”), was, in short, an Anglican achievement. The confessional tradition born during the interregnum now was the official position of the institutional Church of England. At the heart of the formation of that pietistic confessional tradition, I have argued, was a particular historical narrative. With the crown, the episcopate, and the prayer book restored in the early 1660s, that narrative continued to inform Anglican sensibilities about who they were and what they had done in rooting out dissent. The Laudian rhetoric developed first during the Personal Rule – polemical strategies initially deployed to defend east-end altars and increased ceremony – now undergirded Anglican identity. This was not simply a shift in the meaning of conformity or a redrawing of boundaries, but rather the rise of a distinct confessional tradition. The paradox of course was that Anglican identity rested on the notion that nothing had changed, that the Restoration settlement merely reasserted an Elizabethan settlement.

In making this fourth and final argument, I have principally examined texts by David Lloyd. More prolific than Lloyd, however, was the Laudian polemicist Peter Heylyn. A Westminster prebend in the 1630s and editor of the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* during the civil war, Heylyn produced a number of historical texts at the Restoration that warrant close examination. During the Personal Rule, Heylyn had entered the fray over east-end altars and other elements of “the beauty of holiness” by appealing to Elizabethan history. At the Restoration he continued to pitch a particular vision for the established church. Heylyn’s vision for the Church of England, consonant with that found in works by David Lloyd, insisted that Elizabeth Tudor had fashioned a particular religious tradition, one distinct from Reformed Protestantism and guided by a ceremonious and sacrament-centered piety. A close study of Heylyn’s Restoration texts follows.

CHAPTER 5

PETER HEYLYN AND THE POLITICS OF HISTORY
IN RESTORATION ENGLAND

When Charles II returned to England in 1660, the surviving handful of bishops found themselves restored to their old sees while younger clergy who had weathered the Interregnum were elevated to the vacant ones. Peter Heylyn, whose works during the Personal Rule were examined in an earlier chapter, found himself once more the occupant of a prebendall stall at Westminster Abbey. A firm advocate for the “beauty of holiness,” Heylyn had been vocal about east-end altars, rails, the use of vestments like the cope, and figurative religious art. Unlike a number of other Laudians, Heylyn, aged and almost blind, was not advanced to the episcopate. So while William Juxon was translated to Canterbury and men like John Cosin and Gilbert Sheldon were made bishops, Heylyn merely resumed his pre-war post in the Abbey. Although he was dead within two years of Charles’ return to England, this Westminster prebend wrote texts in the waning phase of the Interregnum and during the Restoration which not only implemented the historical strategies examined in much of this dissertation but which shaped the very phenomenon considered in the previous chapter, that is, the consolidation of the confessional tradition Anglicanism as the normative face of the established church and the perception that the Restoration religious project was merely the reassertion of an Elizabethan settlement.

With fresh eyes, historians of early modern Britain need to reassess what contemporaries believed about themselves in those turbulent middle decades of the seventeenth century. Since being freed from the “myth of Anglicanism,” as Nicholas Tyacke describes out-dated historiography, scholars should now ask how women and men in Stuart England understood their present circumstances in light of a possibly

plastic past.⁴⁵¹ In this chapter I will address the work of Peter Heylyn (1599-1662), arguably the most acerbic Laudian polemical writer and the author of a number of historical texts. Having already examined his earlier work, especially his role in the altar controversy of the 1630s, I will focus here on his writing in the late 1650s and 1660s. Anthony Milton has suggested that Heylyn needs to be understood as more than an unscrupulous polemicist. In his biography of this early modern historian, war time news-book editor, and Westminster prebend, Milton writes that Heylyn's works "display an increasing obsession with the view that all disputes could be ultimately reduced to matters of historical fact."⁴⁵² As sixteenth century bishops like Matthew Parker collected medieval historical records, so seventeenth century bishops and clergy wrote histories of the reformation which likewise shaped their self-perception and made sense of the religious and political landscape.⁴⁵³ Narratives like those written by Peter Heylyn could explain to Anglicans why Charles had suffered execution, an event they construed as martyrdom. This literature could explain why the Protectorate church so deeply opposed the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Such material could also explain to the Cavaliers what should be done now that Charles II and the bishops were restored. In short, early modern historical consciousness more often than not needs to be set in the context of polemic, politics, and religious controversy. Heylyn's object was to equate the

⁴⁵¹ Tyacke, "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism," 5-33.

⁴⁵² ODNB: Heylyn.

⁴⁵³ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*, 120-121, 161; Achsah Guibbory, *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion, and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 28-43; Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 8-9; Martin, *Walton's Lives*, passim. See also Peter Lake, "Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism, and Nicholas Tyacke," in Peter Lake and Kenneth Fincham, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006), 8-9; David Norbrook, "The English Revolution and English Historiography," in N. H. Keeble, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 233-250; Jesse M. Lander, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-55; Nicholas McDowell, *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1-21.

deeply contested religious policies of the Personal Rule as well as the extra-legal confessional tradition we call Anglicanism which emerged during the Interregnum with the standards established in the previous century, namely the standards of Elizabeth Tudor. By using well-worn and time-tested Laudian historical strategies, this unusually productive writer constructed a narrative of the past that could convince Cavalier Anglicans that their work in Parliament and in convocation was simply a return to an Elizabethan settlement.

Heylyn at the Close of the Interregnum

During the ‘underground’ years of the 1650s, Peter Heylyn produced *The Way and Manner of the Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified: Against the Clamors and Objections of the Opposite Parties*. Published in 1657, the long title itself points to the author’s polemical goal. True to Laudian form, Heylyn polarized the landscape. He arrayed all prayer book conformists against any who challenged the church’s clerical leadership. Of course one should recall that when Heylyn spoke of the leadership of the Church of England, he blurred together men like Whitgift with later Laudian bishops. This writer was, strictly speaking, a clericalist. While some Laudians had tended to push power into Charles’ hands, Peter Heylyn often stressed the power of the clergy in both reforming and leading the English church. While he does set the English monarch in a conspicuous place, Heylyn was no sycophant to the crown. In his *Observations on Mr. Harmon L’Estrange’s Life of Charles I* (1656), he exposes his less than thorough support for the Stuart dynasty. There is no question that in Heylyn’s narrative the monarch was involved in church affairs. The king or the queen, depending on the timeline, was the supreme governor of the Church of England, and Heylyn recognized that. This is particularly the case when he needed to demonstrate Parliament’s error in interfering with religious business. Heylyn argued that the model established at the reformation was the crown operating together with the clergy.

Parliament, therefore, should have held its peace in the 1640s. Despite the obvious role played by the crown in religious affairs, Heylyn was more committed to an independent clerical estate. The church ultimately served at the behest of neither the crown nor the Parliament. This late interregnum text is clearly marked by certain historical and legal anxieties, and chief among them is the nature of authority in the English church.

In Heylyn's *Way and Manner*, ecclesiastical authority seems to move from the crown to the archbishop of Canterbury and the clerical convocation, and then to Parliament. Nothing is terribly surprising about this. It is a motif, however, one should not pass too quickly as the author admits that he is laying a "ground work." His agenda is to refute the papist claim that England had only a "Parliamentary Religion" and only a "Parliamentary Clergy." In his response, Heylyn does not turn to the Godly magistrate's presence in church governance, but rather defends the clergy's long recognized power. Though he subordinates Parliament and all mechanisms of government to the crown (the nurse of the church), the crown did not *determine* religion. During the reign of Edward VI, Heylyn argues, doctrine was "composed, confirmed, and settled in no other way, than by the clergy onely in their convocation, the king's authority co-operating and concurring with them."⁴⁵⁴ The "ground work" of the first Book of Common Prayer (1549), likewise, was not laid by "the care and goodness" of the Parliament, but rather by the "resolution" of the clergy in convocation. Regarding the Articles of Religion, Heylyn points to their 1562 title. One finds there archbishops, bishops, and clergy in convocation but no mention of Parliament "either in the way of approbation or of confirmation."⁴⁵⁵

Surely, Heylyn admits, the Lords and Commons *approved* the articles in the next decade, the 1570s. The MPs, however, cannot be credited with the *crafting* of these points. Perhaps thinking of convocation, he notes that the participants of the ancient

⁴⁵⁴ *Way and Manner*, 11, 18, 34.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 25.

ecumenical councils were not simply “populi.” With such historical details in mind, Heylyn has a specific target: he intends to demonstrate “the falsehood and absurdities of the collection made by Mr Pryn.” Heylyn dismissed Prynne’s idea that the MPs have the “ancient genuine, just and lawful prerogative to establish true Religion.” He effectively lifts the church from the restraints of Parliament. But Heylyn was not liberating the clerical establishment from lay control so much as proclaiming that the church *had always been free*. The clergy, after all, drove reformation from the start according to his narrative. Did Parliament translate the *pater noster* in the reign of Henry VIII? Did Parliament make those critical changes when the reformation first came to England? Did Parliament craft the Book of Common Prayer? “All this was done,” Heylyn presses, “before the Parliament did anything.”⁴⁵⁶

It seems clear enough that Heylyn marginalized the work of the Lords and Commons in the sixteenth century to counter parliamentary / protectorate claims to religious authority in his own day. “You see how little was done by authority or power of Parliament, so little that if it had been less, it had been just nothing.” This does not mean that Parliament was beyond troubling the waters. This narrative gives the Lords and Commons just enough rope with which to hang themselves. Parliament had some power according to Heylyn – enough at least to stir up mischief. These laymen had fickle, itching ears and would readily listen to those who did not have England’s best interests at heart. This was certainly the case, he argues, when it came to revising the 1549 prayer book. “Some exceptions being taken against the Liturgy by some of the preciser sort at home, and by Calvin abroad, the book was brought under review.” In short, Parliament only made trouble. Moreover, Heylyn emphasizes that the only thing the body could do was take exception. They were critics not creators. The clergy of the established church, on the other hand, made positive contributions. It was the clergy who made the changes

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., 27-29.

and produced the 1552 prayer book. Parliament simply confirmed their efforts in a “blinde obedience.”⁴⁵⁷ Similarly, the few alterations made to the liturgy in 1604 (e.g. the addition of prayers for the royal family now that there actually was one) were accomplished by proclamation, not by Parliaments. Using these historical examples Heylyn establishes a pattern of church government. In doing so he rejects both Catholic and Puritan criticisms.

Put all which hath been said together, and the summe is this; That the proceedings of this Church in the Reformation were not meerly Regall (as it is objected by some Puritans) much lesse that they were Parliamentarian in so great a work, as the Papists falsly charge upon us, the Parliaments for the most part doing little in it, but that they were directed in a justifiable way, the work being done Synodically by the Clergy onely, according to the usage of the Primitive times, the King concurring with them, and corroborating what they had resolved on.⁴⁵⁸

The themes of primitivism and legitimacy captivate Heylyn as he describes a church free from parliamentary oversight and only nursed by the crown. Papists and Puritans violate sacred custom when they insist on Roman or parliamentary encroachment; their arguments lack historical substance. The clergy of the Church of England, defended by the monarch, would propagate true religion as they had done in ancient times and, perhaps more importantly, in the reigns of the Tudor monarchs of blessed memory.

The clergy possessed the right to determine the nation’s common prayer, that most visible element of right religion. The king, according to the model pressed here, simply affirms the decisions of the bishops and clergy gathered in synod. Heylyn’s *Way and Manner* is the third and final edition of a work which began as *Parliament’s Power, In Lawes for Religion*. Published in 1645 this tract argued that the sixteenth century Church of England was in no way governed by the MPs. National strife only came in the seventeenth century when an avaricious Parliament appropriated “the manargy of all

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., 31.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid., 34.

Affairs as well *Ecclesiastical* as *Civill*.”⁴⁵⁹ Parliament, Heylyn argues in the text’s final form, *Way and Manner*, is responsible neither for the constitution of true religion, nor its propagation.

I mean the judgement and conclusions of his Convocation, did he set out... the year 1536 for the abolishing of superstitious Holy days, the exterminating of the Popes authority, the publishing of the book of Articles,... for preaching down the use of Images, Reliques, Pilgrimages and superstitious Miracles; for rehearsing onely in the Church, in the English Tongue; the Creed, the *Pater noster*, and the ten Commandements; for the due and reverend ministering of the Sacraments and Sacramentals; for providing [the] English Bible to be set in every Church for the use of the people; for the regular and sober life of Clergy men, and the relief of the poor. And on the other side, the King proceeded sometimes onely by the advise of his Prelates, as in the Injunctions of the year 1538 for quarterly Sermons in each Parish; for admitting non to preach but men sufficiently Licenced; for keeping a Register book of Christnings, Weddings, and Burials; for the due paying of Tithes, as had been accustomed; for the abolishing of the commemoration of St. Thomas Becket; For singing a *Parce nobis Domine*, in stead of *Ora pro nobis*, and the like to these. And of this sort were the Injunctions which came out in some years succeeding, for the taking away of Images and Reliques, with all the Ornaments of the same; and all the Monuments and writings of feigned Miracles, and for restraint of offering or setting up Lights in any Churches, but onely to the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, in which he was directed chiefly by Archbishop Cranmer.⁴⁶⁰

This is constructive apology-polemic done under the cover of writing history. Gone is Parliament’s role in religious affairs. Gone is the platform of men like William Prynne. Thus the legitimacy of the commonwealth religious experiment evaporates. Shifting from Henry and Edward to Elizabeth, Heylyn argues that once her throne was secure, the queen of blessed memory left church business to church men. This, he writes, had been the custom of her predecessors and she was committed to maintaining that policy.

Princes in the Jewish State, and many of the Christian Emperours in the Primitive times had done before her, in the well ordering of the Church and people committed to their care and government by Almighty God.; and to that end she published her Injunctions, An. 1559. A book of Orders, An. 1561. Another of Advertisements, An. 1562. All tending unto Reformation, unto the building up of the new Ierusalem, with the advise and counsel of the Metropolitan and some other godly Prelates, who were then about her, by whom they were agreed on and

⁴⁵⁹ Peter Heylyn, *Parliament’s Power, In Lawes for Religion* (Oxford, 1645), 33. See also Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 242-243, 207-208.

⁴⁶⁰ *Way and Manner*, 36.

subscribed unto, before they were presented to her, without the least concurrence of her Court of Parliament. But when the times were better sealed, and the first difficulties of her Reign passed over, she left Church work to the disposing of Church-men, who by their place and calling were most proper for it; and they being met in Convocation, and thereto authorised as the laws required, did make and publish several books of Canons, as viz. 1571. An. 1584. An. 1597. Which being confirmed by the Queen under the broad seal of England were in force of Laws to all intents and purposes which they were first made; but being confirmed without those formal words, Her Heirs and Successors, are not binding now, but expired together with the Queen. No Act of Parliament required to confirm them then, nor never required ever since, on the like occasion. A fuller evidence whereof we cannot have, then in the Canons of the year, 1603. being the first year of King James, made by the Clergie, onely in the Convocation, and confirmed onely by the King⁴⁶¹

Heylyn here not only pushes Parliament to the side, limiting its role in religion to extraordinary times, he prioritizes the legal codes handed down to the laity by the learned clergy. A body of accessible law was devised by church men, not by Parliament men. The crown merely confirmed their work. Kicking the ball down the field, he cites James' assent to the Canons of 1604 to demonstrate how ecclesiastical law is properly made. The net effect is to place creative power in rochet-cuffed hands: the clergy determine the practice and belief of the English church. Roles immemorial are to be maintained.

