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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the sermons delivered at Paul's Cross, the outdoor pulpit at St. Paul's Cathedral, during the reign of James I. It examines the preachers' use of rhetoric to influence the religious and political attitudes of contemporaries by comparing theories of preaching, found in sacred rhetorics and other tracts, to preachers' practice in their sermons. By this method, arguments associated particularly with Paul's Cross and its London audience can be identified and the rhetorical, doctrinal and socio-political aspects of Jacobean preaching, which are fragmented in much of the current scholarship, can be integrated. The thesis consists of five 'case studies' in the functions of rhetoric in sermons on different subjects. A short introduction reviews current scholarship on seventeenth-century preaching and describes the methodology used.

Chapter I examines political preaching, focusing on John Donne's 1622 sermon defending James I's Directions concerning Preachers (STC 7053). It demonstrates the importance of the division between the 'exposition' of the scriptural text from its 'application' to the hearers in political preaching. The second chapter looks at preaching on religious controversies. It compares the rhetorical techniques of polemical sermons with those of recantation sermons preached by converts. Examining this topic in relation to William Crashaw's Sermon preached at the Crosse of 1608 (STC 6027) and Theophilus Higgon's recantation sermon of 1611 (STC 13455.7), this chapter shows the centrality of arguments based on the opponent's character (ethos) to controversial preaching. Chapter III studies exhortation with reference to Joseph Hall's Parisisisme and Christianity (1608; STC 12699). It demonstrates that persuasion was considered a function of argumentation, not rhetorical ornament. It also examines the disabling of rhetoric in exhortations to charity by the Church's strict sola fide doctrine. The arguments for plain or ornamented preaching styles and their relation to the role of the preacher in the Church are discussed in Chapter IV, on Daniel Featley's 1618 sermon The Spouse her Pretious Borders (STC 10730). This chapter investigates preaching decorum and the debates over the display of rhetoric and learning in the pulpit. The 'prophetic sermon' or 'Jeremiad' is examined in Chapter V, on Thomas Adams' The Gallant's Burden (1612; STC 117). The characteristic use of biblical types and examples in these sermons is re-examined and the current argument that the use of Old Testament examples suggests a 'special relationship' between God and England is denied.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis studies the functions of rhetoric in the sermons delivered at Paul's Cross, the outdoor pulpit at St. Paul's Cathedral in London, during the reign of James I. It aims to establish some of the rhetorical strategies by which preachers at Paul's Cross sought to intervene in the religious and cultural politics of their time. The hypothesis which this study attempts to prove is that sermons, as rhetorical texts licensed to persuade their auditors, engage directly in the debates that most exercised contemporaries and exhibit, through the arguments and styles they adopt, the conceptual frameworks within which those debates were conducted.

The sermons delivered at Paul's Cross are particularly suitable for studying the functions and impact of preaching rhetoric, as no public pulpit was more influential. One sign of its importance is the frequency and speed with which many of the sermons delivered there were printed. For the Jacobean period alone, one hundred and forty-one sermons are extant in print and notes on several of these, as well as full-text copies of three others, survive in manuscript. As Millar MacLure has shown, Paul's Cross was already a focal point in London's political life during the Middle Ages. As the platform from which proclamations were read, public penance performed and sermons delivered, the pulpit had already accrued all the functions with which it was associated at the Reformation.

---

1 See Millar MacLure, *Register of Sermons* (1989). Full manuscript copies of sermons not printed are: Lambeth Palace MS. 113, item 2, a sermon by Dr. John Jegon, undated but internal evidence suggests a date between 1606 and 1618; Lambeth Palace MS 447, item 1, a sermon by John Harris delivered on the King's Accession day in 1619; Dr. Williams' Library MS. 12.10, a sermon dated 5 of November, 1614, by Dr. Godwyn, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford. A full copy of John Stoughton's 1623 sermon *The Lovesick Spouse* (printed in 1640) is in Bodleian MS Rawl. E. 148 and an incomplete copy is in the library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge in MS 96. A full copy of John Donne's 1622 sermon on the Gunpowder plot, in BL MS. Royal 7. XX, was discovered in 1992 by Jeanne Shami (see Shami, 'Donne's 1622 Sermon on the Gunpowder Plot', *English Manuscript Studies*, 5 (1995)). Notes survive on Thomas Walkington's *Rabboni; Mary Magdalens Teares*, preached on April 23, 1620, in Bodleian MS. Rawl. D. 1350, item 2; Robert Wilkinson's 1607 sermon *Lot's wife* in BL MS. Harl. 6534, item 4; John Milward's 1607 accession day sermon, printed in 1610 as *Jacob's Great Day of Trouble*, in BL MS Add. 12,515. Notes of William Barlow's sermon on the earl of Essex's execution survive in both the Bodleian Library MS Rawl. D. 719 and Lambeth Palace MS. 931, vol. 3 item 62.

2 Millar MacLure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons* 1534-1642 (1958). This remains the standard study of Paul's Cross. The description of the uses made of Paul's Cross before and after the Reformation are taken from MacLure's work: on the early history of Paul's Cross and its use for preaching and proclamations, see pp. 4-7; on the early Reformation to the reign of Edward VI, see pp. 21-49. An older, shorter study of Paul's Cross is Margaret E. Cornford's *Paul's Cross: A History* (London: SPCK, 1910).
the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward and Mary, the Reformation debates were played out from Paul's Cross and with the re-establishment of Protestantism on Elizabeth's accession, it was continually employed to popularise the new religion. The foremost preachers of the age delivered sermons from here, including John Foxe the martyrlogist; John Jewel, the leading apologist of the established Church; and Richard Bancroft, whose famous anti-Puritan sermon of 1589 marked a turning point in the Church's attitude to clerical conformity. No single issue monopolised Paul's Cross during James I's reign, and so this period gives the broadest sample of issues addressed by preachers, from attacks on Puritan non-conformity and Catholic recusancy to denunciations of the lax trading ethics of the city's merchants. Again, Paul's Cross includes the full spectrum of religious opinion held within the 'Jacobean consensus', from William Laud to the notorious Puritan William Whately, the 'roaring boy of Banbury'.

Modern writers have described Paul's Cross as the 'Broadcasting House of Elizabethan England'. Although this appellation recognises its importance as a platform from which controversial events were addressed, it suggests that the pulpit was controlled by the government to a greater extent than the evidence will allow. Paul's Cross certainly was used by the government to explain its actions, most notably in the annual sermons commemorating the king's accession and the failure of the Gunpowder plot. Yet it was also a platform for voicing complaints against powerful interests, and both the Corporation of London and the House of Commons were castigated from there. Even the king's policies were sometimes criticised from this pulpit, especially during the negotiations for a 'Spanish Match' for James' heir, Charles. These sermons do not, therefore, provide a mere benchmark.

---

3John Foxe preached on March 24, 1570 and February 2, 1577 (Register of Sermons, pp. 50, 57). John Jewel preached on June 18, 1559; Nov. 26, 1559 (the famous 'challenge' sermon, which he repeated on March 31, 1560); May 27, 1565 (criticising Hardinge's Confutation); on June 15, 1567 and in April, 1570 (defending vestments): Register of Sermons, pp. 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 51. On Bancroft's sermon, see Register of Sermons, p. 67.

4William Laud preached at Paul's Cross on April 18, 1624 and March 27, 1631; Register of Sermons, pp. 125, 136. The first of these sermons was not printed and no copy has been found. William Whately preached on December 4, 1608. This sermon was printed as A caveat for the covetous (1609).

of orthodoxy, but rather a spectrum of the religious and political attitudes current in early seventeenth-century London.

Ever since Thomas Hobbes included the seditious sermons of Puritans among the causes of the English Civil War, the political and cultural impact of preaching has been the subject of historical enquiry. Recent scholars have greatly increased our understanding of the culture of preaching, and among them the work of Patrick Collinson is paramount. J. Sears McGee, John Morgan and Paul S. Seaver have also analysed aspects of England's religious culture, and their research has reinforced the findings of Collinson on the centrality of preaching. Drawing on a huge variety of sources, these scholars have shown the importance of preaching in strengthening the Reformation in England and the commitment of both clerics and lay people to a learned, preaching ministry. They have described the culture that grew up around preaching, where people 'gadded' to hear favourite preachers and took notes at sermons to meditate upon or to 'repeat' with others later. In historical studies, sermons are often a primary source for the religious or political opinions of individuals and parties: an adequate summary of their use in seventeenth-century studies seems hardly possible.

In view of such studies, and in keeping with the growing emphasis on historicist approaches to Renaissance writing, it is no surprise that a contextualised approach to sermons is becoming more common among literary critics too. This work is badly

---


needed, as the study of preaching was, until quite recently, restricted to the history of English prose style. John King and Barbara Lewalski, both of whom make considerable use of printed sermons, have traced the emergence of a Reformation 'Protestant poetics'. Their work has helped us reconstruct the interpretative inheritance that informs much seventeenth-century English religious writing and has elucidated many of the standard approaches to popular texts shared by poets and preachers. Debora Shuger and Peter Auksi have traced the history of particular aspects of preaching rhetoric - the grand and plain styles respectively - from the arguments of the Church Fathers to the Reformation debates. Much work on sermons has confined itself to individual preachers, notably John Donne. The style of Donne's sermons, their structure and his use of the *ars praedicandi* have been examined in detail by Joan Webber and John Chamberlin. The influence of the political climate on Donne's deployment of rhetoric has been addressed by R.C. Bald in his biography of Donne and by other writers in various articles on Donne's sermons, most notably by Jeanne Shami. The restrictive focus on individual preachers, however, makes it difficult to contextualise their sermons. One corrective to this, in the study of particular pulpits, is now underway. Peter McCullough's recent Ph.D. thesis on court sermons gives a

For example, in his magisterial study of early modern writing on London, Lawrence Manley surveys almost every literary form, but mentions preaching and printed sermons only in passing: *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (1995). Given that over one hundred sermons were preached in London every week (by the calculation of Paul Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships*, p. 125) this is a serious omission.


very full description of the audience, the ceremonial and the physical surroundings of court preaching, leaving us far better equipped to understand its particular context.  

This study of Jacobean Paul's Cross preaching builds on the insights of these scholars. It seeks to integrate the rhetorical and stylistic examinations of Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching with the work of cultural and political historians. The rhetorical features of preaching rhetoric are a vital part of this argument and are dealt with in detail. The system of sermon composition developed in the Reformation is a neglected area of study. It rested on many assumptions foreign to other forms of rhetoric. Two aspects of preaching particularly demanded modifications to classical rhetorical theory: the didactic function of preaching and the unique status of the biblical text on which the preacher spoke.

Unlike other forms of rhetoric, preaching took as its starting point a text from the Bible. Before the preacher could begin to persuade his hearers to a course of action, he first needed to show that this course of action was sanctioned by Scripture. This was done by interpreting the passage of Scripture in a way that 'uncovered' in it precepts which could then be applied to the hearers' attitudes and actions. The twin functions of the sermon (which did not necessarily dictate its structure) were described as explication (or exposition) and application. The most common method of sermon composition used in the seventeenth century was that of 'doctrines and uses' and its popularity is explained by the ease with which it could accommodate these two functions. The explication first involved the 'division' of the text into smaller units, from each of which a precept could be extracted. The division, therefore, took the place of partitio in classical rhetoric (the enumeration of the points to be developed in an oration). Each point in the sermon was assigned to a word or phrase of the text, so that the relation of each point to the scriptural text could be shown. The preacher then proceeded to explicate each part of his text, and hence develop

---

16 Peter McCullough, 'The Sermon at the court of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603', (Princeton University Ph.D., 1992). See also Lori Ann Ferrell on the political context of Jacobean court preaching: 'Sermons at the Jacobean Court' (Yale University Ph.D., 1991). Peter Lake's study of Lancelot Andrewes' and John Buckeridge's sermon styles should also be mentioned: 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity at the Court of James I', in The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, ed. Levy Peck (1991), pp. 113-133. The work of Mr Arnold Hunt on the early Stuart church is expected to add greatly to our knowledge of the context of Jacobean preaching, both in political and doctrinal terms.

17 A good example of the typical 'division' of the text is that in Immanuel Bourne's The true way of a christian, preached on 2 Cor. 5:17:
each *doctrine* in his sermon, in the order given in the *division*. He then *applied* the doctrines developed to contemporary circumstances by describing the *use* that the hearers were to make of them. Although the importance of these two functions is apparent in Jacobean sermons, *explication* and *application* are rarely used as the structuring principle of a sermon. More often, each point is discussed as it arises within the sequential discussion of the words of the text.

Preachers at Paul's Cross often had to *apply* their texts to current political events, and this required them to devise *explications* that did not 'wrest' Scripture (that is, distort it for political or self-serving ends). Chapter I of this thesis examines political preaching, focusing on John Donne's 1622 sermon at Paul's Cross in which he defends James I's recently promulgated *Directions concerning Preachers*. The Directions caused an outcry because contemporaries saw them as limiting preaching contrary to the scriptural precept that ministers should preach constantly and fearlessly. Promulgated at a time when James' tardiness in supporting the Protestant cause in the Thirty Years War was openly criticised, the Directions were perceived as part of a larger plot to weaken the Protestant Reformation in England. Donne's response denies any connection between James' foreign policy and the Directions by employing a strategy common in political sermons. He separates the *explication* from the *application* of his theme to present events. By using the *commonplaces* of deliberative rhetoric (honour and utility), he argues in favour of the Directions without suggesting that their particulars were demanded by Scripture. Donne succeeds in arguing for the king's power and the preacher's duty, balancing both claims by showing how each is governed by law.

The second chapter looks at preaching on religious controversies. It compares the rhetorical techniques of controversial sermons with those of the recantation sermons preached by converts from Roman Catholicism. 'Controversial divinity' was considered one type of *application* that a preacher might make of his text, and it functioned

---

*In which for our methodicall and orderly proceeding, if you observe the words; There is First, an imposition, or setting forth of our new man. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: Secondly, a deposition or laying aside of our old man. Old things are passed away. Thirdly, a Reason and confirmation of them both. Behold, all things become new.*

by exposing the logical fallacies or rhetorical sophisms in the opponent's statements. Although several controversial sermons, including John Jewel's famous 'challenge' sermon, were very influential, most became enmeshed in intricate distinctions and lost their polemic effect. Consequently, an emphasis on exposing sophistries to discredit the opponent, not to refute his argument, soon emerged. As these debates were conducted over the speaker's or writer's ethos, his personal standing as a reliable adviser, an ex-convert is not an obvious choice as a refuter. Yet the convert's direct experience of the opponent's camp allows him to verify the accusations against Catholics. His penitent's stance (as a convert) re-establishes his ethos, making his confession of apostasy a paradoxically effective polemical weapon. This argument is presented through a comparison of William Crashaw's refutational Sermon preached at the Crosse (1608) with Theophilus Higgon's recantation sermon of 1611.

Through 'theoretic' applications, as found in controversial sermons, preachers sought to influence the opinions of their contemporaries. Through the 'practical' applications of their texts, they addressed themselves primarily to persuading their hearers to amend their lives. Chapter III shows that persuasion was effected through exhortation, a vehement type of argumentation that presented the hearers with means and motives for following the preacher's advice. This suggests that writers on preaching rhetoric considered persuasion primarily a function of argument, and not of rhetorical ornament. Rhetorical techniques and Church doctrine conflicted, however, in the case of exhortations to charity, a theme most pertinent to the citizen audience at Paul's Cross. The sola fide doctrine of the reformed Church of England laid down that faith, and not charity, brought a sinner to salvation. The preacher who wished to promote fair dealing or charity could not claim that these actions would benefit a sinner. Yet preachers by no means abandoned the task of encouraging charity and fair dealing, and they found various means to accommodate doctrine with the rhetorical aim of persuading to good actions. Many of these accommodations, however, merely modified the motive of rewards for works, in spite of its unsuitability in a Church that stressed sola fide justification. The disabling of rhetoric by doctrine will be examined with reference to Joseph Hall's Pharisaisme and Christianity (1608).
The second crucial difference between preaching rhetoric and other forms of persuasive speech stems from the status given the scriptural text on which the preacher spoke. The words of the Bible were taken to be irrefutable truths delivered to man to provide the knowledge necessary for salvation. It was, therefore, necessary that these truths be presented in a way that all could understand. The preacher's duty was to explain the meaning of his text and to persuade his hearers to reform their lives accordingly. Preaching in the Jacobean period has commonly been described as either 'metaphysical' or 'plain' in style and these styles have been associated with the factions of the Church of England. Discussions of style within the sermons themselves, however, centre on the duty of the preacher to his hearers. The governing idea in these discussions is the obligation to balance the preacher's didactic aim with rhetorical decorum (suiting a speech to the time, place and people before whom it was delivered). These arguments and their relation to the role of the preacher in the Church are discussed in Chapter IV, on Daniel Featley's 1618 rehearsal sermon *The Spouse her Preтиous Borders*. The rehearsal sermon was an annual event on the Sunday after Easter in which the preacher at Paul's Cross 'rehearsed' (repeated in summary form) the four sermons delivered during Holy Week at Paul's Cross and St. Mary's Spittal. The common theme of these sermons is the preacher's duty to 'rehearse' the fundamentals of faith constantly, a theme consonant with a 'plain style' of preaching. Featley, however, manipulates the decorum of the rehearsal sermon by espousing and practising a complex and learned style. He uses this striking style to defend the learned ministry against the laity, whom he claims are unwilling to support them financially. Ignoring the preacher's duty to teach, however, Featley fails to show what other function rhetoric can serve in the Church, and consequently undermines his own defence of elaborate preaching.

