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In writing this dissertation, it has not been my intention to treat English Puritanism merely as a series of dates and events, although such comparative adiaphora have necessarily entered into it to a large extent. Nor have I been greatly concerned with defending Puritanism; that has been made necessary only occasionally, owing to traditional misconceptions regarding it. As a religious, moral, and political factor in the history of English civilisation, Puritanism cries out to be understood rather than to be defended.

Following out this purpose, therefore, I have tried to bring out the early development of Puritanism as literally a movement, as the growth of a spirit. The first four chapters, delineating the growth of the movement from a petty squabble over vestments to the rise and temporary decline of the Presbyterian revolt, are an attempt to keep this picture of growth and development clear in the mind of the reader. Puritanism began as an attitude toward life and toward certain ultimate religious principles upon which, it declared, life is founded. This attitude, or rather certain ways of expressing it, led the Puritans into conflict with the authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, of their day. It also set them apart from their fellow-citizens. As the adjustment with their environment grew more and more difficult, therefore, and as the hostility and coercive
aggressiveness of the authorities increased, the Puritans pro-
gressively achieved and developed a rock-ribbed partisan solid-
arity. The treatment here seeks to show Puritanism as a kinetic
force, burgeoning and proliferating with events and personalitites
which are simply manifestations of this growth at its various
stages. Fundamentally, all the while, Puritanism continued to be
an attitude, a peculiar relation between a certain group of men
and their God.

The term, Puritanism, has often been used as a historical
omnibus, to include all those, save the Catholics, whose symp-
athies led them into conflict with the rituals or polity of the
Established Church. For our purpose here, however, I have chosen
to confine the designation to those who stayed within the Church
during Elizabeth's reign. Thus, "Puritan", as used in this dis-
sertation, applies to Conformists and nonconformists alike, so
long as they shared in the basic Puritan spirit. The Separatists
and early Congregationalists chose to reject rather than "purify"
the Church of England as a true Church. Hence they merit here
scant attention, for they were a party in their own right, and
as such they demand separate treatment.

Such an account of historical trends is here, of course,
only propaedeutic to our specific concern: Henry Smith. The
latter half of this dissertation approaches Henry Smith as one
whose life and works, to an interesting degree, epitomize and
illustrate early Puritanism. In such an endeavor, Smith emerges,
it is hoped, as much more than a mere source of quotable bits with which to illustrate the history of Puritanism. Such tendenz kritie is all too easy. I have tried to avoid it by using his sermons to give the reader not only a movement but a living, experiencing, intensely human Puritan himself. Perhaps, as we catch something of the man--his predilections, his prejudices, and the figure of his thinking, in short, his personality--we may have a new glimpse of early Puritanism, not merely ab extra, the perspective of most historians, but ab imo, the vantage-point of one who rejoices in a new-found, deep sympathy with these apostles of the English Reformation.
Chapter One

ENGLISH PURITANISM:
Origin and Early Development

In viewing the origin and development of the Puritan movement in England, it is difficult - indeed almost impossible - to fix upon any one place or person as the *fons et origo*. In one sense it is possible to point to John Wiclif and his Lollards in the fourteenth century as the lineal precursors of Puritanism, for much of the teaching of these earliest of English reformers is Puritan in tone. In another sense, we might date the Puritan movement strictly and literally from the year in which the name was first used to describe a section of the English Church.¹ For our purpose, however, either extreme would be misleading. It is our intention to begin our discussion with the first appearance of the controversy over "vestments." This contention, beginning in the reign of Edward VI, grew and spread to include almost every phase of church order and discipline.

Fuller, in speaking of the beginning of this quarrel, says:

"Come we now to the saddest difference that ever happened in the church of England, if we consider either the time, how long it continued, the eminent persons therein engaged, or the doleful effects thereby produced. It was about matters of conformity. Alas! that men should have less wisdom than locusts, which, when sent on God's errand, did not "thrust one another", (Joel 2:8); whereas here such shoving and shouldering, and hoisting and heavings, and jostling and thronging, betwixt clergymen of the highest parts and places. For now nonconformity, in the days of King Edward, was conceived: which afterward, in the reign of Queen Mary (but across the sea at Frankfort) was born; which afterward, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth was nursed and weaned; which under

¹. Fuller: *Church History of Britain*; vol. 2, p. 540
King James grew up a young youth, or tall stripling; but toward the end of King Charles' reign, shot up to the full strength and stature of a man, able not only to cope with but to conquer, the hierarchy, its adversary.  

This "saddest difference" appears strikingly in the case of John Hooper, in the year 1550, though the attitude which caused the incident must have been latent for some time. A man of considerable learning, renowned among the reformers as one who had once been exiled for his faith, Hooper was singled out for the bishopric of Gloucester.  

Difficulty at once arose, however, when the prospective bishop refused to wear certain of the traditional episcopal vestments at his consecration. These vestments, which had been part of the ecclesiastical dress since the early days of the Church, were, in Hooper's opinion, relics of popery, embers of idolatry which could still set fire to the true faith and consume it utterly. The cope, the surplice, the square cap - these things were indelibly associated in the minds of the people with the priest-craft of the Roman Church and with all the superstitions and abuses which had made that church the home of Anti-Christ. So argued Hooper, and he was by no means alone.  

There was already at this time a "left-wing" group among the English reformers, a group of preachers and university theologians, whose chief ambition was to bring

2. vide Heylin: History of the Reformation; p.90.
about a complete break with Rome and everything that even faintly suggested Rome. Led by Hooper, John Knox, Peter Martyr, John A'Lasco, and John Rogers lecturer in St. Paul's, these men were impatient with the slow advances being taken by the moderate, "High-Church" party. ¹ Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley were more cautious. They were not themselves well-affect ed to the vestments,² and their desire for further reform was undoubtedly sincere, but they feared the dangers attendant upon too radical and sudden a break with the past. The vast majority of the people still held to the doctrines and the ritual of the old church and would resent strenuously any abrupt changes.³ Cranmer was determined to preserve unity, or rather uniformity, in their ranks.

As a result of this difference in views, a heated and acrimonious controversy sprang up. The one side insisted that Hooper bow to the authority and tradition of the church, while the other vociferously denounced this clinging to the "symbols of Anti-Christ." Hooper was for some time imprisoned for his obstinacy and finally consented, with the greatest reluctance,

¹ Knox was a Scotsman, with Calvinistic training, and A'Lasco was a Polish exile who had become much respected among the English Reformers.
² Like their successors under Elizabeth, they argued that the garments in question were not in themselves evil and should be kept for the sake of convenience.
³ vide H.M. Dexter: The England and Holland of the Pilgrims; p.80 et seq. "...the real sympathies of most of the country rectors and curates seem to have inclined the other way. Underneath the thin Protestant seeming was the solid substance of Popery."
to wear the despised garments at his consecration. It is
interesting, by the way, to note that both Cranmer and Ridley,
when about to be led to their death at the stake, spoke of these
garments with as much contempt as their fellow-martyr, Hooper.¹
The result of the quarrel was far from conclusive. The views and
prejudices of neither party had been altered by this surface
agreement, and the question was merely temporarily submerged.
Soon it was to appear again and to grow into something far
greater than a petty quarrel over clerical vestments.

The Reformation in England, up to this point, had taken
a course quite different from that of Continental Protestantism.
In Germany, France, and Switzerland the revolt against Rome had
received its inception and its motive power from the people,
gathering strength in spite of the opposition of secular and
ecclesiastical authorities. Luther, it is true, had received
a certain amount of protection and support from some of the
German princes, but it is also true that these men were more
interested in the political significance of a reformation
than in the cause of religion itself. For the most part
the German rulers, working in co-operation with the church
authorities, had vigorously opposed the spread of Luther's
teachings. We may say, therefore, that in Germany as in other
Continental countries, the Reformation came from the people,
cought as they were in the grip of a new and intense evangelical
appeal.

¹ vide Heylin: op.cit., p.91
Thus it was that the Reformation on the Continent had taken from the first a democratic or popular tinge. In England it was quite the reverse. We do not hold entirely with the facile explanation that only the king's marital troubles were responsible for the English Reformation. The ground had been prepared to some extent by the influence of the humanists, Erasmus, Colet, and More. Catholics though they were, their protests as rational individuals against the corruption of the Church of Rome had taken deep root among some of the intellectuals of England. This, however, was not enough to bring about the break with Rome, for the people had not been touched; no popular movement had been aroused.

Here, then, we find a Reformation starting from the top downwards. Henry VIII, for personal and political reasons, had broken away from the domination of the See of Rome. Far from resulting in a free, democratic church, however, this had the virtual effect of substituting Henry for the pope. Whilst energetically plundering the lands and revenues of the church, he retained most of the outward aspects of the traditional Catholic faith.1 His chief churchmen had followed his lead, in spite of his cavalier treatment of the age-old privileges and immunities of the church. This all took place among the leaders of the nation. The people themselves were not very clear as to what the new state of things was meant to be. New creeds and confessions meant nothing to them, and their priests seemed to look and act much as they had always done. The changes,

such as they were, were so mingled and mixed with national policy and with the autocratic nature of their king that they might well be pardoned for feeling some bewilderment.

Gradually, however, the spirit of Protestantism spread. As contacts with the great thinkers and teachers of the Continental Reformation became more frequent, a Protestantism grew up in England which was a thing distinct from the policy-motivated Reformation of the court. Those of the English Protestants who had studied in Geneva and Basle and other protestant centers, returned to their own land with a zeal and enthusiasm which far outstripped the calculated self-interested movements of Henry and his lieutenants. The more ardent Protestants were fearful, and not unjustifiably so, that Henry, who only a few years before had been proud to be called by the pope, Defensor Fidei, might find it expedient to reverse his more recent policy. In case of such a contingency the supremacy of the pope would be fastened more firmly than before on England. Fearful of this, many of the English Protestants advocated a complete break with Rome, a break such as they beheld in Geneva, for example. Henry, on the other hand, was far from desiring any such radical tendencies among his subjects. He was jealous of the power which the pope had exerted over England, but he was determined to keep all that he had wrested from Rome in his own hands. Therefore, bent on regulating this revolution in accordance with his own views, Henry savagely repressed the more advanced Protestant tendencies.
Under Edward VI, however, a new era began, in which the zeal of the Reformers received not only toleration but encouragement. In spite of Henry's quarrel with Rome and his subsequent depredations among the lands and privileges of the church, both he and a majority of his people had remained Catholic in spirit and doctrine. It was largely due to these very depredations, on the other hand, that the reign of his son took on so thoroughly Protestant a tinge. The young king's advisers, Somerset, Warwick, and Southampton, and others of the court clique, were the real rulers of the kingdom. They had all benefitted enormously from the plunder of the monasteries and were well aware that they had everything to gain and nothing to lose by a further widening of the rift with Rome. Selfish and ambitious to an extreme degree, the powerful family of the Howards and the rival house of Warwick which supplanted them, had strong motives for upholding the banner of a cause whose spiritual implications were meaningless to them. It is not strange, then, to find this court oligarchy exerting a powerful influence on the young king in behalf of the Reformation.

Edward himself, moreover, was in his own right a pronounced adherent to the Reformation principles. A youth of deep spiritual and intellectual sensibilities, he was firmly convinced of the need for strengthening the hands of the Reformers in England. Inasmuch as the majority of the
common people, however, still clung to the old faith, any advance in this direction must come from the top down and must come slowly. We have already stated that it was not a democratic movement but an authoritarian, oligarchic one. Much of the legislation in ecclesiastical matters, accordingly, never even came before Parliament for discussion. As Neal remarks,¹

"It was an adventurous undertaking for a few bishops and privy-councillors to change the religion of a nation only by the advantage of the supremacy of a minor, without the consent of the people in Parliament."

However true this may be, and by whatever autocratic means it may have been furthered, and from whatever motives, the fact remains that the Reformation prospered exceedingly in England during the few years of Edward's reign. Archbishop Cranmer, while adhering to certain disputed rites and ceremonies, was sincerely desirous of building an English Protestant Church. His moderation and conservatism, as is always the case, provoked the impatience of men like Hooper, Knox, and John A'Lasco, while his steady pressure toward further reforms outraged Gardiner, Bonner, and the other Catholic leaders. It is hardly likely that any but the most sweeping changes would have satisfied the former party, and it is certain that the latter longed only for a return to Rome.

Quite possibly such sudden and drastic changes as the "left-wing" group demanded could not have been attempted

¹ Neal: History of the Puritans; vol. 1, p. 55.
at that stage without bringing disaster upon the whole cause, a line of reasoning which later influenced the policy of Elizabeth. However this may be, it is certain that Cranmer's cautious advance was soon outstripped by a rapidly growing party of scholars and divines who were to be the nucleus of the Puritan movement.

The publication, under the royal sponsorship, of the First and Second Prayer Books, however it failed to satisfy the extremists, was certainly a definite step in their direction. The first of these two, appearing in 1549, was from the first regarded as a half-way measure by this group. Probably it was not intended to be more than a temporary measure, for three years later appeared the Second Prayer Book. This went far toward removing the more objectionable rites and customs of the old church. "By this Book of Common Prayer all copes and vestments were forbidden throughout England; the prebendaries of St. Paul's left off their hoods, and the bishops their crosses, etc., as by an act of Parliament is more at length set forth."¹

This "Rubric in regard to dresses," as it was called, was only one of several new rulings which the Second Prayer Book contained. Other reforms were instituted, such as discontinuing the use of oil in confirmation and extreme unction. Prayers for the dead and the ancient custom of auricular confession were banned.²

² Dexter, op. cit.; p.75; Dexter's chapter entitled The Protestantism of our Fathers, Progress or Retrogression, provides an interesting discussion of this phase of the Reformation.
More important still was the inclusion of the famous "Black Rubric." In response to a violent sermon of Knox's condemning the practice of kneeling at communion, the council ordered the publication of the Book to be halted while the matter was considered. In spite of Cranmer's protests, the rubric was finally inserted, stating that in kneeling at communion no adoration of the bread and wine is intended.

These reforms constituted so drastic a break with the old religion that bitter protests were heard from the Catholics on all sides. The reforming party might disparage them as half-way measures, and, from the pulpit, demand further and more radical changes, but the fact remains that this Book was a closer approach to the Puritan ideal than anything that followed in the next century.

"It is evident to the careful student of history that the Reformation in England produced its happiest effects in the days of Edward; that the Church of England has never been so pure as soon after its transition from popery; and that its subsequent alterations have ever been in favour of Romanism." 2

While such a statement as the above may be open to dispute, it cannot be denied that the spirit and the tendency of the Reformation under Edward were more thoroughly Puritan than at any later time until the Commonwealth. It was believed, on good authority, that Cranmer was working on still another revision of the Prayer Book, with still further concessions to

1. This rubric was omitted from the Elizabethan Prayer Book to placate the Catholics.
the radicals, when the death of his sovereign interrupted the whole course of the English Reformation. The reaction to Romanism under Mary, however, found a stubborn resistance which a few years earlier would have been impossible. Brief though their time had been, the advanced reformers had laid their foundations well. Their doctrines had gained a firm footing in the sympathies of a vigorous and capable group. This group was a minority, it is true, but a minority substantial enough to withstand the full fury of the stormy years that followed. This sturdy resistance had been achieved partly by Cranmer's patient and careful work at the royal council-table, but even more, we are inclined to think, from the intolerant zeal and uncontrollable fervor of extremists like Knox, Hooper, Miles Coverdale, and John A'Lasco.
Part Two
THE REFORMATION IN EXILE

We come now to the second phase in the development of Puritanism, a phase which is even more significant than the first. We refer to the period of the Marian exile, as it is popularly called. It is not particularly germane to our purpose to discuss the situation in England under "Bloody Mary." The history of her attempt to re-establish Roman Catholicism is well known. Her blind bigotry and fanatical zeal caused considerable havoc among the Protestants, it is true. On the other hand, her relentless and savage persecution in the name of Rome, by its very extravagance, made her cause unpopular and herself odious in the eyes of her people.

This, naturally, did much to nullify any lasting effects that she might have attained. Persecution, when it fails to exterminate, invariably strengthens the very thing against which it is aimed. We see the truth of this both in Mary's case and in that of her sister. Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, and hundreds of others died as martyrs to their faith, and their courage and devotion gained probably as many converts to their cause as all their preaching and legislation had done. But in England, taken by and large, there was little chance for Reformation thinking to grow
and develop. For that we must cross to the Continent, to Frankfort, Geneva, and Zurich.

It has been variously estimated that from five hundred to eight hundred English Protestants sought refuge on the Continent during Mary’s reign. A work recently published has put forth the view that a great number of these refugees were exiles for political rather than religious reasons. That is to say, that they were more concerned with plotting to undermine the power of Mary than with upholding the cause of Protestantism. This may have been the case with a certain number, but it seems beyond dispute that by far the greater number were religious exiles. The two largest groups were at Frankfort and Geneva, and it is with these that we have now to deal.

When the first English refugees arrived on the Continent, the free city of Frankfort-on-Main had long since embraced the principles of the Reformation and was now offering asylum to Protestant exiles from all over Europe. The English, having unfortunately found hostility and intolerance on the part of the Lutheran cities, were forced to turn elsewhere. A large group of them, including wives, children, and servants, arrived Frankfort in June, 1554, led by

1. Christina H. Garrett: *The Marian Exiles*
   The author, in our opinion, has allowed her own thesis to colour the motives for seeking refuge abroad which she attributes to these people.
William Whittingham. They found a friendly welcome, and after some negotiations, were permitted to stay and share a church-building with a French congregation which had been there for some time.

For a while matters progressed satisfactorily, and the leaders of the congregation wrote to fellow-exiles in Zurich and Strasbourg, urging them to come and settle in Frankfort. Those addressed, however, refused to come until one of the regular English bishops then in exile should be placed in authority over the congregation. Word had come to them, moreover, that the colony at Frankfort was tampering with the Second Prayer Book of Edward. In their letter of refusal they went on to say that they would be satisfied with no other form of worship than that enjoined by the full use of the Second Prayer Book, to neglect any part of which would be to cast a reflection upon those who were even then suffering persecution for it in England. Frankfort replied that in any case their arrangements with the local magistrates did not permit them to use the Book in its entirety. Most important of all, they urged, the Book had already been altered from its first form and would have been altered still more if the King had lived.¹

¹. See Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort: p.37
Here was the birth of that "saddest difference" of which Fuller speaks. Out of this correspondence grew what are known as "the troubles of Frankfort." John Knox had, after some reluctance, accepted an urgent call to become pastor of the Frankfort congregation. Probably he foresaw troubles ahead, but when Calvin himself asked him to undertake the charge, he yielded. Indeed it is no small tribute to the reputation of this Scotsman that an English congregation, including such men as John Foxe, Anthony Gilby, Christopher Goodman, and William Whittingham, should call him.

Any apprehensions that Knox may have entertained of troubles ahead were soon realised. Shortly after his arrival there came a deputation of two from Strasburg. These men, Chambers and Grindal, were bearers of a letter signed by sixteen divines, strongly urging full conformity to the Prayer Book. Irritated, the Frankfort leaders retorted to the effect that if those of Strasburg intended to come merely to get them to conform to the Prayer Book, they might just as well stay where they were.

Proceeding in this independent spirit, the Frankfort group decided to adopt a Book of Order which would meet their own views. At first they tried a combination of Calvin's

---

1. vide Brief Discourse; p. 36; Stowell: A History of the Puritans; p. 105; Burrage: Early English Dissenters; pp. 74, 75
2. Brief Discourse; p. 40
French order of Service and the Edwardian Communion Service. This attempt having failed, a committee, consisting of Knox, Whittingham, Gilby, Foxe, and Cole, was appointed to draw up an order which would suit the congregation and at the same time be distinctively English. The result of their labors was a form which played a most important part in the history of Puritanism elsewhere, though it was never put into use in Frankfort. Because Knox was the head of the committee, perhaps, and had undoubtedly a large share in its preparation the book has usually been called Knox's Liturgy or the English Order of Geneva. Why it was never used at Frankfort we do not know for sure. We may find the reason partly in the fact that new arrivals from England or from other parts of the Continent were constantly pouring in, many of them favorable to the old Prayer Book, thus disturbing the status quo. That would have been acceptable to the whole of the original congregation was decidedly too much for some of the later arrivals to accept.

Eventually it was decided to make concessions to the conservative party by using a revised and corrected form of Edward's Prayer Book. Accordingly they wrote to Calvin, giving him a somewhat prejudiced account, it must be confessed, of the prayer Book, and asking for his opinion of it. He replied cautiously that they should not let trifles disturb the peace of their congregation. Nevertheless he could not
give his unqualified approval to preserving the Book in its original form.

"In the Liturgy of England I see there are many tolerable foolish things; by these words I mean, that there is not that purity which were to be desired. These vices, though they could not at the first day be amended, yet, seeing there was no manifest impiety, they were for a season to be tolerated. Therefore it was lawful to begin of such rudiments or 'a-b-ce-daries'; but so that it behoved the learned and godly ministers of Christ to enterprize further, and to set forth something more filed from rust and purer."¹

Impressed with this statement from the outstanding leader of the Reformation, the committee drew up a Compromise Liturgy, "The Anglican Liturgy Expurgated," with other things added as the state of the Church required.

This compromise-form was accepted by the whole congregation, but the peace was unfortunately short-lived. Dr. Cox, formerly one of Edward's tutors, and later, under Elizabeth, the Bishop of Ely, arrived in Frankfort with a group of his followers in March, 1555. The newcomers proved to be utterly unwilling to abide by the existing agreement. They were determined at all costs to procure the full use of the Prayer Book. When rebuked for his refusal to keep the peace, Cox replied stubbornly that they "would have the face of an English Church and do as they had done in England."²

Although Knox appears to have acted in this instance with rather more mildness than was usual with him, a most

---

¹ Brief Discourse: p.51
regrettable bitterness sprang up between the two parties. Defeated in his effort to get his way by congregational vote, Cox resorted to the unworthy subterfuge of undermining Knox with the city magistrates. The Scottish divine had, while a minister in England, preached a sermon in which he called the Emperor "no less an enemy to Christ than was Nero." ¹ Accusing him on these grounds of being a traitor to the Emperor, Cox was able to have his opponent banished from the city. Within twelve days of the arrival of the Coxian party, the congregation was violently split. A good many of the original members followed Knox to Geneva. The resentment of those who remained to combat Cox continued unabated, while the latter proceeded inflexibly on his course. The quarrel raged on, to the great detriment of the spiritual life of the community. Cox, writing to Calvin for approval of his actions, was told sternly that he and his group were too much addicted to their own ceremonies, and that Mr. Knox had been "neither godly nor brotherly dealt with." ² After a while Cox and his party left the city, and later Horne and his adherents, following an acerb battle for supremacy, departed as well. Only then did the still sizeable congregation carry on peaceably in a more simple form of service.

¹. Brief Discourse: p. 60
². Ibid, p. 79
The English Church at Geneva which was thereupon formed was most remarkable for its effect upon the thinking of the puritan leaders. In point of fact, as we are to see later, this Genevan period had its effect even upon those who were to lead the Anglican Church in its struggle against the puritans. Those at Zurich, Basle, and Aarau kept fairly close contact with the Genevan leaders and could not help being impressed with the success of their form of government. At first, while Knox was visiting his native land, the congregation was led by Christopher Goodman and Anthony Gilby, who had followed Knox from Frankfort. Soon, however, Knox himself was called as minister, and the Book of Common order which he and the others had drawn up at Frankfort was adopted.

In the preface of this Book, a preface which appears to be largely the work of Whittingham, it is stated that "The late Service Book of King Edward, being now set aside by Parliament according to law, it was in no sense the Established worship of the Church of England, and consequently they were under no obligation to use it any further than as it was consonant to the Word of God. Being at liberty and in a strange land, they had set up such an order as in the judgment of Mr. Calvin and other learned divines, was most agreeable to Scripture and the best Reformed Churches."  

1. Drysdale, p. 83.
2. Ibid. p. 84.
Also in the same Preface we find the following statement criticizing vestments and ritual: "Because, being invented by men, though upon a good occasion, yet they had since been abused to superstition, and made a necessary part of divine worship." Thus, we see, in the general agitation over the Prayer Book itself, the old question of vestments was not to be forgotten.

This Genevan period seems, by all accounts, to have been a most happy and edifying one for the whole English congregation there. Writing of the city at that time, Knox says,

"This place is the maist perfyt schoole of Chryst that ever was in the erth since the dayis of the Apostillis. In other places, I confess Chryst to be trewlie preachit; but maneris and religion so sincerlie reformat, I have not yit sene in any uther place."^2

However colored by Knox's personal bias toward presbyterianism this estimate may be, the fact remains that the English church at Geneva reached a peak of felicity and harmony which has been, unfortunately, unique in Puritan annals. It was unique not only for the harmony which prevailed in the congregation -- the deep and yet simple piety which was able to subdue the narrow intolerance natural to

---

1. Drysdale, p. 84.
an intolerant age--but also for the effect of this system on the future of the Anglican Church itself. Frankfort may have been the birthplace of Puritanism, to use Fuller's metaphor, but certainly in that case Geneva has been truly called its "cradle." Knox's Service Book received its first trial here and became the model, at least in part, for all the Presbyterian congregations which struggled for a footing under Elizabeth.

Another literary production of this period that was to prove very important for England was the Genevan Bible. While it was not entirely completed until 1560, the New Testament section had been published in 1557. This part was the work of Whittingham for the most part, while Coverdale, Gilby, Sampson, and others collaborated in the translation of the Old Testament. The Geneva version, of course, has been almost forgotten since the appearance of the King James version, but it is interesting for us to note at this point that the earlier edition was the first one in the English language to divide the text into verses and to include marginal notes. It continued in England as the popular version for many years, especially among the Puritans.

With the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth in 1558, the exile of the English Protestants ended.
Most of them returned to England at once, hopefully looking forward to a new and prosperous era in the development of their Reformation. These years spent under the influence and teaching of Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Knox, and others in the great Reformation centers of the Continent had strongly affected the men who were to play the leading parts in the religious affairs of England in the new era. Men like Grindal and Sandys, who were to become Archbishops, and Jewel, Pilkington, Horne, and Parkhurst, who were all to be bishops in the new church, returned to their country deeply impressed with the strength and simplicity of the Calvinistic type of church-polity. While not actually converted to this polity, as were many of their brethren, they found themselves, nevertheless, in sympathy with the spirit of Geneva as well as with its theology.

That all the exiles were not influenced to the same extent is scarcely remarkable. They went to the Continent with different views and prejudices, and in many cases these views were strengthened by personal bitterness arising out of the unfortunate quarrels at Frankfort. Cox, for example, might naturally be expected to do just what he did when, soon after his return to England, he warned the queen that the opponents of the Prayer Book were not only illaffected toward the polity of her church but unruly and seditious.  

1. See Hopkins: Puritans and Queen Elizabeth; vol. 1 p. 189
On the other hand, it was with a view to avoiding just such lingering grudges as this that many of the exiles wrote to each other before their return, urging that the old differences be forgotten. The work of rooting out popery would be difficult enough without their having the disgrace and reproach of internal animosity cast upon them.\(^1\) This attempt to reconcile their differences was no doubt sincere, but it was quite inevitable that some seeds of suspicion and resentment should linger in the minds and hearts of those who had taken part in such a bitter controversy. Thus it was that men who were substantially agreed on the doctrines and fundamentals of their religion were shortly to find themselves divided into two hostile camps. With one or two exceptions, all the exiles had been influenced in the same direction, if not to the same degree, by their experience abroad. But it was this matter of degree, as it turned out, that more or less fixed the two sides. Jewel, Sandys, and Grindal would have cheerfully accepted a Genevan order in England, in all probability, if Elizabeth had so decided. Since she decided otherwise, however, they were not so set on it as to refuse office in the episcopal establishment. This is where they parted company with Coverdale, Gilby, and the rest of the

---

1. See the letters exchanged between Geneva, Frankfort, and Aarau. *Brief Discourse;* p. 223-227
radicals, who had drunk too deep of the wine of Geneva to be willing to forget it. The "saddest difference" was still in existence as the exiles hurried joyfully and optimistically home and was shortly to be revived.
Whatever glad hopes the returning exiles may have entertained received a sudden check from cold reality when they reached England. Happily imagining the new queen to be the exact opposite of her sister in all things, they came back fully expecting to have a directing hand in forming the new Church of England. We may gather something of their attitude from the letter of the Geneva congregation to that at Frankfort.  

"After that we heard, dearly Beloved, of the joyful tidings of God's favour and grace restored unto us, by the preferment of the most virtuous and gracious Queen Elizabeth; we lifted up our hearts and voices to our heavenly Father, who hath...heard our prayers, granted our requests, pitied our country, and restored his Word....

Most earnestly desiring you, that we may together reach and practise the true knowledge of God's Word; which we have learned in this our banishment, and by God's merciful Providence seen in the best Reformed Churches, That (considering our negligence in times past, and God's punishment for the same) we may, with zeal and diligence, endeavour to recompense it: that God, in all our doings, may be glorified; our consciences discharged; and the members of Jesus Christ relieved and comforted...."

Elizabeth, however, while differing from her sister in many respects, was like her in this: she was a Tudor, a

---

1. *Brief Discourse*: pp. 224-225
true daughter of Henry VIII, with all his autocratic temper. He could not tolerate any reformation in which he was not the controlling power. Neither could Elizabeth. While Protestant in her sympathies as well as in her political views, she was nevertheless fond of the old customs and traditions to which she had been accustomed as a child. In her makeup there was comparatively little real spiritual depth. She was no theologian and had no appreciation of that fanatical devotion to God's Word which animated the returning exiles. Their taste for simplicity was quite foreign to her sensuous love of pomp, ritual, and color. What was worse, their independent attitude, their impatient tendency to put their ideas in force, were not only foreign to her wishes but utterly repugnant to her whole psychological outlook. What she wanted was not zeal but obedience and submission.

