

2010

"Unspottyd lambs of the Lord": Presbyterianism and the people in Elizabethan London

Katherine E. Sawyer

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sawyer, Katherine E., ""Unspottyd lambs of the Lord": Presbyterianism and the people in Elizabethan London" (2010). *LSU Master's Theses*. 4157.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/4157

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

“UNSPOTTYD LAMBS OF THE LORD”:
PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE PEOPLE IN ELIZABETHAN LONDON

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of History

by
Katherine E. Sawyer
B.A., Louisiana College, 2006
May 2010

©Copyright 2010 [2010/Copyright]

Katherine E. Sawyer

All Rights Reserved

Saw'st thou ever Si quis patch'd on Pauls Church dore,
To seek some vacant Vicarage before?
Who wants a Churchman, that can service sey,
Read fast, and faire, his monthly Homiley?
And we, and bury, and make Christen-soules?
Come to the left-side Alley of Saint Poules.
Thou servile Foole: why couldst thou not repaire
To buy a Benefice at Steeple-Faire?
There moughtest thou for but a slender price,
Advowson thee with some fat benefice:
Or if thee list not wayt for dead mens shoo'n,
Nor pray ech-morn th'Incumbents daies wer doon
A thousand Patrons thither ready bring,
Their new-falne Churches to the Chattering,
Stake three years Stipend: no man asketh more:
Go take possession of the Church-porch-door:
And ring thy bells: luck stroken thy fist,
The Parsonage is thine, or ere thou wist.
Saint Fooles of Gotam mought thy parish bee,
For this thy base and servile Symonie.

—Joseph Hall, *Virgidemiarum*, 1597

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have to admit that when I began my career as a graduate student, successfully writing and defending a master's thesis seemed like an impossible challenge. With that rather gloomy prognostication in mind, I must take a moment to thank the numerous people who have helped me to ensure that it did not become a reality. First and foremost, I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my advisor, Victor Stater, who has encouraged and guided me through the pitfalls and (dare I say it) pratfalls, of writing this thesis from start to finish, even when it required periodically throwing me into the proverbial deep end and waiting for me to learn how to swim. Suzanne Marchand and Christine Kooi have both been invaluable sources of encouragement and inspiration, both as faculty members and thesis advisors, and I have greatly appreciated their professional and personal mentorship over the past three years. Gaines Foster and Karl Roeder have also served as friendly faces and constant advocates in the History Department, and I am grateful for their guidance and encouragement. Darlene Albritton, our department administrator, has also been a valuable source of support from my very first day at LSU, and I am tremendously thankful for her friendship.

I could not have survived the last three years without the unwavering support and encouragement of my friends and family. I have formed some wonderful friendships during my time in Baton Rouge. My colleagues and fellow minions on the third floor of Himes Hall—Chris Childers, Adam Pratt, Geoff Cunningham, Shauna Ingwell, David Lilly, Aaron Horton, Mike Frawley, Katie Eskridge, Mike Robinson, Jason Wolfe, Alan Forrester, Blake Renfro, and numerous others—have become good sounding-boards and even better friends, and all encouraged me to press on when I doubted myself. I am so grateful for all of them. Heather Thornton generously allowed me to pick her brain when I ran into the inevitable scholarly

roadblocks which accompany a major project, and I cannot thank her enough for her patience with this newbie historian.

I owe special thanks to my Baton Rouge “family.” Harper Levy has been my best friend since we were sixteen-year-olds trying to play basketball against girls twice our size, and as always, I am tremendously thankful for her friendship. Nathan Buman has become like a brother to me, and was a constant source of encouragement throughout the writing process for this thesis. I am so glad that he married my best friend, and I cannot wait to annoy him until we are grey and old. Emily Roark has been a dear friend since our semester abroad in London in 2004, and truly understands just how much I love that city. She, too, has been incredibly supportive over the last few years, for which I will always be grateful. Bradly McCollum has been my walking buddy and sympathetic audience for two years, and I have cherished both his talent for comic relief and his constant friendship. Lindsay Roger also deserves a huge amount of thanks for helping me to survive the last year. Her ability to function as drill sergeant, therapist, comedian, and mother hen helped me to survive self-doubt, fatigue, and intellectual burnout, and I will always be grateful for her friendship. Kristin Bynog has also been a steadfast friend and confidante over the years. I will never cease to value her wise words and kind counsel. I must also say a special thank you to Lisa Kuhn-James and Cassidy Crawford-Hancock, my “London sisters”, with whom I discovered London as a girl and grew to love it as a young woman. They have been constant sources of personal and professional support for the last five years, and I will always love them like sisters.

Perhaps most importantly, however, I must thank my family, who has been the constant in my life when everything else has seemed unstable. My brothers, David and Daniel, have grown from childhood adversaries to trusted friends, and I am so thankful for their support. My sister, Hannah, has become one of my favorite people. I am proud to be her sister and grateful

for her love and encouragement. My parents, Jack and Carolyn Sawyer, have always been my staunchest advocates and most enthusiastic cheerleaders. My father taught me to love history at a young age, and I have never forgotten his history lessons, his stories, or his passion for teaching. My mother taught me how to keep smiling, even in the face of uncertainty, and I treasure her example and friendship. My parents have consistently sacrificed to provide me with a quality education and with better opportunities than they were given, and I can never thank them enough for their hard work, generosity, and unshakable love. I dedicate this work to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 LONDON AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.....	10
Religiosity and the People of London.....	10
English Politics and the Protestant Reformation.....	14
Puritans and the Beginnings of Presbyterianism.....	21
3 THE LONDON PARISHES AND THE EMERGENCE OF ENGLISH PRESBYTERIANISM.....	32
London's Religious Liberties.....	32
The Growth of Parish Lectureships.....	39
The <i>Admonition</i> Controversy.....	42
4 THE PRESBYTERIANS.....	54
The Ministers.....	56
The Nobility and Gentry.....	60
The Merchants.....	65
The Strangers.....	71
The People.....	76
5 THE CONSOLIDATION AND COLLAPSE OF ELIZABETHAN PRESBYTERIANISM IN LONDON.....	82
The Calm before the Storm.....	82
"The Pope of Lambeth" and London's Radicalization.....	86
The Marprelate Tracts.....	90
Presbyterians on Trial and Revolutionaries in the Streets.....	94
6 CONCLUSION.....	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	106
VITA.....	119

ABSTRACT

The official English church in the mid-sixteenth century vacillated back and forth between Catholicism and Protestantism, the two rivals of European Christianity. As these changes engendered a broad array of disagreements over issues such as liturgical practices, clerical attire, and church ornamentation, this thesis focuses on the most provocative of these debates—presbyterianism—and its proliferation among the men and women of Elizabethan London. Despite the propagation of presbyterian-style nonconformity in several regions of Elizabeth's realm, London functioned as the epicenter of this challenge to religious orthodoxy. From their location at the economic, religious, and cultural heart of the nation, Elizabethan Londoners could not avoid encountering the overblown rhetoric and impassioned opining of the various characters of the religious drama that played out in their streets, making the capital one of the most radically-inclined areas in England. Throughout Elizabeth I's reign, the city remained firmly situated at the center of the tension that characterized English religion. Although the conflict between the established Church of England and the presbyterians climaxed under Elizabeth's Stuart successors, it began to emerge during her reign, and noticeably affected the religious climate of the era.

Rather than focusing on specific theological questions, this thesis examines the way in which the various orders of presbyterian Londoners interacted and formed a functional movement. Ultimately, London presbyterianism not only flourished, but also represented a serious challenge to the official Church's authority because of its ability to appeal to men and women from all orders of the city's society: churchmen, nobles, merchants, tradesmen, and the common sort, as well as the influential communities of religious exiles from the Continent who made their homes within the city and its environs. As a result of this popular appeal, the presbyterian movement was able to endure the systematic attempts to eliminate it carried out by

the Queen and the church hierarchy, to continue to help shape the nation's religious climate under the Stuarts, and to leave a lasting mark on English culture.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Friday, July 16, 1591 began like any other day for the men and women of Elizabethan London. Along Cheapside, one of the busiest thoroughfares in the city, merchants energetically displayed their wares: meat, poultry, produce, meal, herbal remedies, gold, flowers, and a host of other goods.¹ Around ten o'clock, however, a frenzied cry rose above the everyday marketplace noise. "Repent, England, Repent!" bellowed Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthington from their perch on top of an empty cart near Cheapside Cross, the funerary monument for Queen Eleanor of Castile standing in the middle of the street. Shouting over the throng of curious onlookers who had assembled around their makeshift pulpit, they passionately informed their audience that Jesus Christ had come to their city "with his Fanne in his hand to judge the earth."² According to Coppinger and Arthington, who referred to themselves as the Prophets of Judgment and Mercy, Christ had manifested himself the form of their friend, William Hacket, and was currently residing near Brokenwharfe, a riverside area of the city located mere minutes walk away from their current position. To those men and women who doubted the truth of their claim, they challenged them to seek out Walker's lodging-house, where they had left Hacket lying in his bed, and to see the evidence for themselves.³

¹ Liza Picard, *Elizabeth's London : Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004), 26-27, 37, 149; see also John Stowe, *A Survey of London : Written in the Year 1598*, ed. Antonia Frasier (Gloucestershire, UK: The History Press, 2009); and Robert Taylor, Adrian Prockter, and John Kerwin Fisher, *The A to Z of Elizabethan London* (London: London Topographical Society, 1979).

² Richard Cosin, *Conspiracy, for Pretended Reformation: viz. The Presbyteriall Discipline* (London, 1592), 55. For other contemporary accounts of the revolt, see: Richard Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings, Published and Practised within this Island of Brytaine, under Pretence for Reformation, and for the Presbyteriall Discipline* (London, 1593), 144-176, and 'Memorandum of the arraignment, at Newgate, of William Hacket, of Northamptonshire, for high treason', 26 July 1591, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Fourteenth Report, appendix, part IV: the MSS of Lord Kenyon* (London, 1984) (HMC, *Kenyon MSS*), 607-609; and Henry Arthington, *The Seduction of Arthington by Hacket especiaillie, with Some Tokens of his Unfained Repentance and Submission* (London, 1592).

³ Cosin, 55.

Continuing their fervent oration, Coppinger and Arthington declared that Christ (Hacket) intended to do away with the traditional structure of the Church of England and to replace it with the presbyterian ecclesiastical organization favored by a small but vocal number of English clergymen and laypeople, as well as by Protestants in Scotland and Switzerland. They promised great joy and success to anyone who would submit to their plan for reformation, but threatened judgment and damnation for those who did not heed their call, warning that if London's citizens persisted in their religious recalcitrance, "men should (there) kill and massacre one another (as Butchers doe kill swine) all the day long, and no man should take compassion of them."⁴

As their boisterous audience expanded, Coppinger's and Arthington's claims grew increasingly treasonous. They insisted that Hacket was not only the physical manifestation of Christ on earth, but also was the King of Europe, a position which, according to them, granted him power over any earthly monarch. They claimed that Queen Elizabeth had forfeited her right to the English crown by failing to institute presbyterian church discipline, and must now submit herself to Hacket's religious and secular authority.⁵ Hoping to spur the crowd into rioting in favor of their cause, they railed against several members of Elizabeth's Privy Council, most likely Christopher Hatton, the Lord Chancellor, John Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Saville, Lord Buckhurst, calling them "traytours to the state and the churche, [and] advising the people to undertake to themselves the reformation of those abuses and the restitution of christian purity."⁶ All the while, they punctuated their message with threats to their own

⁴ Ibid., 57.

⁵ *Fourteenth Report*, 607-609.

⁶ Ibid.; Cosin, 57; Alexandra Walsham, "'Frantick Hacket': Prophecy, Sorcery, Insanity, and the Elizabethan Puritan Movement," *The Historical Journal* 41, no. 1 (March 1998), 28. See also John Booty, "Tumult in Cheapside: The Hacket Conspiracy," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42, no. 3 (September 1973): 294-317; and Michael P. Winship, "Puritans, Politics, & Lunacy: The Copinger-Hacket Conspiracy," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 2 (2007): 345-369.

salvation which were meant to corroborate the truth of their claims, “wishing themselves confounded and damned for ever, if these things they spoke, were not true.”⁷

These self-styled prophets continued their scandalous tirade until they were pulled from their stage by Lawson, an embarrassed acquaintance of Coppinger’s, and forced into the shelter of the nearby Mermaid Tavern, thus ending their plan to lead a riotous mob through the streets of London. Lawson convinced Coppinger to sneak through the back streets to the safety of his sister’s house near Paul’s Wharf. Arthington remained behind, however, and continued to preach Hacket’s message until he was finally persuaded to leave by Lawson’s apprentice, who had been sent back to fetch the overly-zealous evangelist. Continuing to shout his message of repentance, Arthington made his way to Coppinger’s lodgings, only to find that the doors had been locked. Hardly discouraged, and now followed by “a great multitude of lads and young persons of the meaner sort”, he continued on to Hacket’s lodgings in Brokenwharfe, where he and Hacket were restrained by a tenant named Edward Jones.⁸ According to Richard Cosin, the ecclesiastical lawyer who chronicled the ill-fated revolution, news of the bungled uprising traveled quickly “this strange accident being quickly blowen through the citie, all was in a buzze, and in a kinde of astonishment, what to thinke of the matter: and being speedily brought to her Majeseties cares, (then lying but at Greenwich) two of her honourable Counsell were presently dispatched unto London, to take further notice of the whole matter.”⁹

By the close of the day, Coppinger, Hacket and Arthington found themselves imprisoned in the Lord Mayor’s residence and faced with the grim realization that their plan for a swift inauguration of English presbyterianism had failed miserably. After a brief imprisonment and trial at Bridewell and Newgate prisons, Hacket, who remained intractably blasphemous and

⁷ Cosin, 56.

⁸ Ibid., 58-59.

⁹ Ibid., 59; and *Acts of the Privy Council of England: New Series*, vol. 21, A.D. 1591-1592 (London, 1901), 293-294.

treasonous to the end, was dragged on a hurdle from Newgate through the streets of the city to Cheapside Cross on July 28, where he was hanged in front of a sizeable crowd of curious onlookers, after asking his executioner, “Ah thou bastards childe, wilt thou hange William Hacket thy king?” and praying,

Oh God of heaven, mightie Jehovah, Alpha and Omega, Lord of Lordes, King of Kings, and God everlasting, that knowest me to be that true Jehovah, whome thou hast sent: send some miracle out of a cloude to convert these Infidels, and deliver me from these mine enemies: If not, I will fire the heavens, and teare thee from thy throne with my handes.¹⁰

Coppinger, who had refused to eat since his arrest, died the following day in Bridewell. After hearing of Hacket’s execution and Coppinger’s death, Arthington, imprisoned in the Counter prison, swiftly recanted his loyalty to Hacket and was freed in August 1592.¹¹ Eager to exonerate himself, Arthington now maintained that Hacket was not Christ incarnate, but was instead an evil sorcerer who had used witchcraft to dupe Arthington into participating in the doomed enterprise, an argument which he published in 1592 as a book entitled *The Seduction of Arthington by Hacket especially, with some tokens of his unfained repentance and submission*.¹²

Its three protagonists thus apprehended, discredited and summarily disowned as lunatics by the presbyterian ministers whom they sought to defend, the Hacket Revolt stands as one of the more bizarre episodes in the religiously tumultuous Tudor Era. For the nascent presbyterian movement, it functioned as the final blow to the hope of instituting an officially-sanctioned, presbyterian English church. Following on the heels of the religious and political firestorm which had arisen from the controversial Marprelate Tracts in the late 1580s, the failed uprising’s association (however tenuous) with legitimate presbyterianism only served to convince Elizabeth

¹⁰ Cosin, 72; For the order for Hacket’s execution, see *Acts of the Privy Council*, vol. 21, 325-326.

¹¹ *Acts of the Privy Council of England: New Series*, vol. 23, A.D. 1592 (London, 1901), 98.

¹² For a recent analysis of the legitimacy of Arthington’s claims, see Owen Williams, “Exorcising Madness in Late Elizabethan England: *The Seduction of Arthington* and the Criminal Culpability of Demoniacs,” *Journal of British Studies* 47, no. 1 (January 2008): 30-52.

and her divines of the movement's dangerous, radical nature and to supply ample ammunition for the rhetorical onslaught waged by its opponents.¹³

While the Hacket Revolt failed to accomplish its goal of successfully launching an officially-sanctioned presbyterian polity in the Church of England, its existence bears evidence of the Elizabethan presbyterian movement's popular nature. Hacket, Coppinger, Arthington, and their various enablers among the already-harried circle of presbyterians in the city believed they could simply start an ecclesiastical revolution by bringing their message to the streets of London. While they were undoubtedly mistaken as to their ability to manipulate their audience in Cheapside, they were not entirely wrong to believe that the presbyterian polity maintained a devoted following among many in the city. The widespread popularity of the *Admonition to the Parliament* and the Marprelate Tracts among all orders of London society prompted a frenzied search by religious authorities for the illegal presses used to print the pro-presbyterian works, as well as the prosecution of several men and women who were suspected to be their authors. By 1591, the movement in London had already endured several years of concerted persecution from John Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Aylmer, the Bishop of London, and Christopher Hatton, Elizabeth's Lord Chancellor, and would recede from the forefront of official religious policy over the remainder of the 1590s, a decade so marked by political, social and economic tensions that Patrick Collinson has dubbed it the "nasty nineties."¹⁴

¹³ Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 424.

¹⁴ Collinson, "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 150-170; see also: John Pound, *Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1986); Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1988); Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Rui Carvalho Homem and Fátima Vieira, *Gloriana's Rule: Literature, Religion and Power in the Age of Elizabeth* (Porto: Editora da Universidade do Porto, 2006); Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-17; Charles Littleton, "Social interactions of aliens in late Elizabethan London: evidence from the 1593 Return and the French Church consistory 'actes'," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 26, no. 3 (1994): 147.

Despite this fate, London had not seen its last presbyterian. While Whitgift and Aylmer successfully eliminated presbyterian sentiment from London's official pulpits, they could never fully suppress the movement in the city's streets. In fact, as H.G. Owen notes, "So fashionable a refuge had the capital become to the Scotsman and the harried rural radical, as well as the ejected local minister, that the activities of the casual preacher could never be finally subdued."¹⁵

Taking full advantage of the diversity afforded by the sprawling metropolis, the presbyterians managed to preserve their ideas and to maintain their religious identity despite the watchful eyes of the church hierarchy. Indeed, as Elizabeth herself complained, "London was a city 'where every merchant must have his schoolmaster and nightly conventicles expounding scriptures and catechizing their servants and maids, in so much that I have heard how some of their maids have not sticed to control learned preachers and say that such a man taught otherwise in our house."¹⁶

Taking advantage of parishes which maintained a traditional measure of autonomy from the strictures of the official church, the presbyterians preserved their unsanctioned foothold in the capital city and managed to endure the efforts of Whitgift and his bishops.¹⁷ This phenomenon undoubtedly contributed to the theological leanings of Coppinger and Arthington, who, according to Cosin,

having itching eares, most usually heaped to themselves, and made choise to heare and follow such preachers, as were thought fittest to feede their humour: which preachers, with their sad looks, frequent sighes abroad, long and vehement conceived prayers, pitter and playne invectives in private, and privie depraving in publike, of the laws and police Ecclesiasticall, toyed with their usuall speeches, besides sundry infamous libels and other pamphlets spred already for advancing that government (which they strangely terme *The Discipline*) may seeme so to have inflamed these two persons, as that they thought this

¹⁵ Ibid., 573.

¹⁶ State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth 12/176/68, fol. 215; transcribed in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janell Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). 179.

¹⁷ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minorities: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," *East London Papers* 8 (1965): 81-97; E. M. Tomlinson, *A History of the Minorities, London* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1907), 161-189; and D. A. Williams, "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate," *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1960): 24-38

Discipline a worthie subject whereupon they should spend most of their actions and cogitations.¹⁸

The official English church in the mid-sixteenth century vacillated back and forth between Catholicism and Protestantism, the two rivals of European Christianity. Many scholars who have written about the English Reformation and the Elizabethan Settlement in 1559 have focused on high church practices and official doctrines of the church and state.¹⁹ As these changes engendered a broad array of disagreements over issues such as liturgical practices, clerical attire, and church ornamentation, I have chosen to focus my narrative on the most inflammatory of these debates—presbyterianism—and its proliferation among the men and women of London. The Elizabethan presbyterian controversy represents what Owen called one of “the high-water marks of nonconformity, and at the same time, [an inauguration of] a period of Anglican retrenchment.”²⁰ Despite the propagation of presbyterian-style nonconformity in several regions of Elizabeth’s realm, London functioned as the epicenter of this challenge to religious orthodoxy. From their location at the economic, religious, and cultural heart of the nation, Elizabethan Londoners could not avoid encountering the overblown rhetoric and impassioned opining of the various characters of the religious drama that played out in their streets, making the capital one of the most radically-inclined areas in England. According to Collinson, “London churches tended to set the tone for the whole Church of England and nonconformity was nowhere more strongly entrenched or more ably led. In [Archbishop Matthew] Parker’s opinion, ‘a few in London rule over this matter.’ Yet as Bishop Cox had assured him, ‘if London were reformed, all the realm would soon follow.’”²¹ Throughout Elizabeth I’s reign, the city remained firmly situated at the center of the tension that

¹⁸ Cosin, 2.

¹⁹ See G.R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation: England, 1509-1558* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977); A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (London: William Clowes and Sons, Ltd., 1965); J. H. Merle d’Aubigné, *The Reformation in England*, 2 vols, ed. S. M. Houghton (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1962).

²⁰ Owen, 468.

²¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 75.

characterized English religion. Although the conflict between the established Church of England and the presbyterians climaxed under Elizabeth's Stuart successors, it began to emerge during her reign, and noticeably affected the religious climate of the era. Flourishing in what Collinson refers to as "London's Protestant Underworld", the Elizabethan presbyterian movement challenged episcopal authority and laid the foundation for the religious and political struggles of the seventeenth century.²²

Rather than approaching the Elizabethan presbyterians from a theological angle, a task which has been completed definitively by Peter Lake and others²³, I have chosen to dispense with theological questions and to present a social history which examines the way the various orders of presbyterian Londoners interacted and formed a functional movement. As the most vocal challengers of the religious status quo during Elizabeth's reign, the presbyterians often appear in the historiography on Elizabethan religion, but are dismissed as ill-fated radicals who made little impact on the historical record after the 1590s. Most notable among the works which do give credence to the presbyterians is Patrick Collinson's *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, which depicts presbyterianism as the manifestation of militant Puritanism during the Elizabethan period, but focuses more on the presbyterian organizers than on the congregations which they led. I hope to build on Collinson's work by examining the social and religious conditions in London which afforded the presbyterian movement a safe haven in the capital city. It is my argument that London presbyterianism not only flourished, but also represented a serious challenge to the official Church's authority because of its ability to appeal to men and women from all orders of the city's society: churchmen, nobles, merchants, tradesmen, and the common

²² Ibid., 84; see also Charles W. A. Prior, "Ecclesiology and Political Thought in England, 1580-c. 1630," *The Historical Journal* 48, no. 4 (2005): 855-884.

²³ Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1988) and *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Theodore D. Bozeman, "Federal Theology and the 'National Covenant': An Elizabethan Presbyterian Case Study," *Church History* 61, no. 4 (December 1992): 394-407; C.G. Bolam, *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism* (London, 1968)

sort, as well as the influential communities of religious exiles from the Continent who made their homes within the city and its environs. As a result of this popular appeal, the presbyterian movement was able to endure the systematic attempts by Whitgift, Aylmer, Bancroft, and even Elizabeth herself to eliminate it, to continue to help shape the nation's religious climate under the Stuarts, and to leave a lasting mark on early modern English religious culture.

CHAPTER 2

LONDON AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

London hath great cause to praise god, for that his word is here so plenyfully preached. And if London do not thankfully receive it, and truely follow it, it shal be easier for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgement then for thys Citye. But surely when I come out of the cuntry hether to the City, methink I come into another world, even out of darkness into light. For here the word of God is plentifully preached. I pray God it may be as plentifully followed.¹

Religiosity and the People of London

The long sixteenth century stands as one of the most tumultuous periods of England's colorful history. Under the guidance of the powerful Tudor monarchs, the men and women of England survived a series of changes which incontrovertibly altered their existing economic and social structures and traditions. From approximately 1520 to 1630, early marriages, ample harvests, and the decline of disease outbreaks combined to increase population across the European continent dramatically.² While England did indeed experience a nationwide population growth during this time, almost doubling between 1520 and 1700, it was London, specifically, that benefitted most from this trend. In fact, by 1750, London had transformed from an average-sized European city into the most populous metropolis in Europe, surpassing even massive urban centers such as Constantinople and Paris.³ London's continued demographic expansion is especially notable when compared to the fact that its major European counterparts

¹ Edward Bush, *A Sermon Preached at Paul's crosse on Trinity Sunday, 1571* (Imprinted at London by John Awdely, 1576), quoted in Owen, xviii.

² Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700* (New York: Academic Press, 1979), 3.

³ A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay, "The Significance of the Metropolis" in *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1986), 2-4.

experienced residential stabilization or decline during the second half of the seventeenth century, and it continued its exponential growth so that it eventually quadrupled in size from 120,000 inhabitants in 1550 to 675,000 in 1750.⁴

As London's population increased, its suburbs swelled. Roger Finlay and Beatrice Shearer point out: "in 1560 the city within and without [the walls] contained three-quarters of the population of the metropolis and the suburbs a quarter," but by 1680, "only a quarter of Londoners [inhabited] the City and three-quarters [lived] in the suburbs."⁵ As immigrants poured into London from all over the country, the capital city experienced exponential growth in spite of rampant poverty, pitiable living conditions, and high mortality rates. These developments prompted London's population to expand into suburban districts such as Southwark, Bankside, and the East End.

According to A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay, London owed much of its resilience to the strength of its trading capacity, which through "its general buoyancy, despite numerous slumps, helped to sustain the city's growth when many European rivals were falling by the wayside."⁶ London emerged as a leader in international trade through its involvement in overseas ventures such as the London-Antwerp cloth trade and the East India Company. Revenues from international trade encouraged the rise of industries such as shipbuilding, silk-weaving, glass manufacturing, and sugar refining, and greatly contributed to London's increasing prosperity.⁷ Additionally, London benefitted from its role as the primary hub of English domestic trade. Incapable of producing sufficient amounts of food to supply its ever-expanding population, London grew increasingly dependent upon domestic trade to meet its basic needs. As Keith

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Roger Finlay and Beatrice Shearer, "Population Growth and Suburban Expansion," in *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1986), 44.

⁶ Beier and Finlay, 16.

⁷ Brian Dietz, "Overseas Trade and Metropolitan Growth," in *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1986), 127-137.

Wrightson and David Levine note, “the London food market alone extended its tentacles deep into the home counties and beyond, encouraging specialized market gardening, dairying, and corn production.”⁸ While this interchange served to fulfill the practical needs of Londoners, it also encouraged the development of more advanced methods of agricultural production throughout the nation.