The use of figurative language in the Bible and the interpretation of biblical metaphors is the last feature of preaching rhetoric discussed. This topic is of vital importance to the interpretation of the 'prophetic sermons' commonly preached at Paul's Cross. In these sermons, often termed 'Jeremiads' after their primary source, preachers argued from Old Testament prophecies that the sins of the community would bring God's punishment on the whole nation. These sermons have been scrutinised by many critics for
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evidence of a seventeenth-century belief in a special relationship between God and England, expressed through the comparison between England and Israel on which these sermons are build. In Chapter V, on Thomas Adams' *The Gallant's Burden* (1612), these claims are examined and refuted. The characteristic use of biblical *types* and *examples* in these sermons is scrutinised and the terms on which the comparison between England and Israel is made are defined. The Israelite nation was interpreted by exegetes both *typically* (of the elect) and *exemplarily* (of any nation). This chapter argues that in Paul's Cross prophetic sermons, Israel's fate is presented as an *example* to chide the nation for its sins.

The five chapters in this thesis, therefore, deal with the most basic principles of preaching rhetoric. During the sixteenth century, sacred rhetoric developed a classification of *genera, dispositio* and rules of ornamentation distinct from those of classical rhetoric and conditioned by the preacher's unusual relationship to his hearers and his text. These basic categories have not, as yet, been investigated; consequently they are a central concern of this thesis. Three of the rhetorical principles examined are primarily structural: the division between *exposition* and *application*; the sorts of proof used in *theoretic application*; *practical application* and strategies of *exhortation*. Two are more obviously stylistic in emphasis: the interpretation of allegory and the use of ornament in preaching and, finally, the interpretation of *types* and the use of *examples*. Yet in all these, rhetorical techniques show that structure and ornament are equally regulated by the didactic and hortatory needs of the preacher. Structure, style, subject and context all need to be considered together if we are to understand the preacher's aim. A sermon is an argument that begins with a text from Scripture and concludes with an *exhortation* to the hearers to adopt its conclusion. Sampling tropes or subjects (still the most common method of analysis) means that we lose sight of the coherence of each sermon. This thesis, by examining fundamentals of preaching rhetoric in operation through a sample of Jacobean sermons, aims to correct this.

Adopting this strategy has meant choosing to neglect other important issues. No attempt is made here to trace the development of themes or *commonplaces* (or often in preaching rhetoric, *proof-texts*) over time. A sample of sermons over a longer time-span and
on a particular subject would be necessary for such a study. Before the rhetorical fundamentals of preaching are more fully understood, such a study would be premature. A study based around the evolution of *commonplaces* and manipulation of *proof-texts* would make an important contribution to our understanding of the relationship between rhetoric and society. Where *proof-texts* or *commonplaces* used at Paul's Cross have been identified, all the sermons in which they occur are referred to in the notes. These rather lengthy inclusions are intended as a first step towards a fuller, *commonplace*-based study of London preaching.

Another subject neglected in this thesis is the biographies of the individual preachers. No attempt is made to categorise the preachers according to their ecclesiastical affiliations or to group preachers according to perceived similarities in style. Such distinctions do exert an influence on the subjects chosen and styles used by preachers, but they are rarely the governing principle of a sermon at Paul's Cross. A Patristic interpretation of a text or the 'common gloss' known to all preachers can often be of greater relevance to the basic rhetorical analyses now needed than a knowledge of an individual preacher's political opinions. These shared interpretations can easily be traced in the marginal references of sermons, in the printed volumes of annotations and concordances to the Bible and in preaching handbooks. Tracing *proof-texts* through a restricted sample of text also demonstrates that preachers inhabited the same literary community to a greater extent than is often stated in modern studies.

It has also been necessary to a large extent to ignore the auditory of these sermons. Although the writings of diarists and manuscript note-takers help us reconstruct contemporary reactions to these sermons, finding such anecdotal evidence is haphazard. Searching for such responses would not, in any case, contribute to the reconstruction of ideologies through the interpretation of literature that is the goal of the historicist critic. It is to this end that the study of rhetoric has been used. Finally, it should be explained that this thesis tacitly assumes little difference between the sermon as it was preached and as it was printed. This is, of course, not strictly speaking true. The aspects of the sermons discussed, however, relate primarily to *inventio*, either the structural or interpretative foundations of the
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oration, which did not change between the pulpit and the press. In any case, the degree of
difference between the text delivered in the pulpit and through the press may not be great.
Some preachers clearly state that the printed sermon was as close to the original oration and
it may be argued that contemporaries assumed the printed text was a record of the oration
and so any differences would be pointed out. Many early modern texts, especially dramatic
ones, are equally unstable. This does not deter us from the study of plays, nor should it
deter us from studying printed sermons.

The importance of the Bible to Jacobean society is axiomatic. The written
Word, however, reached the majority of people mediated by the preacher, because it was at
sermons that the infallible guide of Scripture was explained and applied to contemporary
circumstances. Preaching involved both an act of interpretation and of persuasion: of
opening, or revealing the meanings of a biblical text and of using that interpretation to
influence the hearers’ actions and attitudes. Because preachers employed the techniques of
formal rhetoric in their efforts to persuade, the rhetorical systems used by them offers the
modern scholar a means of investigating the effects they sought to create in their hearers.
Consequently, the study of these rhetorical systems can help the modern critic bridge the
gap between seventeenth-century writing and the political and cultural context into which it
was designed to intervene. At the moment, our understanding of the rhetorical techniques
used by preachers is too slight to substantiate these claims fully. It is hoped, however, that
this thesis will show that the study of printed sermons can provide us with uniquely valuable
insights into early modern English society and the functions of sacred rhetoric within it.

18Daniel Donne informs his readers that ‘from the Beginning of’ his printed sermon ‘to the 52. Page, I
preached it word for word as it is printed’, but that lack of time meant the rest of the printed sermon was
given only ‘a briefe Paraphrastical Explication’ in the pulpit: A sub-poena from the star-chamber of
heaven (1623), sig. n4r. In publishing his sermon, William Holbrooke claims to have kept ‘as neere as I
can to the very words I used in the preaching of it, without addition or detraction’: Loves complaint, for
want of entertainment (1610?), sig. A4r. The same claim is made by Thomas Bilson, The effect of certain
sermons, sgs. A4v-B1r. Miles Mosse apologises that ‘all things are not here exactly set downe, in that
order and forme in which they were delivered’ because he did not have his notes in the pulpit. When
writing the sermon out, however, he followed ‘the method by which I had in short notes digested my
meditations’: Justifying and Saving Faith (1613), sgs. f12 r-v.
CHAPTER ONE

Political Preaching: John Donne at Paul's Cross and the 1622 Directions concerning Preachers

St. Paul's Cross is often thought of as the site where the efforts of England's monarchs to 'tune' the pulpits for political ends is most apparent. A glance at the Register of sermons preached there, however, shows that monarchs were less than completely successful in this aim. Although the Bishop of London appointed preachers to Paul's Cross, he could not be certain that, once standing in the pulpit, the preacher would say nothing inflammatory. ¹

During the early 1620s, preachers used Paul's Cross to criticise the King's policies more frequently and more forthrightly than at any other time in James' reign. On December 1620 a 'young fellow' spoke about the Spanish Match, contrary to the Bishop of London's orders, and on February 25, 1621, John Everard did the same and was imprisoned in the Gatehouse. In 1622, two preachers, a Mr Clayton and Richard Sheldon, were imprisoned for sermons which embarrassed the King in his negotiations with Spain, as did a sermon by a Mr. Wilson of March 30, 1623. ² In spite of the best efforts of the hierarchy to ensure that only the orthodox and conformable preached there, Paul's Cross was as effective as a platform for opposition as for support of government policies. The auditors would not, then, automatically recognise the preacher as a representative of the civil authorities when he stood in the pulpit, and his sermon would not have been immediately considered a statement of government policy. Preachers were undoubtedly called upon to defend government

¹It appears to be an innovation of William Laud, while Bishop of London, to insist that those he appointed to preach at Paul's Cross provided a copy of the sermon before they preached. Millar MacLure reprints Laud's letter appointing a preacher to Paul's Cross and suggests that this as 'rather an indication of Laud's tight discipline than of general practice in the past: The Paul's Cross Sermons (1958), p. 13. The letter is Rawl. MS D. 399, f. 115r. No letters appointing preachers for the Elizabethan or Jacobean period have been located, but three from the early Tudor period have been found. Two are to Matthew Parker, the first from Thomas Cromwell ([1537]), the second from Nicholas Ridley ([1556?]): Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 114, items 129 and 133. The letter from Cromwell is reprinted in Correspondence of Matthew Parker, ed. John Bruce and T. Perowne (1853), pp. 5-6. The third letter is from Dr. Haynes and the addressee is unknown. Internal evidence suggests a date of 1534: Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 106, item 68. In none of these letters is the preacher asked, or commanded, to have a copy of his sermon ready beforehand.

actions at Paul's Cross. Nonetheless, their primary duty in that pulpit was to preach the word of God to the edification of the hearer to salvation. This chapter will examine the political sermons delivered from Paul's Cross during James I's reign to see how preachers reconciled delivering God's word with promulgating the king's commands. Particular attention will be paid to John Donne's sermon of the fifteenth of September 1622, his second appearance at the Cross, in which he delivered an overtly political sermon on a subject with serious repercussions for preachers.\(^3\)

On the fourth of August 1622, James had promulgated his Directions concerning Preachers, and in September, Donne was called to Paul's Cross to defend the king's actions.\(^4\) The sermon was greeted by James as an accurate defence of his Directions. When the Earl of Carlisle (the former Viscount Doncaster whom Donne had accompanied to the Continent in 1619), returned Donne's copy of the sermon, he reported that the king called it 'a piece of such perfection as could admit neither addition nor diminution' and that James 'longs to see it in print as concerning highly his service'. The sermon was printed with no delay, being entered in the Stationers' Register on October 31, 1622. It was the first of Donne's sermons to be published and one of only six published singly. It proved either popular or newsworthy, as it went through three issues in that year, and was included in the collections of three, four and five sermons printed between 1623 and 1626.

This sermon has been seen by some modern critics of Donne as an example of his sacrificing conscience to expediency by supporting 'absolutist' monarchical politics. Although critics have frequently referred to this sermon, there is no full study of the sermon which examines whether Donne simply accedes to the demands of authority or whether he

\(^3\)All quotations from this sermon are taken from The Sermons of John Donne, eds Potter and Simpson (P&S from henceforth) vol. IV (1958), no. 7, pp. 178-209. References are to page numbers in this edition. References to other Donne's sermon are from Potter and Simpson's edition, giving volume, item and page numbers. This sermon was originally published in 1622 as A Sermon upon the XV verse of the XX chapter of Judges. Preached at the Cross (1622). The sermon was reissued twice in that year, the last issue correcting the reference to the text of the sermon. It was reprinted in Three sermons upon speciall occasions (1623), Foure sermons upon speciall occasions (1625) and Five sermons upon speciall occasions (1626). It was not printed in the folio editions of Donne's sermons: see Evelyn M. Simpson, A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne (1948), p. 274.

integrates these demands with a fuller sense of the preacher's duty within the Church. Rather than view the sermon as an example of Donne's preaching alone, it will be examined here in the context of preaching at Paul's Cross. By comparing Donne's performance with other political sermons, the accommodation between Scripture, monarch and auditory developed by preachers for sermons with a political theme can be seen more clearly and Donne's performance in relation to these demands can be set in context.

II

Preaching manuals of the seventeenth century offer little advice on preaching a political sermon. In fact, using the pulpit to deliver political statements could be considered a misuse of the preacher's role. In The defense of the aunswere to the Admonition, John Whitgift accuses the Puritan Thomas Cartwright of having 'slandered both the Prince & the whole state of religion, in this Churche by publike authoritie established' by suggesting that 'princes pleasures' as well as 'mens devises, Popish ceremonies and Antichristian rites' were defended from the pulpit. Yet the evidence from Paul's Cross clearly shows that the pulpit was used to defend 'princes pleasures'. Accession day sermons, sermons commemorating the Gowrie conspiracy and the Gunpowder plot were annual occasions on which the preachers repeated the lessons of the Homily of Obedience - stable monarchy is a blessing, and

5R.C. Bald writes that Donne was 'at least in part, in sympathy with the King's directions', which he interprets as effectively stifling opposition to the king's policies, but that Donne's sermon 'scarcely touches the real issues' by presenting the Directions as 'unexceptionable': John Donne: A Life (1970), pp. 433-5. A more extreme statement is made by John Carey, who writes that 'Donne, the absolutist, was stirred by the image of numinous majesty, scattering opposition as the sun disperses clouds': John Donne: Life, Mind and Art (1981, repr. 1990), p. 102. Although she does not refer to this sermon in particular, Debora Kuller Shuger describes Donne's politics and theology as absolutist, where both king and God hold absolute power uncircumcibred by law: Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance (1990), pp. 159-210, esp. pp. 159-168. A fairer assessment of the political stance taken by Donne in his poetry and prose is given by David Norbrook and Annabel Patterson: Norbrook, 'The Monarchy of Wit and the Republic of Letters', in Soliciting Interpretation, eds Harvey and Maus (1990), pp. 3-36, p. 22; Annabel Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation (1984) pp. 106-108; 'All Donne', in Soliciting Interpretation, pp. 37-66 and 'John Donne, Kingsman?', in The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, ed. Levy Peck (1991), pp. 251-272. The most historically sensitive work on Donne's sermons is that of Jeanne Shami and Lori Ann Ferrell. Shami in particular examines the means by which Donne 'negotiates' a 'voice' between unquestioning obedience and non-conforming protest: Jeanne Shami 'Reading Donne's Sermons', John Donne Journal, 11 (1992), and 'Kings and Desperate Men: John Donne Preaches at Court', John Donne Journal, 6 (1987). In 'Kings and Desperate Men', Shami rightly states that Donne's sermons on the Directions revolves around the idea of order, but that there is a 'balance of law with discretion', p. 16. Lori Ann Ferrell, 'Donne and His Master's Voice, 1615-1625', John Donne Journal, 11, (1992), 59-70, p. 67. 6John Whitgift, The defense of the aunswere to the Admonition (1574), sig. 3A3v, p. 558.
England was blessed in its government. Preachers were clearly expected to comment on public events in their sermons. In the 1622 sermon on the Gunpowder Plot, that he preached at Paul’s Cross, John Donne repeatedly insists that his duty that day was to apply his text ‘to the day’ (P&S IV no. 9, p. 248). In appearing at Paul’s Cross, however, the preacher did not simply deliver a proclamation of government policy; rather, he delivered an argument whose starting point was Scripture. The difficult task for preachers delivering sermons on public issues was negotiating between the human and divine authorities by which they spoke. Various rhetorical strategies were developed to accommodate these functions.

Political preaching was not recognised as a genus of either sacred or secular rhetoric, although secular rhetoric recognised that debating political issues was one of the primary uses of the deliberative genus. In English preaching theory, political subjects were treated as a use or application of the sermon’s doctrine to the ‘life and manners’ of the hearers in an ‘instructive’ sermon on any subject. The definitions of these terms is best found through a brief examination of the classification of sermons by English and Continental preaching theorists. The classifications of sermon genera used by English preachers developed during the sixteenth century as preaching theorists sought scriptural rather than classical authority for sacred rhetoric. A scheme using 2 Timothy 3.16 (‘All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness’) and Romans 15.4 (‘For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope’) slowly evolved during the century. This may show the influence of Erasmus’ insistence that the role of the preacher was to teach, persuade, exhort, console, counsel and admonish (although he does not actually cite the Pauline texts). The reclassification proper began with Melanchthon’s De officiis concionatoris (1529). Melanchthon invented the ‘didactic’ genus of sermon (which he compared to forensic rhetoric), and compared ‘epitreptic’ (encouraging faith) and ‘paraenetic’ (exhorting to virtue) sermons to deliberative rhetoric. Bartholomew Keckermann classified sermons according to the classical genera but described the functions of preaching (to move the affections to love of God and hatred of sin, &c.) in Pauline terms. Hyperius of Marburg, however, vigorously
dismissed attempts to import the classical *genera* to sacred rhetoric and insists that 'the Apostle Paule of all Preachers the Lode star' defined the *genera* in 2 Timothy 3.16. Neils Hemmingsen used this text for a similar classification. John Alsted compromised by citing the classical *genera* as 'remote' categories but cited 2 Timothy 3.16 and Romans 15.4 for their 'immediate' functions. With minor differences in presentation, then, these writers agreed on five *genera* of sermons - the *didactic*, the *redarguative* (confutational), *institutional* (exhortatory), *corrective* (dehortatory) and *consolatory*. They did recognise that the categories were not mutually exclusive and admitted that there was a 'mixed' type of sermon in which practical applications were included in didactic sermons.⁷

Seventeenth-century English writers spoke rather in terms of the separate functions of rhetoric within a sermon (to teach, to exhort, and so on). Therefore, in English rhetorics, correction, instruction and consolation are treated as *uses*. Political topics were generally considered a *use* (or *application*) of the text in the 'instructive' type of sermon. The general aim of the *application* is to apply the doctrines abstracted from the text to the lives of the hearers; the various *uses* of the doctrine showed the way in which it could be applied, for example, to comfort the penitent, to refute errors or to dissuade from vice. The hearers were persuaded to adopt the virtues detailed in the *doctrines* of the text, partly by being presenting with models for imitation,⁸ partly through arguments for the virtue itself.

The use of models for imitation was a development from the *commonplaces of argument* of

---


⁸On 'commemorative strategies', including the use of *encomia* to present models of piety, see Jessica Martin, 'Izaak Walton and his Precursors: A Literary Study of the Emergence of the Ecclesiastical Life' (University of Cambridge Ph.D., 1993), pp. 6-40.
demonstrative rhetoric; in exhorting to the virtue itself, the arguments from utility and
honour of deliberative rhetoric were employed. In The practis of preaching, the translation
of Hyperius of Marburg's preaching manual, the deliberative and demonstrative genera of
oratory are put within the 'instructive' type of sermon and under the 'use of persuasion'
through exhortation and imitation:

To the kind Instructive doe appertaine al those thinges in especially which the
Rethoricians have placed in the kinde deliberative. For perswasions, exhortations,
admonitions, no man perceyveth not to tend to the right information of mans lyfe in
righteousnesse, lyke as we have above also declared. Further, those thinges that be
peculiar to the kinde demonstrative & encomiastical, shall be reduced to this forme.
For when it falleth out that there is praised in the ecclesiastical assembly, either some
person, as Abraham, Job: ... or any thing els, as bountifulnesse towards the poore,
... no manne doubteth these thinges therefore chiefly to bee done, to the entent the
hearers might be provoked either to the imitation of the lyke in their common trade
of lyfe, or truely to praise and magnyfye God, which would have such notable
thinges accomplished of his chosen.10

Hyperius continues his discussion with the various 'places' of argument for declaring 'any
thing to be just, godly, praise worthy, necessary', in which his emphasis on 'utilitie' and
praiseworthiness shows the influence of classical deliberative oratory.