To do Elizabeth justice, on the other hand, we must understand some of the very real reasons, things not personal but political, which made her course necessarily one of caution. One of her least attractive qualities, personally, was her calculating, disingenuous shrewdness. It was this quality, however, as much as any other one factor, which enabled her to draw her disorganized nation into a compact, effective unit, supporting a throne which had at first been

precarious. Elizabeth, had she been as zealous a reformer as John Knox himself, saw that only one safe way lay open to her, the via media.¹

A majority of her subjects, it must be remembered, was still Roman Catholic. To sever their allegiance to Rome and to destroy the power of their priests was necessary if England was to carry on as a Protestant nation. But to eradicate from the new set-up even the robes and vestments, the last lingering vestiges of their old religion, would be trying the Catholics entirely too far.² So Elizabeth reasoned, and in this she was possibly justified. With hostile Spain and France prevented only by their mutual jealousy from overwhelming her, and with Scotland in the control of the Guises, Elizabeth could not risk arousing her own Catholic subjects to organised opposition.³

The queen and her councillors reasoned, moreover, that the retention of the vestments was defensible on purely religious grounds. Copes, stoles, and the other disputed garments had been abused by the papists, it was true. They were not, however, intrinsically evil. They were not forbidden by Scripture and were hallowed by apostolic usage. That which is not in itself evil, therefore, and which is

¹. Dexter: op. cit.; p. 87; also Birt: op. cit.; p. 180.
². Tulloch: English Puritanism and its Leaders; p. 9, n. says, "These garments, besides the surplice, consisted in the chimere, a long scarlet robe worn loose down to the heels, and the rochet, a white linen vestment covering the shoulders.
³. Glegg: Essays; vol. 2; p. 15; also Dexter: op. cit., p. 89
moreover politically important should be left to the discretion of the government and not of the church. "This seemed a reasonable conclusion, even upon the view of the question taken by the foreign reformers. Adverse as they were to the use of the surplice, they counselled the English clergy by no means to refuse it, since the progress of the reformation seemed to depend on their compliance. The question then, as soon as it ceased to be one of conscience, became one of convenience and expediency, and of that expediency the queen and her council must judge."

Indeed the queen and her council gave unmistakable evidence at the very outset that they meant to "judge" not only in this matter but in others as well." The only thing her majesty did before the meeting of Parliament was to prevent pulpit disputes, for some of the reformed, that had been preachers in King Edward's time, began to make use of his service-book without authority or license from their superiors; this alarmed the popish clergy, and gave occasion to a proclamation dated December 27, 1558. By which all preaching of ministers or others was prohibited; and the people were charged to hear no other doctrine or preaching

1. Marsden: History of the Early Puritans; pp. 30-31
but the Epistle and Gospel for the day, and the Ten Commandments in English, without any exposition or paraphrase whatsoever."

Elizabeth's first Parliament, meeting in January, 1559, sounded at once the keynote of her relation both to Church and State. Two bills were passed, after some opposition in the House of Lords on the part of the Catholic bishops. The first is known as the Act of Supremacy, an "Act restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same."2 In substance this bill was merely a revival of the Twenty-fifth Act of Henry VIII, making it treason for any subject of the English throne to appeal to any foreign power on any matter whatsoever. Henry had styled himself, "Supreme Head of the Church." Elizabeth, for political and religious reasons, preferred to be called "Supreme Governor," feeling that the former title arrogated to itself the pretensions of spiritual dominion. In practice, however, there was little distinction. The Act includes the provision that all persons holding "public employe, whether civil or ecclesiastical, are obliged to take an oath in recognition of the queen's right to the crown, and of her supremacy in all causes, ecclesiastical, on penalty of forfeiting all their promotions in the Church."3

1. Neal: vol. 1. p. 71; also Glegg; vol. 2 p.16
2. Ibid. p.72
3. Ibid. p.73
In short, as Neal remarks, the external policy of the Church was restored to the same footing on which it stood at the death of Edward.

The second act to be noticed in this Parliament is the Act of Uniformity, dealing with two vital questions. The first of these was the revisal of the Second Prayer Book. The left-wing reformers had chosen to regard this Book more as a general directory for public worship than a strict rule. As we have seen, they took liberties with it in Frankfort and were prepared to continue doing so in England. It was in order to meet this increasing disunity that the Act of Uniformity was devised. If the radicals were not satisfied with the few advances which the Second Prayer Book had contained, what was their dismay to find Elizabeth's version actually reverting to the First Book in a few respects!

The Ornaments Rubric, so-called, states that the

"...minister at the time of communion, and at all other tymes in his ministracion, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authoritie in the second yere of the reygne of King Edward VI...." Moreover in this latgest Book the "kneeling rubric" was omitted."

The second question with which the Act dealt was the degree to which uniformity was to be enforced. The dissatisfied clergymen could have born regulations which to them were detestable, had these regulations been loosely

1. vide Glegg: op. cit. pp. 17-19
2. vide Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book; p. 41; also Black: The Reign of Elizabeth; p. 15
applied. It became immediately apparent, however, that the queen and her ministers meant exactly what they said. Uniformity was desired and uniformity was to be enforced in every detail. Furthermore, by way of adding the last straw, the Act included a provision to the effect that, "The queen is hereby empowered, with the advice of her commissioners or metropolitan, to ordain and publish such further ceremonies and rites as may be for the advancement of God's glory."\(^1\)

This was too much. The dissatisfied clergy could not reconcile it with their consciences to conform to requirements which seemed to them thoroughly pernicious, and still less could they commit themselves to granting a queen with such views a "carte blanch" to ordain further and even more objectionable rites.

"Upon this fatal rock of uniformity in things merely indifferent, in the opinion of the imposers, was the peace of the Church of England split.... The rigorous pressing of this act was the occasion of all the mischiefs that befell the Church for above eighty years."\(^2\)

Thus the issue was joined, and the firm stand taken by the queen forced the principal churchmen to make a definite choice of sides. The Puritans argued that in "things indifferent" they should not be required to conform against their consciences. The other side argued from the

---

1. P. B. Eliza p. 14
2. Neal: p. 76. op. cit., Heylin: op. cit; p. 305
directly opposite viewpoint.

"Things indifferent in their own nature, which are neither commanded nor forbidden in the Holy Scriptures, such as rites, ceremonies, habits, etc., might be settled determined, and made necessary by the command of the civil magistrate; and in such cases it was the indispensible duty of all subjects to observe them."

This word, "indifferent," as we see, was used by both sides to point their arguments. Indifferent as they might be in theory, however, the church-party and the court made these things in fact something far more. The unfortunate situation arose in which one's acquiescence in the use of external, superficial observances was the gauge of one's loyalty to the throne.

Actual hostilities did not commence until after the Convocation of 1563, for as yet each side had hopes of persuading the other to make concessions. Meanwhile Matthew Parker had been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, on December 17, 1559. He was a man sincerely and devoutly Protestant in his views, but he was grimly opposed to the Genevan tradition as applied to the ritual and order of the English Church. Shortly afterwards he consecrated a number of new bishops to replace the deposed Catholics. Grindal

1. Neal p. 78
3. Heylin: op. cit., p. 235, gives a complete list of the changes in the episcopal ranks.
was appointed to the see of London, Jewel to Salisbury, Pilkington to Durham, etc. These men had all returned but recently from Germany or Switzerland, and were now forced to face a vexing problem. Should they lend support, by taking office, to measures of which they all disapproved?

Their position becomes much easier to understand when we read their letters to their old friends on the Continent at the time. For one thing, these letters make it abundantly clear that Grindal, Jewel, Horne, and the others submitted from necessity rather than from choice. Jewel, writing to Bullinger, remarks;

"The contest respecting the linen surplice.... is not yet at rest. That matter still somewhat disturbs weak minds. And I wish that all, even the slightest vestiges of popery might be removed from our churches, and above all from our minds. But the queen is unable to endure the least alteration in matters of religion."¹

Horne and Grindal explain themselves to Bullinger in much the same vein. (Evidently the latter had heard from the other side in regard to the matter and was inclined to be troubled by what he had heard.)²

"But if we were to acquiesce in the inconsiderate advice of our brethren, and all unite our strength illegally to attack the habits by law established, to destroy and abolish them altogether, or else all lay down our offices at once;
verily we should have a Lutherano-papistical ministry or none at all. But, honoured brethren in Christ, we call Almighty God to witness, that this dissension has not been occasioned by any fault of ours, nor is it owing to us that vestments of this kind have not been altogether done away with: so far from it, that we most solemnly make oath that we have hitherto laboured with all earnestness, fidelity, and diligence, to effect what our brethren require, and what we ourselves wish. But now we are brought into such straits, what is to be done... but that, since we cannot do what we would, we should do in the Lord what we can."

This, then, was the choice of the early Elizabethan bishops, to do what they could rather than to struggle for a principle, in itself good, but which was out of their reach. They had the support of the Continental reformers in this step, moreover. The advice of the latter was to resist the retention of these evils but not to the point of resigning their posts.¹

On January 13, 1563 a Convocation of the Church of England was opened at St. Paul's in London.² At this time the Articles of the Church were agreed upon, and the rites and ceremonies came up for discussion. There was still a door open for conciliation, it seems, and it is significant to see the relative strength of the two parties. Bishop Sandys offered a proposal³ that private baptism and baptism

1. Zurich Letters: Series I, p. 361; Bullinger and Gualter to Humphrey and Sampson. This letter, dated Sept. 10 1566, urges the two Puritans to remain with their flocks rather than resist to the point of being suspended.
2. Glegg: op. cit., vol. 2, p. 21; Stowell: A History of the Puritans, p. 120.
by women should be banned, as well as the use of the cross in baptism. Also he proposed that the ecclesiastical laws in general should be studied by a commission, with a view to reform.

Other proposals included the express demand that the use of copes and surplices by ministers be abolished in favour of a "grave and comely side garment." This was undersigned by five deans, twelve archdeacons, fourteen proctors, and the provost of Eton, but was defeated. Another motion was then made asking for abolishment of all saints' days and holidays except Sundays and days commemorating the life or death of Christ. All church organs were to be removed, kneeling at the Lord's Supper to be omitted, and ministers to be required to wear the surplice only once, provided they wore thereafter a "comely gown or habit."

These proposals, which seem rather moderate considering all that had gone before and all that was to follow, were rejected by a margin of one vote. Actually, of those present, forty-three were in favor of the resolutions as against thirty-five for the negative, but the latter were able to bring in enough by proxy votes to turn the scale. This one vote proved to be momentous, for it meant that all maneuvering for position was at an end. No longer could Grindal, Horne, and the other newly created bishops hope for a relaxation or moderation of the disputed ordinances. No longer could

1. Marsden: pp. 44-45 (citing Strype's Annals, p. 337)
their old comrades of the exile, Humphrey, Coverdale, Sampson, and the rest hang on, hoping for an occasion to have their grievances redressed. Parker and his few but influential satellites now held the whip-hand beyond any shadow of a doubt. So it was that the bishops, having, as they said, tried their best to remove the causes of dispute, now were left with no alternative but to fulfil their official obligations. This they proceeded to do, reluctantly and with varying degrees of strictness. As the rift grew wider their sympathy with their former companions waned, till in 1566 even the mild Jewel could speak scornfully of the matter which "still somewhat disturbs weak minds."

It was not until the page of battle had been thus definitely thrown down that the malcontents can be said to have formed a party. From now on, as pressure is exerted against them, we find them becoming a distinct and vigorous faction. In 1564, according to Fuller,

"The English bishops, conceiving themselves empowered by their canons, began to show their authority in urging the clergy of their dioceses to subscribe to the Liturgy, ceremonies, and discipline of the church, and such as refused the same were branded with the odious name of Puritans. A name which, in this notion first began in this year; and the grief had not been great, if it had ended in the same." 2

Two years after the convocation, nevertheless, the Puritans were so numerous and so persistent that the queen

---

felt it necessary to take direct action. In a letter
dated January 30, 1565, she issued a proclamation,
peremptorily requiring the bishops to put their house
in order.

"We strictly charge you, that none be here-
after admitted or allowed...to any place
ecclesiastical...but such as shall be found...
well and advisedly given to common order....
We intend to have no dissension or variety crow,
by suffering of persons which maintain the same
to remain in authority. For so the sovereign
authority which we have under Almighty God
should be violate... and we require you to use
all expedition, that hereafter we be not occasion-
ed, for lack of your diligence, to provide such
further remedy by some other sharp proceedings
as shall perchance not be easy to be born by
such as shall be disordered." 1

Her majesty was even more indignant a few days
later when Burleigh, the Secretary, laid before her the
Archbishop’s report of the actual extent to which noncon-
formity had been pushed. It stated that in some churches
the table stood in the body of the church, in others in the
chancel. Some ministers administered communion in surplice
and cap, some with only the surplice, and others in plain
scholar’s clothes. 2 In obedience to the queen’s injunctions
and fearful of further provoking her imperious temper, Parker,

1. Strype’s Parker, Appendix, No. Xliv.
2. Ibid, P.149.
with the collaboration of the Bishops of London, Ely, Lincoln, and Winchester, drew up a series of articles designed to enforce conformity. It is the contention of several historians of the Anglican Church\(^1\) that in these articles Parker laid down what he considered the minimum of observances to which obedience should be demanded. Having found by experience that he could not expect his Puritan bishops to enforce the rubrics entirely, he adopted this as more or less a conciliatory measure, calculated to appease the queen without further alarming the nonconformists. This view of the articles seems to us rather strange, to say the least. It is true that the Advertisements, as they were called at their publication, did not press the matter of using the cope in parish churches, the cross in baptism, or the ring in marriage. On the other hand, the use of the surplice in all parish churches, of the cope in all cathedral and collegiate churches, kneeling at communion, and distinctive dress for the clergy at all times -- all these were enjoined on pain of suspension and deprivation. Inasmuch as these requirements embody the very things against which the Puritans were contending, the Advertisements can hardly be considered conciliatory.

1. e.g. H. O. Wakeman: History of the Church of England; p. 335. cf. also, Black: op. cit. p. 27.
As it happened, they did not please Elizabeth either. When the primate submitted them for her approval she refused it, for what reason we are not told. Quite possibly her councillors, Burleigh, Walsingham, Leicester, and Knollys, who were sympathetic toward the Puritans, desired her to avoid the odium which the Advertisements were certain to bring upon their sponsors. She badly needed the loyalty of all of her Protestant subjects. At any rate she ignored Parker's Advertisements until, chagrined and humiliated, he published them on his own authority in the following year, 1566.

The basic provision of the Advertisements was that all ministers whose license to preach had been granted before March, 1565, were hereby to have these licenses revoked. In return new licenses were to be issued, but only to those who subscribed to the vestments and other disputed rubrics. While the queen steadfastly refused to give this measure the authority of royal sanction, she issued a proclamation of her own which was the practical equivalent. All ecclesiastical persons were to subscribe or be deprived forthwith.

On March 26, 1566, the clergy of London were summoned to appear and subscribe. When they were assembled, Parker told them bluntly that there was to be no argument.
They were to vote *volo* or *nolo*. Out of the hundred present, thirty-seven refused to subscribe. These were immediately suspended, with the threat that unless within three months they had changed their minds, they would be deprived. Among these thirty-seven were some of the ablest ministers in England, as Parker admitted. He predicted, however, that when they had felt the smart of poverty and want they would surrender, for, he said, "the wood is yet green".

By way of extending this pressure to nonconformists throughout the realm, Parker then proceeded to call in all licenses, thus to ensure that every ecclesiastical person in England should have to declare himself one way or the other. He reasoned that all but the most extreme and stubborn of the malcontents would yield when once they had realized his grim inflexibility of purpose. With a great many of the clergy this method proved successful. Facing much the same problem their bishops had faced, they chose to submit rather than leave their flocks without pastors.

With a great number of others, however, the course initiated by Parker and the queen proved to be, if not a blunder, at least a failure. Scores of ministers chose to

1. Neal: Vol. 1, p. 100
be deprived rather than yield. The case of John Foxe, revered as the author of the "Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs", respected as one of the fathers of the English Reformation, and personally popular with Elizabeth, will serve as an example. Called before the Ecclesiastical commissioners to subscribe to the Advertisements, he drew from his pocket a Greek New Testament, saying,

"To this will I subscribe. I have nothing in the church save a prebend at Salisbury; and much good may it do you if you will take it away from me." 1

The authorities could not bring themselves to deprive such an eminent and venerable man, and the same proved to be the case with regard to many others.

The truth of the matter is that in spite of Parker's determination, his bishops were still reluctant to enforce the Advertisements more than half-heartedly. Ordinarily they did not search very energetically for instances of non-conformity, preferring to turn away their heads unless the matter were forced upon their attention. As a result, whatever benefits might have been realized by an absolutely rigorous, all-inclusive attack from the start, were lost to

the church-party. At the same time the scores of ministers who were deprived and the hundreds of spiritually hungry laymen who clamored for preachers added their share to the confusion. The offensive, taken by the Church, was failing, and far from being destroyed, the resistance of the Puritans was growing stronger, spurred on by their resentment.

The situation rapidly became very awkward for Parker. The puritans had powerful friends at court and in the House of Commons, and these, by more or less open refusal to help Parker in their capacities as civil magistrates, did much to make his attempts ineffective. Meanwhile, hundreds of those who had conformed, with greater or lesser degrees of sincerity, resented, nevertheless, the compulsion under which they did so. Many of them required only a little more provocation to drive them into the ranks of the active and avowed Nonconformists. Indeed, in one sense it might almost be said that this sums up the whole course of the controversy; year by year more ministers being forced to cross the dividing line in the ranks of nonconforming Puritanism.

Parker, as we have said, found himself in a most unenviable position. His measures had been intended to eradicate and instead were only acting as an irritant. Popular sympathy in London and in various of the southern countries was largely on the side of the oppressed clergy.
and this sympathy was not without its repercussions in Parliament. Having silenced any voice the Puritans had had in the councils of the church, he found that the attack was now coming from outside. Silenced in Convocation, the Puritans became vocal in Parliament. In 1566, according to one historian, no less than six bills touching Reformation or adjustment of religious matters were proposed in Parliament, which was, however, dissolved before any of them could be passed. One bill, proposing to make the Articles into an Act, passed its three readings in the lower House and one in the House of Lords, when the queen peremptorily ordered the discussion to be stopped. While such a bill was certain to prove a fresh hindrance to the Puritans, Elizabeth felt that any attempt by Parliament to initiate legislation in religious matters was an infringement of her royal prerogatives. We have no way of judging how strong a representation the Puritans had in the Commons at this time -- probably not very strong -- but here, at least, we see the beginnings of their campaign to achieve through civil legislation what they were denied in ecclesiastical procedure.

Moreover in this year we find the first attempts on the part of the Puritans to state their case through the channel of the press. What amounted to an official party

statement appeared, entitled, "A Brief Discourse against the Outward Apparel and Ministering Garments of the Popish Church." In the main this document embodies the objections we have already noted. The vestments are pernicious because they speak of Rome to the minds of simple people. They are evil because they are additions to the Word of God. The enforcement of these vestments by civil authority is an infringement on Christian liberty, and their adoption from sources partly Jewish, partly Romish, is contrary to the doctrines and spirit of the Reformation. This is the gist of the argument.

The Church-party did not fail to respond, and soon a war of pamphlets was begun. It did not last long, however, for the commissioners soon played their trump-card, restraint of the press. They procured a decree from the Star Chamber to the effect that:

"No person shall print or publish any book against the queen's injunctions, ordinances, or letters patent, set forth or to be set forth, or against the meaning of them."

"The Puritans being thus foreclosed, and shut out of the Church by sequestrations, imprisonments, the taking away of their licenses to preach, and the restraint of the press, most of them were at a loss how to behave, being

1. A full and interesting resume of this conflict may be found in., Dexter: op. cit. Chapter IV, (entitled The Literature of the Conflict); also cf. Stowell: op. cit. pp. 12-13.

2. Strype: Life of Parker; p.22.
unwilling to separate from the Church where the Word and Sacraments were duly administered, though defiled with some popish superstitions. Of the number were Dr. Humphreys, Sampson, Foxe the martyrologist, Lever, Whittingham, Johnson, and others, who continued preaching up and down as they had opportunity and could be dispensed with for the habits, though they were excluded all parochial preferment."

This, as Neal shows, was the case with the vast majority of Puritans, whether deprived or not. Driven to the verge of desperation, they still abhorred the idea of a schism in the Church. With some few however, this course seemed to be not only permissible but necessary. When extreme measures are adopted, they are usually met by others just as extreme.

"So at length, after having waited about eight weeks to see if the queen would have compassion on them, several of the deprived ministers had a solemn consultation with their friends, in which, after prayer, and a serious debate about the lawfulness and necessity of separating from the established church, they came to this agreement: That since they could not have the Word of God preached, nor the sacraments administered without idolatrous gear... and since there had been a separate congregation in London, and another in Geneva, in Queen Mary's time

1. Neal. Vol. 1 p. 104; vide the case of Henry Smith (Ch. Five) Many of these men took posts as "lecturers", and were roundly denounced by Barrow for so doing, (vide infra Ch. Six)
which used a book, that the Great Mr. Calvin had approved of, and which was free from the superstitions of the English service; that, therefore, it was their duty, in their present circumstances, to break off from the public churches, and to assemble, in private houses or elsewhere worship God in a manner that might not offend against the light of their consciences."

Using the Genevan Prayer Book of John Knox as their model, these earliest of the Separatists followed the Presbyterian form, ordaining elders and administering the sacraments accordingly. Since many of the laity were fully as ardent in their nonconformity as their ministers, the congregation grew in numbers and in boldness. The queen, naturally, was thoroughly aroused by the reports brought to her of this body. She threatened to invoke all the penalties of the law against them. Finally they hired the Plumbers' Hall, in Anchor Lane, and there, on June 19, 1567, they were arrested — one hundred in number — by the Sheriff. When brought before the commissioners, they obstinately refused to abandon their separatist principles, and as a result thirty-one of them were sentenced to Bridewell prison for a year.

Among this group were seven women, and the sufferings of the little flock gained them a good deal of sympathy, although few of their Puritan brethren could approve of the step which they had taken. Their letters to Knox, Bullinger, and Beza were answered, firmly but kindly in the same spirit.

Knox, for example, wrote,

---

2. An excellent account of this early Separatist group is to be found in Burrage: Early English Dissenters; vol. 1, pp. 90-93.
"Our brethren do give hearty thanks for your gentle letter written unto them; but to be plain with you, it is not in all points liked."

Here, then, we come to the close of a more or less clearly defined phase in the development of Puritanism. Already the battle over vestments, which began with Hopper, was broadening out to include fundamental principles. It had progressed from a dispute over mere clerical trappings to an attack on the Prayer Book, and from there to a deeply rooted hostility to the whole external policy of the Church of England. The very validity of that Church, indeed, had been questioned by some few radicals, for the very principle of separation involves a doubt of the validity of the earlier body.

To the large majority of the Puritans the idea of leaving the established Church was, as Neal says, abhorrent. Their quarrel was not with the Church but with certain of its officers and their fatuous course of action. Quite frequently the reader of history finds scornful references to this war over such trifling things as robes and ornaments. To pass the Puritan movement off so lightly, however, even at the stage which we have just discussed, is to be woefully superficial. In itself, perhaps the objection to surplices may seem nugatory and quibbling. But behind this objection,

if we take the trouble to penetrate, we find the spirit and the tremendous moral earnestness of the Reformation. To men who had such a spirit, nothing was trifling or indifferent which in any way imperilled the advance of God's Church. It was just because their earnestness was dismissed as quibbling that the Puritans were forced further and further away from the central position of the Anglican Church. While they remained, for the most part, faithful to that Church as an institution, they found themselves opposed to the conduct and eventually the polity adopted by its leaders. This opposition we are to see taking shape more definitely in the next two decades.
The beginning of the second decade of Elizabeth's reign presents considerable resemblance to the ringing up of the curtain on the second act of a play. The prologue was spoken through the lips of Hopper, and the first Scene of Act One consisted of the Troubles of Frankfort. Both have served to establish the setting of the whole first Act. This Act, in turn, while it has been short, has been important, for in it we are given the theme and keynote of the whole play — a theme stated as clearly and unmistakably as that of a Greek tragedy. It is with something of the latter's sense of fatalism and relentless inevitability moreover, that we see the dream of Puritanism unfolding itself. The minor squabble over the haberdashery of the Church has become a large-scale battle of principles, a battle in which each side realizes that it must conquer or be conquered. The seemingly trivial factor of one vote in the convocation of 1563 becomes fraught with tremendous significance when we see that it points directly, beyond Parker and Elizabeth, to Laud and Charles I — and Cromwell.

During the second phase of the struggle, we find that the dramatis personae is gradually changing. The
early leaders of both sides, men who had been part of the Reformation in England from the beginning, are drawing back from the heat of the conflict -- or are being shouldered aside by a new and fiercer group. Jewel, shortly before his death in 1571, wrote to his old friends on the Continent of his dismay as he found himself attacked by men of his own religion and, in good measure, of his own way of thinking. Many of his fellows in the high offices of the church, veterans like himself of the Marian exile, shared his wistful readiness to abandon all but the gospel for the sake of peace. Peace was not to be. Among the Puritans also new faces were appearing. Men leaped to the front with principles which had hardly been dreamed of before, and these ultra-Puritans communicated their temper to multitudes of others. A spirit of "surly independence" spread among them in response to the growing severity and exasperation of the authorities. And almost from the beginning of the decade it became obvious that this spirit was seeking not for toleration so much as for ecclesiastical revolution. Nor are we to suppose that the banner of revolt was carried by the Puritan clergy alone. The laity had also its outstanding leaders who made their force felt in Parliament, notably the two brothers Peter and Paul Wentworth.

When the Parliament of 1571 met, the House of

Commons, through its Speaker, made the customary request for freedom of speech in the House. Lord Keeper Bacon, in reply, said that the queen had been seriously displeased of later by "some disorders and certain offences... and that they would do well to meddle with no matters of state, but such as should be propounded unto them, and to occupy themselves in no other matters concerning the commonwealth." These disorders had taken place during the session of 1566, when the queen had peremptorily banned discussion in the House of the question of her successor. Paul Wentworth had demanded bluntly if her majesty meant to restrain their constitutional liberty, and in the face of their gathering indignation, the queen, ever the shrewd tactician, withdrew her injunction. Nevertheless, the matter still rankled, and Elizabeth was too much a Tudor to accept such an affront to her power. There was, she was determined, to be no repetition of this independent spirit in the present session.

That, nevertheless, is precisely what occurred.

"But they entered for the first time on a new topic, which did not cease for the rest of this reign to furnish matter of contention with their sovereign. The party called Puritan, including such as charged abuses on the actual government of the church, as well as those who objected to part of its lawful discipline, had, not a little in consequence of

the absolute exclusion of the catholic gentry, obtained a very considerable strength in the commons. But the queen valued her ecclesiastical supremacy more than any other part of her prerogative. Next to the succession of the crown, it was the point she could least endure to be touched. The house had indeed resolved, upon reading a bill for the first time for Reformation of the common prayer, that petition be made to the queen's majesty for her license to proceed in it, before it should be further dealt in."

The queen's jealousy for her ecclesiastical supremacy could not tolerate even this respectful display of initiative. Strickland, the venerable Puritan who had moved consideration of the bill, was summoned by the council and restrained from appearing again in his place. The House was at once indignant at this interference with its liberties. The queen, they flatly maintained, had no power to make laws and far less to break them. Her majesty realized that she had once more overstepped the bounds, and Strickland was restored to his place.

While it is true that nothing definite was accomplished in religious matters by all this skirmishing, the incident is not without its importance. Even though the bills which they managed to get sent up to the House of Lords

were ignored, the fact that they did send them, in the face of the queen's displeasure, is an indication of the strength and boldness of the Puritans in Parliament at this time. The political aspect of the Puritan movement was beginning to make itself apparent, as the party became better organized and as popular sympathy began to form behind its demands. The Parliament of the following year was, it is true, more submissive to the queen's will in this respect, but in 1575 we find the Wentworths again heading a protest against the autocratic course adopted by Elizabeth. Peter Wentworth, in fact, was imprisoned in the Tower for his forthrightness in denouncing her majesty's interference in the deliberations of the House.

During the same session the House was faced with the matter of passing upon the "articles of religion". Parker was astonished and angered to find that the articles "for the homilies, consecration of bishops, and such like" had been ignored. He approached Paul Wentworth, a member of the committee appointed for the purpose, and enquired the reason. In his own report to the House, Wentworth replied as follows:

"Surely, sir", said I, 'because we were so occupied with other matters that we had not time to examine them how they agreed with the word of God.' 'What' said he, 'surely you mistake the matter; you will refer yourselves wholly to us therein.' 'No, by the faith I bear to God', said I, 'we will pass nothing before we understand what it is; for that were but to make you popes: make you popes who list', said I, 'for we will make you none.' And sure, Mr. Speaker, the speech seemed to me to be a pope-like speech, and I fear least our bishops do attribute this of the pope's canons to themselves; Papa non potest errare."

Here, it is to be noticed, there is no mention of vestments. The quarrel has got beyond that stage. It is now the careful and not too favorable scrutiny of the episcopacy and its powers that marks the attitude of progressive Puritanism.

Turning away from the purely Parliamentary aspect, we find the Puritan movement as a whole moving rapidly into its new stage. A most important year for our consideration is the year 1572; important because it saw the eruption of militant Presbyterianism in the ranks of the Puritan party. The main body, be it remembered, had little or no part in this development, save for a wide-spread sympathy for its principles. Nor are we to confuse the idea of Presbyterianism with the congregationalism of the avowed Separatists. The latter belong to a classification of their own and must receive separate consideration. In 1572 two events of

---

major importance took place: one, the forming of the first "presbytery" in England, and the other, the publishing of the famous Admonitions to Parliament. Discussion of these events, however, is fruitless apart from an appreciation of the central figure of the party, its acknowledged leader for the remainder of the century.