Unfortunately, not all of these economic and social developments resulted in positive changes for the English people. Perhaps the most devastating of these consequences were the rampant price inflation experienced throughout the country and the massive urban migration which it provoked.⁹ Additionally, changes in agricultural methods and property-leasing customs made by English landowners created a scarcity of resources which drove prices up significantly. As the wool trade grew increasingly lucrative, English landowners converted communal farmlands into private pastures for sheep grazing, a trade which employed significantly fewer workers than had traditional farming. By enclosing these common lands, landlords eliminated a major source of livelihood for many of their tenants, and as a result, newly impoverished agricultural laborers flooded into England’s major cities—especially London—in search of better wages and improved living conditions.¹⁰ While some of these migrants managed to attain satisfactory livelihoods in the cities, “the decline in living standards pushed ever-increasing numbers of urban households perilously close to the brink of starvation.”¹¹ For London’s laboring poor, “crammed into overcrowded, dilapidated tenements rising from squalid streets and

⁸ Wrightson and Levine, 4.

⁹ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth century England* (London: Redwood Press Limited, 1971), 3-4.

¹⁰ Susan Bridgen, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors, 1485-1603* (New York: Penguin Books, Ltd., 2000), 11; Joan Thirsk, “Tudor Enclosures,” in *The Rural Economy of England: Collected Essays* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984), 65-84; Elton, 2-3.

¹¹ Steve Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 163.

alleys, doubtless each day's dawn was greeted apprehensively."¹² Population growth and commercial expansion only served to exacerbate existing social tensions as they inevitably affected political and religious interactions among the English populace. London served as an example of these trends, for "in every parish and street in London families, friends, and neighbors who had once shared faith and ideals, as well as much else, could find their ways dividing."¹³

As London expanded, it swiftly consolidated its position as England's political, cultural, and religious nucleus. It is worth noting, however, that despite the city's growth, the capital and its suburbs covered an area not much larger than one square mile, meaning that its residents lived in very close proximity to each other. London's social diversity fostered a symbiotic interaction between its rich and poor. As Susan Brigden notes in *London and the Reformation*, the City of London was a multilayered urban organism:

In their parishes, wards, precincts, companies, and fraternities the citizens met, worshipped, and feasted together. Great distinctions of wealth and status divided them, but the rich and poor were neighbors, worshipping in the same parish churches, knowing each other as fellow communicants, as givers and receivers of charity.¹⁴

Because of its position as a prominent European trading center, London attracted an eclectic mix of merchants, craftsmen, drifters, adventurers, and other individuals who treasured the city's ability to provide a safe haven for adherents to unorthodox religious and political ideas.¹⁵

London's ecclesiastical and social multiplicity made it so difficult to govern that Edmund Grindal, bishop of London from 1559 to 1570, warned William Cecil that London "tended to mob rule, for it was 'a port and overmuch populous' . . . Then as now, outlaws and social deviants went there to hide, and at the Reformation those seeking to evade persecution found

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 4.

¹⁴ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 2.

¹⁵ For more on this subject, see Chapter 4.

shelter among the like-minded in the metropolis.”¹⁶ As the sixteenth century progressed, London’s size, diversity, and ability to provide anonymity subverted the religious unity of its inhabitants and made it increasingly important to one of the most revolutionary movements of the age: The Protestant Reformation.

English Politics and the Protestant Reformation

Martin Luther’s posting the Ninety-Five Theses to the door of the Wittenberg Cathedral on October 31, 1517 marks a defining moment in the history of the western world. Luther’s opposition to the corrupt practices of the Roman Catholic Church, including the sale of indulgences and the tolerance of pluralism, simony and immorality, sparked a movement that swiftly spread across Europe. Over the course of the sixteenth century, Luther’s contemporaries and successors, such as Ulrich Zwingli, John Calvin and John Knox, carried the Protestant movement to cities such as Zurich, Geneva and Edinburgh. The division between Catholics and Protestants led to political, social, and economic changes as it challenged the power of the Catholic Church.

The Protestant Reformation in England was both similar to and different from the Reformation on the Continent. It certainly represented a break with the authority of the Pope and the Catholic Church and resulted in extensive change in English religion. It was also noteworthy, however, because it represented a top-down transformation begun in the highest echelons of power and imposed on a reluctant population, as opposed to the pattern of reformations of the continent which generally enjoyed more popular support—what Collinson

¹⁶ Edmund Grindal to William Cecil, London, September 8, 1562, TNA, SP 12/24/24, cited in Brigden, “Religion and Social Obligation in Early Sixteenth-Century London,” *Past and Present*, no. 103 (May 1984): 69.

refers to as change “not from the roots but by imposition from above.”¹⁷ Richard Rex notes that “the single determining event of Henry VIII’s Reformation was the establishment of the royal supremacy over the Church of England.”¹⁸ This was perhaps the most important feature of the English Reformation, as it set a precedent by greatly reinforcing the power of the monarchy and subjecting the church to secular authority.

Upon his accession to the English throne in April 1509, Henry VIII inherited a mandate to preserve stability within his realm and to ensure the survival of the Tudor dynasty. Haunted by the political chaos of the fifteenth century, which primarily stemmed from Henry V’s failure to leave behind an adult male heir, and the resulting quarrels over royal succession instilled in Henry lived with an overwhelming compulsion to ensure that a viable, legitimate male heir succeeded him to the English throne.¹⁹ By the late 1520s, Henry’s frustration over his wife’s failure to give birth to a son transformed into desperation and he began, with the guidance of his trusted advisor, Thomas Cromwell, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, to pursue ending his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. After forcing an English church council led by Cranmer to declare his marriage to Catherine of Aragon invalid and secretly marrying Anne Boleyn, Henry was summarily excommunicated from the Catholic Church. The break from the Catholic Church was solidified by Parliamentary legislation, including the 1534 Act of Supremacy, which exalted the monarchy over the church and established Henry as the head of the new Church of England.²⁰

Henry’s dramatic assertion of royal power over papal authority resulted in significant political and religious changes in his kingdom. Political necessity, rather than religious

¹⁷ Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (Houndsmills, UK: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1988), 41. England was not alone in this trend however, as state-sponsored religious Reformations occurred in Scandinavia and several German states, such as Saxony, Prussia, and Hesse.

¹⁸ Richard Rex, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), xiii.

¹⁹ Elton, 105-106.

²⁰ Brigden, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds*, 120.

conviction, determined Henry's actions as he worked to eliminate threats to the royal supremacy. To persuade English laypeople to reject Catholicism and embrace the new Church of England, the Henrician reformers introduced the English Bible and emphasized preaching over rituals. Yet Henry's church retained many Catholic teachings and practices, such as clerical celibacy, auricular confession to priests, belief in transubstantiation, denial of justification by faith, and adherence to the seven Catholic sacraments.²¹ The passage of the Act of Six Articles in 1539 frustrated both English and Continental reformers by solidifying the church's retention of these vestiges of Catholicism and by making nonconformity to its religious specifications a punishable offense.²² Ultimately, however, the most important legacy of Henry's reformation was its subjugation of the Church of England to the Crown's authority, as it set up inevitable conflicts between religiously conservative monarchs and their reform-minded subjects.

Despite the fact that Henry left behind a Protestant heir, Edward VI, religious security in England was not ensured for many years. After his accession in 1547, Edward and his ministers zealously sought to continue reforming Henry's nominally Protestant church. While his advisors undoubtedly pushed for change, much of this drive came from Edward himself. With the help of Protestant reformers such as Thomas Cranmer, Hugh Latimer, and Nicholas Ridley, Edward nullified the Act of Six Articles and recognized only two sacraments (Baptism and the Lord's Supper), ordered that all religious images be removed from English churches, and allowed clergy to marry. He also authorized the production of Cranmer's *First Book of Common Prayer* in 1549, and the more stridently Protestant *Second Book of Common Prayer* in 1552.

²¹ The seven Catholic Sacraments are: Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Anointing the sick, Holy Orders, and Matrimony.

²² Dickens, 177; Elton, 287-288; D.J. McGinn, *The Admonition Controversy* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1949), 5.

Under Edward's rule, European Protestant reformers flocked to England, both to escape persecution on the Continent and to aid "the young King Josiah" in his mission to perfect the Reformation in England.²³ As Brigden notes:

Leading Continental divines came at the anxious invitations of Cranmer and Somerset—Bucer, Peter Martyr, Fagius, Ochino, Dryander, Utenhove, à Lasco, Tremellius, de la Rivière, Poullain, Vauville, Micronius, ab Ulmis, Veron, Alexander. Some of the exiles found positions at the universities. Many others came to London. . . These men were to [guide] England's infant reformed Church, but also to guide their own countrymen who had fled, like them, to London.²⁴

By counteracting England's traditional religious isolationism and drawing England into Europe's tumultuous religious dialogue, the presence of these Continental reformers greatly influenced the development of English Protestantism. Several of them, such as the Polish divine John à Lasco, founded autonomous congregations for their fellow expatriates, or "Strangers" as the English called them, living in London and other cities and imported their Calvinist ideologies into England's religious discourse.²⁵ Additionally, a significant number of Catholics still resided in England, although they were forced to conceal their loyalty to the pope for fear of government retribution.²⁶ While many English clerics were satisfied with Edward's modifications, some reformers pushed for further changes to ensure ideological distance from the Catholic Church.²⁷ Ultimately, this religious diversity thwarted attempts by Edward and his religious leaders to enforce religious uniformity in the Church of England.

²³ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (New York: Palgrave Publishers, Ltd., 2001), 57-104; Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1986), 35.

²⁴ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 459; see also Frederick A. Norwood, "The Strangers' 'Model Churches' in Sixteenth-Century England", in *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, ed. Franklin H. Littell (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1962), 181-182.

²⁵ For more information on the Strangers' Churches in London, see Chapter Four, 71-76.

²⁶ MacCulloch, 155-156.

²⁷ During Edward's reign we see the very beginnings of the controversy over clerical vestments which would feature prominently in the religious debates of the 1560s and provoke the split between the early Puritans and the Church of England. For more information on this topic, see McGinn, 7.

After Edward's death in 1553, Mary ascended to the throne in the midst of great rejoicing. While most of her subjects, including her sister Elizabeth, recognized Mary's legitimate right to the throne, they were far from willing to comply with her desire to return England to the Catholic fold. Mary's political naïveté caused her to institute policies "dominated by repeals of schismatic laws and attempts to revive powers for the destruction of heretics"²⁸ with little regard to the political and social complexities involved. Despite her best efforts, Mary was unable to eradicate English Protestantism before her short reign came to an end in 1558.²⁹ She did, however, contribute to the evolution of the English church which would continue under her successors. In her zeal to shepherd England back into the Catholic fold, Mary forced many of her Protestant subjects into exile in Protestant strongholds on the Continent, such as Zurich, Geneva, Strasbourg, and Frankfurt. It was here that a generation of English Protestants—both churchmen and laypeople—first interacted with more developed forms of Protestantism. The experience of living in exile and witnessing firsthand functioning models of reformed church polity would bolster the protestant convictions of a generation of clerics who would become the early leaders of the Elizabethan church. Men such as Edmund Grindal, Edwin Sandys, Robert Crowley, and even veteran reformer Miles Coverdale returned from their sojourns on the Continent determined to be "men of conviction rather than time-servers" in the new Elizabethan church and would form the core of London's clergy in the early years of Elizabeth's reign.³⁰ Perhaps most importantly, however, the religious polarization created by Mary's zealous

²⁸ Rex H. Pogson, "The Legacy of the Schism: Confusion, Continuity and Change in the Marian Clergy," in *The Mid-Tudor Polity, c. 1540-1560*, eds. Robert Tiltler and Jennifer Loach (Totowa, New Jersey: Rowan and Littlefield, 1980), 122.

²⁹ Dickens, 259-282.

³⁰ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 61-62; W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt with a Reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and Kindred Documents, 1572* (London: Published for the Church Historical Society, S. P. C. K., 1954), xi; Dickens, 339-349, 356; Owen, "Lecturers and Lectureships in Tudor London," *Church Quarterly Review* 162 (January-March, 1961), 63.

persecutions created a severe, lasting fear of Catholicism among many English men and women which would plague their monarchs throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³¹

Elizabeth I's reign, which stretched from 1558 to 1603, marked a period of dynamic demographic growth and cultural development for the English people. In the early years of her reign, Elizabeth faced the tasks of solidifying her authority as England's rightful ruler and restoring prestige to a monarchy that had been humiliated by the reigns of a boy king, Edward VI, and a Catholic queen, Mary I, as well as the disastrous attempt to subvert Henry VIII's plan for the succession by installing Lady Jane Grey as queen.³² She was also charged with establishing England as a legitimate power in international diplomacy, for as Richard Wernham states, "the country during the sixteenth century was a middleweight, at best, in a world dominated by two heavyweights, Spain and France."³³ Elizabeth's dedication to Protestantism necessitated continued religious upheaval to remove the English church from the Catholic fold and to reestablish it as an independent Protestant entity. The Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity, both passed in 1559, reestablished the primacy of the Church of England and restored Protestant doctrinal guidelines over English theology.³⁴ Nevertheless, a significant Catholic population still remained in England and retained their devotion to the Catholic faith

³¹ Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 624-625; For examples of Marian persecutions, see John Foxe, *Acts and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable happening in the church, with an universal historie of the same [microform] : wherein is set forth at large the whole race and course of the Church from the primitive age to these latter times of ours : with the bloody times, horrible troubles, and great persecutions against the martyrs of Christ sought and wrought as well by heathen emperors, as now lately practised by Romish prelates, especially in this realme of England and Scotland : whereunto are annexed certaine additions of like persecution which have happened in these latter times* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1641).

³² See Christopher Haigh, ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985) and A. N. McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth 1558* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

³³ R. B. Wernham, *The Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy, 1558-1603* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980), 23.

³⁴ For more on the Elizabethan Settlement, see Winthrop S. Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Religious Settlement of 1559* (Durham, NC: North Carolina Press, 1980); J. E. Neale, "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity," *The English Historical Review* 65, no. 256 (Jul., 1950): 304-332; and Agha Uka Agha, "Puritan Presbyterian Polity in Elizabethan England, 1559-1593" (PhD diss., Drew University, 1985), 17-32. The acts are reprinted in George Burton Adams and H. Morse Stephens, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History* (New York: Macmillan, 1901), 296-306.

and traditions, worshipping in secret despite widespread anti-Catholic propaganda and government threats of persecution.³⁵ The political instability provoked by this divergence ensured that Elizabeth could not afford to ignore the growing religious diversity which existed in her realm.

Ultimately, “the Elizabethan government’s intention was to pick out only the more obvious and aggressive [religious] opponents and to ‘include in’ the rest and hope for the best.”³⁶ While state-recognized ecclesiastical diversity in England did not exist until the passage of the Toleration Act in 1689, Elizabeth’s reign marked a move towards unofficial religious tolerance, although the Queen would prove to be a harsh opponent to advocates of religious opinions outside of what she deemed acceptable religious practices.³⁷ Much like her father, Elizabeth viewed religion as a kind of political tool, and was determined to pursue a *via media*, or middle way, despite pressure from both Protestant and Catholic zealots to move the English church towards their respective ends of the religious spectrum.³⁸ From her earliest days on the throne, however, Elizabeth was more concerned with preserving her authority as head of the Church of England than with advancing any particular theological position. As she expressed in a letter to Grindal written in 1571, “none shuld be suffred to decline ether on the left or on the right Hand, from the direct Lyne lymitted by Authorite of our sayd Lawes and Injunctions.”³⁹ To the stubbornly erastian queen, the uninvited calls for theological reform and unsanctioned attempts at enacting religiously reformist practices made by both Catholics and Puritans represented the

³⁵ Ibid; Paulo Lardi and Winifred Smith, “Anti-Catholic Propaganda in Elizabethan London,” *Modern Philology* 28, no. 2 (Nov., 1930): 208-212.

³⁶ Ibid., 137; John F. Hurst, “The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of England,” *The American Journal of Theology* 3, no. 4 (Oct., 1899): 679-684.

³⁷ It is worth noting that despite the very public struggle over the amount of Puritan policy tolerated by the English government and church, neither Elizabethan policy nor the 1689 Toleration Act officially sanctioned Catholicism, meaning that this idea of tolerance was limited at best.

³⁸ Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethans* (London: Humbledon and London, 2003), 228-229; Paul S. Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1970), 21-22.

³⁹ Elizabeth to Edmund Grindal, London, August, 1571, in William Murdin, *A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. From the Year 1571 to 1596. Transcribed from Original Papers . . . Left by William Cecill Lord Burghley, . . . By William Murdin* (London: printed by William Bowyer, 1759), 183.

ultimate challenge to her authority. As Elizabeth's rule progressed, her bishops learned that they would not be able to force the Queen into endorsing any changes of which she did not approve, which Bishop Horne noted in a 1571 letter: "we who stand in a more elevated situation do not act in compliance with the importunate clamours of the multitude; for it would be very dangerous to drag her on, against her will, to a point she does not yet choose to come to, as if we were wresting the helm out of her hands."⁴⁰ Indeed, throughout the course of her reign, Elizabeth "preferred to see the English Protestant church sink into a state of mildly scandalous torpor than to give it capable leadership which might in time disturb her political equilibrium."⁴¹ While Elizabeth's attitude allowed Puritan reformers to hold office within the Church of England, it also ensured that their days were numbered as soon as they acted against the official tenets of the Elizabethan Settlement.⁴²

Puritans and the Beginnings of Presbyterianism

Despite the new queen's returning the English church to Protestantism, the struggle over religion in England was far from over. While Catholics advocated a return to England's traditional Catholic heritage, Puritans called for further reforms to purge the church of any vestiges of Catholic customs. Elizabeth's Church of England stood in opposition to the growing Puritan movement which emphasized personal piety and cultural austerity.⁴³ Much of this

⁴⁰ Bishop Horn to Heinrich Bullinger, London, August 8, 1571, in Hastings Robinson, *The Zurich letters; or, The correspondence of several English bishops and others, with some of the Helvetian reformers during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, chiefly from the archives of Zurich* (Cambridge: Printed at the University Press, 1846), 355.

⁴¹ Knappen, 178.

⁴² The prime example of this reality is the case of Edmund Grindal, whose powers as the Archbishop of Canterbury were severely curtailed when he clashed with Elizabeth over the issue of Puritan prophesyings in 1577, thus presenting an official challenge to her authority. For more information on Grindal's life, see Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal, 1519-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979).

⁴³ Patrick Collinson, "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture" in *The Culture of English Puritanism: 1560-1700*, eds. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 32-57.

opposition resulted from Elizabeth's personal resistance to the Puritans' demands for further reform. According to M. M. Knappen, Elizabeth's "feeling of hostility to Puritanism was . . . supported by her political instincts. . . Her character was already formed in the rough school of experience. . . Religiously she was in 1603 what she was in 1558, a huge boulder in the path of Puritanism, unavoidable, insurmountable, immovable."⁴⁴

Contrary to its reputation of achieving a widely-favored *via media*, the Elizabethan Settlement completely satisfied very few of the new Queen's subjects. In 1563, the Convocation of the Clergy passed the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, which expressed the core doctrines of Elizabeth's Church of England.⁴⁵ According to Lewis Spitz, the carefully-worded articles articulated doctrinal moderation instead of ecclesiastical extremes. They confirmed the primacy of the Scriptures, emphasized justification by faith, accepted predestination (although they avoided the extreme predestination advocated by Calvinists), acknowledged Baptism and the Lord's Supper as the only two legitimate Sacraments, and deftly endorsed Christ's real presence during communion while "expressly denying the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation on the one hand and the Zwinglian symbolic interpretation on the other."⁴⁶ Additionally, the articles required kneeling during communion, mandated the use of clerical vestments, denied the existence of purgatory, allowed for clerical marriage, condemned the veneration of saints, and advocated the use of vernacular language(s) for use during worship services.⁴⁷ Ultimately, however, the theological and liturgical tenets of the *Articles* most closely resembled the conservative religious preferences of the queen and her closest advisors and failed to satisfy the reformist agendas of many of the early Elizabethan clergymen who were now returning from

⁴⁴ Knappen, 168.

⁴⁵ Reprinted in Philip Schaff and David S. Schaff, *The Evangelical Protestant Creeds, with Translations*, vol. 3 of *The Creeds of Christendom, With a History and Critical Notes* (Franklin Square, N. Y.: Harper & Brothers: 1919), 615-621.

⁴⁶ Spitz, 526.

⁴⁷ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 33-35; Schaff and Schaff, 620-621.

their sojourns among the more advanced Protestant congregations on the continent determined to rid the Church of England of any traces of its Catholic past.⁴⁸

Many of these divines, such as Grindal, Robert Horne, John Parkhurst and John Jewel chose initially to suppress their objections to the settlement and to submit to Elizabeth's authority as Supreme Governor of the church, arguing that they could serve Christ more effectively from the Church's official pulpits.⁴⁹ To these men, protecting the Church from further schism and respecting the crown's authority was more important than giving in to extremist ideals, sentiments which Horne expressed in a letter to the Swiss reformer, Heinrich Bullinger:

We aim at this, that although badly habited, we may yet be strong hearted in doing the Lord's work; and we are not so much concerned about the fitness of our apparel, as about rightly dividing the bread of the Lord; nor, in fine, do we deem it of so much consequence if our own coat appears unbecoming, as it is to take care that the seamless coat of the Lord be not rent asunder.⁵⁰

Despite these concessions, the confrontation between these conflicting ideas of the roles of the church and the queen set the earliest groundwork for the development of protestant nonconformity, or Puritanism, in the Elizabethan church.

As Elizabeth's reign progressed, objections to official church policy steadily forced increasing numbers of clergymen from legitimate clerical offices into England's religious periphery.⁵¹ The presbyterians were part of the wider Puritan movement which steadily gained strength throughout Elizabeth's reign, and "London was . . . the centre for the campaign to bring true reformation to a Church 'but halfly reformed'." The politics of religion during Elizabeth's reign forced the creation of "a 'church within a Church,' [one] of curates, preachers, lecturers,

⁴⁸ Knappen, 168-171; Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), 244-245.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 179-180.

⁵⁰ Horn to Bullinger, London, August 8, 1571, in Robinson, 355-356.

⁵¹ Knappen, 178.

and the ‘brethren of London’, who determined upon further reformation. Here the leaders of the radical, even revolutionary, Puritan movement preached and gathered support.”⁵²

The term “Puritan” was originally used as a disparaging idiom to criticize the Protestant claim that they were working towards a pure, simple church while resorting to fighting with each other over complicated theological minutiae. Over the course of Elizabeth’s reign, however, “Puritan” was steadily incorporated into the wider English vocabulary as Protestants gradually divided amongst themselves and publicly censured each other for their respective theological shortcomings. Simply defined, “Puritanism was the Protestant form of dissatisfaction with the required official religion of England under Elizabeth.”⁵³ While this group of deviant Protestants made up an insignificant religious minority at the beginning of Elizabeth’s rule, they steadily gained support as dissatisfaction with the crypto-Catholic nature of the Elizabethan Settlement grew. The first example of group identified as “Puritans”, or as John Stowe dubbed them, the “Unspottyd Lambs of the Lord,” can be found in the city liberty of the Minories during the late 1560s.⁵⁴ While Collinson maintains that “these would almost certainly be opprobrious labels attached to them, not what they called themselves,” they became progressively more common over the course of Elizabeth’s reign.⁵⁵ Indeed, by the 1590s, the label “Puritan” “was being used by the dominant group in English society as an emotional symbol for things as various as sedition, foreign influence, hypocrisy, usury, social rank, popular unrest, rigidity and singularity.”⁵⁶ The Puritan umbrella sheltered a wide variety of religious sects, such as anabaptists, congregationalists, and presbyterians, as well as Anglicans who favored episcopacy

⁵² Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 635; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 50.

⁵³ Leonard J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 9.

⁵⁴ John Stowe, “Historical Memoranda of John Stowe: General, 1564-7,” in *Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles, with Historical Memoranda by John Stowe, the antiquary, and contemporary notes of occurrences written by him in the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Westminster: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1880), 143; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 86.

⁵⁵ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 86.

⁵⁶ Trinterud, 9; Collinson, “Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism,” 155.

but desired further doctrinal reform of the Church of England. Ultimately, this ecclesiastical inclusiveness meant that while all presbyterians were Puritans, not all Puritans were presbyterians.⁵⁷

The presbyterian movement originated during the Protestant Reformation in Europe. “presbyterianism as a church system rightly and rigidly implies (1) a disciplinary system in the parish; (2) a church system of graduated meetings, classes, synods. . .”⁵⁸ At the individual church level, presbyterians advocated a system of ecclesiastical government in which elected delegates, or elders, represented the congregation to a gathered assembly of regional representatives known as a presbytery.⁵⁹ This representative system extended to the national level through a system of gatherings known as synods or general assemblies.⁶⁰ During the mid-sixteenth century, John Calvin pioneered this system of church governance while presiding over the church in Geneva, Switzerland. After Calvin’s death in 1564, Theodore Beza took over his role as Geneva’s spiritual and temporal leader, and continued to advance his agenda of religious and social reform.⁶¹ Other variations of this organizational system could be found in cities such

⁵⁷ Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, 1-6, and “Puritan Identities,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984): 112-123; Paul Christianson, “Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 463-382; Collinson, “A Comment: Concerning the name Puritan,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 438-488; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1540-1700” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, 1-31; Michael Finlayson, “Puritanism and Puritans: Labels or Libels?” *Canadian Journal of History* 8 (1973): 201-233; and Polly Ha, “Elizabethan Presbyterianism, c. 1590-1640” (Ph. D. diss., University of Cambridge, 2006), 7 n.27.

⁵⁸ William A. Shaw, “Elizabethan Presbyterianism,” *The English Historical Review* 3, no. 12 (Oct., 1888): 655.

⁵⁹ Norwood, 189-190.

⁶⁰ A. H. Drysdale, *History of the Presbyterians in England: Their Rise, Decline, and Revival* (London: Publication Committee of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1889), 6-7.

⁶¹ For more information on Calvin’s Geneva, see E. William Monter, *Calvin's Geneva* (New York: Wiley, 1967); Jack W. Sawyer, “Moses and the Magistrate: Aspects of Calvin’s Political Theory in Contemporary Focus” Th.M. Thesis (Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1986), Chapter 5; and A. C. Duke, Gillian Lewis, and Andrew Pettegree, eds., *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1610: a Collection of Documents* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1992). It should be noted however, that while Calvin was responsible for the ideological roots of presbyterian polity, Beza developed Calvin’s ideas into a defined system of church government. According to Collinson, “the responsibility for elevating polity to the rank of a protestant dogma and for anathematizing episcopacy, name and thing, lies with Calvin’s successor.” Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 109-111; Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, 3-4.

as Zurich, Frankfurt, Strasbourg, and Basel. Taken together, these churches operated as part of the wider Reformed Christian tradition.

The most widely disseminated creedal statement of the Reformed movement in the mid-sixteenth century was the Second Helvetic Confession, written by the Zurich-based reformer Heinrich Bullinger in 1566.⁶² This confession, which greatly influenced the ideological development of English presbyterianism, offered a systematic presentation of the points of agreement between the Swiss and Genevan reformers, while “deftly [sidestepping] many of the detailed questions about which Reformed theologians were beginning to disagree.”⁶³ The confession stressed the central liturgical importance of preaching in vernacular languages, insisted on simplicity in worship according to the example of the early churches found in the Scriptures, advocated the predestination of God’s elect for salvation, promoted the symbolic efficacy of the Sacraments (Baptism and the Lord’s Supper), rejected the veneration of saints and the practice of image-based worship, discredited the observance of holy days other than a limited number which commemorated Christ’s birth and resurrection, and emphasized the salvific covenant between God and the elect through Christ’s mediation.⁶⁴ Additionally, Reformed theologians recognized the danger of clinging to any vestiges of popery which remained for the Catholic past.⁶⁵ Adherence to this Reformed ideology would bring the presbyterians into heated conflict with Elizabethan Anglicanism.