In exhortations and encomia, however, the preacher is restricted by his text.
Because his arguments are employed only as a means of persuading the hearers to make
'use' of the doctrines propounded, they are determined by the text and are reliant on it for
verification. The purpose of argumentation in sacred rhetoric is not merely to show that
something is laudable or useful, but that its laudability and usefulness can be demonstrated
from Scripture. As Niels Hemmingsen writes, in preaching only arguments proved by
Scripture are irrefutable:

There is a three fould kinde of proofes in Divinity. The first and most safest kind, is
when proofe is brought out of the evident and cleare propositions of the Scripture.
... The second kind is reasoning as oftentimes as it is not pronounced by plaine

9The topics, or commonplaces of argument, were headings for the types of argument which the speaker
could apply to a particular issue. Cicero described them as the 'seats' of arguments: literally, the 'places' in
the memory from which arguments could be taken and applied to particular circumstances: Cicero, Topica
II.8, trans. Harry Caplan (1949; repr. 1993), pp. 386-7. Although Cicero claims that he is following
Aristotle, his treatise emphasises means of 'inventing' convincing arguments at the expense of Aristotle's
discussion of valid reasoning by enthymemes in his Topica. It was Cicero's description of the
commonplace which was most prevalent in the Renaissance: W.S. Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in
England (1956), pp. 15-17; Walter Ong, S.J., Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue (1958), pp. 60-
61, 102-3. Defining exhortation and dehortation as uses aiming at the hearers' affections, William
Chappell details the various commonplaces that provide arguments as motives and means 'to the object of
hope, which is, a future, sublime or difficult, possible good': William Chappell, The Preacher (1656),
sigs. IIv-K6r, pp. 188-203. On the use of commonplaces in exhortation, see chapter three, pp. 100-105.
10Hyperius, The practis of preaching, sigs. U6v-U7r, f. 150v-151r.
woordes, but is gathered by a stronge and unmovable consequence. ... The thirde kinde is, of lesse reputation, when we laboure in the testimonies, & examples of them, which seme to have flourished in the church, which kinde is disproved, if it be deprived of the former proofes.

The testimony (or 'witness') of Scripture for any argument rendered it sound, because the strength of testimony, as proof, rested on the credit and authority of the witness. As the 'witness' in Scripture was God, proofs from Scripture were necessarily true. As the preacher begins his sermon with the truth set out in his text, however, anything which is not proved out of that text, or other parts of Scripture, is of less argumentative force, because it is supported by a weaker 'proof' than the witness of Scripture. In applying his text, therefore, the preacher's task was to relate his themes to the text on which he preached. The arguments by which he exhorted his hearers to adopt that advice were meant only to bring home to the hearers the guidance provided by Scripture to the matter in hand. Therefore, the application of the text delivered advice on social and political matters by connecting the text to contemporary circumstances.

The application of the text to the lives of the hearers was principally described by preaching theorists as the means of promoting godliness in the individual hearer. Many other themes, however, could claim inclusion in the application, as they pertained to the community at large as well as to individual Christians. Hyperius writes that such an application of the text to the needs of the Church or the times was to be encouraged:

For the tractation of what place soever thou shalt judge to be most profitable and necessary either to the state of the Church, or to the tyme and causes incident, in the

---

11Niels Hemmingsen, *The Preacher*, sigs. G6r-v, ff. 46r-v. On testimony, human and divine (as found in Scripture) and its use as proofs in argument, see Thomas Granger *Syntagma logicum* (1620), sigs. 2D3r-2E4r, pp. 223-233.

12When William Ames pronounces that the 'use and application' should ordinarily be the part of the sermon most insisted on, his reason is that the men's minds 'doe more difficultly admit nothing, nor doth their condition require any thing more, then the effectuall accommodation of the Word, to the subjection of the conscience in all things to the will of God': Ames, *Conscience, with the cases and power thereof* (1639), sig. 2K3r, p. 77 (3rd. pag.). Thomas Granger insists on the application of scripture from 'this practise of the Prophet ...whether of commandement; exhortation, admonition, reproufe, &c. to those to whom they are sent, whether it be a kingdome, to a particular people, or to private men', primarily for the conversion of sinners, who will not see their sins unless the preacher 'applies' his text to particular abuses: Granger, *The application of scriptures* (1616) sig. A3v, p. 2. By 'particular application' Granger does not mean the denunciation of individuals from the pulpit (a practice universally condemned): see sig. D1r, p. 21.
illustration thereof chiefly, beyonde the rest, thou shalt employ thy dilligent labour, and also endeouer thy selue to move the affections of the hearers. 13

As examples of this, he cites exhortations to 'liberalitie', which 'induce the myndes of the hearers to bountifullnesse, and 'compassion towards the poore' at times when corn is scarce and 'charitie is very colde'. When people are 'given to drounkennesse and excesse', the preacher should, 'if there happen any wher in the Sermon a place of sobrietie and temperance, or agaynst superfluitie', 'tary' at that theme to 'styrre up the affections of the hearers, that they may both covet sobrietie and abandon excesse'. This strategy of creating an analogy with the particulars of a biblical text was the most common means to connect the text to the circumstances of the sermon, as it made the application arise directly from the explication of the text. The application, therefore, made the text topical, and the events narrated from the Bible gave scriptural authority to the preacher's interpretation of contemporary affairs.

The effect of these principles for political preaching can be seen from the sermons preached at Paul's Cross on occasions such as the anniversary of the Gowrie conspiracy, the Gunpowder plot and the accession of James I. The following section of this chapter will analysis these sermons to determine the most common strategies used by preachers to incorporate political themes in the applications of their sermons. This will provide us with the correct context for judging John Donne's performance in his sermon on the Directions concerning Preachers.

Preachers commonly incorporated their topic material and their praise of James with the explication of the text by developing an analogy between biblical exemplars and their modern counterparts. In his 1608 sermon on the Gunpowder Plot, Robert Tynley, Archdeacon of Ely, describes the Church on earth as surrounded by enemies. 14 He derives five points from his long text (Psalm 124. 1-8) relating to this: the subtlety of the enemies

---

13Hyperius, The practis of preaching, sgs. G1v-G2r, ff. 41v-42r. In 1596, Archbishop Whitgift circulated a letter ordering preachers to exhort their flocks in this way. The government having taken measures to prevent the scarcity of corn worsening, it was the preacher's task, 'forasmuch as this covetous humoure doth growe chiefly by want of that christian charity, which all men ought to have', to 'admonish the farmers, and owners of corne' in their sermons 'of this dishonest and unchristian kinde of seeking gain by oppression of their poor neighbours, and recommend to the richer sorte keeping of hospitality, for the relief of the poore': Documentary Annals, ed. Cardwell (1839) vol. II, p. 36.

14Robert Tynley, A sermon preached at Paules Crosse, in Two learned sermons preached the one at Paules Crosse the 5 of November, 1608, the other at the Spittle the 17. of April, 1609 (1609).
of the Church; their cruelty; their wrath; that God delivers the Church; and that the Church
has a duty to praise him for this. The first three points are developed by drawing
comparisons between the sufferings of the Israelites, of Christ, and of the ancient Church
with those of the Church of England, surrounded by the Popish enemy who is constantly
seeking to overthrow it by direct assault or by treason. He presents the last two points as the
application of the text to the particular day commemorated in his sermon:

I will fould up in a word, by way of application to our selves: whom as God hath
made examples of his mightie power, no nation under heaven more, in delivering us
out of the hands of our enemies, both from the Snares of secret treacheries, and
from the open violence of their intended cruelties: so there is no people in the world
more obliged to the duetie of praise and thankes-giving to the Lord (sig. Elv, p.
26).

Taking the national Church, of which all his hearers were members, as his
theme allowed Tynley combine his public theme with the 'edification' of the individual
Christian. In most cases, however, different means of achieving both these ends had to be
found. In John Donne's accession day sermon of 1617, on Proverbs 22.11 ('He that loveth
pureness of heart, for the grace of his lips, the King shall be his friend'), the first half of the
sermon explains the 'pureness' and 'grace' expected of the Christian and what it means to
have the friendship of a king. When he starts to apply his text (the 'accommodatio ad Diem',
as noted in the margin), he begins with an encomium to England's king, who is the friend of
the pure in heart:

Now, Beloved, as we are able to interpret some places of the Revelation, better then
the Fathers could do, because we have seen the fulfilling of some of the Prophecies
of that book, which they did but conjecture upon; so we can interpret and apply this
Text by way of accommodation the more usefully, because we have seen these
things performed by those Princes whom God hath set over us ... for, Gods hand
hath been abundant towards us, in raising Ministers of State, so qualified, and so
endowed; and such Princes as have fastned their friendships, and conferred their
favors upon such persons. We celebrate, seasonably, opportune, the thankful
acknowledgement of these mercies, this day (P&S I, pp. 216-7).

This approach resulted in a twin application. There are particular duties which the Christian
must fulfil, such as pureness of heart, and there are public duties which the people as a
Church must fulfil, which in political sermons are invariably the duties to praise God for
protecting his people and to pray for their wise rulers.
This division of public and private applications, one undertaken in the explication of the text, the other by exhortation and exemplary encomia in the application, is most clearly seen in sermons on the Gowrie conspiracy, where the division between explication and application forms the structuring principle of the sermon. Generally in these sermons, the first half of the oration deals with the text in abstract terms, the second half applies the text to the events of the conspiracy. The most common way to connect the events of the Gowrie conspiracy with biblical paradigms was to begin by separating the sermons' two themes, biblical and contemporary, and expounding the biblical paradigm first, in the explication. The application could then be used to show the applicability of the text to the events of the conspiracy by retelling the story of the conspiracy in a way that created a thematic connection. In the final exhortation, the two themes are reunited, so that the hearers can be exhorted to praise God for an escape proved providential and the preacher's praise of the king is shown to have scriptural endorsement. This retelling of the story of James' escape also served to familiarise the hearers with these events, as the conspiracy itself happened in 1600, in Scotland. In order to show that the failure of the conspiracy provided an example of God's care for the English, it was necessary that the hearers be familiar with the events, especially according to the providential reading of them provided by the preachers.

This separating of explication and application, with the application used to prove the applicability of the text, is also invariably used by preachers on other topics where events with which the hearers may not have been familiar were to be narrated, and narrated in such a way that they could be given the endorsement of scriptural paradigms. This sort of division is used by William Barlow, chaplain to Queen Elizabeth and later Bishop of Lincoln, in both of the political sermons he preached at Paul's Cross: the first on the Essex rebellion, the second on the Gunpowder plot. In each sermon, he separates the discussion of his text

15 Of sermons preached between 1603 and 1625 on the anniversary of the Gowrie conspiracy (5 August), the following were printed: John Milwarde, Jacob's great day of trouble and deliverance. A sermon (1610), preached in 1607; Samuel Purchas, The kings towre and triumphant arch of London. A sermon (1623), preached in 1622; Thomas Adams, The Temple, in Works (1630), preached in 1624 and Barten Holyday, A sermon preached at Paul's Cross (1626), preached in 1625.
16 This strategy was also used by preachers of funeral sermons, who were discouraged from praising the dead and needed to reconcile the different aims of exhortation and commemoration: Jessica Martin, 'Izaak Walton and his Precursors', pp. 16-31.
from his discussion of the circumstances of his oration. Dealing with the latter purely in the
application, he can narrate the events in a way that connects them to the scriptural text. By
showing the relevance of the one to the other, he emphasises the heinousness of both
treasonous acts because they directly contradict the precepts of Scripture.\textsuperscript{17} Such an
approach could also be employed on topics which related neither to the fundamentals of
religion nor the safety of the state. Henry King, for example, treated his text in this way in
his sermon condemning rumours that his father, Bishop John King, converted to Rome on
his death-bed. The sermon, on John 15.20 ("Remember the word that I said unto you, the
servant is not greater then the Lord: If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute
you"), first describes the hierarchical order by which the 'servant is not greater then the Lord'
and infers from this that as Christ was persecuted in body and in reputation, so his followers
will be persecuted. The Disciples are the primary examples of this, but another is King's
father, and the second half of the sermon details John King's final days as the means of
confuting the rumours about his conversion. There is a double application of the sermon,
one placed in the explication (that Christians must be prepared to meet afflictions (sig. F4r,
p. 39)) and the second in the application of the theme to John King (against believing the
false reports of slanderers (sig. L1v, p. 74)). The text of the sermon itself is shown to give
the strongest proof against believing such rumours, so that, in his final exhortation, King can
integrate the two applications made from it in his sermon:

Lastly, that none may wonder, or be perplexed, or through a nice misprision suspect
there could not but bee some ground for this farre-blowne Catumnie, let him but
\textit{[Remember the word that Christ sayd,]} and what \textit{He} Suffered, and then all wonder
will end in satisfaction. For who can thinke it strange that \textit{Christs servants}
are slandered, when \textit{Hee their Lord and Master} could not avoyd the poysoned breath of
\textit{slander}?\textsuperscript{18}

John King himself preached two sermons at Paul's Cross on topical issues,
where he also employed this separation of explication and application.\textsuperscript{19} Most interestingly,

\textsuperscript{17}William Barlow, \textit{The sermon preached at Paules Crosse ... the next Sunday after the Discoverie of this
late Horrible Treason (1606); A sermon preached at Paules Cross ...with a short discourse of the late Earle
of Essex (1601).}
\textsuperscript{18}Henry King, \textit{A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse ... touching the supposed apostacie of ... John King,
late Lord Bishop of London (1621),} sigs. L2r-v, pp. 75-6. (The parenthesis of citation is King's). This
\textsuperscript{19}John King, \textit{A Sermon of publicke thanks-giving (1619); A sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of
Paules Church (1620).}
in his sermon 'on behalfe of Paul's Church', King employs arguments based not on Scripture but on utility and honour, the basic arguments of deliberative rhetoric. He also does not integrate these arguments fully with the *explication* of his text but leaves separate *uses* for both halves, one general and moral, the other specific and financial. The text of the sermon is Psalm 102. 13-14 ('Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Sion, for the time to favour her, yea the set time is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof'). In the first part of his sermon, King discusses God's mercy to men and in particular to the Israelites. They were punished for their sins by the destruction of the Temple, and so King exhorts his hearers to seize God's mercy when it is offered to them.

The second part of his *explication* deals with the duty of mercy belonging to men, who must follow God's lead. The particular example of this in the text is the rebuilding of the Temple when God showed that the 'set time' for this work had come. This forms the link to the *application* of the sermon: that true Christians must show their opposition to atheists, who account 'the houses of God, common and profane', by showing their love to the house of God. Such love, King claims, will be demonstrated in action. The time for this action has now been appointed by the king, the commanding voice 'next to heaven' whose presence at the sermon shows that the preacher has no 'common message' of 'Moses or Christ, Law or gospel' such as is preached 'every Sabbath day, out of this chaire' (sigs. E4r-v, pp. 31-32).

This extraordinary message from the king refers to the text of the sermon because it pertains to another Sion or temple which needs rebuilding:

> I am now to speake unto you, from Him, and in His name, of an other Sion, (neerer by far then that in Iudaea, we are under the bower of it) a literall and artificiall Sion, a Temple without life and motion, yet of a sickly and crazie constitution, sicke of age it selfe, and with many aches in hir joynts (sig. F2r, p. 35).

But there is not such a simple correlation between the Temple in his text and the temple for which he appeals. The Temple of Sion was interpreted as a *type* of the Christian Church, so that whatever was said in the Old Testament regarding the Temple applied to the invisible Church, and each believing soul in it, rather than to individual churches. God's commands to the Jews concerning the Temple in Jerusalem did not apply to Christian churches in the same way. In *Solomon's Porch*, a sermon preached at Paul's Cross,
William Westerman shows the qualifications the preacher need to include in any comparison between the Temple of Jerusalem and Christian churches:

But it may bee some will except, that the *house* of God in *Salomons* time, & the Houses of God now, do differ, ... For answer to which objection, may it please you to understand, that there is indeede a difference, because three *Resemblances* of the Temple are now sucreased and determined. For first, as the 'Temple figured Christ Jesus, and had those particular priviledges, that all must *repaire* unto it, ... Secondly, as it was a visible representation of the *Church Catholique*, now beleved of us (though not seen). ... Thirdly, the Necessity is sucreased, as the Temple represented every *Sanctified beleever*, whose Soule and body is nowe made a consecrated *Temple* of the living God. ... Now in these three former Representations, the necessity of one peculiar place, is not remayning.\(^{20}\)

Christian churches are 'convenient places' for people to gather so 'that unity and unifomity might be nourished, publike prayers used, the Law read and expounded'. They are not inherently holy in the way that the Temple in Jerusalem was holy, but are holy only because of the holy uses to which they are put.