If Hooper may be called the father of Nonconformity, in its earlier stages, surely Thomas Cartwright is entitled to the same description as applied to this later phase. It was he, more than any other, who enabled the Puritans to develop their principles from a more or less inchoate mass of protests into a definite system. His contentions represented the beliefs, hitherto uncrystallized, of nearly all the more advanced Puritans and probably in great part of that greater number of Puritans who conformed and suffered in silence. Around him as champion gathered the dissatisfied clergy and their lay followers, and upon him, to a great extent, was expended the attention and apprehension of the church leaders.

Cartwright's first appearance in the public eye was in his capacity as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. There, in 1570, he delivered a series of
lectures on the first two chapters of Acts, dealing with the problem of ecclesiastical polity as, in his opinion, it was presented in the text. Although he did this not so much as a critic of the Anglican system as an expositor of Scripture, his teachings took a direction which was undeniably subversive to that system. Briefly summarized they are as follows:

1. The names and offices of Archbishops and Bishops should be done away with. In their stead the offices of Bishops and Deacons as described in the New Testament should be established. The Bishop should have a spiritual function only, that is to say, he should act as a pastor or teaching minister. The deacon should confine his duties to caring for the poor. The government of the Church should be entrusted, not to the Bishops or Archdeacons, but to the ministers and the Presbytery of the Church. Each minister should be attached to one congregation and should be elected and called by that church, instead of being appointed to the place by the Bishop.

This summary, based upon Cartwright's own statement of his views before the Vice-Chancellor, is not too brief to indicate clearly the basic principle of his teaching, namely that the Church should be patterned strictly upon that of apostolic times. The result of this, as Pearson

1. Scott Pearson: Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism; p. 28.
says, would be "the total abolition of diocesan episcopacy and the establishment of Presbyterianism." In view of this it is not strange that we find a storm raging in the University over this matter. His lectures were attended by crowds of students and hot controversies were soon raging. The officials of the University wrote to Burleigh, the Chancellor, asking him to suspend Cartwright, and this he proceeded to do. Largely instrumental in this was John Whitgift, who was called upon also to refute these attacks from the pulpit. Thus began a long hostility, for Whitgift became the chief spokesman and apologist for the Church-party, while Cartwright assumed a similar position among the Presbyterians.

Cartwright was forced to leave Cambridge and soon departed for the Continent, where his tendencies toward the Genevan system were developed and confirmed. The uproar which he had aroused, however, remained unabated. The publicity which his disputes with the authorities had gained had made the question of polity the new rallying cry of the Puritans. This change, if we consider its full implications, marks a shift on their part from defence to attack. Whether or not the church leaders realized it, they were now using their repressive powers to defend themselves. Before this time they had used these powers in an attempt to

force back further and further a disorganized group which had no effective weapon of attack.

Cartwright's return to England is variously dated by historians anywhere from February to November of the year 1572. Meanwhile the screws had been tightened when the canons of 1563 were passed at last as laws. Urged by the leaders of the party at home, who sensed that a crucial point had been reached, he returned, according to the best authority in April. Shortly after this the opening gun of the new offensive was fired—the First Admonition to Parliament. Cartwright has been reported as being concerned in its authorship, but this report seems entirely unjustified by the facts. Two Puritan ministers, John Field and Thomas Wilcocks, were arraigned before the ecclesiastical commissioners in June, 1572 and confessed to having written the document. They were sentenced to prison for a year as a result.

This Admonition is actually divided into two parts. The first section deals clearly and concisely with the abuses existing in the ministry of the Word, the administration of

1. 1571.
2. Pearson, p.57. The author's reasons seem most conclusive.
3. (a) An Admonition to Parliament. (b) A View of Popish abuses yet Remaining in the English Church, For which God's Ministers have Refused to Subscribe.
the Sacraments, and the ecclesiastical discipline. The
author's line of attack consists in showing the discrepancies
between the Apostolic Church and the Anglican. Typical of
the style and of the general approach is the following ex-
cerpt:

"Touching the fyrst, namely the ministerie
of the worde, although it must be confessed
that the substance of doctrine by many de-
levered is sound and good, yet herein it
faileth, that neither the ministers thereof
are according to Gods worde proved, elected,
called, or ordayned: nor the functions in
such sorte so narrowly loked unto, as of
right it ought, and is of necessitie require-
ed. ....Then, (1) none admitted to the
ministerie, but a place was voyde before
hand, to which he should be called: but
now, bishops (to whom the right of ordering
ministers doth at no hand appertaine)
do make 60, 80, or a hundred at a calp.
...Then, after just tryal and vocation they
were admitted to their function, by laying
on of the hands of the eldership onely:
now ther is (neither of these being loked
unto) required an albe, a surplesse, a
vestment, a pastoral staffe, beside that
ridiculous, and (as they use it to their
new creatures) blasphemous saying, receive
the holy gost. ....Then the ministers
wer preachers: now bare readers. ....Then,
as God gave utterance, they preached the
worde onely: now they read homilies,
articles, injunctions, etc. Then it
was painful; now gaineful. .....And therefore titles, livings, and offices
by Antichrist devised are given to them,
as Metropolitane, Archbishops, Lords grace,
Lorde Bishoppe, Suffragen, Deane,
Archdeacon... All which, together with
their offices, as they are strange & un-
heard of in Chrystes church, may playnely
in Gods worde forbidden: So are they
utterlie with speed out of the same to be
removed."

1. i.e. in Apostolic times.
2. Puritan Manifestoes, pp. 10, 11.
The solution to all this, as the author points out, is for Parliament to remove the law requiring subscription and to sweep away the abuses themselves. Above all the ministry of the Church must be reduced to the Apostolic form, consisting only of pastors, elders -- or seniors -- and deacons. It is much the same scheme as that contained in Cartwright's lectures at Cambridge, and like them it aims at re-shaping the English Church according to Puritan standards.

The second section of the Admonition covers somewhat the same ground, therefore we need not to examine it closely. It attacks the Prayer Book, "culled and picked out of that popishe dunghill, the Portuise and Masse boke." The rubrics concerning dress, posture, rites, and ceremonies are denounced in fierce and sometimes almost scurrilous language. Such forthrightness was the rule rather than the exception in the polemics of that age. What is important for us to notice is the directness and cogency with which militant Puritanism is assailing the very foundations of the diocesan episcopacy.

Field and Wilcocks were sentenced to a year's imprisonment, but from the outset, even before their trial, they were in constant communication with their friends and

---

with the Reformers abroad. Meanwhile their Admonition went rapidly through several editions and received such wide-spread attention that Whitgift was called upon to publish a rebuttal. Parker, Grindal, Sandys, and the other leaders of the establishment felt that to keep silent in the face of such an attack would be dangerous. Not only were the ideas expressed in it a direct step toward "Anabaptism"; they were also sure to provide ammunition for the Roman Catholics. From every viewpoint it was intolerable, and the Puritan documents that were published more or less as auxiliaries to the Admonition gave the whole affair rather the aspect of a rebellion.

In November, soon after Whitgift's "Answer" appeared, the Puritan press, working in secret, published "A Second Admonition to Parliament." Tradition has almost unanimously ascribed its authorship to Thomas Cartwright, and indeed much of his reputation for harsh intolerance and bitter fanaticism has been due to this tradition. The author's intense rancor against the bishops, his ruthless attitude toward all who oppose his views, whether papist, prelatist, or Anabaptist --these things are regarded as permanent blemishes on the reputation of a great scholar and leader. Pearson, however, with some finality, rejects the traditional

1. *An Answer to a Certen Libel entituled, An Admonition to the Parliament.* (October 21, 1572; also, vide Stowell: op. cit. p. 158.

2. cp. Peel (ed): *A Conscientious Objector of 1575*; (a controversy between "S.B., an English Anabaptist, and Wm. White, A Puritan") It is well known that the Puritans were as hostile to the Anabaptists as were the bishops.
Among other things, Whitgift, Bancroft, Hooker, and Rogers, in alluding to the Second Admonition, "are tacitly agreed in not ascribing it to him and write as if they did not know who the author was."

This document, for all its unmeasured acrimony, is clear and logical. It serves, as it was intended to serve, as a corollary to the First. The First deals with the need for reform and points out in general what course the reform should take. The Second tells specifically how this is to be achieved, giving the actual mechanics of the proposed Presbyterian reorganization, and herein lies its importance for church historians. Briefly the scheme is this. In each parish church there is to be a Consistory, equivalent to the modern "Kirk session", headed by the pastor and composed of a number of elders and deacons. These, elected by the congregation and ordained with prayer and laying on of hands, are entrusted with the discipline of the parish--rebuking and admonishing--and with the administering the affairs of the parish. Two kinds of ministers are allowed, pastors and teachers, the latter confining their activities to lecturing and expounding the scriptures.

The body next above the Consistory is the Conference, equivalent to the modern presbytery.

"A conference I call the meeting of some certaine ministers and other brethren... to confer and exercise themselves in prophesying or in interpreting the scriptures. (1)...At which conference any... of the brethren are at the order of the whole, to be employed upon some affaires of the church...The demeanours also of the ministers may be examined and rebuked,... sundry causes within that circuit...may be decided." (2)

Next in order is the "Synod Provinciall". Like present-day synods of the Presbyterian Church, it is composed of representatives of each Conference and has much the same functions. At the top is the Nationall Synod, i.e. the General Assembly.

Ministers are to be supplied to vacant parishes through the Conference, but they must be approved by vote of the Consistory. Thus the last vestige of diocesan episcopacy is banished. The author does not entirely reject the title of bishop but demands that the "Lordshippe of bishops" be renounced, for it is manifestly contrary to scripture. As for the "Pope" at Lambeth and his confederates, "Take them for better, who shall, they are none other but a remnant of Antichristes broode, and God amende them and forgive them..." (3)

1. See discussion of prophesying, pp. 76-79.
3. Ibid. p. 111.
It is inconceivable that any church with a system and convictions of its own could consider for a moment such revolutionary proposals. And these were frankly revolutionary, although the Puritans vehemently defended themselves from any share of sedition or revolution by extra-legal means.

On the contrary, they proposed to work through Parliament and under the approval of the sovereign. For, while civil magistrates had, according to Cartwright and his colleagues, no authority to make laws for the church, still it was their duty to enforce and protect the laws which the church had made. Perhaps if the hierarchy and the queen had adopted more lenient measures from the beginning, yielding in the "things indifferent", these proposals would never have arisen. Certain it is that the constant and increasing use of arbitrary power to enforce conformity had brought the Puritans to the verge of desperation. Each year ministers were being suspended and deprived in ever increasing numbers and in 1572 the persecution had reached a new peak. The demands of the Nonconformists had been fairly reasonable at the beginning: now, born in frustration and bitterness, they had become unreasonable. More clearly than ever the struggle had become for each side a matter of "conquer or perish".

Of the controversy which ensued upon the appearance of the two Admonitions, it is not necessary for us to speak at great length. Whitgift's "Answer" to the First was promptly answered by Cartwright in "A Replye to an Answere." ¹

¹ By a reference to this document in a letter, Sandys to Burleigh (Puritan Manifestoes, p.152) dated April 30, 1573, we may date it about that time. Its full title is,
A year later Whitgift published "A defence of the Answere", and again Cartwright rejoined with a second "Replye". By his prestige and learning, Cartwright added to what the authorities considered already a very dangerous situation. (1) Whitgift, ably and voluminously presented the defence of the established Church. So the altercation continued. The gist of Whitgift's arguments, from first to last, is this: the episcopal form of government is admittedly not prescribed in scripture, but neither is it forbidden. It is not contrary to the will of God nor the implicit teaching of the New Testament. God has given his Church definite rules and doctrines in essential matters of faith and life but has left the government, discipline, and ritual of the several churches to be determined by their own requirements whether of time or of national urgency. Thus the author does not deny the right of Geneva to have a Presbyterian polity, but the polity of the Anglican Church is its own affair. It is expedient, and therefore it is justified.

1. "Replye to an Answere made of Mr. Whitgift against the Admonition to Parliament, by T.C."

2. Black: The Reign of Elizabeth; p. 158, "There was no gainsaying that Cartwright was the most dangerous man in the Church."
"We make not an archbishop necessary to salvation, but profitable to the government of the church and consonant to the word of God. ...We are well assured that Christ in his word hath fully comprehended all things necessary to faith and good life, yet hath he committed certain orders of ceremonies and kind of government to the disposition of his church; the general rules given in his word being generally observed; and nothing being done contrary to his will and commandment." (1)

It must be admitted that Whitgift's position seems more logical and reasonable than that of the Presbyterians. Cartwright and his fellows were blinded by their zeal to the fact that the full adoption of the Apostolic system would be utterly impossible in any but the same age and the same setting as that in which the system had actually originated. They did not take into account the different habits, the changing outlooks, and the varying needs which accompany the passing of the ages. Whitgift brought to bear on the matter an outlook which was less adventurous but more practical. What is profitable and possible, other things being equal is better than that which is good in itself but doubtful or impossible of attainment.

It is regrettable, although typical of that intolerant age, that Parker, Whitgift, and the others in authority, could not follow their own logical arguments to a logical conclusion. If the government and discipline of the Church were not fixed by divine law to any one form,

1. Quoted Marsden, p.91.
if it was left so much to their own discretion, why should they not have allowed certain alterations to suit such a large and earnest group? If they could determine for themselves upon what was expedient and profitable, why were they so sternly opposed to any concession in non-essentials? Because some of Cartwright's demands were unreasonable, they condemned all of them. They directed their energy to alienating from the Church a large body of sincere and able men, who had they been allowed to have a share in the councils would have provided a source of valuable and healthy restraint upon the hierarchial tendency to pomp and circumstance. Not only did they treat Cartwright and his followers with contempt and aversion - men as learned and at least as pious as themselves - but they treated every Puritan in the same way, including many who were by no means agreed with Cartwright's faction.

On November 20, 1572, the first Presbytery in England was established at Sandworth. Actually it was not a Presbytery in the modern sense but a Consistory of the sort described in the Second Admonition. Bancroft, on whom we must rely for the only contemporary account of this matter, states that eleven elders were elected, the order of their ordination set down, and their duties and offices described

in "a bill endorsed with [aster Field's] hand, thus: The order of Wandsworth." Actually both Field and Wilcocks were still in prison at the time, and the tradition which makes of them the leaders of the Wandsworth Presbytery is therefore erroneous.

This meeting at Wandsworth is significant more for its implications than for any actual influence it exerted. It was speedily crushed by the Court of High Commission, but we may see in it, nonetheless, the degree to which the spirit of the Admonitions had permeated the Puritan movement. Cartwright's principles had become more than an undercurrent of theory. They were by this time an actual, working reality. Modern English Presbyterians may well point to this date as marking the beginning of their historical existence. True, it was avowedly a movement within the Church, and its founders were sincere in so describing it. They meant it to be so. Essentially, however, it represents and typifies the Puritan attempt to destroy—not the Church—but the then-existing framework of the Church.

Sandys, Bishop of London, sums up in a letter to Bullinger the demands of the extreme Puritans at the time.  

1. Bancroft: op. cit., p. 67. Stowell, op. cit. 187, makes the curious mistake of confounding the Wandsworth group with the Separatists, whose beginning, he says, was here. He seems to have overlooked the Plumber's Hall group of 1577, for he declares that none of the Puritans had thought of separation "until 1572, when they privately set up a communion at Wandsworth."

2. Zurich Letters; Series 1, p. 295; (dated 1573).
"New orators are rising up from among us, foolish young men, who, while they despise authority and admit of no superior, are seeking the complete overthrow and rooting up of our whole ecclesiastical polity. ...and are striving to shape out for us, I know not what new platform. And you would not imagine with what approbation this new face of things is regarded, as well by the people as the nobility. The people are fond of change and seek after liberty; the nobility (seek) what is useful. ...But that you may be better acquainted with the whole matter, accept this summary of the question at issue reduced under certain heads.

1) The civil magistrate has no authority in ecclesiastical matters. He is only a member of the church, the government of which ought to be committed to the clergy.

2) The church of Christ admits of no other government than that by presbyteries; viz. by the minister, elders, and deacons.

3) The names and authority of archbishops, archdeacons, deans, chancellors, commissaries, and other titles and dignities of the like kind should be altogether removed from the church of Christ.

4) Each parish should have its own presbytery.

5) The choice of ministers of necessity belongs to the people.

6) The goods, possessions, lands, revenues, titles, honours, authorities, and all other things relating either to bishops or cathedrals, and which now of right belong to them, should be taken away forthwith and for ever.

7) No one should be allowed to preach who is not a pastor of some congregation; and he ought to preach to his own flock exclusively and no where else.
8) The infants of papists are not to be baptized.

9) The judicial laws of Moses are binding upon Christian princes, and they ought not in the slightest degree to depart from them."

These proposals fairly represent the mind of the left-wing Puritans at that time, as we may judge from reading their own documents. We should not find it strange, therefore, that the church dignitaries and the patrons of livings should become alarmed at such proposed treatment of their income and titles. Moreover this new spirit was entirely too independent of civil power in church matters to suit the domineering Elizabeth. A party which flouted her wishes and her prerogatives in such a way must, she reasoned, be ill-affected and dangerous to her civil supremacy as well. The Wandsworth Presbytery, and others as they appeared from time to time, were violently crushed, and their leaders were sentenced to short terms in prison. This was one of the first duties of the Court of High Commission, a body whose history was as noteworthy as it was unfortunate. With that, however, we will deal later.

Beginning with 1574 and lasting for several years, Puritanism in England seems to have reached a period of frustration. This was due directly to the increased vigor

---

1. vide Walsingham's letter to Critoy, Secretary of France, quoted by MacColl: The Reformation Settlement in the Light of History and Law, in which the former praises Elizabeth for her lenient dealings with the Presbyterians. (p. 107 et seq.)
with which the queen's injunctions to the bishops were being carried out. She had already admonished them to enforce conformity upon everyone in the land. Now, indignant at the audacity of the Admonitions and Cartwright's Reply to Whitgift, she issued an injunction to all law-abiding citizens, forbidding them to have these documents in their possession, much less to print or circulate them. Each citizen, on his allegiance to the throne, was to conform to the Book of Common Prayer and on the same allegiance to report to the authorities anyone who failed to do so.

As a result of this Cartwright was forced to flee to the Continent, where he spent the next nine years. During this time he continued his controversy with Whitgift and maintained a copious correspondence with the Puritans at home. The latter, meanwhile, were feeling the full force of the queen's hostility. The bishops, who before had been half-hearted in their pressing of conformity, had been startled out of this attitude by the Admonitions and by the rapidly rising tide of Presbyterianism. The leaders of the radical party were, of course, the most conspicuous objects of their wrath, but this wrath, now thoroughly aroused, did not stop with the Presbyterians alone. It included, on suspicion, vast numbers of the clergy who were of the moderate school of Puritans. Nonconformity was now identified with disloyalty, both to the Church and to the throne.
Dozens of ministers were deprived and many of them were imprisoned. Temporarily, it appeared, the Puritans had shot their bolt, and it was now the turn of the church-party to retaliate.

One of Cartwright's first tasks after his arrival in Heidelberg, in 1574, was to prepare for publication, with a preface of his own, a Latin book, *De Disciplina Ecclesiastica*. Generally attributed to Walter Travers, who was also on the Continent at that time, this book was to have a most important part in the Presbyterianism of this and the following century. Cartwright translated it into English shortly after this, but the translation was banned in England. In 1584, the Cambridge press published it, but the vigilant censorship exercised by the authorities prevented the edition from being circulated.

This Book of Discipline, or "Explicatio", as it was usually called, was at once adopted by the English Presbyterians as embodying in systematic form their aims and the framework of their polity. Whereas the scheme outlined in the Second Admonition was written for the enlightenment of its opponents and in the heat of controversy, the Explicatio,

---

1. The correct title is, *Ecclesiasticae Disciplinarum, et Anglicanae Ecclesiae ab illa aberrationis, plena e verbo Dei, & dilucida explicatio; vide Dexter, op.cit. p.137.
2. Commonly confused with the *Book of Discipline*, or *Directory of Church-government* (1644); See Pearson, p.141.
was meant as a directory for supporters of the system. In the main, nevertheless, the proposals contained in it differ very little from those which we have already seen.

Judging by the number of Puritan writings emanating at this time from the same press that produced the Explicatio, it seems probable that there must have been a small coterie of Puritans responsible. Silenced in England to a great extent, the party was carrying on its struggle in print through its leaders abroad. One such publication was the "Brief Discours of the troubles begonne at Frankford in Germany, Anno Domini 1554". This work, which we have already noted, was intended to serve as a record of the whole controversy, beginning in the time of the Marian exiles and leading up to the latest events. Meant for propaganda purposes, the book carried the record only as far as the accession of Elizabeth.

From the same press came Cartwright's Second Reply, of which part appeared in 1575 and "The Rest of the Second Reply" in 1577. There is little that we need note about this document except one rather significant item. In the "Rest" Cartwright gives it as his considered opinion that ministers should not abandon their posts over the matter of vestments and ceremonies. However evil these things may be—and he is as much opposed to them as anyone—a minister's first duty is to remain at the head of his flock. This opinion was sent
to a group of the London Puritans for their judgment, and they were by no means in agreement with it. This is not unnatural, for the group included such men as Field, Wilcocks, Crane, Penry, and Standen, all of whom had been deprived for nonconformity. They held the uncompromising viewpoint that nothing could justify yielding to the hated abuses. It is interesting to note that Cartwright was less an extremist than he has generally been supposed, both then and later. Perhaps in the rigid Presbyterianism of Heidelberg he began to see elements which could never be made feasible in England. At any rate, we see him at this point beginning to diverge, however slightly, from the other leaders of his party in England.

The year 1575 saw in England some important changes in the personnel of the church-party. In this one year not only Archbishop Parker but Parkhurst and Pilkington died. Jewel had already gone, and the death of Horne was shortly to occur. Thus the Reformation in England was being transmitted to new men, and when Grindal succeeded to the primacy of Canterbury, there were few of his old comrades of the exile left among the bishops. The new men, for the most part, lacked their predecessors' record of sufferings and their personal love of simplicity. Consequently they felt absolutely no sympathy with the Puritan-Genevan outlook.

Grindal himself was a man of markedly mild ten-

1. Stowell: op. cit., p. 165; cites The Seconde Parte of a Register, p. 896.

2. Glegg: op. cit., p. 35.
dencies. In his sympathies he was virtually a Puritan, although he had cast in his lot with the other side. While he had no patience with the Presbyterians, therefore, he remained to the end kindly disposed to the moderate Puritans. As stern as Parker toward what he considered dangerous and seditious teachings, he has been blamed by his enemies for harshness. On the other hand his Puritan sympathies have never been forgiven by the Anglican historians, who have almost without exception criticised him for weakness and vacillation. Either judgment seems to us to be unduly prejudiced. He was neither a wolf in sheep's clothing nor vice-versa. It might be more proper to say that he was a Puritan in bishop's clothing, trying to balance the exigencies of his office with the dictates of his own conscience and sympathies.

The first, and really the only great problem with which Grindal was able to concern himself at Lambeth was the matter of "the prophesying". As early as 1571 there had arisen among the Puritan clergy this practice, designed to answer the desperate need for a preaching ministry. They assembled at stated intervals to exercise and increase their ability as preachers, to broaden their grasp on theology and to enhance their critical faculties. The most famous of these prophesying was organized at Northampton, with the full approval of the bishop and the mayor. To read their

Confession of Faith is to see Puritanism in its most concentrated form. Its provisions are simple and, for that age, moderate. Each minister participating must subscribe to this Confession.

"That they believed the Word of God, contained in the Old and New Testaments, to be a perfect rule of faith and manners; that it ought to be read and known by all people; and that the authority of it exceeds all authority, not of the pope only, but of the Church also, and of councils, fathers, and angels."

"They condemn as a tyrannous yoke whatsoever men have set up of their own invention. ...all those customs and manners of serving God which men have brought in without the authority of the Word for the warrant thereof, though recommended by custom, by unwritten traditions, or any other names whatsoever; of which sort are the pope's supremacy, purgatory, transubstantiation. ...distinction of meats, apparels, and days, and briefly, all the ceremonies and whole order of the papistry, which they call the hierarchy."

"And we content ourselves," they conclude,

"with the simplicity of this pure Word of God, and doctrine thereof, a summary of which is in the Apostles' Creed; resolving to try and examine and also to judge all other doctrines whatsoever by this pure word of God, as by a certain rule and perfect touchstone. And to this Word of God we humbly submit ourselves and all our doings, willing and ready to be

judged, reformed, or further instructed thereby in all points of religion."

These meetings took place usually about twice a month, on week-days. A minister was chosen for a certain term to act as president, and at each meeting three ministers were appointed as speakers at the next. The first was to speak for three-quarters of an hour, expounding some text or passage of scripture. The next could enlarge on this but was not to repeat nor concern himself with refuting the first. The third followed the same course, each of the last two speaking for about fifteen minutes. The meeting closed with prayer, after which the laity departed, while the clergy remained to discuss the sermons.

Earnest attempts were made at these meetings to guard against any tendency to disorderliness and disputes. In such a novel and popular form of gathering, however, these faults were bound to creep in. Ministers who were anxious to display their rhetorical skill or indulge their taste for polemics not infrequently disturbed the meetings. Also it happened now and again that political discussions took place, and the queen's policy was attacked by ministers who were smarting under the sting of suspension or deprivation. Even had these faults not become apparent, the prophesying would probably have aroused the suspicions of the queen, but
as it was, she certainly had no intention of allowing free discussions and criticism of her policies in any group, much less in such popular and influential gatherings as these. The bishops, seeing the immense amount of good that could be gained, approved the prophesyings and tried to regulate them so as to remove all cause for the queen's displeasure.

Grindal, when he came to Lambeth, promptly drew up a series of regulations designed to just such an end. The meetings were henceforth to be held only with a bishop or his representative being present, and no discussion whatsoever of the ecclesiastical laws, persons, or policies was to be allowed. No suspended or deprived minister was to be permitted to speak at all in these meetings.

This could not prevent the axe from falling, however. The queen's wrath was aroused as well as her fears, and no such considerations as the development of a preaching ministry or the pleas of her leading bishops could avail. She ordered the prophesyings to be suppressed. Grindal tried in vain to dissuade her, but she angrily berated him for his temerity, saying that "two or three preachers in a diocese are enough." Finally the Archbishop, braving her majesty's certain wrath, wrote her a letter which has remained ever since as a monument to his honor and courage.

Grindal stressed in this letter the fact that live preaching is absolutely essential to a live Church. Homilies are well enough as a makeshift, but they are merely that and nothing more. Ignorance among the clergy is rife and the corresponding ignorance of God's Word among the people is providing the papists with a perfect field in which to sow rebellion— as had recently occurred in the case of the revolt led by the Duke of Norfolk. The surest way of endangering her own throne, he warns her, is for her to ignore this calamitous state among clergy and people. In terms of the most unexceptional humility and yet with complete firmness, he refuses to burden his conscience and disobey the manifest will of God in order to obey her. In conclusion, he requests her with respectful but dignified language, to consult her own will less and the ripe experience and wisdom of her church leaders more in these religious matters.

It is difficult to imagine how the term "weak" can be applied to a man who could speak in this way—and to a Tudor, especially. Parker and Whitgift, for all their strength of character, would never have dared to remind Elizabeth that she was as much subject to God's laws as her lowliest subject and must answer for her sins like all the rest of mankind. If, in her pride she neglects God's laws, she will be called to account for it. This letter, written in June, 1577, was

1. vide infra, Chapter Eleven.
2. vide Dexter: op. cit., p. 145.
3. The archbishop objected to the sic volo, sic jubeo tone of her commands as being "no better than the anti-christian voice of the pope." (cf. Marsden, Neal, Black, Hopkins, and Greer for accounts of this episode.)
presented to the queen, whose reaction was all that might have been expected of a sovereign who, on far less provocation, wrote to Bishop Cox, "Proud prelate: You know what you were before I made you what you are. If you do not immediately comply with my request, by God! I will unfrock you. Elizabeth."

To deprive Grindal would have suited the queen, but she was dissuaded on grounds of policy. Instead she suspended him from his office and ordered his see to be placed in sequestration for six months and himself to be confined to his own home. The suspension lasted till his death in 1583, his duties being performed almost entirely by Aylmer, Bishop of London. The bishops of his see petitioned the queen to restore their primate. Her councillors advised it, and the sympathy of the majority of the people was in favor of it, but Elizabeth could not forgive the man who had not only defied but rebuked her. Blind and infirm, the aged Archbishop at last offered to resign, but before the queen could decide whether or not to accept the offer, he died.

With his disgrace, the great champion of preaching was silenced, and preaching itself became once more neglected

in England. The Church, by its official, court-directed policy, had chosen to reject this vital weapon. The Puritans, on the other hand, took it up and developed it according to their own temper. In their hands it was to become a mighty, and on occasion, a terrible weapon, for by their virtual monopoly of it, they gained a hold on the people which was the real source of their power. Their use, and to some extent, their misuse of this power makes it seem quite probable that in crushing the prophesyings Elizabeth committed a blunder whose repercussions were political as well as religious. It was from the pulpit, after all, that Puritan preachers generated the spirit that moved the country toward the Long Parliament.

With the death of Archbishop Grindal, Puritanism came to another milestone in its progress. During the seventies the movement had found its leaders, Cartwright, Travers, and their lieutenants. The Admonitions, Cartwright's controversy with Whitgift, and the Explicatio had given the party a clearly-defined objective and a new cohesiveness. The court and the church-party, on the other hand, had at the same time provided the Puritans with an ever-increasing list of grievances to spur them on. The new archbishop was to find that he had on his hands the invidious task of dealing with a party which, while not powerful enough to achieve its own goal, was yet too strong to be crushed.
CHAPTER FOUR
(1583-1603)

When Elizabeth chose John Whitgift, Bishop of Worcester, to succeed Grindal in the primacy, she did so with a specific purpose in mind. Grindal, by his weakness, had placed the welfare of the Church in jeopardy. The Puritan movement must be crushed, and Whitgift was obviously the man for the task. His able defence of the Establishment in the controversies of 1572 had marked him as the recognized voice of the Church. The queen, moreover, knew him to be not only able but vigorous and inflexible and a violent opponent of the Puritans. In fact, he was a man after her own heart. No amiable tolerance or sympathy for their cause would make this man turn in her hand like a faulty tool. Like most one-sided men, he was not apt to be sparing in his use of the power placed in his hands, and since his views matched her own, she felt she could safely give him this power.