Reformed strongholds existed not only in Geneva and Switzerland, but also in Scotland, the Netherlands, several German states, and France. John Knox’s Scottish Presbyterian Church exerted considerable influence over the growth of the presbyterian tradition in England, but as

⁶² Benedict, 118-119; For a transcript of the Second Helvetic Confession, see John H. Leith, *Creeeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine, from the Bible to the Present* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 131-192.

⁶³ Benedict, 118.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 119.

Leonard J. Trinterud acknowledges, “the members of this wing were international in their orientation. From time to time they invoked the name of Calvin . . . but chiefly they had their eyes on the “Calvinistic” Huguenots and the Protestants of the Palatinate and the Netherlands, as well as Scotland.”⁶⁶ These connections to Continental Reformed churches contributed to the distinctly transnational quality that characterized the presbyterian movement in England.

The origins of the division between English Anglicans and Puritans lie early in Elizabeth’s reign with the controversy which erupted over the issue of clerical vestments. As part of the 1559 religious settlement, the Church of England required its ministers to wear ceremonial clothing, such as the alb, the surplice and the tippet, while performing the liturgy, signifying a return to the more conservative policies of Edward VI’s first Act of Uniformity in 1549.⁶⁷ To the queen and her advisors, most notably William Cecil and Matthew Parker, the wearing of these vestments represented an acceptable continuation of clerical tradition and a reasonable separation from Catholic practices. To the returning exiles, however, the traditional robes and caps signified a dangerous link to the aggressive Catholicism which had forced them from their homes and livelihoods a mere five years earlier.⁶⁸ In fact, during their time on the Continent, a number of the Marian exiles had complied with reformed tradition and dispensed completely with wearing vestments other than the basic black gown used in Geneva.⁶⁹ Many of these men, such as Grindal, Sandys, and Robert Horne, chose, at the urging of continental reformers such as Beza and Bullinger, to submit to the queen’s authority rather than

⁶⁶ Trinterud, 13; for further discussion of Presbyterian ties with the Scottish church, see Gordon Donaldson, “The Relations Between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604” (PhD diss., University of London, 1938).

⁶⁷ Knappen, 170.

⁶⁸ “Account of the Examination of Certain Londoners before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 20 June 1567,” in *Puritanism in Tudor England*, ed. H. C. Porter (Columbia, S. C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1971), 80-94; Owen, “Tradition and Reform: Ecclesiastical Controversy in an Elizabethan London Parish,” *Guildhall Miscellany* 2(1961), 63-64.

⁶⁹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 33; Knappen, 182-188.

accommodating their scruples over clerical dress, and took up positions within the Church.⁷⁰

Other reformers could only salve their consciences for so long, and the conflict over vestments continued to simmer just under the surface of the supposed settlement.⁷¹

By 1566, however, the erastianism of the queen and her Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, had brought the anti-vestarians, led by Thomas Sampson and Laurence Humphrey, to their breaking point. After the 1563 Convocation of the Clergy failed to endorse any of the changes to clerical dress and liturgical practices proposed by the Puritans, they unsuccessfully attempted to push anti-vestiarian legislation through Parliament before simply ignoring the offensive regulations.⁷² While Parker's and Grindal's unwillingness to persecute the members of this faction temporarily kept the peace, the Queen forced Parker's hand in 1565 and made it clear that, ever the consummate politician, "she wished the laws enforced, but she did not want to be publicly involved."⁷³ Parker attempted to make an example of Sampson by removing him of his office of Dean of Christ Church College at Oxford and jailing him in June 1565, but even this action failed to engender submission among the nonconformist clergy, especially in London.⁷⁴ Still working to enforce the Queen's authority, Parker composed a series

⁷⁰ Much of the correspondence between English clergymen and the continental reformers is reprinted in Hastings Robinson's *The Zurich Letters* (Cambridge: 1846). Grindal defended his conformity to a group of puritan separatists in 1567, saying, "you see me wear a cope or a surplice in Paul's. I had rather minister without these things, but for order's sake and obedience to the prince." Porter, 89. The choice of Grindal and his fellow conformists to submit to royal authority on the issue of vestments points to the larger question of royal authority over the church. While Beza maintained in a 1566 letter to Bullinger that English clergymen would "resemble also the priests of Baal in their square caps, bands, surplices, hoods, and other things of the kind," he also recognized the need to keep reform-minded men in English pulpits by submitting to the Queen's opinions about clerical dress. Robinson, 247. Ultimately, the controversy over vestments acted as a stand-in for the more important debate over the role of the monarch as Supreme Governor of the church. To the reformers, both English and Continental, the Church of England was essentially the Roman Catholic church under a different name, as Beza wrote, "just the same as under the papacy, they have in the place of a lawfully appointed presbytery their deans, chancellors, and archdeacons," with the Queen playing the role of the pope. Robinson, 246-247.

⁷¹ John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together with an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, and Letters*, Volume I, Part 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), 264; Collinson, *EPM*, 65, Knappen, 179-184.

⁷² Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, 500-506.

⁷³ Knappen, 190.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 194-196.

of articles defining clerical conformity, known as the *Advertisements*, but Elizabeth's unwillingness to endorse the document publicly greatly limited its ability to influence the nonconforming ministers.⁷⁵

On March 26, 1566, Parker convened a conference at Lambeth Palace and called for members of the London clergy to appear before an ecclesiastical council to settle the matter. After displaying a model of proper clerical attire and providing only a brief period for debate, the council demanded to know whether or not the ministers would comply with the council's standards. Of the one hundred and ten ministers who attended the conference, thirty-seven refused to bend to the council's will and were promptly stripped of their livings and given three months in which to comply with the *Advertisements*, which would become the standard for clerical conformity in the wake of this episode.⁷⁶ Effectively silenced by Parker's heavy-handed discipline, the Puritans were forced to concede the point for the time being, but the issue of vestiarian reform would continue to feature prominently in the ecclesiastical debates of the day, which Horne notes in a 1571 letter to Bullinger:

Our church has not yet got free from those vestiarian rocks of offence, on which she first struck. Our excellent queen, as you know, holds the helm, and directs it hitherto unto her pleasure. But we are awaiting the guidance of the divine Spirit, which is all we can do; and we daily implore him with earnestness and importunity to turn at length our sails to another quarter.⁷⁷

The vestiarian controversy proved to be disastrous for the emerging Puritan movement in London, as it effectively removed the reformist movement from the city's official pulpits.

Across the city, popular ministers such as Robert Crowley, Thomas Wood, John Bartlett,

⁷⁵ *Advertisements partly for due order in the publique administration of common prayers and using the holy sacramentes, and partly for the apparrell of all persons ecclesiasticall, by vertue of the Queenes maiesties letters commaunding the same* (London, 1567); Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 70; Knappen, 192-193.

⁷⁶ Knappen, 196-210; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 76; Owen, "Lectures and Lectureships in Tudor London," 64. Eventually, according to Knappen, Parker was able to outlast the nonconformists, and most of them grudgingly submitted to Parker's *Advertisements*: "exactly how many persisted in their stand to the point of being finally deprived is uncertain, but the learned ones were so few as to be negligible..."(Knappen, 210).

⁷⁷ Horn to Bullinger, London, August 8, 1571 in Robinson, 355.

Anthony Gilby, and even Miles Coverdale were removed from their preaching positions and forced to seek livings in parishes and institutions, such as hospitals and inns of court, which allowed them to circumvent Parker's subscription regulations. These events marked the beginnings of radical Puritanism, as many of the deprived ministers did not return to their positions in London's official pulpits and were replaced by a new generation of Puritans who were convinced that religious reform could only be achieved from outside the official church administration.⁷⁸ This shift to outspoken radicalism is signified by the publication Crowley's *A Brief Discourse against the Outwarde Apparell and Ministring Garmentes of the Popishe Church* in 1566, which argued the anti-vestiarian case and, according to Collinson, served as the first Puritan manifesto.⁷⁹ The publication of Crowley's pamphlet launched an increasingly virulent trend of literary polemicizing by both sides of the Elizabethan religious debate and served as "the preliminary volleys in the imminent pamphlet-war between Puritan and Episcopalian" which would feature such heated exchanges as the *Admonition* controversy and the Marprelate Tracts.⁸⁰ Ultimately, the vestiarian controversy functioned as the breaking point between the Puritans and the Church of England, and greatly contributed to the development of radical presbyterianism in the following decade, for as Collinson notes, "after this episode the English Church and English Protestants could never again pretend to be entirely at peace."⁸¹ It

⁷⁸ According to Knappen, only one leading Puritan, George Withers, left the country as a result of the vestiarian controversy, while the rest reluctantly conformed and waited another opportunity to push for reform. Knappen, 210-218; Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," in *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), 337-338; Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, 1.

⁷⁹ Robert Crowley, *A brief discourse against the outwarde apparell and ministring garmentes of the popishe church* (Emden: Printed by Egidius van der Ereve, 1566); Collinson, 77.

⁸⁰ McGinn, 16-22.

⁸¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 60-61.

was in this dramatic climate that the second generation of Puritans were introduced to Elizabethan church politics and assumed leadership of the movement.⁸²

⁸² Idem, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 344-345; Owen, "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 18, no. 1 (April, 1966), 68; for more on this subject, see Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 3

THE LONDON PARISHES AND THE EMERGENCE OF ENGLISH PRESBYTERIANISM

Yf it had bene looked unto about 9 Yeares agoe, this hurle burle had not now happened; and if it be not looked unto now, it is like that some greater inconvenience will insue. At the begynninge, it was but a Cappe and a Surplice, and a Typett; but now it is growen to Bishopps, Archbishopps and Cathedral Churches, and the overthrow of Order established, and (to speake Plaine) to the Quenes Maiestie's Authoritie in Causes ecclesiasticall.¹

London's Religious Liberties

While the ecclesiastical upheavals of the sixteenth century certainly affected religious conditions across England, their effects were felt most keenly by the men and women of London.

² As Brigden notes, "religious choices were demanded most immediately from the Londoners, because in London the English Reformation began, and the capital was 'the common country of all England' . . . the power of the City's religious example was immense."³ As the Reformation progressed throughout the Elizabethan era, Londoners were the first to experience its effects and would, in turn, play a vitally important part in the development of English Christianity. The upheaval of the vestiarian controversy ended the monopoly the early Puritans had previously enjoyed over London's pulpits. Cut off from their most effective platform for evangelizing the city's population, they were now forced to seek other methods of promoting their reformist

¹ Matthew Hutton to William Cecil, October 6, 1573, in Murdin, 262.

² Trinterud, 14.

³ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*), 2; for a basic summary of the hierarchies and rituals typical to London parishes, as well as the changes they experienced as a result of the Reformation, see Michael Berlin, 'Reordering Rituals: Ceremony and the Parish, 1520-1640' in *Londonopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*, eds. Paul Griffiths and Mark S. R. Jenner (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2000), 47-66.

agenda.⁴ They were most easily able to adapt to these circumstances in the city liberties, a handful of London parishes which maintained traditional exemption from the oversight of both city and church governments and answered only to the crown's authority.⁵ These parishes, including Blackfriars, St. Martin's le Grand, Holy Trinity Aldgate, Whitefriars, the two St. Bartholomew's, Charterhouse, the Clerkenwell priories, St. Katherine's, the Minories, and the abbey of Tower Hill, were the sites of monastic houses which had been allowed by Henry VIII to maintain their religious and administrative autonomy after the Reformation.⁶ This independence enabled the liberties—especially the Minories and Blackfriars—to serve as havens for the various of nonconformist Puritan clergymen who were now without pulpits.⁷

The precinct of the Minories occupied a five-acre area just outside Aldgate in the easternmost suburbs of the city. The site had been home to the convent of the Sisters of St. Clare, known as the Minoresses, until its dissolution in 1538. After passing through a series of private owners, the precinct was acquired by the crown to be used as a storage facility in 1563.⁸ According to E.M. Tomlinson's *A History of the Minories, London*, during the early years of Elizabeth's reign, the Minories "was practically a miniature kingdom of its own, acknowledging no allegiance to any authority whatever except the Crown. The parishioners appointed their own minister, and, when appointed, he claimed freedom from any jurisdiction of bishop or archbishop."⁹

⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 84.

⁵ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 81.

⁶ *Ibid.*, n2.

⁷ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 338-339; Valerie Pearl, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution: City Government and National Politics, 1625-43* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1961), 23-24; Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 577, and "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 81-97.

⁸ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 84; Tomlinson, 2-4, 76-118, 121-8, 390-1; Pearl, 24.

⁹ Tomlinson, 165.

The Minories' residents came from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds, from the very rich to the very, very poor. While a number of wealthy and powerful families took up residence in the Minories, perhaps the most influential of its inhabitants was Catherine Brandon, the Dowager Duchess of Suffolk, who proved to be a powerful patron of the early Puritans in the Minories, employing several of them as chaplains in her household.¹⁰ On the other end of the social spectrum, the Minories also served as home for a wide variety of tradesmen and immigrants who were banned from practicing their trades within the confines of the city so they would not adversely affect the business of native-born merchants and craftsmen. Many of these immigrants, or "strangers" as they were known to the Elizabethans, had fled to England escape religious persecution on the continent, and had infused the religious character of the Minories and its residents with a distinctly Reformed flavor.¹¹ According to Owen, the socioeconomic conditions in the Minories mirrored those in the City's other liberties: "overcrowded, cosmopolitan areas, afflicted by the consequences of rapid tenement development," making them ideal locations for the development of radical forms of Protestantism.¹² In the years following the vestiarian crisis, the parish of Holy Trinity Minories employed a string of nonconformist clergymen including Coverdale, Crowley, John Gough, Nicholas Crane, Richard Allen, and, most importantly for the development of presbyterianism, John Field, the young Oxford graduate

¹⁰ Owen, "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72," 68, 86; Knappen, 231; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 50, 52, 87; Seaver, 28; for further reading on the Duchess of Suffolk, see Melissa Franklin-Harkrider, *Women, Reform and Community in Early Modern England: Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk, and Lincolnshire's Godly Aristocracy, 1519-1580* (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2008).

¹¹ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 85-86, and "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72," 73. For more on the Strangers and their role in the development of Elizabethan presbyterianism, see Chapter 4, 75-80.

¹² Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 85.

who would function as the driving force behind the Elizabethan presbyterian movement until his death in 1588.¹³

Unfortunately for the Puritans, their days of safety within the shelter of Minories' traditional liberties were numbered. While the parish maintained its position as the leading center of Puritan nonconformity in the 1560s and early 1570s, its association with a group of Puritan separatists provoked a systematic crackdown by the Bishops of London which effectively ended its ability to promote and protect the Puritan movement.¹⁴ While Grindal began this process almost immediately after the vestiarian controversy, he made little progress before his translation to the archbishopric of York in 1570. By 1574, however Edwin Sandys, Grindal's successor in London, had successfully forced the Minories to attend episcopal visitations as a means of regulating their theological and organizational conformity. Despite these measures, the Minories continued to function as a nonconformist stronghold until 1578, when John Aylmer,

¹³ Ibid, 95-97, and "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72," 68-69; Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 338-339, and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 85-86.

¹⁴ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 92-94. In 1567, a group of fifteen Puritans was arrested as representatives of a larger separatist congregation, pastored by Richard Fitz, which had hired the Plumber's Hall for a wedding. In their hearing before the ecclesiastical committee, the separatists maintained that "so long as we might have the word freely preached, and the sacraments administered without the preferring of idolatrous gear above it, we never assembled together in houses. But when it came to this point, that all our preachers were displaced by your law, that would not subscribe to your apparel and your law, so that we could not hear none of them in any church by the space of seven or eight weeks. . . we remembered that there was a congregation of us in this city in Queen Mary's days; and a congregation at Geneva, which used a book and order of preaching, ministering of the sacraments and discipline, most agreeable to the word of God; which book is allowed by that godly and well learned man, Master Calvin, and the preachers there; which book and order we hold. And if you can reprove this book, or anything that we hold, by the word of God, we will yield to you, and do open penance at Paul's Cross; if not, we will stand to it by the grace of God." Porter, 82. An analysis of this episode, as well as an edited transcript of the separatists' hearing before the ecclesiastical commission, can be found in Porter, 75-94. This group, as well as a series of other separatist conventicles in the city, would continue to agitate against the official church throughout the remainder of the 1560s, despite the Privy Council's ordering the arrest of anyone "that take upon them as ministers to preach within mens houses not being admitted to any such ministry or function at undue times gathering unto them much simple and evil disposed people." Corporation of London Record Office, Repertories, 16, fol. 334v, quoted in Owen, "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity," 75. While this group was obviously associated with the wider Elizabethan puritan movement and took advantage of the ecclesiastical laxity afforded by the Minories and other city liberties, their decision to separate themselves completely from the Church of England marks an important philosophical difference between the separatists and the presbyterians. Unlike the members of the separatist conventicles, the presbyterians never advocated leaving the church, but instead favored the idea of forming "a church within a church" until they could bring about their desired reforms of the official church structure. Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 339, 346, and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 132; Seaver, 30; Knappen, 213-216.

who took over as Bishop of London in 1577, imposed an interdict on the parish of Holy Trinity Minories for its ministers' failure to follow the sacramental liturgy contained in the *Book of Common Prayer* or to wear the surplice while conducting church services. As the interdict prohibited the entire congregation from taking communion or participating in public worship services until they complied with the bishop's wishes and followed the prayerbook order of service, the ministers capitulated within two days of Aylmer's interdict.¹⁵ By this point, the bishops had effectively neutralized the Minories' traditional exemption from ecclesiastical oversight, and undercut the parish's position as the hotbed of London nonconformity, which was a major blow to the Puritan cause. As Owen notes, "the success of the major offensive against London clerical nonconformity in the later part of the reign rested in no small part upon the prior elimination of crucial immunities claimed by the inhabitants of the Minories."¹⁶ While the Minories continued to favor the nonconformist position throughout the remainder of Elizabeth's rule, the mantle of Puritan leadership now passed to the parish of St. Anne Blackfriars.¹⁷

The liberty of Blackfriars earned its name from the order of black-robed Dominican monks which had maintained a monastery in the precinct until its suppression in 1538. As with other monastic houses within the city, the black friars maintained a church for the parish's lay population, and it was this church which would function as a presbyterian stronghold in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. According to John Stowe, the parish's pre-Reformation structures were destroyed during Queen Mary's reign, and the parishioners took refuge in a "lodging chamber above a stair" until they consecrated a new church in December,

¹⁵ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 90, and "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72," 76; Tomlinson, 170; Seaver, 29.

¹⁶ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 84.

¹⁷ Ibid., 94; Brian Burch, "The Parish of St. Anne's Blackfriars, London, to 1665," *Guildhall Miscellany* 3, no. 1 (October, 1969): 1-54.

1597.¹⁸ St. Anne's proved to be one of the most popular pulpits in the city until 1666, when the Great Fire of London destroyed both the church and most of its records and the parish was combined with the neighboring parish of St. Andrew by the Wardrobe.¹⁹ Like the Minorities, Blackfriars attracted a significant number of both immigrants and Catholics seeking the religious and economic freedoms afforded by a city liberty.²⁰ St. Anne's congregation also featured a notably large proportion of women, as is evidenced by diarist John Manningham's description of his visit to Blackfriars to hear Egerton preach in December 1602.²¹

Additionally, the parish's social composition was undoubtedly colored by the presence of the Blackfriars Theatre, which had been built on the grounds of the former monastery.²² Initially used by the Children of the Queen's Chapel for the practice and staging of court plays, the theater was eventually rebuilt and taken over by James Burbage as the winter performance space for the King's Men, William Shakespeare's company of professional players, in 1608.²³ While the freedoms of the liberty attracted the theater set to Blackfriars, their presence within the strongly Puritan parish only served to antagonize its non-theatrical residents, who repeatedly petitioned city officials to close the theater.²⁴ Not surprisingly, this friction served as the inspiration for the development of the stereotypical cranky Puritan which became a common stock character in the era's plays.²⁵ By affording the intellectual and social freedom for both of

¹⁸ Stowe, 291-292.

¹⁹ Burch, 1; Pearl, 40-41, 162-163.

²⁰ Burch, 14, 20.

²¹ John Manningham and John Bruce, *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple and of Bradbourne, Kent, Barrister-at-Law, 1602-1603* (Westminster: Printed by J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1868), 101.

²² David M. Bevington, ed. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, 5th ed. (New York: Pearson Longman, Inc., 2004), xlix.

²³ *Ibid.*, xlix-1; Stanley W. Wells, *Shakespeare and Co.: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Fletcher, and the Other Players in His Story* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2006), 15-17; Michael Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre: Plays in Performance* (London: Routledge, 2005), 10.

²⁴ Burch, 18-19.

²⁵ T. Fairman Ordish, *Shakespeare's London; A Study of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London: J.M. Dent & Co, 1897), 201-204; Collinson, "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism," 154-155.

these elements to flourish, Blackfriars played an important part in perpetuating the popular idea of Puritanism, as well as the religious tradition which inspired the theatrical stereotype.

Ultimately, despite its relatively limited lifespan as an independent parish, St. Anne's served as a vital element in the presbyterian movement's survival after the neutralization of the Minorities in the 1570s and 1580s.

St. Anne's parishioners did not gain the right to select their own clergy until 1607, when its trustees bought the advowson rights from the parish's patron, Sir George More.²⁶ Despite this limitation, the parish's pulpit served as a forum for the promotion of the presbyterian message at as early as June, 1591, when, according to both Bancroft and Cosin, Hacket heard Stephen Egerton, one of the city's most outspoken presbyterian ministers, preach in the days leading up to his doomed attempt at a religious revolution.²⁷ Agitation by the parishioners for independence from civil and religious oversight can be traced back to 1580, when they petitioned the Queen for, among other things, the right to "a preacher there maintained by the benevolence of thinhabitants whose every Sunday and hollieday preachethe in the said Churche, saitethe Devine service, and every first sonday in the monethe ministrethe a Communion" instead of the typical preaching ministry maintained by the diocesan authorities.²⁸ While the parishioners did not get their wish until 1607, the parish still served as a home for presbyterians such as Egerton his assistant and successor, William Gouge, and a Scottish Puritan import, David Englishe, throughout the later years of Elizabeth's reign. After the parish trustees purchased the advowson and gained the right to appoint the ministers of their choosing in 1607, St. Anne's functioned as

²⁶ Ibid., 11. For further information on Sir George More, see Chapter Four, 64, and Louis A. Knafla, "More, Sir George (1553–1632)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19177> (accessed November 17, 2009).

²⁷ Bancroft, 160, cited in Booty, 302; Cosin, 35.

²⁸ TNA SP 12/137/74, quoted in Burch, 13.

an even more important center of presbyterianism within the city of London and the wider English presbyterian movement.²⁹

The Growth of Parish Lectureships

Capitalizing on the religious freedoms of the city liberties was not, however, the only means of furthering the reformist agenda available to the Puritans. Only temporarily deterred by Parker's vestiarian crackdown, the Puritans swiftly found a means of promoting their message in the office of parish lecturer, a minister engaged by parish vestries or wealthy individual patrons to perform "a supplementary but quite separate role from that of the incumbent; he was hired only to preach and catechize, and—at least before 1580—was not bound to concern himself with other priestly functions."³⁰ The tradition of hiring parish lecturers stretched back to Edward's reign, when London's devout citizenry began to contract additional preachers to supplement the preaching schedules of their incumbents.³¹ While these additional lectureships fell into disfavor under Mary's tenure, they regained their support in the city parishes from the earliest years of Elizabeth's rule and became a mainstay of the Elizabethan church structure, especially after the vestiarian crisis. According to Owen, "Parker's purge of 1566 had made the office respectable; the next twenty years made it fashionable. By 1583, thirty parish lectureships are known to have been in existence, more than four times the number in 1566, and almost twice that of 1577."³² Importantly for the Puritans, the freedom from complying with the ordinances of the *Book of Common Prayer* maintained by these parish lecturers enabled them to conduct services according

²⁹ Burch, 24-25.

³⁰ Owen, "The Liberty of the Minorities: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 91; Knappen, 221-222; Collinson, "The Elizabethan Puritans and The Foreign Reformed Churches in London," 246.

³¹ Idem, "Lectures and Lectureships in Tudor London," 63.

³² Ibid., 65.

to the Genevan liturgy which they had embraced during their exiles on the continent, which is evidenced in their earliest manifestations in the parish of St. Antholin.³³

The rapid propagation of the parish lectureship not only bears evidence to the spread of Puritanism through the ranks of the city's unbeneficed clergy, but also grants valuable insight into the religious leanings of London's citizenry. Indeed, it is here that we see one of the first examples of intervention by a lay population which was keenly interested in maintaining a high quality of preaching in their local pulpits. As Paul Seaver notes in *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*,

not only did the pulpit outdraw bearbaiting and morris dancing, but even in sophisticated London the popular preachers attracted larger audiences week after week than Shakespeare and Jonson in their prime. Whether or not the sermon was the ordinary means of salvation, it was undoubtedly the ordinary means of mass communication³⁴

Due to this high degree of public interest, the pulpit remained one of the most effective platforms for publicizing and promoting ideas—both religious and political—throughout the early modern period.³⁵ Initially, pious laymen utilized lectureships to compensate for the lack of educated preaching incumbents in their respective parishes and enjoyed the full support of the London bishops for their efforts. While the lectureship certainly did not begin as a vehicle for religious radicalism, as Elizabeth's reign progressed it steadily gained a more radical character, and increasingly became a valuable tool for advancing the nonconformist cause. While it is important to note that “not all lecturers were Puritan nor all Puritans lecturers . . . there can be no question that the lectureship was essentially a Puritan institution, that the impetus behind it was Puritan in motivation, and that it was staffed predominantly by Puritan preachers.”³⁶ By the 1580s, even parishes which maintained an educated preaching incumbent were hiring extra

³³ Ibid., 63-64, 66; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 50; Seaver, 22; Pearl, 163.

³⁴ Seaver, 5.

³⁵ Knappen, 221.

³⁶ Seaver, 22.

lecturers to increase the number of sermons available to their parishioners and to circumvent the regulations of the prayerbook liturgies.³⁷ For example, according to Owen, over half of the men hired to serve as lecturers in the Minories during the Elizabethan period were confirmed members of the radical Puritan movement, including Field, Coverdale, Crowley, and Gough.³⁸ Other parishes which engaged radical Puritans as parish lecturers included St. Giles Cripplegate, another hotbed of Puritan activity, Christ Church Newgate, St. Lawrence Jewry, St. Mary le Bow, All Hallows Honey Lane, Lincoln's Inn, and St. Botolph Aldgate, as well as numerous other parishes across the city.³⁹ In this way, the "nonconformists found in [the] lectureship a refuge that enabled them freely to advocate reform from a position within the Church . . . the lectureship became the principle public platform of members of the first presbyterian classis in the City."⁴⁰

As with the city liberties, however, the episcopal leadership was unwilling to allow the Puritans to take advantage of the parish lectureships to promote their reforms, and passed a series of regulations to limit this trend over the course of the 1580s. Under Alymer's administration as Bishop of London, the Privy Council passed an order forcing all lecturers periodically to assist in the administration of communion in their respective parishes, effectively forcing them to use the prayerbook to conduct these services.⁴¹ Additionally, beginning in 1583, Aylmer insisted that the parish lecturers join the rest of the Elizabethan clergy in attending periodic episcopal visitations, the Bishop's most effective tool for regulating clerical conformity. John Whitgift, Grindal's successor to the Archbishopric of Canterbury and presbyterianism's most aggressive

³⁷ Owen, "Lectures and Lectureships," 65; D.A. Williams, "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate," *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1960), 26.