In the light of this, we can clearly see why King should base his appeal on behalf of St. Paul's Cathedral not on a duty to follow the example provided by his text, but on the grounds of honour and utility. Firstly, King outlines the history of the cathedral, its first builders and its pious benefactors since then. That a church enriched by so many in times of ignorance should be allowed to collapse at a time when 'the light of the Gospell shineth' would be a disgrace to the nation. The honour of the city is at stake too, for if, amid all the good works and public building sponsored by the citizens (and detailed in the sermon), the Cathedral goes unrepaired, then 'there is yet one thing wanting vnto you', without which all else is useless (sig. G3v, p. 46). Not only is the repair of the cathedral a question of honour for the city, it is also a matter of utility, for the cathedral is the church for the entire city, 'your *Sion* indeed', where parish churches are 'but *Synagogues*', and so it is the natural place for the whole city to join in prayer (sigs. G3v-G4r, pp. 46-47). King then exhorts his hearers to support this appeal by stressing the extraordinary virtue of James in setting about this work and in condescending to attend this sermon at the Cross to make this petition through the preacher.

\(^{20}\)William Westerman, *Salomons porch* (1608), sigs. F2r-F3r, pp. 89-91. The date of this sermon's delivery is not known. See also Thomas Adams, *The Temple*, in *Works* (1630), sigs. 4O6v-4Pv, pp. 970-972.
By separating his *explication* of the text from the *application*, therefore, King can argue for a particular course of action which he could not claim to be inherent in his text. He argues that the appeal for the repair of St. Paul's should be supported on the grounds of utility and honour, the *commonplaces* of deliberative rhetoric, and can exhort his hearers to follow the pattern of piety in this set by the King, the pattern for epideictic rhetoric, and he does both within the *application* of the text, as allowed by preaching precepts. As his *application* clearly does not concern the fundamentals of religion, this allows him to present his theme without 'wresting' Scripture or misinterpreting it for political purposes. Yet, by including his appeal for St. Paul's as a topical *application* of the text, he can nonetheless present his appeal as something commended in Scripture; it fits the pattern of the biblical characters' actions, even if their actions do not necessarily provide a rule to follow. This scheme for political sermons, therefore, seems to offer the preacher the best accommodation between preaching the Scripture 'purely' (i.e. with a primary concern for the edification of the hearers to salvation) and presenting the hearers with official pronouncements on current events. While some of the events which preachers were called upon to comment, such as the Gunpowder plot, could be presented as analogous to events narrated in the Bible, some, such as John King's appeal for financial support to rebuild St. Paul's Cathedral, could not. The strategy used by preachers in such cases was to separate topics without scriptural precedent from the *explication* and to prove their applicability to the text (and so their connection with scriptural precepts) in a separate *application*, so that the two themes can be united in a final *exhortation*.

III

On an initial reading, John Donne's sermon on King James' *Directions concerning Preachers* seems to follow the scheme outlined above. He divides his sermon into the *explication* and *application* of his text, and in the *application* he presents the justification for the Directions given by James through the archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot. Donne's justification of the Directions, however, was complicated by the circumstances in
which they were promulgated and, in the light of these circumstances, the subtle changes he makes to the typical form of the Paul's Cross political sermon can reveal his understanding of the Directions themselves. Donne takes the Directions to demand complete silence of ministers on the politics of the Spanish Match, but he interprets their details in a way which minimises their impact on preaching in general. He presents them as relating only to good order in the Church, where good order is scripturally prescribed but its administration is the responsibility of the king as he is bound by law and precedent.

In the immediate context of the promulgation of the Directions concerning Preachers, they appeared to many to be an attempt to 'muzzle' the Pulpits from discussing James' unpopular decision to negotiate a 'Spanish Match' for Prince Charles. Even more alarming to many in England, these negotiations went on at a time when James appeared to be doing little to recover the patrimony of his daughter's children in the Palatinate. In August 1620, the Catholic Duke of Bavaria invaded the Palatinate and ousted James' daughter Elizabeth, her husband Frederick and their family. The return of these lands to their Protestant rulers appeared to many in England, including Prince Charles, to be a point of honour and a religious duty. Appearing only two days after the formal suspension of the laws against recusants, the Directions concerning Preachers were seen by those already alarmed by James' foreign policy as the first sign of a plot by the Spanish to manipulate James into fatally weakening the Reformation in England. That public uncertainty over James' willingness to support Protestants abroad was one of the major concerns to be addressed by Donne in his sermon is evident from the letter he sent to Thomas Roe, ambassador in Constantinople, with a copy of the sermon:

... many men, measuring public actions with private affections, have been scandalised [over the Spanish negotiations] and have admitted suspicions of a

22 On the suspension of the recusancy laws, see John Rushworth, Historical Collections of Private Passages of State (1659), sigs. I3r-K1v, pp. 63-6. That contemporaries viewed this as part of the same policy which motivated the Directions concerning Preachers is clear from the diary of Walter Yonge, a Devonshire Squire, who wrote on 19 August 1622 that 'there is a report that Papists shall have toleration here in England, and that the Protestant ministers shall preach but once a Sabbath.' Six days later, confirming these reports, he wrote 'quod Deus averat': quoted by Paul S. Scafer, The Puritan Lectureships, p. 61. Thomas Scott, the author of Vox populi, or newes from Spayne ([London?] 1620) presents the silencing of preachers by Star Chamber as part of the plot by Gondomar to quell resistance to Spanish plans to overthrow England: repr. in Somers Collection of Tracts (1809), vol. II, pp. 508-524, pp. 520-1.
tepidness in very high place. Some Civil Acts, in favour of the Papists, have been with some precipitation, over-dangerously misapplied too. It is true there is a major proposition, but the conclusion is too soon made, if there be not a minor too. I know to be sorry for some things that are done (it is sorry that our times are over taken with necessity to do them) proceeds of true zeal, but to conclude the worst upon the first degree of ill is a distilling with too hot a fire. One of these occurrences gave the occasion to this sermon, which by commandment I preached, and which I send your Lordship.23

In a letter to his friend Henry Goodyer, Donne writes as one assured that his task was performed well, that the people 'received comfortable assurance of his Majesties constancy in Religion and of his desire that all men should be bred in the knowledge of such things, as might preserve them from the superstition of Rome'.24 John Chamberlain, however, wrote to Dudley Carleton that the sermon was not such a success. Donne, he said, had chosen 'somewhat a strange text for such a business', 25 Judges 5. 20 ('They fought from Heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera'), a text that does not appear to have been used as a commonplace on preaching.26 Chamberlain also remarked that Donne 'gave no great satisfaction, or as some say spake as if himself were not so well satisfied'. Annabel Patterson sees in this comment, and in Donne's letter to Goodyer, a 'tension between the authorized message of the sermon and its author's actual feelings'.27 Donne's epistle dedicatory could also be read to show Donne's discomfort at being commanded to make an official statement on this topic. Donne had been advised by Viscount Doncaster 28 to dedicate the sermon to Buckingham, which he duly did. Donne states his reasons for this in the epistle dedicatory:

When I would speake to the King, by your Lordships Meanes, I doe: now, when I would speake to the Kingdom, I would do that by your Lordshippes Meanes to: and therefore I am bold to transfer this Sermon to the World, through your Lordships

24 Quoted in P&S IV, p. 34. See Letters to Severall Persons of Honour (1651) (repr., 1977), pp. 231-232, for date, see p. xx1.
25 The Letters of John Chamberlain, ed. McClure, vol. II, p. 451. That Donne chose this text could paradoxically argue for the relative freedom he was allowed in pursuing this topic. When John King preached at St. Paul's Cross on a less controversial topic - the appeal for the repair of St. Paul's Cathedral - he admits that both his topic and his text were chosen for him by the king. He writes: 'The truth is, my text was not taken but given me, though not by a voice from heaven, as that of St. Austins Tolle lege, Tolle lege; yet by a voice from earth, that is next to heaven': John King, A sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church, sigs. E4v-F1r, pp. 32-33.
26 Neither preaching nor order in the Church are referred to in the glosses on this passage in the Geneva Bible or the Julius / Tremellius Latin Bible. Donne's is the only printed sermon preached at Paul's Cross on this text.
27 Annabel Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation, pp. 106-7.
28 This advice was given in the letter returning Donne's copy of his sermon with the king's permission to print quoted above: The Life and Letters of John Donne, ed. Edmund Gosse, vol. II, pp. 160-161.
Donne claims the authority of the Holy Ghost for what he says in the first part of the sermon, and he is responsible to none but his conscience if he preached it badly. When he comes to speak of what 'His Majestie' intended, he uses the authority of the Duke of Buckingham and claims to speak only as the king, not the Holy Ghost, intended. He presents, therefore, a strict division between matters of religion and matters of politics in his sermon. The same rigid division is apparent in the sermon itself, where Donne makes his explication and application as distinct as the globe's two hemispheres:

So the first part of our Text, will bee as that first Hemisphere; all which the ancient Expositors found occasion to note out of these words, will be in that: but by the new discoveries of some humors of men, and rumors of men, we shall have occasion to say somewhat of a second part to. The parts are, first, the Literall, the Historicall sense of the words; And then an emergent, a collaterall, an occasionall sense of them. The explication of the wordes, and the Application, Quid tunc, Quid nunc, how the words were spoken then, How they might be applied now, will be our two parts (P&S IV, p. 181).

The image of the new continent lately discovered is a particularly apt way of introducing an application which could not be said to arise from traditional teachings on the text, for his application can, at best, be seen as a consequence of the teachings of the Church applied to a particular context. Nonetheless, the preacher is entitled to build on the teachings of ancient expositors in applying his text to his time, just as the Fathers applied Scripture to their circumstances. This rigid division serves to separate the different authorities, scriptural and political, by which Donne spoke, and, in presenting a hierarchy of authority, it dissociates the purely administrative orders Donne has been called upon to defend from the absolute orders of God as delivered in Scripture. This division of themes can be made apparent by exposing the argument of Donne's sermon in a summary (see fig 1.).

In the explication of his text, however, Donne does not simply explain the circumstances and context of the verse he has chosen, but makes subtle, yet unmistakable, reference to the controversy surrounding the Spanish Match. Donne begins his explication by stating the subject (contextualised in Scripture) and the argument of his text. In
John Donne's 1622 St. Paul's Cross sermon on Judges V. 20 ('They fought from Heaven; The stars in their courses fought against Sisera') P&S IV. 7.

Opening the Text: Scope (Theme) of the text: God protects his people. Aim of the text: to confute 'murmurers' who mistrust God's power.

Division: Explication: 'the Historical sense of the words', 'Quid tunc' Application: the 'collaterall', 'occasional sense', 'Quid nunc'.

Brief analysis of Judges Chapter V, giving the context of verse 20.

Protestation: Donne is 'farre from giving fire to them that desire warre', but wishes to 'settle them, that suspect Gods power ... to succour those, who... grove under heavie pressures in matter of religion'.

Doctrines: God can fight his battles without the help of man. God chooses the time to fight his battles. God asks for the co-operation of his people. Those who helped God's cause are remembered.

2nd Division: 'War' is now interpreted as spiritual war; the 'munitions' - preaching; the stars - preachers.

Argument for Order: Preaching is necessary: no peace between Truth and Error. Preaching is 'God's ordinance' and must be done 'in order'. Ministers must preach (1 Cor. 9.16), and so they must be 'orderly'. Examples of 'disorders' that make preaching ineffective.

The rules by which the Church is kept 'in order' are given by 'the Head of the Church'.

Argument for the Directions:

(Argument from Honour): James' actions are just. England's rulers since the Reformation exercised this power (example: the Lambeth Articles). James' care for Religion: he wished to prevent defections to Roman or Separatist Churches.

(Argument from Utility): The Directions summarise the Church's doctrine. The use of the catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles and the Homilies; these summarise the Church's doctrine.

Refutation of those who say the Directions will hinder preaching.

Final exhortation: Let us all, clergy and lay, be obedient and orderly in the Church.
contemporary terminology, he gives the *scope* (theme) and *aims* (arguments) of the text to be discussed:

And, in passing through our first, we shall make these steps. First, God can, and sometimes doth effect his purposes by himselfe; entirely, immediatly, extraordinarily, miraculously by himselfe: But yet, in a second place, we shall see, by this story, That he lookes for assistance, for concurrence of second causes, and subordinate meanes: And that therefore, *God* in this *Song of Deborah*, hath provided an honourable commemoration of them, who did assist her cause (P&S IV, pp. 181-2).

Before beginning to discuss his theme, that God works *his own will by his own means or through the weak means of man*, Donne places a caveat on emphasising the 'holy war' described in his text, for although the text, and so his sermon, will deal with God as the 'Lord of Hosts', Donne is 'farre from giving fire to them that desire warre' (p. 182). Peace in this world is a foretaste of peace in the next. The particular war that some seek 'to succour those, who in forraine parts, grone under heavie pressures in matter of *Religion*, or to restore those, who in forraine parts, are devested of their lawfull possessions, and inheritance' (p. 183) is referred to only in general terms which must have been readily understood by the auditors.

Donne then described how God is able to do all things by his own means, and yet how he demands that some part, no matter how small, be done by man. Describing as a *use* of this *doctrine* the precept that all must do something to help God's cause, and so express their faith by their good works, Donne follows the catalogue in Judges chapter five, of those who helped and those who stood back from the fight against Sisera, beginning with princes. Here again, he qualifies what it means to help God's cause by emphasising a quietist politics. Kings aid God not only in personally engaging in wars but, more tellingly, in their 'Meditations for *Peace*' and by the example of peaceful government they give other princes (p. 187). Therefore 'Kings goe many times and are not thanked, because their wayes are not seene' (p. 187). The willingness of the 'governours' of Israel, the 'great Persons' and 'Officers' of the commonwealth, is also qualified by Donne, for their actions must be in accordance with the policy of the king; they 'may not bleed out in any subventions and assistances of such causes under-hand, as are not avowd by the *King*' (p. 188). Their willingness may be 'not *contra* but *praeter* the kings will. Merchants too play their part in defending God's causes; but again, this is only according to the direction given by the king. Donne states
emphatically that there is no particular cause which merchants are being called upon to support:

I am not here to day, to beg a Benevolence for any particular cause on foot now: there is none; but my Errand in this first part is, first to remove jealousies and suspicions of Gods neglecting his businesse, because he does it not at our appointment, and then to promote and advance a disposition, to assist his cause and his glory, in all wayes, which shall bee declar'd to conduce thereunto, whether in his body, by relieving the poore, or in his house by repairing these walls, or in his honour in employments more publique (p. 189).

The use of the word 'benevolence' here reveals the context of Donne's appeal to the city for ordinary charity rather than for extraordinary financial help. The 'Benevolence' of 1620 was a type of extra-parliamentary funding to aid the Palatinate in the form of requests for 'voluntary' contributions made first to nobles, then to the clergy and finally to all subjects. That Donne should stress that no 'benevolence' would be asked in this sermon for any extraordinary cause is in marked contrast to the sermon at Paul's Cross by George Montaigne on June 23 of that year, one of the 'chief points' of which was, according to John Chamberlain, 'touching the benevolences'. By restating his theme of 'tarrying for the magistrate' and addressing it so clearly to the London audience of merchants and citizens, Donne presents his advice as something particularly revelant to them. The role of kings and great men has been explained, but the role of the merchants has been addressed to them as applied advice. According to this construction, then, it is not the great men who are most aggrieved by the apparent neglect of God's cause by the monarch, but the merchants, and so it is from Paul's Cross, the pulpit most readily identified with the city as a corporation of merchants, that Donne addresses this issue.

By not mentioning the political situation between England and Spain and yet pointedly applying to the auditors what he had initially described as purely explicatory material, Donne preaches a quietist course of action to those concerned about the Spanish

---

29 documentary Annals, ed. Cardwell, vol. II, pp. 141-145; Letters of John Chamberlain, ed. McClure, vol. II, p. 443. Some preachers at Paul's Cross did say that the English had an obligation to help their continental co-religionists. In a sermon of 1623, The Love-sick Spouse, John Stoughton writes that a Christian who can see his 'brother Germans in the faith suffering' and not be sorry is a 'sorry Christian' and that Religion 'whispers' to the King that 'Defender of that Faith is a more glorious title then Beauclerk'; John Stoughton Choice sermons preached upon select occasions (1640), sigs. T3r-v, pp. 139-140. Stoughton's sermons were published posthumously, and they are not dated in the printed edition, but two manuscripts of the Paul's Cross sermon, Bodleian MS Rawl. E 148 and Emmanuel College, Cambridge MS no. 96 (shelf-mark I.4.18) both date the sermon to 1623.
Match. As it is presented simply as an explication of the text, Donne also dissociates the controversy over the Spanish Match from that over the Directions concerning Preachers, severing the link between the two which his letters suggested was the reason for his sermon.

He also preaches an example to the clergy of how much silence was enjoined on them in matters of politics - a silence fully in line with the policies of a good king - so that if James ordered silence, a silence loaded in favour of the king's proceedings was the course to be followed by preachers. By presenting the explicatory material as arising naturally from the text and in need of little explanation, Donne presents it as a duty directly and incontrovertibly assigned to the Christian hearers by Scripture. It stands, unlike the section that follows, as a direct command, as pertinent to the religious wars of the seventeenth century as it was for the ancient Israelites. By presenting this advice in the context of a religious war, however, and clearly basing his comparison on religious wars, Donne slyly suggests what James would not then admit: that, however much peace may be wished for, the politics of Europe had become polarised on confessional lines with the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. The cause for which some may desire to fight, and the war which they are ready to support financially, is God's cause and a holy war. Donne's sympathy with the plight of Elizabeth and Frederick and the Protestant cause in Europe is the assumption upon which he bases his explication.

30 Even preachers who followed Donne in silence, but a silence not favouring the kings policy, were questioned. Thomas Cogswell cites two examples from 1622/23 after the Directions were promulgated. John Everard preached a sermon in which he divided his sermon into 'spiritual and political' halves, dealt with the first half and promised to deal fearlessly with the second the next week. He was arrested before the following week's sermon. When Prince Charles was in Spain, Bishop Montaigne ordered the clergy to pray for his safety and no more, and so another minister duly prayed for the Princes safe return 'and no more', for which he was questioned by the bishop. See Thomas Cogswell, The Blessed Revolution, pp. 33, 44. As the author of Tom Tell-Troath points out, even 'by the very choice of their texts' preachers could make their opposition to the king's policy known: Tom Tell-Troath, repr. in The Somers Collection of Tracts, vol. II, pp. 469-492, p. 472. STC gives the suppositional date for this pamphlet as 1630, but the events referred to are clearly those of the early 1620s.