The situation in regard to Puritanism, it must be admitted, was not of a sort calculated to create an easy mind in the queen or her new archbishop. The sudden onslaught marked by the Admonitions had, it is true, been met and repulsed, and its leaders had been silenced or forced into exile. Temporarily the Presbyterians, the spearhead of the Puritan movement, had been thrown into confusion, but

since then they had begun to revive and to make small but steady advances. It is futile to speculate on the extent to which Grindal's Puritan leanings would have tempered his hostility to the Presbyterians, for, one way or another, his suspension eliminated him as an important factor. What is more important, the queen's councillors and most of the leading magistrates of the kingdom were reluctant to press too hard upon the Non-conformists. The precarious relations existing with the Roman Catholic forces at home and abroad made it imperative for Burleigh and his colleagues to encourage a countering force. This they had in the Puritans, who were devoutly loyal to the throne and violently hostile to papistry in any form. To crush them entirely at this point, therefore, would be to remove the nation's strongest guarantee of safety.

Countenanced by this more or less surreptitious toleration, therefore, the Puritans in general proceeded on their course without too galling a pressure from the authorities. Denied official sanction for their "exercizes" and "prophesyings", they soon began to form "Conferences". Meeting in secret, without official recognition, as early as 1572 these bodies fulfilled much the same purpose as the forbidden Presbyteries.

1. Glegg: op. cit. vol. 1, p. 33 says, "But in her short sightedness, Elizabeth failed to take in the whole situation. Puritanism, as it was then developed, might question her supremacy in religious matters, but it never questioned her civil power. Catholicism, as it then existed, when fully taken to heart, would question both. This it was that led her counsellors from an early day, to foster the Puritans as the main defence against the tide which, sweeping over Continental Europe, might soon be expected to cross the Channel."

2. I.e. the equivalent of the modern Presbytery. Bancroft, in his Dangerous Practices, p. 45 et seq. is one of our leading sources of information on this subject.
The earliest of these Conferences, or "Classes", as they came to be called, were held in London, but the most famous and influential were those at Cockfield and Dedham, in Essex. We need not go into detail in this matter. For our purpose it is enough to point out that from 1572 to 1588 it was these Conferences that bound the Presbyterian movement together and enabled it to make any progress it was in fact able to make. From these meetings came a steady stream of petitions and remonstrances in behalf of deprived ministers. Among themselves they debated on matters of discipline and doctrine. When Travers' Explicatio became available, they began to adopt its standards officially as their own model and quietly to put them into practice. As a result there grew up and flourished for a time within the Anglican Church a body which virtually amounted to a Presbyterian church of England. It was a growth which, it is easy to see, had no real place in an episcopalian Church. The hierarchy probably exaggerated the strength of this party but it was quite right in regarding the aims of that party as being dangerous to the existence of the parent Church. The Presbyterians aimed not at overturning the Church of England but at absorbing it.

It was to meet this threat that Whitgift was made Archbishop. Almost immediately upon his accession, he promul-

1. Usher: The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth; has contributed a most enlightening study of the "classical" movement.
gated certain Test Articles, more commonly known as Whitgift's Articles. They were aimed directly at the Nonconformists, and their grim purposefulness is evident in the following lines.

"That all preaching, catechising, and praying in any private family, where any are present besides the family, be utterly extinguished. That none do preach or catechise, except also he will read the whole service, and administer the sacraments four times a year. That all preachers and others in ecclesiastical orders, do at all times wear the habits prescribed. That none be admitted to preach unless he be ordained according to the manner of the Church of England. That none be admitted to preach or execute any part of the ecclesiastical function, unless he subscribe to the three following articles:

1) To the queen's supremacy over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical, and civil within her majesty's dominions.

2) To the Book of Common Prayer, and of the ordination of priests and deacons, as containing nothing contrary to the Word of God; and that they will use it in all their public ministrations and no other.

3) To the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, agreed upon in the synod of 1562 and afterward confirmed by Parliament."

These Articles were set forth with the royal approval

but not under the royal seal. For this reason, according to the constitution, they had not the force of laws. What is more, the laws of the land required that the subscription of the clergy be limited to those articles which concern doctrines of faith and administration of the sacraments. Here they are required to subscribe to the whole thirty-nine. The Puritans, in objecting to these Articles, had the laws of England to support them. They contended that, while the queen had legally the right to publish new articles to procure conformity, she had no right to publish articles in opposition to the laws. Since she had not this right, the archbishop, in his turn, had no right to command that such articles be obeyed, and the clergy were not bound to obey. However true this might be in theory, in practice it was irrelevant. Whitgift, if he had not the actual right had the might. He did not need to be legally unassailable, since his power in fact gave him the first and last word.

The machinery for making this power effective was ready at hand in the Court of High Commission. This body had been created as a provision of the Act of Supremacy, designed to deal with offenses against both this Act and the Act of Uniformity. It empowered the queen, by her letters patent under the great seal to authorize, whenever she saw fit, and for as long as she pleased, a commission of both lay
and clerical persons to exercise supervision over all spiritual problems. They had the power to visit, reform, and redress "All heresies, errors, schisms, contempts, enormities, and offenses whatsoever." The only stated limitations were that the members should be born Englishmen and that they could declare as heresies only such things as were so declared in canonical scripture or by the first four general councils, or by any other general council whose findings were supported by scriptural authority. But beyond this, another clause extended their authority to cover heresies as yet undefined, offenses declared heretical by Parliament with the concurrence of Convocation.

A body so powerful as this could not long be restrained within its proposed limits. The High Court itself was the judge and the accuser. It answered to no one for its decisions, and no appeals could be made against these decisions. What made the Court all the more terrible was the fact that any three of the forty-four commissioners, one of the three being the archbishop or one of his bishops, had power to act in ecclesiastical matters. They were at liberty to command all sheriffs and officers of the prisons,

1. A fairly complete account of this Court and its powers is to be found in Neal, vol. 1, p. 160. vide also, Glegg, p. 51.
to employ torture, and to imprison without trial any whom they suspected. Perhaps more odious than any other aspect of this body, however, was its power to administer the "oath ex officio". Any suspected person might be arrested and required to answer on his oath any question put to him by the commissioners. A list of twenty-four questions was drawn up by Whitgift, covering every conceivable aspect of conformity. The person on trial could scarcely help falling into one or another of these pitfalls. Frankly unconstitutional, as the law states that no man may be forced to incriminate himself, this "oath ex officio" proved to be a terrible weapon. Many who were confronted with it refused to accept it and were accordingly imprisoned for contempt of court.

Armed with this Thor's hammer, Whitgift lost no time in exacting subscription to the Articles. In his first metropolitan visitation, at least two hundred and thirty-three ministers were suspended, forty-nine of them being summarily deprived. While this may not seem a large number, we must remember that out of approximately ten thousand parishes in England at that time, only two thousand had pastors.

If we add to these two hundred-odd suspended ministers the unknown numbers already silenced and deprived, we may gain some idea, not only of the condition of the Church but of the complete relentlessness of Whitgift's determination.

While the suspended ministers, their congregations, and their families were clamoring for relief, Whitgift's policy had many critics in higher circles. Burleigh, who was not a Puritan, rapidly lost most of his first respect for the new Primate and wrote several times sharply remonstrating with him for these excesses.

"I have read over your twenty-four articles... And I find them so curiously penned, so full of branches and circumstances, that I think the Inquisition of Spain used not so many questions to comprehend and trap their priests... This kind of proceeding is too much savouring of the Roman Inquisition, and is a device rather to seek for offenders than to reform any. ..."

Another letter, from the Lords of the Council, complained that able and godly ministers were being deprived, while ignorant, loose-living, and unworthy clergymen, of whom there were many, were left in peace. The Lords, including Leicester, Walsingham, Burleigh, Hatton, and Warwick, expostulated with Whitgift for this disproportionate harshness with men who in

1. Neal. vol. 1, p. 165.
the main were willing to subscribe to all but a few unimportant trifles. Neither of these letters had any effect on the archbishop beyond that of irritation.

In 1584 the House of Commons, having a strong Puritan contingent, sent up to the House of Lords a petition seeking to curb the powers of the Court of High Commission. At the same time a private petition was presented to the queen, proposing that the power hitherto vested in the bishops might be transferred to provincial synods, national, and general councils. "The Presbyterian drift of this letter petition is unmistakable; but it shows the strong sympathy there was with it, even among the ruling classes, that the Privy Council was itself divided in respect to it; while in the House of Commons, the feeling was so strong that had its will prevailed, Whitgift would have been deposed and his Articles abolished. ...."

While the above quotation is no doubt an exaggeration of the actual facts, it is evident, none the less, that Puritanism, particularly in Parliament, was once more regaining its voice. The lean years of 1574-1577 and the fury that followed upon the appearance of the Admonitions

had partially stunned and paralyzed the leaders of the party. Now the sting of persecution was rousing them once more to action.

In order to gain a clear and concisely representative view of the Puritan activities at this time, however, we must once more revert to its two leading exponents, Cartwright and Travers. The latter had been minister of the English Church in Antwerp for two years prior to June 1580. At that time he returned to England. Cartwright took his place, and his two years there, followed by two and a half more in Middleburg, were important enough to demand our attention. It was during the latter period that he came into contact with the Brownist movement through its two leaders - Browne and Harrison - who had recently come to the Netherlands. Robert Browne himself is worth our consideration, for he was the founder of the first really organized Separatist movement. At the age of twenty-two (he was born in 1550) he began to proclaim the opinion that the Church of England was no true Church and that right-minded men should have no part in it. In 1582, he published a book in which he decried the attitude of those who clung to the corrupt Church, waiting

1. "The Life and Manners of True Christians", to which is prefixed "A Treatise of Reformation without tarrying for any, and the wickedness of those preachers which will not reform themselves and their charge, because they will tarry till the magistrate command and compel them."
and hoping for reform to come through the magistrates. The magistrates would never bring in reform. What is more, he contended, the magistrate has no place at all in relation to the Church, no authority of any sort in ecclesiastical matters, for the Church is a divine community of believers whose only covenant is with God.

By 1581 Browne had begun to gather his followers into separate congregations in and about Bury St. Edmunds. Although suspended promptly by the Bishop of Norwich, he continued to propound startlingly radical views on the relation of the Christian to the community. Only the fact of his being related to Lord Burleigh prevented his being summarily imprisoned. Eventually his turbulence forced him to flee to Middleburg, where we shortly find him in altercation with Cartwright. By his blunt refusal to remain within the communion of the Church of England, Browne cut himself off from the main body of Puritans, and, in fact, he and his followers for this very reason should, in the interests of accuracy, not be called Puritans. The latter sought for reform only with the help of the magistrates and by Constitutional means. Browne insisted that conscience is the only force which will move men into the Kingdom of God.
Let the magistrate use force to back his mandates in civil affairs, but let him have no part, as a magistrate, in religious matters. Over this question the two exiles joined battle. The reports which reached England of the stand taken by Cartwright undoubtedly did much to placate the authorities toward him. Browne, on the other hand, soon quarrelled even with his own colleague, and their congregation of forty was split. Harrison was of the opinion that, in spite of its many faults, the Church of England was still a true church. This being the cause of Browne's departure from the city, was also the cause of bringing Harrison and Cartwright into more or less amicable relations.

The friendly controversy between these two, Cartwright seeking to persuade the other to return to the Anglican fold, brings out two significant facts. One; it shows Cartwright changing from critic to defender of the Church of England; and two; it shows that Harrison, not Browne, was allied more closely to the Presbyterianism in which both started. Browne could no longer claim to be part of that movement. His followers might well be classed as the radical Congregationalists. Whatever be their classification, they increased in numbers at an astonishing rate, Gregory quotes Sir Walter Raleigh's speech in Parliament in 1580:

2. op. cit. p. 136.
"I am afraid there are nearly twenty thousand of them in England. ..."

Browne himself deserted the movement some years later. After his return to England, and after several years of heated skirmishes with the authorities, he accepted a charge in the English Church. While he himself was discredited in the eyes of friend and foe alike, the movement which bore his name continued to gather strength.

During these Middleburg years, Cartwright also entered upon his Confutation of the Rhemish Testament. This was undertaken at the invitation of Burleigh himself, to refute some of the Counter-Reformation interpretations inserted in a recent translation of the New Testament. This latter work had been produced by the English Seminary at Rheims and was later incorporated in the Douay Version. It was no small tribute to Cartwright's prestige that he should be asked to take up the cudgels for the whole of English Protestantism, for this is what it amounted to. Unfortunately, while he tried hard to keep out of his work any traces of his bias toward Presbyterianism, he was apparently not entirely successful, for Whitgift's suspicion was aroused, and he ordered the author to cease work on it.

1. vide Fletcher: History of the Revival and Progress of Independency in England, vol. 2, p. 83. - Powicke: Henry Barrow, Separatist, p. 52, points out the obvious exaggeration of this estimate: "It is not unlikely that London held the only congregation of any size, and though able to hold its own...could do little more."

In these two activities of Cartwright's period in Middleburg, however, we see much of Puritanism exemplified. Violently anti-Roman, and almost as violently anti-Separatist, he typifies the moderate left-wing attitude which caused Elizabethan Puritanism, while resisting the religio-ten
dency of the established Church, to remain a part of that Church. He still advocated the Presbyterian system but was gradually coming to see that it was futile to attempt to achieve it through controversy. During these years of exile his views had been modified and clarified, bringing him to a deeper sense of loyalty to the traditional heritage of the English Church. This firm conviction in the outstanding Puritan leader of the time had its effect on the whole party. The extremists, to their disgust, found themselves without a suitable head, while the more moderate, "wait-and-hope" Presbyterians gradually followed Cartwright into quieter paths.

This tendency, it must be admitted, is not immediately apparent as we study the situation which existed at this time. Whitgift's pogrom was at its height, and the pages of Neal, Strype, Heylin, and other historians are full of accounts of ministers imprisoned or suspended.

1. vide infra Chapter Six, for further discussion of this attitude.
2. Pearson: op. cit. dates his return April, 1585.
Coupled with the popular sympathy which this bloodless but savage persecution was enlisting on their behalf, was the ever growing awareness of impending invasion from Spain and France. The Puritans were, as we have said, loyal, and as the year of the Armada loomed closer and closer, loyalty and patriotism, combined with a heightened religious fervour, swept the whole nation and helped, incidentally, to augment the forces of Puritanism in Parliament.

During the Parliament of 1586, therefore, we find a lower House, in the midst of its important political deliberations, pausing to consider ecclesiastical reforms. A Bill, asking for nothing less than the annulment of the existing ecclesiastical laws in favour of a Presbyterian System, was introduced. Before the matter could reach the stage of a reading, the queen sent for the document and the Book presented with it and suppressed them. Peter Wentworth, for boldly advocating the liberty of speech in the House, was sent to the Tower, as were Hurlston and Bainbridge for their pleading in behalf of the Bill and Book.

Despite their strength in Parliament, the Presbyterians were beginning to feel the futility of "tarrying for the magistrates." The bishops had the power and would

---

1. A modified version of Knox's Genevan Liturgy.
not permit any sort of legislation for reform to get beyond the stage of discussion. It was therefore decided by the leaders that the whole movement should be officially organized along definite lines— to wit those set down in Travers' Book of Discipline. Translated from the Latin by Cartwright, this Book provided a manual for the organization of the local conferences as well as a standard for the whole party. "By 1587 the Puritan movement, moulded by the influence of the Book of Discipline, was thus assuming the definite features of a Presbyterian organization. The nomenclature of the Book was adopted, and the Conferences now came to be known as classes. ...."

An important event for the party was the session of the Warwickshire Synod, in 1588. Here a number of men, including Cartwright, set their signatures to a list of articles approving the Book of Discipline and promising to put certain sections of it into practice. They avowed their intention of proceeding by lawful means, and as a gesture of compromise, proposed to allow bishops to ordain ministers, once the latter had been elected by the congregation. Clearly these Presbyterians were, for the time being, willing to graft their system upon the existing framework of the

---

1. Pearson: op. cit. p. 259.— Valuable information on the whole classical movement, with special reference to the Dedham Classes, is to be found in Usher: The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth. (Especially the introduction, pp. 20-24)
Church. It was a foregone conclusion, of course, that the queen and the Bishops would refuse to allow this intention even to reach the length of a petition to throne, Council, or Parliament.

Growing out of the bitterness which these constant rebuffs engendered among the Puritans, arose the strange controversy of the Martin Mar-Prelate Tracts. These tracts, taking the form of letters addressed to the Bishops, represent the first really successful attempt to use satire in ecclesiastical polemics. The author, or authors, sought to gain a hearing with the nation and to impress the Presbyterian arguments upon the mind of each reader. In order to do this Martin Mar-Prelate used methods which were precisely the opposite of the learnedly pious publications of the regular Puritan press. He assailed the Bishops with ribald satire, flippant irony, exasperating arrogance, and often with scurrilous abuse. Most of the readers were shocked by his irreverence toward men who, after all, were God's chosen servants; this was just what the writer wanted, for shocked or not, they read his letters with avidity. The Puritans in general disapproved of the means adopted, though the aims declared by Martin were their own. They hastened to disclaim

2. The most authoritative works dealing with the Martinist controversy are: Arber: An Introductory Sketch to the Martin Marprelate Controversy;—Pierce: The Marprelate Tracts; also An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts;—Powicke: Henry Barrow, Separatist.
any connection with the Tracts, and, in perfect sincerity, deprecate the coarseness and scurrility of their tone. In spite of this the authorities included the whole party in their anger at the writer, and while everyone in England who could beg, borrow, or buy a copy was chuckling or fuming over Martin's latest bit of impudence, the Bishops were making diligent search for him.

A brief example of the style and the type of argument used must suffice to give us the flavour of the Tracts.

The Book of Discipline had evoked a reply from Dr. Bridges, Dean of Sarum, and Martin assailed both Book and author.

"... you are to understand that D. Bridges hath written in your defence a most senseless book, and I cannot very often at one breath come to a full point when I read the same. Againe, may it please you to give me leve to play the Duns for the nonce as well as he, ... For I have heard some cleargie men say that M. Bridges was a verie patch and a duns, when he was at Cambridge. And some say, saving your reverence that are Bishoppes, that he is as very knave and enemy unto the sincerity of religion, as any popish prelate in Rome." 2

Elsewhere in the Epistle the bishops are described as

"cogging and cosening Knaves...proud, popish, presumptious, profane, paltry, pestilent, and pernicious prelates."

---


2. This Tract bore the title of The Epistle.
This sort of thing could not fail to goad the Bishops to fury. The commissioners and their pursuivants scoured England far and wide for the author and his printer. Anyone suspected of collaborating with the author was arrested. Indeed one man, John Penry, was condemned and hanged on a charge of being Martin himself or one of his confederates. The secret press, meanwhile, moved from place to place as the search grew too close, often eluding the officers by a hairbreadth. Once the press itself was captured—but the author remained unknown, continuing to jeer at his pursuers in his letters, to jeer at the Bishops for their affectionate desire to have him as their guest, etc. Continually he warned them to forsake their pomp and riches, their usurped powers and titles, and their persecution of godly men, on pain of having their secret blemishes bared to the world by Martin Mar-Prelate. The Bishops, in their turn, were not slow to adopt the same weapon. Anti-Martinist writers poured out satire and abuse in pamphlets which were quite as objectionable as Martin's own, without being as keen or as witty. Cartwright and the other Puritan leaders were derided, slandered, and lampooned by one side and defended by the other.

1. Dexter: pp.131-202. Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years... asserts that Henry Barrow was the author. Powicke: Henry Barrow, Separatist, denies this; "For one thing he (Barrow) did not write the Marprelate Tracts... Suspicion has attached most strongly to John Penry as the writer; and recently his authorship has been as good as proved (by Arber: Introductory Sketch to the Marprelate Tracts). p. 33.

The result of the whole controversy, lasting as it did from 1588 till late in the following year, was decidedly unfortunate for the Puritans. Whoever the author was, and it is probable that a small group of Puritan free-lances was concerned, none but the most radical Presbyterians had a good word for the writings themselves. Cartwright and the other moderates realized that their only hope lay in an orderly, dignified, and reverent approach to the matters in dispute. Invective and coarse satire might gain them attention but would not bring them respect. These pasquinades might be amusing and entertaining to read in the taverns, but they were certain to bring down the full wrath of the hierarchy. This is precisely what happened. Presbyterianism from here on began to wane in popular support. It became temporarily a lost cause, and its Book of Discipline became little more than a historical document.

With the defeat of the Spanish Armada and with the passing of the danger-clouds which had loomed over the nation for so long, there was no longer such urgent need to tread softly with the Puritans. Their loyalty had been vital to the preservation of the kingdom, and hence the queen's native shrewdness, as well as the advice of her councillors, had constrained her to a certain degree of moderation. Now the coasts of England were safe from invasion, and she turned

1. Powicke: op. cit. p. 156, says, "In fact, however numerous the Puritan ministers and their followers might be, they had come nearly to the end of their political influence before the death of Elizabeth.... They had either virtually to retract their former denunciations of the Church...to conform, or else to separate and dare all. For the most part they chose the first. ..."
with untrammeled vigor to setting her own house in order as she had been longing to do. For the first time since her accession, Puritans were executed for their religious beliefs. Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry, Separatist leaders, were hanged in 1593, and Udall, a deprived Puritan minister, was condemned to a similar fate but died in prison in 1592.

Perhaps it was because these first three were Separatists, (rather than "Puritans" properly so-called) rejected as such by the Puritan party, that their martyrdom failed to quicken that party into renewed life. It is more likely, however, that the Puritan-Presbyterian movement had spent its force and was now bowing before a powerful and unremitting pressure from the hierarchy. We hear little more of Cartwright from this time on. Master of a small hospital in Warwickshire, he lived there in comparative quietness. True, he was arrested in 1590 and in the following year tried before the Star Chamber on charges of sedition. Although he was acquitted on this charge, he was imprisoned for over a year for his Presbyterian activities, particularly for having signed the articles of the Warwickshire Synod. His imprisonment did much to disintegrate further the crumbling morale of

---

1. Penry, of course, was executed on the charge of complicity in the Martinist publications. The other two were hanged by virtue of the Recusancy Law, making it a felony to write or preach against the Church of England as a true Church. Burrage: Early English Dissenters, Powicke: Henry Barrow..., Stowell: op. cit. (pp.195-197) should be read in connection with this.
his followers. His release could not revive it. By this time Leicester and Walsingham were dead, and Burleigh broken and decrepit, was soon to die also. Deprived thus of its champions at court, Puritanism was at last forced to concede the victory to Whitgift. For the rest of the reign we hear very little of Nonconformity.

Two events of importance must yet claim our attention in these closing years of the century -important not so much for the Puritans as for the Anglican Church. The first was the publishing of Richard Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity". Hooker, who had come into conflict with Travers when the latter was lecturer under him at the Temple, had been much perturbed by the controversy. He felt the need for some adequate reply, on the part of the episcopacy, to the Puritan insistence on the Bible as the one court of appeal. His Ecclesiastical Polity fulfilled this need. Whitgift's solution, we will remember, had been this: Scripture is the final authority, but it does not cover such secondary things as polity and ceremony. These must be determined by considerations of expediency and practicability. Hooker goes further than this. Scripture is not the only court of appeal. Reason must be consulted. Scripture is a revelation of divine law, it is true but all truth is that. All true laws, whether of nature or of human government, proceed alike from the

---

1. The first four books appeared in 1594, the fifth in 1597, and the last three were not published till after his death and then in a somewhat doubtfully authentic form.
divine reason, forming a sort of cosmic unity. The laws of church-government - those under dispute at the time, for example - do not require the medium of revelation, for they are themselves part of God's revelation and as such have His sanction.

Furthermore, Hooker contends, the present order of bishops, an order above that of elders or deacons, was instituted by Christ when he appointed twelve disciples to be a special order, above that of the seventy. Since episcopacy is hallowed, therefore, by its peculiar origin in the commands of Christ, it does not need the dogmatic sanction of Scripture. The matter at once shifts to the plane of reason as against the merely mechanical interpretation of one part of divine revelation.

"The question accordingly came to be not merely what is laid down in Scripture, but what in all points is fair and conformable, 'behaveful and beautiful', in harmony with the consecrated usages of history and the exercise and development of the Christian consciousness in the Church." ¹

In 1588 Bishop Bancroft had preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross proclaiming for the first time the "Divine right of episcopacy."

At that time even the prelates and the queen were inclined to feel that he had gone too far. Now Hooker was laying for the claim a systematic foundation. The "Divine right of presbyteries" had been met by a counter-doctrine, "the Divine right of episcopacy."

Hooker had outflanked the Puritans and carried the argument into a realm where they were unwilling and perhaps unable to follow. But to say, as some Anglican writers have done, that he refuted the Puritan position is to exaggerate. Such writers err in assuming that the position of the Puritan party was identical with that of Cartwright and the Admonitions. Presbyterianism had never been more than a part, though the most noteworthy and progressive part, of the larger Puritan movement. That movement however dead Presbyterianism might be, was scarcely under way at this time. In view of the subsequent history of Puritanism, the claims of such writers as Dean Church are somewhat premature. The main significance of Hooker's work, in the last analysis, has not been its effect on Puritanism but on the Anglican Church itself.

The second important event, to which we may

1. Gregory, p. 112, quotes Dean Church's Introduction to Book 1 of the Ecclesiastical Polity.
refer only briefly, was the appearance of Whitgift's Lambeth Articles. These Articles, nine in number, were set forth as the answer to the appearance of an anti-Calvinistic tendency in the University of Cambridge. There, in 1595, William Barrett, preached a sermon for his B.D. degree. In the course of this sermon he attacked the doctrines of assurance and indefectible grace, both of which, of course, are among the central tenets of Calvinism. This caused the Archbishop some concern, and he promptly adopted a set of Statements drawn up by Whitaker, stating clearly the Calvinistic doctrines of predestination, assurance, reprobation, etc. Peter Baro, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, disagreed with this dogmatic stand for Calvinism and was eventually forced to resign. He was supported in his views, however, by some of the leading thinkers among the younger churchmen, such as Overall and Andrews. The queen herself did not approve of this action, so the Articles were not maintained as the authoritative and official statement of the Church.

The truth is that, while Calvinism had been the

1. Concio ad Clerum.
private, unofficially accepted system of most English Protestants, it had never been fully applied in the official Church Articles. The Puritans had been Calvinistic without exception, and this had so far been one bond they held in common with the leaders of the episcopacy. Unobtrusively, however, some of the more advanced thinkers of the non-Puritan school, were seeking about for a theology less drastically exclusive and less narrowly dogmatic. This they had found in teachings which were beginning to make a more or less timid appearance in Holland. This system, which soon took the name of Arminianism from its leading exponent, attracted to a certain extent some of the best minds in England. Hooker, among others, tended to deprecate the rigid dogmatism of Calvinism and to welcome a more latitudinarian system.

This gradually widening split in the doctrinal position of the Anglican Church was destined, in the following two reigns, to leave Puritanism the almost exclusive possessor of the Calvinistic system, both of polity and of doctrine. Even the unifying force of a common theology was taken away, leaving Puritanism in general to take the road toward Independency. Thus, while Elizabeth and Whitgift might well have felt that their victory over Puritanism was final,

they were mistaken. Nonconformity had been temporarily suppressed but by no means annihilated. In silence the Puritans awaited the day when James of Scotland, nourished and trained in Presbyterianism, should come to champion their cause. When Elizabeth died in 1603, she bequeathed to her successor a united and flourishing kingdom. She left him also, among other problems, the Puritan question still unsettled. Cartwright and his cohorts had left the stage, but the movement and the spirit of which they were only a manifestation was destined to bring about in England a new era in its political as well as its spiritual history.
CHAPTER FIVE

LIFE OF HENRY SMITH

Having observed the trend and character of English Puritanism in its earlier stages, we come now to consider a man in whose life and writings the spirit of that Puritanism is apotheosized. Henry Smith was not a leader in the movement in the sense that Cartwright, Travers, and Field were leaders, but his part was, nonetheless, an important and influential one. While he published no great treatises in support of Presbyterianism as did the others whom we have mentioned, he was one of that army of preachers who, preserving an attitude of more or less inconspicuous nonconformity, gave power and substance to the movement. Having studied the historical aspects of Elizabethan Puritanism, we are in a position to understand the man, and conversely, in so doing we may better appreciate the movement itself.

It is unfortunate for our purpose that so little biographical material bearing on Smith is available. Thomas Fuller, who collected and edited Smith's sermons in 1656-1657, prefixed to them a brief sketch of the author's life, and in the preface to this later edition, the editor adds a few facts arising from his own research. To this scanty array of information we have been able to add but little, although that little is not without its importance. In all, however, the biography of this once-famous man

1. 1867 edition; Thomas Smith, editor.
covers not more than a few pages. Such facts as there are, we set forth briefly as a necessary background for our examination of his works.

Henry Smith was born at Withcote (Leicestershire) in 1560, the eldest son of Erasmus Smith. The family were evidently in affluent circumstances, for Henry's grandfather had been known as the "Lord of Withcote", and his material uncle, Bryant Cave, was High Sheriff of the county. Ambrose Smith, his father's brother, had made a fortune in the silk-trade in London, and Erasmus himself was the master of Withcote Hall. Son and heir, therefore, of a comfortably wealthy country squire, Henry enjoyed from the start advantages which had much to do, probably, with placing him high among the eminent preachers of the sixteenth century. Perhaps the greatest of these advantages was the fact that his father married a second time, and Henry thus became the step-son of Margaret Cecil, sister of Lord Burleigh. This relationship was to stand him in good stead during his career in London.