³⁸ Idem, "The Liberty of the Minories: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism," 91.

³⁹ Seaver, 122-132; D. A. Williams, "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate." *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1960): 24-38, and "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Stephen Coleman St." *Church Quarterly Review* 160 (1959): 464-482.

⁴⁰ Owen, "Lectures and Lectureships," 66.

⁴¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 202.

adversary, was responsible for continuing the policing of parish lectureships by demanding that all members of the Elizabethan clergy sign off on a series of articles noting their “unqualified approval of the entire contents of the Prayer Book.”⁴² Ultimately, the enforcement of these measures severely limited the ability of the parish lectureship to function as a means of promoting the Puritan cause, and the number of nonconformist lecturers employed by churches throughout the city declined over the course of the 1590s.⁴³ Despite its eventual decline following the enforcement of Aylmer’s and Whitgift’s strict regulations, the parish lectureship served as a useful tool for the promotion of the Puritan agenda, and functioned as an important element in the development of English presbyterianism and its following in London. Ultimately, the ability to exploit loopholes in church policy, such as the city liberties and parish lectureships, in their favor enabled the early presbyterians to exist within the confines of the Church of England while still working towards further reformation.

The *Admonition* Controversy

English presbyterianism developed as a response to the oppressive religious policies of the Queen and her bishops. After the vestiarian crisis stifled moderate calls for reform and forced radical Puritans to seek shelter in the city liberties and parish lectureships, it was only a matter of time before these suppressed religious tensions erupted into a controversy far more radical than even the early Puritans had expected.⁴⁴ Following the example of pamphlet warfare set by the participants in the vestiarian debate, the presbyterians swiftly took advantage of the power of print to promote their message of reform based on the Reformed model. The 1572

⁴² Ibid., 246; Owen, “Lectures and Lectureships in Tudor London,” 66.

⁴³ Owen, “Lectures and Lectureships in Tudor London,” 66.

⁴⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 115, and “John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism,” 344.

publication of John Field's and Thomas Wilcox's *An Admonition to the Parliament* served as the first widely publicized articulation of the presbyterian system as the only acceptable form of church polity and, according to Collinson, functioned as "a declaration of war, not against the Queen, who was really responsible, but against the bishops who were her instruments in enforcing conformity."⁴⁵

The presbyterian offensive began early in 1570, when Thomas Cartwright, a popular young fellow of Trinity College at Cambridge University, introduced the presbyterian discipline to English theologians in a series of lectures on the book of Acts delivered after his election to the prestigious Lady Margaret professorship.⁴⁶ In these wildly popular speeches, Cartwright criticized the existing English episcopal system, calling for the abolition of archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and all other titled offices besides pastors and deacons, for the attachment of ministers to specific congregations, and for the appointment of ministers to be made by their respective churches instead of by their diocesan bishop.⁴⁷ According to A. F. Scott Pearson, "the guiding principle running through them [was] that the Church should be modeled on that of Apostolic times and the inevitable consequence of this principle . . . should be the total abolition of diocesan episcopacy and the establishment of presbyterianism."⁴⁸ Cartwright's views,

⁴⁵ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 341, and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 112; Frere and Douglas, xvi; Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, 4.

⁴⁶ A. F. Scott Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925), 26-27; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 112; McGinn, 34. For more information on Cartwright and Presbyterianism at Cambridge, see Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, chapters 3 and 5 and Drysdale, 111-114.

⁴⁷ Pearson, 28-29; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 112; Knappen, 224. A summary of these articles can be found in TNA SP 12/74/29i, 30 and reprinted in John Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift, D.D., the third and last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: the whole digested, compiled, and attested from records, registers, original letters and other authentic mss. taken from the choicest libraries and collections of the kingdom : Together with a Large Appendix of the Said Papers, in Four Books* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822), volume III, 19-20; as well as in Edmund Grindal and William Nicholson, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D.: Successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), 323-324.

⁴⁸ Pearson, 29.

although certainly not new, found widespread acceptance among the younger generation of Cambridge scholars and provoked an academic frenzy across the university which threatened the foundations of the Elizabethan church.⁴⁹ The seriousness of the debate over Cartwright's message is reflected in a letter written by the usually-lenient Grindal, by now Archbishop of York, to Cecil in June, 1570:

There is one Cartwright, B.D., and reader of my Lady Margaret's Divinity Lecture, who, as I am very credibly informed, maketh in his lectures daily invectives against the extern policy and distinction of states in the ecclesiastical government of this realm. . . The youth of the University which is at this time very toward in learning, doth frequent his lectures in great numbers; and therefore in danger to be poisoned by him with love of contention and liking of novelties, and so become hereafter not only unprofitable, but also hurtful to the church.⁵⁰

To the conservative Cambridge dons, Cartwright's challenge to the episcopal system required immediate action, and they appealed to Cecil, the university's chancellor, to discipline the precocious scholar. Cecil, however, was distracted by fallout from the 1569 Northern Rebellion which had attempted to place Mary, Queen of Scots on the English throne, and authorized the dons to deal with Cartwright as they saw fit. The responsibility for dealing with Cartwright now fell to John Whitgift, the Master of Trinity College who had recently been elected Cambridge's Vice-Chancellor.⁵¹ By December, no amount of popular support could save Cartwright, and he was ordered to appear before a disciplinary panel to defend himself. Lacking support among the influential heads of the colleges, Cartwright and was promptly voted out of his Lady Margaret professorship.⁵² Although Whitgift and the Cambridge dons allowed Cartwright to retain his fellowship at Trinity College, after the upheaval at Cambridge,

⁴⁹ Knappen, 224-225; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 113

⁵⁰ Grindal to William Cecil, June 24, 1570, in *The Remains of Edmund Grindal*, 323-324.

⁵¹ McGinn, 35-37; Pearson, 39-40;

⁵² Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, 17-20; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 124; Knappen, 225.

Cartwright chose to withdraw to Geneva, where he lectured at the Genevan Academy and, more importantly, observed Beza's presbyterian polity in action.⁵³

In Cartwright's absence, the rift between the Puritans and the Church of England had grown even wider following the failure of both clerical and lay Puritans to bring about any reform in either the 1571 Convocation of the Clergy or Parliament.⁵⁴ The experiences of the vestiarian controversy had taught the Puritans to expect little cooperation from the Convocation. Thus, while they still introduced reformist measures to the meeting, the reformers now pinned their hopes on effecting reform through an alliance with Puritan representatives in Parliament, led by William Strickland, Thomas Norton, Peter Wentworth, and Christopher Yelverton.⁵⁵ This intrusion of lay officials into an ecclesiastical matter deeply offended the Queen and many of her bishops, including moderates such as Horne, Cox, and Jewel, who by now, according to Collinson, had lost any sympathy for the radical reformers and their presbyterian agenda and had begun speaking against them from London's most influential pulpit, Paul's Cross.⁵⁶ Horne even noted his disdain for the radicals in a letter to Bullinger on the state of the English church:

There are not however wanting some men of inferior rank and standing, deficient indeed both in sagacity and sense, and entirely ignorant and unknown, who, since they do not yet perceive the church to square with their wishes, or rather vanities . . . desert their posts, and hide themselves in idleness and obscurity; others, shaping out for themselves their own barks, call together conventicles, elect their own bishops, and holding synods one with another, frame and devise their own laws for themselves. They reject preaching, despise communion, would have all churches destroyed, as having been formerly dedicated to popery; nor are they content with merely deriding our ministers, but regard the office itself as not worth a straw.⁵⁷

After the conclusion of the 1571 parliamentary session, the leaders of the presbyterian faction—Field, Wilcox, Sampson, Percival Wibur, Edward Dering, and several others—were hauled

⁵³ Pearson, 46-54; Knappen, 225; Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 4.

⁵⁴ Knappen, 226-230

⁵⁵ Knappen, 225-229; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 116-117.

⁵⁶ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 117.

⁵⁷ Horn to Bullinger, London, August 8, 1571, in Robinson, 356.

before the Ecclesiastical Commission and ordered to sign a statement declaring their support for the Prayer Book, the surplice, and the Thirty-Nine Articles. When they refused to comply with this order, they were promptly removed from their livings.⁵⁸ Having alienated their best hope for allies within the episcopal hierarchy, the presbyterians now turned to the Puritans in the 1572 parliament for assistance in forcing reform on a hostile Queen and church. Their attempts at reform were blocked by a ruling from Elizabeth, delivered by the Speaker of the House, which required the prior approval by the ecclesiastical authorities of any new legislation before its presentation to the parliament.⁵⁹

Frustrated at their lack of progress, Field and Wilcox began drafting a summary of their beliefs in March 1572. Their manuscript, which was essentially a repetition of Cartwright's Cambridge lectures, was published in June under the title of *An Admonition to the Parliament*, together with two letters written in 1566 by Beza and Rodolph Gualter, one of the Zurich ministers, in support of the anti-vestiarian Puritans and a shorter treatise by Field entitled *A view of popishe abuses yet remaining in the English Church*.⁶⁰ More forceful in its advocacy of the presbyterian system than anything published up to this point, the *Admonition* was so blunt in its critique of the episcopal system that Collinson refers to it as "public polemic in the guise of an address to Parliament."⁶¹ The obviously frustrated authors begged for ecclesiastical reforms similar to those occurring in other parts of Europe:

Is a reformation good for France? And can it be evyl for England? Is discipline meete for Scotland? And is it unprofitable for this Realme? Surely God hath set these examples before your eyes to encourage you to go forward to a thorow and a speedy

⁵⁸ Knappen, 230; Albert Peel, *The Seconde Parte of a Register: Being a calendar of manuscripts under that title intended for publication by the Puritans about 1593, and now in Dr. Williams's Library, London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), 82; Matthew Parker, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury, comprising letters written by and to him, from A.D. 1535, to his death, A.D. 1575*, ed. by J. Bruce and T.T. Perowne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), 381-381.

⁵⁹ Knappen, 233-234; Frere and Douglas, xvi.

⁶⁰ Frere and Douglas, xviii, 40-55; Knappen 235

⁶¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 118-199.

reformation. You may not do as heretofore you have done, patch and peece, nay rather goe backward, and never labour or contend to perfection. But altogether remove whole Antichrist, both head body and branch, and perfectly plant that puritie of the word, that simplicitie of the sacraments, and severitie of discipline, which Christ hath commanded, and commended to his church.⁶²

The criticisms in Field's section, the *View of Popishe abuses*, were even more vituperative, labeling the Prayer Book "an unperfected booke, culled and picked out of that popishe dunghil, the Masse booke full of all abominations,"⁶³ and referring to the bishops as

emptie feeders, darcke eyes, ill workmen to hasten in the Lordes harvest, messengers that cannot call, Prophets that cannot declare the wil of the Lorde, unsavory salte, blinde guides, sleepe watchmen, untrustie dispensers of Gods secretes, evil dividers of the word, weake to withstand the adversary, not able to confute, and to conclude, so farre from making the man of God perfect to all good works, that rather the quite contrary may be confirmed.⁶⁴

Despite attempts by Elizabeth's government to find and shut down the illegal press on which the *Admonition* was printed, the provocative pamphlet proved to be extremely popular within London and other areas of the countryside, so much so that it was already on its third edition by August when Field and Wilcox were arrested for violating the Act of Uniformity and incarcerated in Newgate prison.⁶⁵ By August, the pamphlet had secured such a loyal readership in London that an irritated Archbishop Parker reported to Cecil,

for all the devices that we can make to the contrary, yet some good fellows still labour to print out the vain 'Admonition to the parliament.' Since the first printing it hath been twice printed, and now with additions. . . We wrote letters to the mayor and some aldermen to lay in wait for the charect, printer, and corrector, but I fear they deceive us. They are not willing to disclose this matter.⁶⁶

⁶² *An Admonition to the Parliament*, in Frere and Douglas, 19.

⁶³ *A View of Popishe abuses yet remaining in the Englishe Church, for the which Godly Ministers have refused to subscribe*, in Frere and Douglas, 21.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁶⁵ Frere and Douglas, xvii; Knappen, 235.

⁶⁶ Parker to Burghley, Lambeth, August 25, 1572, in *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, 397.

Indeed, by October 1572, Whitgift complained that “there is no likelihood that the matter should die; seeing their book be once again printed, and in every man’s hand and mouth”⁶⁷ and Sandys wrote to William Cecil, now Lord Burghley, and Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, that “the City will never be quiet, until these authors of sedition, who are now esteemed as gods, as Field, Wilcox, Cartwright and others, be far removed from the City. The people run to them as in popery they were wont to run to pilgrimage” and that “there be some Aldermen, and some wealthy citizens, which give them great and stout countenances; and perswade what they can, that others may do the like.”⁶⁸ This pattern of lay loyalty to and protection of the *Admonition* and its authors from their ecclesiastical and governmental adversaries continued to plague church officials such as Sandys, who complained in July, 1573 that

althoughe the date of the late proclamation for bringinge in of the *Admonition to the parliament* and other sediciouse bokes is alreidy expired, yet the whole Citie of London wherare no dowl is greate plenty, hath not one brought to my hands, and I can hardly think that the Lords of hir Majesties Privy Counsell have receyved many.⁶⁹

The alliance between the presbyterian movement and London’s lay population continued to vex church officials throughout Elizabeth’s rule and even more seriously under the Stuarts, making the *Admonition* and the literary debate which it provoked an important precedent for the development of the English religious, political, and literary traditions.

From the publication of Field’s and Wilcox’s pamphlet arose the notorious *Admonition* Controversy, which centered on a series of published exchanges between Cartwright and Whitgift. In April, 1572, Cartwright returned to London from his sojourn in Geneva at the urging of Field, Wilcox, and the other London presbyterians and resumed his role as leader of the

⁶⁷ Whitgift to Thomas Norton, October, 25, 1572, in Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, vol. I, 62; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Movement*, 120.

⁶⁸ Sandys to Burghley and Leicester, Fulham, August 5, 1572, in Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, vol. III, 33-34; Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 533.

⁶⁹ Sandys to Burghley, Fulham, July 2, 1573, in Frere and Douglas, 154.

presbyterian cause.⁷⁰ While Cartwright maintained a low profile in London, Whitgift managed to strip him of his Trinity fellowship at Cambridge on the grounds that he had not submitted himself for priestly ordination within the five years specified in the terms of his fellowship, thereby depriving the reformer of his last official tie to Cambridge.⁷¹ Nevertheless, despite Whitgift's best efforts to counteract the growing popularity of Cartwright's message, the months following the *Admonition's* publication saw the circulation of a number of smaller tracts which only served to create a public fixation with the presbyterians and their anti-episcopal agenda. Even before Whitgift could publish his *Answere to a certen Libell intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* in November, 1572, the polemical firestorm began with the publication of a handful of anonymously-authored pamphlets such as the pro-presbyterian *An Exhortation to the Bishops to Deale Brotherly with Theyre Brethren*, which was published in the same volume as *An Exhortation to the Bishops and Their Clergie to Aunswer a Little Booke That Came For the the Last Parliament*, as well as the anti-presbyterian *A View of the Church that the authors of the late published Admonition would have planted within this realme of England, containing such Positions as they now hold against the state of the said Church, as it is nowe*, of which no surviving copies exist, and is only remembered in the historical record through its pro-presbyterian response, *Certaine Articles collected and taken (as it is thought) by the Byshops out of a litle Boke entitled An Admonition to the Parliament with an answeere to the same*, which, due to its references to St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, can be dated to around September 1572.⁷²

⁷⁰ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 118, 124; Knappen, 233.

⁷¹ Pearson, 63-64; Knappen, 236; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 125.

⁷² The St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre served an important validation of presbyterian anticlericalism, since, together with Pope Pius V's excommunication of Elizabeth in 1570, it was utilized as confirmation of a Catholic conspiracy against international Protestantism, and contributed to their sense of urgency to rid the Church of England of its vestiges of popery. Knappen, 235-237; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 119-120, 147-148; Frere and Douglas, xviii. All of these tracts, with the obvious exception of *A View of the Church that the authors of the late published Admonition would have planted within this realme of England, containing such*

A Second Admonition to the Parliament, the last pamphlet to appear before the publication of Whitgift's *Answer* presents readers with a more comprehensive exposition of the presbyterians' proposed reforms to the Church's liturgy and polity. Originally thought to be Cartwright's handiwork, the *Second Admonition*'s garbled style and complex prose have led scholars, including Collinson, to attribute its authorship to any one of the other presbyterian agitators.⁷³ Additionally, Field and Wilcox continued to work for reform from their cells in Newgate prison throughout the duration of their one year imprisonment for their authorship of the original *Admonition*.⁷⁴ By August, the literary warfare between the radical Puritans and the conformist Anglicans had engendered such widespread support for the presbyterians in London that Sandys desperately appealed to the Privy Council for help in maintaining ecclesiastical order:

Truly, my Lords, it is high time to lay to your hands, if you mind the good of God's Church, the safety of this State. You can hardly believe what parts are made, what mischief is minded. For my part, I will do what I can . . . but I am too weak. Yea, if all of my calling were joined together, we are too weak. Our estimation is little; our authority is less. So that we are become contemptible in the eyes of the basest sort of people.⁷⁵

The publication of Whitgift's *Answer* in November marked the beginning of the *Admonition* Controversy proper. The series of six published pamphlets—Whitgift's *Answer*, two editions of Cartwright's *Replie to An Answer made of M. Doctor Whitgift Agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament*, Whitgift's *Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition against the Replie of T.C.*, Cartwright's *Second Replie against Maister Whitgiftes Second Answer* and *The Rest of the Second Replie*—exchanged polemical blows between the two adversaries of

Positions as they now hold against the state of the said Church, as it is nowe, are reprinted in Frere and Douglas's *Puritan Manifestoes*, 57-148.

⁷³ McGinn, 49-50; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 139.

⁷⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 136.

⁷⁵ Sandys to Burghley and Leicester, Fulham, August 5, 1572, in Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, 34.

Elizabethan Protestantism until 1577.⁷⁶ These literary debates addressed not only the questions of ecclesiastical organization and the distinction between religious and secular authority, but also issues such as the use of the sacraments, the significance of liturgical traditions and ceremonies, and the composition of the visible church. Instead of Cartwright's vision of a limited, disciplined fellowship that eschewed any and all remnants of popery, Whitgift advocated an inclusive church that maintained many of the elements of its Catholic predecessor. Cartwright maintained that by purifying the church from any practices and positions not specifically commanded in the Scriptures, presbyterianism represented the closest possible modern equivalent to the early, apostolic church. In response, Whitgift argued that although the traditions in question—vestments, prayer book liturgies, monarchical authority as the final word in ecclesiastical matters, clergymen serving multiples parishes, and a variety of other practices—were not specifically mandated in Scripture, they were vital for the edification of the English church, making their elimination neither necessary nor prudent.⁷⁷ Ultimately, however, the controversy's extended debate did nothing to resolve the differences of opinion between Whitgift and the conformists and Cartwright and the presbyterians. While presbyterianism continued to gain adherents across the south of England, Lake maintains that the conformist message floundered throughout the 1570s and that “those who wanted a religious or emotionally compelling alternative to Puritan divinity were not going to find it in Whitgift's works. The search to fill the resulting religious vacuum at the heart of the conformist position was to occupy anti-Puritan polemicists for the rest of the reign. Whitgift had left them plenty to do.”⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Knappen, 247; McGinn, 27-28.

⁷⁷ For a detailed explanation of the theological debates of the Admonition Controversy, see Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 13-66.

⁷⁸ Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 66.

The first phase of the presbyterian offensive reached its apex in early 1573, as ecclesiastical authorities struggled in vain to shut down the presbyterian presses and to halt the spreading of the message which threatened the Church's theological and organizational foundations.⁷⁹ Presbyterians, especially the young and engaging Dering, remained some of the most popular preachers in London, and Sandys struggled (often unsuccessfully) to fill the city's pulpits with preachers who advocated the conformist position.⁸⁰ Despite their prosecution of Dering and several other presbyterian ministers for their parts in distributing Cartwright's *Replye*, Parker and the ecclesiastical authorities seemed unable to neutralize the presbyterians, who remained protected by their powerful patrons such as the Dowager Duchess of Suffolk, the Earl of Leicester, and Sir Nicholas Bacon.⁸¹ As the conformist churchmen well knew, "the literary controversy aroused by the *Admonition*, the evidence of popular support for the imprisoned authors, Field and Wilcox, and the infiltration of nonconformists into the most public of all pulpits at Paul's Cross, made essential a comprehensive campaign of disciplinary action."⁸² It was not, however, until Elizabeth intervened in October 1573 that they were able to counter effectively the burgeoning presbyterian movement. On October 14, Peter Birchet, a crazed lawyer with tenuous ties to the presbyterians, attempted to assassinate Sir Christopher Hatton, an alleged crypto-Catholic and one the Queen's favorite privy counselors, outside of the Middle Temple. In reality, however, Birchet stabbed the famous sea-dog, Sir John Hawkins, after mistaking him for Hatton.⁸³ Ultimately, Birchet's only link to the presbyterians was his attendance that morning at a lecture given by the veteran presbyterian Thomas Sampson at

⁷⁹ Knappen, 237-242; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 146-150.

⁸⁰ Sandys to Burghley and Leicester, Fulham, August 5, 1572, in Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, 32-33; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 148, and "A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of 'Godly Master Dering'," in *Godly People*, 289-324.

⁸¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 148.

⁸² Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 532-533.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 533; Knappen, 243-244.

Whittington College. Birchet went on to prove his insanity by professing and then recanting the presbyterian position several times before murdering his jailer.⁸⁴

The Birchet incident, together with the discovery of a plot by one of the printers of Cartwright's *Replye* to murder his master and mistress, served to convince Elizabeth of presbyterianism's subversive and threatening nature, and she finally heeded the bishops' calls for help and gave them the authority needed to bring the presbyterian movement to its knees by early 1574.⁸⁵ Renewed orders for subscription to Parker's ecclesiastical articles by both London's clergymen and lay population in December, 1573 resulted in the arrest of numerous members of the presbyterian group, both clergy and laypeople, as well as, according to Collinson, the death of at least four presbyterian ministers in various city prisons.⁸⁶ While Field and Wilcox finally finished their jail sentences and were released from Newgate, the threat of re-imprisonment by the hostile ecclesiastical authorities forced them to maintain low profiles and wait for a more favorable climate to resume their reformist activities.⁸⁷ At the same time, Cartwright only narrowly avoided arrest by fleeing to the Continent and beginning a second exile in the strongly Calvinistic Palatinate, one of the smaller states of the Holy Roman Empire. While Cartwright continued to publish his later *Admonition* tracts from afar, his absence from London proved to be severely damaging to the presbyterian cause.⁸⁸ While these setbacks did not end the presbyterian movement, they did usher in an Anglican resurgence which forced the presbyterians to bide their time until they could effectively resume their push for reformation.

⁸⁴ Strype, *The life and acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: Under whose primacy and influence the reformation of religion was happily effected; and the Church of England restored, and established upon the principles whereon it stands to this day* (London, 1711), 449-450; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 150.

⁸⁵ Strype, *The life and acts of Matthew Parker*, 454.

⁸⁶ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 152; Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 534.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 153-154; Knappen, 244-247.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 4

THE PRESBYTERIANS

“There is a conventicle or rather conspiracie breedinge in London. Certain men of sundrie callings are as it were in commission together to procure hands to Mr. Cartwright’s booke and promesse to stande in the defence therof unto death. . .”¹

We have now traced the development of Elizabethan presbyterianism through its suppression after unsuccessfully challenging English episcopacy during the *Admonition* Controversy. With their leadership effectively neutralized and their lay supporters subjected to the same strictures as the clergy, the London presbyterians had no choice but to retreat back to the safety of the city’s Puritan enclaves and to wait for another chance to push their reformist agenda. At this point, it would be useful to analyze the social makeup of the London presbyterian group and to examine the manner in which members of the city’s various orders united under the presbyterian umbrella. Like the wider Puritan movement, English presbyterianism “drew its converts from many ranks in a highly stratified society, recruiting its numbers from as far down the social scale as the rural copyholder and the urban artisan, as well as from the upper ranges of status—merchants, gentry, and peers,” and London was no exception to this pattern.²

As the most enthusiastic and influential manifestation of Puritanism during the Elizabethan period, presbyterianism drew adherents from all elements of London’s population, and it was this social diversity which enabled the movement to survive the persecutions waged

¹ Edwin Sandys to Lords Burghley and Leicester, August 5, 1573, in W.H. Frere and C.E. Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt with a reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and kindred documents, 1572* (London: Church Historical Society, 1954), xix.

² Seaver, 39.

against it by the Queen and her bishops. The movement's potential to effect religious reform (or at least, the ecclesiastical establishment's perception of its potential) did not, however, correlate to a sizeable following.³ Ultimately, despite their undeniable zeal for reform, the men and women who claimed membership in the presbyterian movement represented a relatively small element of English society and identified with a specific Puritan mindset which maintained a degree of separation from the mainstream of the general public. "From the inside looking out," Lake notes, "such people saw themselves as 'the godly', true Christian professors in an otherwise profane society. From the outside looking in other men saw them as 'Puritans', over precise hypocrites, who delighted in nothing so much as the contemplation of their own virtue and the condemnation of the supposed vices of others."⁴ This calculated ideological and communal separation from the wider culture would become increasingly pronounced under the Stuart monarchs, as the Puritan movement grew increasingly radicalized and splintered into groups which favored official separation from the Church of England.⁵ For the Elizabethan presbyterians, however, separation from English religious and secular culture was an impractical and unappealing idea, as it would only serve to hinder their economic livelihoods and their ability to bring about religious reformation to the existing Church.⁶ Instead, the presbyterians continued to engage in London's vibrant, bustling culture, and set themselves up as an integral part of the capital's religious, social, and economic makeup. By utilizing the advantages, exemptions, and anonymity afforded by their respective positions in the City's social order, the

³ Ibid., 36-37.

⁴ Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 5.

⁵ For further reading on the development of English religious dissent and separatism, see Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1998); and "From Puritanism to Dissent, 1660-1700," in *The Culture of English Protestantism*, eds. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 234-265; and Stephen Brachlow, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology, 1570-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

⁶ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 346; and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 132-133; Knappen, 213-216; and Seaver, 30.

London presbyterians were able to preserve their religious identity and to ensure the survival of their message.