31 On James' reluctance to see the war on the continent as a matter of religion, his anxiety that such a war 'would stir up all Europe' and the implications of this for his domestic and ecclesiastical policy, see Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', Journal of British Studies, 24 (1985), pp. 198-202.

32 Koos Daley has argued that Donne's paraphrase of the Lamentations of Jeremiah can be dated to 1622. She shows how this work and Donne's 1622 Paul's Cross sermon on the anniversary of the Gunpowder plot (on Jeremiah 4.20) reflect Donne's anti-Spanish politics and his fear of the threat to Protestantism presented by the increasing power of the Hapsburg and Spanish monarchies: "And Like a Widdow Thus": Donne, Huyghgs, and the Fall of Heidelberg, John Donne Journal, 10 (1991), 57-69. It is important to remember in this context that the 1619 diplomatic mission by Viscount Doncaster which Donne accompanied was intended to mediate in the Bohemian situation after the death of Matthias, Archduke of Austria and King of Bohemia. The Bohemians had rebelled against his successor, Ferdinand of Styria,
In a sermon preached at St. Paul's on May 21, 1626, Donne explicitly justifies the king's attempt to subdue the pulpits during the negotiations with Spain by the Directions concerning Preachers. In this sermon, the assumption that war and peace with Spain was a confessional issue as much as a political one is openly stated. While James negotiated for peace, the 'Pulpit-drums', proclaiming the errors of the Catholic church, were silenced 'so far, as to passe over all impertinent handling of Controversies, meerly and professedly as Controversies, though never by way of positive maintenance of Orthodoxall and fundamentall Truths'. Controversial theology is the preacher's weapon in this 'holy war' and is now in use again following James' failed attempts to secure peace:

Things being now, I say, in this state, with these men, since wee heare that Drums beat in every field abroad, it becomes us also to retume to the brasing and beating of our Drums in the Pulpit too, ... so wee also may employ some of our Meditations upon supplanting, and subverting of error, as well as upon the planting, and watering of the Truth (P&S VII, pp. 166-7).

In his Paul's Cross sermon, Donne had argued that James demanded silence from preachers as from all others outside the government. The reasons he gives in the Paul's Cross sermon for not deploying the weapon of controversy, however, are very different to those given above. As his division of text and themes at Paul's Cross presented no connection between the Directions and the negotiations with Spain, Donne had argued that the Directions were promulgated by the king as part of his ordinary care for the Church and that they had no connection with foreign policy. In the 1626 sermon, the king's efforts to quieten controversies in the pulpit is presented as an extraordinary policy motivated by the laudable aim of promoting peace in Europe, a policy which nonetheless did not harm religious instruction in England. Although Donne contradicts himself in these two sermons, he does not sacrifice his conscience to political expediency at Paul's Cross. In both sermons, the king's right to dictate what is said in the pulpit is limited. In the 1626 sermons, it was the kings 'desire' to have 'slumbred all Pulpit-drums' as all 'Field-drums' and in both, his attempt is not the same as a command. As the king could only negotiate for international peace, so claiming that the crown of Bohemia was elective. Doncaster was effectively excluded from negotiations for the new Holy Roman Emperor, and on August 8, 1619, Ferdinand was elected emperor, despite the protests of Elector Frederick and his Protestant supporters. The Bohemians rejected his election as emperor and elected Frederick the Elector Palatine as king of Bohemia; see Rushworth, Historical Collections, sig. C2r, p. 11. On Donne's role in this diplomatic mission, see Paul R. Sellin, So Doth, So Is Religion (1988), pp. 9-12, 177.
he could only silence the pulpits in matters not 'fundamental' or 'orthodoxall'. In the 1622 sermon also, Donne limits to matters of 'good order' the king's ability to regulate the pulpits and limits the king's Directions by the scriptural precepts demanding preaching, as he limits the preachers' speech by those demanding order. As his division of the text separates the subtle references to foreign politics from the discussion of the *Directions concerning Preachers*, so it distances those *Directions* from the words of the text which give his theme the authority of a scriptural basis.

**IV**

Following his *explication*, Donne turns to the immediate context of his own sermon and begins his argument in favour of the *Directions concerning Preachers*. The *Directions* have been read as severely restricting what preachers could say about contemporary politics, contentious doctrinal issues or against the threat of Rome. Before looking at Donne's approach to them, it may be helpful to detail the contents of the Directions themselves.

The first direction appears to be the most stringent and is certainly the most vague, as it summarises the substance of what follows. It is also most pertinent to the strategies of political preaching employed at Paul's Cross. It forbids any preacher 'under the degree and calling of a Bishop, or Deane of a Cathedrall or Collegiate Church' to preach on any 'discourse or Common-place ... which shall not be comprehended and warranted, in essence, substance and effect, or naturall inference, within some one of the Articles of Religion set forth 1562', and even those allowed may only do so on 'Kings dayes, and set festivals'. The preachers were not to be so restricted in the 'opening the coherence and division of his Text', which suggest that it is in the *application* of biblical themes that abuses

---

33R. C. Bald termed James' Directions 'repressive'; *John Donne: A Life*, p. 116; Thomas Cogswell describes the Directions as 'severe'; *The Blessed Revolution*, p. 32; Lori Ann Ferrell writes that the *Directions* placed a 'ban' on preaching of the doctrine of predestination as well as on state matters, which slightly exaggerates the scope of *Directions*; Ferré, *Donne and His Master's Voice, 1615-1625*, p. 67. Writers who concentrate on the particular articles in the Directions, however, have noticed that they were far less severe in their implementation on all issues except those relating to foreign politics. Paul Seaver reveals that the *Direction* relating to the licensing of lecturers was not enforced in the 1620s; *Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships*, pp. 60, 230-231. Ian Green, who only discusses the *Directions* in relation to catechising, notes that the order for catechising in the Directions was ambiguous and its implication softened by Archbishop Abbot; *Green, The Christian's ABC* (1996), pp. 106-7.
were seen to arise. As this order restricted the application of a preacher’s text to the ‘matters of faith’ laid out in the Thirty Nine Articles, except on special occasions, so it would restrict the introduction of contentious doctrinal issues and the discussion of contemporary events. The next point seemed to have been interpreted by some as a direct ban on afternoon sermons. No preacher was to preach on Sunday afternoons except on ‘some part of the Catechisme’ (except for funeral sermons), and preachers were to at least include with this the ‘examining the children in their catechisme’. The third direction is aimed at contentious, speculative theology in the pulpits, and it forbids any preacher (under a bishop or Dean) from preaching to the public on the more speculative, or ‘deepe points’, of ‘Predestination, Election, Reprobation; of the Universalitie, Efficacie, Resistibility or Irresistibility of Gods grace’. Those allowed to handle these themes were to do so only 'by way of use and application, rather then by way of positive doctrine, as beeing fitter for the Schooles and Universities, then for simple auditories'. The emphasis here on the 'deepe points' of Predestination, not on all teaching on Predestination, is crucial, as is the fact that the pastoral aspects of this doctrine - the comfort of assurance and the perseverance of the saints - are not prohibited. This suggests that it is not the doctrine itself but the controversies over its more speculative aspects that are being targeted. (The universality, efficacy and resistibility of divine grace were all issues disputed between Calvinists and Arminians.) A sort of self-censorship in these themes is evident at Paul's Cross before the Directions were promulgated. References to soteriology were usually restricted to uncontroversial Calvinist fundamentals (that justification is a free gift of God, for faith and not works and by the imputed merits of Christ; that those justified had been elected by God, that they are sanctified throughout life and glorified in the life to come; that those not elected by God are reprobate and will suffer the just punishment of their sins). The emphasis on these topics was pastoral rather than speculative and they generally led to exhortations to repentance or to perseverance in

34 I take it that this is the article referred to by Walter Yonge and John Chamberlain when they say that preaching is to be restricted to once on a Sunday (see note 22). On the interpretation of this order to refer to catechetical sermons rather than to examining children by question and answer, see Ian Green, The Christian's ABC, pp. 106-7.
godliness. Articles one and three of the Directions, therefore, assert a hierarchy in the Church both in administrative functions and in preaching by restricting by whom and to whom speculative issues might be addressed. The speculative areas of the doctrine of predestination were restricted to the schools; the 'applicable' parts of the doctrine (assurance and perseverance) were allowed to all the clergy.

The fourth article most clearly relates to the politics of 1622, and places a complete ban on all the clergy 'of what title or denomination so ever' from discussing the 'Power, Prerogative, Jurisdiction, Authoritie, or Duty of Soveraigne Princes', except according to the example laid out in the Homily of Obedience. Otherwise, preachers were to confine their material to matters of 'Faith and good life'. The fifth article also relates primarily to the tense situation during the negotiations with Spain. No preacher 'without invitation from the Text' is to 'fall into biter invectives, and undecent rayling speeches against the persons of either Papist or Puritanes', but when occasion arises they may 'free both the Doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, from the aspersion of either Adversarie'.

The emphasis given to preaching in the religious life of early modern England, and in particular of London, has been cited too often to need repetition. Two aspects of this emphasis, however, would appear to be in potential conflict with the wishes of James to control the pronouncements made in the pulpit. Both of these points had become commonplaces on the role of the preacher as it was described at Paul's Cross. The first, again, relates to the tense situation in 1622. It was apparent that the king wanted nothing to be said from the pulpits which would embarrass him in the negotiations with Spain. This was not as easy as it might appear, because preachers could claim that they condemned Catholics and Catholic states only insofar as they are the enemies of religious truth. The litany of the Armada, the Gunpowder plot and the peaceful succession of James, frequently repeated at

---

35For similar emphases in catechesis, see Ian Green, *The Christian's ABC*, pp. 387-421. The most notable exceptions to this pattern of preaching on predestination at Paul's Cross are Nathanael Delaune's *The christian's triumph* (1617), which deals almost entirely with the reality of an assurance of faith against the Roman position that the assurance of election was presumptuous; George Downman's *A treatise ... concerning christian libertie* (1609), which details the 'liberty' from sin given the elect by faith in Christ, and Humphrey Sydenham's *Jacob and Esau* (1626), which presents a full, schematic account of supra-lapsarian predestination refuting Arminianism.
Paul's Cross, had become part of the providential reading of England's history that established God as the protector of Protestant England against those who would forcibly return her to allegiance to Rome. This litany was recited in almost all the accession day, Gowrie conspiracy and Gunpowder plot sermon preached there. It described a war of the Gospel against Babylonian darkness, which often conflated national and confessional polemic, a polemic that James feared could draw all of Europe into a war of religion. When preaching on the threat to England of the Popish enemies that surrounded her, a commonplace of the prophetic sermon used to promote penitence, could be considered a comment on foreign politics, preachers might well feel that the tables had been turned on them and that subjects once blamelessly within their jurisdiction had been placed outside it.

The second effect of James' Directions was to suggest that fewer sermons might be preached. Preaching was considered a necessary sign marking England as a true Church. It was one of the 'ordinary means of salvation', the means, along with prayer and the sacraments, of the receipt of grace. Sermons were essential to a godly life, for in them the Word was so explained that its application to life and actions was made apparent.

---

36 On the central place of the anniversaries of the Armada, the Gunpowder Plot and accession days in the 'Protestant calendar', and the role of sermons in these celebrations, see David Cressy, Bonfire and Bells (1989), pp. 34-49, 50-66, 110-129. On the spontaneous celebrations of Charles I's return from Spain and the failure of the Spanish Match, see pp. 93-109.

37 Archbishop Abbot was among those who subscribed to an apocalyptic view of the Thirty Years War as the beginning of the final conflict with the papal Antichrist. When Elector Frederick accepted the crown of Bohemia, Abbot wrote to Sir Robert Naunton, the king's secretary saying 'God had set up this Prince, his majesties Son in Law, as a Mark of Honor throughout all Christendom, to propagate the Gospel, and to protect the oppressed. ... That by peece and peece, the Kings of the Earth that gave their power to the Beast, shall leave the whore and make her desolate': quoted in John Rushworth, Historical Collections, sig. C2v, p. 12; Cabala, Mysteries of State (1654), pp. 169-70.

38 The best example of this is the 'severe reprimand' (DNB) given to Richard Sheldon for his sermon on 1 of September 1622, entitled A sermon preached at Paules Crosse laying open the beast, and his mark (1625). In this sermon, on Rev. 14.9-11, Sheldon argued that the beast of Revelations is the Papacy, that the 'marks' of the beast are the superstitious rites, such as the sign of the cross, used by Papists. A similar argument was used by Thomas Thompson in Antichrist arraigned (1618). Thompson argues, from 1 John 2. 18-20, that the papacy is not merely anti-christian but the Antichrist mentioned in the Book of Revelations; that the Papacy is responsibly for all the heresies which have crept into the Church; and that the signs of the end of Antichrist's reign are now visible. There is no record of Thompson being reprimanded for this sermon.

39 Preaching is treated as the ordinary means of salvation by Stephen Denison, The new creature (1619), sig. D7r-v, p. 53-4 and Thomas Cheaste, The way to life (1609), sigs. E2v-E3v, pp. 28-30. For an extreme statement on the importance of preaching in this respect, see Samuel Hieron, The Dignity of Preaching, in Works ([1620?]), sigs. 3G2v-3G4r, pp. 580-583.

40 On the emphasis placed on sermons by the 'godly' laity, see Patrick Collinson, Religion of Protestants (1982), pp. 242-249 and J. Sears McGee, The Godly Man in Stuart England (1976) pp. 97-8. The emphasis given to preaching at this period became itself a matter of debate by the 1630s, when the Laudian faction of the Church sought to rebalance the role of preaching with the sacraments and public
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39 Preaching is treated as the ordinary means of salvation by Stephen Denison, The new creature (1619), sig. D7r-v, p. 53-4 and Thomas Cheaste, The way to life (1609), sigs. E2v-E3v, pp. 28-30. For an extreme statement on the importance of preaching in this respect, see Samuel Hieron, The Dignity of Preaching, in Works ((1620?)), sigs. 3G2v-3G4r, pp. 580-583.

40 On the emphasis placed on sermons by the ‘godly’ laity, see Patrick Collinson, Religion of Protestants (1982), pp. 242-249 and J. Sears McGee, The Godly Man in Stuart England (1976) pp. 97-8. The emphasis given to preaching at this period became itself a matter of debate by the 1630s, when the Laudian faction of the Church sought to rebalance the role of preaching with the sacraments and public
Preachers at Paul's Cross encouraged their brethren to preach more frequently and more effectively. Although preachers were encouraged not to concern their auditors with obscure points of divinity or controversy, not to interfere in matters of state nor ostentatiously to preach beyond the capacity of their auditors to understand, no restrictions on the number of sermons were placed on preachers by those addressing them at Paul's Cross; rather the ignorant and the lazy (who did not preach at all or often enough) were condemned. James' Directions appeared to impose undue restrictions on preachers, as they placed limitations on which doctrines could be expounded by what rank of cleric before which auditory. If the 'high points' of predestination were only to be handled by the upper clergy and the afternoon sermons of lecturers were to be replaced by the examination of children in the catechism, then both the efficacy of sermons in pronouncing the truth and the frequency with which they might do so would be severely curtailed, contrary to apostolic injunctions to preach the truth fearlessly and constantly, 'in season and out of season' (2 Tim 4.2). This is the substance of the objections Thomas Fuller 'heard and read' about James' Directions:

I. Christ grants ministers their commission: "Go teach all nations" ... Man therefore ought not to forbid what God enjoins. ... II. This is the way to starve souls, by confining them at one meal a-day... III. Such as are licensed to make sermons may be intrusted to choose their own texts and not in the afternoons to be restrained to the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandements. ... IV. In prohibiting the preaching of predestination, man makes THAT "the forbidden fruit" which God appointed for "the tree of life"; so cordial the comforts contained therein to a

prayer: see Peter Lake 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s', in The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642, ed. Fincham (1993), pp. 161-185 and 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity at the court of James I', in The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, ed. Levy Peck (1991), pp. 113-133. Only one printed sermon from Paul's Cross during James' reign suggests that the English Church needed fewer sermons and more prayers, and that is Henry King's A sermon preached at Paul's Cross ... touching .. John King, late Lord Bishop of London (1621). In his sermons, Donne was careful to balance prayer and preaching. In the fourth Prebend sermon, preached at St. Paul's, 28 January 1626/27, he writes: 'they that undervalue, or neglect the prayers of the Church, have not that title to the benefit of the Sermon; for though God doe speake in the Sermon, yet answers, that is, applies himselfe, by his Spirit, onely to them, who have prayed to him before.... Petition God at prayers, and God shall answer all your petitions at the Sermon. There we begin (if wee will make profit of a Sermon) at Prayers; And thither wee returne againe, (if we have made profit by a Sermon) in due time, to prayers' (P&S VII, p. 312).