Concerning Smith's education we know very little beyond the fact that he studied at Oxford for several years. Wood's "Athenae Oxoniensis" states that "Henry Smith, son of Erasmus Smith of Bosworth was matriculated as a member of Lincoln col. in 1575, thus: 'Henricus Smith, Leicestere-

1. vol. 1, p. 603 et seq.
2. More commonly known as Husband's Bosworth, evidently the village of which Withcote was the chief manor.
ensiis generosus, aetat 15.' What stay he made in the same house, or whether he was the same Hen. Smith who received the benefaction of Jno. Claymond, in Bras. col., an. 1574, or took the degree of batchelor of arts, it appeareth not. . . ."

Brook, in his "Lives of the Puritans", states that two years earlier Smith had been admitted to Queen's College, Cambridge, as a Fellow Commoner, but had not actually matriculated. Instead, it appears, he was tutored privately by Richard Greenham, Puritan minister at Dry Drayton, a village not far from Cambridge. The authority for the Cambridge episode is vague, and it is possible that Brook has confused this period under Greenham with a later period when it is definitely known that Smith was studying with this man. However that may be, he was attracted to Oxford and there pursued his studies for the new few years. Strype remarks that: "...he was bred for a little while in Oxford; but desiring to spend a little more time there, his father would not yield him his suit."

Another explanation for this interruption is that young Henry was offered some sort of ecclesiastical employment—probably at Market Bosworth, near his home. At any rate, we find him there in 1582, dealing in an official capacity with one, Robert Dickens, a partially demented

1. P. 108.
2. Strype's Life of Aylmer; p. 100.
young religious imposter. Dickens had claimed to have had "visions" in which angels appeared to him, hailing him as "Elias", and giving him the gift of prophecy. The wild prophecies which he thereupon proceeded to proclaim among the local peasants aroused so much excitement that the Lord Justices of the county, acting on the recommendation of Bryant Cave, the High Sheriff, requested Smith to interrogate the "new Elias". This he did, in such relentless and thorough fashion that he soon demolished the imposter's claims and reduced him to terrified recantation. Indeed it is hardly to be wondered at, for, young as he himself was, Smith's fiery denunciation, including a promise of the rack and stake in this world and eternal torment in the next, must have sounded in the ears of the trembling, brain-warped young peasant like the voice of doom. In an age in which both the learned and the ignorant feared witchcraft and anything smacking of traffic with the powers of darkness, such claims as those of Dickens could not go unnoticed. To us the energy and indignation expended on this rustic visionary may seem absurdly out of proportion, but to Smith and the stern-faced judges seated around him, the whole matter was of the most vital importance. Hence, both in Fuller's chronicle of his life and in the list of his own sermons, this episode, Smith's first public appearance, receives prominent mention.

1. Appended to this chapter is a list of the questions asked of Dickens by Smith.
Whether he returned to Oxford after this or not is a matter of some debate. Wood insists that he did return, and took his M.A. in 1583 at Hart-Hall. As it happens, two Henry Smiths took this degree at Hart-Hall in that year, and our author may quite possibly have been one of them. Against this Strype argues that Smith never used the title, M.A., in the written introductions to various of his sermons and is never spoken of as "Master" Henry Smith, as was usually done in the case of those who had received the degree.

However this may be, shortly after 1583 Smith resumed his studies under the guidance of Richard Greenham. This man is worth noting, not only for his connection with Smith but for his own sake. He was well-known both in Cambridge and in London for his scholarship and also for his vigorous partisanship in behalf of the Puritan cause. His name appears repeatedly along with those of such prominent leaders as Cartwright, Field, Travers, and Knewstubbs. He was one of the signers of the articles of the Warwickshire Synod, the offense for which Cartwright had been imprisoned. For some reason, however, he was comparatively unmolested by Whitgift's crusade against the Nonconformists. By a curious coincidence, it was Greenham who, according to Fuller, knew, and to some extent

1. op. cit., vol. 1, p. 603.
2. The editor, Thos. Smith, argues that the title, "Mr." commonly denoted the possession of an M.A.
3. vide supra, p. 102.
influenced the young Lancelot Andrewes at Cambridge. On the other extreme, Robert Browne, soon to become the leader of the Separatist party, studied under Greenham and took from him an evanescent, short-lived taste for Presbyterianism.

There can be no doubt that this association with Greenham was largely responsible for Smith's own development in the paths of Puritanism. Indeed, it would have been remarkable if such had not been the case, for, in the first place, the very fact of his having been sent to study under such a "notorious" Puritan argues that Erasmus Smith himself was in some measure of sympathy with what Greenham represented. It seems altogether probable that the young scholar had early absorbed his Puritan tendencies from his father and his uncles. The movement which had attracted so many of the merchants and burgesses of London was also finding a favorable reception among the rural gentry—the squires and land-owners, and the village and county magistrates. Especially was this true in the southern and eastern counties. As a boy of twelve Smith must have heard much discussion around his father's table of the Admonitions to Parliament and the teachings of Cartwright. It was probably Greenham's reputation for Puritanism, then, quite as much as his renown as a scholar which caused Erasmus Smith to entrust Henry to his teaching.

During this period, 1583-1587, we are told nothing further about Smith's activities. There is indeed one mention of a Henry Smith, parson at Solihall in Warwickshire, in 1586. In this year the Puritans, complaining of the ignorance and ungodliness of so many of the clergy, drew up extensive lists of the clergy in several of the larger counties and "hundreds". Thus in the list of Warwickshire we find the following:

"Solihall: Henry Smith, pa.; dombe and unlearned, a tainted parson of life and suspected of drunkenness, he hat 2 benefices, one about Carlile, 10 £ (pounds), this at Solihall, 100 £."

Obviously this refers to some other Henry Smith, possibly one of the two already mentioned. During these years it is almost certain that our author engaged in no regular ecclesiastical employment at all. Whitgift's Test Articles, let us remember, were at this juncture, making it almost impossible for anyone with Puritan leanings to secure a church-living. However, in 1587 Henry Smith applied for the post of "lecturer" at St. Clement Danes in London. This post was in the gift of Burleigh, whose sister, as we have said, had recently married Henry's father. The Lord Treasurer was too much the diplomat to seem openly to favor his young kinsman, so he wrote to Greenham for references. The latter replied tactfully:

2. *Vide supra* p. 113.
'That he would not speak of his (Smith's) human literature, whereof he supposed Smith himself had given him (the Lord Treasurer) some small token, (he meant, I suppose, by a sermon preached before him) but he had perceived him to have been well exercised in the holy Scriptures, religious and devout in mind, moderate and sober in opinions and affections, discreet and temperate in his behaviour, industrious in his studies and affairs, and, as he hoped, of a humble and upright heart, joined with a fervent zeal for the glory of God and the health of souls. Which mixture God's gifts put him in hopes that God might hereafter be much glorified in him, especially if he might have tarried in the University until his gifts were grown, into some more maturity. In which particular, he added, he had earnestly dealt with him unto the same end (and so had the Lord Treasurer) but he still answered that he could not obtain that favour of his father.'

In short, he was permitted to read (that is to preach a lecture) at St. Clement's, where one Harwood was now parson." 1

The custom of occupying a lectureship was popular among those of the clergy who wished to preach but refused to subscribe to the Articles. Unwilling to dispense the sacraments according to the prescribed form of ritual, or debarred from a living by reason of their rejection of the hated vestments, many of the Puritan preachers secured posts as lecturers. In this way they escaped the invidious responsibility of complying with the full letter of the law and at the same time were able to pursue their calling and to earn a living for themselves and their families. Inasmuch as the incumbent parsons, being a "conformist", was apt to preach but seldom, many congregations were eager enough for regular preaching to support a lecturer by voluntary contribution. Such was the case at St. Clement's Danes. 2

1. op. cit. Strype: p. 100.
2. For Barrowe's denunciation of the lecturers, see Powicke: A. Henry Barrow Separatist; p. 147
Even as a lecturer, however, Smith was not entirely protected from the close scrutiny of the ecclesiastical authorities. His very popularity, which all his biographers assure us was great from the beginning of his ministry, no doubt served to bring him under the watchful eye and suspicion of John Aylmer, Bishop of London. Certain people in the congregation "whose theology was more scrupulous than either their charity or, indeed, their common sense," reported him to the bishop for nonconformity. Aylmer, a man fully as zealous as Whitgift in ferreting out and punishing any signs of disloyalty to the Establishment, proceeded immediately to suspend the young lecturer of St. Clement's.

The charges on which he was suspended and his replies to them Smith took the precaution of copying and sending to his patron, Burleigh. The document, according to Strype, is as follows.

"Reasons objected and alleged by the Bishop of London against Henry Smith, preacher of St. Clement's-without-Temple Bar, as causes for which he hath proceeded to the suspension of the said Henry Smith from the exercise of his ministry.

1) That I was chosen by a popular election, as His Lordship termeth it, that is, by the minister and congregation, without his Lordship's license.

2) That I have preached against the Book of Common Prayer.

3) That I have not yielded my subscription to certain articles which his Lordship required at my hands.

MY ANSWER TO THE SAME.

'First, touching my calling hither, I was recommended to the parish by certain godly preachers which had heard me preach in other places in this city; and thereupon accepted by the

1. A.W. Fox: A Book of Bachelors; p. 99
2. op. cit., pp. 101, 102.
parish, and entertained with a stipend raised by voluntary contributions, in which sort they had heretofore entertained others without any such question or exception. Secondly his Lordship, calling me to preach at Paul's Cross, never moved any such question to me. Nevertheless, if any error have been committed herein either by me or by the parish, through ignorance, our joint desire is to have his Lordship's good allowance and approbation for the exercise of my function in his Lordship's diocese.

Touching the second, however His Lordship hath been informed against me, I never used speech in any of my sermons against the said Book of Common Prayer; whereof the parish doth bear me witness in this supplication to your Lordship.

Concerning the third, I refuse not to subscribe to any articles which the law of the realm does require of men of my calling; acknowledging with all humbleness and loyalty Her Majesty's sovereignty in all causes and over all persons in Her Majesty's dominions; and yielding my full consent to all the articles of faith and doctrine taught and ratified in this church, according to a statute in that behalf provided, the thirteenth year of Her Majesty's reign. And therefore I beseech his Lordship not to urge upon me any other subscription than the law of God and the laws positive of the realm do require."

The cautious and defensive tone of his reply to the third charge would indicate that Smith was almost certainly guilty on that point at least. Many ministers had been deprived or suspended on far slighter grounds. Others had gone to prison for refusing, as Smith did here, a blanket subscription to all the Thirty-Nine Articles. It was not at all unusual for a suspected Puritan to be charged with some trivial infraction of the Act of Uniformity in order that he might be embroiled with the oath "ex officio". But it was decidedly unusual for such men as Smith to escape unscathed from the clutches of the ecclesiastical commissioners. Smith's
popularity alone could not have saved him. Travers, at the nearby Temple, had found out not long since that Aylmer and Whitgift cared nothing for popularity unless there was also complete conformity. We can assume only that Burleigh's protecting arm had been stretched over his young kinsman, as it had been extended in behalf of another, Robert Browne. While there had for some time been coldness between Burleigh and the archbishop and his metropolitan, the aging statesman's power was greater than ever. Hence it was that the bishop was "satisfied" concerning Smith, and the suspension was lifted after a period of two or three months.

His lectures, as Wood's account puts it, came to be "much frequented by the puritanical party... (he) was by them esteemed (as he was by the generality) the prime preacher of the nation, which his sermons, taken into the hands of all people, did shew. ...." Fuller, with his usual flair for colorful narrative, says:

"He was commonly called the Silver-tongued preacher, and that is but one metal below St. Chrysostom himself. His church was so crowded with auditors, that persons of good quality brought their own pews with them, I mean their legs, to stand thereupon in the alleys. Their ears did so attend to his lips; their hearts to their ears, that he held the rudder of their affections in his hands, so that he could steer them whither he was pleased; and he was pleased to steer them only to God's glory and their own good."

The congregation, moreover, was not entirely composed of "persons of quality". A petition presented to Burleigh

1. op..cit.., vol. 1, p. 603.
2. Introduction to Smith's sermons, p. ix.
in 1589 by the parishioners, signed "with the hands of divers of St. Clement's and Lion's Inns, and the two churchwardens, the one a grocer, the other a locksmith, and a good number besides of ordinary tradesmen, as smiths, tailors, saddlers, hoziers, glaziers, cutlers, and such like, most of them setting their marks." The occasion of this petition was the illness of Harwood, the rector. Seeing that the latter was obviously on his death-bed, the parishioners requested Burleigh to present the living to Smith, thus relieving them of the burden of his stipend and at the same time providing them with a pastor whose "preaching, living, and sound doctrine, had done more good among them than any that had gone before, or, they doubted, should come after."  

It seems, notwithstanding this rather blunt but enthusiastic petition, that Smith either was not offered the post—which is probably the case—or being offered it, could not accept it, for the reasons already mentioned. He was still a non-subscriber, and even Burleigh dared not prefer him to the post when such action would inevitably embroil both him and his protegé in a losing fight with Aylmer and Whitgift. When Harwood died, Richard Webster, formerly a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, became rector, and Smith continued as lecturer until 1590.  

During these years at St. Clement's Smith became involved in the Presbyterian movement. Curiously enough, Strype,

1. Strype, op. cit.; pp. 102, 103.  
2. ibid. p. 103.
Fuller, and the other biographers of Smith, have failed to note any such activity on his part, leaving the reader to infer that his sympathy with the movement went no further than a occasional utterance from the pulpit. This avoidance of the "synods" and "classes" would seem rather puzzling in view of his known opinions and his eminence among the Puritan ministers of London. It would argue a degree of discretion or, to put it more bluntly, of timidity on his part oddly at variance with the boldness of these same utterances.

It is, in a way, reassuring, therefore, to find that Smith actually took part in the meetings of the classes. Usher, who has compiled a partial list of the Puritan clergy who were known to be on the rolls of various of the classes, mentions one, "Henry Smith, Lecturer in 1587 at St. Clement's without Temple Bar, and a friend of Richard Greenham's." Since most of Usher's material was gathered from Bishop Bancroft's survey of the Presbyterian movement it seems not unlikely that even at the time Smith's participation in the London synod-meetings was known to the leaders of the Establishment. If this was the case, it becomes even more obvious that it would have been impossible for Smith to aspire to the rectorship. Under the circumstances, the fact that he was allowed to continue even as lecturer is an added testimony to the

1. vide supra, ch. 4, p. 84.
2. Roland G. Usher: The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Usher does not indicate in which classeis Smith was a member, but it seems logical to assume that it was that in London.
efficacy of Burleigh's influence. Even at that his part cannot have been a very prominent one, for in such a case not even the Lord Treasurer's power would have been of any avail against the wrath of Aylmer. In all likelihood Smith had not time, during his short career in London, to attain to a leading role among the older and more seasoned Presbyterians.

In the spring of 1590 the development of some fatal malady—consumption, if we may accept the traditional account—forced Smith to retire. Realizing that he had not long to live, he withdrew to Husband's Bosworth. There he spent his last months in preparing his sermons for publication. The effort and devotion which this task involved appears in the short dedicatory epistles which he appended to several of the sermons. "Now labour for thyself as I have laboured for thee: I would have thee profit somewhat more by this book, because it hath weakened me more than all the rest." In the preface to the Examination of Usury, he remarks "If I could take but this one weed out of the Londoner's garden, I were answered for my health and my strength spent amongst them."

There is some disagreement among the biographers as to the date of Smith's death. Fuller, in his Life of Mr. Henry Smith tells us that he was assured by Roger Smith, Henry's

1. These were addressed largely to his old congregation at St. Clement's.
2. Epistle To The Treatise Of The Lord's Supper; vol. 1
brother, that the latter died in 1601. Wood, on the other hand, says, "...this person was in very great renown among men in fifteen hundred ninety-three, in which year, if I mistake not, he died, aged thirty-four, but where he was buried, the register of St. Clement's before-mentioned, tells us not; for his brother, who lived to about the time of the restoration of King Charles 2, did assure my friend that he retired for health's sake out of the said parish, and died in another more remote."

Roger Smith, seemingly, was somewhat vague in his recollections of his older brother. Fortunately we have more definite evidence as to the date. Thomas Nash, in his *Piers Pennilesse: His Supplication to the Diuell* (1592), wrote an "encomium Henrici Smithi"; "Silver-tongued Smith whose well-tuned style hath made they death the general tears of the muses...." Even more definite is this entry in the Parish Registers of Husband's Bosworth; "Anno 1591. Henricus Smith, Theologus, filius Erasmi Smyth, armageri, sepult. fuit; 4 to die Julii."

In addition to the fifty-three sermons left to us, Smith wrote a treatise which, during his lifetime and for many years afterward, was one of the most popular works among the apologetic literature of English Protestantism; entitled *God's Arrow Against Atheism and Irreligion*, it

---

1. op. cit., vol. 1, p. 605.
2. vide Introduction to Smith's sermons, Vol. 1.
3. cf. A. W. Fox; op. cit. p. 100, no. 2.
represents the only attempt of Smith, as far as we know, in the field of written controversy.

Of the poetry which Nash praises so highly there are only a few remnants, and those have been translated from the Latin by Joshua Sylvester, the first editor of Smith's works. If the translation does them justice, which is doubtful, the loss to the realm of poetry caused by the author's death was not very great. It is in his sermons and the one or two written prayers which are found in the later editions of his works, and to some extent in the once-famous God's Arrow that we find Smith's contribution to the enrichment of religious literature and history.

1. This treatise will be discussed more fully in the ensuing chapters.
Questions put by Henry Smith to Robert Dickens.

Whether you are sure you shall live these three years, because you say, after three years you must preach?

Whether may a man expect visions from God, because you say, for these three years you are to look for more visions?

Whether shall you be able at any time to interpret the truths of the Scripture in all places without error, better than all the Doctors?

One of your sentences saith, you shall live chaste in wedlock: when must you take a wife? and why should you not rather continue single?

Whether there hath been neither pestilence, nor dearth nor war nor earthquake in your country for five years, nor shall be any time of your continuance there, because the Angel so promised? Is this more than ever was granted to Christ?

What Bible or translation mean you when you say, this Bible is truly translated?

Whether it be necessary to salvation to believe all the Creed?

Whether any man, since the Apostles, did stand so right in the whole doctrine of the Scripture, that he did hold and believe the true interpretation of all the words and sayings throughall the Prophets, and Apostles in all the Bible?

Whether predestination, election, etc. are to be preached unto lay men? What free-will had Adam, and what free-will remaineth unto us?

What Scriptures are canonical, and which are not canonical?

Whether a man may marry his child with a Papist or other heretic, hoping to convert him?

Whether Ministers should have livings or stipends?

Whether in some cases, a Minister may not be a non-resident?

Whether heretics, living to themselves, without corrupting others, are to be punished with death?
Whether Satan knoweth the inward thoughts, further than by the outward habit of the body, and whether he can read and say, "Verbum caro factum est"?

Whether Christ was, or is, or shall be known and preached unto all nations of the world?

Where is hell? and what shall be the manner of punishment there to the reprobate?

What think you of the Antipodes, and those monstrous people which live in Asia, and of monsters in general?

What think you of that saying of Christ, this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise? what kind of place is this; and where; and to what purpose now it serveth, and whether it was a material Apple that Adam did eat?

How esteem you of Astronomy, Physiognomie, Palmistry, casting of a figure, of music in the Church, etc.?

What think you of our common prayer book & Litany?

What esteem you of Fairies, Hobgoblins, etc. Whether their money be true, or how they have it?

Whether should one, meaning to be a preacher, first study the Arts, or else study nothing but divinity, as you have done?

Whether the font, surplice, caps, tippets, bells, holidays, fasting-days, and such-like ceremonies, are better observed or omitted?

Whether they which are called Protestants, or those whom we call Puritans, be of the purest religion, and most reformed unto the primitive Church?

What is meant by the prison in Peter, whether Christ descended in spirit?

Whether our joys in heaven shall be, to all equal, and the torments in hell, to every one alike? and whether we shall see, and know one another?

Where was the soul of Lazarus while his body was in the grave?

Whether Elizeus cursing the little children did not sin?
At what age and stature shall all rise in the resurrection? and whether the wounds and scars shall remain in our bodies glorified?

What think yet of the Scribes in the third of Mark, that said Christ had an unclean spirit, and casted out devils by Belzebub, did they not sin against the holy Ghost?

Whether images be in no respect tolerable, and whether a man, remembering Christ by seeing the Cross, doth sin?

Which is the greatest sin that reigneth in England?

How is the soul created in man, and when it cometh, how, or in what parts is it placed in the body?

In what estate shall the Sun, and Moon, the heavens and elements be after the last day, when there shall be no creature upon earth?

What think you of plays, and representing divine matters, as in pageants?

Whether all things amongst the faithful Christians ought to be in common, Acts, 4:32?

What do you think concerning the bishoping of children?

What city is described of John in the seventeenth of his Revelation?

Whether did the Apostled know sufficiently their salvation before Christ died and rose again?

Answer to every point, or yield.

Henry Smith of Husband's Boreswell (Bosworth) at the commandment of the right Worshipful his Uncle, Master Brian Cave, high Sheriff of Leister-shire.
CHAPTER SIX.
SMITH, CHURCHMAN AND PRESBYTERIAN.

The controversy between Cartwright and Robert Browne at Middleburgh illustrates one of the salient features of sixteenth century Puritanism, namely that while it attacked the prelatic government of the Established Church, this Puritanism regarded itself as being inseparable from the Church. This characteristic is strikingly apparent in the sermons of Henry Smith. He was both a Churchman and a Presbyterian, a combination which, in the type of Puritanism which developed under the Stuarts, would have been almost impossibly paradoxical. It was a combination which permitted him almost simultaneously to attack the errors of the Church and to defend that Church, in terms fully as impassioned, from the Separatists.

Here, for example, speaks Smith the Presbyterian.

"Yet shall I say that we have not the show of error?... If Paul would have us abstain from every appearance of evil, sure, he would have us abstain from heresy and idolatry, for these are the greatest of evils. But if we be not idolaters, yet we have the show of idolatry. If we be not of antichrist's religion, yet we are of antichrist fashion, so long as we have the same orders and the same titles that antichrist knoweth his ministers by. It is said that the serpent's sting is in her tail, and so it seems; for this tail of antichrist (which the pope hath left behind him like an evil savour) is unto us as the remnant of the Canaanites were unto the Jews. They should have expelled the Canaanites, ... so we should have expelled the head and tail of antichrist; but because we did not, therefore the remnants of popery are goads in our sides and pricks in our eyes, that we cannot yet be quiet for them. Therefore let us pray that he which hath taken away the evil, will take away the show of evil too." 2

1. vide supra, pp;92-96.
These are which rival those of Bishop Hooper or the fierce Anthony Gilby or Cartwright himself.

As a fledgling preacher, he had derisively pounced upon one of Robert Dickens' statements in praise of the English Church.

"You avouch that religion is most sincerely professed and thoroughly purged from ceremonies in England; now I would that Elias were not a false prophet. But here I descry that Elias the prophet knoweth not what is done beyond the seas. No, Elias, Geneva is yet to learn of England. I would that all the wisdom of Elias could move England to learn of her sister, Geneva; then we should have more religion and less ceremonies. ...Is it come to pass that England is before Geneva in sincere profession? We see, also, it is not so."

Several years later, in London, we find him attacking diocesan episcopacy in more direct fashion. His acquaintance with Greenham and his experience in the London classis, we see, had not altered his opinion on the matter.

Speaking of the Bishops, archdeacons, etc., he says indignantly:

"If they were worthy to be called, as other, pastors, doctors, and teachers, we would give them those titles. They which give them more than the Lord gives them, make them proud, insolent, and tyrannous. ...But for these usurped titles and base-born honours which they have encroached from men...they would have intended the duty of ministers and teachers as the apostles did; whereas now they are so cumbered and mingled with their usurping over princes, that they are neither good ministers or good magistrates, but linsey-wolsey, a mingle-mangle between both, nay, utterly fallen from both, being no shepherds but wolves...who, seeking a superfluous title, they have forgotten all necessary duties, ...for they never preach or write but to maintain their kingdom. ...Therefore, as Naomi said, 'Call me no more Naomi', so they may say, 'Call us no more bishops, pastors, or doctors, or preachers, but call us robbers, and sleepers and giants, and pharisees, whom we succeed'. For why should they be called bishops, which do not watch; or

pastors, which do not feed; or doctors, which do not teach; ... except this reason: the idols were called gods, though they were unlike God." (1)

These are strong words—The Admonitions themselves used no stronger—but they fairly represent the views of the Presbyterian party, and, indeed, of the vast majority of the Puritan party as a whole. Taken alone they might seem to indicate that Smith was opposed to even the slightest form of compromise with the "robbers", "sleepers", and "giants". Such a conclusion, of course, would be far from the actual fact. Although they engaged in the meetings and exercises of the synods and classes, he and Cartwright and the other Presbyterians were unanimous in the belief that reform must come about through the agency of the magistrates and even of the bishops themselves. However much the Church might be in error through its clinging to popish ceremonies and offices, it was established by law and was a true Church. Until the law abolished the rank and function of "Lord Bishop", therefore, neither Smith nor any of the leaders of the Presbyterian movement would go so far as to deny recognition to the authority of the bishops.

Indeed, in common with Cartwright and Travers he preferred to temporize with these "evils" rather than be deprived of his post, thus leaving his flock untended. This is seen clearly in his conduct at the time of his suspension by Aylmer.

2. Here he and Cartwright, together with the large majority of the Puritans, disagreed with Gilby, Field, Crane, and the other extremists.
Even the extremists, however, be it noted, deprived or not, recognized the power of the bishops. What is more, they appealed to that power even while attacking its right to exist. We find them, therefore, in the hopeless position of urging that power to abolish itself. It was because they recognized that this was hopeless that they attempted at the same time to move Parliament to their aid. In other words, as Browne scornfully put it, they believed in "tarrying for the magistrates". For this reason Smith could, in all sincerity and with perfect consistency, in his own opinion, attack the bishops in such terms as those quoted above, and yet remark, equally scathingly:

"Some there are which are so nice that they had rather pine than take their food of any which is licensed by a bishop, as if Elias should refuse his food because a raven brought it to him and not an angel." (l)

So also he could humbly ask Aylmer for permission to preach, while at the same time attending the classes, whose purpose it was to procure the abolishment of Aylmer's power to grant such requests.

It was just this willingness to temporize with the bishops that drew a tirade from Henry Barrow, the successor to Browne in the leadership of the Separatists. As Powicke says,

"Barrow outdid the bishops. Whenever he speaks of the 'preachers', his language is scathing. They seem to him alike dishonorable and dangerous. As men who expect payment for preaching, they are 'stipendiary, mercenary men', ... as masters of 'ambiguous and doubtful terms', in order to reconcile their 'reformist' tendencies with their acceptance of the Prayer Book, they are 'pernicious"

deceivers', ...as railers, with the bishops, at Christ's most faithful servants, 'slanderously called Brownists', they are the greatest hinderers of Christ's Kingdom.' (1)

For Separatists and schismatics, such as Browne, Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry, Smith had nothing but condemnation. This, equally with his Presbyterianism, marks him as an authentic sixteenth-century Puritan. Like Cartwright, he had a deep and abiding Church-sense, or, to put it more clearly, perhaps, he had a feeling for the catholicity of the Church of England. Hence, he and his fellow Presbyterians might well be called "railers with the bishops" at the seceders, for the hostility of Whitgift himself toward these "anabaptists, the Brownists" was not more pronounced than that of these early Presbyterians.

While Browne, decrying the iniquities of the English Church, upheld the lawfulness and even the advisability of separating from it, nevertheless admitted that communion with it might be consistent with true Christianity. Barrow, his successor in the leadership went further. He denied that it was a true Church and asserted in plain words that it was the duty of every true Christian to separate from it.2 This consideration, that separation was necessary or even lawful, was the factor which sets the Separatists and Congregationalists of Elizabeth's reign entirely apart from the Puritans, in whose ranks they had, for the most part, had their beginning. The

2. vide Burrage: Early English Dissenters, p. 130.
Puritans believed as firmly as did Elizabeth herself in the necessity of having one Church in England. They had not thought of setting up the Presbytery as a rival to Episcopacy, nor had they any illusion that the Presbyterian system could endure permanently within the existing framework. It was to be all one way or the other. Whichever system was ultimately adopted, however, the Church was still the Church, and to separate from its communion was to commit the sin against the Holy Ghost. So, in effect, Cartwright had told Browne at Middleburg. So Smith proclaimed in the concluding chapter of God's Arrow Against Atheism and Irreligion.

"Others there be who, for that in so long time they cannot see their desired discipline and church government to be established, run from our church, and make a schism and a separation from us, erecting discipline by their own authority, condemning our church to be no church, that they may make their detestable schism more allowable. These are the Brownists and Barrowists, who will not stay the chief magistrate's pleasure for the establishing thereof. But they... and you must understand, that a church may be and is, though it have neither elders, nor deacons, nor discipline in it; ...Inasmuch, therefore, as we have the preaching of God's holy word and the right administration of the sacraments, which be the essential marks of the true church, none ought to forsake our church for any other defect or corruptions."