The Ministers

Without a doubt, the presbyterian ministers functioned as the movement's ideological and organizational leaders. While this model certainly applied to presbyterian communities across England, it rang truest in the nation's capital, a city which was, as discussed in Chapter Two, so inundated by eager university graduates and unemployed churchmen seeking pulpits or patronage that William Fisher, a divinity student himself, claimed, "there is good cause the Citie of London should become an other Thessalonica, in seeking an honouring our Phisition Christ Jesus. There is so much Preaching, and so diligent hearing, that needs there must be some following."⁷

These ministers represented a new, younger generation of Puritans who, in the years dominated by the presbyterian crisis, took over the leadership of the puritan movement from the older generation of the Marian exiles. By the 1570s and 1580s, many of the older Puritans and sympathetic conformist clerics, such as Grindal, Sandys, Sampson and Humphrey, were forced by both age and infirmity to pass the leadership of the reformist cause to a new group of younger Puritans who had finished their university educations during dramatic years of the vestiarian and *Admonition* controversies.⁸ Primarily organized by John Field, one of the effusive authors of the *Admonition*, these radical presbyterians reached their ideological maturity under the influence of

⁷ William Fisher, student of diuinitie, *A sermon preached at Paules crosse the firste Sunday after Newyeeres day, beeing the thirde day of Ianuary* (London : [By Thomas Dawson] for Thomas Charde and Edward Aggas, 1580), 45, quoted in Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," iii, 206, 410; Archer, 88.

⁸ Grindal to Bullinger, York, July 31, 1573, in Robinson, 434-435; Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 344.

Cartwright's doctrines and Field's ardent calls for reform. They dedicated themselves to reforming the Church of England to a degree which their moderate predecessors had never aspired. According to Collinson, "Field and his friends led what was essentially a new Puritan movement, which attracted many of the young men now entering the ministry from the expanding universities, and especially from Cambridge, where the doctrines of Cartwright had become the watchword for a younger generation in revolt."⁹ It is important to note, however, that the presbyterians were not the only divinity students affected by the ideological mudslinging and saber rattling at the universities. While Cartwright served as the ideological leader of and inspiration for a new generation of Puritans, his opponent in the *Admonition* controversy, John Whitgift, provided the episcopalian antithesis for Cartwright's ideology, and acted as the rallying point for a new generation of churchmen, such as Richard Bancroft, Matthew Sutcliffe, Richard Hooker and George Abbot, who articulated an episcopalian reaction against the presbyterians which would dominate England's ecclesiastical policy through the 1640s.¹⁰

As Elizabeth's reign progressed, opportunities for legitimate employment for the radical presbyterians became increasingly scarce, and aside from the notable exceptions of William Charke, a lecturer at Lincoln's Inn,¹¹ Thomas Croke, a lecturer at Gray's Inn,¹² and Richard Gardiner, the rector of St. Mary, Whitechapel,¹³ most presbyterian churchmen were forced to find positions as lecturers in city liberties or private chaplains to sympathetic noble families.¹⁴ Indeed, as Collinson notes, this reality was so widely understood by the Puritan community that when they "spoke of 'the church in London' they meant, in effect, a group of unbeneficed

⁹ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 345.

¹⁰ For further information on conformist literature and its writers, see Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*

¹¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 234; Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 557.

¹² Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 557.

¹³ Collinson, John Craig and Brett Usher, *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St Edmunds, 1582 - 1590* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003), 132, fn 377.

¹⁴ Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 567.

stipendiary curates and preachers, some of them lecturers in the parish churches or in the inns of court, others lacking even that measure of settled responsibility.”¹⁵ Ministers who were unable to secure salaried positions often settled for short engagements as guest preachers in parishes with vestries and incumbents who were sympathetic to their cause.¹⁶

Faced with such limited options for public expression of their ideas, the London presbyterians resorted to meeting in the homes of various members across the city, most often the homes of Walter Travers, Richard Gardiner, Stephen Egerton, and Thomas Barber.¹⁷ According to Bancroft’s account of the presbyterians’ covert meetings, their agenda grew increasingly radical as time passed:

They had then their meetings of Ministers, tearmed brethren, in private houses in London: as namely of Field, Wilcox, Standen, Jackson, Bonham, Seintloe, Crane, and Edmonds, which meetings were called conferences, according to the plot in the first and second admonitions mentioned. In these London-meetings, at the first, little was debated, but against subscription, the attire, and booke of common prayer. Marry after . . . that Charke, Travers, Barber, Gardner, Cheston, and lastly Crooke and Egerton, joined themselves into that brotherhood, then the handling of the Discipline began to be rife: then many motions were made, and conclusions were set downe.¹⁸

The arrival in London of radical ministers from other presbyterian strongholds in England such as Essex and Northamptonshire, as well as a group of radical presbyterian ministers who were forced out of Scotland in 1584 only served to bolster the presbyterian cause in the capital city.¹⁹ Giles Wigginton, the Northamptonshire firebrand who was deeply involved in both the Marprelate Tracts and the Hacket Revolt²⁰, and George Gifford, the Essex preacher and Puritan propagandist who lectured at St. Botolph Aldgate while suspended from his living in Essex for

¹⁵ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*,” 85.

¹⁶ Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 176-177, 419, 557-558, 573.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 562; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 320.

¹⁸ Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions*, Book 3, Chapter 2, 43-44.

¹⁹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 275-276.

²⁰ Walsham, “‘Frantick Hacket’: Prophecy, Sorcery, Insanity, and the Elizabethan Puritan Movement,” 33; Winship, 351; John Creaser, “Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* and Bancroft’s *Dangerous Positions*,” *The Review of English Studies* 57, no. 229 (April 2006): 179-180

nonconformity, both made their way to London in the 1580s and 1590s.²¹ Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, the arrival of the Scottish ministers, especially Andrew Melville, James Lawson, Walter Balcanquhal, and John Davidson, in the summer and autumn of 1584 provided the ideological and organizational impetus for a new push to bring about presbyterian-style reforms.²² As opposed to the much-maligned English presbyterians, “Scotland’s presbyterian ministers . . . were well acquainted with headbanging encounters with monarchs—they were currently in the ascendancy of their struggles with James VI—and they had developed the politics and justification of pressuring errant rulers by the ‘people’ to an art.”²³ Since they were forbidden from forming their own church similar to those of the French at Threadneedle Street and the Dutch at Austin Friars, the Scots integrated themselves into the ranks of London’s presbyterian group and began appearing in several of the city’s pulpits, where they swiftly gained reputations as dynamic and popular preachers.²⁴ Ultimately, as Owen notes, “the influx of Scots, the infiltration of ministers ejected from country areas, and the feverish activity of the clandestine presbyterian brotherhood, produced an ecclesiastical atmosphere in London more disturbed and restless than at any time since 1566.”²⁵ This growing radicalization of the ministerial corps and its shift away from working for reform from within the established episcopacy did cause, however, the defection of one member of the presbyterian group, Thomas Edmunds, to the ranks of London’s conformist clergy.²⁶ While the loss of Edmunds did not affect the presbyterians initially, it would come back to haunt them in 1591, when his testimony

²¹ Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 558-559. For more information on Gifford and his activities as a propagandist, see Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., “George Gifford, Puritan Propaganda and Popular Religion in Elizabethan England,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 1978): 27-49; and Timothy Scott McGinnis, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort: Puritan Priorities in Elizabethan Religious Life* (Kirksville, Mo: Truman State Univ. Press, 2004).

²² Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 276-277.

²³ Winship, 350.

²⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 277.

²⁵ Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 564.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 562; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 237.

before the High Commission and the Star Chamber gave the ecclesiastical authorities an all-too-revealing insight into their covert activities in London.²⁷ Nevertheless, as it became clear that the Queen intended to convene a new Parliament at the end of 1584, the London presbyterian ministers, now energized by their English and Scottish additions, prepared for a fresh attempt at Parliament-sponsored reform which would require the full cooperation of the City's lay presbyterian population.

The Nobility and Gentry

Regardless of their academic credentials or pastoral abilities, the presbyterians could not have hoped for any kind of ideological survival without the patronage of reform-minded nobles and members of the emerging Elizabethan gentry. According to Claire Cross, after the “dissolution of the monasteries and the sale of a large part of monastic lands by the Crown . . . a greatly increased amount of patronage became vested in lay hands. The Church's theological inclination could be determined by the type of men presented by lay patrons to livings throughout the length and breadth of the country.”²⁸ As some of the most influential political figures in the realm, Elizabeth's nobles, especially Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester²⁹, his brother Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick³⁰, Henry Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon³¹, and Francis Russell,

²⁷ Owen, 557. Edmunds's testimony, along with the rest of the presbyterian trial proceedings, can be found at The National Archives, TNA STAC 5: Court of Star Chamber: Proceedings, Elizabeth I.

²⁸ M. Claire Cross, “Noble Patronage in the Elizabethan Church,” *The Historical Journal* 3, no. 1 (1960): 1.

²⁹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 62-63, 166; Simon Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 225-234.

³⁰ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 166; Simon Adams, “Dudley, Ambrose, earl of Warwick (c.1530–1590),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8143> (accessed November 5, 2009).

³¹ *Ibid.*, and *The Puritan Earl: The Life of Henry Hastings 3rd Earl of Huntingdon 1536 - 1595* (London: Macmillan, 1966).

Earl of Bedford³², maintained an important degree of religious authority through their ability to select and protect the ministers who served in their respective domains, as well as to offer considerable protection to their clerical clients in London against the strictures of the episcopal establishment. As four of Elizabeth's favorites, these decidedly reformist earls functioned as protectors and perpetuators of the Puritan movement, for "in an age of volatile opinion, the ownership of land on a large scale by such 'nurses of religion' . . . could stabilize the religion of half a shire, both directly, through the right of presenting the parish clergy which the nobility and gentry exercised in so many churches, and indirectly in a hundred less definable ways."³³

The puritan earls were not, however, the only members of Elizabeth's court upon whom the presbyterians relied, and "among the leading gentlemen of the Court there were not a few staunch friends of the radical preachers. Some, like Sir Francis Knollys, a cousin by marriage to the queen, and Sir Anthony Cooke, the father-in-law of Cecil and Sir Nicholas Bacon, had been exiles themselves in Mary's reign and . . . led the effective protestant agitation in the 1559 Parliament."³⁴ Other Puritan sympathizers at court included William Cecil, Baron Burghley³⁵, Elizabeth's oldest and most trusted advisor; Sir Francis Walsingham, her secretary of state and spymaster; and Sir Walter Mildmay, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, all of whom held seats on the Privy Council³⁶, as well as Robert Beale, who served as clerk for both the Privy Council and

³² Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 52.

³³ *Ibid.*, 22.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 53; Dickens, 299, 316; Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, "Sir Anthony Cooke: Tudor Humanist, Educator, and Religious Reformer" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119, no. 3 (June 1975): 233-250; Wallace T. MacCaffrey, "Knollys, Sir Francis (1511/12–1596)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, October 2007, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15755> (accessed November 9, 2009).

³⁵ Knappen, 250; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 62, 271; Michael A. R. Graves, *Burghley: William Cecil, Lord Burghley* (London: Longman, 1998).

³⁶ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 162; Dickens, 316.

the Council of the North.³⁷ Other patrons of presbyterians in London included William Davison, a diplomat who had been one of Walsingham's assistants before serving as ambassador to the Netherlands and Scotland and, as secretary of state, delivered Mary Stuart's death warrant to Fotheringay Castle in 1587³⁸; Catherine Brandon, the Dowager Duchess of Suffolk, who maintained an influential presence in the Minories in the 1660s and 1670s³⁹; Sir George More, the Puritan M.P. from Surrey who held the advowson rights of St. Anne's Blackfriars, arguably the city's most radical parish, until 1607⁴⁰; and Mrs. Elizabeth Casleton, more commonly referred to as Mistress Crane, the widow of Anthony Crane, an influential courtier, who used her London home in Aldermanbury ward as a safe house for the presbyterians involved in the production and distribution of the Marprelate Tracts.⁴¹ While other pro-presbyterian members of parliament, such as Peter Wentworth, Job Throckmorton and Richard Knightley, made periodic appearances in the city and fought intensely for the passage of presbyterian reforms in the House of Commons, their spheres of influence lay more in their home counties and conferences, and their stories fall, therefore, outside the scope of this study.

³⁷ Collinson, "Servants and citizens: Robert Beale and other Elizabethans" *Historical Research* 79, no. 206 (November 2006): 506-507; and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 166.

³⁸ Simon Adams, "Davison, William (d. 1608)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7306> (accessed November 30, 2009). Mary Stuart's execution would mark the end of Davison's diplomatic career, due to Elizabeth's desire to find a scapegoat for the execution of an anointed queen. Interestingly enough, however, this incident gave Davison the reputation of a defender of England against the threat of a Catholic coup from the north, for which he was so well known that on the morning of their failed revolt, Coppinger and Arthington paid him a visit and offered to make him Chief Governor in their new regime. Not surprisingly, Davison wanted nothing to do with them, but they left him a copy of Hacket's autobiography in case he changed his mind. Cosin, 48-49; Winship, 364; Walsham, 29.

³⁹ Owen, "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72," 68, 86; Knappen, 231; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 50, 52, 87; Seaver, 28

⁴⁰ Burch, 11; Louis A. Knafla, "More, Sir George (1553-1632)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁴¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 393; Julia Norton McCorkle, "A Note Concerning 'Mistress Crane' and the Martin Marprelate Controversy," *The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 4th series, 7, no. 3 (1931): 276-283.

Despite the obvious religious ties between these men and the presbyterian reformers, it is important to note that the members of the nobility and gentry who patronized and protected the presbyterians were not solely motivated by their religious loyalties, but were also motivated to embrace the Puritans in order to undercut the episcopacy's political power and to weaken further its monopoly over English religious affairs. Ultimately, "the effect of [the presbyterian] reforms would have been to reduce still further the both the powers of the unpopular ecclesiastical courts and the social status of the higher clergy, while exposing spiritual government to lay interference."⁴² This political situation meant that patrons and their religious clients often varied in the degrees to which they embraced the reformist agenda. In the case of the Earl of Huntingdon, for example, "although presbyterian radicals dedicated their books to Huntingdon . . . the dedications confirm the impression of Huntingdon as a moderate reformer. He was willing to accept works in which the reformation of abuses within the Church was strongly advocated, but nothing was published under his patronage which attacked the government of the Church."⁴³

Regardless of the various motivations for and the degree of religious radicalism implied in the system of religious patronage, these relationships represented one of the most powerful methods of propagating a specific religious ideology in England. The presbyterians were certainly aware of this reality, and actively sought patrons from the nobility and gentry orders. John Field's patrons repeatedly protected him from the full severity of Parker's and Whitgift's wrath. As early as 1573, Leicester and Warwick secured his release from Newgate after his initial imprisonment for penning the *Admonition*.⁴⁴ As discussed in Chapter Three, "Field had powerful friends, even among privy councilors, and it was with difficulty that [Parker] persuaded

⁴² Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 187.

⁴³ Cross, "Noble Patronage in the Elizabethan Church", 15.

⁴⁴ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 139; Peel, *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, I, 91; *Puritan Manifestoes*, app. III, 153.

the council to issue a proclamation calling for obedience to the established order and prohibiting possession of the ‘Admonition’ and other presbyterian tracts.”⁴⁵ By 1579, Leicester’s patronage of Field consistently thwarted Aylmer’s attempts to force him into exile in the north of England, and even proved powerful enough that, with the help of Knollys and Henry Norris, the Puritan High Sheriff of Oxfordshire, he secured Field a new preaching license from Oxford and set him up as a parish lecturer in the London parish of St. Mary Aldermary.⁴⁶ Additionally, Leicester also secured a living for Cartwright as the master of his hospital in Warwick upon his return to England in 1586.⁴⁷ While his powers of patronage could not convince Whitgift to issue Cartwright a new license to preach, Leicester did ensure that Cartwright would live out his days comfortably and, more importantly, in England. In 1590, Huntingdon orchestrated John Udall’s employment in the parish church of Newcastle-upon-Tyne after Udall’s suspension from the parish of Kingston-upon-Thames, a considerable feat in light of Udall’s outspoken radicalism and ties to the inflammatory Marprelate Tracts.⁴⁸

While few Elizabethans wielded the degree of influence afforded to Leicester and Huntingdon by their status as the Queen’s favorites, other noble and gentry patrons of the presbyterians ensured that the movement was afforded an important degree of protection from its episcopalian opponents. As Elizabeth’s reign progressed, however, this protection weakened as the older generation of Puritan patrons died off.⁴⁹ This trend had devastating consequences for the presbyterians, as they became increasingly vulnerable to the attacks of Whitgift and his bishops. According to Collinson,

⁴⁵ Collinson, “John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism,” 346.

⁴⁶ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 202.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 295.

⁴⁸ Cross, 12. Two years later, Udall would be imprisoned and sentenced to death as one of the possible authors of the Marprelate Tracts.

⁴⁹ Leo F. Solt, “Revolutionary Calvinist Parties in England under Elizabeth I and Charles I,” *Church History* 27, no. 3 (September 1958), 236.

With the death of Leicester [in 1588], the political foundations of Elizabethan puritanism began to crumble away. Other powerful friends were soon to follow him: Sir Walter Mildmay in 1589 . . . Warwick and Sir Francis Walsingham in 1590. The Earl of Bedford had gone in 1585. Of the old guard, Sir Francis Knollys was now left virtually alone, a political dinosaur . . . The Earl of Huntingdon would survive until 1595, but he was without much influence at Court.⁵⁰

The dramatic demise of Leicester's stepson, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, in 1601 certainly did nothing to help the presbyterian cause, since "enough of the leading City radicals were also associated with the Essex household to suggest the Earl's own inclinations."⁵¹ As with the Hacket Revolt, the seditiousness of Essex's failed coup d'état meant that the presbyterians were, once again, tainted by association.⁵² By the end of Elizabeth's reign, a new generation of English ecclesiastical patrons was busy appointing conformist ministers to their pulpits, signaling the end of the heyday of Elizabethan Puritan patronage. Ultimately, the episcopacy's undermining of the Puritan patronage system meant that the survival of the presbyterian movement came to depend more heavily upon the support of its lay adherents.

The Merchants

While patronage from the upper orders of society provided the presbyterian ministers with employment in London, their efforts would have been futile had they not been embraced by the city's lay population, and the influential London merchant community contained some of their most devoted adherents. The affinity between the Puritan movement and the increasingly

⁵⁰ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 387.

⁵¹ Ibid., 444-445; Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 585. For more information on Essex, see Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), and "Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex (1565-1601)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, October 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7565> (accessed November 10, 2009).; G. B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1973); Robert Lacey, *Robert, Earl of Essex: an Elizabethan Icarus* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971).

⁵² Ibid., 584-586.

powerful English middle class has long since been recognized as a distinctive characteristic of early modern society, so I will not belabor that point any further.⁵³ For the purposes of this thesis, however, a few examples of the interaction between the London merchant population and the presbyterians will serve as illustrations of the important role which the merchants played in the development and perpetuation of the presbyterian movement. The merchant community's exposure to advanced protestantism while conducting business on the Continent, specifically in Germany and the Low Countries, served to convince them of the doctrinal and organizational weakness which existed in the Church of England and encouraged their patronizing of London's radical parish churches upon their return to the city. Not surprisingly, this activity drew complaints that the

London merchants returned home '...contemptuouse and rebelling against our state ecclesiasticall.' This led to '...privet reading in howses', the infiltration of 'straunge preacher[s]' into men's cures, and the tendency of 'manie citizens' to desert their own churches and join the reformed Dutch and French churches. The latter complaint was an open acknowledgement of the influence of the foreign congregations in London on the development of nonconformist trends, an influence due not only to the Calvinistic organization of their churches, but also to the activities of their ministers who were often found preaching or in charge of a Sunday service in City parishes.⁵⁴

The bond between English and continental presbyterianism was only strengthened by the establishment of English expatriate churches in major trading cities abroad. The English congregation of the Merchant Adventurers in Antwerp would prove especially important, since its pulpit featured both Walter Travers, a noted English presbyterian theologian who was sent to Antwerp by the London presbyterians and there given a presbyterian-style ordination, and

⁵³ Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 2003); Louis B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935); Laura Caroline Stevenson, *Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 1984); Richard Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653* (London: Verso, 2003.), 240-315.

⁵⁴ Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 551.

Thomas Cartwright when he was forced to flee England to escape prosecution for nonconformity in 1580. According to Collinson, the Antwerp congregation “took every advantage of its situation to abandon every vestige of Anglicanism for the liturgy and discipline of the continental churches,” and thereby provided the presbyterians with an important forum in which to test out their reforms.⁵⁵ By 1573, the influence of the merchant community proved powerful enough that Sandys complained to Parker that “there be some Aldermen, and some wealthy citizens, which give them [Cartwright, Field, and company] great and stout countenances; and perswade what they can, that others may do the like.”⁵⁶

Empowered by the powerful examples of the continental churches, both English and otherwise, members of London’s merchant community enthusiastically engaged themselves in the city’s presbyterian movement. Sir Richard Martin and his wife Dorcas served as two of the most powerful merchant advocates for presbyterianism in the city, and were “active members of the radical London community [which] included figures such as Thomas Cartwright, Edward Dering, Anne Lock[e], Thomas Wilcox, and John Field.”⁵⁷ Martin, a Cheapside goldsmith who would eventually serve as an alderman for two city wards, city sheriff, Master of the Mint, and Lord Mayor of London, actively participated in the city’s presbyterian underworld.⁵⁸ It was his wife Dorcas, however, who played a more active role in working towards presbyterian reform.⁵⁹ “Far from being a silent, retiring wife, Dorcas Martin was a visible and vocal participant in public religious life: in addition to being a translator, she was the suspected stationer of an

⁵⁵ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 233-234.

⁵⁶ Sandys to Parker, Fulham, August 5, 1573, in Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, 34.

⁵⁷ Micheline White, “A Biographical Sketch of Dorcas Martin: Elizabethan Translator, Stationer, and Godly Matron,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 30, no. 3 (Autumn 1999), 785.

⁵⁸ C. E. Challis, “Martin, Sir Richard (1533/4–1617),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18205> (accessed October 26, 2009); White, 780-781.

⁵⁹ Elaine V. Beilin, “Martin, Dorcas, Lady Martin (1536/7–1599),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46911> (accessed October 26, 2009).

illegally printed religious pamphlet, the dedicatee of several religious works, [and] a supporter of the French church in Threadneedle Street.”⁶⁰ Dorcas, the daughter of a Cheapside grocer who had most likely grown up in the Puritan parish of All Hallows, Honey Lane⁶¹, demonstrated her dedication to the presbyterian cause in 1573 when she served as Cartwright’s secretary and stationer for the *Replye to An Answere made of M. Doctor Whitgift Agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament* during the *Admonition* controversy.⁶² Grindal reported the situation to Parker in December, writing, “I hear say that Cartwright is lodged in Cheapside, at Mr. Martyn’s house, the goldsmith. His wife was the stationer for all the first impressions of the book.”⁶³ As stationer, Dorcas would have acted as the bookseller for the *Replye*, a role which placed her at the heart of the controversy surrounding Cartwright and the presbyterian agenda. The Martins, along with Richard’s brother Anthony, a potter who also lived on Honey Lane, served as hosts for the Scottish ministers who sought refuge in London in 1584.⁶⁴ James Lawson, one of these ministers, died at Anthony Martin’s home in October 1584, and his funeral became the staging ground for a massive demonstration of Calvinist cooperation between the Scots, the English and the French, as an estimated five hundred people attended the funeral and followed the funerary procession to the burial site in Bedlam churchyard.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ White, 777.

⁶¹ Ibid., 779-780.

⁶² Collinson, “The Role of Women in the English Reformation Illustrated by the Life and Friendships of Anne Locke,” in *Godly People*, 283.

⁶³ Grindal to Parker, Bishopsthorp, December 9, 1573, in Edmund Grindal and William Nicholson, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal: Successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury* (Cambridge: Printed at the University Press, 1843), 347-348, cited in White, 785.

⁶⁴ Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 560; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 277; White, 787.

⁶⁵ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 277. For an account of Lawson’s funeral, see David Laing, *The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society: Containing Tracts and Original Letters, Chiefly Relating to the Ecclesiastical Affairs of Scotland During the 16th and 17th Centuries*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1844), 449-452.

In addition to the Martins, Anne Locke also stands out as a member of the London merchant community who furthered the presbyterian cause.⁶⁶ Raised in Cheapside in a family of mercers and Merchant Adventurers with ties to Antwerp, Locke was intimately familiar with the relationship between the expanding merchant world and the Puritan movement, especially since her first husband, Henry Locke, was also a Cheapside mercer with interests in Antwerp.⁶⁷ Anne Locke's primary importance to the presbyterian movement was, however, her relationship to John Knox, the famous, or rather infamous, Scottish presbyterian reformer. Having left her husband to tend to business in London, she spent the years of Mary I's reign in Geneva, where she spent her time translating a selection of Calvin's sermons into English and forming a close friendship with Knox based on their shared religious and academic interests.⁶⁸ After her return to Cheapside in 1559, she functioned as the liaison between Knox, who had permanently removed himself from the Queen's favor with his ill-advised publication of *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regimen of Women*. Effectively limited to working for reformation in Scotland due to Elizabeth's refusal to allow him entrance into England, Knox "depended on Mrs. Locke to loosen the purse strings of wealthy London protestants in order to sustain the faltering cause of the Scottish lords of the congregation, and to send him books. He urged her to have nothing to do with the imperfect religious settlement made in England."⁶⁹ After the death of Henry Locke in 1571, Anne remarried Edward Dering, the popular young preacher who was arguably the most prominent Puritan in London until his suspension for

⁶⁶ Patrick Collinson, "Locke, Anne (c.1530–1590)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69054> (accessed November 14, 2009).

⁶⁷ Collinson, "The Role of Women in the English Reformation Illustrated by the Life and Friendships of Anne Locke," 277-278.

⁶⁸ Collinson, "A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of 'Godly Master Dering'," in *Godly People*, 317.

⁶⁹ Collinson, "The Role of Women in the Elizabethan Church Illustrated by the Life and Friendships of Anne Locke," 281-282 and *DNB*.

nonconformity in 1573.⁷⁰ The marriage, which lasted from 1572 until Dering's death from consumption in 1576 and was, perhaps not surprisingly, arranged by Dorcas Martin, only served to reinforce Anne Locke's position at the center of the London presbyterian community, a position which she would maintain until her third marriage to Richard Prowse, an Exeter merchant, took her out of the city in the early 1580s.⁷¹

Another fixture in London's religiously radical merchant community was Robert Waldegrave, the Puritan stationer who is best known as the printer of the first four Marprelate Tracts.⁷² Originally from Worcestershire, Waldegrave operated in London from 1578 to 1588 and published a plethora of pro-presbyterian works by the city's leading radicals, including Field, Fulke, Udall, William Perkins, Dudley Fenner and Laurence Chaderton, as well as seminal Calvinist works such as the Geneva Prayer Book.⁷³ Despite the destruction of his shop in St. Paul's Churchyard and most of his tools and supplies by the Stationers' Company in April, 1588, Waldegrave managed to save enough supplies to set up a clandestine press at Mistress Crane's home in the village of East Molesey in Surrey, near John Udall's parish of Kingston-upon-

⁷⁰ It is important to note that while Dering was certainly a puritan and probably a presbyterian, he was not necessarily a radical, and proved reluctant to comment publicly on the issue of presbyterian-style reforms to the existing church structure. According to Collinson, "in his teaching on the ministry Dering had more in common with the first generation of Protestant reformers than with the new and more narrowly dogmatic Calvinists who were coming to the fore in the 1570s" ("A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of 'Godly Master Dering'", 314), but his personal and professional ties to the radical presbyterians, especially Cartwright, meant that he could not avoid being drawn into the conflict. Interestingly enough, however, while he was target early on for prosecution by the bishops, "the truth was that Dering was so well-connected that nobody wanted to bear the odious responsibility of suspending him. The courtier Henry Killigrew and his wife were close personal friends and Mrs. Killigrew was the sister-in-law to Burghley and Sir Nicholas Bacon who took the most active part in examining Dering in the Star Chamber. The earl of Leicester also regarded him with favour" (Ibid., 309-310). Despite his eventual suspension in 1573, Dering serves as an important example of the powerful protection which lay patrons afforded the presbyterians.