Heylyn also wants to be clear about the nature of the English episcopate, specifically the source of the bishops' power. He insists that they do not derive their authority from Parliament (*nisi a Parliamentari derivatum*). "The Bishops as they now stand in the Church of England, derive their calling together with their authority and power in Spiritual matters, from no other hands, then those of Christ and his Apostles."⁴⁶² The English church, in other words, has the real thing, not simply sycophantic creatures of Parliament. This cut against the Catholic "cavil" that the established church lacked proper clerical leadership as well as the parliamentary claim to authority in ecclesiastical matters. Heylyn even resorts to allusions from scripture to support his clericalist read of the past, blending recent English history with biblical allusions.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid., 37.

⁴⁶² Ibid., 39.

Neither the Parliaments of K Edward, or Q Elizabeths time knew what it was to make Committees for Religion, or thought it fit that Vzzah should support the Ark though he saw it tottering. That was a work belonging to the Levites only, none of the other Tribes were to meddle with it.

This time-tested paradigm, however, was derailed by the “Puritan faction.” William Prynne, according to the author, had the temerity to make the “strange assertion” that all reformation had been accomplished by Parliament.⁴⁶³ The location of religious authority was obviously not the only concern Heylyn had about Prynne’s view of the English reformation and the established church. Heylyn placed blame for all insurrection and instability on the opponents of “beauty of holiness.”

But here perhaps it will be said that we are fallen into Charybdis by avoiding Scylla, and that endeavouring to stop the mouth of this Popish Calumny, we have set open a wide gap to another no lesse scandalous of the Presbyterians; who being as professed enemies of the Kings as the Popes Supremacy, and noting that strong influence which the King hath had in Ecclesiastical affairs since the first attempts for Reformation, have charg'd it as reproachfully on the Church of England, and the Religion here established.

One of the most striking aspects of Heylyn’s model of the reformation is that it is, almost word for word, the description faithfully accepted and transmitted by generations of historians. Between a Catholic Scylla and a presbyterian Charybdis, the Church of England, firmly established in the sixteenth century, sailed with clergy and crown at the helm. Problems came, so the story goes, when roles got confused and the Parliament brazenly appropriated power. The foundation for this interpretation blurs together material from scripture, the early church, and the reformation-era to create an impregnable sense of legitimacy. This proves, Heylyn might say, that the model for church governance is a royal supremacy working hand in glove with a strong clerical estate.

In defending the Church of England’s break from Rome – or rather the *reassertion* of English independence from the papacy – Heylyn also wants to be clear that

⁴⁶³ Ibid., 42.

neither a general council nor assistance from foreign Protestant churches was necessary in the sixteenth century. One cannot forget that this author was tilting against two perceived enemies, Scylla and Charybdis. A clear example is his attempt to neutralize the influence of Calvin and, a more difficult task, the physical presence of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli at Cambridge and Oxford respectively during Edward's reign.

And 'tis as true that Calvin offered his assistance to Archbishop Cranmer, for the reforming of this Church; *Si quis mei usus esset*, as his own words are, if his assistance were thought needfull to advance the work. But Cranmer knew the man and refused the offer; and he did very wisely in it. For seeing it impossible to unite all parties, it had been an imprudent thing to have closed with any. I grant indeed that Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr (men of great learning and esteem, but of different judgements) were brought over hither, about the beginning of the reign of K Edward 6. the one of them being placed in Oxford, the other in Cambridge; but they were rather entertained as private Doctors to moderate in the Chairs of those Universities, then any waies made use of in the Reformation.⁴⁶⁴

With the continental Reformed influence quarantined, Heylyn's church proceeded "without reference to the different interesses of the neighbouring Churches" while maintaining "a conformity in all such points of Government and publique order with the Church of *Rome*, in which that Church had not forsaken the clear Tract of the primitive Times." Episcopacy and good liturgy, he argues, had been abolished in the Reformed churches and rendered impotent in the Lutheran. Heylyn's English church knew better and would have no part in either project.

With a wide perception of the Christian church in space and time, Heylyn argued "neither our King or Parliaments have done more in matters which concern'd Religion and the Reformation of this Church, then what hath formerly been done by the secular Powers, in the best and happiest times of Christianity." Papist and Puritan "clamours" are therefore "both false and groundlesse." Below the surface, however, is a more pressing situation. Heylyn was not simply supplying talking points to use against papists and puritans. In the waning years of the interregnum, a time when, as I have argued, a

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid, 69.

self-conscious Anglicanism was taking shape, Peter Heylyn was engaged in telling himself and his coreligionists a narrative that made sense of the situation.⁴⁶⁵

The Anglican Moment Revisited

During the Interregnum prayer book loyalists, while experiencing oppression and the absence of government support, heard a particular story about the nature of the Elizabethan church. This combination of factors produced, as I have argued, the confessional tradition we can responsibly call Anglicanism. At the Restoration, with the bishops back in their sees, the church courts busy at work, and the king recognized as supreme governor, that confessional tradition, Anglicanism, became in fact coterminous with the institutional Church of England. At this moment when the face of the established church was up for redefinition, Peter Heylyn's historical work came to the fore. Such texts offered a legitimating pedigree for Cavalier designs, spurring the Anglicans' obstinate stance against reconciliation and comprehension. The hopes of moderates on either side of the presbyterian-episcopalian divide were lost as the Savoy conference turned out to be, in Richard Baxter's memorable description, a meeting of the deaf. Laudian historical polemic had functioned within the discourse of legitimacy during the Personal Rule, as a variety of writers argued for or against east-end altars and increased ceremony. During the interregnum it had informed the sensibilities of adherents of a confession independent of governmental support. Now at the Restoration, the Laudian narrative of the sixteenth century and the Tudor church explained to the resurgent Cavaliers why they should turn a deaf ear to calls for comprehension.

Heylyn's influence on the Restoration church, so Anthony Milton estimates in his recent biography, can be located primarily in three texts. In his *Ecclesia Restuarata; or The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1661), Heylyn once more

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid, 75.

described the character of the established church in the sixteenth century, the recognized paradigm for right belief and right practice in the Anglican imagination. This work was followed by two posthumously published texts: a biography of William Laud, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, set the fallen archbishop on a martyr's pedestal, while Heylyn's *Aërius Redivius* provided a history of the presbyterians and thus a foil for the right reformation of the Church of England. Peter Lake has argued that from the 1570s to the Restoration there existed a literary genre that can be described as anti-puritan history. Lake writes: "The foreign origins and factious and populist nature of the puritans... were given narrative form by the likes of Richard Bancroft and later Peter Heylyn."⁴⁶⁶ What cannot be missed, though, is that this literary genre which Lake identifies changed shape and intent over time. Late Elizabethan conformists like Richard Bancroft had one set of goals for the Church of England. Laudian writers like Heylyn, picking up the tools left by such older conformists, aimed at something slightly different while covering that difference as skillfully as possible. To be sure, Heylyn wanted to appear as the direct descendant of men like Bancroft. In this way he shaped the Anglican sense that, at the Restoration, the settlement was merely a reassertion of the old church of Bancroft, Whitgift, and Elizabeth Tudor. After the above discussion of Heylyn's interregnum text *Way and Manner*, we are now principally concerned with the historical claims Heylyn made in his three Restoration texts about the nature of the Church of England.

Ecclesia Restaurata

Within a year of Charles II's return to England, Peter Heylyn published his *Ecclesia Restaurata*. Heylyn's vision is of an immutable Church of England, one founded on principles stretching back before the Tudor century but finding their golden moment with that dynasty. Enigmatic enough to elicit a published refutation in the same

⁴⁶⁶ ODNB: Heylyn; Lake, "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice," 91.

year of its publication (1661), the text attempts to highlight continuity and veil change. The High Commission, for instance, was created as a “bulwark and preservative of the Church of England against the practices and assaults of all her adversaries, whether popish or puritan.” During Elizabeth’s reign the liturgy was expunged of its most decisively anti-papal element, the petition in the litany for deliverance from “the detestable enormities of the Bishop of Rome.” Such a measure was designed, so the narrative runs, to draw in certain fence-sitting Catholics. Scylla and Charbydis never leave Heylyn’s model. Regarding the priest’s communion administration sentences, Heylyn presents the English devotional pattern as capable of joining Reformed and Catholic sentiments.

In the first liturgy of King Edward, the sacrament of the Lord’s body was delivered with this benediction, that is to say, “The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for the preservation of thy body and soul to life everlasting; The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,” &c. Which, being thought by Calvin and his disciples to give some countenance to the gross and carnal presence of Christ in the sacrament, which passeth by the name transubstantiation in the schools of Rome, was altered to this form in the second liturgy, that is to say, “Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving. Take and drink this,” &c. But the revisers of the book joined both forms together, lest, under colour of rejecting a carnal, they might be thought also to deny such a real presence as was defended in the writings of the ancient Fathers.

Heylyn further notes that the church’s leaders also removed the so-called black rubric which had in the 1552 liturgy declared that kneeling at communion was only a posture of gratitude and did not indicate that the elements had the “reall and essential presence” of Christ’s body and blood.⁴⁶⁷

In sum, the argument is that the Church of England at its seminal period in the sixteenth century navigated between Reformed and Catholic practice. Moreover,

⁴⁶⁷ Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata; or The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1661), 284-286. See also *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, 225, 389; Booty, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559*, 264. For the response to *Ecclesia Restaurata*, see Henry Hickman, *Plus ultra, or, Englands reformation, needing to be reformed: being an examination of Doctor Heylins History of the reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1661), 13, 16-34, 48.

between the two, the English church tends to have more sympathy for Rome, according to Heylyn, because the established church still operated along pre-Reformation ecclesiological lines. Elizabeth also called for sacred music and liturgical festivals reminiscent of church life before her brother's reign. Heylyn openly writes that these measures were undertaken to bring English practices "up the closer to those of the Church of Rome." In this section of his Elizabethan church history, he subtly inserts a claim about the position of the communion table: "She also ordered that the Lord's table should be placed where the altar stood."⁴⁶⁸ Heylyn was of course right here. Elizabeth did indeed order the table placed altar-wise at the east end. He conveniently forgot, however, to include the qualification that during the communion rite itself the table was to be taken down and set length-wise in the chancel. He defended the Laudian altar policy, as had the archbishop and other Laudian polemicists before him, by reading the past and the rubrics through a selective lens.

The queen's injunctions, according to Heylyn, were similar to those of Edward VI but "more accommodated to the temper of the present time." Here the author has pushed the normative moment for confessional definition securely into the reign of Elizabeth Tudor. Edward's reign was just a step in the process. The notion is that certain extreme measures had to be taken to uproot superstition in the 1540s and early 1550s. In Elizabeth's reign, however, the people's instincts had been corrected. The Elizabethan orders "more accommodated to the temper of the present time" were picked up and continued, he argues, by James VI and I when the English crown passed to the Stuarts. Heylyn quotes verbatim the passage in Elizabeth's injunctions concerning the communion table. Here he cannot get around the fact that it is to be moved at the time of administration. However, after citing the Elizabethan order, he discusses the St. Gregory's Case (1633) to establish the current standard operating procedure. In this

⁴⁶⁸ Heylyn, *Ecclesia*, 286.

passage one hears echoes of Heylyn's earlier controversy with Archbishop John Williams.

Which permission of removing the table at Communion times, "is not so to be understood," (as the most excellent King Charles declared in the case of St. Gregory's) "as if it were ever left to the discretion of the parish, much less to the particular fancy of any humorous person; but to the judgment of the ordinary, to whose place and function it doth properly belong to give direction in that point, both for the thing itself, or for the time when, and how long, as he may find cause."⁴⁶⁹

The argument here shifts from the injunction to its *natural* successor, Charles' decision for the ordinary's right to determine church patterns. This hinge establishes continuity while frankly admitting change. With Laudian bishops in place, one may surmise that Charles and Laud were moving to a point where the table could be permanently set and railed in at the east end. Heylyn's immediate shift from the Elizabethan injunction concerning the table to this moment in the 1630s is an attempt to weave together these two orders, making them part of a single, uninterrupted devotional ethos born in the reign of Elizabeth, accepted by James, and only bolstered by Charles the martyr-king.

In all three reigns, he continues, this ethos faced detractors, unsettled and ill-tempered persons. The queen's commissioners went about the nation removing idolatrous pictures and statues, eliminating popery where they found it. Yet one should note, Heylyn writes, that "this they did without any tumult and disorder, and without laying any sacrilegious and ravenous hands on any of the Church's plate, or other utensils which had been repaired and re-provided in the late Queen's time." Elizabeth not only eschewed passionate iconoclasm, she even preserved some of the restorations made by her Catholic sister Mary ("the late Queen"). Heylyn may have been making claims that even his fellow Laudians might find troubling. His excess aside, the underlying

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., 299-301. See also "The Elizabethan Injunctions, 1559," in Bray, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation*, 335-348, specifically 347.

argument is that the Elizabethan church's detractors were no different in character or agenda than the Caroline church's detractors: they wanted to lay "ravenous hands" on

church property. This is clear in his discussion of the material context of worship. And as it is many times supposed that a thing is never well done if not over done, so happened it in this case also; zeal against superstition had prevailed so far with some ignorant men, that in some places the copes, vestments, altar-cloths, books, banners, sepulchers, and rood-lofts, were burned altogether.⁴⁷⁰

According to Heylyn, such zealots simply did not understand the character of the Church of England and, perhaps being over-read in continental Reformed authors, yearned for a different, foreign tradition. The point is that nothing had changed. Heylyn was employing the negative strategy of historical appeal, a strategy used since the 1630s to define opposition to Laudian designs as coterminous with opposition to the near-sacred authority of Elizabeth Tudor. Instead of rehashing the names of the immutable Puritan party (e.g. the familiar list starting with Thomas Cartwright), he focuses on the zealous assault on the material context, portraying the desire to purge churches as irrational, theologically unwarranted, and buoyed by foreign interlopers.

Heylyn was not opposed, though, to the Church of England maintaining a role in international affairs. It appears that he simply wanted to distance his church from the Reformed communion of churches and set it, instead, as the equal of the Church of Rome in pedigree, apostolicity, and catholicity. After the death of Henry II of France, Heylyn continues in his history, Elizabeth attended services in England to mark the king's passing in 1559. Such were prayer book rites and performed by the bishops of the legitimate and established church.