The preacher's duties are the main theme of Nathaniel Cannon's The cryer (1613). Sermons which contain long exhortations to preachers include: Thomas Myriell, Chriists suite to his church (1613), sigs. D7r-D8v, pp. 61-64; and John Hoskins, The Conclusion of the Rehearsal Sermon (1615), sigs. F1v-F3r, pp. 34-37. Other attempts to 'tune' the pulpits stressed what the preachers ought, rather than what they ought not to say. Preachers were instructed by their bishops on how they should approach topics such as the earl of Essex's rebellion or the Spanish Match: The Letters of John Chamberlain, vol. 1 p. 120; vol. 2, p. 331. In 1620, James instructed the preachers, through the bishops, to emphasise the 'excesses' in women's fashions in their sermons, in much the same way that Elizabeth had commanded preaching against corn hoarding: The Letters of John Chamberlain, vol. 2, pp. 286-7. These commands do not seemed to have given rise to the same level of controversy as the 1622 Directions, because they do not restrict the number of sermons or the doctrinal issues allowed in public sermons.
Donne presents a two-fold answer to these sorts of objections to James' Directions. Firstly, he argues that the Directions will not restrict preaching, but will increase its effectiveness by making it more pastoral in emphasis. To do this, he presents the Directions themselves as interpreted by Archbishop Abbot, the powerful friend of the 'godly' sections of the English Church. This interpretation takes the narrowest possible meaning of the restrictions placed on preachers by the Directions. First, however, Donne argues for the correctness of the King's proceeding: he insists on his right, as head of the Church, to promulgate directions that reassert the doctrinal basis of the reformed Church of England and he emphasises James' conformity to the laws of the Church and the precedent of his reforming predecessors. In order to defend James' proceedings, then, Donne must first show that some restrictions on preaching could be allowed, and to do this, he takes from his text the idea of order. His argument begins by asserting the necessity of preaching, but he emphasises that its efficacy is increased by orderliness. From his scriptural arguments in favour of order, he argues on the grounds of utility for the particular directions James has promulgated. He claims that they will provide the order the Church needs. This argument from deliberative oratory connects the Directions to scriptural precepts only through the argument for order, which is grounded on scriptural proof-texts.

Donne's application of his text begins, unusually, with a second division of the text, which is also explicated for a second time. In this explication, the text is read metaphorically to refer to preaching as the weapon of God in the war of Truth. This metaphor allows Donne to develop the two themes upon which his defence of the Directions will be based: the necessity

---

43 On Archbishop Abbot as a supporter of the more puritan-inclined conformists and a vigorous opponent of Roman Catholicism, and on his fall from favour over his opposition to the Spanish Match, see Kenneth Fincham, 'Prelacy and Politics: Archbishop Abbot's Defence of Protestant Orthodoxy', *Historical Research*, 61 (1988).
of preaching and the necessity of order in the Church's preaching. Crucial to this defence is Donne's adoption of the Vulgate reading of his text, for the phrase on which his argument is based, 'keeping their order and courses' ('manentes in ordine, et cursu suo'), is found in the Vulgate but does not appear in the Authorised Version that Donne used in the first half of the sermon. The explication in this second part of the sermon centres on the idea of order. It is developed by the careful employment of the various meanings of the word 'ordinance': from military 'ordnance' in a physical war, to ordinance in the sense of preaching and other religious services, and hence to orders and regulations. His reference to Aquinas' lectures on Corinthians suggests that this was the source of Donne's interpretation of the text. At the beginning of this second part of the sermon, Donne quotes Aquinas as his authority for incorporates his text with the Pauline injunction commonly used to defend the rights of Church authorities to regulate the administration of Church services, 1 Cor. 14.40 ("Let all things be done decently and in order"):47

For that is the force of that phrase, and of the manner of expressing it, Manentes in Ordine, The Starres, containing themselves in their Order, fought. And that phrase induces our second part, the accommodation, the occasionall application of these words: God will not fight, nor be fought for disorderly; And therefore in illustration, and confirmation of those words of the Apostle, Let all things be done decently, and

---

44The word 'order' does not occur in either the Geneva Bible's reading of the text ('They fought from heaven, even the starres in their courses fought against Sisera') or that of Junius and Tremellius' Latin Bible ('E Coelis pingvarunt. Sydera ipsa e suis aggeribus pingnaverunt contra Siseram'). The Vulgate would appear to be the most obvious source of Donne's text.

45It appears from this exposition that, contrary to the account given by Izaak Walton, Donne did not always take a scriptural text as the starting point for his composition of a sermon. In this sermon, rather, he appears to have begun with the idea of order and then sought texts around which a sermon on that theme could be written: Izaak Walton, The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sr. Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker and Mr. George Herbert (1670), p. 61. Mark Vessey concurs with Walton's account of Donne's composition method in a study of another Donne sermon, 'Consulting the Fathers: Invention and Meditation in Donne's Sermon on Psalm 51:7', John Donne Journal, 11 (1992). On Donne's use of the Vulgate, and of other versions of the Bible, and on his knowledge of the biblical languages, see Don Cameron Allen, 'Dean Donne sets his Text', ELH, 10 (1943). The various uses of ordinance given in the OED that are relevant to Donne's exposition are: 1. Arrangements in ranks or rows, especially in order of battle, or the equipment and provisions for a war, modern Ordnance (4c); 8. 'A practice or usage authoritatively enjoined or prescribed; esp. a religious or ceremonial observance, as the sacraments'; 2. 'Arrangements in regular sequence or proper relative position...according to rule; ordered, arranged, or regulated conditions. On Donne's use of the various meanings of ambiguous words or phrases, see John S. Chamberlin, Increase and Multiply (1976), pp. 119-120.


47Calvin uses this text to defend both the set times for church services and public prayers: Institution of christian religion, Bk II, ch. VIII, 32 and Bk III, ch. XX, 29, trans. T. Norton (1561), sigs. G8v, 2G4r, ff. 56v, 228r. John Whitgift, citing Calvin, uses the same text to defend the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical authorities in legislating on 'things indifferent': The defense of the aunswe re to the Admonition (1574), sigs. K1v - K2r, pp. 110-111, see also sigs. I1v and K6r, pp. 98, 119. I would like to thank Dr. Mark Perrott for referring me to this work. At Paul's Cross, Samuel Collins uses the same argument for subscription to maintain the unity of the Church in A sermon preached at Paules-Crosse (1608), sigs. D1r-v, pp. 17-18.
Aquinas interprets the passage as giving precepts for preaching and these include the rule that suitable order ("congruum ordinem") be kept. For this rule, Aquinas cites Judges 5.20. Donne also combines these texts in the first stage of the process of re-reading his text to mean that preaching is the weapon of God in the war of Truth. When he divides his text in this part of the sermon, Donne makes it clear that the reference he gives his text is changing. Where he has spoken of a physical war, he will now discuss a spiritual war. The weapon to be used in this spiritual war is preaching, 'Gods Ordinance', and the soldiers in this war are the preachers of the Gospel. Quoting the primary injunction for preachers, 1 Corinthians. 9.16 ('A necessity is laid upon me, and woe unto me if I do not preach the Gospel'), he incorporates it with his text, as he did the Pauline injunction given earlier, uniting the two in order to qualify one by the other:

... and vae si non, woe be unto them, if they doe not fight, if they doe not preach: But yet in the last place, they must fight, as the Stars in heaven doe, In their order, in that Order, and according to those Directions, which, they, to whom it appertaines, shall give them: for that is to fight in Order (p. 192).

Donne asserts the reality of God's spiritual war by insisting that there can be no compromises over the fundamentals of faith. Although peace-makers are blessed (including James, 'our Peace-maker'), there is no blessing for those who would seek peace where God has declared war - between truth and error. God has assigned preaching as the means of fighting this war. By restating the fundamental necessity of preaching as a preface to his argument, Donne firmly places his argument for the regulation of preaching within the Reformed orthodoxy of the necessity of preaching.

Having shown that preaching is the essential means by which God's cause is fought for in the commonwealth and within the individual soul, Donne then proceeds to

---

48 Donne often refers to preaching, either alone or along with the sacraments, as 'God's ordinance'. In a sermon in Whitehall, from April 19, 1618, he described how God draws man near by 'the cords of man, the voice of the Minister, and the power which Gods Ordinance hath infused into that, and with the band of love, that is, of the Gospel so proposed unto us.' (P&S I, no. 9, p. 313). On April 30, 1626, he delivered another sermon in Whitehall, in which God's calling was taken to be 'by the Word preached, according to his Ordinance, and under the Great Seal, of his blessing upon his Ordinance' (P&S VII, no. 5, p. 157); In a sermon delivered in St. Paul's, possibly in November or December 1627, he says 'the subject of our speech, (let it bee in holy Conferences, and Discourses, let it be in Gods Ordinance, Preaching)' (P&S VIII, no. 4, p. 121).
argue that this weapon is most effectively deployed when it is properly organised. He first shows that preaching was ordained by God as 'a fixt and constant course of conteyning Subjects in their Religious and Civill duties' unique to Christian communities (p. 194). The first type of 'disorder' which diminishes the effectiveness of preaching is the failure to preach. As preaching is a 'necessity' laid on the minister in the present tense, Donne takes the argument of 2 Timothy. 4.2 ('Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season'), without quoting the text, to show that preaching is the constant duty of the minister. The ministers of England who do not preach because they have been silenced for non-conformity have failed to preach correctly, that is, in order.49

The next type of disorder is one which the Directions concerning Preachers specifically condemned: the 'indecent railing' against the 'persons' of Papists and Puritans. Donne expands the meaning of 'in order' to include 'quietly and peaceably'. To proceed peaceably is to convince the sinner of his error while hating the error, and to proceed without this peaceable decency is to lose the advantage and to fail to persuade:

When their insolencies provoke us to speake of them, we shall doe no good therein, if therein we proceed not decently, and in order. Christ says of his Church: Terribilis ut Castrorum acies, It is Powerfull as an Armie; but it is ut actes ordinata, as an armie disciplin'd, and in order; for without order, an armie is but a great Ryot; and without this decencie, this peaceablenesse, this discretion, this order, zeale is but fury, and such preaching is but to the obduration of ill, not to the edification of good Christians (p. 197).

It is a common theme at Paul's Cross that although zeal in religion is a virtue, it can too readily be used to justify disobedience to civil or religious authorities, especially by Separatists and non-Conformists. Consequently, preachers often qualified their exhortations to zeal at Paul's Cross. Humility and obedience were also virtues prescribed by Scriptures, they insisted, and these virtues are in accord with, and should not be made opposed to, zeal.50

49Sermons that include denunciations of those who have abandoned their duties in the Church because of their disapproval of the Church's ceremonies and discipline include: Samuel Collins, A sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1608), sigs. E1r-E2v, pp. 25-7; Arthur Lake, A sermon preached at Saint Pauls Cross (1640), sigs. B3v-B4r, pp. 6-7; William Westerman, The faithfull subject (1608), sigs. B5r-C1v, pp. 19-27 and Salomons porch, [printed with The faithfull subject], sigs. G6r-v, pp. 113-4.

50Preachers who distinguish between laudable and blameworthy types of zeal include: William Hull, Repentance not to be repented of (1612), sig. H6v-H7v, ff. 62v-63v; Robert Johnson, Davids teacher (1609), sigs F2v-F3r; Daniel Price, Sauls prohibition stayde (1609), sigs. D2v-D4v; John Whalley, Gods plentie, feeding true pietie (1616), sigs E3v-F1v, pp. 30-34; Thomas Sutton, England's second summons, in Englands first and second Summons (1616), sigs N8v-O3r, pp. 196-201. On zeal in Donne's sermons, see Jeanne M. Shami, 'Donne on Discretion', ELH, 47 (1980), pp. 55-56.
Donne claims that even the title given to the ordination of ministers, the taking of orders, reinforces the idea that the minister is one who fights God's cause as a soldier in an army, following orders. Those orders, analogous to the rules of trades or professions and to the laws laid down in Parliament, are decided by the clergy when they come together in Convocation (p. 198). The ministers of the Church of England are bound by the laws of the state as they are bound by the laws of their own order.

The orderliness for which Donne argues is, then, no more than that demanded of preachers many times at Paul's Cross. It condemns only ministers who are ignorant or non-Conformist, who 'indecently' particularise individuals or whose sermons are individualistic or ostentatious. But how are the orders that ministers must follow in their religious duties decided and delivered? Donne now develops his argument that the orders of the clergy are defined by it as a corporate body under the government of the king. He next shows that the king, as head of the Church, is entitled to promulgate orders directing the clergy in their duties. Donne present this not as an arbitrary power but as one circumscribed by the laws of the Church and the precedents set by the other Reformed heads of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{51} Beginning with a dictum from Aquinas, 'Order alwayes presumes a head', Donne argues in a bare, syllogistic way that the Church must define the order by which the ministers fight God's battles. From the head of the Church on Earth, then, the means of ordering the clergy are to be sought.

Although not formally marked in the text, this point ends the second explication of the text, as the rest of the sermon concerns itself exclusively with the Directions concerning Preachers. In this second part of his sermon, Donne has, in accordance with the pattern of political preaching seen at Paul's Cross, derived doctrines from his text which will give scriptural backing to the application of the sermon to the circumstances of the delivery. He has found in the Vulgate version of his text the idea of order, and has developed its reference to preaching by comparison with Pauline precepts on preaching and order. The idea of order developed in this second explication, however, is

\textsuperscript{51}In his accession day sermon at Paul's Cross of 1617, Donne writes that James came to the throne of England 'by his obedience, his obedience to the law of Nature, and the laws of this Kingdom, to which some other King would have disputed, whether he should have obey'd or no' (P&S, I, no. 3, p. 219).
built on the necessity of preaching, and only the arguments for order and for preaching are shown to be proven by Scripture. Donne's 

exhortation

in the second part of the sermon is for orderliness; the Directions are merely a way of providing order. In this way, Donne confines the Directions strictly to the sphere of Church government, those 'things indifferent' which the heads of individual churches are allowed to regulate and change but which do not themselves bind the conscience except in terms of obedience 'to the powers that be' (Romans 13).

VI

Having laid out James' right to deliver directions to preachers, Donne proceeds to show that the Directions James gave are laudable and useful. In this, he is drawing from the commonplace arguments of deliberative rhetoric used by preachers when dealing with matters that could not claim to be commanded by Scripture. Donne first argues that James' actions were laudable, because they show his care for the Church and do not exceed the limits of his jurisdiction. The king is shown to have behaved correctly according to precedent and ecclesiastical law. Donne's first line of argument was that James, as supreme governor of the Church, was within his rights to issue orders. Donne now argues that he has exercised his power only within the sphere allowed him as head of the Church. The king's power over the Church had been defined in the second canon of the 1604 convocation as equal to that of 'the Kings of Judah' and 'Christian Emperours',\(^{52}\) (pp. 199-200). From the time since the medieval papal usurpation of ecclesiastical power,\(^{53}\) precedents exist for James' Directions. Most importantly, Queen Elizabeth's actions with regard to the Lambeth

---

\(^{52}\)Canon II of the 1604 convocation reads 'Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, That the king's majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical, that godly kings had among the Jews and Christian emperors in the primitive church; or impeach in any part his regal supremacy in the said causes restored to the crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established; let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored, but only by the archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of those his wicked errors': Synodalia, ed. Cardwell (1842), p. 249.

\(^{53}\)Donne's account of the supremacy, resting in the crown de jure in spite of the Pope's de facto exercise of it, is the same as that described by Robert E. Rodes as the 'popular and governmental view', especially identified with the common lawyers. In Cawdrey's Case, Edmund Coke appended a long list of Medieval examples of the monarchs exercising control over ecclesiastical affairs: Robert E. Rodes Jr., Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church: Edward I to the Civil War (1982), pp. 104-109. This is very similar to Donne's claim here that 'even then [when the Church was in 'a forraine Prelates hand'] our Kings did exercise more of that power, then our adversaries ... will confesse' (p. 200).
articles are presented as a pertinent example of the monarch's right to intervene in the Church, for here too, the doctrine of grace was at issue. According to Donne, the articles were controversial not because of the doctrine they put forward, but because they were not properly presented in a synod or council; they were merely to be pronounced in a sermon *ad clerum*. The Queen stopped their promulgation as it was procedurally improper. Only with her permission could the clergy, properly represented, promulgate new formulations of the Church's doctrine:

Yet her *Majestie* being informed thereof, declared her displeasure so, as that, scarce any hours before the Sermon was to have been, there was a Countermaund, an Inhibition to the Preacher for medling with any of those points. Not that her *Majestie* made her selfe *Judge of the Doctrines*, but that nothing, not formerly declared to be so, ought to be declared to be the *Tenet*, and Doctrine of this Church, her *Majestie* not being acquainted, nor supplicated to give her gracious allowance for the publication thereof (pp. 200-201). 54

As James followed the precedent set by Elizabeth, so he shows even greater favour to preachers, allowing speculative doctrine to be discussed *ad clerum*. Nor is this the limit of his willingness to encourage preachers, for having promulgated the *Directions*, he made public his reasons for them.

Having said that the king made his reasons for the *Directions* public through the archbishop of Canterbury, Donne proceeds to present the archbishop's explanation of the Directions as the king's own. By doing so, he ignores the very different emphases the two men gave in their explanations for their *Directions*. 55 Donne presents to the public a picture of complete unity in the upper spheres of the Church's hierarchy, but he also gives them an interpretation of the Directions that fully agrees with his argument for plentiful, but orderly, preaching. Archbishop Abbot's interpretation of the Directions minimises the restrictions they place on preaching, both on the subjects allowed in sermons and on the allowance for Sunday sermons. He conflates the Directions in a way that gives them a very

---


55 These 'reasons' were published separately (from the copy of the archbishop's letter sent to the bishop of Oxford (STC 33)), and along with the Directions (from the copy sent to the Bishop of Norwich (STC 15379.5)). Abbot has not been credited with drafting the Directions themselves, although the author is unknown. Ian Green (*The Christian's ABC*, p. 106) suggests it may have been Lancelot Andrewes, but Peter Heylyn says that Laud appeared 'to have a hand' in drawing them up: *Cypriani Anglicus* (1658), sig. O1r, p. 97.
different emphasis to that apparent in the king's original letter. The king writes that some students have preached 'unprofitable, unseasonable, seditious and dangerous doctrine, to the scandal of the Church, and disquieting of the State and present Government', as had been reported to the king by the archbishop and other prelates, and that his Directions are 'limitations and cautions' to be observed in preaching. Abbot, on the other hand, puts a decidedly pastoral emphasis on the king's actions. The king, dismayed that there should be so many defecting to 'Poperie and Anabaptistrie', reasoned that the cause was the 'lightnes, affectednes, and unprofitablenesse' of recent preaching, which, 'soaring up in points of divinitie', is 'too high for the capacities of the people'. As a result, the people remain ignorant of the rudiments of their faith and so are prey to the errors of Roman Catholics and Anabaptists. In order to prevent these defections from the Church of England, the practice of preaching is to be reformed in accordance with the methods used in the early stages of the Reformation, as these were successful in 'driving out the one, and kept out the other from poisoning and infecting the people of this Kingdome'. The doctrines which prevented England slipping into either error were those contained in the Thirty Nine Articles, the catechisms and the Homilies, and so these are presented by Abbot as defining the doctrines appropriate for public teaching. They are not examples to be slavishly copied, but they demonstrate 'the whole scope of this doctrine which is 'the proper subject of all sound and edifying Preaching'.