⁷¹ White, 789; Collinson, "The Role of Women in the Elizabethan Church Illustrated by the Life and Friendships of Anne Locke," 283-284.

⁷² Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 273-274; Knappen, 294-295; and Katherine S. van Eerde, "Robert Waldegrave: the printer as agent and link between sixteenth-century England and Scotland," *Renaissance Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1981), 40-41; and A. J. Mann, "Waldegrave, Robert (c.1554-1603/4)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28441> (accessed November 19, 2009).

⁷³ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 274; van Eerde, 44-45.

Thames.⁷⁴ It was here that Waldegrave, with the help of Udall and John Penry, published the first of the Marprelate tracts, *The Epistle*, as well as several other presbyterian tracts by Udall and Penry. In the spring of 1589, after a year of moving around southeastern and central England with the clandestine press and printing three more Marprelate tracts, Waldegrave left the Martinist camp, apparently unhappy with its increasing radicalization, and the task of printing additional Marprelate works passed into other hands.⁷⁵ By early 1590, Waldegrave had reestablished himself in Scotland, where he served as James VI's royal printer until his death in late 1603 or early 1604.⁷⁶ Despite the fact that Waldegrave only lived in London for ten years, he functioned as one of the most important lay members of the presbyterian movement, and, together with the Martins and Anne Locke, serves as an interesting example of how the London merchant community protected and propagated radical presbyterianism throughout the Elizabethan period.

The Strangers

Another element of London society which greatly aided the survival of the presbyterian movement was the influential population of foreign Calvinists, or as the Elizabethans called them, the Strangers, who “played the part of a Trojan horse, bringing Reformed worship and discipline fully armed into the midst of the Anglican camp.”⁷⁷ Since Edward VI's reign, Londoners had been exposed to working models of the presbyterian polity through the presence

⁷⁴ William Pierce, *An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts: A Chapter in the Evolution of Religious and Civil Liberty in England* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1908), 151-154; van Eerde, 50-51. Before fleeing the city, Waldegrave stayed at Mistress Crane's London home in Aldermanbury, where, according to Collinson, “she kept what was virtually a puritan salon” and provided a safe haven for the Martinists from which they could distribute their pamphlets throughout London. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 393.

⁷⁵ van Eerde, 52; Knappen, 295; Mann, *DNB*.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Collinson, “The Elizabethan Puritans and The Foreign Reformed Churches in London,” in *Godly People*, 248.

of the city's Stranger communities which were composed of religious refugees fleeing persecution on the Continent, as well as a number of foreign merchants who lived in London in order to oversee their business ventures.⁷⁸ Upon settling in England, they "found a refuge from persecution, but a Church insufficiently reformed, with few who could preach, and none in their language . . . the strangers' churches would stand as a powerful example of a Church fully reformed for an English Church which was struggling to reform itself."⁷⁹ By setting up churches organized according to the presbyterian model, they hoped to inspire the spread of the reformed discipline across the city and to influence a continued shift away from the remnants of England's Catholic past.

Although the Stranger Churches—the Dutch at the Austin Friars church⁸⁰, the French and the French-speaking Walloons at St. Anthony's Chapel on Threadneedle Street⁸¹, and the short-lived and less influential congregations of Italians in the chapel of the Mercers' Hall on Cheapside and Spaniards at the church of St. Mary Axe⁸²—functioned as the cultural centers of their respective communities, it is important to understand that the strangers' presence in Elizabethan London was predicated much more upon their positive contributions to the city's economy than upon any government-sanctioned religious agenda, a reality which signified a

⁷⁸ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 113-115; Knappen, 90-95; Pettegree, 144; and Mark Greengrass, "Protestant Exiles and their Assimilation into Early Modern England," *Immigrants & Minorities* 4, no. 3 (1985): 68-81.

⁷⁹ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 460-469; Frederick A Norwood, "The Strangers' 'Model Churches' in Sixteenth-Century England," in *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, ed. Franklin H. Littell (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1962), 186.

⁸⁰ Johannes Lindeboom, *Austin Friars; History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London, 1550-1950* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950); and Ole Peter Grell, *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London: The Dutch Church in Austin Friars, 1603-1642* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989).

⁸¹ Greengrass, 75; Irene Scouloudi, *Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis, 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639: A Study of an Active Minority* (London: Huguenot Society of London, 1985).

⁸² Paul J. Hauben, "A Spanish Calvinist Church in Elizabethan London, 1559-65," *Church History* 34, no. 1 (Mar., 1965): 50-56.

distinctive ideological break from the royal attitude towards the strangers under Edward.⁸³ In 1550, Somerset and Cranmer had invited foreign divines to settle in England in hopes that their presence would serve as a constant, tangible reminder to the English people of the need for further religious reform.⁸⁴ With this goal in mind, they issued John à Lasco, the Polish reformer who organized the first stranger congregation at Austin Friars, a charter which explicitly exempted the strangers from the religious authority of the Church of England.⁸⁵ Under Mary's rule, the stranger congregations disbanded, sought refuge on the Continent, and, like the rest of the Marian exiles, waited anxiously for the return of a Protestant monarch to the English throne. Much to their chagrin, however, Elizabeth proved unwilling to grant the strangers the same degree of religious freedom which they had enjoyed under Edward. While she did allow for the reestablishment of the strangers' churches in 1560, she also placed them under the authority of the Bishop of London and prohibited them from engaging in any liturgical practices not accepted by the Church of England, making it abundantly clear that she had no sympathy for their mission to reform the English church.⁸⁶

Ultimately, however, the Elizabethan government and the English inhabitants of London tolerated the religious foibles of the immigrant communities because of their important contributions to the English economy, especially in the cloth trade and professions related to it. Even after immigration to London intensified in the wake of anti-protestant incidents on the Continent, such as the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572 and the siege and sack of Antwerp in 1585, Londoners overcame their traditional aversion to foreigners and accepted

⁸³ Grell, *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London*, 3; Liên Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London, 1500-1700* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005), 88.

⁸⁴ Pettigree, 35.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 459; Lindeboom, 198-203.

⁸⁶ TNA, SP 12/11/24; Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, Volume II, Part 2, 517-521. As we will see, however, the official submission of the Strangers' Churches to the Bishop of London's authority had very little effect on their actions, especially under the unapologetically internationalist Grindal. Pettigree, 137-138.

waves of immigrants into their city.⁸⁷ Most often the strangers settled in London's swiftly-expanding suburbs or city liberties in order to avoid additional economic penalties for competing with native English craftsmen. This trend continued well after Elizabeth's reign, and is evidenced in Ben Jonson's 1616 play, *The Devil is an Ass*:

We will survey the suburbs, and make forth our sallies
Down Petticoat Lane, and up the Smock Alleys,
To Shoreditch, Whitechapel, and so to St. Katharine's,
To drink with the Dutch there, and take forth their patterns.⁸⁸

While periodic complaints that the strangers were taking too much business away from English merchants and tradesmen were relatively common among the city's laboring orders, especially during periods of economic decline, "it was their financial clout and organizational skills which guaranteed that the stranger churches had a long term future. . . Without [the] Dutch and Walloon merchant-banking aristocracy, the stranger communities would have found themselves far more exposed to xenophobic reactions from the host population in times of crisis."⁸⁹

While the strangers ensured their future in London through their economic success, their churches continued to play an integral role in shaping the city's radical religious culture. Although Elizabeth required the immigrant congregations to submit to the Bishop of London's authority, they maintained an impressive degree of liturgical freedom during the bishoprics of both Grindal and Sandys, and "provided a convenient and confidential link with the reformed churches overseas. Beza sent his letters by way of the French church in London, 'very frequently' according to Percival Wibun."⁹⁰ In hopes of effecting further religious reformation

⁸⁷ Grell, *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London*, 7; Collinson notes that "in 1568, after the renewal of civil war in France, there were no less than nineteen émigré ministers gathered in London from that country alone; and in 1572, after St. Bartholomew's night, more than sixty French pastors took refuge in England." "The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches in London," 247.

⁸⁸ Ben Jonson, *The Devil is an Ass*, ed. Peter Happé (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), 1.1.59-62.

⁸⁹ Grell, *Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart England* (Hants, UK: Scolar Press: 1996), 25; Scouloudi, 76.

⁹⁰ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 113-114; Pettigree, 137-138.

among Londoners, their ministers made consistent efforts to extend their influence to more general audiences than their expatriate parishioners. At the French Church, for example, Nicholas de Gallars, a well known French theologian and friend of John Calvin, held services in Latin as well as in French, and drew crowds of educated English listeners from both the clergy and the laity, some who had encountered the presbyterian discipline on the Continent and were no longer willing to worship in their parish churches, and others who were simply interested in hearing a good sermon.⁹¹ Although they were not technically permitted to encourage English men and women to stop attending their parish churches, the ministers of the strangers' churches did very little to prevent this ecclesiastical drift, and even administered the Lord's Supper to the Earl of Leicester in 1568.⁹²

As time progressed, the ties between the strangers' churches and the radical London presbyterians grew even stronger. When Dering submitted a report of his beliefs to the Ecclesiastical Council in 1573 in response to the growing controversy surrounding the *Admonition*, Sandys complained to Parker that "the French ministers are medlers in these matters. For Mr. Dering confessed to me, that he conferred with them touching the articles, before he delivered them to the Council; and had their consent."⁹³ This accusation is not surprising when one considers the consistent presbyterian demand for the institution of "such forme of prayer and mynistracion of the woorde and sacraments, and other godlie exercises of religion as the righte godlie reformed Churches now do use in the ffrenche and Douche congregation, within the City of London or elsewhere in the Quenes maiesties dominions."⁹⁴

⁹¹ Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 551, 565; Collinson, "The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches of London," 262.

⁹² Collinson, "The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches of London," 263.

⁹³ Sandys to Parker, Fulham, August 5, 1573, in Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, 34; Collinson, "The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches of London," 263-264.

⁹⁴ Collinson, "The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches of London," 261; Grell, *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London*, 13.

Dorcas Martin maintained close ties to the French congregation and, in addition to donating money to the church following the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre, she translated a French catechism into English.⁹⁵ Additionally, three of the French ministers and several members of the French congregation attended James Lawson's funeral in 1584.⁹⁶ The case of the two Dutch Anabaptists who were burned at the stake at Smithfield in 1575 is an especially interesting example, since the Anabaptists lived in the heavily-Dutch suburb of Whitechapel, and were therefore under the jurisdiction of Richard Gardiner, one of the few members of the London presbyterian group to maintain a beneficed position at this time.⁹⁷ While Gardiner's presbyterianism would have been theologically and organizationally distinct from the Anabaptists and the association with Anabaptism would have only served to associate the presbyterians with seditious religious radicalism, it is not entirely surprising that a clandestine Anabaptist congregation could have flourished in a parish run by a rector who was himself a member of a concealed religious minority. In any case, this episode is a fascinating example of the way in which the strangers interacted with London wider population and contributed to the development of radical Protestantism within England's capital.

The People

The fifth and final category of my analysis, the ambiguous mass of "the people," is perhaps the most difficult to evaluate, since it presents the challenge of documenting the religious affiliations of a group of people who did not, in fact, leave behind a wealth of

⁹⁵ White, 788-789.

⁹⁶ Ibid., *The Wodrow Miscellany*, 449-452.

⁹⁷ "Martyrs with a Difference: Dutch Anabaptist Victims of Elizabethan Persecution" in A. C. Duke, Judith Pollmann, and Andrew Spicer, *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low Countries*, (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 199-250; Peel, *The Seconde Parte of a Reigster*, I, 103-107; Collinson, "The Elizabethan Puritans and The Foreign Reformed Churches in London," 268.

documentary evidence to support a definite conclusion on the subject. Nevertheless, the presbyterian movement's ability to appeal to "the people" (essentially any other elements of London society which I have not yet examined) and to offer them increased participation in religious life on both personal and parochial levels presented a serious threat to the existing Church of England and its episcopal hierarchy. Indeed, according to Paul Seaver, while presbyterianism "as a Protestant reform movement naturally found its ideological leadership in the ranks of the clergy, the potency of its challenge to orthodoxy came from the fact that increasing numbers of lay Englishmen looked to Puritan divines for spiritual guidance and in a larger sense for a new way of life."⁹⁸

The cultural scope and rhetorical intensity of the presbyterian controversy indicate that both the presbyterians and the episcopalians were keenly aware of the importance of obtaining and preserving the religious loyalties of the indefinable mass of "the people" in securing a conclusive liturgical victory. A prime example of this mindset comes from Edmunds's Star Chamber testimony, in which he remembered Fields's reaction in 1587 to the latest failure of the parliamentary Puritans to bring about government-sanctioned religious reforms: "Tush, Mr. Edmunds, hold your peace: seeing we cannot compass these things by suit nor dispute: it is the multitude of people that must bring them to pass."⁹⁹ We see Fields's expectation that the force of the people's will could affect religious reform echoed in Coppinger's and Hacket's failed attempt "to move tumult and sedition; that by many handes of the common multitude (which they bragge of, saying, they are already inflamed with zeale) they might have brought all their

⁹⁸ Seaver, 3.

⁹⁹ TNA, STAC 5, Court of Star Chamber: Proceedings, Elizabeth I, A 49/34, cited in Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 292, and "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 367; Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions*, Book 4, Chapter 2, 135.

purposes at length to a sure and speedie conclusion . . . for their pretended Reformation.”¹⁰⁰ At the other end of the religious spectrum, Sandys summarized the Church’s fear of a laity left to its own religious devices in a letter to Bullinger: “take away authority, and the people will rush headlong into every thing that is bad. Take away the patrimony of the church, and you will by the same means take away not only sound learning, but religion itself.”¹⁰¹

While the struggle to claim and keep the religious loyalties of “the people” emerged across England during Elizabeth’s reign, its most intense manifestation took place in London, where the abundance of ministers and diversity of theological cliques enabled Londoners to circumvent their specific parochial affiliations and to patronize the preachers and churches of their choosing. “‘But you Londoners,’ cried Whitgift in 1587, ‘are so given to novelties that if there be one man more new than another, him will you have,’ and many were those who echoed his sentiments.”¹⁰² As the presbyterian message became associated with specific ministers and parishes—the Minories, Blackfriars, Whitechapel, etc.—increasing numbers of Londoners ignored their obligations to attend their assigned parish churches and instead frequented churches where they could hear the presbyterian message preached.¹⁰³ Both religious and secular authorities made regular attempts to restrict this parochial osmosis, such as Aylmer’s 1588 “inhibitions to the minister and church-wardens of the Blackfriars and Whitechapel against allowing any but their own parishioners to receive communion at their church,”¹⁰⁴ and the Privy Council’s 1573 letter to the elders of the Dutch church advising, “if there be any that, out of a wanton conceitedness, leave and come from the use and custom of their native country, and will joyne themselves with you, such wee think ought not to bee received by you, that so they may

¹⁰⁰ Cosin, 57.

¹⁰¹ Sandys to Bullinger, London, August 15, 1573, in Robinson, 440.

¹⁰² Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 562-563.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*,” 565.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 563.

not occasion discord and contention; which would be troublesom to us, and prejudicial to you.”¹⁰⁵ Despite their best efforts, however, London’s size and diversity easily undermined any hope of enforcing parochial assignments and ensuring ecclesiastical homogeneity.

According to Seaver, “the godly preachers aimed always at producing a laity zealous for reformation . . . the summons to a reformation was a call to action, first to transform the individual into an instrument fit to serve the divine will, and then to employ that instrument to transform all of society.”¹⁰⁶ Several examples serve to illustrate the tangibility of this process in Elizabethan London. As discussed in Chapter Three, the growth of the lay-sponsored parish lectureship and its identification with London’s radical ministers bears witness to the increased involvement of the laity in defining the religious climate of their respective parishes.¹⁰⁷

Additionally, the widespread and sustained popularity enjoyed by radical propaganda, such as the *Admonition* and the Marprelate Tracts, denotes an obvious interest in the radical message among all orders of London society. While Whitgift complained that copies of the *Admonition* were “in every man’s hand and mouth”¹⁰⁸, the satirical prose of Marprelate Tracts achieved an even broader popularity in London. “Martin’s ‘bitter jests,’ a presbyterian minister remembered a decade later, were ‘savoured among the people’ and his books worn out ‘with continuall reading and handling of them’.”¹⁰⁹ The authors of the tracts were well aware of their popular appeal, and even taunted the episcopal authorities in *The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin*

¹⁰⁵ Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, Volume II, Part 2, 518-519.

¹⁰⁶ Seaver, 44.

¹⁰⁷ See Chapter Two, 42-45.

¹⁰⁸ Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, vol. I, 62.

¹⁰⁹ Thomas Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John Illustrated with an Analysis and Scholions*, 3rd ed. (Leiden, 1616), 192, cited in Winship, 348.

Junior: “marke if you see any before the sermon beginnes, setting their heads together, and whispering vnder their cloakes, if you doe, be sure they are reading Martin.”¹¹⁰

The Hacket Revolt also affords several examples of common lay men and women playing active roles in London’s presbyterian network. In December, 1590, Thomas Lancaster, a schoolmaster living in Shoe Lane, hosted and participated in a fast with Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthington, after which Coppinger claimed to have received his divine mandate to reform the Church of England according to the presbyterian model.¹¹¹ Lancaster, whom Coppinger and Hacket would call “a more holie man then any Preacher in London, or throughout the whole land,”¹¹² had already been in trouble with the diocesan authorities in 1589 for his attendance at St. Anne’s Blackfriars instead of his assigned parish church, St. Brides¹¹³, and remain in close contact with the Hacket conspirators throughout the buildup to the failed revolution. Another member of London’s lay population with ties to both the Hacket Revolt and the London presbyterians was Mrs. Mary Honeywood, a London housewife whose seemingly unappeasable insecurity about the state of her soul prompted her to seek out the spiritual guidance of a wide variety of London’s prominent clergymen, including Dering and John Foxe, over the course of her unusually long life.¹¹⁴ Ever the hypochondriac, Honeywood played host to Hacket on July 11, 1591, when he performed an exorcism on her in hopes of finally ridding her of the evil spirit

¹¹⁰ Martin Marprelate, *The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin Junior*, printed in *The Marprelate Tracts [1588-1589]*, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1970.

¹¹¹ Cosin, 10; Bancroft, 144; Walsham, “‘Frantick Hacket’: Prophecy, Sorcery, Insanity, and the Elizabethan Puritan Movement,” 34; Winship 351-352.

¹¹² Cosin, 42.

¹¹³ Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 563n4.

¹¹⁴ Jacqueline Eales, “Honywood , Mary (1527–1620),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, May 2006, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13666> (accessed November 29, 2009); Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England*, Volume II, 1662, 85-86; Collinson, “The Role of Women in the Elizabethan Church Illustrated by the Life and Friendships of Anne Locke ,” 284, and “A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of ‘Godly Master Dering’ ,” 318; Thomas Freeman, “The Good Ministrye of Godlye and Vertuose Women”: The Elizabethan Martyrologists and the Female Supporters of the Marian Martyrs” *Journal of British Studies* 39, no. 1 (January 2000), 19-20.

which she believed had caused her ill health for fourteen years.¹¹⁵ Honeywood's reliance upon Dering's spiritual counsel and Hacket's alleged abilities as a supernatural healer put her into contact with London's clandestine presbyterian network, although it should be noted that Hacket and his minions cannot be considered legitimate members of the presbyterian faction, despite the fact that they believed they were working for the benefit of the movement. Nevertheless, Honeywood and Lancaster both serve as enlightening examples of the way in which the presbyterian movement influenced the religious activities and affiliations of London's lay population.

¹¹⁵ Cosin, 5; Arthington, 14-15; Booty, 306; Eales, *DNB*; Winship, 360; Walsham, 42.

CHAPTER 5

THE CONSOLIDATION AND COLLAPSE OF ELIZABETHAN PRESBYTERIANISM IN LONDON

We have used gentle words to long, and we perceive they have done no good. The wound groweth desperate, and dead flesh hath overgrowne all, and therefore the wound had neede of a sharpe corsive and eating plaister. It is no tyme to blanch, nor to sewe cushens under mens elbowes, or to flatter them in their synnes.¹

The Calm before the Storm

After Matthew Parker's death in May, 1575, the presbyterians began to see a glimmer of hope for their cause as it became increasingly clear that the next Archbishop of Canterbury would be their old friend and ally, Edmund Grindal.² With the elevation of two other Marian exiles to the Church of England's highest positions of power, Edwin Sandys to the Archbishopric of York and John Aylmer to the Bishopric of London, in 1577, many Puritans began to expect a swift realization of their long-awaited reforms, for, "if reform was to come from within the establishment; there would never be a more favorable opportunity, short of a change of sovereign."³ Grindal's translation to Canterbury garnered widespread approval in all but the most radical elements of English society, for, to Grindal, "it was inconceivable that the reformed bishop should rule as an autocrat, without consideration for his fellow-presbyters, and without their assistance. The protestant nobility and gentry were delighted with a bishop who was no prelate, and whose religious and political principles so nearly resembled their own."⁴ Their high

¹ Peel, *Seconde Parte of a Register*, 89, quoted in Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 341.

² Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 159-160.

³ Knappen, 250-251; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 159-161.

⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 159-160.

hopes were soon thwarted, however, as Aylmer proved to have long since forgotten any sympathy he might have once held for the reformist cause, and Grindal's conflict with Elizabeth over prophesying would turn his tenure at Canterbury into, to use Collinson's phrase, a "long Kafkaesque ordeal."⁵

Still, despite its bleak epilogue, Grindal's archiepiscopacy provided the presbyterians with a relatively peaceful interlude in which they could recover from the setbacks of 1573 and prepare for their next opportunity to challenge the hegemony of the episcopacy. In the few short months before his clash with the Queen in June, 1577, Grindal effected several reforms which moved the Church of England much closer to the Puritan model.⁶ Almost immediately after taking office, he guided the 1576 Convocation of Canterbury to issue a series of regulations which regulated clerical education, licensing and ordination, prohibited baptisms by midwives, and lifted the existing ban on contracting marriages on certain days of the year.⁷ Grindal also attempted to reform the clerical court system and oversaw the publication of an English-produced edition of the Geneva Bible, complete with accompanying Calvinist annotations, which was designed for private use.⁸

Since his elevation from the Bishopric of London to the See of York in 1570, Grindal had spent his time working against Catholic recusancy in the northern counties, and he continued this mission as Archbishop of Canterbury. Rather than dividing the ranks of English Protestants by enforcing strict conformity to the Prayer Book, Grindal united the disparate elements of Anglicans and Puritans and put them to work against their mutual Catholic enemies.⁹ In so

⁵ Collinson, "Grindal, Edmund (1516x20–1583)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11644> (accessed November 3, 2009); Knappen, 250.

⁶ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 350.

⁷ Knappen, 251-252; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 163.

⁸ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 163-165.

⁹ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 350-351.

doing, he brought about an uneasy truce between the warring Protestant factions and as a result, “in these altered circumstances, doctrinaire attacks on episcopacy were of doubtful relevance and we hear less of them. The Puritans were now directing most of their polemical effort into writing, preaching and disputing against the common Roman enemy.”¹⁰ Interestingly enough, in 1577 Aylmer would recommend to Lord Burghley, although for an entirely different reason than Grindal, a similar method of dealing with presbyterian radicals like Field and Wilcox who were, according to him, preaching “God knows what” in the great houses of London:

that they might be profitably employed in Lancashire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, and other such barbarous countries, to draw the people from Papism and gross ignorance: and that though they went a little too far, yet he supposed it would be less labour to draw them back, than now it was to hale them forward. . . And though he thought this might grow greatly to the profit of the Church . . . he said all this, not because he liked them, but because he would have his cure rid of them.¹¹

Grindal’s sudden fall from Elizabeth’s favor in June 1577 would bring this “goodly space of quietness” to a screeching halt.¹² The conflict between the Queen and the Archbishop erupted over the Puritan practice of holding regular ecclesiastical conferences, known as “prophesyings,” of Puritan clergy and, in some cases, laypeople in order to provide continuing education and practice for poorly-educated ministers.¹³ As these meetings grew increasingly popular

¹⁰ Ibid., 165; Peel, *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, I, 190-191.

¹¹ John Strype, *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Aylmer, Lord Bp. of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Wherein Are Explained Many Transactions of the Church of England, and What Methods Were Then Taken to Preserve It, with Respect to the Papist and Puritan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821), 36-37, cited in Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 202, and Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 544.

¹² Josias Nichols, *The Plea of the Innocent: Wherein Is Auerred, That the Ministers & People Falslie Termed Puritanes, Are Iniuriouslie Slaundered for Enemies or Troublers of the State : Published for the Common Good of the Church and Common Wealth of This Realme of England As a Countermure against All Sycophantising Papists, Statising Priestes, Neutralising Atheistes, and Satanising Scorners of All Godlinesse, Trueth and Honestie* (Middelburg: R. Schilders, 1602), 9-10.

¹³ The Puritan system of prophesyings and conferences would become increasingly important for the Elizabethan presbyterian movement across southeastern England, so much so that Owen and Collinson both refer to them as “presbyterianism in embryo form” (Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 195). For the most part, this pattern did not pertain to London, where presbyterianism developed out of clandestine meetings in private homes across the city (Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 537-538). For the purposes of this thesis, then, I have limited my discussion of the prophesying movement to its connection to Grindal’s career and the

throughout East Anglia and the Midlands, the Queen became convinced of their potential threat to her ecclesiastical authority, and ordered Grindal to put a stop to them immediately. Grindal was not convinced of their subversive nature, however, and after further investigation into the movement, concluded that prophesyings were, in fact, useful forums for clerical education and for compensating for a paucity of preachers in rural areas. Armed with his newfound conviction, Grindal wrote to the Queen and refused to comply with her instructions, asking her to “bear with me . . . if I choose rather to offend your earthly majesty, than to offend the heavenly majesty of God.”¹⁴ Adding insult to injury, he also wrote, “remember, Madam, that you are a mortal creature,” and begged her to leave ecclesiastical matters to the educated clergy, rather than expecting to wield the same authority to which she was entitled in secular issues.¹⁵ Despite Grindal’s arguments for the necessity of clerical education and fellowship, “Elizabeth wanted obedience rather than intelligence in her subjects. Popular education bred fantastical notions of equality. Gatherings of clergy smacked of conspiracy against her throne. . . To her, cost what it might, ignorance was a small price to pay for docility.”¹⁶ Not surprisingly, Grindal’s actions provoked the Queen’s wrath, and by June, 1577, she had essentially stripped him of all of his political responsibilities and most of his ecclesiastical duties, which were now carried out by Whitgift, at this time Bishop of Worcester but already marked for promotion to Canterbury, and

way in which Grindal’s downfall prompted renewed presbyterian radicalism in the 1580s. For further reading on the subject of prophesyings and conferences, see Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 168-239, and *Archbishop Grindal*, 234-235; Owen, 140-141; Collinson, John Craig and Brett Usher, *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St Edmunds, 1582 - 1590* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003); Trinterud, 191-201.

¹⁴ Grindal to Queen Elizabeth, December 20, 1576, in *The Remains of Edmund Grindal*, 387.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 389-390; Knappen, 256.