The divine offices performed by Doctor Matthew Parker, Lord Elect of Canterbury, Doctor William Barlow, Lord Elect of Chichester, and Doctor John Scory, Lord Elect of Hereford, all sitting in the throne of the Bishop of London, no otherwise at that time than in hoods and surplices: by whom the Dirige was executed at that time in the English tongue; the funeral sermon being preached by the Lord of Hereford, and a Communion celebrated by the Bishops, then attired in copes upon their surplices... By which magnificency and the like this prudent

⁴⁷⁰ Heylyn, *Ecclesia*, 301-302.

Queen not only kept her own reputation at the highest amongst foreign Princes, but caused the greater estimation to be had by the Catholic party of the religion here established.⁴⁷¹

Elizabeth in Heylyn's account maintained the proper rites for the proper occasion. There are two subtle messages in this episode. First, Heylyn wanted to portray the Church of England as the equal of the Church of Rome; it is the ancient and legitimate church in England. Second, this is a description of how one should celebrate communion in the 1660s if one wishes to be consistent with the practice of Elizabeth Tudor. Heylyn was at once arguing with Papists (the issue of legitimacy and antiquity) and Puritans (the issue of liturgical style). These claims, though, always rested on an interpretation of English church history, specifically the reformation of the church in the sixteenth century. That narrative of the past which had driven Laudian polemic and consolidated Anglicanism as a confessional tradition continued to power Heylyn's arguments in the 1660s.

Rounding out this discussion of *Ecclesia Restuarata*, one has to comment on Heylyn's depiction of an Elizabethan settlement that set the pace for the Church of England c.1559. The presentation of the queen's accession as the classical moment for settling religious affairs is captured with no shortage of poetry in the author's blending of the biblical image of Elijah waiting for God on Mount Horeb (1 Kings 19) with recent English history.

It may be feared that God was neither in that great and terrible wind which threw down so many monasteries and religious houses in the reign of King Henry; nor in the earthquake which did so often shake the very foundations of the state in the time of King Edward; nor in the fire in which so many godly and religious persons were consumed to ashes in the days of Queen Mary; but that he shewed himself in that 'still small voice' which breathed so much comfort to the souls of his people, in the gracious and fortunate government of a virgin Queen.⁴⁷²

As mentioned earlier in this dissertation, Heylyn wove this same biblical-historical comparison years before in a 1642 court sermon while Thomas Cheshire in a sermon he

⁴⁷¹ Heylyn, *Ecclesia*, 302.

⁴⁷² Heylyn, *Ecclesia*, 224-225.

published in 1641 used the same passage from 1 Kings to rhapsodize about continuities between Elizabeth's reign and that of Charles.⁴⁷³ While Cheshire had carried his comparison forward to the Stuarts utilizing what I have described as the *Semper Eadem* strategy, Heylyn focuses on identifying the pace-setting early years of Elizabeth's reign as a time for the "settlement" of religion. This rhetoric is meant to establish that in the 1660s one has to justify his vision for the church against the state of things in the reign of Elizabeth, not that of her younger and more evangelical brother. It was in her reign and not in those of Edward or Henry that the "still small voice" was found.

Cyprianus Anglicus

Heylyn's arguments have a consistency across his three Restoration texts. To understand his *vita* of William Laud, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, he writes that one must first "see upon what Principles and Positions, the Reformation of this Church did first proceed; that so we may the better Judge of those Innovations which afterwards were thrust upon her." Published in 1668, some six years after Heylyn's death, the biography identifies which continental divines the Church of England's leadership preferred at the critical moment of the church's reformation in the sixteenth century. Moreover, Heylyn spells out the method these men used in proceeding with reformation and the sources to which they appealed.

In the managing of which great business, they took the Scripture for their ground, according to the general explication of the ancient Fathers; the practise of the Primitive times for their Rule and Pattern, as it was expressed to them in approved Authors: No regard had to Luther or Calvin, in the procedure of their work, but only to the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles, Christ Iesus being the Corner-stone of that excellent Structure. Melancthons coming was expected (*Regiis Literis in Angliam vocatus*, as he affirms in an Epistle to Camerarius) but he came not over. And Calvin made an offer of his service to Arch-Bishop Cranmer, (*Si quis mei usus esset*, if any use might be made of him to promote the work) but the Arch-Bishop knew the man, and refused the offer; so that it cannot be affirmed, that the Reformation of this Church, was either Lutheran or Calvinian in its first original. And yet it cannot be denied, but that the first Reformers of it did look

⁴⁷³ Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth Century England*, 200-201.

with more respectful eyes upon the Doctrinals, Government, and Forms of Worship in the Lutheran Churches, then upon those of Calvins platform; because the Lutherans in their Doctrines, Government, and Forms of Worship, approach't more near the Primitive Patterns than the other did: and working according to this rule, they retain'd many of those ancient Rites and Ceremonies, which had been practised; and almost all the Holy Dayes or Annual Feasts which had been generally observed in the Church of Rome. Nothing that was Apostolick, or accounted Primitive did fare the worse for being Popish; I mean for having been made use of in times of Popery: it being none of their designs to create a new Church, but reform the old.⁴⁷⁴

Philip Melanchthon, if Heylyn is pressed, might be a model reformer for the English church to imitate. The Lutherans proceeded wisely in as a much as their reformation was not the creation of a new church but the reforming of an old one. The Lutheran reformers looked on the church, Heylyn notes, as the church of the apostles groaning under recent papal enormities. In his discussion of the Lutherans, Heylyn employs the familiar concept *abusus non tollit usum*, remarking that traditional ceremony and vestments were not cast off simply because papists had abused them. Scripture and the Fathers were foundational; these authorities guided both the Church of England and the faithful in Wittenberg.

Reading this material one can easily forget that the key period for Heylyn really is the sixteenth century. He was looking back on the Tudor period and remarking on what was important then, namely scripture and the Fathers. For all his praise of those sources, Heylyn viewed them through the medium of the sixteenth century as the classical moment for the Church of England. One cannot take that principal source for right-doctrine and right-practice out of the equation. Bishops and presbyters, he argues, continued as separate orders because the arrangement can be found in the Bible and in the “Ancient Authors.”⁴⁷⁵ This appeal to history consistently shapes the church’s best practices. Yet this whole discussion of the primitive church finds its interpretative flashpoint in the sixteenth century. After a lengthy discussion of vestments, specifically

⁴⁷⁴ Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 1.

⁴⁷⁵ Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 3-4. See also Martin, *Walton’s Lives*, 130-132.

the cope at the Eucharist, in which he cites a host of Fathers, Heylyn writes that the real decision-making moment was the sixteenth century. Then he turns and makes a classic Laudian jab at the laxity of certain prelates since the hey-day of Elizabeth Tudor and John Whitgift. This is a variation on the Abbott thesis that helped to make sense of the appearance of novelty during the Personal Rule and after. Heylyn writes that he cannot imagine the “fatal negligence” of some clergymen who, at the administration of Holy Communion, set aside the cope.⁴⁷⁶

In addition to discussing the fate of clerical apparel, the author cannot help but comment on the nuanced physical arrangement of churches during this axial moment in English church history. He observes that those who object to figurative art in churches look to several documents from the Elizabethan church. The clearest example of this phenomenon is Peter Smart at Durham Cathedral, a principal player discussed at the outset of this dissertation. So of course we have to bear in mind that in the early 1660s, Heylyn was tilting against not simply presbyterians and other radicals, but all opponents of “the beauty of holiness.” Puritans and old-style conformists alike could cite bans on shrines, paintings, pax boards, and “all other Monuments of feigned miracles.” Heylyn, though, had an answer. He came back at such criticisms of “the beauty of holiness” with well-worn Laudian interpretations of the same period.

But these objections carried their own answers in them, it being manifest by the words both of the Articles and Injunctions, that it never was the meaning of the Queen, her Council, or Commissioners, to condemn, abolish, or deface all Images, either of Christ himself, or of any of the Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and other godly Fathers in the Church of Christ; the abuse whereof is ordered to be reformed by the first Injunction, but only to remove such Pictures of false and feigned Miracles, as had no truth of being, or existence in Nature; and

⁴⁷⁶ Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 6-7. One wonders why Heylyn does not mention Archbishop Matthew Parker’s *Advertisements* which first pushed the modified retention of the cope, that is, during communion and only in cathedrals. See also Parker’s, “Advertisements,” in Frere and Kennedy, eds., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, 175-179; “The Canons of 1604,” in J. P. Kenyon, ed., *The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688*, 137-146. For the complete canons in Latin and English, see Bray, ed., *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947*, 258-453.

therefore were the more abused to Superstition, and Idolatry in the times of Popery.⁴⁷⁷

Here one finds the idea that the real driving engine of Elizabethan reforms was just to rid the church of popish superstition. Art itself could remain according to this interpretation. Moreover, Heylyn's arguments pivot on the belief that popular religious perceptions simply need to be corrected. In other words, the English reformers knew that idolatry is a subjective action. Once the people know that forms of religious art are aides to devotion – helps to stirring up a pious disposition – and not vehicles for participating in the divine (the purpose of the sacraments), such elements as statues, paintings, and images on vestments can return.

Notwithstanding the surface strength of these arguments, the dominant stratagem for Heylyn in this preface to his biography of Laud was the twin use of positive and negative appeal, that is, the author's aligning of himself and his fellow Laudians with iconic figures from the sixteenth century and maligning his opponents by associating them with presumably villainous characters from the same period. Continuing to discuss religious art, Heylyn draws on the experience of Lutherans in Germany.

Images are still used in the Lutheran Churches, upon which our first Reformers had a special eye; and that Luther much reprov'd Carolostadius for taking them out of such Churches, where before they had been suffered to stand, letting him know, *Ex mentibus hominum potius removendas*, that the worship of Images, was rather to be taken out of mens mindes by diligent and painful preaching, then the Images themselves to be so rashly, and unadvisedly cast out of the Churches.⁴⁷⁸

Heylyn and good conformists are aligned here, somewhat unusually, with Luther while opponents of good worship are pushed into company with Andreas Karlstadt. The variation, of course, is that Heylyn is here uncharacteristically reaching into another country's history for iconic figures. The argument that the English reformers were at first in harmony with the German Evangelicals as opposed to the "sacramentarians" is atypical

⁴⁷⁷ Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 13.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

for Heylyn as he was more wont simply to distance the English reformation from the reformation in foreign lands. Despite his use of Luther and Karlstadt as exemplars, Heylyn was nevertheless employing the well-worn Laudian strategy of historical appeal to past figures. It carries, one should note, an interesting justification for religious art. Images may persist as long as clergy do their job, that is, they faithfully preach to the people the proper use of images, admonishing their cures to use pieces of figurative art as remembrances of sacred moments and persons but not themselves the recipients of devotion. “It appears by the Queens Injunctions,” Heylyn reports, “that the Priests being commanded not to extol the dignity of any Images, Relicks, &c. and the people diligently to teach, that all Goodness, Health, and Grace ought to be asked and looked for only at the hands of God, whereby all Superstition might be taken out of their hearts, the Images might lawfully remain as well in publick Churches.”⁴⁷⁹ While this may seem a convincing argument on its own merits, its strength is that it was the decision, so Heylyn argues, of the English reformers.

Regarding the practice of bowing not simply at the name of Jesus but to the communion table, Heylyn uses Laud’s argument. Once again, surface arguments are run through an historical filter giving them a potency that cannot be glossed over. Elizabeth and James, Heylyn argued, both participated in the ceremonies of the Order of the Garter, ceremonies which included the gesture of bowing. Because such monarchs would never participate in idolatry, this practice must therefore be free from the charge. As such bowing was the habit of these princes, it is a behavior the church should encourage among the faithful. Heylyn then discusses the name of this piece of furniture to which Elizabeth, James, and good conformists would bow. He argues that the table may, after the custom of the Marian martyrs, be called the “altar” as those holy men called the Eucharist the sacrament of the altar. What Protestant would dare diverge from their

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid.

practice?⁴⁸⁰ This is that tried and true Laudian appeal to iconic figures. Here the women and men burned in the reign of Mary Tudor for the Protestant faith were brought into service. As one might expect, Heylyn also comments on the position of the communion table.

That this Sacrament might the longer preserve that name, and the Lords Supper be administred with the more solemnity, it was ordained in the *Injunctions* of Queen *Elizabeth*, no *Altar* should be taken down, but by the over-sight of the Curate of the Church, and the Church-Wardens, or one of them at least, and that the Holy Table in every Church be decently made and set up in the place where the *Altar* stood, and there commonly covered as thereto belongeth. It is besides declared in the Book of Orders, *Anno* 1561. published about two years after the said *Injunction*, That in the place where the Steps were, the Communion Table should stand; and that there shall be fixed on the Wall over the Communion Board, the Tables of Gods Precepts imprinted for the same purpose. The like occurs in the Advertisements published by the *Metropolitan*, and others the High Commissioners, 1565. In which it is ordered, That the Parish shall provide a decent Table, standing on a frame for the Communion Table, which they shall decently cover with a Carpet of Silk, or other decent covering, and with a white Linen Cloath in the time of the administration, and shall set the Ten Commandments upon the East-Wall over the said Table. All which being laid together, amounts to this, that the Communion-Table was to stand above the steps, and under the Commandments; therefore all along the Wall, on which the Ten Commandments were appointed to be placed, which was directly where the *Altar* had stood before.

Heylyn stresses that, at Elizabeth's command, the table was placed where the stone altar had been, on raised steps at the east end. He spends quite a bit of time on the word altar, how the Church of England can without impropriety use the word to describe the communion table, and how the prayer book teaches Christ's real presence in the sacrament but not the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.⁴⁸¹ All of these contentions, however, found their strength in that they were made within the same historical rhetoric that had given Laudianism its coherence during the Personal Rule and, along with the absence of governmental support, had caused the birth of the confessional tradition Anglicanism.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 18, 21.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 22, 23-26.

Heylyn again defines the Church of England in this preface to his biography of Laud as a body wisely steering between Reformed and Catholic teachings. The concept *abusus non tollit usum* once more features in his wide-angle view of the established church.

Truth is no more restrained to the Schools of Calvin, then to those of Rome; some truths being to be found in each, but not all in either. And certainly in this the first Reformers did exceeding wisely, in not tying up the judgements of learned men, where they might be freed; but leaving them a sufficient scope to exercise their wits and Pens, as they saw occasion. Had they done otherwise, and condemned every thing for Popish, which was either taught or used in the times of Popery, they must then have condemned the Doctrine of the Trinity it self, as was well observed by King James in the Conference at Hampton-Court: And then said he, You (Dr. Reynolds) must go barefoot, because they wore hose and shoes in times of Popery.⁴⁸²

King James himself, Heylyn argues, recognized that the Church of England did not need to abolish every ceremonial element because of popish abuse. Were that true the Godly would need to dispense in turn with the Trinity and, indeed, with shoes. These arguments surely had strength on their own merits. However, the real galvanizing power in this narrative is the appeal to history. “Such was the Moderation which was used by our first Reformers,” Heylyn writes, “and on such Principles and Positions, did they ground this Church.”⁴⁸³ In short, Heylyn’s claims for the Church of England always rest on his interpretation of the catalytic sixteenth century. It is clear enough, therefore, why he has added this history of the English reformation and its underlying principles to his biography of William Laud. By knowing the past, the reader may judge for himself where exactly innovation was truly hatched. Was it with the archbishop, or was it with his cruel detractors? If one knows the history of the English church, Heylyn’s argument runs, he will see that Laud upheld the Elizabethan prayer book constitution and, moreover, that the archbishop suffered for his loyalty.