Smith goes on to admit that there is some truth in the Separatist's charge that ministers in the English Church are not "truly created" (i.e. by congregational election and ordination by Presbytery), but, he argues:

"...will they therefore count they be no ministers? By as good an argument they may say, that he that is born into

1. vide supra., p. 93.
the world, not according to the right course or order of nature, but otherwise, (as by ripping of his mother’s belly) is no man, for one cometh unorderly into the world, as the other doth into the Church. I am sure the corrupt ordination of a minister doth not prove him to be no minister, neither doth any other corruption in our Church take away the life and being of a Church: ...They say we do not only want the right discipline, but we have also put a wrong discipline in place thereof. But what of this? The error, then, I confess, is great, but yet not such as doth make a nullity of our Church, so long as it holdeth Christ Jesus the life and soul of the Church, and is ready to reform her error whenever by good proof it shall be manifested unto her. In the meantime, their argument is nothing worth: for if a man lose a leg or arm, yet none will deny him to be a man for all this blemish or defect; yea, though he put a wooden leg instead of his leg which he wanteth, yet he remaineth a man still, because his principal parts remain. So, though we want that right discipline, yet we have the principal parts of the Church, namely the right preaching of the word of God and administration of the sacraments, and therefore a true Church of God undoubtedly. And if we have a true Church, though not a perfect Church, let the Brownists and Barrowists consider from whence they are fallen; for if the Church of Christ be the body of Christ, as St. Paul affirmeth, what do they by their separation and schism rent themselves from the body of Christ? And let them then remember whose members they be until they be reunited. .......

I therefore wish them to cease their slander against this Church, and to cease from their damnable schism, and to be reconciled to that Church from which they have foolishly departed; for how imperfect a Church soever it be—whose imperfections God cure in his good time—yet shall they never be able to show but that the Church of England is the true Church, from which it is utterly unlawful to make a schism.” (1)

It must be admitted, in justice to the Separatists, that there was more behind their secession a merely negative dissatisfaction with the discipline of the Established Church.

Troeltsch has drawn a valid distinction between the "sect-type" of ecclesiology and the "Church-type". The former, of which the Elizabethan Separatists were an example, regarded the Church as any "company or number of Christians or believers, which, by a willing covenant made with their God, are under the government of God and Christ, and keep his laws in one holy communion." There is no organic connection with other local congregations beyond that which is involved in mutual consultation. Above all, the Church is composed exclusively of true believers, Christians whose professions and lives show them unmistakably to be filled with saving grace.

The "Church-type", on the other hand, believes firmly in one, all-embracing body (for each nation, of course) with a centralized authority which administers a uniform discipline among all the local congregations. To this type the Presbyterian has always belonged. His central authority is the General Assembly or National Synod instead of the Bishop or Archbishop. Henry Martyn Dexter, in his book on Congregationalism has expressed the sectarian view of this type of Church by saying, "Their (Presbyterian) theory of the church was as unsuited to any genuine and thorough reform as it was unscriptural in essence, because it included the entire baptized population, 

1. vide passim, his Social Teachings of the Christian Churches.
3. The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years... p. 57
trusting to church-discipline to raise the general life to the Gospel level, ...and because, although vaguely, it so constituted from within an organic unity between the different local sections, and so bound them together with the State-bonds; from without, that no one portion could lift itself toward a purer development until all the other portions were ready to be exalted with it."

In other words, the Dissenters, the sect-type, were opposing a sort of individual mysticism to a deep-rooted principle of power through unity. They claimed their authority in the example of the apostolic churches, which were local congregations, locally governed. The Church-type, on the other hand, insists that the Pauline doctrine of the visible Church as representing the body of Christ, enjoins communion with that Church upon all Christians. As we have seen, in Smith's view to create a schism with this Church is literally equivalent to tearing away from the body of Christ. To the horrified eyes of Smith and the other Presbyterians—in fact of all who belonged to the Church-type—Separatism was nothing less than ecclesiastical anarchy. Again he demands:

"Hath it not the show of error, to retain an opinion which the author himself hath recanted (1)? as though ye would suck up that which the dog hath vomitted? ...Hath it not the show of error to affirm that we have not Church, and yet to grant that our martyrs which died in Popery, were true members of the Church? Hath it not the show of error to affirm that two or three may excommunicate all the rest without a minister, seeing the Pastor is the mouth of the Church? Hath it not the show of error to affirm that the Church of Christ was ever invisible before this age, and

---

1. This refers, of course, to Browne's submission to the Church of England (vide supra, p. 94)
that it is such a small flock as their number is, and that it hath set foot nowhere but in England? Hath it not the show of error to hold that for good and sound religion, which is altered every day, adding and detracting, as though a man should make a religion of his own invention, so fast as new conceits come into his brain?..." 1

Hence it was inevitable that Smith, even when suspended by the authority of the Anglican Church, would recognize no other Church in England than that one. His "Church-sense" governed his thinking to such an extent that incomparably his anxiety for a more correct discipline becomes of secondary importance. In the heat of his defence of the Church, he could say, as we have read above, "...a Church may be and is, though it have neither elders, nor deacons, nor discipline in it." In a later portion of the same discourse, he states:

"For this desired discipline is not an essential part of the Church; for it doth resemble the wall of a City, or a hedge, or ditch about a vineyard; and it is a vineyard, though the hedge or ditch be wanting; and it is a city, though the wall be wanting, though so much the less fortified, I grant." 2

Smith, then, was not willing to make an issue of church-polity. Compare this moderation with the grim persistence of the die-hard Presbyterians as reported by Sandys: "The Church of Christ admits of no other government than that by Presbyteries; viz. by the ministers, elders, and deacons." Here Smith parted company with the more determined members of the synods. In so doing he was closer to the attitude of the Continental Reformers than were his more dogmatic compatriots. Calvin and his successor,

1. Sermons: The True Trial of the Spirits; vol. 1, p. 142.
3. vide supra, p. 69.
Beza, made no effort to oppose their influence to the established polity of the English Church.

There is a quite feasible explanation for this moderate attitude on Smith's part. It lies in the fact that his mentor, Greenham, was of the same mind. Active though the latter was for some time in the Presbyterian movement, he was loath to force the issue, as Gilby, Field, and the other extremists were doing. Dexter, in speaking of the minister of Dry Drayton, draws attention to this significant fact.

"With all this he did not estimate highly the importance of the questions then agitated as to church polity. 'Many', we find him writing, 'meddle and stirre much about a new Church government, which are senseles and barren in the doctrine of new birth; but also, what though a man know many things, and yet know not himselfe to be a new creature in Jesus Christ? It is often the policy of Satan to make us trauell in some good things to come, when more fitly we might be occupied in good thinges present.'"

Cartwright himself was finally forced to adopt much the same viewpoint. Presbyterianism at this juncture could not join open battle with the hierarchy with any hope of success, for the main army of Puritanism was not yet ready to support it in such action. Indeed, while nearly all the Puritans were sympathetic toward Presbyterianism, less than one-third of them were actually concerned in its activities. Granted that this minority was the most significant part of the movement at this stage, we must face the fact that it was a minority. Smith, heart and soul in favor of a Presbyterian form of government,

2. Congregationalism....; p. 91
was nonetheless closely allied with the moderate spirit of the main body. It was from this body that the movement gained its real momentum, while the Presbyterian element gave it its direction. It may safely be said, therefore, that a conjunction of the two is found in Smith, Churchman and Presbyterian.
CHAPTER VII

SMITH AND THE MAGISTRATES

or

LOYALIST VERSUS EVENTUAL PRESBYTERIANISM

The social philosophy of sixteenth century Puritanism, compared with that of the next two centuries - indeed, with that of the next two generations - seems undeveloped and immature. And so, to a certain extent, it was. The strong tides which surged upward to the Long Parliament - the tides which swept the Stuart Dynasty from the throne, were, in the time of Elizabeth, almost imperceptible. On the other hand, the religious force from which those tides grew, and the problems and conflicts in contending with which that force gained its strength were all apparent in the earlier age. For the Puritans of the seventeenth century one great problem stood uppermost, namely the vital one of apprehending the tremendous fact of God's sovereignty over the realm of political life and applying in a practical way this apprehension. For their predecessors of the sixteenth century the task was more largely to apprehend and apply the same fact to ecclesiastical life. Thus, as we have seen, the Puritans from the beginning were motivated by this idea of the awful sacredness of God's sovereignty. Anything, no matter how trifling, which conflicted with that supremacy was damnable. So, while Whitgift and the other High-Church leaders could relegate vestments and ritual to the category of adiaphora, matters indifferent, to be decided on grounds of expediency, the Puritans saw them as out-and-out impediments to the ascendency of God over the religious life of the Nation.
We see in Smith, however, proof that there were definite problems for the Puritan in his social and political relations. If his goal was to guide his whole life according to the dictates of this all-embracing sovereignty, how was he to adjust his life as a social being to this goal? For instance what was to be Smith's attitude toward rulers and magistrates whose actions were quite likely to clash with the dictates of his private conscience?

One thing seems certain. For the Puritan, with his insistence on the inviolability of the individual conscience obedience to civil authority must have its limits. John Poynet in his "A Shorte Treatise of Politike Power" writes bluntly:

"The papists....recke andstretch out obedience to muche, and wil needes have civile power obeид inal thynges. ... The prince can but take from men their goodes and lives; but God can take from us both goodes and bodie, and cast both in to hell."

Much the same thing is said by Christopher Goodman in his treatise, "How Superior Powers Ought to Be Obeyed of Their Subjects."

"To obeye man in anie things contrary to God and his precepts thoghe he be in heist authoritie, or never so orderly called... is no obedience at al, but disobedience."

In other words, the Christian citizen owes full obedience to his rulers where purely civil matters are concerned, such as defence of the realm against invasion, insurrection, and so forth. Society must be protected against

lawless men, and it is the duty of the magistrates to see this done. He has no right, however, to contradict the obedience which each man owes to God. This loyalty takes precedence over all other duties and obligations.

It must be admitted that both Poynet and Goodman wrote in the time of Queen Mary, with an eye to uprooting the "the politike power" of papistry. Such radical views in civil obedience were seldom heard during Elizabeth's reign—at least among the Protestants. While the papist did "racke and stretch out obedience to muche", so did the Protestants. For the theology of Smith and his contemporaries, was mediaeval, just as was that of the Romanists. His attitude toward the Church and toward civil authority, accordingly stemming logically from his theology, was likewise mediaeval. To him as to his forefathers, the powers-that-be were still tremendously impressive. The prince of the realm was the Lord's anointed. The Puritans were unanimously agreed that the magistrate occupied an essential part of God's commonwealth, and as God's vicar appointed to deal with secular matters, he must be obeyed. It was for this reason that the Puritans, whose peculiar reservations on the ground of conscience seemed to carry potential rebellion, were by far the most loyal and law-abiding of Elizabeth's subjects.

2. The Magistrates' Scripture and A Memento for Magistrates.
The attention which they paid to the importance of the Magistrate, his powers and functions, and the proper attitude of the people to their rulers, is exemplified in the frequency with which Smith refers to these matters in his sermons. Two whole sermons are devoted to this consideration, not to mention frequent references in passing in other sermons. He leaves no doubt as to his position on the matter of the reverence due to magistrates.

"So magistrates have not only authority to make and establish good laws, but also to determine betwixt men, according to the same; unto whose censure the subject must submit himself, as the Apostle proveth to the Romans, when he saith: 'Let every soul submit itself of the authority of the higher powers, for all power is of God, wherefore whosoever resisteth that power, resis­teth the ordinance of God, and purchaseth unto himself damnation. For magistrates are not to be feared of them that do well, but of them that do evil. Wilt thou not fear? Do well when so shalt thou have praise, for he is the minister of God for they wealth: but if thou doest evil, then fear, for he beareth not the sword for naught, but is the minister of God to take vengeance upon them that do evil.'

Where it is to be remembered, that the civil magistrate, who beareth the sword, is called the minister of God, as well as the spiritual magistrate that preacheth the Word; and that no doubt, to the intent that he might take care as well to maintain true religion, as to minister deserved discipline. For it standeth with all divine and human reason, that if all masters and fathers ought to have a more than ordinary care to instruct and help forward their families in Christian religion, so much as in them lieth, much more ought the magistrate to meditate by all means possible to perform his duty therein, who is a father over all families." 2

Here we see the mediaeval aspect of Puritanism coming out strongly. The mediaeval theory, both in Church and in State, was paternalistic. The magistrate is chosen by God and responsible to God, and the people under his charge can no more resist

1. The Magistrates' Scripture and A Memento For Magistrates.
or defy his authority than children can defy the commands of their father. Notice also that Smith distinctly proclaims the function of the civil power to enforce and protect the decrees of the Church. The Separatists and other sectarian were in this age the only ones who rejected this function of the secular power. For Smith and his fellows as for Elizabeth, there was never any doubt as to the duty of the State to correct abuses in the Church and stand as champion and defender of the church.

As for purely civil authority, even the Separatists would not have disputed the doctrine of *regium jus divinum*. This was part of the mediaeval paternalism which had attained more and more prominence as the break-up of the old feudal and hierarchial authority came. This break-up, however, took the form of a movement toward a new authority, or rather, several new types of authority, chiefly that of national princes. As England's submission to Rome was withdrawn the loyalty of the people turned inward, centering about the throne of Elizabeth. The perils which threatened the nation from without served to increase this loyalty. Obviously, then, the attention of the people to the importance of the sovereign became more marked. The mediaeval concept of the divine right of princes was reinforced by the upsurge of patriotism. The position of Elizabeth and of her representatives, the magistrates, became for the time being impregnable in the hearts of her Protestant- and for the most part of her Catholic-subjects.
The following declaration from Henry Smith, then, may be taken almost literally. The divine origin of the magistrate's office is attested in every line. Taking as his text Psalm 82, Verses 6, 7, he cries:

"I have said, ye are gods; and ye are all the children of the Most High; but ye shall die as a man, and ye princes shall die like the others.

There is a difference between kings and inferior magistrates; for the prince is like a great image of God, the magistrates are like little images of God, appointed to rule for God, to make laws for God, to reward for God, to speak for God, to fight for God, to reform for God. ... Howsoever other care for the glory of God, the performance of His Will, the Reformation of His Church, princes and rulers, which are gods themselves, are to do the business of God. God's business is their business, God's law is their law, God's honor is their honor." (1)

"Princes and rulers have many names of honour, but this is the honourablest name in their titles, that they are called gods; other names have been given them of men for flattery or for reverence, but no man could give them this name but God himself. Therefore, their name is a glass wherein they may see their duty.

Thus their names tell them how they should rule, and by consequence teacheth how we should obey. God calls them gods, therefore he which contemneth them, contemneth God; God calls them fathers, therefore we must reverence them like fathers; God calls them kings, princes, lords, judges, powers, rulers, governors, which are names of honour; and shall we dishonour them whom God doth honour? Our first lesson is 'Fear God'; the next is, 'Honour the King', Prov. XXIV, 21, No. 1 Peter, 11, 17; that is (as Paul interpreteth), we must 'obey for conscience', Rom. XIII, 5; not against conscience; for that were to put a stranger before the king, and the king before God. "...

This is the typical expression of Elizabethan Puritanism. "Fear God and honour the king." But in Smith's mind there was no blind attitude of "The king can do no wrong". On the contrary, the responsibility of representing in his ownperson...

1. The Magistrates' Scripture, Vol.1, P. 359
butes of God caused the magistrate to pass under the closest sort of scrutiny on the part of the Puritan. If obedience was a duty of the subject, godliness, in its most literal sense, was demanded of the ruler.

"...they which use their power against God, which bear the person of God and execute the will of the devil, which make laws against God's law, and be enemies of his servants, are worse than Balaam, which would not curse whom God blessed, Num.xxii, 18; and so much as in them lieth, make God a liar, because they cannot so well be called gods as devils. Such gods go to hell." (1)

"...Doth iniquity become gods? Doth partiality become gods? Doth bribes become gods? They are greedy gods, idol gods, belly gods... which do but stay (like Nebuchadnezzar) until their iniquity be full, that they may be cast out like beasts, as a derision to them they govern. Dan.iv." (2)

This sermon, then, while it exalts the office of ruler and magistrate, is intended largely as a warning to those persons who occupy the office. Repeatedly the author reverts to the words of his text. "I have said ye are gods; but ye shall die as a man, and ye princes shall die as others". Only a few years before this, Archbishop Grindal had courageously reminded the queen, in words much like these, that she, too, must account for her sins before the Judgment Throne of God, like the lowest of her subjects. Smith goes on in the same vein to say:

(1)op.cit, p. 359;
(2) Ibid, p. 363;
"Be not cruel in thine authority, as though it should last always; for thou shalt die.... a hundred princes of England are dead, and but one alive; and the rest are gone to give an account how they ruled here, when they sustained the person of God." (1)

There is in this outspoken warning no trace of that "Burgeoning, sturdy spirit of democracy" which many modern proponents of Puritanism eagerly ascribe to the movement. At this early stage in its development of Puritanism presented no challenge to the "Divine right of kings". This is surely apparent in the foregoing passages from Smith's sermons. To make Smith merely an earlier counterpart of Samuel Rutherford would be to fall into an egregious anachronism. The "social contract" theory of the latter would have been entirely foreign to Smith or to even the most rabid Presbyterian of his day.

The upsurge of Puritanism, with the Presbyterians in its van, came at a time when the intellectual life of the Protestant countries was undergoing a new renaissance. Puritanism, of course, shared in this awakening; indeed, during the next few decades Puritanism joined hands with Rationalism in an attack on not only ecclesiastical but political authority as well - not in the interests of democracy but of other types of authority. Rationalism sought the authority of reason. It sought to liberate the rational, mystical, moral individual. Puritanism, on the other hand, sought to transfer its allegiance from all earthly authority to that of the Sovereign God. The Puritanism, even of the seventeenth century,

(1) op.cit.pp 367-369.
therefore, was not democratic, but constitutional, in all its thinking. Having delivered the people from the oligarchical, heıraphical authority of priests, bishops, and kings, it bound them in a higher, more inclusive loyalty. God, The Supreme Sovereign, had established His theocracy in a constitutional mould. This constitution in its written form being found in the Scripture, His Will, thus revealed, was the foundation on which the whole structure of life, private or corporate, was to be reared.

In order to impute a spirit of democracy to sixteenth century Puritanism, therefore, we must read all this into it, which, of course, would be unthinkable. Henry Smith, in his day, saw only the beginning of the intellectual renaissance of which we have been speaking. The struggle at this stage of development, as we have pointed out, was almost entirely concerned with establishing God's complete sovereignty over the ecclesiastical life of England. Therefore those who point to the writings of Poynet and Goodman and to the bold struggle of the Wentworths in Parliament as being the first dawning rays of democracy, are, in our opinion, mistaken. These manifestations were aimed not at the domination of the Throne, but at the "usurped power" of the Church-hierarchy.

To say that Elizabethan Puritanism was opposed to the Democratic spirit would, on the other hand, be fully as great a mistake. It simply had not progressed that far in its growth. Had Smith lived in the next century, under the influ-
ence of the covenant-theology, his lot would certainly have been cast with the Rutherford-Presbyterians. Their aim, let us assert once more, was the apprehension and practical application of the truth of God's sovereignty over the political life. At the Westminster Assembly Smith, who was loyal on religious grounds to Elizabeth, would have been willing to apply this divine sovereignty without the aid of her successor Charles I. This is the point which Presbyterianism had eventually reached. So thoroughly was it imbued with a sense of God's ascendancy that the king who interfered with that ascendancy must be swept aside.

Since he was not of the seventeenth century, however, this eventual development of Presbyterianism stands out in sharp contrast with his actual views. He was a man of his times; therefore he was a Loyalist to the core. He was willing, as the latter-day Puritans would not have been, to accept his ecclesiastical preferment at the hands of a secular authority, Burleigh, and to continue in it by deferring to the arbitrary power of the Episcopal Hierarchy. This does not mark him as a time-server, but, as has just been said, as a man in tune with his times. The same spirit, three centuries earlier, would have probably made him one of John Wyclif's followers. Two centuries later he would have been out with the Wesleys. It so happened that the Puritanism of his day decreed that he should remain a Loyalist as well as a Presbyterian.
Chapter VIII

Smith, The Biblicist

Max Weber, in his book, "The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism", speaks somewhat disparagingly of "The well-known biblicocracy of the Calvinists". The phrase leaves something to be desired in the way of accuracy, for in the last analysis Calvinism sets forth not a biblicocracy so much as a theocracy. Their awareness of God's claim to supremacy over the whole of life in every detail of living, was a thing of cosmic significance. But there is this measure of truth in Weber's description, that they regarded the Bible as the final rule whereby they might guide themselves in attempting to meet that claim. Everything in life, they believed with passionate earnestness, must be referred to the Word of God. It was on this ground that Cartwright and his fellow Puritans took their stand, denouncing the tendency of the Episcopal Hierarchy to "derogate from the Word by seeking to add to it." It was with the open Bible in their hands that the deprived ministers faced the Court of High Commission.

It was, therefore, the Puritans, in England at least, of whom Weber was really speaking, for, until the end of the century, the church-leaders themselves were Calvinists. They were Calvinists, however, who were faced with the problem of adjusting a Church to meet the peculiar needs of the nation - needs which were political as well as spiritual. Obviously, a biblicocracy on such a grand scale could not be compatible with the type of civil and religious supremacy which Elizabeth exercised.

1. P. 123.
The Puritans, refusing to sacrifice the sovereign rights of God, as they regarded it, on the alter of expediency, may have justified to some extent their opponents' charge of narrowness and unreasonableness. This charge constituted a favorite _tu quoque_, hurled by either side at the other in the heat of conflict—usually with considerable cause. In spite of the narrowness of their view, the insistence of the Puritan on what is right rather than what is expedient compels our respect. We cannot help seeing something of the pathetic strain in their unceasing cry, "Thus saith the Lord".

Henry Smith shows himself to be thoroughly Puritan in this respect. In the course of a sermon in which he deplores the sorry state of preaching in that age, he digresses to make a most sweeping claim for the authority of the Bible.

"...the men of Berea would not receive Paul's doctrine before they had tried it; and how did they try it? It is said they searched the Scripture. This is the way Paul would teach you to try others, whereby he was tried himself; whereby we may see that if you used to read the Scriptures, you shall be able to try all doctrines, for the word of God is the touchstone of everything, like the light which God made to behold all his creatures, Gen. 1, 2. So is the light of Scripture to decide all questions: every doubt must come to the word, and all controversies must be ended at this tribunal. The Scripture must speak which is right and which is wrong; which is truth and which is error; and all tongues must keep silence to hear it... Here a man may ask; if it be so that God would have us try our religion by the Scripture, and not by fathers, nor by doctors, nor by councils, nor by angels, nor by pope, how then do the papists say we must believe as the church believeth, and never look in the Scripture...? But he which chooseth before he try, taketh worse sooner than the best; and therefore the Pope's Priests, because the people should take superstitions before religion, will

never let them have the touchstone, but keep them from the Scripture, and lock it up in an unknown tongue, which they cannot skill of, lest they should try their doctrines, like the men of Berea, making religion a craft, as men call their trades. Therefore, as Josiah rejoiced that the Book of God was found again, so we may rejoice that the Book of God is found again; for when the people might not read it, it was all one as if they had lost it."

This view of the Scriptures is so thoroughly typical of the Puritans that it might almost be called exclusively theirs. "The Word of God is the touchstone of everything .... The Scriptures must speak which is right and which is wrong." Cartwright, in his controversy with Whitgift, had established this as the basis of all his contentions against the established polity and ritual. "Nothing allowed but that which is allowed by Scripture." Whitgift's riposte had been, "Nothing forbidden but that which is forbidden by Scripture". In other words, the latter was willing to bow to the actual commands of Scripture, but claimed the right to argue ex silentio for the sanction of his policy of expediency. The Puritans argued in reply that if God had wanted anything added to the revelation already set forth in the Bible, he would have added it himself. If he had meant the Church on earth to have diocesan bishops, he would have mentioned as much in his written constitution. Smith, in the sermon just quoted, sets forth this viewpoint succinctly.

"We should set the word of God always before us like a rule, and believe nothing but that which it teacheth, love nothing but that which it prescribeth, hate nothing but that which it forbideth, do nothing but that which it commandeth, and then we try all things by the word." (2)

1. vide supra
2. Italics mine.
This Calvinistic-Puritan exaltation of the Bible as the final Court of Appeal had, as we have seen, been met by Hooker. Going beyond Whitgift's plea of expediency, he had proclaimed the cosmic unity of law and reason. The truth of God was to be found not only in the Scripture but in the laws of nature and of human society for all law proceeded from the mind of God. Where the Puritan sought for his guidance in a chapter-and-verse appeal to the Bible, Hooker steered his course by the light of several stars, of which this was only one. The *ordo universalis*, the time-hallowed usages of the centuries, the ordinances of State and Nation, based on the corporate experience and corporate need of the people - all these elements were integral parts of the revelation of God's mind and purpose. Man must apply his intellect to the task of drawing all revelation - that of Scripture included, and admittedly paramount into a working, organic unity.

No one would have been more astonished - or more horrified - than Henry Smith to find that he bear[s] out this thesis in every one of his sermons. To his last breath he would have insisted that the whole word of God is contained in the Bible, and that nowhere else was to be found the true rule for faith and life. As far as he was consciously aware, he never added anything to the revelation which he felt was speaking directly from the pages of the Bible.

Unwittingly, however, he was continually doing so. One of the salient characteristics of Smith's preaching is this very element of reason. By this, let us hasten to explain, we do not mean reason in the sense of eighteenth-century rationalism. This inductive, systematic reason is not to be found in Smith, for at the time it simply was not known. What we identify as reason in his sermons is, in reality, nothing more than the application of commonsense and imagination, whether to the interpretation of Scripture or of life. This strain is especially apparent in his profuse use of analogies.

Thus, in arguing against the evils of usury:

"You see a river when it goeth by an empty place, it will not pass until it filleth that empty place, and then it goeth forward to another empty place, and filleth it; ... So should we; the rich should fill the poor, the full should fill the hungry, they which abound should fill them which want; for the rich are but God's almoners and their riches are committed to them of God, to distribute and do good, as God doth himself. As the water is charitable, after a sort, so is the air...nature cannot abide that any place should be empty; and therefore the air, though it be light-bodied, and so naturally ascendeth upward, yet rather than any place in the earth should be empty, the air will descend (as it were) from his throne, and go into caves, into dens, and into dungeons, to fill them. If the rich were so good to their empty brothers as the air and the water are to other empty things; as there is no empty place in the world, so there should be no empty persons in the world. But the rich make the poor to fill them; for usurers feed upon the poor, even as great fishes devour the small."(2)

This is not the revelation of Scripture. Here we have a lesson drawn from nature - we might almost say from science.

1. For further discussion of this, vide Ch. eleven.
2. The Examination of Usury; 1st. sermon: vol. 1, p. 90
Where in the Bible is there any assertion that, "Nature abhors a vacuum"? Usury is forbidden because the Bible, God's Word, forbids it. Yes, but apparently that is not enough, Smith feels, to satisfy his listeners; he therefore brings out the fact that the physical order of the Universe is opposed to the fundamental principle on which usury rests. While the analogy is not unassailable, this does not concern us here. The ratiocinative type of logic to which Smith is so partial, is evident.

The process by which the Puritans employed logic to develop the meaning of Scripture was frequently reversed. They sometimes brought their opinions and beliefs ready-made to the Bible and then proceeded to find chapter and verse to support them. Of this process, of course, they were not conscious. They sincerely believed that they found all their ideas in Scripture. This is why, as Tulloch puts it, "St. Paul appeared to speak to it (Puritanism) with its own voice, to be a dogmatist of its own type." Thus logic was often tortured to support biblical interpretation. Likewise, the sense of Scripture was forced often into an unhappy marriage with a faulty logic. Smith, who sinned less than most of his fellows in this respect, yet showed occasional traces of it.

"It seemeth that Zaccheus was no great thief, because he restored four-fold for all that he had gotten wrongfully at the most, or else he could not have restored four-fold again. But now, if some should restore four-fold for all that they have gotten wrongfully, they should restore more than they have, because all which usurers get, they get wrongfully; for their occupation is a sin, and therefore one saith, Because they cannot restore four-fold here, they shall suffer an hundred-fold hereafter.
"Amaziah is forbidden to strengthen himself with the armies of Israel, only because Israel had offended God. If Amaziah might not join the armies of Israel with his armies to strengthen him, darest thou join the goods of the poor with their goods to enrich thee?" (1)

For the most part, however, Smith's inferences drawn from Scripture, are amazingly sound. His reasoning from general to particular is sometimes over-elaborate, but seldom disingenious or sophistical. What we are concerned in pointing out here is the fact that he was not entirely consistent with his own dictum that, "The Scripture must speak which is right and which is wrong; which is truth, and which is error...". For Smith continually went beyond this to appeal to human reason to decide "which is truth and which is error". When we speak of the "well-known bibliocracy" of the Puritans, therefore, we must realize that the term is to be qualified, and that Smith was, in practice, if not in theory, nearer to Hooker than he himself would have dreamed possible.

The Puritan, then, clamoured for "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,". While he was not completely consistent with his own theory in this last respect, many historians have declared that he was even less so in the other. We refer to the time-honored belief that Puritanism was not a religion of the whole Bible, but of the Old Testament, almost exclusively. Turning again to Weber, we find a concise statement of this view. The bibliocracy of the

1. The Examination of Usury, Vol. 1, p. 92.
Calvinists of which he has been speaking, is thoroughly Hebraic in its religious tone.

"It is important to note that the...Calvinists held the moral precepts of the Old Testament, since it was fully as authentically revealed, on the same level of esteem as those of the New. It was only necessary that they should not obviously be applicable only to the historical circumstances of the Hebrews, or have been specifically denied by Christ...the influence of the God-fearing, but perfectly unemotional wisdom of the Hebrews, which is expressed in the books most read by the Puritans, the Proverbs and Psalms, can be felt in their whole attitude toward life. In particular, its rational supression of the mystical, in fact the whole emotional side of religion, has been rightfully attributed...to the influence of the Old Testament. " (1)

This charge has never been more than a half-truth, even in these times when Puritanism had sunk very, very largely into a devitalizing legalism. Certainly it is erroneous to include Elizabethan Puritanism in such a statement. Theirs was an age in which Puritanism was almost synonymous with Evangelical piety, and such piety has never been, a "rational supression of the mystical, in fact, the whole emotional side of religion". It is true, that not having had the benefit of modern biblical criticism, the Puritans did not distinguish greatly between the moral precepts of the Old and New Testaments. Much of the ruthless savagry and stern, calculating barbarity of which history has often found them guilty, is due to this literal application of the Old Testament's moral code to their lives. Even their "Christian" names they chose

largely from the Hebrew prophets - although this, too, was in a later day.