¹⁶ Knappen, 253.

Aylmer, whose “longe wished for purpose’,” according to Field, “was to reduce the church ‘to a dead carcasse, that she may be utterly buried.’”¹⁷

With Grindal effectively neutralized until his death in 1583 by both Elizabeth’s restrictions and his steadily failing health, the tenuous truce which he had maintained between the London presbyterians and the Church of England began to crumble. Whitgift’s high-handed behavior in the 1581 Parliament not only revealed his assumption that he would soon be Archbishop of Canterbury, but also left a terrible impression upon the Puritan members of Parliament, convincing many of them, and by extension the presbyterian ministers, of the need to prepare for the ecclesiastical attack which would inevitably accompany his elevation to Canterbury.¹⁸ Thus, all too soon after Grindal’s death, “the moderate, progressive tendencies of [his] archiepiscopate withered under fire from both the opposed flanks of the Elizabethan Church,” and as the 1580s wore on, “reaction in its turn made extremists more extreme and revived the extravagant language and action of the early ‘seventies.’”¹⁹

“The Pope of Lambeth” and London’s Radicalization²⁰

Whitgift’s accession in November, 1583, provoked mixed feelings among the religious reformists. While some Puritans hoped for at least a fair, if not friendly, relationship with the new Archbishop, others, such as Nicholas Faunt, Walsingham’s secretary and a dedicated Puritan, greatly feared Whitgift’s almost inevitable crackdown on Puritan nonconformity: “the choice of that man at this time to be archbishop maketh me think that the Lord is even

¹⁷ Field to Anthony Gilby, 1581, quoted in Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 542; Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, 249-252; 268-269, and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 205; Knappen, 257.

¹⁸ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 205-206, 236-237.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 208.

²⁰ Martin Marprelate, *Theses Martinianae*, printed in *The Marprelate Tracts [1588-1589]*, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1970, cited in Collinson, “Religious Satire and the Invention of Puritanism,” in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John A. Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 164.

determined to scourge his Church for their unthankfulness.”²¹ Whitgift, whose experiences during the *Admonition* controversy had left him with a virulently anti-Puritan predisposition²², swiftly confirmed their worst suspicions in his inaugural sermon at Paul’s Cross, laying out his plans for an ecclesiastical policy in which Puritan nonconformists would be treated with the same level of severity as Catholics and Anabaptists.²³ Additionally, he demanded that all clergy subscribe to a series of three articles which recognized the Queen’s authority over everyone living in her territories in both spiritual and secular matters, endorsed the doctrines contained in the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, and, most importantly, required unconditional approval of the Prayer Book.²⁴ When hundreds of ministers across the country refused to subscribe to his articles, specifically because of the articles’ unconditional support for the Prayer Book, Whitgift was forced to compromise and settled for “a protestation to use the Book of Common Prayer and none other.”²⁵ Still not satisfied in his quest for uniformity, Whitgift produced a new system for depriving nonconformists: a series of twenty-four articles to be used in conjunction with the notorious *ex officio* oath in the questioning of anyone called before the Ecclesiastical Commission. By summoning clerics who refused to subscribe to the three broad articles, forcing them to take the *ex officio* oath (a legal device which was designed to force self-incriminating testimonies), and asking them questions about a range of theological hot-button issues, such as vestments, set prayers and wedding rings, the commissioners were almost guaranteed to find sufficient grounds for deprivation.²⁶ While this subscription crisis resulted in the capitulation of

²¹ Lambeth Palace Library, MS. 647, fols. 151v and 162v; cited in Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 243.

²² Knappen, 265-266.

²³ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 244.

²⁴ Strype, *The life and acts of John Whitgift*, 228, cited in Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 245; Knappen, 266-267.

²⁵ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 264.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 266-267; Knappen, 272-273.

many of the formerly-defiant ministers, a radical core, including Field and Barber in London, remained steadfast in their nonsubscription and were, as a result, deprived of their livings.²⁷

Rather than producing the theologically unified clerical corps that he desired, Whitgift's stubborn insistence on narrowly defined ecclesiastical subscription served to unite the otherwise schism-prone Puritans against the common enemy of the autocratic archbishop, and the London presbyterians, led by the ever-enthusiastic John Field, once again acted as the ideological and organizational leaders of this trend.²⁸ Energized by the identification of a new arch-enemy in Whitgift and encouraged by the arrival in London of the radical Scottish ministers in June 1584²⁹, the London presbyterian group intensified its reformist efforts throughout the remainder of the year.³⁰ In August 1584, when the teeming crowds of the Bartholomew Fair markets could ensure a degree of protection from the watchful eyes of Aylmer and his minions, the London presbyterians hosted representatives from various presbyterian conferences across southeastern England, at which they hoped to set up a unified, national ideology which could present a legitimate challenge to Whitgift's suppressive activities.³¹ For the radical Londoners, the time for compromise was past, and "there could be no reconciliation between the godly defenders of the truth and their persecutors, no end to the struggle but the defeat of the Antichristian bishops."³²

As a new parliament assembled in November 1584, a parliament which featured impressive numbers of Puritans and Puritan sympathizers, London's presbyterian population eagerly anticipated the easy passage of, at the very least, moderate religious reforms. Despite the

²⁷ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 358.

²⁸ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 245-246.

²⁹ See Chapter Four, 59-60.

³⁰ Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 561.

³¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 250-251.

³² *Ibid.*, 251.

introduction into the House of Commons of a bill by Dr. Peter Turner, a London physician, which provided for the creation of a national presbyterian church according to the Genevan model, presbyterians were once again forced to accept defeat at the hands of Whitgift and his faction.³³ Their hopes would be similarly thwarted by the inability of the Puritans to bring about the long-awaited religious reforms in the 1586 parliament.³⁴ For many of the London brethren, the 1584 and 1586 parliaments served as frustrating reminders of the improbability (if not impossibility) of bringing about reform through official modes of appeal, and provoked an important shift in their attitudes towards authority.³⁵ Indeed, “as most of the members were now denied a public platform, their campaigning [now became] literary, or in a clandestine personal capacity.”³⁶

“To ‘erect discipline’, that is, to set up presbyterian church government secretly, within the Church of England: this was the ‘grand design’ . . . with which Field and other presbyterian leaders were now increasingly occupied.”³⁷ Puritan presses in London and on the Continent churned out pamphlets and other printed propaganda in support of the presbyterian message. As discussed in Chapter Four, perhaps the most significant of these printers was Robert Waldegrave, from whose shop near St. Paul’s treatises by the city’s leading presbyterians flooded the streets. Over the course of the early 1580s, and especially in 1584 and 1585, Waldegrave produced a number of important works, such as Fulke’s *Learned discourse of ecclesiastical government*, Field’s *A briefe and plaine declaration concerning the desires of all those faithfull ministers that have to do and seeke for the discipline and reformation of the Church of England*, as well as the

³³ K.E Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments: 1584-1601* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1957), 58-83; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 278-288, and “John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism,” 364.

³⁴ Neale, 145-165.

³⁵ Knappen, 277-279;

³⁶ Owen, “The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I,” 561.

³⁷ Collinson, “John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism,” 263.

anonymous but well-timed piece entitled *A lamentable complaint of the commonalty, by way of supplication to the high court of Parliament for a learned ministry*, and a number of sermons by presbyterians such as Chaderton and Udall.³⁸ By early 1587, Travers completed revisions on his *Disciplina Ecclesiae*, commonly known as the Book of Discipline, and at the request of the 1587 general assembly (the national meeting of representatives from the regional presbyterian conferences), circulated copies of it among the individual classes for their examination and approval.³⁹ This cooperation between the general assembly and the various local conferences demonstrates the level of organizational sophistication and efficiency which the wider presbyterian movement had achieved by 1587. The events of the next four years, however, not the least important of which were the deaths of Field in March 1588 and Leicester in September 1588, robbing the presbyterians of both their ideological leader and their chief political patron, would bring the newly-erected presbyterian structure to its knees.⁴⁰

The Marprelate Tracts

In 1602, Josias Nichols, a presbyterian minister from Kent remembered that by 1588,

while the time slipt away, and mens minds wavered, this way and that way, three most grievous accidents, did greatly astonish us, and verie much darken the righteousness of our cause. The first was a foolish jester, who tearmed himselfes Martin Marprelate and his sonnes, which under counterfeit and apish scoffing, did play the Sycophant and slanderously abused manye persons of reverend place and note.⁴¹

³⁸ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 273-274; van Eerde, 44-47.

³⁹ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 364-365.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 369-370; Knappen, 293.

⁴¹ Nichols, 31-32. On page 36, Nichols records the second and third accidents to befall the puritan movement: the separation of "the Brownistes [who] tooke offense against both sides, and made a temerarious and wicked separation," and the Hacket Revolt, "whose working this was, all wise men know, who know the wiles of Sathan." I have discussed the importance of the Hacket Revolt throughout this thesis, but, since the Brownists were separatists, and thereby were operating under a fundamentally different set of convictions about the relationship of Puritanism to the existing church than the presbyterian goal of "a church within a church," they do not fall within the scope of my analysis. For further reading on the Brownists, see Knappen, 303-316; Watts, 1, 65; Champlin Burrage, *The True Story of Robert Browne (1550?-1633) Father of Congregationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906), and

Nichols's assertion that the publication of the Marprelate Tracts ultimately hurt the presbyterian cause by provoking the ire of both the ecclesiastical and secular authorities is certainly a valid statement. At the time of the tracts' publication, however, they seemed to do little else but vilify the episcopacy and extol the many virtues of the presbyterians and their system of church governance. Illegally published under the pseudonym "Martin Marprelate" but now widely attributed to Job Throckmorton, a well-connected and decidedly presbyterian Warwickshire MP, they publicized their author's satirical critique of episcopacy in a "witty, irreverent, and swashbucklingly self-confident" manner which made them hugely popular with London's lay readers and frustratingly obstructive to Whitgift and Aylmer's attempts to suppress the city's presbyterian agitators.⁴² Between October 1588 and September 1589, Martin Marprelate and his fictional sons published seven highly inflammatory tracts—*The Epistle, The Epitome, Certain Mineral and Metaphysical Schoolpoints, Hay any Work for Cooper, Theses Martinianae, The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin Junior* and *The Protestation of Martin Marprelate*—which, upon their arrival in London, were distributed by a cobbler named Humfrey Newman and "sold out of the homes of sympathizers or under the counter in shops."⁴³ This pattern repeated across England, and "startled officials complained that Martin's works were available in every county in the realm."⁴⁴ Regardless of his or her identity, the tracts' author(s) obviously understood that "the public the reform movement was so eager to engage had, after

The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research (1550-1640), vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA: The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc: 2001), 28.

⁴² Joseph Black, "Marprelate, Martin (fl. 1588–1589)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73908> (accessed November 30, 2009). For more on the debate over Martin Marprelate's identity, see Leland H. Carlson, *Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Master Job Throckmorton Laid Open in His Colors* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1981); and Donald J. McGinn, "The Real Martin Marprelate," *PMLA* 58, no. 1 (Mar., 1943): 84-107.

⁴³ Black, *DNB*; Edward Arber, ed., *An Introductory Sketch to the Martin Marprelate Controversy, 1588-1590* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1967), 131; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 393.

⁴⁴ Black, *DNB*.

decades of pamphlet warfare, ceased paying attention to the arguments presented on either side. A new strategy was clearly required. The difficulty lay in crafting an appeal to popular taste while still honoring the call for scholarly discussion.”⁴⁵

In order to achieve this tricky balance of academic relevance and popular appeal, the author(s) situated their polemical discourse within the framework of the existing English ballading tradition, which incorporated vernacular language, catchy rhymes and well-known melodies to facilitate the spread of information to a semi-literate populace.⁴⁶ This discursive familiarity, together with the “addition of the weapons of satire and parody to the polemical arsenal of presbyterian reform,” enabled Martin Marprelate to communicate his biting criticisms of Whitgift and the episcopacy to a wider audience than previous polemicists could have ever hoped for, especially in London.⁴⁷ Indeed, Thomas Brightman the Bedfordshire presbyterian minister who was, at the time a fellow at Queen’s College, Cambridge, would later remember Marprelate’s widespread popularity, writing, “how were those bitter jests of his savoured among the people, how plausible were they in a manner to all men, how willingly, greedily and with what great mirth were they every where intertayned.”⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Black, ed, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), xxiv-xxv.

⁴⁶ Collinson, “Religious Satire and the invention of Puritanism,” 163-164. For further information on popular literary culture, see Burke, Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: New York University Press, 1978); Robert Collison, *The Story of Street Literature: Forerunner or the Popular Press* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1973); Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Norman Jones, *The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd., 2002); Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Leslie Shepherd, *The History of Street Literature: The Story of Broadside Ballads, Chapbooks, Proclamations, News-Sheets, Election Bills, Tracts, Pamphlets, Cocks, Catchpennies, and other Ephemera* (Detroit, MI: Singing Tree Press, 1973); and Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

⁴⁷ Black, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition*, xxv.

⁴⁸ Brightman, 162. For more on Brightman, see Theodore Dwight Bozeman, “Brightman, Thomas (1562–1607),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3425> (accessed December 1, 2009).

Ultimately, however, Josias Nichols's evaluation of the Marprelate furore would prove correct, and the tracts' sweeping popularity immediately provoked a harsh backlash from both the episcopalian establishment and Elizabeth's government. Incensed by Marpelate's claims that they were "pettie Antichrists, pettie popes . . . intollerable withstanders of reformation, enemies of the gospel . . . presumptuous, profane, paultrie, pestilent and pernicious prelates," Anglican bishops such as Thomas Cooper and Richard Bancroft threw themselves into a heated pamphlet war and lecture campaign against Marprelate, even hiring popular authors such as Thomas Nashe and John Lyly to produce anti-Martinist publications.⁴⁹ In his *Admonition to the People of England*, Cooper warned of the danger of undisciplined radicals like Marprelate, writing, "if this outrageous spirit of boldeness be not stopped speedily, I feare he wil prove himself to bee, not onely *Mar-prelate*, but *Mar-prince*, *Mar-state*, *Mar-lawe*, *Mar-magistrate*, and all together, until he bring it to an Anabapticticall equalitie and communitie."⁵⁰ From the pulpit at Paul's Cross, Bancroft denounced Martin and his presbyterian co-conspirators, calling them "'false prophets', seeking after singularity, all one with the Arians, Donatists, anabaptists and other sectaries . . . [dangerous because of] their sinister alliance with 'the lay factious.'"⁵¹ At the same time, the Anti-Martinist coalition launched a frenzied search to locate Martin's secret presses, and, over the course of the following months, their representatives chased the Martinists and their portable press across East Anglia and the Midlands.⁵² In August 1589, when the authorities finally caught up to them near Manchester, they discovered a core group of "more than twenty people [who

⁴⁹ Marprelate, *Oh Read Over Dr. John Bridges, or The Epistle*, in *The Marprelate Tracts [1588-1589]*; Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 3 (Autumn, 1997): 707-713; and Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 565-566.

⁵⁰ Thomas Cooper, *Admonition to the People of England* (1589), quoted in Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89)," 710.

⁵¹ Bancroft, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse, 1588* (1589), quoted in Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 397.

⁵² Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 392.

had] been involved in the tracts' production, and behind them was a well-organized network of suppliers, distributors, and sympathizers; all risked charges of treason."⁵³ Although Martin would make a final appearance in September's *The Protestation of Martin Marprelate*, the harsh treatment of the apprehended Martinists, who "in spite of their good social standing and, in most cases, fairly remote connection with Martin . . . [received] crushing fines and sentences of imprisonment at her Majesty's pleasure" the following year served to silence the otherwise-garrulous author(s).⁵⁴ The two presbyterian ministers most often identified as possible authors of the tracts, John Penry and John Udall, were faced with even more serious consequences. Both men were sentenced to death for producing Puritan literature besides the Marprelate tracts, and while Udall was able to shake off the Martinist cloud and earn a pardon, Penry was hanged in Surrey in 1593.⁵⁵ As the only presbyterian to lose his life for the reformist cause, Penry is the prime example of Lake's assertion that "the only presbyterians to come to genuinely nasty ends were those foolish or unlucky enough to become mixed up in the Marprelate affair."⁵⁶

Presbyterians on Trial and Revolutionaries in the Streets

Martin Marprelate may have been silenced, but the presbyterians were only beginning to feel the effects of his mischief. Under Bancroft's guidance, the search for Martin and his printing press evolved into a mission to bring down the entire presbyterian organization.⁵⁷ As Josias Nichols remembered,

⁵³ Black, *DNB*.

⁵⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 418.

⁵⁵ Udall's pardon would do him very little good, since he died in jail before he could secure his release. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 407. It is ironic to note that while Udall and Penry essentially forfeited their lives for their involvement with the Marprelate tracts, Job Throckmorton, the most plausible candidate for the tracts' author, survived completely unscathed. Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 10.

⁵⁶ Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 10.

⁵⁷ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 404.

then did our troubles increase, and the persuite was hardlie followed against us: the enemie of the Ghospell forslowd not the occasion, to make our good, just, honest and godlie cause, to be ill thought of and verie much condemned: as if the verie state had taken knowledge that we were wicked men, our cause unjust, and we no longer to be suffered.⁵⁸

During their search for Martin's hidden press in the Midlands, Bancroft's agents uncovered overwhelming evidence which confirmed the existence of a well-defined system of presbyterian polities, known as *classes*, across the region and throughout East Anglia.⁵⁹ Together with Martin's outlandish claims and abrasive criticisms of the episcopacy, this organizational definition was all the proof Bancroft needed to portray the presbyterians as dangerous radicals and to justify a wide-scale, systematic operation to bring them down. With this goal in mind, then, "from the earliest official responses to Martin to the documents compiled for the 1591 trials of the presbyterian leadership, the government used the Marprelate tracts to construct an image of presbyterianism as a sect given to violence and revolution."⁶⁰

Over the winter of 1589 and 1590, the Court of High Commission, the ecclesiastical court charged with enforcing adherence to the Act of Supremacy, summoned to London and interrogated hundreds of ministers in hopes of gaining insight into the clandestine presbyterian community. While most of these deponents offered very little useful information to the committee, three frustrated presbyterian clergymen, John Johnson of Northamptonshire, Richard Parker of Dedham and Thomas Edmunds of London, provided them with a wealth of information about presbyterian operations, both in their local *classes* and at the national level.⁶¹ Armed with this information, the Commissioners selected nine presbyterian ministers whom they intended to call before the High Commission and turn into discouraging examples of the consequences of

⁵⁸ Nichols, 33.

⁵⁹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 396; Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 577.

⁶⁰ Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89)," 716.

⁶¹ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 408.

participation in the radical presbyterian movement: Edmund Sharpe, Andrew King and William Prowdlove from Northamptonshire; Thomas Cartwright, who had served as the chaplain of Leicester's hospital in Warwick since 1586, Humfrey Fen, Daniel Wight and Edward Lord from Warwickshire; John Payne from Staffordshire, and Melanchthon Jewel from Devonshire.⁶² These hearings, much like the ones associated with Whitgift's subscription crisis in 1584, were essentially designed as sham trials in which the ministers would be forced to incriminate themselves for nonconformity. According to Bancroft's strategy, "on each occasion the judge tendered a general oath, *ex officio mero*, after which he would have assumed the role of prosecutor, presenting the examinee with a schedule of articles which assumed his guilt and which his oath would require him to answer."⁶³ The ministers frustrated this plan, however, by refusing to take the *ex officio* oath at all, and since the only prescribed response for this situation was to deprive and imprison the ministers and suspend proceedings until they agreed to take the oath, the trial reached an impasse by early 1591.⁶⁴

While these events troubled the London presbyterians, they did not affect what was left of the city's presbyterian ministerial corps as much as one might expect.⁶⁵ Although a limited number of ministers, such as Stephen Egerton, William Charke and Thomas Barber would be temporarily suspended from their preaching posts at various points over the 1590s, the focus of the episcopalian offensive had by now shifted to presbyterian cells in other areas of the country. Nowhere was this shift made more obvious than in the conspicuous absence of any London preachers from the group of nine ministers summoned before the High Commission in 1590. According to Owen, "on the whole the contrast between the moderation of their treatment and

⁶² Ibid., 409; Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-1589), 716.

⁶³ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 409.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 578.

the penalties prescribed to classical leaders elsewhere, suggests that the dominant influences in the movement may have drifted away from the London group following the death of Field.”⁶⁶ As the date for Cartwright’s appearance before the High Commission approached, however, the London presbyterians momentarily revived themselves and held a series of meetings in homes across the city in order to discuss how Cartwright should respond to the Commission’s questions. Eventually, Cartwright’s refusal to take the *ex officio* oath before the Commission in October 1590 landed him in close confinement in the Fleet Prison.⁶⁷ By the spring of 1591, the High Commission had deprived eight of the nine ministers on trial and placed them in jails across the city while it continued searching for any elusive scraps of evidence which would prove the existence of a seditious presbyterian conspiracy.⁶⁸ In reality, however, the Commission had reached the limits of its authority, and was soon forced to hand the matter over to the secular Court of Star Chamber. While the majority of London’s presbyterians seemed content to follow the trial’s shift from the canonical courts to the secular legal system and to wait patiently for a final verdict, the trial’s progression proved especially troublesome to one resident in particular: Edmund Coppinger.

By May 1591, Coppinger had been working diligently for months to fulfill his divine mandate “to bring the Queene to repentance, and to cause al her Councel and Nobles to doe the like out of hand, or els detect them to be traitors that refused.”⁶⁹ Since he received his “extraordinary calling” after a fast at Thomas Lancaster’s house in the fall of 1590, Coppinger had almost constantly pestered presbyterian ministers and academics in England and Scotland with letters requesting their opinions on the legitimacy of his mission, hoping to find approval

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 411-412.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 415. Of the nine ministers, only Cartwright retained his position at Warwick Hospital.

⁶⁹ Cosin, 10-11.

from the movement in which he existed, at best, in the radical periphery. For the most part, Coppinger's inquiries provoked gentle disapproval from the presbyterian ministers, with Egerton warning him "to be careful and circumspect over himself; to take heede lest he were deceived by the subtiltie of Satan, and so misled: wherby he might endagern himself both for his libertie, estate and credite, and also be an hinderance to the great cause, which he would seem to be most desirous to further."⁷⁰ Despite warnings from Egerton, Cartwright, and a number of other learned presbyterians, the endorsements he received from Giles Wigginton, Job Throckmorton, Peter Wentworth and James Gibson, a Scottish presbyterian minister and friend of John Penry's, encouraged Coppinger to continue in his divine mission.⁷¹ In April 1591, Wigginton introduced Coppinger to William Hacket, his illiterate, rabble-rousing partner in a malt-making business in Northamptonshire. In the formerly Catholic and constantly pugnacious Hacket, whose personal brand of presbyterianism was ultimately little more than a different set of oaths by which to swear, Coppinger finally found a co-conspirator who shared his "alarm over conspiracies in high places and sense of mission" to reform the Queen, to save her from the evil, Catholic councilors who surrounded her, and to rescue the presbyterian ministers from their undeserved persecution in the ecclesiastical courts.⁷²

Before the ministers' first appearance in the Star Chamber on May 13, an apprehensive Coppinger wrote to Hacket: "the zealous preachers (as it is thought) are to be in the Starre Chamber tomorowe, the Lord by his holy Spirit bee with them: my selfe (if I can get in) am moved to be there: and I feare (if sentence with severitie be given) I shall be forced (in the name of the great and fearefull God of heaven) to protest against it."⁷³ While Coppinger's anxiety and

⁷⁰ Ibid., 16.

⁷¹ Walsham, 32-34; Winship,

⁷² Winship,

⁷³ Cosin, 23.

expectation of a swiftly delivered verdict betray his failure to understand the legal procedures of the Star Chamber, they proved crucial in dictating his actions in the following months.⁷⁴ By July 16, when Coppinger and Arthington stormed the streets of Cheapside to proclaim Hacket's ascendancy, the lawyers were still hearing witness testimonies and preparing to make their cases to the court.⁷⁵ Rather than achieving its goal of liberating the presbyterian ministers and legitimizing the presbyterian polity, the Hacket Revolt's unmitigated failure served as further proof of the movement's seditious nature. Bancroft quickly capitalized on the 'tumult in Cheapside' in his legal brief, portraying the failure of Cartwright and the other presbyterian ministers to stop the would-be-revolutionaries as their implicit approval of Hacket and his treasonous actions.⁷⁶ Despite this major judicial break for the episcopal plaintiffs, the case against the presbyterians suffered from a crippling lack of evidence to back up their allegations of sedition, and while the trial dragged on through the remaining months of 1591, by the following year, the two sides compromised: the presbyterians apologized for insulting the Queen and the bishops by forming their classes and promised to cease their offensive activities, and in return, and Whitgift allowed them to leave London and return to their homes, although not necessarily to their pulpits.⁷⁷ In any case, "the long imprisonment and trial had worn down and all but defeated the nine ministers and the movement for which they stood as representative figures. They had promised to end their formal meetings. It was all over, at least for the moment."⁷⁸

⁷⁴ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 420.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 424.

⁷⁶ Booty, 294; Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 424-425.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 428-429.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 428-431.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

He, even he knoweth, that these things were cunninglie wrought, by these deep sleights and suggestions of that olde serpent; too hinder our good cause, and to hurt the prosperous and godly proceedings of the Church of England. For by this meanes, we finding the mighty winds and stronge streame against us, were faine to humble our selves under Gods mercies, and commending our selves and our cause to him, who judgeth righteously: we reserved ourselves to a better time, when it should please his gracious wisdom, to make his owne trueth to appeare, and to move the minds of our superiors to bee more favorable.¹

By 1592, the dream of establishing a legitimate, presbyterian-style national church in England had been shattered by the events of the previous four years. After the prolonged religious and political trauma of the Star Chamber proceedings, the presbyterians receded from the forefront of England's public religious discourse and gave way to a decade of Anglican ascendancy before they dared to reassert themselves.² After the deaths of Bedford, Field, Leicester, Mildmay and Walsingham, which robbed the presbyterians of their ideological leader and several of their most influential political advocates; the defeat of the Spanish Armada, which neutralized the "Catholic bogeyman [and invalidated] any reason for pampering the Puritans as a supposed counterpoise"³; the vicious mudslinging of the Marprelate Tracts; and the scandal of the Hacket Revolt, the loss in the Star Chamber sent the presbyterian movement to its organizational nadir in the remaining decade of Elizabeth's reign.⁴ Bereft of any hope for effecting presbyterian reforms in the Church of England, "many Puritans were driven into the

¹ Nichols, 34-35.

² Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 369; Shaw, 663-664.

³ Knappen, 296.

⁴ Collinson, "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism," 369.