⁴⁸² Ibid., 40.

⁴⁸³ Ibid., 41.

Aërius Redivivus

In the early 1660s, Cavalier Anglicans could read Heylyn's history of the English reformation (*Ecclesia Restuarata*) and his biography of William Laud (*Cyprianus Anglicus*) and drink in the narrative that upheld the "beauty of holiness" movement during the Personal Rule and shaped the distinctly confessional tradition we know as Anglicanism during the Interregnum.⁴⁸⁴ The third, and perhaps most fascinating of his trio of Restoration texts provided the established church with its "other," a sure help in determining Anglican character, practice, and belief within an historical framework. Heylyn's history of the presbyterians was, in some respects, the Laudian negative analogue strategy in macrocosm; it was an entire project committed to illustrating the timeless villainy of presbyterians, both in England and abroad. With the staggering title *Aërius Redivivus*, the text is in many respects a diatribe against John Calvin as Heylyn locates the origins of English presbyterianism beyond the heady moment of the admonition controversy in the 1570s. In short, the whole Reformed tradition for Peter Heylyn was and is an international conspiracy, one hell-bent on obliterating good order in church and state. The flash-point for this historical attack, like the aim of the "beauty of holiness" movement itself, was the nature of the liturgy.

That naked Form of Worship which Calvin had devised for the Church of Geneva, not beautified with any of those outward Ornaments which make Religion estimable in the sight of the people; and by the which, the mindes of men are raised to a contemplation of the glorious Majesty which they come together to adore: All ancient Forms and Ceremonies which had been recommended to the use of the Church, even from the times of the Apostles, rejected totally, as contracting some filth and rubbish in the times of Popery, without being called to answer for themselves, or defend their innocencie. And as for the habit of the Ministry, whether Sacred or Civil, as there was no course taken by the Rules of their Discipline, or by the Rubricks of the book of their publick Offices; so did they by themselves, and their Emissaries, endeavour to discountenance and discredit all other Churches, in which distinct Vestures were retained. Whence came those manifold quarrels against Coaps and Surplices, as also against the Caps, Gowns and Tippetts of the lower Clergie, the Rochets and Chimeres of the Bishops, wherewith for more then twenty years they exercised the patience of the

⁴⁸⁴ For a discussion of my usage of "confessional tradition," particularly in contradistinction to the use found in works by continental historians like Heinz Schilling, see chapter 4.

Church of England. But naked as it was, and utterly void of all outward Ornaments, this Form of Worship looked so lovely in the eyes of Calvin, that he endeavoured to obtrude it on all Churches else.⁴⁸⁵

This Reformed sense of right religion was foreign and had no place in the Church of England according to the author. Here in *Aërius Redivivus* Heylyn opted for the more extreme Laudian attitude to Reformed Protestantism. As described earlier in this dissertation, avant-garde conformists either adopted the mantle of the Reformed tradition for themselves, isolating Puritans from the mainstream, or they simply denied that the established church had any substantial connection to what Diarmaid McCulloch has described as the Strasbourg-St. Gall Axis.⁴⁸⁶ Heylyn chose that latter course. Following the narrative, Heylyn argued that even though the English reformers fashioned a third way of being Protestant (in addition to the Lutheran and Reformed parties), the Swiss / South German ethos crept into England and caused all sorts of difficulties. Problems first surfaced in the 1540s. Heylyn describes early in his 400 plus pages the objections of Bishop John Hooper to the vestments he was required to wear at his consecration.

Willing enough he [i.e. Hooper] was to accept the charge; but he had lived so long at Zurick, in the Reign of King Henry, where there was no distinction of Apparel, either Sacred or Civil, that he refused to wear such Robes at his Consecration, as by the Rules of the Church were required of him. And by the Rules of the Church it was required, that for his ordinary Habit he should wear the Rochet and Chimere, with a square Cap upon his head, and not officiate at the Altar without his Coap, or perform any Ordination without his Crosier. Incouraged by his refusal, many of the inferiour Clergie take the like exceptions against Caps and Surplices, as also against Gowns and Tippetts, the distinct Habits of their Order.⁴⁸⁷

Heylyn goes to the trouble of enumerating the required apparel to remind his readers that the Church of England had always required such ornaments. Such vestments, he implies, were not simply Laudian excess. One can be sure that the author is concerned that his

⁴⁸⁵ Heylyn, *Aërius*, 11. For a counter to this history, see MS Additional C 304b, fol. 79v.

⁴⁸⁶ MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 173-179.

⁴⁸⁷ Heylyn, *Aërius*, 19. See also J. H. Primus, *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the Church of England in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth* (Amsterdam: N. V. Kampen, 1960), 16-35.

readers recognize that the English clergy have a distinct and indispensable habit. As important as the surface arguments are – that is, that English bishops are to be vested in rochet and chimere for the choir offices and in cope for Holy Communion – is the historical foundation on which these arguments rest. Heylyn highlighted this moment from the sixteenth century and provided a particular commentary on the episode to arrive at a determination for how the church should be ordered in the 1660s.

Heylyn goes on to note how Vermigli and John Lasko, both foreigners, encouraged the grating disobedience first broached by Bishop Hooper. The whole affair in the middle years of the sixteenth century is summarized as a tension between an insular, self-contained English reformation and “a Reformation upon Calvins Principles.” The latter of course, according to Heylyn, was the theological heir of Zwingli, intolerant of disagreement (he cites Calvin’s impasse with Sebastian Castellio), and the proponent of predestination, “a cruel and Horrible Decree, to pre-ordain so many millions to destruction, and consequently unto sin, that he [i.e. God] might destroy them.”⁴⁸⁸ Arriving at the vestiarian controversy of the 1560s, Heylyn concludes that “power was left unto the Queen to Ordain other Rites and Ceremonies, as she saw occasion: and finally, that the Bishops were invested with the sole Authority for ordering matters in the Church.”⁴⁸⁹ This is the historic paradigm he wishes to impress upon his contemporary readers: the crown decides which ceremonies (those neither enjoined nor forbidden in scripture) should be used while the bishops deal with the actual business of the church. While this may sit uneasily with what he had written in *Ecclesia Restaurata*, ultimately the precedent is that ceremonious worship is acceptable and desirable, and that the decisions pertaining thereunto rest with the monarch and the episcopate. Parliament, both ignorant of the method and its own role in the process, should keep its peace. Again, it

⁴⁸⁸ Heylyn, *Aërius*, 20-21.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 38.

cannot be forgotten that the real power of these arguments made for a mostly Cavalier Anglican audience is that there are wrapped in the aura of historicity.

Making principal use of the negative appeal to historical figures in *Aërius Redivivus*, Heylyn's description of Theodore Beza's approach to episcopacy is a case in point. Calvin's successor, according to this historian, held that "as the Bishops were the first means to advance the Pope, so the pretended Bishops would maintain the Relicks of Popery." Writing off the Reformed as narrow Biblicists warped by their own anti-Catholic hysteria, Heylyn understood Beza as utterly rejecting that which the papists had abused. Heylyn's Church of England, however, knew better. That which the Church of Rome had abused, the Church of England could recover and rightly use. Episcopacy need not be abandoned, he insisted, on the grounds that previous generations of bishops had been at the disposal of the papacy. In short, Heylyn aired to his Anglican coreligionists in the 1660s, that concerns about the Reformed communion of churches are irrelevant to the English; the Church of England stood apart from the Swiss, the Scots, the Dutch, and other Calvinists. His evidence here was both Beza's agitation over episcopacy (a pillar of the English church) and the Genevan reformer's inability to appreciate the *abusus non tollit usum* principle which so informed the English reformation in Heylyn's narrative.

Heylyn's history moves from initial reflections to his account of the "presbyterians" in France, Germany, and Scotland. The image is of a gaggle of malcontents troubling princely estates from east to west goaded on by a skulking John Calvin who appears to write everyone in Europe to apprise them of their faults. In the sixth of his thirteen books on the subject, Heylyn recounts the activities of these trouble makers from the reign of Edward VI to the 1560s. One continues to meet the same villainous characters as Heylyn employs the familiar negative appeal strategy. After losing the prayer book dispute to the Coxians in Frankfort, the followers of John Knox

found sanctuary in Geneva, and the same “made foul work in England at their coming home” starting in late 1558.

But this about the Liturgy, though it was the greatest, was not the onely quarrel which was raised by the Zuinglian or Calvinian Zealors. The Church prescribed the use of Surplices in all Sacred Offices, and Coapes in the officiating at the holy Altar. It prescribed also a distinct habit in the Clergy from the rest of the people; Rochets and Chimeres for the Bishops; Gowns, Tippetts, and Canonical Coats for the rest of the Clergy; the square Cap for all.⁴⁹⁰

It should come as no surprise that Heylyn bases his approach to sixteenth century history on the nature of worship. That had been the great concern of the Laudian “beauty of holiness” movement. It should also be no surprise that Heylyn’s account of what was prescribed in (presumably) the early 1560s has some shading. First, the Elizabethan prayer book uses the word *table*. The currency of the word *altar* had shifted and even become a point of debate in the intervening century. Elizabethan conformists, it is safe to say, were uncomfortable with describing the communion table by that particular name. Second, only cathedral clergy were required to wear copes at communion. Hence, while this was definitely a visible part of the English church’s liturgical fabric, it was not a blanket requirement. Heylyn on the other hand would have his readers see copes everywhere in the 1560s and legally mandated.⁴⁹¹ While these details may seem subtle (perhaps semantic), they are, nevertheless, indicative of Heylyn’s reading of an authoritative past, one in which he saw his own Laudian image reflected back. And he could not help but throw in the barb that behind all dissent lay “Calvin’s Rule.”⁴⁹² The

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid., 241.

⁴⁹¹ The tippet too stands out in Heylyn’s list. While certainly often worn by conformist clergy and disdained by many of the reformist exiles, the black scarf was not mandated until Archbishop Matthew Parker’s Advertisements in 1566 and then only mentioned in relation to masters of colleges, deans, and archdeacons. Not until James’ canons of 1604 was there a national prescription for the tippet. It is also noteworthy that James’ canons specifically mention Parker’s Advertisements. As Elizabeth never gave this document her royal approval, the Advertisements technically only carried the weight of Parker’s primatial office. See Parker’s “Advertisements” in *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, 175-179; “The Canons of 1603 (1604),” in Bray, ed., *The Anglican Canons*, 367.

⁴⁹² Heylyn, *Aërius*, 241.

negative appeal to historical figures was central to Heylyn's narrative in *Aërius Redivivus*.

Having established a cleavage between the Reformed Protestants led by Calvin and later Beza and the Church of England, Heylyn then turns his attention back again to the home scene. In typical Laudian fashion, he elides all opposition to prayer book worship (perhaps better understood here as Laudian ceremony) as disciples of John Calvin, fomenters of sedition, and respecters of no law. He recounts opposition to the prayer book rubrics, to the royal injunctions, and then to Parker's Advertisements. In their parishes, Heylyn writes, these Reformed malcontents began to act on their own, moving the communion table to the nave. This reordering of sacred space Heylyn brands with the ignoble name innovation. "Such as proceeded in their oppositions after these Advertisements," Heylyn explains, "had the name of Puritans; as men that did profess a greater Purity in the Worship of God"⁴⁹³ While he makes a few comments about the early church and the Fathers, Heylyn roots his arguments about the normative face of the Church of England in the middle years of the sixteenth century, that is, the time of "the Reforming of this Church."⁴⁹⁴

One ought to recognize here just whom Heylyn is writing about. On the surface he is discussing how reform-minded clergy and their allies in the 1560s chafed under the required liturgical standards. There was, so his argument runs, a time of reformation, a settling of problems. And soon thereafter dissent reared its head. But Peter Heylyn was also throwing in the face of his contemporary opponents their discontinuity with and rejection of this settled past. In the seventeenth century, the Laudian narrative of the English reformation – that is, that Elizabeth Tudor fashioned a moderate, perhaps rationalistic middle way or *via media* between Rome and the Reformed – hinged on the

⁴⁹³ Ibid., 249.

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid., 254.

idea that there was a clear, coherent “Elizabethan Settlement of Religion” in the year 1559. As discussed in detail in the Introduction, this *via media* model is largely mythic.⁴⁹⁵ Having discussed at length Laudian historical polemic during the Personal Rule, the Interregnum, and now at the Restoration, stressing how this rhetoric provided the “beauty of holiness” movement with coherence and helped to consolidate Anglicanism as a confessional tradition, I would like to suggest that the Laudians largely created this *via media* interpretation of the English reformation. This understanding of the sixteenth century was a major factor at the Restoration and it was a touch-stone for Anglican identity during the nineteenth century, though that is beyond the scope of this project. Limiting discussion here to the seventeenth century use of the *via media* paradigm, the Laudians frankly needed the church settled by 1559 to discount the perspective of both moderate Puritans and conformist Calvinist episcopalians who understood their church to be a full constituent member of the international communion of Reformed churches. Anyone questioning the hard facts, Laudian polemicists like Heylyn might argue, was simply laboring to “bring the Church of England to a Conformity in all points with the Rules of Geneva.”⁴⁹⁶

Shifting from Scylla to Charbydis, Heylyn employs the trope that the English prayer book was shrewdly devised to keep Catholics within the established church by not offending some of their liturgical sensibilities. The papists, he argues, remained within Elizabeth’s church. These

did in general as punctually attend all Divine Offices in the same, as the vulgar Protestants. And it is probable enough, that they might have held out longer in their due obedience, if first, the scandal which was given by the other Faction, and afterwards the separation which ensued upon it, had not took them off. The Liturgie of the Church had been exceedingly well fitted to their approbation, by leaving out an offensive passage against the Pope; restoring the old Form of words, accustomedly used in the participation of the holy Sacrament; the total

⁴⁹⁵ MacCulloch, “The Myth of the English Reformation,” 1-19; Tyacke, “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism,” 5-33; Idem, “Anglican Attitudes,” 139-167.

⁴⁹⁶ Heylyn, *Aërius*, 258.

expunging of a Rubrick, which seemed to make a Question of the *Real presence*; the Scituation of the holy-Table in the place of the Altar; the Reverend posture of kneeling at it, or before it, by all Communicants; the retaining of so many of the ancient Festivals; and finally, by the Vestments used by the Priest or Minister in the Ministration. And so long as all things continued in so good a posture, they saw no cause of separating from the rest of their Brethren in the acts of Worship.”