It was not, however, true that the Puritans claimed for the Old Testament an authority equal to or greater than that of the New. Like all true Christians, they regarded it as a preparation for the New. They fully appreciated the fact that the Law and the Prophets merely lead up to Christ and the New Covenant. The Puritan's never-ending struggle in life was to achieve for himself the assurance that God had numbered him among the elect, and never for a moment did he forget that this assurance lay not in the message of the Old Testament but in that of the New.

While it is not conclusive evidence, it is also not without its bearing on our question, that the Puritan preachers of Smith's day chose their texts more often from the New Testament than from the Old. Of Smith's fifty-three sermons for example, thirty-one were preached from New Testament texts. Perkins, Chaderton, Culverwell, and others of the great preachers of Smith's time or shortly after show much the same proportion. Surely these are indications of the trend of Puritan piety at that time, at least. But one thing is certain: from whichever part of the Bible they chose their texts, the theme underlying their preaching was the gospel of reconciliation in Jesus Christ.

Thus Smith:

"Yea, if a preacher reprove sin, he is thought to do it of hatred, or of some particular grudge, andto be too busy, too bitter, too sharp, too rough; and therefore they say he should preach God's love and mercy, for he is a preacher of the gospel; he tells us of and threatens us with the Law, and so throws us down too low; some to despair. As though we preached the

1. Charles Sanders; The Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature deals interestingly with this aspect. He attributes the fact
Law only or chiefly and not the gospel also continually to them that loathe and strive against their sins, ... and, therefore, though with persecution we preach the Law to lead you to the gospel, we preach judgment that you may find mercy, we preach hell to bring you to heaven; whatsoever and howsoever we preach, we do all to fill your hearts with joy in believing..." (4)

Smith, then, was an ardent biblicist - with the additions noted in the earlier part of this chapter, and his biblicism was not of the one-sided, Old Testament type, but full-orbed. This characteristic we assert, furthermore, was not peculiar to him alone, but was common to the Puritanism of his time.

2. vide Robertson: Aspects of The Rise of Economic Individualism, p. 94 et seq.
3. Italics mine.
CHAPTER IX
SMITH: HUMANIST

"Silver-tongued Smith", wrote Thomas Nash, "whose well-tuned style hath made thy death the gentle tears of the muses, quaintly couldst thou devise heavenly ditties to Apollo's lute, and teach stately verse to trip it as smoothly as if Ovid and thee had but one soul. Hence along did it proceed that thou was such a plausible pulpit man. Before thou enteredest into the wonderful ways of theology, thou refinedest, preparedest, and purifiedest thy wings with sweet poetry. If a simple man's censure may be permitted to speak in such an open theatre of opinion, I never saw abundant reading mixed with delight, or sentences which no man can challenge of profane affection sounding more melodious to the ear, or piercing more deep to the heart."

This encomium, included in the Introduction to the Sermons, becomes, perhaps, more significant to us as we become better acquainted with Henry Smith. With our minds prepared, by the traditional picture of the Puritan, for certain characteristics to appear, it comes as somewhat of a surprise to find that there was a great deal of the humanist in him. The Puritan, we are often told, is concerned with the good, rather than with either the true or the beautiful. He devoted himself to the ethical and the moral; and in order to do so, he turned his back upon the aesthetic and the mystical aspect of life.

1. vide supra, p. 123.
To a very large extent this picture of Puritanism is justified, especially if we apply it to the seventeenth-century conditions. Even in the sixteenth-century there was a strong tendency among the Puritans in this direction.

It is all the more striking, therefore, to find that in Henry Smith, the humanistic spirit appears with considerable prominence. This is apparent, not so much through isolated facts, as in the general style, tone, and attitude of the man. In his obvious classical learning and in the play of his intellectual curiosity, he demonstrates that the influence of Colet, Moore, Grocyn, and Linaere—and to an even greater extent, of Erasmus, had not disappeared from the Universities when young Smith matriculated at Oxford. Indeed, it is largely an Erasmian humanism which we detect in him—that thirst, not for knowledge per se, but for knowledge which would better his fellow-men. It was the humanism of the practical moralist, who wished to use the lessons of past centuries and the richness of classical beauty to make human society better than he found it. Where this spirit in Erasmus eventuates in his greatest works, i.e. those of Biblical translation, criticism, and exigesis, in Smith it comes out in sermons and in his poems, Micococosmographia.

That Smith should have written Latin poetry at all gives us some clue to his intellectual bent.

1. The Italian Humanism, as distinguished from this type, valued self-culture is the prime object. Erasmus, while he treasured the true Renaissance love of beauty, either of language or of plastic art, made this subservient to a higher end.
While the translation which Sylvester renders of the one poem left us gives little indication as to the merit of the original, we must account Nash's criticism as being worth something. The latter was far from being the "simple man" which he himself rather coyly suggests. He was at least enough of a critic to know good Latin poetry from inferior, and if he could compare Smith to Ovid, we must concede Smith some credit for being at least fairly competent in this field. And this ability was certainly not common among his Puritan contemporaries. Their knowledge of Latin, while often extensive, did not incline them to "devise heavenly ditties to Apollo's lute."

Vigorous and colorful prose they could and did write, but the instinct for gracefulness and for beauty of form and language which is peculiar to the poet was very seldom part of their make-up.

Quite apart from his excursion into the field of verse, however, we find in Smith a decided fondness for the liberal arts. One of his questions to Robert Dickons is significant in this connection: "Whether should one, meaning to be a preacher, first study the Arts, or else study nothing but divinity, as you have done?" (Another question in the same list affords us a rather amusing commentary on the ignorance of even the scholars of that age on certain matters) "What think you of the Antipodes, and those monstrous people which live in Asia, and of monsters in general?"

1. This curiosity and ignorance in regard to the "mysterious East" was evidently not confined to Smith, as witness Shakespeare: "It was my hint to speak -such was my process,- And of the Canibals that each other eat The Anthropophagi, and men whose heads Do grow beneath their shoulders." Othello; Act 1, Scene 3.
This is also, however, evidence of the curiosity of the humanist to know, a curiosity which was causing England, as never before in her history, to adventure into new fields in search of information as well as for treasure.

That Smith's own studies in the Latin and Greek antiquities were comprehensive and exhaustive is illustrated by the frequency and facility with which he cites them. The pages of God's Arrow, for example, are thickly documented with references to both pagan and Christian writers. A glance at the first few pages of his opening argument will serve to bear this out. In quick succession he mentions Protagoras, Diagoras, Cicero, Tertullian, Seneca, Zeno, Caligula, Aristotle, Plotinus, Plutarch, Justin Martyr, etc. Only occasionally does he quote from the original tongue in which these men wrote, for his purpose is to convince, not to display his own learning. Nowhere in this treatise or in his sermons does he use Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, without adding a clear explanation or translation.

Mere erudition, of course, is not to be confused with humanism. We have dwelt on this aspect only by way of showing that Smith's own educational background had made him conversant with most of the body of knowledge which the Renaissance had made available at the time. It was because his erudition was kinetic rather than static that we class him as a humanist. He studied deeply and explored widely, and what he learned he applied to the pursuit of his calling. To him, as to every real humanist, the good, the true, and the beautiful, were in-
escapably linked together. If, as a Puritan, he regarded the ultimate purpose of all truth and beauty as one of subserving a moral, religious end, he is in this no less humanistic than Erasmus himself. The reactionary Puritanism of a later day, which suspected all culture, not definitely "sacred", of being "profane", finds little support in Smith.

Another indication of Smith's humanistic tendency, while perhaps indirect, is his remarkable wealth of fables, analogies, proverbs, and illustrations drawn from practically all fields of knowledge. He was what might be called "a fanciful thinker". His sermons abound in such apophthegms as, "Bread will serve beggars, and they must be no choosers." 1 "Great boast and small roast makes unsavoury mouths." 2 Or turn to the passage on usury already quoted in an earlier chapter; the analogy of water and air filling all empty places in the earth comes from a mind both learned and imaginative. Again, he denounces rapacious lawyers with similes.

"They (the clients) contend and strive about a thing commonly till the lawyer hath gained more by them than the thing which is in controversy is worth. These are like the mouse and the frog, which strove so long about marsh ground that at length the kite came and took them both from it. Others will come up to law about a small matter and therein so entangle themselves that they cannot rid their hands of it.... like a silly sheep that is hunting for a fly, that runneth from bush to bush, and every bush catcheth a lock of hair, so that the poor sheep is threadbare ere he hath done and hath not a fleece left to cover himself withall." (4)

1. The Poor Man's Tears, Vol. 1, P. 44.
2. Ibid, P. 50.
3. Vide supra, P. 150.
With Smith's remarkable mastery of illustration we will deal more fully in a later chapter. It is, however, germane to the discussion of our point here. Such imaginative power is of a sort belonging usually to poets, for poetry, to quote T. R. Glover, "depends on truth, on true feeling and true expression; its essence is not delusion for interpretation... the genuine experience of the world which none have but those who are at heart poets." In this realm of imagery and fanciful thinking, Smith had probably no equal among the Puritans of his time. Thomas Adams, in the generation following him, had much the same gift, earning from Southey the sobriquet, "The Prose Shakespeare of Puritan Theologians".

The same title might well have been given to Smith, for while, as a poet he was by no means a Shakespeare, his poetic bent is everywhere visible in his prose-writing. "Hence along," as Nash says, "it did proceed that thou was such a plausible pulpit man. Before thou enteredest into the wonderful ways of theology, thou refindestest... thy wings with sweet poetry." The humanist strain in Smith, then, unusual as it was among the Puritans, was perhaps for that very reason, if for no other, a contributing factor in his eminence.

1. T. R. Glover: Poets and Puritans; p. 3
CHAPTER X
THE PURITAN AND THE WORLD

In speaking of the theology of Puritanism, we do not refer to the Calvinistic system of doctrine, for on the general tenets of this system, both Puritan and Anglican were substantially agreed. Henry Smith and the Archbishop of Canterbury would not have quarrelled on the matter of Predetermination, Justification, and Original Sin, for they were equally Calvinistic on these points of dogma. And yet it was the theology of Puritanism which turned his feet in one direction and those of the Anglican in another, - or, to be more precise, it was the peculiar emphasis which Puritanism put on certain aspects of the Calvinistic system.

We have said that the Puritan was gripped, to the point of obsession, by his awareness of God's sovereignty. We come now to the logical corollary to that, which took the form of a constant preoccupation with his own relation to that sovereignty. He was constantly troubled by the haunting dread lest he, through pride or human weakness, should be found withholding his life and heart from God's grasp. The paralysing dread of uncertainty, the fear that he might, after all, not be among the elect, caused him to enter upon a rigorous course of "checking-up", to examine whether or not his conduct showed the fruits of one of whose election was assured. Thus, Usher writes

1. Vide Supra, P. 140, et seq.
of the Elizabethan Puritanism:

"By the Puritan theology, man had been humbled before God, had been degraded in dignity, and in the worth of his personal efforts. By Anglicanism he was placed once more upon his feet in the world, to enjoy its beauties without feeling that they hindered the purity of his relation with God. ...While Puritanism had centered about the strivings of the simple soul to justify himself with God, and had revolted against the Roman ideal that the secluded monastic life was holier than a life in the world, the Puritan, once he had come into the world, stood aloof from it, alone with God."

This aloofness from the world was inevitable. In the constant striving, not to justify himself, as Usher says, but to assure himself of his having been justified, the Puritan felt bound, not to single good works, but to a life of good works, combined in a unified system. His moral conduct lost its planless character, and became a consistent method for conduct as a whole. The life of the saint was directed toward one supreme goal - salvation, and in order to achieve that goal this life had to be rationalized in this world. It was this rationalizing process which gave the Puritan his ascetic tinge.

This pronounced ethical emphasis rapidly became one of the chief characteristics of the early Puritan - not accented to the same extent as the code of the constitution-minded legalism of seventeenth-century Puritanism, but nonetheless developed in its own right to a striking degree.

1. R. G. Usher: The Reconstruction of the English Church; Vol. 1 P. 82.
Was Smith an ethicist? We have, of course, little direct insight into his private meditations or his personal system of moral self-government. But his sermons frequently display a minute attention to ethics which helps us to place him in his approximate relation to the matter. In a sermon, appropriately entitled, "The Trumpet of The Soul-Sounding to Judgment", he thunders:

"What! Do you think that God doth not remember our sins, which we do not regard; for while we sin, the score runs on, and the judge setteth down all in the tale of remembrances, and his scroll reacheth up to heaven.

Item, for lending to usury; item, for racking of rents; item, for deceiving thy brethren; item, for falsehood in wares; item, for starching thy ruffs; item, for curling thy hair; item, for starving of souls; item, for playing at cards; item, for sleeping in church; item, for profaning the Sabbath Day; ... O son, thou hast taken they pleasure, take thy punishment; the careless prelate for murdering so many thousand souls; the landlord for getting money from his poor tenants by racking their rents."

This idea of God as a sort of cosmic tally-keeper was indelibly stamped on Smith's mind— and in this, of course, he was typically Puritan. Here there is the basis for the well-known Puritan aversion of anything smacking of "vanity". To lavish care and pride upon fashionable clothing was a sin, and it is to be noticed that in the foregoing list there is no distinction in degree between this sin and that of the careless prelate, "for murdering so many thousand souls". All alike are entered in the great ledger of God, and all incur the guilt of damnation. Again, in vain against immodest apparel in women,

he remarks, somewhat acidululously:

"As Herodias was worse for her fine dancing, (Mat. XIV, 6) so a woman may have too many ornaments; frizzled locks, naked breasts, painting, perfume, and especially a rolling eye are the forerunners of adultery, and he which has such a wife, has a fine plague." (1)

The Protestant theology repudiates the Roman Catholic distinction between "venial," "mortal" sins. While this comfortable doctrine even often creeps into the Presbyterian view of sin in later times, we find none of it in the Puritan. To Smith and his brethren, sin was sin, with no palliating circumstances and no excuses.

"The papist say some thoughts, affections, words, and outward actions not agreeing with the law of God, are easily washed away with a little holy water, and so forth. They are not deadly, they deserve not the wrath of God, they are but venial. Did you ever read of these venial sinners in the Scripture? But think you they have nothing but that Scripture? Yes, they have decrees, they have decretals, the ceremonies whereof observed, these venial sins are soon pardoned, and they have a Pope that can forgive any sin; thus they lessen sins, thus they abate the price of sins, and they can buy out the sins with money, or redeem them with masses, and by a little short penance purchase a long pardon." (2)

The Puritan, believing firmly in the priest — how of all believers felt himself face to face with God in the Holy of Holies, where his sins, each and all, stood out in utter nakedness. This was the basic principle on which he "cultivated" his conscience — remembering that "Thou God seest me", fighting a constant battle with the insidious lures of Satan, bringing up before his imagination the awful Day of Judgment.

---

...sinners go on merrily till wrath overtakes them at unawares; like the fool, I will sit a little longer and fold my hands together a little, yet a little and a little longer, till poverty come as an armed man, and God's just judgments as the whirlwind, suddenly, irresistably: then, though thou hast gotten gold with Ghezei, or honours, with Haman, or Naboth's vineyard with Ahab or all the delights of the world, if thou have not an assurance of thine own salvation, if sin be still pleasant, if it be not bitter in thy belly, though it be sweet in thy mouth, deceive not thyself; believe God, thy hope is but doubting: thy strongest confidence but a vain trust. " (1)

There is little wonder, then, that Smith was to a large extent preoccupied with ethics. All human life, to him, was depicted in the story of Jonah. The folly and weakness which leads man to flee from the face of God; the sinner asleep in his sin while destruction hovers about him; the sudden, searing awakening of conscience, leading to repentance and submission to God's sovereign will. This dramatization of the conscience grew progressively more active in the Puritan's life as his conduct became more and more disciplined and systematized.

It is greatly to be regretted that Smith left no diary of his private devotional life. Had he done so, we might have seen, as we can never see in his sermons, which, after all, largely concern other people, just to what extent his mind ran in these channels from day to day. It would have been interesting to compare his diary with those of two other Puritan ministers of his own day, Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward. The record which these two men have left us of

2. Two Puritan Diaries; edited by M. M. Knappen, Rogers was older than Smith, Ward probably younger. Both lived well on into the seventeenth century. The editor's introductory comments on the diaries are as interesting as the diaries.
their inner struggles reveals to us the more extreme type of Puritanism of that age. From Rogers, for instance, we cite an entry marked "December 22, 1587".

"The 6 of this month we fasted betwixt ourselves, ministers, to the stirrings of our selves to greater godliness. Very good things we gathered to this purpose, Ephesians 1: 1-2, and then we determined to bring into writing a direction for our lives, which might be both for our selves and others. And till we ended all the time passed fruitful. But when we should ende with prayer, whilsts it was conceived by one of the company, I wandred, neither did mine hart goe with the least part of it, which at such a time was no small sin and occasion to unsettle me. O wofull hart. And thus I am carried either with drouzines and wearisomenes commonly at the prayers of others, who should ill take it that others should doe so at mine.

I saw how it was with me in my retourn to home. But my hart was so unsettled with disquietnes for it that all the 6 mile was not enough for me to come to my selfe hartily to bewail it and so to obteine ease to my soule...."

A few pages later we find another such entry.

"One day this while I was sodainly overtaken with hardnes of hart because of the rain. I held from murmuring, but I could not lik nor be contented with it nor bringe my hart to it. This went to my hart when I saw what rebellion was in me. I was then to study for my sermon, and nether could I goe about that with such unsettlednes of hart, and yet not goe about it, my sorrow was the more to be idle. I purposed to bewail my sin at more leisure, and for that time to proceed in my study, and so did. The next day I had harty detestation of my sin, and so returned to my god." (3).

1. Extreme in this sense only. It is worth noting that both held positions in the Established Church, hence their Puritanism was ethical rather than political.
3. Ibid, p. 78.
Ward's heart-searchings are recorded in a slightly different form. He does not go so much into the detail, but merely notes for each day the outstanding sin for that day.

"Oct. 3, 1595. ...My immoderate eating of walnutes and cheese after supper, whereby I did distemper my body..."

Nov. 6, 1595. My dissembling with Mr. Brown about his cittern. Also my prid in doying things in geometry.

Feb. 21, 1596. My impatience when Hobson told me he had non letters for me.

Jun 30, 1596. My anger att Sir Sharpe for that he found fault with me for sweping the table with the brush.

May 31, 1598. My anger att Mr. Pott, though dissembled, for that he would not have me att eating of his capon.

Jun 4, 1598. My negligence incommending the medicine for my nose to Godes blessing." (1)

This systematic harrowing of the soul follows certain well-defined lines. The editor remarks:

"The ideal state, which the Puritan was constantly seeking to attain, may be described by his own term, 'Godlines'. It is seen, upon analysis, to have consisted of and attitude of mind. When the writers are 'staid', 'settled in (their) course', 'well-seasoned', having fruitful meditations and good thoughts, they are content, but when they are 'unsettled', 'wanderings', 'roaving', dull, dead, slack in hearing chapel talks, making 'imperfect' prayers—in other words, unable to concentrate on the right things—they are driven to complaints and self-accusations. The proper frame of mind was one which kept a man constantly fit and willing to fulfill his Christian obligations, whatever they might be. A phrase which briefly describes the desired attitude is to be found on page 68, 'settled firmnes in fitnes to some part of duty'. " (2)

The nature of this duty varied with the circumstances. It included the general obligation to think on spiritual matters, to humble one's self, and to assist one's fellowmen, spiritually or materially, thinking on religious matters, of course, meditating on God, and the believer's relation to Him, the plan of salvation, the thinker's past conduct, the resolution to do better, and so forth. There is little evidence that Rogers and Ward - or for that matter, most Puritans, engaged in mystical dwellings on the abstract qualities of God. They thought rather of their conduct and God's opinion of it.

The obligation to aid others spiritually - i.e., to persuade them of the error of their ways, and to get them to start off on this vigorous course of self-discipline, was important, but evidently, if we are to judge from these two diaries, less important than the obligation of one's own spiritual meditation. Rogers (1) speaks of his desire, "to winne and keep men's love to the Gospel...so farre as other duties thereby might not be neglected."

If this was typical Puritanism - which is very doubtful - Smith was certainly not typical in this respect. Much as he might meditate on his own shortcomings, the state of his own soul, he was primarily a preacher. No consideration of allowing other duties to interfere with his winning and keeping "men's love to the Gospel" could have crossed his mind.

There is a certain morbid and sickly quality in the introverted agonies of Rogers and Ward which is utterly at variance with the robust morality of Smith's sermons. He was a thorough-going ethicist: yes. He, too, searched his soul carefully for blemishes and admonished his listeners to do likewise. But this method of putting his soul, as it were, under glass, this artificial "forcing" process of cultivating a satisfactorily abject frame of mine is foreign to all that we know of him. Smith was in deadly earnest about his distrust of the world and its vanity, but he was not neurotic.

Here, again, we wish to point out, he is to be classed with the main body of Elizabethan Puritans. They had, for the most part, neither the time nor the opportunity to indulge in what modern science would call a "sin-psychosis". Ward and Rogers lived almost entirely apart from the world and its every-day activities. The Puritans who thronged St. Clement's Dames every week to hear Smith were faced with the necessity of adjusting themselves to society. However much their search for "godliness" might lead them on a spiritual pilgrimage to Zion, they could not escape the fact that they were actually living and working in the city of Vanity Fair. However reluctantly the Puritan might turn to the world, that is, to the political, social, and economic environment in which he lived, he was impelled to do so, not only from material but from religious considerations. Weber, arguing a close, even genetic relation between Calvinism and Capitalism, the former
producing the latter, dwells at length on the Calvinistic doctrine of calling. The Calvinist more especially the Puritan believed that God had called him to labour in his appointed station in life. Thus, whether he mended shoes, plowed fields, or preached, he did so in majorum gloriām. Therefore, Weber decides his views on the dignity of labor gradually and subtly become a sanction to him to earn more and more wealth - as a religious duty. Thus developed a systematic organizing and exploiting of his less shrewd or less capable fellow men, in what is known as capitalism.


Robertson, however, denies that this interpretation of calling is fair to Puritanism. It was, after all, nothing more than the old mediaeval concept of "the ordered status". One's occupation and station are directed by Providence. Each man had his task to perform. In other words, the doctrine of calling, ideally, is the doctrine of the dignity of each man in his station. So conceived it provided for the Puritans an antidote to selfish ambition, and it sternly disapproved of amassing wealth with a view to dominating the lives and properties of others. Indeed, all Christian Churches in England were opposed to any system where one man was forced to labor for another man's profit. It was for this reason that they were opposed to usury. Especially was this true of the Puritans, who cited the laws of God and the basic principles of the natural
and social world. Their viewpoint in the matter may be found in Smith's denunciation of usury.

"When God set Adam to his work, he said, 'In the sweat of thy brows shalt thou live,' Gen. 3:19; not in the sweat of his brows, but in the sweat of thy brows; but the usurer liveth in the sweat of his brows and her brows, that is by the pains and cares and labours of another; for he taketh no pains himself, but only expecteth the time when his interest will come in; like the belly, which doth no work, and yet eateth all the meat." (2)

"Some will not take usury, but they will have the use of your land, or your orchard, or your team, or your kine, until you pay the money again. . . Some will not take usury, but they will lend their money to occupiers, upon condition to be partakers in their gains, but not in their losses. So one takes all the pains and abideth all the venture, and the other that taketh no pains reapeth half the profit. This usury is forbidden in 2 Thes. 3:10, where it is said, 'he which will not work let him not eat.' " (3)

The punishment of the userer Smith asserts in the second sermon like that of the non-resident, is to be consigned to make his bed in hell. Bribery, non-residency, and usury, he remarks, are "three sins which are accounted no sins and yet they do more hurt than all their fellows . . ."

The practice of usury clashed with the Puritan idea of "the ordered status. It broke down the boundaries between one occupation and another, one stratum of society and another, putting all classes and all occupations in the grasp of the money-lender. This, quite apart from religious or ethical objections, was enough to evoke the disapproval of the Puritans.

1. We have already mentioned (vide supra p.151) his two sermons entitled The Examination of Usury; these caused him to be listed by Blaxton (English Usurer) 1634, as one of the chief writers against usury. Robertson in citing Blaxton's list of prominent Puritans, identified Parkins, Adams, Wilson, and others; he fails, curiously enough, to identify the Dr. Smith, who calls him. This
That these boundaries were meant to remain untouched in Smith's opinion is certain.

"The...property is to keep within our calling; he which meddleth with that he hath nought to do, is compared to one that catcheth a dog by the ears, and dare neither hold him still, nor let him go; so he can neither go forward for want of skill, nor backward for shame. Paul saith, he was set apart to preach the Gospel; so to every work God hath set some men apart, and fitted them to that work, as he did Bezaleel to the building of the Tabernacle; and therfore unless a man set himself apart to this work, he should think of Peter, which when he struck with the sword, was bid to put up his sword again, for the sword was not committed unto him, but the keys. In Exod. 17:11, we find Joshua fighting, and Moses praying, and Aaron and Hur holding up his hands; so every man should have a several work. God hath given certain gifts to certain callings; as no man can exceed his gifts, so no man should exceed his calling. ...If thou doest ever so well and be not called to it, the Scripture saith straight, 'Who hath required this of thee?' Thou art an usurper of another's office. A fool (saith Solomen) is meddling, shewing that a wise man meddleth not, but where he have to do. We are compared to a body; some men are like the head, and they must rule; some are like the tongue, and they must teach; some are like the hand, and they must work; when this order is confounded, then that cometh to pass which we read of Eve, when the woman would lead her husband, both fell into the ditch." (41)

It is curious to note that directly following the passage just quoted, Smith states what he considered the next most important property of the "wise and sober" Christian - that is, the property "not to be curious in searching mysteries".

The Christian is to concern himself with his relation to God,

Smith, no doctor, is almost certainly our author. (Robertson, op. Cit., p. 125.)

2. Op cit. vol.1, p.93 (1st sermon)
4. In 1571, the statute forbidding usury was repealed in Parliament in favor of a new law, forbidding the taking of interest beyond ten per cent.
5. A Looking Glass for Christians; vol.1, pp.431-332; see also An Alarum From Heaven; vol. 2, p.53.
and not indulge in speculation or in esoteric points of theology.

"Let no man presume to understand above that which is meet to understand. The star, when it came to Christ, stood still, and went no further; so when we come to the knowledge of Christ, we should stand still and go no further. ... It is not necessary to know that which God hath not revealed; and the well of God's secrets is so deep, that no bucket of man can sound it; therefore we must row in shallow water because our boats are light and small and soon overturned. ... Curious questions and vain speculations, are like a plume of feathers, which some will give anything for, and some will give nothing for. Paul rebuketh them which troubled their heads about genealogies; how would he reprove men and women of our days, if he did see how they busy their heads about vain questions, tracing upon the pinnacles where they may fall while they might walk upon the pavement without danger? Some have a great deal more desire to learn where hell is than to know any way how they may escape it; to hear what God did purpose before the world began, rather than to learn what he will do when the world is ended: to understand whether they shall know one another in heaven, than to know whether they belong to heaven; this rock hath made many shipwrecks, that men search mysteries before they know principles."

Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus! Had Smith forgotten the questions he hurled at Robert Dickons? Let us recall a few of them.

"Whether Satan knoweth the inward thoughts, further than by the outward habit of the body, and whether he can read and say, Verbum caro factum est?"

"Where is hell? and what shall be the manner of punishment there to the reprobate?"

"What think you of the Antipodes, and those monstrous people which live in Asia, and of monsters in general?"

"What think you of that saying of Christ, this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise? What kind of place is this; and where: and to what purpose now it serveth and whether it was a material Apple that Adam did eat?"

1. vide supra, pp. 126-128.
"What esteem you of Fairies, Hobgoblins, etc., whether their money be true, and how they have it?"

"Whether our joys in heaven shall be, to all equal, and the torments in hell, to every one alike? and whether we shall see, and know one another?"

"How is the soul created in man, and when it cometh, how, or in what parts is it placed in the body?"

"At what age and stature shall all rise in the resurrection? and whether the wounds and scars shall remain in our bodies glorified?"

"In what estate shall the Sun and Moon, the Heavens, and the elements be after the last day, when there shall be no creatures upon the earth?"

Smith, of course, expected no answer to these questions, for they were all unanswerable, all leading to fine points of dispute, which he himself could not settle. But the fact remains obvious that his own curiosity had led him to ponder on these very matters. Why, then, should he warn his congregation at St. Clement's against indulging in the same sort of thing? Was it psychological reaction, whereby he denounced in others the tendency which he uneasily felt was a besetting sin of his own? Quite possibly this was in part responsible for the inconsistency.

There is more here, however, than this. Smith's reason is also tied up directly with his ethical, practical preaching. While he himself was thoroughly conversant with the speculative subtleties in which the scholasticists of that age loved to dabble, he regarded these matters as far too abstruse for the lay mind. He demands of Dickons "Whether predestination, election, and so forth, are to be preached to laymen?"
Certainly his own answer would have been a decided negative. Seldom if ever does he mention these doctrines in his sermons, for while he himself was a theologian, versed in the minutiae of doctrine, he was not one to feed babes with meat. As far as his listeners were concerned, his injunction held good, "so, when we come to the knowledge of Christ, we should stand still and go no further." Probably much of his popularity as a preacher was due to his absence from his sermons of the more difficult points of theology. Not that there is any lack of the doctrinal element in any of his sermons; they are full of it. But the doctrines which he preached were those teaching him how to live the godly life and what to do in order to be saved.