Congregationalist separatism of the Barrowist movement, while many more conformed and reserved themselves ‘to a better time.’ Very few found the presbyterian position of the ‘church within the Church’ to be any longer tenable.”⁵ As a result of Marprelate’s mischief, both religious and secular authorities cracked down on London’s presbyterian contingent and worked to neutralize the city’s notorious ability to offer protection to religious radicals, in both the pulpits and the printshops. “The days were now past when London was an open city for Puritan extremists. *Agents provocateurs* haunted the booksellers’ stalls in St. Paul’s churchyard, engaging the clergy who came to buy books in conversation, and pretending a sympathy for the cause.”⁶ Episcopalian clergymen, such as Bancroft and Cosin, continued their anti-presbyterian publishing campaign, producing works which created “a compulsively frightening picture of a presbyterian threat to all established authority, as formidable as that emanating from Rome.”⁷

In reality, however, this bleak state of affairs represented only one stage in the presbyterian movement’s turbulent history in the capital city, rather than its ignominious end. While the London presbyterians were, admittedly, forced to maintain a low profile in order to avoid ecclesiastical and political repercussions, their actions followed the same pattern they had employed after the setbacks of the vestiarian and *Admonition* controversies. Once again, the

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 405. Ironically enough, Marprelate himself recommended this policy in *The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin Junior*, in which (in perhaps what was his greatest blunder) he took on the character of John Whitgift, and offered advice on how to locate Martin and put a stop to his activities: “Let a six or seuen of you, or your substitutes that stay heere in London, watch mee Paules Churchyard, especially haue an eie to Boyles shop at the Rose. And let some one or two of you that are vnknown goe in thither, and if there be any strâgers in the shop, fall in talke with them of Martin, commend him, and especially his sonnes last libell, (and heere, hee that will take that course, take me this, that if need be you may shew it) shewing, that by great friendshippe you gote one of them, saying also, that you vnderstoode a man might there helpe his friend to some, if he were acquainted with Master Boyle, and offer largely for it. Now sir, if any shall either enter with you vnto any speches against the state, and in defence of these libelles: or else, if any can procure you to the sight of the bookes, be sure to bring them before vs” (Marprelate, *The Just Censure and Reproof of Martin Junior*, printed in *The Marprelate Tracts [1588-1589]*, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1970). Martin’s taunting seems to have worked a little too well, however, since *The Just Reproof* was the last tract published before the discovery of the Martinists near Manchester.

⁷ Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 111.

presbyterians retreated to the relative safety of the city liberties and suburbs and found employment in the same handful of parishes which maintained their radical identities through lectureships and lay-sponsored incumbencies.⁸ Additionally, as the Crown's financial troubles intensified over the course of the 1590s, several city vestries were able to purchase their advowson rights, giving them much greater control of the theological leanings of their respective parishes.⁹ Two important examples of this trend were St. Anne Blackfriars, which ensured the continuation of its presbyterian identity by purchasing its advowson in 1607¹⁰, and St. Stephen Coleman Street, which began to develop its radicalism only after its parishioners gained control of the pulpit by purchasing their impropriation and advowson in 1590, thus gaining the right to appoint the preacher(s) of their choosing. St. Stephen Coleman Street would become such an important enclave of radical Puritanism in the 1630s that Valerie Pearl nicknamed it "the Faubourg St. Antoine of London."¹¹ In this manner, increasing lay patronage allowed for the survival and strengthening of the presbyterians, as well as other developing nonconformist groups, that "the Puritan eclipse was temporary."¹²

English presbyterianism in London lived on in covert form until its reemergence under Charles I, when the threat of a monarch and an Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, with alleged crypto-Catholic sympathies provoked fears of a Catholic resurgence and awakened dormant religious divides among the English people. The presbyterians had hoped for a more congenial relationship with the official church when James VI of Scotland inherited the English crown after Elizabeth's death in 1603. At the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, however,

⁸ Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 577.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 591.

¹⁰ Burch, 24.

¹¹ Pearl, 183; D. A. Williams, "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate" *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1960), 466.

¹² Owen, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I," 591.

James made it clear that while he would entertain calls for further reform, he was primarily concerned with preserving the authority of the crown over the church. Over the course of his twenty-two year personal reign as King of Scotland, James had been forced to contend with an influential, presbyterian Scottish Kirk, and had constantly sought to balance his claim to royal authority with the Kirk's demands for self-regulation and religious reform. James "saw that presbyteries, although potentially effective tools of the state, posed a threat because they increasingly tended to act in defiance of the crown."¹³ This danger to his authority ultimately prompted James to abandon loyalty to the Scottish presbyterian system and instead to advocate the reinstatement of episcopacy in the Kirk. In writings such as *The Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies* and *Basilikon Doron*, he advocated the establishment of a strong episcopate through which the crown could exercise religious and political control over the Kirk.¹⁴ Ultimately, the English presbyterians had to resign themselves to continued apathy from a monarch who was only too familiar with their demands for reform along presbyterian lines.

As James's reign progressed, further ideological divisions developed within the Church of England. Arminians, including Laud and Richard Neile, attacked Calvinists, such as Robert Abbot and Arthur Lake, for emphasizing evangelism at the cost of reverent, decorous worship. Calvinists, on the other hand criticized the Arminians for advancing what Lancelot Andrewes called "the beauty of holiness"—statues, crosses, carpets, candles, vestments, and the like—and thereby retaining dangerous vestiges of Catholicism. While evangelical Calvinists made up the majority of Jacobean bishops, Kenneth Fincham maintains that James allowed the Arminian minority to flourish during his reign. Rather than addressing the emerging rivalry between

¹³ Alan R. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1998), 68.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 87-88; see also James I and Charles Howard McIlwain, *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918), 3-11, 53-70.

Calvinists and Arminians, James concentrated his efforts as Supreme Governor of the Church of England on enforcing subscription to his religious mandates, for, as noted in Fincham's *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* and illustrated in Alan MacDonald's *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy*, "his years in Scotland had taught James that a Presbyterian polity would emasculate his spiritual jurisdiction and permit him to act only as the civil sword of the Presbytery."¹⁵

James refused to succumb to pressure from both Arminians and Calvinists to enforce either participation in ecclesiastical ceremonies or continued elimination of popish elements from the church's official liturgy. Although he retained many of the traditional elements of the Elizabethan service, James only required verbal subscription to his religious mandates and tolerated a moderate degree of nonconformity within his church in the interest of maintaining religious unity in England. While this policy ensured nominal uniformity, it also allowed for the establishment and growth of Arminianism and the resurgence of Calvinism within English churches and universities, and thus gave rise to the heated religious struggles of Charles I's reign. This trend was certainly true in London, where "by the late 1630s, after three generations of Puritan activity, only about 10 per cent of the [its] incumbents were Puritan preachers, yet the city was notoriously hostile to Laudian Anglicanism."¹⁶ James's religious pragmatism had afforded the presbyterians a life after the Elizabethan repression and ensured that "the real watershed of the early Stuart Church occurred in 1625, for the new Caroline regime rejected

¹⁵ Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 36. See also: Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993); Jenny Wormald, "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: The Kirk, the Puritans, and the Future King of England," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 171-19; Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I," *The Journal of British Studies* 24, no. 2 (April, 1985): 169-207; Alan R. MacDonald, "James VI and I, The Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence," *The Historical Journal* 48, no. 4 (2005): 885-903.

¹⁶ Seaver, 54.

Jacobean ideals of unity and reconciliation in favor of ceremonial order and uniformity of public worship.”¹⁷ Additionally, and perhaps symptomatic of these religious developments, the Marprelate Tracts enjoyed a popular resurgence in the 1630s and 1640s, as censorship laws were relaxed and propagandist pamphlets again circulated throughout England and encouraged renewed opposition to traditional English episcopacy.¹⁸ Richard Overton, a prominent polemicist in the 1640s, even revived Martin’s character and anti-episcopal message under the name of Margery Mar-Prelate:

Martin Mar-Prelate was a bonny lad
His brave adventures made the Prelates mad:
Though he be dead, yet he hath left behind
A generation of the Martin kind.
Yea, there’s a certaine aged bonny Lasse,
As well as He, that bringes Exploits to passé
Tell not the Bishops, and you s’ know her Name,
Margery Mar-Prelate, of renowned fame.¹⁹

By Charles’s reign, however, the ideological descendants of the Elizabethan presbyterians had become deeply entrenched in England’s political and religious infrastructure, and were able to mount an effective resistance to Laud’s efforts at imposing high-church uniformity on the English church, a resistance which would reach its bloody climax in the English Civil War.

¹⁷ Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 303.

¹⁸ Black, Joseph L., “The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 3 (Autumn 1997), 724; Black, ed., *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), lxxxiii-xciv; Raymond A. Anselment, “*Betwixt Jest and Earnest*”: *Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 59-60; Collinson, “Ecclesiastical Vitriol,” 170.

¹⁹ Richard Overton, *Vox borealis, or the northern discoverie : by way of dialogue between Jamie and Willie, Amidst the Babylonians [i.e. London or Edinburgh]*, (Printed, by Margery Mar-Prelat, in Thwackcoat-lane, at the Signe of the Crab-tree Cudgell; without any priviledge of the Cater-Caps, the yeare coming on, 1641), see also Black, “The Rhetoric of Reaction,” 724.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Arthington, Henry. *The seduction of Arthington by Hacket especially, with some tokens of his unfained repentance and submission.* London, 1592.
- Bancroft, Richard. *Daungerous positions and proceedings, published and practised within this iland of Brytaine, under pretence of reformation, and for the presbiteriall discipline.* London, 1593.
- Camden, William. *The historie of the life and reigne of that famous princesse Elizabeth containing a briefe memoriall of the chieftest affaires of state that haue passed in these kingdomes of England, Scotland, France or Ireland since the yeare of the fatall Spanish invasion to that of her sad and ever to be deplored dissolution : wherevnto also is annexed an appendix of animadversions vpon severall passages, corrections of sundry errors, and additions of some remarkable matters of this history never before imprinted.* London: Printed for William Webbe, 1634.
- Carr, John, and W. Phillippes. *A Larume Belle for London, with A Caueat or Warning to England: Also a Pitifull Complaint of the Penitente Synner, Newlie Set Forthe by Ihon Carre, Citezein of London.* Imprinted at London: By [W. How for] Henry Kirckham, at the signe of the blacke Boie, at the little north doore of Poules, 1573.
- Cosin, Richard. *Conspiracie, for pretended reformation: viz. presbyteriall discipline. A treatise discovering the late designments and courses held for advancement thereof, by William Hacket yeoman, Edmund Coppinger, and Henry Arthington gent.* London, 1591.
- Elizabeth I, Leah S. Marcus, Janel M. Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Foxe, John. *Acts and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable happening in the church, with an universal historie of the same [microform] : wherein is set forth at large the whole race and course of the Church from the primitive age to these latter times of ours : with the bloody times, horrible troubles, and great persecutions against the martyrs of Christ sought and wrought as well by heathen emperors, as now lately practised by Romish prelates, especially in this realme of England and Scotland : whereunto are annexed certaine additions of like persecution which have happened in these latter times.* London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1641.
- Frere, W. H., and C. E. Douglas. *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt, with a reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and Kindred Documents, 1572.* London: Published for the Church Historical Society [by] S.P.C.K., 1954.

- Grindal, Edmund, and William Nicholson. *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D.: Successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843.
- Hall, Joseph. *Virgidemiarum, Sixe Bookes. First Three Bookes, of Tooth-Lesse Satyrs. 1. Poeticall. 2. Academicall. 3. Morall*. London: Printed by Thomas Creede, for Robert Dexter, 1597.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission. "Memorandum of the arraignment, at Newgate, of William Hacket, of Northamptonshire, for high treason," 26 July 1591. *Fourteenth Report, appendix, part IV: the MSS of Lord Kenyon*. London: Printed for Her Majesty's Stationary Office by Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1984.
- Jonson, Ben. *The Devil is an Ass*. Ed. Peter Happé. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Manningham, John, and John Bruce. *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple and of Bradbourne, Kent, Barrister-at-Law, 1602-1603*. Westminster, UK: Printed by J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1868.
- Marprelate, Martin, pseud. *The Marprelate Tracts [1588-1589]*. Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1970.
- Murdin, William. *A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, : From the Year 1571 to 1596. Transcribed from Original Papers . . . Left by William Cecill Lord Burghley, . . . By William Murdin*. London: printed by William Bowyer, 1759.
- Overton, Richard. *Vox Borealis, or, the Northern Discoverie*. [London?]: Amidst the Baylonians, Printed by Margery Mar-Prelate, 1641.
- Nichols, Josias. *The Plea of the Innocent: Wherein Is Auerred, That the Ministers & People Falslie Termed Puritanes, Are Iniuriouslie Slaundered for Enemies or Troublers of the State : Published for the Common Good of the Church and Common Wealth of This Realme of England As a Countermure against All Sycophantising Papists, Stating Priestes, Neutralising Atheistes, and Satanising Scorners of All Godlinesse, Trueth and Honestie*. Middelburg: R. Schilders, 1602.
- Peel, Albert. *The Seconde Parte of a Register: Being a calendar of manuscripts under that title intended for publication by the Puritans about 1593, and now in Dr. Williams's Library, London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Porter, H. C. *Puritanism in Tudor England*. Columbia, S. C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1971.

Robinson, Hastings. *The Zurich letters; or, The correspondence of several English bishops and others, with some of the Helvetian reformers during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, chiefly from the archives of Zurich*. Cambridge: Printed at the University Press, 1846.

Scouloudi, Irene. *Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis, 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639: A Study of an Active Minority*. London: Huguenot Society of London, 1985.

Stowe, John. *A Survey of London: Written in the Year 1598*, ed. Antonia Fraser. Gloucestershire, UK: The History Press, 2009.

Stowe, John and James Gairdner. "Historical Memoranda of John Stowe: General, 1564-7," in *Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles, with Historical Memoranda by John Stowe, the antiquary, and contemporary notes of occurrences written by him in the reign of Queen Elizabeth*. London: Camden Society, 1880.

Strype, John. *Annals of the Reformation and establishment of religion and other various occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign, together with an appendix of original papers of state, records, and letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824.

Strype, John. *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Aylmer, Lord Bp. of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Wherein Are Explained Many Transactions of the Church of England, and What Methods Were Then Taken to Preserve It, with Respect to the Papist and Puritan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821.

Strype, John. *The history of the life and acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal, the first Bishop of London, and the second Archbishop of York and Canterbury successively, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth : To which is added, an appendix or original mss. faithfully transcribed out of the best archives; whereunto reference is made in the history*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821.

Strype, John. *The life and acts of John Whitgift, D.D., the third and last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: the whole digested, compiled, and attested from records, registers, original letters and other authentic mss. taken from the choicest libraries and collections of the kingdom*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822.

Strype, John. *The life and acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: Under whose primacy and influence the reformation of religion was happily effected; and the Church of England restored, and established upon the principles whereon it stands to this day*. Printed for John Wyat, at the Rose in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1711.

Udall, John, and Robert Waldegrave. *A Demonstration of the Trueth of That Discipline Which Christe Hath Prescribed in His Worde for the Gouvernment of His Church, in All Times and Places, Vntill the Ende of the Worlde.: Wherein Are Gathered into a Plaine Forme of*

Reasoning, the Proofes Thereof; Out of the Scriptures, the Euidence of It by the Light of Reason Rightly Ruled, and the Testimonies That Hauē Beene Giuen Therevnto, by the Course of the Churche Certaine Hundredths of Yeares After the Apostles Time; and the Generall Consent of the Churches Rightly Reformed in These Latter Times: According As They Are Alleaged and Maintained, in Those Seuerall Bookes That Hauē Bin Written Concerning the Same. East Molesey: R. Waldegrave, 1588.

United Kingdom. 1890-1907. *Acts of the Privy Council of England.* Ed. J. R. Dasent. 32 vols. London.

United Kingdom. 1547-1603. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic.* Volume 3. Ed. Mary Anne E. Green. London.

Secondary Sources

Books

Anselment, Raymond A. *“Betwixt Jest and Earnest” : Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Arber, Edward. *An Introductory Sketch to the Martin Marprelate Controversy, 1588-1590.* New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

Archer, Ian W. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Beier, A.L. and Roger Finlay, eds. *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis.* London: Longman Group Limited, 1986.

Bevington, David M., ed. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare.* 5th ed. New York: Pearson Longman, Inc., 2004.

Black, Joseph L., ed. *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Brigden, Susan. *London and the Reformation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

_____. *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors, 1485-1603.* New York: Penguin Books, Ltd., 2000.

Carlson, Leland H. *Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Job Throckmorton Laid Open in His Colors.* San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1981.

- Collinson, Patrick. *Archbishop Grindal, 1519-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Houndsmills, UK: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1988.
- _____. *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1983.
- _____. *Elizabethans*. London: Hambledon and London, 2003.
- _____. *Elizabethan Essays*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967.
- _____. "John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism." In *Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale*, edited by S. T. Bindoff, J. Hurstfield, and C. H. Williams, 127-162. London: The Athlone Press, 1961.
- Collinson, Patrick, John Craig and Brett Usher. *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St Edmunds, 1582 - 1590*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Denny, Joanna. *Anne Boleyn: A New Life of England's Tragic Queen*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2006.
- Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation*. London: William Clowes and Sons, Ltd., 1965.
- Doran, Susan, and Christopher Durston. *Princes, Pastors, and People: The Church and Religion in England, 1529-1689*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Drysdale, A. H. *History of the Presbyterians in England: Their Rise, Decline, and Revival*. London: Publication Committee of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1889.
- Durston, Christopher and Jacqueline Eales, eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Elton, G. R. *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- _____. *The Early Stuart Church: 1603-1642*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake, eds. *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- Adam Fox. *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Green, Ian M. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Grell, Ole Peter. *Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart England*. Hants, UK: Scolar Press: 1996.
- _____. *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London: The Dutch Church in Austin Friars, 1603-1642*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989.
- Guy, John A., ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Griffiths, Paul and Mark S. R. Jenner, eds. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Haigh, Christopher, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985.
- Hammer, Paul E. J. *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Knappen, M. M. *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1988.
- _____. *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy", "Heterodoxy", and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Leith, John H. *Creeeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine, from the Bible to the Present*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.
- Lindeboom, Johannes. *Austin Friars; History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London, 1550-1950*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950.

- Luu, Liên. *Immigrants and the Industries of London, 1500-1700*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005.
- Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Marshall, Peter, and Alec Ryrie. *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. New York: Palgrave Publishers, Ltd., 2001.
- MacDonald, Alan R. *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1998.
- McGinn, Donald J. *The Admonition Controversy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1949.
- McLaren, A. N. *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth 1558*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Merle d'Aubigné, J. H. *The Reformation in England*. 2 vols. Edited by S. M. Houghton. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1962.
- Meyer, C. S. *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960.
- Neale, J. E. *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1584-1601*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1957.
- Norwood, Frederick A. "The Strangers' 'Model Churches' in Sixteenth-Century England." In *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, edited by Franklin H. Littell. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1962.
- Pearl, Valerie. *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution: City Government and National Politics, 1625-43*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Picard, Liza. *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004.
- Pierce, William. *An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts: A Chapter in the Evolution of Religious and Civil Liberty in England*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1908.

- Pound, John. *Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1986.
- Rappaport, Steve. *Worlds Within Worlds: Structure of Life in Sixteenth-Century London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Rex, Richard. *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*. 2nd ed. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Scarisbrick, J. J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd., 1984.
- Scott Pearson, A. F. *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Sheppard, Francis H. W. *London: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Slack, Paul. *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1988.
- Spitz, Lewis W. *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements*. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Company, 1971.
- Spurr, John. *English Puritanism, 1603-1698*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Spurr, John. *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Longman, 2006.
- Taylor, Robert, Adrian Prockter, and John Kerwin Fisher. *The A to Z of Elizabethan London*. London: London Topographical Society, 1979.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England*. London: Redwood Press Limited, 1971.
- Todd, Margo, ed. *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England. Rewriting Histories*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Tomlinson, Edward Murray. *A History of the Minorities, London*. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1907.
- Trinterud, Leonard J., ed. *Elizabethan Puritanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

University of London, A. F. Pollard, and R. W. Seton-Watson. *Tudor Studies, Presented by the Board of Studies in History in the University of London to Albert Frederick Pollard, Being the Work of Twelve of His Colleagues and Pupils*. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.

Usher, R. G. *The Reconstruction of the English Church*. New York: D. Appleton, 1910.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Wells, Stanley W. *Shakespeare and Co.: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Fletcher, and the Other Players in His Story*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2006.

Wernham, R. B. *The Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy, 1558-1603*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980.

Williams, Penry. *The Later Tudors: England, 1547-1603*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Wrightson, Keith and David Levine. *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling 1525-1700*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Articles

Black, Joseph L. "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 3 (Autumn 1997): 707-725.

Booty, John. "Tumult in Cheapside: The Hacket Conspiracy." *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42, no. 3 (September 1973): 294-317.

Bozeman, Theodore D. "Federal Theology and the 'National Covenant': An Elizabethan Presbyterian Case Study." *Church History* 61, no. 4 (December 1992): 394-407.

Brigden, Susan. "Religion and Social Obligation in Early Sixteenth-Century London." *Past and Present*, no. 103 (May 1984): 67-112.

Burch, Brian. "The Parish of St. Anne's Blackfriars, London, to 1665." *Guildhall Miscellany* 3, no. 1 (October, 1969): 1-54.

- Christianson, Paul. "Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 463-482.
- Collinson, Patrick. "The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches in London." *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London* 20, no. 5 (1964): 528-555.
- _____. "The Politics of Religion and the Religion of Politics in Elizabethan England." *Historical Research* 82, no. 215 (February 2009): 74-92.
- _____. "Servants and citizens: Robert Beale and other Elizabethans" *Historical Research* 79, no. 206 (November 2006): 488-511.
- Como, David R. "Secret Printing, the Crisis of 1640, and the Origins of Civil War Radicalism." *Past and Present*, no. 196 (August 2007): 37-82.
- Creaser, John. "Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* and Bancroft's *Dangerous Positions*." *The Review of English Studies* 57, no. 229 (April 2006): 176-184.
- Cross, M. Claire. "Noble Patronage in the Elizabethan Church." *The Historical Journal* 3, no. 1 (1960): 1-16.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake. "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I." *The Journal of British Studies* 24, no. 2 (April 1985): 169-207.
- Greengrass, Mark. "Protestant Exiles and their Assimilation into Early Modern England." *Immigrants & Minorities* 4, no. 3 (1985): 68-81.
- Haigh, Christopher. "The Taming of the Reformation: Preachers, Pastors and Parishioners in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England." *History* 85, no. 280 (October 2000): 572-588.
- Hauben, Paul J. "A Spanish Calvinist Church in Elizabethan London, 1559-65." *Church History* 34, no. 1 (March 1965): 50-56.
- Hickman, David. "Religious Belief and Pious Practice among London's Elizabethan Elite." *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 4. (December 1999): 941-960.
- Hurst, John F. "The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of England." *The American Journal of Theology* 3, no. 4 (October 1899): 679-194.
- Lake, Peter. "Puritan Identities." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35, no. 1 (January 1984): 112-123.
- Lake, Peter and David Como. "'Orthodoxy' and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of 'Consensus' in the London (Puritan) 'Underground'." *The Journal of British Studies* 39, no. 1 (January 2000): 34-70.

- Lake, Peter and Michael Questier. "Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric Under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England." *Past & Present*, no. 153 (November 1996): 64-107.
- Lardi, Paulo and Winifred Smith. "Anti-Catholic Propaganda in Elizabethan London." *Modern Philology* 28, no. 2 (November 1930): 208-212.
- Littleton, Charles. "Social Interactions of Aliens in Late Elizabethan London: Evidence from the 1593 Return and the French Church consistory 'actes'." *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 26, no. 3 (1994): 147-159.
- _____. "The French Church of London in European Protestantism: The Role of Robert le Maçon, dit de la Fontaine, Minister, 1574-1611." *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 26, no. 1 (1994): 45-57.
- Luu, Lien Bich. "French-speaking Refugees and the Foundation of the London Silk Industry in the 16th Century." *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 26, no. 5 (1997): 564-576
- MacDonald, Alan R. "James VI and I, The Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence." *The Historical Journal* 48, no. 4 (2005): 885-903.
- Mahony, Michael. "Presbyterianism in the City of London, 1645-1647." *The Historical Journal* 22, no. 1 (March 1979): 93-114.
- McGinn, Donald J. "The Real Martin Marprelate." *PMLA* 58, no. 1 (March 1943): 84-107.
- Neale, J. E. "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity." *The English Historical Review* 65, no. 256 (July 1950): 304-332.
- Owen, H. Gareth. "A Nursery of Elizabethan Nonconformity, 1567-72." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 18, no. 1 (April, 1966): 65-76.
- _____. "Lecturers and Lectureships in Tudor London." *Church Quarterly Review* 162, no. 1 (January-March, 1961): 63-76.
- _____. "Parochial Curates in Elizabethan London." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 10, no. 1 (April 1959): 66-73.
- _____. "The Liberty of the Minorities: A Study in Elizabethan Religious Radicalism." *East London Papers* 8 (1965): 81-97.
- _____. "Tradition and Reform: Ecclesiastical Controversy in an Elizabethan London Parish." *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1961): 63-70.

- Prior, Charles W. A. "Ecclesiology and Political Thought in England, 1580-c. 1630." *The Historical Journal* 48, no. 4 (2005): 855-884.
- Scouloudi, Irene. "The Stranger Community in the Metropolis, 1558-1640." *Huguenots in Britain and Their French Background, 1550-1800: Contributions to the Historical Conference of the Huguenot Society of London, 24-25 September 1985*, edited by Irene Scouloudi, 42-55. Houndsmills: The MacMillan Press, 1987.
- Shaw, William A. "Elizabethan Presbyterianism." *The English Historical Review* 3, no. 12 (October 1888): 655-667.
- Solt, Leo F. "Revolutionary Calvinist Parties in England under Elizabeth I and Charles I." *Church History* 27, no. 3 (September 1958): 234-239.
- Wallace, Jr., Dewey D. "George Gifford, Puritan Propaganda and Popular Religion in Elizabethan England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 1978): 27-49.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "'Frantick Hacket': Prophecy, Sorcery, Insanity, and the Elizabethan Puritan Movement." *The Historical Journal* 41, no. 1 (March 1998): 27-66.
- White, Micheline. "A Biographical Sketch of Dorcas Martin: Elizabethan Translator, Stationer, and Godly Matron." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 30, no. 3 (Autumn 1999): 775-792.
- Williams, D. A. "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate." *Guildhall Miscellany* 2 (1960): 24-38.
- _____. "London Puritanism: The Parish of St. Stephen Coleman St." *Church Quarterly Review* 160 (1959): 464-482.
- Winship, Michael P. "Puritans, Politics, & Lunacy: The Copinger-Hacket Conspiracy." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 2 (2007): 345-369.

Theses and Dissertations

- Agha, Agha Uka. "Puritan Presbyterian Polity in Elizabethan England, 1559-1593." Ph. D. diss., Drew University, 1985.
- Ha, Polly. "Elizabethan Presbyterianism, c. 1590-1640." Ph. D. diss., University of Cambridge, 2006.
- Owen, H. Gareth. "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I." Ph. D. diss., University of London, 1957. Microfilm.

Donaldson, Gordon. "The Relations Between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604." Ph. D. diss., University of London, 1938. Microfilm.

VITA

Katherine Sawyer was born in February 1984 in Abingdon, Pennsylvania. At six months old, she and her family moved to New Zealand, where they lived until 1994. She attended schools in Silverstream, New Zealand; Hastings, New Zealand; New Rochelle, New York; and Pelahatchie, Mississippi, before graduating from Grace Christian School in Alexandria, Louisiana, in 2002. After matriculating at Louisiana College in Pineville, Louisiana, for two years, she participated in a semester abroad program in London, England, in the fall of 2004. During this semester, she became captivated by London's diverse culture and storied history. She returned to Louisiana and earned her Bachelor of Arts degree from Louisiana College in May 2006, majoring in history and minoring in English and education.