Although Abbot presents his letter as the king's own thoughts on the matter, he does not claim that they are the king's words. This is precisely what Donne does, because he attributes Abbot's words to the king as direct quotations:

But when men doe neither, neither Teach, nor Preach, but (as his Majestie observes the manner to bee) To soare in points too deepe, To muster up their owne Reading, to display their owne wit, or Ignorance in medling with Civill matters, or (as his Majestie addes) in rude and undecent reviling of persons; ... His Majesty therefore calls us to look, Quid primum, what was first in the whole Church? And againe, Quid primum when we received the Reformation in this Kingdom, by what means, (as his Majestie expresseth it) Papistry was driven out, and Puritanisme kept out (p. 202).

If, as Donne advised, ministers consulted the Directions, they may not have seen as clearly as he suggested they would that 'his Majesties generall intention therein is, to put a difference, between grave, and solid, from light and humerous preaching'. The gloss
Donne has placed on the Directions, by presenting them as interpreted by the godly Archbishop Abbot, makes such an interpretation easier than a stricter reading of the king's letter will allow. But in doing this, Donne does not contradict the orderliness he has argued for, because he can rightly claim that this interpretation, as given by the king to his archbishop and transmitted to the clergy, is the correct interpretation of the Directions. Donne's use of Abbot's interpretation of the Directions also increases the standing of that interpretation as the official one. Through Abbot's letter and Donne's sermon, therefore, the public, including other members of the clergy, had it made clear to them that the Directions were not to be taken as restrictions on preaching. Donne treats the Directions less as rules than as guidelines to be interpreted, and he chooses the interpretation which can be reconciled most readily with a high opinion of preaching and which can be presented as part of a consolidation, rather than a reformulation, of the role of the preacher within the Church of England.

By these means, Donne shows the praiseworthiness of the king's Directions. They are, as he has shown, in accordance with the king's power as supreme governor of the Church and demonstrate James' care for the promotion of piety in his people. Donne next shows the utility of James' Directions by arguing that their emphasis on the catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles and the Homilies will return preaching in England to the efficacy it had at the Reformation. The Homilies, Articles and catechisms are presented as the statements of orthodoxy of the Church of England. They provide the subject matter around which the preacher could base his sermon without restricting the preacher to these themes or laying down extraordinary limitations on how they could be applied.

Donne describes catechesis as any means of instruction in the fundamentals of faith. It is the 'first way' by which Christianity is received, both by individuals in the Church now and by the Church itself in its early ages. In keeping with Abbot's interpretation of the Directions, Donne goes on to argue that catechising and preaching are not necessarily different practices. In the early church, sermons on an entire book of Scripture or on the fundamentals of faith were understood as exercises in catechising. Catechising, then, is an essential function of the minister, but it does not set the limit on the role of the minister.
Again, Donne protests that James' Directions will not restrict, but increase, the efficacy of the Church of England's ministers, and will reform, not curtail, their performance of their ministry:

Except yee, yee the people bee content at first to feed on the milke of the Gospell, and not presently to fall to gnawing of bones, of Controversies, and unrevealed Misteries, And except yee, the Ministers and Preachers of the Gospell, descend and apply your selves to the Capacitie of little Children, and become as they and build not your estimation onely upon the satisfaction of the expectation of great and curious Auditories, you stopp theirs, you loose your owne way to the kingdome of Heaven. Not that wee are to shut up, and determine our selves, in the knowledge of Catechetical rudiments, but to bee sure to know them first (p. 205).

The Articles and the Homilies are presented as the natural means for the preacher to build on the fundamentals of the catechism. Firstly, Donne describes the Articles as the 'extention' of the catechism, the statement of the full range of orthodox teaching. With regard to controversial doctrine, there are articles that contradict the teachings of the Church of Rome, such as article twenty-two (against Purgatory, images, and invocation of the saints) and article twenty-eight (against transubstantiation). His two examples for the range of 'positive divinity' left within the scope of orthodoxy are themselves highly controversial, presenting a range of topics within the preacher's reach which are not just metaphorically miles apart.56

In the third Article there is an Orthodoxe assertion of Christs descent into Hell; who can go deeper? In the 17, Article there is a Modest declaration of the Doctrine of Predestination; who can go higher? (p. 206)

As the 'Foundation is in the Catechisme,' the 'growth and extention in the Articles', so 'the Application of all to particular Auditories' is in the Homilies. In James' Directions, the Homilies were redefined not only as providing material for non-preaching clergy, the original Elizabethan view, but as providing preaching clergy with 'further instruction' on how to construct their sermons. Again, where the Directions limited the subjects that preachers could discuss, Donne emphasises the range of doctrine left to them. As official examplars of how texts should be applied by preachers, Donne argues that the Homilies also

56Calvin famously contradicted the teaching of the Church Fathers on Christ's local descent into Hell: Institution of Christian Religion, Bk II, ch. XVI, 8-10, trans. Norton, sigs. N2r-N3r, ff. 98r-99r. The controversies caused by the move away from Calvinist views of predestination by some within the English Church has been well documented: in particular, see Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists (1987); Peter Lake, Anglicans and Puritans? (1988). Donne presents these two doctrines as the poles of the Calvinism of the Church of England, and the two points of speculative theology which best show her independence from continental Calvinism.
place few restrictions on preachers. They are not shy of presenting the Protestant argument against the Church of Rome, as the first and second homilies contradict its teaching on the sufficiency of Scripture and the use of images.

Returning to his text for the final exhortation, Donne emphasises again that it is order, and not the particular orders for which he argued, that carries the authority of Scripture. He divides his hearers in two, clergy and laity, and demands of both the orderliness he has found commanded in his text. Requesting the 'Starres in this Firmament, Preachers in this Church' to follow his advice and follow their lieutenant in order, he implicitly asks for compliance with Directions without granting the Directions themselves the warrant of scriptural reference. To the others, 'Gods holy people' he asks them first to respect their preachers, not for ostentatious displays of learning, but for their attempts to teach all, ignorant and young. They are 'not ignorant, unlearned, extemporall men', but neither are they 'over curious men'. In suggesting that their learned preachers stoop to teach them, he requires them to lend a hand and stoop to teach their children and servants. The order for which he preached is here, in the closing lines of the sermon, expanded to include the laity, as Donne extends to them the obligation of obeying their teachers in the Church and makes orderliness in the Church a means of organising the common-wealth as well as of regulating the clergy:

That so, Priest and people, the whole Congregation, may by their religious obedience, and fighting in this spiritual warfare in their Order, minister occasion of joy to that heart, which hath beene grieved; in that fulnesses of joy, which David expressseth (p. 209).

With a quote from Psalm 21, that 'the king shall rejoice', Donne demands of his hearers the orderliness for which he has preached. He breaks the tradition of Paul's Cross preachers and does not end his sermon as a prayer but merely announcing that he has said all he means to say and dismissing the hearers:

And with that Psalme, a Psalme of Confidence in a good King, and a Psalme of Thanksgiving for that blessing, I desire that this congregation may be dissolved; for this is all that I intended for the Explication, which was our first, and for the Application, which was the other part proposed in these wordes (p. 209).
Throughout his sermon, Donne has been at pains not merely to pronounce the king's policy, but to present to those listening an example of the sort of sermon still possible in spite of these regulations. Only in relation to the king's foreign policy does he maintain a strict silence. In relation to the Spanish Match, Donne demands the total loyalty typically insisted on by conformist preachers. As his argument for patience is presented as part of the *explication* of the text, it is given as something directly commanded by Scripture without the need of interpretation by the preacher, and so it is given considerably more weight, albeit presented in far fewer words, than the lengthy and multi-faceted arguments for the *Directions concerning Preachers*. Donne practises the injunctions laid out for the ordinary clergy in the Directions and is still able to present the range of issues left to the preacher. By presenting the Thirty Nine Articles, the catechism and the Homilies as the scope but not the sum of the English Church's divinity, and by preaching about them rather than repeating them, Donne shows the extent of the freedom left to preachers. By building his sermon on a word not in the authorised translation of the text, Donne shows that, even while insisting on order in the Church, he does not derogate from the preacher's role as interpreter of the Word. Most importantly, by following the division of material practised by preachers at Paul's Cross, Donne effectively divides the matter which is directly commanded by Scripture from matters of government or 'order' in the Church, and so he insists that the Directions take nothing from the necessity of preaching. As matters of order, they are within the administrative sphere of the king in his capacity as supreme governor of the Church, limited by the laws and precedents that define that role. Therefore, although Donne's sermon may have quelled some discontent over the *Directions concerning Preachers*, he does not sacrifice conscience to monarchical or absolutist politics. Rather, he maintains the limitations of the king's actions concerning the Church to matters of order. Matters of doctrine are defined by Scripture, and Scripture here demands plentiful, yet orderly, preaching. Donne's sermon, far from showing absolutist leanings, demands of the preacher no more than preachers at Paul's Cross generally practised before the Directions were published. It was not
for them to meddle in foreign politics but to enjoin obedience to the powers that be 'for peace and for conscience sake'. Most importantly, as preachers, a 'necessity' was laid on them to preach the gospel and 'be instant, in season, out of season'.
Conveying the correct doctrinal message to the auditors at Paul's Cross was of obvious importance to the Jacobean authorities. Catechetical sermons were naturally important in this task but equally common as a means of instruction were anti-Catholic sermons, in which the errors of Popery were presented as a vivid comparison to the purity of the doctrine taught in the English Church. Anti-popery reinforced confessional divisions, because it reaffirmed for the auditory that substantial and fundamental doctrinal differences separated the Churches. It thickened the line dividing denominations and reassured the auditory that they were on the right side of that line. In the following chapter, two forms of anti-popery will be discussed and compared: the first is best described as 'refutation' and is a form of controversial divinity; the second is the recantation sermon. On the basis of the different rhetorical strategies used in these types of sermons, it will be argued that anti-popery at Paul's Cross (and in the controversies that began there) was not designed to persuade the Catholic opposition but to reassure the Protestant auditory of the verity of its Reformed religion. As such, it was a powerful means of confessionalisation even if, as will be shown, both forms of anti-popery used at Paul's Cross were difficult to perform successfully.

The most obvious form of anti-Catholic rhetoric used at Paul's Cross is that found in the recantations of heresy for which this pulpit was well known from the early Reformation through the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Some public recantation, however, appear to be highly problematic vehicles for reinforcing religious orthodoxy. An

---

1Recantations were demanded only of those guilty of heresy. Their forms and functions are discussed by Susan Wabuda, 'Equivocation and Recantation During the English Reformation', JEH, 44 (1993), pp. 226-228. Wabuda suggests that equivocation in recantations was practised in Mary's reign. This supports my argument that the speaker of a recantation sermon is one whose ethos is open to question.

2The prominence of Paul's Cross as a site for recantations in the early years of the Reformation is evident from the number delivered there: Millar MacLure, Register of Sermons (1989), pp. 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 45, 50, 55, 64, 66, 71, 96. A description of a recantation from the Caroline period is found in Stephen Denison's The white wolf (1627), preached at the recantation of John Hetherington, a familist. Denison gives an account of the disciplinary proceedings against Hetherington and his recantation at Paul's Cross: Denison, The white wolf, sigs. F1r-F2v, pp. 33-35.
example of this is the recantation sermon delivered on March 3rd, 1611, by Theophilus Higgons (1578?-1659), a Church of England minister (he had served as lecturer at St. Dunstan's in London) who had converted to Roman Catholicism two years earlier. Higgons had produced polemics for both Catholics and Protestants, in which his changes of heart can be traced. He reports that a conference with Catholics led him to question Protestant teaching on Purgatory, prayers for the dead and the nature and authority of the visible Church.³ Wavering, though not yet converted, he went to the North of England from where, in 1608, he published a small tract called A briefe consideration of mans iniquitie, in which he denies the Catholic distinction between mortal and venial sins and the efficacy of human merits. Later, he explains that this tract set out his doubts to see if Catholics could answer them.⁴ Whether he was answered or not, he probably left England later that year, as 1609 saw the publication of a tract giving his 'motives' for conversion. Following an attack in Sir Edward Hoby's A Letter to Mr. T.H., he wrote an Apology defending himself.⁵ Higgons spent two years in training at Douai and St. Omer before returning to England. In his Paul's Cross sermon, he insisted that he returned to England as a mission priest, not as one already reconverted. He did reconvert, however, under the spiritual direction of Thomas Morton, then Dean of St. Paul's.⁶ As a sign of his 'hearty reunion' with the Church of England, he publicly confessed his apostasy at Paul's Cross.

Other clerical converts from Catholicism recanted at Paul's Cross even if they did not preach a sermon there. In 1563, Lawrence Caddey delivered a declaration against the Pope and Catholicism from Paul's Cross after the sermon. (Caddey later reverted to Catholicism).⁷ On December 1, 1588, William Tedder recanted his Catholic beliefs; a week

³Theophilus Higgons, A sermon preached at Pauls Crosse the third of March, 1610 (1611; Anr. ed. W. Hull f. W. Aspley, 1611) sigs. F2r-v, pp. 43-4.
⁴Theophilus Higgons, A briefe consideration of mans iniquitie (1608); Apology, sig. E1r, p. 25.
⁵The first motive of T.H. (1609), STC notes that a York copies of this work has an approbatio dated 26 of January, 1609, which suggests that Higgons' conversion must have been in late 1608. Sir Edward Hoby was Higgons' main detractor during his apostasy but was also instrumental in his subsequent reunion with the English Church. On his role in Higgons' reversion, see Michael Questier, The Phenomenon of Conversion: Change of Religion to and from Catholicism in England, 1580-1625 (University of Sussex D. Phil., 1991), p. 114, and Questier, Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625 (1996), p. 60, n. 98.
⁶Higgons, A sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, sigs. F4v-G1v, pp. 48-50. Higgons was rewarded with the rectory of Hunton near Maidstone, Kent, where he remained until the living was sequestered during the civil war (DNB).
Later Anthony Tyrrell did the same. In 1593, Thomas Clarke recanted at Paul's Cross after a sermon delivered by 'Mr. Buckeridge' (probably John Buckeridge, later bishop of Ely). Nor was Theophilus Higgons the only Paul's Cross preacher to convert to Catholicism for a time. On October 31, 1624, John Gee, curate at Newton in the parish of Winwick, Lancashire and crypto-Catholic for some of his time there, preached a sermon in which he admitted this and talked of his miraculous escape from the 'Fatal Vespers' at Blackfriars on October 26, 1623. Recantation sermons seem to have been delivered only by those who had served as Church of England ministers before their apostasy (John Nichols in the Tower in 1581; Theophilus Higgons and John Gee at Paul's Cross).

These recantation sermons adopt the form of the recantation proper, in which the penitent gave a statement of his errors, his reasons for his conversion and asked for forgiveness. This adaptation complicates the character projected by the preacher. In recantations, the penitent does not set out to teach the hearers: that task is performed by the minister who preaches beforehand. The penitent's role is, therefore, purely exemplary: he presents himself as an example of one who fell into the traps discovered by the preacher, but has subsequently been granted repentance. The preacher of a recantation sermon has to combine both exemplary and didactic roles. His claim to authority as a Protestant preacher, however, and his ethos as a speaker are badly compromised by the revelations of his own apostasy, because he is guilty of precisely those sins about which he has warned his hearers. Both Nichols and Higgons had taken sides with the 'adversary' in religious polemic battles, leaving written records of their inconstancy in religion. Recantations attracted enormous

---

8 There were two other recantation sermons by clerical converts not preached at Paul's Cross. John Nichols delivered his recantation sermon before the other clerical prisoners in the Tower in 1581: A declaration of the recantation of J. Nichols (1581). Nichols had been a Church of England curate (at Withycombe, Somerset) before his conversion to Catholicism (DNB). John Harding delivered his at the Gatehouse in Westminster in 1620: A recantation sermon preached at the gatehouse (1620). Thomas Bell, another clerical convert and controversialist, did not publish a recantation sermon as such.


10 The most striking example of this is John Nichols' reprinting of the recantation he made before the Inquisition at Rome. Rather characteristically, Nichols describes it as an 'oration and sermon ... presented before the Pope and his Cardinallles in his consistorie'. In his Discovery of Nichols, Robert Parsons points out that the place where Nichols made his 'oration' and the office in which it was registered were occupied by the Inquisition and what Nichols reprinted was, in fact, his voluntary repudiation of Protestantism: John Nichols, The Oration and Sermon made at Rome (1581), sigs. B1r-B2v: Robert Parsons, A Discoverie of J. Nichols (1581), sig. A7r-B1v.
attention. Theophilus Higgons' Paul's Cross sermon went through three editions in the year of its delivery. Lords of the Council, the nobility, 'divers bishops' and a auditory so large 'the like audience was never seen in the place' heard it delivered. If, as seems obvious, a past conversion would diminish a preacher's authority, why was Theophilus Higgons called to preach at Paul's Cross and his sermon there published? A comparison between recantation sermons and the alternative form of anti-popery in sermons can reveal the rhetorical strategies used in Paul's Cross anti-popery and the reasons why the recantation sermon was found effective.