This, after all, is the point where the power, lines of early Puritanism, converge. An ethical code, having its roots in an unceasing awareness of the sinner's relation to God, its effects in a rigorous, ascetically-inclined supervision of the conscience by its possessor, held the Puritan aloof from the "worldliness" of his social and economic environment. At the same time the practical content of that code, the sense of being called by God to an appointed station in the social structure, sent him out from his citadel of aloofness to carry God's standard into the very ranks of the hostile forces. It was the preacher, to a large extent, who armed him for the fray and directed his uncertain footsteps. Such preachers

1. For evidence of which, see the complete list of questions to Dickons, pp-125-127 supra.
as Smith, keeping in close touch with the problems and spiritual needs of the great masses of the people, were really the guiding and controlling force in the Puritan movement.

In speaking of the slow but irresistible growth of Puritanism, one writer has remarked:

"The preachers were the true authors of that advance, and among the preachers those were far from being the least influential who mainly devoted themselves to setting forth the Puritan way of life by precept, image, and example in pulpit and press, rather than to agitation against the existing government or to the effort to erect separate churches in defiance of law. They, and not the doctrinaire controversialists or the martyrs of persecution were the men who did most, in the long run, to prepare the temper of the Long Parliament."

Smith, who took part, as we have seen, in agitation against the existing church government, and also to some extent in controversial writing, was nonetheless primarily a preacher. In proportion to his eminence, furthermore, we may ascribe to him a considerable amount of influence over Puritan thinking and living at that time. In studying his views on the conduct of the "Christian who is wise unto sobriety" we may therefore discern, to a large extent, the forces which shaped the Puritan's relation to the non-Puritan world about him.

CHAPTER XI

SMITH, THE SILVER-TONGUED PREACHER.

To speak of Henry Smith as a typical Puritan preacher will be to involve ourselves at once in difficulties unless we thoroughly understand clearly what the description implies. What is there in his preaching which we may identify as Puritan, as distinct from that of any great preacher - Lancelot Andrews, for example? We must guard against any facile, "sheep-and-goats" division of Elizabethan preachers. The Puritan did not have a monopoly of the good qualities in this field, for these qualities, for the most part, have been common to all great preachers from Pentecost down to our time.

Having made this reservation, however, we must realize what is equally true - namely that the Puritans not only cultivated and valued these qualities far more than did their Anglican adversaries in that era; but beyond that they developed certain qualities which partook of the peculiar character of the whole movement. It was inevitable, from the day when Elizabeth crushed the prophesying, that Puritan and Anglican preaching would become further and further separated. The latter gradually adjusted its tone and character to fit the queen's viewpoint. Elizabeth, from the first, had felt preaching to be a spiritual luxury at best - diverting and perhaps profitable for those able to assimilate it. It was by no means

1. Vide supra, p. 81.
indispensable, however, and often it was positively dangerous. Hence, three or four preachers in a diocese were enough—men who could be trusted not to preach anything liable to excite the people in any way.

The Puritans, however, realized with Archbishop Grindal that preaching is an ordinance of Christ, and that no church can neglect it and live. Hence their never-ending cry for "godly preachers" to minister to the ignorant, unchurched masses in England. It was from the ranks of the Puritans that young and zealous men like Henry Smith came. Thus, while the Anglicans thought rather in terms of priest and prelate, the Puritan thought of profit and preacher. The distinction is important, for it means that the two approached the ministerial office with rather widely divergent ideas on the duties and obligations and ideals of that office.

Haller observes that preaching of the Puritan type soon came to be called "spiritual", in contradistinction to the "witty" preaching of the Anglican conservatives. He also quotes Baxter's Christian Directory, in which the author recommends to his reader a list of books by "affectionate, practical English writers", of whom, by the way, Smith is one. They are practical because they tell men what to believe and how to act. They are affectionate because they appeal through the imagination to the affections.

1. vide supra, p. 79
A more inclusive term than either spiritual or affectionate, however, is the word gajbhotic, for this really summed up the Puritan's attitude toward his office as preacher. In a series of lectures delivered at Cambridge, William Perkins, one of the most famous of the Puritan preachers of Smith's day (although his fame reached its height after the turn of the century) described the Puritan ideal of the minister; what he should strive for and aim at.

"The most of us...are either prophets or the sons of the prophets. If thou be a prophet, thou are God's angel. If a son of the prophets thou intendest to be, then mark thy duty. Prophets and Ministers are angels in the very institution of their calling. Therefore thou must preach God's Word as God's Word, and deliver it as thou received it, for angels, ambassadors, and messengers carry not their own message, but the message of the Lord of Hosts."

Smith uses almost the identical terms inspeaking of preachers; "prophets"; "messengers". As the prophets of the Old Testament denounced the judgments of God uponthe sins and errors of Israel, so the Puritan preacher regarded his office as one of rebuke and reproof. As the messenger of God, dealing with imperilled souls, he interpreted in a very literal way the words of St. Paul to Timothy (2 Timothy, 3:16)

"Every Scripture inspired by God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction unto righteousness, etc."

1. This series was entitled, The Calling of the Ministry, Describing the Duties and Dignities of that Calling: (Works of William Perkins, vol. 3, p. 430)
Smith, as we have seen already, was, like all Puritans, intensely biblical—that is to say, he based his sermons chiefly on the deliverance of Holy Scripture. There he looked for his authority and for the principles on which his ministry was to be conducted. Because the Bible, especially the Old Testament, spoke to him in terms of an ethical message, his preaching as well as his whole religious outlook took an ethical turn. But this task of, "instruction unto righteousness" entailed also the element of "reproof and correction", and Smith and his colleagues in the pulpit did not flinch from their duty. Sin, not in general, but in particular, was flayed mercilessly, and individual sinners received an attention which was anything but flattering. We might quote almost *ad infinitum* in support of this, but let one or two of the more direct and pungent rebukes suffice.

"I would that there were not many worse than Jonah among us. Would you know what I think of you? I think you are worse than infidels, Turks, or pagans...." (1)

And in the same sermon, thundering at those in the congregation whose placidity in the face of the foregoing tirades has been suspiciously close to somnolence:

"I marvel how you can sleep with so many eyes looking on you...how long shall I preach before I can convert the userer, the extortioner, the drunkard, or the blasphemer, seeing that I speak thus long, and cannot convert you from your sleeping." (2)

The preacher's duty, after all, was to guide and correct the conduct of his hearers to the saving of their souls.

If he had to accomplish this by the occasional application of "whips and scorpions", he could not as God's messenger draw back.

This brief glance at the theories which the Puritan minister entertained concerning his office has, we feel, been necessary to the understanding of Smith's own technique. Having seen what were his principles as a Puritan, we ask now how he applied those principles to the production of his sermons. In other words, why did men call him "Silver-Tongued Smith"? Leaving out of account such factors as his pulpit-manner, his voice, and other such characteristics, what must we say was the secret of his success?

First, then, let us see what were the themes on which he preached. Usually these themes were clearly indicated in the titles. "A Glass for Drunkards", "The Drunkenness of Noah", "The Examination of Usury", "The Pride of Nebuchednezzar," "The Honour of Humility", "The Humility of Paul", "The Trumpet of the Soul Sounding to Judgment", etc. The titles are attractive and colorful. They seem to invite the reader to examine further. Usually the personal element is either implied or directly stated, for Smith knew that a concrete, personal application of his discourse had far more appeal than a sermon full of "toothless generalities". Thus the magistrate, the lawyer, the drunkard, and the usurer all took their places at the whipping post, and the whistle of the lash seemed to sound in the ears of both victim and onlooker from the moment the title was announced.
In all the list there are only three "occasional" sermons. To explain this term we need only to mention the titles of the sermons themselves, "A Preparative to Marriage", "A Treatise of the Lord's Supper", and "The Lost Sheep is Found", (Robert Dickson). The rest of the sermons are devoted largely to the ordinary precepts of ethical and spiritual conduct. The sins and virtues on which he preached lend themselves to capitalisation; like the Seven Deadly Sins of Spencer's allegory: Pride, Humility, Sobriety, Contentment, Envy, Gluttony, etc. The rich man is rebuked for his hardheartedness; the worldling for his contempt and ill-treatment of the "prophets", (preachers); the magistrate for his arrogance or his partiality, etc. Smith's themes, in short, were the themes around which every-day life is centered. The sins against which he inveighed were sins which concerned his hearers, among whom were magistrates, usurers, lawyers, and drunkards. The virtues which he enjoined were concrete and practical. "The vanity of human wishes", the constant theme of Puritanism, did not remain an indefinite phrase in the sermons of Smith. His hearers were informed as to what these wishes were, and wherein their vanity lay. The desire for riches, for the admiration and flattery of one's fellows, the getting of something for nothing (as in the case of the non-resident and the usurer), the taste for mere

1. The first two consist of two sermons each.
beauty of form, face, or apparel - all these are described explicitly and relegated to the category of vanity and folly.

The style in which these themes are presented, however, is the real source of Smith's greatness. Certainly it is not free from faults, and in great measure it is merely the orthodox style of all Puritan preachers of his day. But on the other hand there are elements in it which betoken real genius.

"So far as Puritanism was a system of religious thought, an interpretation," writes Rufus Jones, "it was essentially forensic." This naturally applies also to Puritan preaching, and here is an element which was both a strength and a weakness in their homiletical method. On one hand it preserved some semblance of orderly progression and logic in the long sermon, but on the other hand it frequently made for tediousness. Haller says, "The Puritans...even held up a perfectly arid and schismatic dialectic as the ideal mode of discourse - knowing better, it must be said, that to practice it upon every occasion."

It is true that Smith, for instance, did not always employ this method, but in more than one sermon we find a "perfectly arid and schismatic dialectic". The Puritan's sermon was, as a modern writer describes it, "A long and ardent discourse, which was divided into 'doctrine', or the subject under discussion, and the 'use' or practical inference to be derived from it. 'Three draughts of sack indoctrines and four in uses', is the way Ben Jonson alludes to the sermon plan.

1. Rufus M. Jones: Mysticism and Democracy.
An example of this is conveniently at hand in one short paragraph from Smith's sermon, "The Lawgiver's Answer"; “But let us examine the words 'Thou shalt love they neighbour as thyself'. Here are four things to be observed: First, what is required, love; secondly, who must love, thou; thirdly, whom must we love, namely, our neighbour; and lastly, how and in what manner we must love him, as we love ourselves.”

Or elsewhere, in the first of two lengthy sermons on marriage. His opening words are abrupt and business-like. “You are come hither to be contracted in the Lord, that is, of two to be made one; ... you are contracted but to be married, therefore I pass from contracts to speak of marriage, which is nothing else but communion of life between men and women according to the ordinance of God. First I will shew the excellency of marriage; then the institution of it; then the cause of it; then the choice of it; then the duties of it; and lastly the divorcement of it.

Well might Paul say, Heb. XIII, 4, 'Marriage is honorable'; for God hath honored it himself. It is honorable for the author, honorable for the time, and honorable for the place."

There is an obvious forensic strain in these passages, and it is a strain which runs through all these sermons. The author is not appealing to the heart but to the mind. He argues the question through as though he were in Court, laying down his premises as so many buoys to mark the course, and then arguing, rather laboriously, from one to another, like a

1. A. N. Myers: Representation and Misrepresentation of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama, p. 57.
2. vide vol. 2; p. 213.
3. A Preparative to Marriage: (1st sermon): vol. 1, p. 5.
sailboat in a heavy sea. Systematically he takes up almost every conceivable aspect of married life, from the question of "Whether ministers may marry" to "Whether mothers should nurse their children".

This kind of sermon, grinding relentlessly on for at least two hours, would, of course, seem intolerable to any modern congregation. His method was over-schismatic and certainly, in the bare outline, is arid and by its very elaboration confusing. And another fault which nearly all sermons of that time displayed, is the tendency of many of Smith's discourses to heap up too many proofs for one point. A case in point is the passage in which Smith cites eleven examples from the Old Testament and seven from the New in order to prove to his hearers that God had chosen the Gentiles rather than the Jews. The cumulative effect of this is stupefaction rather than conviction.

When we have noted these faults, however, we have seen the word in Smith's style. They were faults, as we say, which were common to all preachers of his day—and for generations after him. The virtues in his preaching, on the other hand, while also, to a large extent characteristic of the school in which he was raised were to an even greater degree, his own. The Puritans in general, while they disapproved, as a matter of religious principle, of literary and classical allusions—"profane" wisdom, as they felt—nonetheless shared in the

typical Elizabethan love for witty phrase and colorful image. They revelled in homely similes, parables, and striking allegories.

Probably the most outstanding characteristic of Smith's style was his genius for parallelisms of all sorts. Here his poetic imagination stood him in good stead, giving him a faculty for pungent and expressive sentences, brilliant language, and vivid metaphors. The age which produced Shakespeare, Jonson, Spenser, and others was one in which grandeur of thought, combined with fertile imagination, was not infrequently to be found in churchmen as well as poets. Smith, being both poet and churchman, is therefore particularly noteworthy in this respect. It is impossible, therefore, to get at the secret of his freshness and "readability" without paying close attention to his powers of illustration.

Here, for example, is a beautifully turned passage in a sermon which we have already quoted as an instance of the "arid schismatic dialectic".

"As the light of the candle doth not dazzle but rather commend the light of the sun, so our love to our neighbour doth not diminish but rather accomplish our love to God. He that loves the fruit will love the tree on which it grows, and he that loveth the stream will love the fountain from which it floweth. Even so he that loveth man, which is a creature, will much more love God that hath created him."

In another sermon where the elaborate array of heads and sub-heads would seem hopelessly laborious, he employs figures of speech which combine beauty with blunt

1. TheLawgiver's Answer: Vol. 2, p. 213 (vide supra, p. 189)
rebuke in a striking way. He is pleading with the wealthy members of his audience to exercise themselves in charities to the poor.

"The clouds, if they be full, do yield forth their rain; much rain is a burden to the clouds, and much riches are burdens to men. ... Again, to eat much, to drink much, and to rest much is a burden to the soul, though it be pleasant to the body. ...

Beloved in the Lord, let me entreat you rich men to consider it your duty to remember the poor and their continual want; you that eat till you blow, and feed till your eyes swell with fatness; that taste first of your coarse meats and then fall to your finer fare, that have your several drinks for your stomach, and your sorts of wines for your appetite."

Such language as this has the effect of making all clear and fresh. The dry bones of the skeleton of his sermon cease to rattle and become clothed with flesh, color, and life. While the reader may not be able to keep in mind the various involutions and digressions of the outline as a whole, the individual points are driven home and riveted unforget-tably by these flashing, trenchant thrusts of the imagination. And while, as we have intimated, he could occasionally err on the side of over-loading, this was seldom the case where imagery rather than Scriptural illustration was concerned. Thus he paints a series of pictures of the sinner struggling with the weakness of the flesh.

1. A Treatise of The Lord's Supper; vol. 1, pp. 50, 51.
"We stand all in a slippery place where it is easy to slide and hard to get up; like little children which over-throw themselves with their clothes, now up, now down at a straw, so soon we fall from God and slide from his word, and forget our resolutions as though we had never resolved. ...Thus man is set upon the side of the hill, always declining and slipping; the flesh muffleth him to make him stumble, the world catcheth at him to make him fall; the devil undermineth him to make him sink. ...Sin is not long in coming, nor quickly gone, unless God stop us, as he met Balaam in his way, and stay us, as he stayed the woman's son when he was a-bearing to the grave. We run over reason and tread upon conscience, and fling by counsel, and go by the word and post to death, as though we run for a kingdom. Like a lark, that falls to the ground sooner than she mounted up; at first she retires as it were by steps, but when she cometh near the ground, she falls down with a jump. So we decline at first and waver lower and lower, till we be almost at the worst, and then we run headlong as though we were sent post to hell: from hot to lukewarm, from lukewarm to keycold, from keycold to stark dead."(1)

A device often used by Smith and the other Puritan preachers of the day took the form of allegory. Man's pilgrimage to Zion, his battles on the way with Appolyon, his trials and Vanity Fair - all these pictures, in one guise or another, were in common use long before Bunyan's time. During Elizabeth's reign, the Miracle and Mystery plays were still very popular with the more humble classes of society. Spenser's Faerie Queen came out in 1589, as Haller puts it,  

"The growing attraction of the stage among the people forced the minister to go to new length and new devices to interest and edify his hearers, most of whom were of the class which also frequented the theatres. The problem of moral conduct became a war between good and evil, a stirring drama in which the Seven Deadly Sins are used as actors."

Maller even goes so far as to quote a passage from Smith. While only one of numerous such passages, this perhaps is the most widely quoted and the most vivid illustration of Puritan allegorizing.

"There is a warning conscience and a gnawing conscience. The warning conscience is oft lulled asleep, but the gnawing conscience wakeneth her again. If there be any hell in this world, they which feel the worm of conscience gnawing upon their hearts may truly say that they have felt the torments of hell. Who can express that man's horror but himself? ... sorrows are met in his soul as at a feast; and fears, thought, and anguish divide his soul between them. All the furies of hell leap upon his heart like a stage. Thought calleth to fear, fear whistleth to horror, horror beckoneth to despair, and sayeth Come and help me to torment this sinner. One saith that she cometh from this sin, and another saith that she cometh from that sin; so he goeth through a thousand deaths and cannot die." (I)

The language conjures up pictures of a Morality Play, with Satan's minions pitchforking gyrating sinners into the gaping maw of the fire, - belching dragon, Satan - all to the delight of the simple peasants and tradesmen who watch the spectacle.

Here the abstract categories of the moral sphere are clothed with body and personality. Each temptation is

1. The Betraying of Christ; Vol. 2; pp. 418-419.
identified and personalized. "Radical evil", a philosophical abstraction much invogue today, would have meant nothing to Smith's listeners, but Satan, with his tail and horns, caused them to thrill and shudder.

We have learned already, however, that Smith did not always allegorize sin. He was capable of lashing out in direct attack on the individual sinner. Usury is not dressed up in a costume, for instance, but is attacked and stripped of what scanty rags of respectability it had. Not only does he devote two complete sermons to demolishing the defences of usury, but here and there in other sermons he refers bitterly to "those great thieves, our biting usurers". It was a trait of the Puritan preachers that they never hesitated to say "you" instead of "they" in denouncing evil-doers.

There is often in his scoldings and warnings a strong flavour of ironical humor. Indeed, the humour in some places is astonishing in a Puritan - even in such a Puritan as Smith. His exasperation with the sleeping members of his audience is frequently expressed in brisk, unsparing words, but at the same time there is frequently a note of jocularity.

"What would you do if I read some homilies unto you, whereas you cannot wake while I preach to you? ...if all of you were, as many of you be, I mean asleep, the strangers which come hither to hear you would think that you are all dead, and that I preached your funeral sermon; therefore, for shame - leave off your sleeping." (1)

This vein of humor, furthermore, does not always run to irony. We find instances where Smith speaks out with a playful earnestness which must have brought a surprised answering smile to many a face.

"It is said that drunken porters keep open gates; so when Noah was drunken he set all open. As wine went in, so wit went out; as wit went out, so his clothes went off. Thus Adam, which began the world at first, was made naked with sin... and Noah, which began the world again, is made naked with sin, to shew that sin is no shrouder but a stripper. This is one fruit of the vine more than Noah looked for; instead of being refreshed and comforted, he was stripped and scorned." (1)

There is a delightful naiveté here entirely out of keeping with the traditional picture of the stern, ranting Puritan. Even more so is the manly tenderness and half-playful earnestness of the following passage. Taken from the first long sermon on marriage, it comes as rather a soothing, pleasant note after the formidable propaedeutics which precede it; admonishing husbands to deal kindly with their wives, he says;

"But if he strike her he takes away his hand from her, which was the first part he gave her to join them together, and she may put her complaint against him, that he hath taken away part of her goods. Her cheeks are made for thy lips, but not for thy fists." (2).

The last quality of Smith's style to which we would draw attention is its fundamental simplicity; not of sermon

1. A Glass for Drunkards; Vol. 1, p. 305
2. A Preparative to Marriage; 1st sermon, vol. 1, p. 26
outline, for that, as we know, could be far from simple, but of thought and expression. This appears in his carefully thought-out images and metaphors, which, however, are clear and unmarred by excess verbiage. His titles, also, we notice, are simple and unembellished by superfluous wording, but many of them have a quaint simplicity that amounts to sheer artistry - The Sweet Song of Old Father Simeon, for example. In his reproofs he is forthright and blunt - as witness his stinging remarks to the false prophet, Robert Dickons:

"God is my witness, I have suffered the Spirit to speak unto thee, because I seek they conversion; but if thou wilt not return, while mercy is ready, I bring thee sorrowful tidings; when Satan shall not help thee, the rack must prove this doctrine. Wilt thou heap God, and the Devil, and Men upon thee all at once? O wretched creature and miserable prophet! " (1)

And yet, almost in the next breath Smith pleads with a simple eloquence:

"If thy portion be amongst the righteous... if thou canst go with me, and it may please the Divine Providence to call thee at my voice, I will sing praises, I will give thanks..." (2)

The simplicity which is such an important factor in Smith's eloquence is of the sort which can come only from a rich mind. Style, after all, is not so much a matter of training as it is of the speaker's personality and his purpose. If his aim in preaching is to display his erudition, his style will be or-

1. The Lost Sheep is Found; vol. 2, p. 316
2. ibid. p. 317.
nate, full of flourishes and learned allusions in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew. If his aim be to demolish the arguments of an opponent, his style will be aggressive, hectoring, and profuse in argument. Smith was sometimes guilty of the latter fault, but never of the former. His main purpose in preaching was to call the sinner to repentance—therefore he was, for the most part fundamentally simple. That it was a painstaking simplicity is obvious from one of his incisive criticisms of the ignorant clergymen of that age.

"As every sound is not music, so every sermon is not preaching. ...for as Jesus would have us consider what we ask before we come to pray, much more would we consider before we come to preach; for it is harder to speak God's Word than to speak to God; yet there are preachers risen up lately, which shroud every absurd sermon under the name of the simple kind of preaching, like the popish priests, which made ignorance the mother of devotion; but, indeed, to preach simply is not to preach unlearnedly nor confusedly, but plainly and perspicuously, that the simplest which doth hear may understand what is taught as if he did hear his name."(1)

Perhaps no other example could so well illustrate Smith's style and his purpose—and, let us say, his genius—as the closing remarks of what must have been almost his last sermon in St. Clement's. In this passage there is, to be sure, nothing of the forensic, but there is the gift for imagery, the gentle humour, and the rich simplicity which gained for him the title, "Silver-Tongued Smith".

---

1. The Art of Hearing; vol. 1, p.p. 336-337
"Thus ye have heard what God requires for all that he hath given you. ...What shall I wish you now before my departure? I wish you would give your hearts to God while I speak, that yet might have a kingdom for that. Send for your hearts where they are wandering, one from the Bank, another from the Tavern, another from the Shop, another from the Theaters; call them all home and give them to God and see how he will welcome them, as the father embraceth the son.

...when you pray, let your heart pray; when you hear, let your heart hear; when you give, let your heart give; whatsoever you do, set the heart to do it, and if it be not so perfect as it should or ought to be, yet it shall be accepted for the friends that gives it.

I have but one day more to teach you all that you must learn of me; therefore I would hold you here until you assent to give your hearts to God. If ye give them not now, where have I cast the seed, and how have you heard all this year? If ye will give them now, ye shall be adopted this day the sons of God, and I shall leave you in the bosom of Christ, which will give you heaven for your hearts. The Lord Jesus grant that my words be not the savour of death unto any soul here, but that you may go in strength thereof, through prosperity and adversity, till you hear that comfort from heaven, 'Come, ye blessed and receive the inheritance prepared for you.' " (1)

CHAPTER XII
HENRY SMITH: AN EVALUATION

Let us pause briefly, before we close this dissertation, in order to gain an integrated view of Henry Smith. What aspects of his career make him a significant figure and one worthy of our attention? The relative paucity of material bearing on his life and the fact that only two volumes of his sermons are left to us, prevent us from finding in him a historical importance equal to that, say, of Cartwright or Travers. He produced no Book of Discipline, nor did he lead the Puritan Party in its controversy with Whitgift. He was for the most part, as Strype says of him, "a man peaceable in Israel". Such men, however peaceable they may seem to their contemporaries, are usually forgotten by those who live in later ages. So with Smith. His name is seldom mentioned - and then only in passing - by historians dealing with Elizabethan Puritanism.

And yet Smith has a right to be noticed with respect by the students of Puritan history, if for no other reason than that he was a great preacher in a day when preachers of any sort were scarce. Parish priests with ability and education were the exception rather than the rule, for when Elizabeth, coming to the throne, had ejected the Roman Catholic clergy, she had made almost no provision for ministers to take their places. As time went on, furthermore, hundreds of the Puritan clergy who, of course, took a serious view of their office, were suspended or
imprisoned, leaving the field to nonresidents, "dumb dogs" who could not preach and whose lives in many cases were anything but a good example for their parishioners.

The eagerness of the people to hear the Word of God preached increased rather than diminished, and as the Puritan controversy gathered momentum, a situation arose in which, especially in London, any reasonably able preacher was bound to have large crowds attending his services. Into this situation, then, came Smith. With an intellect and educational background which would have distinguished him in any age, he stood out as a preaching giant in Elizabethan London.

The Puritan movement, furthermore, while exercising a most salutary effect on the morals - private and public - of England, was increasing largely through the hold which its preaching was gaining in the hearts and minds of the middle and lower-middle classes. Cartwright and Travers might lead the ministers and the intelligentsia of the Puritan party, but it was the preachers themselves who led the people. Smith's significance, therefore, is that of one who not only was part of the great preaching tradition in which the real power of the movement was generated, but who also enriched that tradition. Such a contribution marks him as being one of the great Christian succession - Chrysostom, with whom Fuller compares him, Augustine, Savanorola, Wesley, and the rest - and one who stands in this succession is significant in any age.
Henry Smith was, furthermore, representative of a stage of Puritanism. The movement in his time had not entered the great "classical era" of its history, but the forces were slowly gathering which ultimately produced that era. Those forces, in the years when Smith was a part of the movement, took the form, on one hand, of an agitation for ecclesiastical reform, and, on the other hand, a determined attempt to regulate personal life and beliefs according to a strict ethical code.

As regards the one, Smith was typical of the group who organized, developed, and led the advance of Puritanism - the men who gave the movement cohesiveness and a definite goal. In other words, he was a Presbyterian. But being a Presbyterian at that stage involved also loyalty to the Church of England. Smith was as vigorous in his defense of the Church against the attacks of the Separatists as any of the Bishops. The centrifugal, schismatic force represented by the sect-type had not yet become part of the Presbyterian movement. Smith was loyal to the Established Church, much as he was loyal to the throne, for he regarded both as divine institutions, appointed by God to rule over all religious and civil life in England. This loyalty was part of his religion. Only when both the throne and the Established Church seemed to the Puritan to be clearly interfering with the operation of God's sovereignty did he allow himself to be caught up in this movement toward independency.
In the matter of theology - the relation of man's soul to God, Smith was again representative of a stage in the development of Puritanism. During the next half century, as the Anglican Church drifted further and further toward the Arminian position, Puritanism gathered itself into a legalistic Calvinism, which was far more extreme than that of the lawyer, Calvin. The ethical emphasis which appears so markedly in the time of Smith, increased in the next few decades into something well-nigh as vigorous and deadening as the Jewish law had been.

We see then in Smith's preaching probably the limit to which this ethical emphasis could go before it merged into a "doctrine of good works". In Smith this code is still healthy and in keeping with sound Christianity. All life, for him, rested on the propositum oboedientiae, serving for one end only, the greater Glory of God. A systematic code of ethics was therefore necessary for every believer in order that he might have standards by which to judge whether or not his life was serving in majorem gloriam Dei. The constitutionalism of the next century, was by its very nature dangerously open to the insidious permeation of legalism. Smith, as we say, represents Puritanism in the stage just prior to this development. His was the stage which lacked the systematic character of the latter period. He and his contemporaries for that very reason retained a spontaneity and a freedom of thought which seventeenth century Puritanism seemed somehow to lack.
Finally, Smith demands our interest because he was a colorful and dramatic figure. He was a Puritan who wrote poetry - a Puritan with a strong tinge of the romanticist in his sermons. This in itself was unusual enough to engage our attention. And then his very youth has an appeal for us. We see him as the stern young inquisitor, heir of the Dickons affair. A few years later, still a mere lad compared to most of the other ministers in London, we see him preaching to a crowded church, the most popular preacher in London. The sermons which are extant today, in spite of changing customs and conditions, are still interesting and edifying. Some of them deserve to be ranked among the literary masterpieces of the sixteenth century.

One who dies young is nearly always an object of speculation. When he is a genius, and Smith undoubtedly deserves to be rated as such, the speculation is doubly tantalizing. What would he have been had he lived? Like young George Gillespie, who played so prominent and glorious a part in the Westminster Assembly, half a century later, Smith died when his popularity and his effectiveness were still increasing. Such wistful speculation is, of course, idle. We can only surmise as to what he might have become, but we know what he was. In the short span of life allotted to him, Henry Smith developed qualities in which the Puritanism of sixteenth-century England is reflected.

Macaulay, with his flair for vivid but superficial thumb-nail sketches, has remarked that, "the....Puritan was
at once known from other men by his gait, his garb, his lank hair, the sour solemnity of his face, the upturned white of his eyes, the nasal twang with which he spoke and, above all, by his peculiar dialect." "In other words, Macaulay has described here the perfect "stage Puritan." Had he studied the Puritans themselves instead of the lampoons about them, it is hardly likely that he would have written as he did. We have endeavored to give, in this study of the Puritan movement and of the personality of Henry Smith, a clear picture of the real character of Early English Puritanism. That character, both through its strength and its weaknesses, has played an important part in shaping the civilization of the whole English-speaking world.
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