Heylyn argued that when the tender Catholics saw the puritans move the table to the nave, they absented themselves from prayer book worship. The problem with this narrative is that the table was by rubric supposed to be brought to the nave or chancel. In this history – at least at this point – the implication is that the table was fixed altar-wise at the east end. Thus the wavering Catholics could be drawn into prayer book worship. This depiction of Elizabeth engineering a comprehensive settlement was central to the Laudian construction of sixteenth century history and consequently it became central to Anglican identity at the Restoration. I am far from arguing, however, that political maneuverings never factored in the religious policies of Elizabeth and her chief advisor William Cecil. Without question, there was some calculation going on. Nevertheless, the reductionist model of a concrete comprehensive settlement devoid of theological commitment and engineered to accommodate as many as possible while navigating carefully between Rome and the Reformed is simply untenable and frankly romantic. What should be gleaned here, though, is the centrality of this *via media* paradigm for the Laudian historical project and therefore the emergence of Anglicanism as a confessional tradition.

Continuing his narrative, Heylyn recounts the row between Cartwright and Whitgift at Cambridge, specifically noting that the former’s abandoning of the surplice violated the law.⁴⁹⁷ Here in almost textbook fashion, the author deployed the positive and negative strategy of historical appeal. What is particularly important, however, is the way Heylyn defines the Church of England as something distinct from the Reformed churches of the continent by highlighting the ill-tempered response of puritans like

⁴⁹⁷ Ibid., 262-262.

Cartwright to the mandates of the establishment and the loyal counter-response of government sympathizers like Whitgift. Capturing the division in international terms, Heylyn styles Cartwright “the very Calvin of the English.”⁴⁹⁸ His judgment is that in the 1560s and early 1570s the puritans had to effectively choose between two distinct churches: they “maintained their Quarrel by the Authority of Calvin, the sawciness of Knox, the bold activities of Beza, and the more moderate interposings of some Forreign Divines.”⁴⁹⁹

Heylyn effectively creates two neatly defined religious traditions distinct in their features and their adherents. There is the Reformed tradition and the English tradition. These two remained intact from the mid-sixteenth century to the mid-seventeenth. Events in one century elucidate events in the other almost typologically. Surely with another royal execution in mind, Heylyn recounts the trial and “murther” of Mary Stuart, queen of Scots. After portraying English puritan patrons as bloodthirsty, he writes that he will only discuss, for the sake of relevance, the character of the Scots presbyterians and their English allies in the affair. “The particulars of that Horrid Act, by which a Sovereign Queen, lawfully Crowned and Anointed” was tried and executed boiled down to a presbyterian scheme.⁵⁰⁰ This discussion of Mary’s execution quickly transitions into a reflection on the puritan influence among Elizabeth’s counselors. The net effect is to strike fear in his Restoration-era readers’ minds as they witness how deep foreign interference in English affairs could go. The only true son of the Church of England on Elizabeth’s council, according to Heylyn, was John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury. Here also he likely had another archbishop in mind while writing. Using the work of Sir George Paul, Heylyn has Whitgift in council proclaim that he has always endeavored to

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid., 286.

⁴⁹⁹ Ibid., 271.

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid., 272-273.

talk matters through with the “sectaries” before administering the warranted discipline.

The good archbishop in Heylyn’s account continues:

It is objected, by some, that my desire of Uniformity, by way of Subscription, is for the better maintenance of my Book. They are mine Enemies that say so; but I trust my Friends have a better opinion of me. Why should I seek for any confirmation of my Book, after twelve years approbation? Or what shall I get thereby, more than already I have? Yet, if Subscription may confirm it, it is confirmed long ago, by the Subscription of almost all the Clergy of England, before my time. Mine Enemies likewise, and the slanderous Tongues of this uncharitable Sect, report that I am revolted, become a Papist, and I know not what. But it proceedeth from their Leudness, and not from any desert of mine.⁵⁰¹

It is not his agenda, Heylyn’s Whitgift argues, but the good of the Church of England he is striving after. He reminds his fellow counselors that his predecessor Archbishop Matthew Parker pushed for subscription and that effort was successful. Witness too, Heylyn’s Whitgift requests, that his opponents resort to character assigation when thwarted, that is, they call him a papist. The archbishop, to put things very simply, was just doing his job according to Heylyn.

I have taken upon me, by the Place which I hold under Her Majesty, the defence of the Religion and the Rites of the Church of England, to appease the Schisms and Sects therein, to reduce all the Ministers thereof to Uniformity, and to due Obedience, and not to waver with every wind; which also, my Place, my Person, the Laws, Her Majesty, and the goodness of the Cause, do require of me; and wherein the Lords of Her Highness Privy Council, (all things considered) ought in duty to assist and countenance me.

Whitgift claims that he has suffered the epithets tyrant, knave, and even pope for his officious work. His name has been a byword for contempt and abused by diabolical forces. “So was Cyprian himself used, and other godly Bishops, to whom I am not comparable” he bemoans.⁵⁰² The reference to this third century bishop of Carthage illustrates Heylyn’s sense of continuity between the Elizabethan-Whitgiftian regime and

⁵⁰¹ Ibid., 274.

⁵⁰² Ibid., 275-276. There is evidence that Whitgift himself identified with this third century bishop. See BL MS Sloane 1008, fol. 266.

the Caroline-Laudian one: as we have seen, he titled his biography of William Laud *Cyprianus Anglicus*, the English Cyprian.

Whitgift was almost alone in his vigorous defense of the established church. Huntingdon, Leicester, Walsingham, and Knollys, “a professed Genevian,” were obstacles. Cecil was “a Neutral at the best.” Christopher Hatton, a figure prominent at the close of the reign was apparently Whitgift’s only ally. Other bishops, notably John Bridges and later Richard Bancroft, Whitgift’s successor, did indeed valiantly strive against the chaotic designs of the Puritans. Heylyn’s narrative presents the reader with a church well settled, well defined, yet under assault from Puritans inside and out. These have in their sights the twin sacred institutions of monarchy (e.g. their bloodlust for Mary Stuart’s head) and episcopacy (e.g. their slander of Whitgift). Heylyn was speaking directly to the Cavalier Anglicans in the 1660s who had witnessed the executions of Charles and Laud and understood themselves as the adherents of an Elizabethan settlement neither Roman nor Reformed.

When he relates the Hacket and Coppinger episode, for example, Heylyn simply paints Cartwright into their company when unable to draw direct connections. While he admits that Cartwright and his supporters did not espouse the “damnable practices” of the cart-riding preachers, Heylyn insists that these messianic preachers did keep the “chief Presbyterians” well informed of their plans through letters. This is enough to put Cartwright in their cart, as Heylyn puts it, the “proper pulpit for such preachers.”⁵⁰³ Drawing things forward, though, Heylyn sees “conformity” and “non-conformity” as rather immutable positions. Just as earlier Laudian polemicists had done, Heylyn not only polarized the religious landscape, he collapsed the historical situation c.1550 to c.1660. Cartwright, the fanatics Hackett and Coppinger, the New England separatists,

⁵⁰³ Heylyn, *Aërius*, 307-310.

and the presbyterians hoping for comprehension in the 1660s were all in the same company according to this galvanizing rhetoric.

Thomas Cartwright, Heylyn argues, was spared the punishments he so rightly deserved by the leniency of John Whitgift. Recalling Heylyn's earlier elisions of the past and the present and his allusions to Laud, perhaps he wanted to see Whitgift as a placeholder for all good conformist bishops. At any rate, such a pernicious non-conformist as Cartwright, Heylyn continues, left behind a son who differed strikingly from his father.

[Cartwright's son] proved as great a Zealot for Conformity, in the time of King Charles, as his Father was reputed for his Non-conformity in the times we write of. And he paid almost as dear for it, as his Father did, being sequestred about the year 1643, not submitting to some Oaths and Covenants then required of him; his bed-ridden Wife turned out of doors, and left most unmercifully in the open Streets.⁵⁰⁴

This discussion of Cartwright's son is more than a passing reference. Conformity and non-conformity, according to Heylyn, were positions that had not changed from the middle of Elizabeth's reign to the reign of Charles. The passing of two generations meant little. Charles' church was Elizabeth's church. The glaring assumption is that those elements which constituted conformity in Charles' church were – without mutation – the very same elements which had constituted conformity in Elizabeth's church. Hence, in this narrative, the defenders of the Caroline church were the direct heirs of the defenders of the Elizabethan church. Whitgift had his Cartwright and Laud had his Prynne. The names had changed, but the roles and contested issues, according to Heylyn, had not.

Peter Heylyn continued to stage individuals in stark and immutable roles in his coverage of the Temple row between Richard Hooker and Walter Travers. Regarding his protagonist, Hooker, he writes that the apologist came from Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he was “well stocked in all kind of Learning, but most especially in Fathers, Councils, and other approved Monuments of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.” The

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., 311.

Puritan Travers, on the other hand, got a backhanded compliment. Coming from Trinity College, Cambridge, he was “well skilled in the Oriental Tongues, and otherwise better studied in Words than Matter.” Travers had the sound and the fury, to borrow from his contemporary William Shakespeare, but he signified nothing.⁵⁰⁵ The Temple reader, moreover, had the “affection” of Cartwright. Thus a whole package of “damnable practices” – practices antithetical to the fixed ethos of the Church of England – came with him to this high profile London law school chapel. Nevertheless, according to Heylyn, good conformists like Richard Hooker always won out in the Elizabethan church: “Thus have we seen Travers taken off, and Beza quieted; nor was it long before Cartwright was reduced to a better temper.” Take notice, he subtly admonishes his Cavalier Anglican readers, for “by the Imprisonment of Cartwright, the Condemnation of Vdal, and the Execution of Hacket, the times had been reduced to so good a temper.”⁵⁰⁶ Such “contemners” will all meet bad ends like the separatists Henry Barrow and John Greenwood who were taken to the gallows at Tyburn “in a Cart.” One cannot be certain that Heylyn was intentionally toying with Cartwright’s name, but he does blur into one mass all dissenting groups, a standard element of Laudian historical polemic. It is, moreover, interesting that Heylyn’s contemporary Thomas Fuller felt no need to include this detail about conveyance in his coverage of the execution. Barrow, according to Heylyn, informed a group of interrogators including Lancelot Andrewes that it was Cartwright who had rightly exposed the gross errors of the Church of England. In short, Whitgift’s old nemesis had been Barrow’s inspiration. Following Heylyn’s narrative, this separatist was taken to Tyburn Tree in a physical cart and in an ideological one.⁵⁰⁷ Using

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., 313.

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid., 315, 323.

⁵⁰⁷ See also Ibid., 346. According to Heylyn, the puritans argued that the cross at Cheapside ought to be defaced on account of its “hindering of Carts.” For Thomas Fuller’s account of the execution, see his *The Church History of Britain* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1842), Vol. III, 137.

the same historical rhetoric that had given coherence to the Laudian movement and shape to an emerging Anglicanism, Heylyn pushed all of his opponents together into one villainous company.

The rather simple polarity of opinion in Heylyn's account continued in the new century with the accession of James VI in England. Drawing from James' *Basilikon Doran*, Heylyn reports the new monarch's impression of the Church of England.

He found that Form of Religion which was established under Queen Elizabeth of famous memory, by the Laws of the Land, to have been blessed with a most extraordinary Peace, and of long continuance; which he beheld as a strong evidence of God's being very well pleased with it. He tells us also, that he could find no cause at all, on a full debate, for any Alteration to be made in the Common-Prayer-Book, though that most impugned; that the Doctrines seemed to be sincere, the Forms and Rites to have been justified out of the Practise of the Primitive Church.⁵⁰⁸

The church of Elizabeth Tudor was to be the church of James Stuart. All was well. In his description of the Hampton Conference, Heylyn mentions, almost extraneously, that the members there "on behalf of the church" were "apparelled all of them in their Robes and Habits, peculiar to their several Orders." Their opponents, however, failed to dress appropriately. The message here is that the incumbent policies were the correct policies. The Puritans who had longed for the meeting had quite visibly lost the argument before the conference began. Once more in this narrative one sees looming in the shadows the villainous Calvin and his English mouth-piece, Thomas Cartwright, here only indicated by his initials. "Great hopes they gave themselves for settling the Calvinian Doctrines in the Church of England, and altering so much in the Polity and Forms of Worship, as might bring it nearer by some steps to the Church of Geneva." As one might expect from Heylyn, "the Bishops and Conformable Party went away with an easie Victory."⁵⁰⁹

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid., 368.

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid., 372-373. Heylyn had earlier noted the Puritans' disregard for priestly dress at the Hampton Court Conference in Heylyn, *Cyprianus*, 52.

Innovation, the king argued in Heylyn's narrative, should be eschewed. After James' meeting with the Puritans, all was still well.

The new Scots king also promised to harry both non-conformists and "half-conformists," a terrifically curious label. Heylyn of course leaves the meaning of this latter designation open-ended. Here one immediately thinks of old style conformists like Peter Smart, those who had challenged the Laudian hegemony and the "beauty of holiness" movement but remained committed to the prayer book. Here we might also consider the time-tested Abbott thesis that posited a lax George Abbott at Canterbury allowing the hard-won gains of Whitgift and Bancroft to slip away. "Half-conformists" are for Heylyn as venomous, if not more so, than outright presbyterians in that they are false friends.

In addition to these standard Laudian historical strategies, one can also find the less common argument used by the avant-garde conformists that papered over "improvements" to worship and sacred space. As examined in an earlier chapter, the Laudians had stressed that certain principles of decency undergirded the constitution of Elizabethan prayer book worship, and ultimately those principles stood above, in an almost Platonic fashion, the actual rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. Hence, by changing certain elements in order to push back against the inevitable tide of crude irreverence (e.g. dogs in the chancel and school boys playing on the communion table), the church was effectively staying the same. The spirit of the prayer book, one might put it, would be maintained by building rails, for instance, an element that had not been mandated in any of the classical Elizabethan sources. Witness Heylyn admitting to and then explaining away changes by reference to the religious settlement of Elizabeth Tudor:

Hereupon followed a great alteration in the Face of Religion; more Churches beautified and repaired in this short time of his [i.e. James'] Government, than had been in many years before: The Liturgy more solemnly officiated by the Priests, and more religiously attended by the common people; the Fasts and Festivals more punctually observed by both, than of later times. Coaps brought again into the Service of the Church, the Surplice generally worn without doubt or

hesitancy; and all things in a manner are reduced to the same estate in which they had been first settled under Queen Elizabeth⁵¹⁰

Despite the appearance of a “great alteration,” the constitution, one might say, of Elizabethan prayer book worship persisted. As James had followed Elizabeth on the throne, Richard Bancroft followed Whitgift at Canterbury. *Semper Eadem*.

Archbishop Bancroft, however, was dead by the close of the decade. The natural successor, according to Heylyn, was Lancelot Andrewes. In this narrative, George Abbott was chosen because the bishops were so confident of Andrewes’ succession that they neglected to press his advancement with James. Regarding the intervening years, Heylyn employed the now familiar construal of Abbott’s tenure at Canterbury, one that made sense of the appearance of innovation when Laud was translated to the same see. Consistent with earlier iterations of the Abbott thesis, Heylyn’s Abbott in *Aërius Redivivus* was lax in pressing conformity and his yielding indifference to the cherished principles of the established church bolstered the Puritans. With the dissident position strengthened, anyone could have and should have predicted trouble for the day when a man of the same ideological mold as Bancroft and Whitgift would come to Canterbury. Abbott’s term was an interlude, an unexpected and long nadir according to Heylyn. According to this argument the rise of William Laud was really just the resurfacing of a true conformist. Had Laud followed Andrewes, rather than Abbott, no one would have questioned what amounted to, according to Heylyn, thoroughly conformist designs in the 1630s. “The Puritan Faction,” Heylyn wrote, grew strong in Parliament after “the death of Bancroft; when by the retirements of K. James from all cares of Government, and the connivance or remisness of Arch-bishop Abbot, the Reins were put into their hands.”⁵¹¹

More or less, this model was assumed by generations of historians up to the twentieth century. Only in recent decades have scholars come to recognize the Jacobean

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., 376.

⁵¹¹ Ibid., 434.

episcopate as something much more muddled and diverse than composed of proto-Laudians on the one hand and lazy time-servers, perhaps with Puritan sympathies (e.g. George Abbott) on the other.⁵¹² The point to be garnered here, however, is that in the early 1660s, Peter Heylyn deployed the same historical rhetoric in *Aërius Redivivus* that had provided Laudianism with its operational coherence before and after 1640 to inform Cavalier Anglican sensibilities about the normative confessional face of the English church at the Restoration.

The Immutable Church of England

The negative analogue strategy, the most prominent of Heylyn's polemical tactics in his history of the presbyterians was joined by other typically Laudian approaches in the same text. It is obvious that *Aërius Redivivus* targets John Calvin, Theodore Beza, and other Reformed figures from the sixteenth century, marginalizing even the most conformist Puritan as connected not to the Church of England but to obstreperous, interloping foreigners. Opting for the more extreme Laudian attitude to the Reformed tradition, that is, positing the English church as a third form of Protestantism, Heylyn gives his readers the impression that official interaction with men like Vermigli and Bucer, guests at Oxford and Cambridge respectively, only brought trouble. The typological mirroring of regimes, the rhetorical tactic described earlier in this dissertation as the *Semper Eadem* strategy, is also present in *Aërius Redivivus* as Heylyn describes the make-up of Elizabeth's privy council, Whitgift's single-handed efforts for conformity, the execution of Mary Stuart, and the apparent reiteration of the Elizabethan settlement at the Hampton Court Conference. That event in 1559, described here more as a construction of Laudian polemicists in the seventeenth century than an actual settling of the Church of England as a middle way between Scylla and Chrybdis, was becoming

⁵¹² Fincham and Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I," 23-49; Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, passim.

increasingly central to avant-garde conformist arguments since the Personal Rule. In addition to grounding his portrait of the English church on the *via media* paradigm, Heylyn even employs both the standard Abbott thesis and the less common strategy of appealing to certain principles of prayer book worship that stand above the actual rubrics, that is an appeal to the spirit of the prayer book. All of these maneuvers informed the Anglicans' sensibilities about the nature of properly established religion in England, who they were as good conformists in an historic succession of good conformists, and what should be done with the presbyterians seeking comprehension or simply toleration.

Aërius Redivivus, which has received the lion's share of attention in this chapter, was not the only piece Peter Heylyn wrote at this pivotal moment in English religious and political history. The three Restoration texts themselves were preceded by Heylyn's *Way and Manner*, a work which examines the nature of the middle sixteenth century reformation. Here Heylyn was particularly concerned to demarcate the flow of authority in the English church, both in its reformation and current governance. In the wake of the Long Parliament's reforms, specifically the abolition of the episcopate and the Book of Common Prayer, Cavalier Anglicans could read Heylyn's text and see how Parliament violated the reformation-era paradigm of crown and clergy operating together in religious affairs with Parliament a distant third mechanism. The other dominant theme of this text is the now familiar presentation of the English church as a *via media* between a Roman Scylla and a Reformed Charybdis. Neutralizing the influence of Peter Martyr Vermigli and Martin Bucer, Heylyn presented an English church that could compete with the Roman church on the Roman church's terms, that is in apostolicity and ecclesiology. One cannot get distracted, though, by Heylyn's detours into scripture and the Fathers. Although he recognized the normative weight of these sources of theological authority, his perspective on them was always colored by seeing scripture and the Fathers through the lens of the sixteenth century, the classical moment of reformation. In other words, the

strength of his arguments is that they are presented as reiterations of decisions made in the heady sixteenth century.

In *Ecclesia Restaurata* Heylyn continues to treat the history of the English church in the sixteenth century, a narrative shaped by the standard Laudian polemical strategies. Considering the English church as a third form of Protestantism, one not critically indebted to foreign theologians, he portrayed the Church of England as the equal of the Church of Rome, and hence a native tradition. In his specific description of the ceremonies attended by the queen, Heylyn was at once arguing with Puritans over liturgical practice and Catholics over ecclesiology. It also cannot be forgotten that, for all his forays into patristic literature and scripture, Heylyn's claims always rested on an interpretation of recent history, specifically the reformation of the church in the sixteenth century. In this regard, Heylyn is reasonably consistent in all of his writings. His biography of Laud, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, begins with the rather direct contention that if one wishes to judge the career of the late archbishop who was accused and condemned for the dread crime of innovation, he has to step back and consider the principles of the English reformation. Thus Heylyn begins his biography with a discussion of the sixteenth century. He gives his readers an English church led by men who knew that superstition and idolatry were largely subjective categories. The people were in need of reformation, Heylyn seems to argue, and with this accomplished religious art could be used as aids to devotion, helps for women and men to stir up a pious disposition within themselves. While this may seem a convincing argument, its galvanizing power is that it is presented as reportage. This notion about religious art is not given as Heylyn's opinion, but that of the English reformers. Along with the positive strategy of historical appeal, specifically his pairing of Laud with Whitgift, the *Semper Eadem* strategy actually looms largest in *Cyprianus Anglicus* as Heylyn describes an uninterrupted devotional ethos stretching from Elizabeth to Charles. With this narrative of the reformation and of the Elizabethan settlement in place, a reader in the 1660s could judge

whether Archbishop Laud was really guilty of innovation or if he was abused and indeed martyred by malignant Puritans, the same sort who now ask for comprehension.

Heylyn's message was clear.

That narrative of the recent past which had driven Laudian polemic during the Personal Rule and during the commonwealth winter, the same narrative which helped to consolidate Anglicanism as a confessional tradition during the Interregnum, continued to drive Heylyn's arguments in the 1660s. The Cavaliers shaping such measures as the Clarendon code, those Anglicans in Parliament and convocation who resisted not only comprehension but even the tissue-thin veil of toleration, were convinced of this historical narrative. The techniques described in this dissertation as the positive and negative analogue appeals, the *Semper Eadem* strategy, and the Abbott thesis helped resurgent Cavaliers perceive the religious and political landscape in a particular way. It is clear that in the 1660s, when royal and episcopal thrones once more had occupants, Anglicanism coalesced around a distinct reading of the past while moves for comprehension became a dead-letter. This was largely the result of Peter Heylyn's histories. Thus the whole Restoration religious project, including the purges of St. Bartholomew's Day and the iconic 1662 Book of Common Prayer, was presented merely as the reassertion of the Elizabethan Settlement.

CONCLUSION
HISTORY, POLEMIC, AND
THE LAUDIAN REDEFINITION OF CONFORMITY

At the Restoration, a particular interpretation of the English reformation and of conformity to the Book of Common Prayer emerged to install the confessional tradition Anglicanism as the normative face of the Church of England. Its Cavalier proponents understood this installation as a return to an Elizabethan orthodoxy. While it would be hard to imagine that this was the ultimate goal of the Laudians who dominated the church in the reign of Charles I, their arguments initiated a trend in polemics and rhetoric that resulted in this Anglican sensibility three decades later. In 1628, when the old-style conformist Peter Smart stepped into the pulpit at Durham Cathedral, he invoked a legitimating history, a narrative that would, for him and others, oust his immediate superiors as gross innovators. The new copes, the candles, the figurative art, the consecration rituals, and of course the new stone altar had, according to Smart, violated the constitution of prayer book worship, a devotional and theological paradigm located in the relatively recent past. It would be difficult to describe this man as a Puritan in the 1620s, but that was the course that the Laudians took in their response to Smart's criticisms. While John Cosin slapped his fellow Durham prebend with the derisive moniker a "most froward, fierce and unpeaceable spirit," other Laudians articulated a competing historical narrative, one that legitimated their vision of the established church's devotional, pastoral, and theological life and pushed conformists like Smart into a polemical construction of wicked Puritanism. That approach, over the long term, led to a reimagining of the Church of England and of its history, and resulted in the phenomenon known as Anglicanism and the Cavalier Settlement of 1662.

The goal of this dissertation has been to examine how the discourse of legitimacy was, in a sense, a marketplace whose commodity was citations of the past. To

accomplish this, the focus has been on the Laudian's creative use of history, first to justify the beauty of holiness during the Personal Rule and then later to explain to fallen prayer book loyalists during the war and the Interregnum why they were suffering. The appetite for history was clearly high in the seventeenth century, and the image of Elizabeth Tudor and of her reign could garner the aura of legitimacy. In this dissertation, I have explored and tested Peter Lake's label for the Laudians: avant-garde conformists, innovators who hid their innovation under a veil of conservative, traditional language and motifs.⁵¹³

To review this exploration, we will first consider the arguments raised by the junior clergy in the 1620 and '30s. Two approaches to the Church of England's relationship to the Reformed churches of Europe are present in Laudian literature. Some presented the English church as unique among the Reformed, even awarding it an ideal status. The Church of England was, according to this view, the best Reformed church. Opposing the existing structure, that is, the bishops and the dominant Laudian agenda, was to oppose the Reformed tradition. Avant-garde conformists could, by this logic, claim the legacy of John Calvin and other foreign divines while trying to "out-Reform" their opponents. This was the more conservative of the two approaches to the relationship between the Church of England and the Reformed. The other was on the leading edge of Laudianism. This approach disconnected England from Calvin and the Reformed entirely, arguing that the Church of England, at its founding, was a third manifestation of magisterial Protestantism in addition to the Reformed and the Lutherans. Such a claim often came packaged with an attack on Calvin and the Continental and Scots Reformed. Calvin, Beza, and men like Vermigli and Bucer who actually came to England were cast as malicious busy-bodies bent on infecting other nations with their foreign ideas.

⁵¹³ Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I," 113-133.

In addition to a commentary on the relationship between the Church of England and the Reformed, the Laudians also offered an interpretation of the rubrics, canons, and injunctions – set mandates for the confessional and devotional face of the established church. These had been set down in the classical sixteenth century, and they marked the boundaries, so to speak, in the English church. Some Laudian authors pushed that these rubrics and injunctions had been misread by many (e.g. the lazy time server George Abbott, as they might describe Laud's predecessor). This accounted for the illusion of innovation to the untrained eye when the Laudians put things right. Laws crafted in the golden age of the English church did not, according to these polemical authors, support the claims of Peter Smart, but rather ousted him as a Puritan. This was a discourse highly invested in the construction of orthodoxy in historical terms. Similar to competition over the rubrics, the analogue strategy of recruiting iconic figures from England's Tudor past was a way to pair champions of the Reformation, some of whom had given their lives in the reign of Queen Mary, with the Laudians. The aura of old-fashioned conservatism, manufactured here by the blending past and present, was a valuable commodity. This analogue strategy, however, could appear in a few different ways. The most basic route would be to make reference to the efforts of John Whitgift or John Jewel with the connotation that such sixteenth century figures were doing the same thing in their day that the Laudians were doing during the Personal Rule. Sometimes, however, when an opponent made a detailed examination of the work of one of these iconic figures, Laudian authors responded by neutralizing the evidence. They would isolate the references as an aberration or 'hiccup' in the Reformation, a moment when Jewel, for instance, was distracted and veered from the Elizabethan settlement's major features. Related to this strategy was another I have here called the Abbott Thesis, an approach that could account for the appearance of novelty by casting Laud's immediate predecessor, George Abbott as a lazy time-server who neglected his duty to impose conformity.

Yet another manifestation of the recruiting or analogue strategy is the parallel positive and negative appeal to iconic figures. While currency for the beauty of holiness movement was achieved by references to near-hallowed figures from England's golden age, the avant-garde conformists also aligned their opponents with dissidents from that same period, men who were usually perceived as villainous. Thomas Cartwright or "T.C." made regular appearances in Laudian literature. The most interesting aspect of this phenomenon is that these historical figures – both the "good" and the "bad" – were in reality fairly distinct. With seemingly blunt force, Laudian polemic polarized the landscape from the middle of the sixteenth century to the reign of Charles, dissolving historical change, and dismissing the reality of individual opinion. Good conformists like Cranmer, Jewel, Whitgift, and their rightful successors the Laudian bishops squared off against dissidents like Cartwright, "Martin Marprelate," the New England Separatists, and Peter Smart in an epic struggle. The goal was to mark all opponents – old-style conformists, presbyterians, separatists, radical anabaptists, and still others – as cut from the same cloth. The ones faced by the regime in the 1630s, so the narrative ran, were no different than their equally wicked forbearers in the Elizabethan church.

Still another strategy the Laudians employed during the Personal Rule was the appropriation of Elizabeth herself. I have termed this approach the *Semper Eadem* strategy. In the seventeenth century, Elizabeth, the queen of blessed memory was widely perceived as the godly monarch who rooted out superstition, settled the Church of England after years of religious confusion, and beat back the Spanish in a seemingly Biblical struggle against Antichrist. The Laudian goal was to tie the memory of Elizabeth to Charles, portraying the regimes as coterminous. These polemical authors also made a commentary on the power structures of the church established in Elizabeth's reign, observations that would inform contemporaries about their role. In short, the Laudians wanted to reduce lay influence, specifically the role of the Parliament. Often articulated in sacerdotal language, clerical authority was at issue, and the queen of

blessed memory appeared in their literature to affirm that authority. Nothing, the Laudians argued, had changed between the reign of Elizabeth Tudor and that of Charles Stuart. *Semper Eadem*.

Before leaving the Personal Rule, we should be clear that, if we expand our definition of polemical media, the junior clergy and the senior clergy were making roughly the same arguments. While Anthony Milton has maintained that it was left to the junior clergy to pitch arguments for the beauty of holiness, I have here suggested that the bishops were making the same claims only in different ways. Clearly, as Milton himself admits, Archbishop William Laud made direct arguments about the beauty of holiness, specifically, that it was consonant with the patterns established in the sixteenth century. The archbishop was careful to get his censure speech from the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick into print in addition to his published arguments with Fisher the Jesuit. The Irish bishop Henry Leslie also made direct claims in published essays like *A Treatise of the Authority of the Church*. These instances, I will quickly agree, were exceptions. It is true that junior clergy like John Pocklington, Giles Widdowes, and Peter Heylyn wrote the bulk of the literature defending the Laudian agenda. It is true that the higher clergy, for most part, did not make direct arguments in controversial texts like *A Coale from the Altar*. However, the bishops were not silent in this critical period. They did raise serious arguments about the legitimacy of their movement. Moreover, these arguments were the same historically-oriented arguments raised by the junior clergy. While some (Laud and Leslie) made claims in print, many more pitched their case indirectly. Bishop William Piers devised a “schedule” of arguments for the east-end altar topped by a reference to Elizabeth’s injunctions. Having faced the critiques of Peter Smart, Bishop Richard Neile produced a close commentary on the same historical material used by the disaffected Durham prebend.

Still others spoke through their diocesan articles and injunctions, as many ordinaries managed to get apologia into their directives. Articles like those based on

Bishop John Overall's 1619 set definitely included historical justifications. Bishop Matthew Wren's highly annotated 1636 articles for Norwich – directives that reached all the way back to Archbishop Parker's 1567 Advertisements – indicate that this ordinary was searching for sources. Such annotations, we may reasonably suspect, were to 'arm' his deputies with historical precedents as they went through the Norwich diocese. Likewise, Peter Heylyn was sure to build historical claims about the normative face of the English church into his 1640 set of articles. Used by Bishop William Juxon in London, these questions drew from an array of historic materials, and they were packaged with a user-friendly interpretation. In short, the Laudians – both the junior clergy and the higher clergy – marketed a particular vision of the sixteenth century, the English reformation, and the Elizabethan settlement to portray their program for the Church of England as normative and old-fashioned.

During the Personal Rule, the Laudians made the case that the beauty of holiness was consonant with an Elizabethan orthodoxy. The same can be said of Laudian literature during the 1640s and 1650s, that is, during the Civil Wars and the Interregnum. The collapse of Laudian hegemony, the violent death of both William Laud and Charles I, and the banning of the prayer book and episcopacy (the twin pillars of conformity) were not enough to halt the use of this rhetoric. I have further argued here that this rhetoric provided Laudianism with its internal coherence. These authors continued to use what I have described as the positive and negative strategy of historical appeal. They continued to align themselves with iconic figures from the Elizabethan church while dismissing their opponents as the heirs of earlier dissidents. They continued to deploy the Abbott Thesis to account for the appearance of novelty during the Personal Rule. They continued to distort historical change and polarize the landscape from c.1550 to c.1640, pushing all conformists into one column and all who challenged the established church and successive regimes into another. They also continued to use the *Semper Eadem* strategy, blurring Charles' regime with that of Elizabeth Tudor. Texts like

Bibliotheca Regia, present adherents of an extra-legal, pietistic tradition as simply faithful to the religion of Queen Elizabeth. These narratives of the sixteenth century and of the reformation supplied prayer book loyalists (whom we can now describe as Anglican) with a satisfying confessional identity, one which turned on the perception of conservatism. This rhetoric was adapted, of course, after the execution or “martyrdom” of Charles Stuart to meet a changed landscape. Historical rhetoric, particularly the Laudian construction of conformity in the wake of the royal execution, could explain to prayer book loyalists why they suffered. It fixed blame on the plans fashioned by men like old “T.C.” which had at long last come to fruition. Ostensibly the pious diary of the martyr-king, *Eikon Basilike* stressed Charles’ sufferings in the defense of established, old-fashioned ways. Charles’ execution, in short, was not simply the bloody death of one man. It was also an entry in an on-going discussion about authority in early modern England. The resulting martyr cult and its accompanying literature was a new construal of that same familiar Laudian rhetoric, one deeply informed by perceptions of the past.

Moreover, the Laudian polemical use of history continued when Charles II returned to England. This rhetoric had shaped, if not birthed Anglican identity during the Interregnum, and now, at the Restoration, it was helping to install this confessional tradition as the normative face of the established church. Cavaliers, like their Laudian clergy, perceived themselves as the heirs of an Elizabethan prayer book tradition. Presbyterian hopes for comprehension were crushed by these Cavaliers in Parliament and by an aggressively Anglican clergy in convocation. The spirit of the Declaration of Breda was ignored; the Savoy conference was a dead end. Along with the new 1662 Book of Common Prayer and the ejections of Black Bartholomew came a ceremonious episcopal church equipped with a Laudian spirituality. The confessional tradition born during the Interregnum now was the official position of the institutional Church of England. The Laudian rhetoric developed first during the Personal Rule – polemical strategies initially deployed to defend the beauty of holiness and east-end altars – now

buoyed Anglican identity. This was not simply a redrawing of boundaries, but rather the rise of a distinct confessional tradition. The conclusion that needs to be drawn here is that Anglican identity at its seminal or classical moment in 1662 operated on the notion that 1662 was *not* in fact the seminal or classical moment, but rather a simple moment of reasserting an Elizabethan settlement (however mythic such a phenomenon might be).

Works by men like David Lloyd and Peter Heylyn pitched that vision for the established church at the Restoration. Elizabeth Tudor, they argued before a Cavalier audience, had fashioned a particular religious tradition, one distinct from Reformed Protestantism and guided by an altar-centered piety. Anyone challenging that historically-guided vision was just a Puritan and one to be quickly dismissed as a dangerous schismatic. After all, such dissidents might plunge England back into the dark days of Cromwell and persecution. An examination of Heylyn's Restoration histories have occupied an entire chapter in this project, and rightfully so. In these texts one finds a culmination of sorts to the Laudian rhetoric that first developed in the late 1620s. Moreover, Heylyn himself participated in this polemical theatre from the very start.

Heylyn's claims informed Anglican sensibilities in the early 1660s about the nature of the established church in historical terms. He sold a polemically constructed landscape marked by conformity and non-conformity. The techniques described in this dissertation as the analogue or recruiting strategy, the positive and negative appeals, the *Semper Eadem* strategy, and the Abbott Thesis can be found in Heylyn's writings in spades. These helped resurgent Cavaliers perceive the religious and political landscape in a particular way. In Heylyn's histories, John Calvin and other Reformed figures from the sixteenth century appear as interloping foreigners who wanted only to pull down the Elizabethan settlement, a middle way between Scylla and Chrybdis. Cavalier Anglicans could read Heylyn's texts – *Ecclesia Restuarata*, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, and *Aërius Redivius* – and see how the Long Parliament had violated the reformation-era paradigm of crown and clergy operating together in church affairs while the Parliament chimed as a

distant third voice. They could see how Archbishop Laud was wronged for simply following the path cleared by Archbishop Whitgift. They could see that things had changed not in the Personal Rule, but in the 1640s when Puritans overturned the pacific Elizabethan settlement. Reading this narrative of the recent past, the Cavaliers shaping such measures as the Clarendon code rejected toleration, convinced that they were reasserting an old-fashioned Settlement of Religion.

Avant-garde conformity, first broached in the late 1620s, swelling during the Personal Rule, and persisting through the wars and the Interregnum, turned on a particular rhetoric of conservatism and operated in a historically-oriented market place. The merchandise traded was the image of Elizabeth Tudor and the classical moment of Reformation in England. Through their historical claims, whether in published texts, sermons, or articles, the Laudians crafted a narrative of the past for the purpose of legitimating the beauty of holiness movement. After the collapse of Laudian power in 1640, that same rhetoric helped to set in motion the formation of an entire confessional identity. When Peter Heylyn wove his memorable and rhapsodic lines about the still small voice of God manifesting itself in the reign of Elizabeth, he was constructing meaning for his contemporaries through a plastic past. They reached back to what they perceived as a seminal moment in history, assured of their orthodoxy and their conformity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

Bedford County Record Office, St. John of Bletsoe MSS, J, 1361.

British Library, London, MS Additional C 304b

British Library, London, Lansdowne MS 985

British Library, London, MS Sloane 1008

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Clarendon MS 72

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Egerton MS 2978

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Harleian MS 1219

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS A 127

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS A 441

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS D 158

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS D 821

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS D 1364

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner MS 68

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner MS 314

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Sancroft MS 11

Durham Cathedral, Dean and Chapter Muniments: Chapter Act Book, 1619-38

Durham University Archives, Cosin Library B.IV.4

Durham University Library, Mickleton and Spearman MS 30

Lords Record Office, Braye MS, Vol. 8

Lambeth Palace Library, London, MS 731

Lambeth Palace Library, London, MS 943

The National Archives, London, HMC Cowper

The National Archives, London, PRO SP 16/3/243

The National Archives, London, PRO SP 16/308/38

The National Archives, London, PRO SP 16/406/99

The National Archives, London, PRO SP 16/499/5

Printed Primary Sources including Modern Collections

Austin, William, *Devotionis Augustinianae Flamma, or Certain Meditations*.
London, 1634.

Articles of Impeachment against Matthew Wren. London, 1641.

Bargrave, Isaac, *A Sermon against Selfe-Policy*. London, 1624.

-----, *A Sermon Preached before King Charles March 27, 1627*.
London, 1627.

-----, *A Sermon Preached before the lower house of Parliament*.
London, 1623.

Baxter, Richard, *Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most
Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*. London, 1696.

Binnall, P. B. G., "Bishop Sanderson's Ordination Book," *Transactions of the
Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society*. IX (1961).

Booty, John E., ed., *The Book of Common Prayer 1559*.
Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1976.

Boughen, Edward, *An Account of the Church Catholic*. London, 1653.

-----, *A Sermon of Confirmation*. London, 1620.

-----, *Master Gerees Case of Conscience Sifted*. London, 1648.

-----, *Observations upon the Ordinance of the Lords and Commons at
Westminster after advice had with their Assembly of Divines for the Ordination of
Ministers pro tempore according to their Directory*. Oxford, 1645.

Gerald Bray, ed., *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947*.
Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998.

Gerald Bray, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation*.
Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Bruce, John, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I, 1625-26*. London, 1858.

Bruce, John and Thomas T. Perowne, eds., *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker, DD
Archbishop of Canterbury: Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A. D.
1535, to His Death, A. D. 1575*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853.

- Buck, James, *A Treatise of the Beatitudes*. London, 1637.
- Bulteel, John, *A Relation of the Troubles of the 3 Foreign Churches in Kent, Caused by the Injunctions of Wm. Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury*. London, 1645.
- Calderwood, David, *The Altare of Damascus or the Patern of the English Hierarchie*. London, 1621.
- Cardwell, Edward, ed., *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England: Being a Collection of Injunctions, declarations, Orders, Articles of Inquiry, &c. from the year 1547 to the year 1716*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1839.
- , ed., *Synodalia: A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons, and Proceedings of Convocations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842.
- Casaubon, Meric, *King and His Subjects Unhappily Fallen Out*. London, 1660.
- Cheshire, Thomas, *A True Copy of that Sermon which was preached at S. Paul's the tenth day of October Last*. London, 1641.
- Clay, William Keating, ed., *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847.
- Cope, E. S. and W. H. Coates, eds., *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*. London: Royal Historical Society, University College London 1977.
- de Beer, E. S., ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- D'Ewes, Simonds, *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the Beginning of the Long Parliament to the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Stratford*. Wallace Notestein, ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923.
- Drant, Thomas, *The Royall Guest: or, A sermon preached at Lent Assises*. London, 1637.
- Featley, John, *A sermon of obedience and submission: preached at St. Sauours-church in South-warke, at a visitation, on Tuesday, the eighth day of December, anno Dom. 1635*. London, 1636.
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998, 2 Vols.
- Fisher, Jasper, *The priest's duty and dignity, preached at the triennial visitation in Ampthill 1635. 18 Aug.* London, 1636.
- Foulis, Oliver (David Lloyd), *Cabala: or the Mystery of Conventicles Unvaild: in an Historical Account of the Principles and Practices of the Non-Conformists, against Church and State: From the First Reformation under King Edward the VI Anno 1550 to this present Year, 1664*. London, 1664.
- Frere, W. H. and W. P. M. Kennedy, eds., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*. London: Longmans, 1910.
- Fuller, Thomas, *The Appeal of Injured Innocence: Unto the Learned and Ingenuous Reader*. London, 1659.

- , *The History of the University of Cambridge and of Waltham Abbey, With the Appeal of Injured Innocence*. London: Thomas Tegg, 1840.
- , *The Church History of Britain*. London: Thomas Tegg, 1842.
- Gataker, Thomas, *An Anniversarie Memorial of Englands Delivery from the Spanish Invasion*. London, 1626.
- Gauden, John, *Slight Healings of Publique Hurts*. London, 1660.
- Gee, Henry and W. J. Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*. London: MacMillan, 1896.
- Griffiths, John, ed., *The Two Books of Homilies to be Read in Churches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859.
- Hickman, Henry, *Plus ultra, or, Englands reformation, needing to be reformed: being an examination of Doctor Heylins History of the reformation of the Church of England*. London, 1661.
- Hacket, John, *Scrinia reserata: a Memorial offered to the great Deservings of John Williams, D.D.* London, 1693.
- Henshaw, Joseph, *Meditations Miscellaneous, Holy and Humane*. London, 1637.
- Heylyn, Peter, *Aërius Redivivus; or The History of the Presbyterians*. London, 1670.
- , *Antidotum Lincolniense, or An Answer to a Booke entituled The Holy Table, Name and Thing*. London, 1637.
- , *Brief and Moderate Answer to the seditious and scandalous Challenge of H. Burton*. London, 1637.
- , *A Coale from the Altar*. London, 1636.
- , *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, The History of The Life and Death, of The most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William By Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*. London, 1668.
- , *Ecclesia Restaurata; or The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. London, 1661.
- , *Parliament's Power, In Lawes for Religion*. Oxford, 1645.
- , *The Way and Manner of the Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified: Against the Clamors and Objections of the Opposite Parties*. London, 1657.
- Hoard, Samuel, *The Churches Authority Asserted*. London, 1637.
- I. W., *Certain Reasons why the Booke of Common-Prayer Being Corrected Should Continue*. London, 1641.

- Journal of the House of Commons*. London, 1802.
- Journal of the House of Lords*. London, 1802.
- Juxon, William, *The Subjects Sorrow: or Lamentations Upon the Death of Britaines Iosiah, King Charles*. London, 1649.
- Kenyon, J. P., ed., *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Laing, David, ed., *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662*.
Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1841-1842.
- Langbaine, Gerard, *Episcopall Inheritance*. Oxford, 1641.
- Laud, William, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.*, J. Bliss and W. Scott, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1847-1860.
- Laurence, Thomas, *Two Sermons: First at S. Maries Oxford July 13, 1634 being Act Sunday. The Second in Salisbury Cathedral at the Visitation of Archbishop Laud May 23 1634*. Oxford, 1635.
- Laurence, Thomas, *Sermon Preached before the King's Majestie at Whitehall, February 7 1636*. London, 1637.
- Leslie, Henry, *A Treatise of Authority of the Church*. (Dublin, 1637).
- Ley, John, *A Letter (Against the erection of an Altar) Written Iune 29, 1635*.
London, 1641.
- Lloyd, David, *State-Worthies or, the Statesmen of England Since the Reformation*.
London, 1665.
- Longstaff, W. H. D., ed., *The Acts of the High Commision Court Within the Diocese of Durham*. London, 1858.
- Mason, Francis, *The Authority of the Church in Making Canons and Constitutions concerning Things Indifferent*. Oxford, 1634.
- Maxwell, John, *Answer by Letter to a Worthy Gentlemen who desired of a Divine some reason by which it might appear how inconsistent Presbyteriall Government is with Monarchy*. Bristol, 1644.
- May, Thomas, *The History of the Parliament of England which began November 3, 1640*.
London, 1647.
- Maynwarring, Roger, *Religion and Allegiance*. London, 1627.
- Mede, Joseph, Churches, *That is Appropriate Places for Christian Worship*
London, 1638.
- Milton, John, *Eikonoklastes in answer to a book intitl'd Eikon basilike, the portrature of his Sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings*. London, 1649.

- Morley, George, *A Modest Advertisement concerning the Present Controversies about Church-Government*. London, 1641.
- Nicholls, William, *The Book of Common-Prayer, And Administration of the Sacraments*. London, 1709.
- , *A Supplement to the Commentary on the Book of Common-Prayer*. London, 1711.
- Ornsby, George, ed., *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham*. Durham: Andrews and Co., 1869.
- Page, Samuel, *Nine Sermons: preached upon speciall occassion*. London, 1630.
- Pocklington, John, *Altare Christianum, or The Dead Vicar's Plea*. London, 1637.
- , *Sunday No Sabbath: A Sermon*. London, 1636.
- Porter, J. R., ed., *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1952.
- Potter, Christopher, *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of Barnaby Potter as Bishop of Carlisle, Ely House March 15, 1628*. London, 1629.
- Prynne, William, *Histriomastix*. London, 1633.
- , *Canterburies doome, or, The first part of a compleat history of the commitment, charge, tryall, condemnation, execution of William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury*. London, 1646.
- Quelch, William, *Church Customes Vindicated in Two Sermons*. London, 1636.
- R. T., *De Templis: A Treatise of Temples*. London, 1638.
- Read, Alexander, *A Sermon preached April 8 1635 at a Visitation in Brentwood in Essex*. London, 1636.
- Reeve, Edmund, *The Christian Divinitie contained in the Divine Service of the Church of England*. London, 1631.
- , *Communion Booke Catechism Expounded*. London, 1634.
- Robartes, Foulke, *Gods holy house and service, according to the primitive and most Christian forme thereof, described by Foulke Robarts, Batchelor of Divinity, and prebendary of Norvvich*. London, 1639.
- S. Wren, ed., *Parentalia: or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens*. London, 1750.
- Sanderson, Robert, *Ad Clerum. A Sermon Preached... 8 October, 1641*. London, 1670.
- Skinner, Robert, *Sermon before the King at Whitehall, 3 December 1634*. London, 1634.

- Smart, Peter, *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedrall Chvrch of Dvrham, Iuly, 7, 1628.* London, 1640.
- , *A Catalogue of Superstitious Innovations in the Change of Services and Ceremonies; of presumptuous irregularities, and transgressions, against the Articles of Religion, Act of Parliament for uniformity, Canons, Advertisements, Injunctions, and Homilies.* London, 1640.
- , *A Short Treatise of Altars, Altar-cringing, and Musick of all the Quire, Singing-men and Choristers, when the holy Communion was administered in the Cathedrall Church of Durham, by the Prebendaries and Petty-Canons, in glorious Copes embroidered with Images.* London, 1629.
- Sparrow, Anthony, *Sermon concerning Confession.* London, 1637.
- , *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England.* London, 1655.
- Squire, John, *A Thankesgiving for the Decreasing and Hope of Removing of the Plague.* London, 1637 .
- Stuart, Charles (Charles I), *Eikon basilike the pourtraicture of His sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings.* London, 1649.
- , *A Perfect Copie of Prayers used by His Majestie in the time of His Sufferings delivered to Doctor Iuxon, Bishop of London, Immediatly before his Death .* London, 1649.
- , *Bibliotheca Regia.* London, 1659.
- , *Eikon basilike the pourtraicture of His sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings.* London, 1649.
- Swan, John, *A Sermon Pointing out the Chief Causes and Cures of such unruly stirres as are not seldom found in the Church of God.* London, 1639.
- Sydenham, Humphrey, *Sermons Upon Solemn Occasions.* London, 1637.
- Symmons, Edward, *A Vindication of King Charles: or a Loyal Subjects Duty.* London, 1647.
- Tedder, Richard, *Sermon at the Primary Visitation of Matthew Wren as Bishop of Norwich.* London, 1637.
- Warmstry, Thomas, *A Convocation Speech... Against Images, Altars, Crosses, the new Canons and the Oath, etc.* London, 1641.
- Widdowes, Giles, *The Lawless, Kneesse Schismatical Puritan.* Oxford, 1631.
- , *The Schismatical Puritan.* Oxford, 1630.

Williams, John, *The holy table, name & thing, more anciently, properly, and literally used under the New Testament, then that of an altar*. London, 1637.

Wren, Matthew, *Sermon before the King at Whitehall, Sunday 17 February 1627*. Cambridge, 1627.

-----, *Bishop Wren's Petition to the Parliament in defence of Episcopacie*. London, 1642.

Secondary Sources

William Abbot, The issue of episcopacy in the Long Parliament: the reasons for abolition. Oxford University DPhil Dissertation, 1981.

Abernathy, G. R., *The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965.

Appleby, David J., *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic, and Restoration Non-Conformity*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Aston, Margaret, *England's Iconoclasts Volume I: Laws against Images*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Backus, Irena, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

-----, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Bagchi, D. V. N., "Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism," in Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 1999, 3-15.

Beddard, R. A., "The Restoration Church," in J. R. Jones, ed., *The Restored Monarchy, 1660-1689*. London: Macmillan, 1979, 155-175.

Betteridge, Thomas, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

Bond, Edward L., "Religion in Seventeenth-Century Anglican Virginia: Myth, Persuasion, and the Creation of an American Identity." Louisiana State University PhD Dissertation, 1995.

Bosher, Robert S., *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662*. London: Dacre Press, 1951.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

- Brightman, F. E., *The English Rite*. London: Rivingtons, 1921, 2 Vols.
- Brownley, M. W., *Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- Brydon, Michael, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1600-1714*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Carlton, Charles, *Archbishop William Laud*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Clarke, W. K. L. and Charles Harris, eds., *Liturgy and Worship: A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion*. London: SPCK, 1981.
- Coffey, John, "The toleration controversy during the English revolution," in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006, 42-68.
- Collinson, Patrick, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967.
- , *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.
- Coster, Will and Andrew Spicer, "Introduction: the dimensions of sacred space in Reformation Europe," in Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, eds., *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 1-16.
- Cressy, David, *Travesties and Transgressions: Tales of Discord and Dissension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- , *Bonfire and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989.
- , *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- , "Revolutionary England, 1640-1642" *Past and Present* 181 (2003), 35-71.
- , "Remembrancers of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographers of the 1640s," in Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006, 253-264.
- Cross, Clare, "The Church in England, 1646-1660," in G. E. Alymer, ed., *The Interegnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660*. London: Macmillan, 1972, 99-120.
- Cuming, G. J., *The Godly Order: Texts and Studies Relating to the Book of Common Prayer*. London: SPCK, 1983.
- Cust, Richard, *Charles I: A Political Life*. New York: Longman, 2005.
- Davies, Julian, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Dickens, A. G., *The English Reformation*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1964; 1991.
- Doran, Susan and Thomas Freeman, eds., *The Myth of Elizabeth*. New York: MacMillan, 2003.
- Dyrness, William, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Eire, Carlos M. N., *War against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Fincham, Kenneth, "Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2000, 125-158.
- , "The Restoration of the Altars in the 1630s"
Historical Journal 44 (2001), 919-940.
- , *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1990.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547- c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I," in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993, 23-49.
- Fissel, Mark Charles, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns against Scotland, 1638-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Foster, Andrew, "Richard Neile Revisited," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2000, 159-178.
- Fuggles, J. F., "A History of the Library of St. John's College, Oxford." Oxford, B.Litt. Thesis, 1975.
- Fussner, Frank Smith, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Gardiner, S. R., *History of England from the accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*. London: Longman, Green and Co., 1894.
- Gee, Henry, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion 1559-1564*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- Gee, Henry, *The Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments*. London: MacMillan, 1902.
- Gordon, Bruce, ed., *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996.

- Grafton, Anthony, *What was History?: The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Green, Ian, "The Persecution of "Scandalous" and "Malignant" Parish Clergy during the English Civil War." *English Historical Review* 94 (1979): 507-531.
- , *The Re-Restabishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Guibbory, Achsah, *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion, and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Haigh, Christopher, "The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation," in Christopher Haigh, ed., *The English Reformation Revised*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 19-33.
- Hoffman, John G., "The Arminian and the Iconoclast: The Dispute Between John Cosin and Peter Smart." *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 48 (1979): 279-301.
- Hughes, Ann, "'The public profession of these nations': the national Church in interregnum England," in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006, 93-114.
- Hunter, Christopher, *An Illustration of Mr. Daniel Neal's History of the Puritans in the Article of Peter Smart, A.M. Prebendary of Durham, Prosecuted for Preaching a Vile Sermon, in the Cathedral There, July 27, 1628*. Durham, 1736.
- Hutton, Ronald, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Hutton, W. H., *S. John Baptist College*. London: Robinson, 1898.
- John, Norman, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Keeble, N. H., *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*. Oxford: Blackwells, 2002.
- Kennedy, W. P. M., *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*. London: Mowbray, 1924.
- Kewes, Paulina, "History and Its Uses," in Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*. San Marino, CA: Hunting Library, 2006, 1-30.
- Kitchen, G. W., *Seven Sages of Durham*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911.
- Lacey, Andrew, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Lake, Peter, "'The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s," in Stephen Platten, ed., *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change, and the Search for Communion*. Norwich, Norfolk: Canterbury Press, 2003, 90-121.

- , "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice," in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006, 80-97.
- , *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy,' 'Heterodoxy,' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- , "Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism, and Nicholas Tyacke," in Peter Lake and Kenneth Fincham, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- , "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity in the Court of James I," in Linda Levy Peck, ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 113-33.
- , "The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity, and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s" in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993, 161-185.
- , "The Laudians and the Argument from Authority," in Bonnelyn Young Kunze and Dwight D. Brautigam, eds., *Court, Country, and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1992, 145-179.
- , *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Lake, Peter and Steven Pincus, eds., *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- Lambert, Sheila, "The Opening of the Long Parliament." *Historical Journal* 27 (1984): 265-269.
- Lamont, W. M., *Puritanism and the English Revolution*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1991.
- Lander, Jesse, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Lane, Calvin, "Before Hooker: The Material Context of Elizabethan Prayer Book Worship." *Anglican and Episcopal History* 74 (2005): 320-356.
- Levy, F. J., *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1967).
- Litzenberger, Caroline, "Defining the Church of England: Religious Change in the 1570s," in Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger, eds., *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from his Students*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. New York: Palgrave, 1999.

- , "The Latitude of the Church of England," in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006, 41-59.
- , "The Myth of the English Reformation." *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991): 1-19.
- , *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Makey, Walter, *The Church of the Covenant, 1637-1651: Revolution and Social Change in Scotland*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979.
- Maltby, Judith, "'By this Book': Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church," in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993, 115-37.
- , "From Temple to Synagogue: 'Old' Conformity in the 1640s-1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2000, 88-120.
- , "Petitions for Episcopacy on the Eve of the Civil War 1641-1642," in Stephen Taylor, ed., *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Church of England Miscellany*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1999, 103-168.
- , *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- , "Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the formation of 'Anglicanism', 1642-60," in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, eds., *Religion in Revolutionary England*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006, 158-180.
- Marshall, Peter, "Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the Semantics of Schism," in Ethan Shagan, ed., *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2005, 22-48.
- , "(Re)defining the English Reformation." *Journal of British History* 48 (2008): 564-586.
- Martin, Jessica, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the rise of Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- McCullough, Peter, "Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-1642." *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 418-419.
- McDowell, Nicholas, *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Mentzer, Raymond, "The Reformed Churches of France and the Visual Arts," in P. Corby Finney, ed., *Seeing beyond the Word: Visual Arts and the Calvinist Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999, 199-230.

- Milton, Anthony, "Anglicanism by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall," in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006, 159-176.
- , *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- , "The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach," in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, eds., *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 162-84.
- , *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Morgan, Paul, "Donations of Manuscripts to St. John's College, Oxford, during the Presidency of William Laud, 1611-21." *Studies in the Book Trade* 13 (1937): 71-90.
- Morrill, John, "The Church in England, 1642-9," in John Morrill, ed., *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642-1649*. London: Macmillan, 1982, 89-114.
- Musset, Patrick, ed., *Lists of Deans and Major Canons of Durham, 1541-1900*. Durham: Durham University Press, 1974.
- Nockles, Peter, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Norbrook, David, "The English Revolution and English Historiography," in N. H. Keeble, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Writing of the English Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 233-250.
- Notestein, Wallace and Frances Relf, eds., *Commons Debates for 1629*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1921.
- Oberman, Heiko A., *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Oman, Charles, *English Church Plate 597-1830*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Packer, John, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1969.
- Palmer, W. G., "Invitation to a Beheading: Factions in Parliament, the Scots and the Execution of Archbishop William Laud in 1645." *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 52 (1983): 17-27.
- Potter, Lois, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Primus, J. H., *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the Church of England in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth*. Amsterdam: N. V. Kampen, 1960.
- Prior, Charles W. A., *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Pruett, J. H. *The Parish Clergy under the Later Stuarts: The Leicestershire Experience*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1978.
- Robertson, Randy, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- Russell, Conrad, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1990.
- , "Why did Charles I call the Long Parliament?." *History* 69 (1984): 375-383.
- Seaward, Paul, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Shagan, Ethan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sharpe, Kevin, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Spellman, W. M., *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Spurr, John, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Thompson, Bard, ed., *Liturgies of the Western Church*. Cleveland and New York: First Fortress Press, 1968.
- Tillbrook, Michael, "Arminianism and Society in County Durham, 1617-42," in David Marcombe, ed., *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494-1660*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press, 1983, 202-226.
- Towers, S. Mutchow, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Trevor-Roper, H. R., *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645*. London: Macmillan, 1962.
- Tyacke, Nicholas, "Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War." *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996): 139-167.
- , *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

- , "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000, 5-33.
- Wadkins, Timothy, "The Percy-"Fisher" Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622-1625." *Church History* 57 (1988): 153-169.
- Walker, Julia, ed., *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Webster, Tom, "Religion in Early Stuart Britain," in Barry Coward, ed., *A Companion to Stuart Britain*. Malden, MA: Blackwells, 2003, 253-70.
- White, Peter, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Wilcher, Robert, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Williams, J. B, *Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings of Sir Matthew Hale*. London: Jackson and Walford, 1835.
- Woolf, D. R., *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology and the "Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Woolf, D. R., *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Woolf, D. R., *Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Wormald, Brian, *Clarendon: Politics, History, and Religion 1640-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.