II

Controversial sermons were, like recantation sermons, commonly preached at Paul's Cross, and many of the period's most famous controversies were played out, at least partly, from this pulpit. On November 26, 1559 and again on 31 March, 1560, John Jewel's famous 'challenge' was delivered as a sermon from the cross and sparked off a long-running controversy between Jewel and the Catholic exile John Harding. Anti-popery was not the only use of controversial rhetoric at Paul's Cross; in 1589 Richard Bancroft delivered a

---

11Sir William Browne to Trumbull. William Devick also wrote to him of the event, reporting that there was 'an infinite number of people' at Higgons' sermons and that Higgons performed it 'exceeding well with evident demonstration of true repentance and sorrow for his offence': HMC Marquess of Downshire III, pp. 31-33.

12Michael Questier has shown the zeal with which some members of the English Church hierarchy, most notably Archbishop Abbot, exploited the propaganda opportunity afforded by converts from Catholicism. They were anxious to encourage conversion among Catholic priests in their custody and offered spiritual guidance and financial incentives to those who appeared to be wavering. Such converts were clearly considered to be of great propaganda potential because they could 'witness' to the corruption of the Roman Church: Michael Questier, 'John Gee, Archbishop Abbot, and the Use of Converts from Rome'. See also, Questier, 'The Phenomenon of Conversion', pp. 114, 127-133, 196-198.

13Controversial is here used in the sense of 'debating' or 'disputational' as this was the sense (as found in the term 'controversial divinity') used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Modern scholars of this subject often use the word 'polemic' to convey this idea, but the OED does not list 'polemic' or 'polemical' before the 1640s. The present writer has found only one earlier instance of its use. (This is Samuel Ward's 1616 Paul's Cross sermon *Balm from Gilead to Recover Conscience* (1617) sig. A8r, p. 5, when Ward complains that 'Polemical and Schoole-divinitie' dominates Paul's Cross.) Instead, the words 'refutational', 'confutational' and 'redargutive' are generally used to describe works that engage in partisan debate. Therefore, the word 'polemic' will not be used as a term describing a particular form or genus of writing, although it may be used in a more general sense to describe political use of the pulpit and print media.

stinging attack on Puritanism from here. In James' reign, confessional offensives were not launched from Paul's Cross and preachers tended to insert anti-popy digressions within their sermons instead. Purely controversial sermons were still preached at Paul's Cross, however. On November 1, 1607, Samuel Collins, chaplain to Richard Bancroft, delivered a sermon against schismatics. In 1622, Humphrey Sydenham, fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, defended a supra-lapsarian account of predestination from the 'Pelagians' and 'troope of Arminians' who had 'taken head against this truth'. By far the most common target for controversial sermons was 'the common enemy', the Church of Rome. Nathanael Delaune, a French Protestant minister received by Archbishop Abbot into the English ministry, delivered a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1617 which dealt almost exclusively with the wickedness of the Roman Church's denial of assurance of faith. William Symonds' *A heavenly voyce. A sermon tending to call the people of God from among the Romish Babylonians* is clearly polemical in its approach to anti-Catholicism. Symonds preached on Revelations 18.4-5 ('And I heard another voice from heaven say, go out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins are come up to heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities') a text used repeatedly as a proof-text justifying of the Reformation. Thomas Thompson's *Antichrist Arraigned* also draws on the same apocalyptic interpretation of the opposition between the Papacy and the reformed churches.

---

15Richard Bancroft was then chaplain to Sir Christopher Hatton. Taking 1 John 4.1 as his text, he placed England's presbyterians among those who have troubled the Church. They are among the 'false prophets' of which John warned. Bancroft's sermon had an immediate impact, and responses came from the Scottish church and, in England, from the presbyterian and Martinist John Penry. Patrick Collinson has described this sermon as 'a minor landmark in English church history'. Bancroft's sermon marked a change in the Church's attitude to Puritanism. 'Such a diatribe', Collinson notes 'would hardly have been uttered in the earl of Leicester's time, yet now it was published within the month, according to Whitgift, "by direction" from Hatton and Burghley'. It gave Bancroft's opponents 'a foretaste of his [Bancroft's] disclosures and the forensic ruthlessness of his use of them': Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (1967), p. 397.

16Samuel Collins, *A sermon preached at Paules-Crosse* (1608). Collins succeeded in using his text (1 Tim. 6.3-5) to present all those who objected to details in the Church's organisation as ludicrous malcontents while retaining a position of apostolic mildness in his attack. Humphrey Sydenham, *Jacob and Esau* (1626), sig. B3r, p. 5.

17Nathanael Delaune, *The christians tryumph* (1617). Delaune thanks Abbot for receiving him into the English ministry, having received testimonies of his 'thirteene yeares service in the French Ministerie without spot or dis-reputation', in the dedicatory epistle, sigs. A3r-v.


Whether as part of a sermon or its main theme, addressing controversies in religion was universally recognised as a function of preaching. Referred to as the 'refutation of false doctrine', a clear scheme of how this was to be accomplished in a sermon was arrived at early within the Protestant tradition. Refutation (or 'redargution') was included among the four uses derived from 2 Timothy 3.16 ('All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness'). William Perkins lists the teaching of doctrine, redargution ('whereby teaching is used for the reformation of the minde from error'), instruction and correction as the four uses, a scheme followed by John Wilkins. In The faithful shepheard, Richard Bernard classifies the four uses as redargutive ('when the doctrine is used to confute and overthrow an error or heresie), instructive, corrective and consolatory. Matthew Sutcliffe used these texts to create five uses of sermons: doctrinal, refutational ('refutationem haeresis alicuius, aut erroris') instructive, corrective and consolatory. The anonymous Officium Concionatoris, published in Cambridge in 1655, also follows this classification of uses and lists 'redargution' as the use which confutes errors.

All of these writers, therefore, describe the refutation of errors as one of the primary functions of a sermon. Bernard gives it the 'first place' among the uses because 'if the truth delivered have any adversaries, they must be confuted first'. He defines this use as 'a solid reasoning for the truth, and the overthrowing of the opinions held against it, contrary to the truth of Faith, or contrary to the truth for practise, and the errors in both contradicting either kind of doctrine'. The importance of argumentation is evident in this definition and the forms of argument are also laid out by preaching theorists; most are also prominent in tracts and other controversial genera. Hyperius gives detailed information on the sorts of arguments that could be used so that statements hiding logical fallacies, false interpretations and doctrinal errors could be exposed. He lists them as arguments taken

21Matthew Sutcliffe, De recta studii theologici ratione (1602), sgs. F2r-v, pp. 75-76; Officium concionatoris (1655), sig. D4r, p. 31.
from the logicians, the rhetoricians and divinity. Richard Bernard summarises these into ten commonplaces of argument,23 all of which were generally employed by preachers at Paul's Cross and in the controversies in which they partook.24 The widespread use of these commonplaces is easily seen by a survey of their occurrence in Paul's Cross sermons.

The first of these commonplaces draws refutations from 'some principle of Divinity, or of Nature and common experience'. In The christians triumph, Nathanael Delaune grounds his insistence on assurance of faith, and so salvation, in the 'nature of faith', from which chronic doubt is absent by definition. In his Sermon preached at Paules-crosse, Thomas Aylesbury gives a difficult and detailed refutation of Christ's ubiquity on the grounds that the properties of man and God are united only in the person of Christ. George Downname digresses in his A treatise ... concerning christian libertie to clarify the distinction between justification and sanctification, which Catholics conflate, and to confute the consequent doctrine of justification by inherent righteousness.25

Probably the most common means of refutation is that listed second by Bernard: the use of 'plaine and expresse Texts of Scripture', or 'necessary consequence from the same'. George Downname argues for obedience to the Church's hierarchy from the fifth commandment. Nathanael Delaune justifies his omission of other forms of proof, notably 'many ornaments from the Fathers, and others', in The christian's triumph, because he was sure he could 'give full proportion in all points necessarie,' by using proofs only from 'the testimonie of Scripture, the onely rule for Articles of faith, and salvation.26

---

23Hyperius, The practis of preaching, sigs. U2r-U4v, ff. 146r-148v. Bernard gives a shorter list of arguments and does not distinguish between the sources of argument, although his main points are identical to Hyperius: The faithfull shepheard (1621), sigs. N8r-v, pp. 275-6. A similar list is given by Matthew Sutcliffe, De recta studii theologici ratione, sig. F5v, p. 82. Another list, albeit with only seven of these points, is given in the anonymous Officium Concionatoris, sig. D4v, p. 32.

24 In what follows, the refutational material used is either from a sermon at Paul's Cross or part of a controversy begun at Paul's Cross or part of a controversy begun by one of the converts who recanted at Paul's Cross. The volume of refutational material from this period prohibits a survey of refutation in this thesis. As the sample used here is quite large and chosen by location rather than for any set topic or writer, it is reasonable to assume that it is representative.

25Nathanael Delaune, The christian's triumph, table of contents; Thomas Aylesbury, A sermon preached at Paules-crosse (1623), sigs. F1v-F2v, pp. 34-36; George Downname, A treatise upon John 8.36 concerning christian libertie (1609), sigs. E2v-F1v, pp. 28-34.

26George Downname, A treatise ... concerning christian libertie, sig. K3v, p. 70; Nathanael Delaune, The christians triumph, sig. D8v, p. 54. Robert Bedingfield also cites a list of scriptural places in his confutation of human merits: A sermon preached at Paul's Crosse (1625), sigs. E2v-E3r, pp. 36-7.
Yet, as Samuel Collins points out, everyone who has risen up 'in contradiction against the Church' has had 'a scriptum est of his side, and somewhat to say for himselfe'.27 Church councils and the writings of the Church Fathers, Bernard's third and fourth sources of proof, were also commonly deployed in these sermons, most commonly to deny the antiquity of the Roman church by charging her with doctrinal innovations.

Purgatory was unknown to the Fathers of the Church, says Thomas Myriell in *The christians comfort*. So too says Gabriel Price in *The laver of the heart* and Robert Bedingfield in his *Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse*.28 The controversy caused by Theophilus Higgons' *The first motive* revolved around his use of Augustinian and pseudo-Augustinian testimonies.29

Bernard's next three proofs are by human testimony more generally: 'from Lawes Civill, Canon, Common, and Municipall. *Sixthly*, from testimonies in all ages. *Seventhly*, from the Confessions of the Faith of Churches', and all are used as additional, but rarely as independent, sources of proof. For example, in *The patterne of all invincible faith*, William Worship cites a succession of those who 'held with us' against Rome 'in the darkest...
times' (including the Greek Church, the Waldensians, Lollards and the Bohemian Church) as additional proof that Rome is not the true Church.\textsuperscript{30}

The last three forms of refutation recommended by Bernard function by demonstrating the weakness of the opponents' case instead of proving the opposite position. This is done:

from the adversaries themselves, and that two ways: first, in bringing such of their side, as hold with us, especially such as bee of note among them, contradicting so one another: secondly, in shewing how some one or more of the generalTenents held by both us and them, doe overthrow them. Ninthly, from the opinion it self, which they hold, observing therein, how a Contradiction is in it, overthrowing it selfe, and so is absurd. Tenthly, from the discovery of the weake and false grounds whereon they build as these, bare opinions of men, old custome. Examples of many, deceived Counsels, forged Testimonies, Testimonies of Fathers mistaken, or misconstrued, pretended unwritten Verities and Traditions Apostolicall, Apocryphall booke, erroneous translations, or from the abuse of the Scripture, alledging words without the sense, or part of a sentence for the whole, or by adding to something (1621 ed., sig. N8v, p. 276).

Charles Sonnibank uses the first of these arguments when he narrates a story about the Marian bishop Stephen Gardiner in which Gardiner almost admitted that justification is by faith only. So too Nathanael Delaune quotes two Dominicans to show that the Council of Trent contradicted the opinions of Catholic writers when it disallowed assurance of faith. Robert Bolton uses Bernard’s ninth refutational argument when he reveals the circularity of the Catholics’ claim to accept Scripture as the teacher of doctrine but their insistence that the Church must interpret Scripture.\textsuperscript{31}

By far the most popular refutational argument, however, was the ‘discovery of the weake and false grounds’ upon which the opponents based their teaching. Edward Chaloner uses Cardinals Baronius’ and Bellarmine’s writings on altars to show that the Catholic Church persists in using pagan ceremonies despite biblical injunctions. William Jackson lists the ‘unwritten verities’ held by the Roman Church to show that they do not follow the path of righteousness. Thomas Aylesbury quotes some of the more tendentious readings of Scripture accepted by Catholic divines:

That precious corner Stone, and sure foundation, which Esay the Prophet foretold; and Peter the Eagle applyed unto Christ, Bellarmine hath squared it for the Pope: He

\textsuperscript{30}William Worship, \textit{The patterne of an invincible faith} (1616), sig. B1r-v, pp. 5-6.

can convert omnes into solos: Christ saith of the Chalice, \textit{Drinke you all of this}: that is, (saith hee) the Priests alone: and \textit{manducationem in Monarchiam}; Peter kill and eat, \textit{ergo Peter} was head of the Church.\textsuperscript{32}

Nonetheless, argumentation according to these topics was not the only means of persuasion in refutational sermons and it is clear that argumentation, especially on complex topics, was considered counterproductive in certain situations. Provoking unthought-of error was treated as a real danger by the writers on preaching rhetoric and they insisted that refutational sermons should only be preached when absolutely necessary. Richard Bernard gives the following warnings to refuters:

\textit{First}, let none fall to convince error, except by extreme necessity they be urged thereunto, before they have for some time delivered a certaine truth, and catechized the people. ... \textit{Secondly}, herein let none meddle farther, when they beginne, then may benefit the hearers, and themselves well able to deale with. It is good to raise up no more spirits, by shewing the arguments of the adversary, then may bee cunningly conjured downe againe ... \textit{Thirdly}, let us beware wee call not up, or once mention old, dead, or by-past heresies, out of mens memories; this were but to keepe in mind what were better buried in oblivion; neither devise any new, which are not held: which were so to fight with out owne shadow, and to utter lies, and offend against charitie by slander (1621 ed., sigs. N12r-O2r, p 283-287).

Bernard's concern is clearly that a refutation in which orthodoxy did not obviously have the strongest case would be counterproductive.

III

There was another way of confuting an opponent that did not rely on argumentation and it was equally common in refutational sermons. This strategy was to attack the character, or \textit{ethos}, of the opposition. The importance of the speaker's character for the suasory effect of an oration was described in detail by the classical rhetoricians on whom the theorists of sacred rhetoric drew. They assumed that the character a speaker projected had an enormous influence on the persuasiveness of his oration. Aristotle wrote that the speaker's \textit{ethos} was one of the three forms of persuasion (along with pathic, or emotional appeals, and dialectical arguments) available to the rhetor. Cicero and Quintilian considered it an

important means of winning the good will of the hearers, through which they can more easily be persuaded of the rhetor's claims. The Rhetorica ad Herennium added to these discussions a point less often made in preaching rhetorics: that the destruction of the opponent's ethos can be an equally effective means of persuasion. This insight found its way into English rhetoric through Thomas Wilson's The Arte of Rhetorique (1553). Wilson describes three ways we can 'get favoure' by discussing the adversary. These are by making the opponent hated, envied or 'altogether despise[d]'. Where Aristotle had defined good sense, virtue and good will to the hearers as the means to establish a speaker's ethos, Wilson shows how the opposites can destroy the ethos of an opponent. He give detailed means to produce each effect:

We shall sone make our adversaries to be lothed, if we shewe and set furth, some naughtie deede of theirs, and declare how cruelly, how vile, and how maliciously thei have used other men heretofore. We shall make them be envied, if we reporte unto the Judges, that thei beare theimselves haulte, and stoute upon their wealthy frendes, and oppresse poore men by might ... And by the waie declare some one thyng, that they have doen, which honest eares would scant abide to heare. We shall make theim to bee sette naught by, if we declare what luskes thei are, how unthriftely thei live, how their do nothing from daie to daie, but eate, drinke, and slepe, rather sekynig to live like beastes, then myndyng to live like men, either profityng their countrey, or in renderyng their awne commoditie, as by right thei ought to do.

An attack on ethos can, therefore, be a powerful weapon in refutation. In The Foundation of Rhetorike, Richard Reynoldes gives examples of the rhetorical exercises known 'the destruccion' and 'the confirmacion'. The 'destruccion', called a 'confutacion' in the table of contents, is 'a certain reprehension of any thyng declaimed, or dilated, in the whiche by order of art the declarer shall proced to caste doune by force, and strengthe of reason, the contrary induced'.

33To produce conviction in the hearers in this way, Aristotle wrote that the speaker must have good sense, virtue and goodwill towards the hearers. Cicero also accepted that such a character is so compelling that it may often be as important as the merits of the case, but he suggested that the orator need only 'appear' to be 'upright, well-bred and virtuous'. At the end of his extended discussion of the proper definitions and functions of ethos and pathos, Quintilian integrates both these positions. The orator must possess or be thought to possess those virtues for which he is to commend his client: Aristotle, The "Art" of Rhetoric, trans. John Henry Freese (1926; repr. 1994), I.II.3; II.I.5, pp. 16-17, 170-171; Cicero, De Oratore, trans. E.W. Sutton, intro. H. Rackham (1942; repr. 1967), II.xliii.184, pp. 328-9; Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, VI.II.18-19, trans. H.E. Butler, (1920-22; repr. 1966-69) vol. II, pp. 426-9. Aristotle differs from most rhetoricians by making ethos one of the three sources of conviction (pistes), along with logical and pathetic proofs. On ethos in Aristotle, see William W. Fortenbaugh, 'Aristotle on Persuasion Through Character', Rhetorica, 10 (1992), pp. 226-230. On the connection between ethos and the moral theories of Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, see Nan Johnson, 'Ethos and the Aims of Rhetoric', in Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse, eds Connors, Ede and Lunsford (1984), pp. 98-14, pp. 99-105.

34Rhetorica ad Herennium, trans. Harry Caplin (1959; repr. 1989), I.V.8, pp. 14-15; Thomas Wilson,
Here a distinction must be made between the various forms of debate, including refutation, that harboured under the umbrella term 'controversial divinity'. The use of the word 'controversial' to describe the inter-denominational disputes at this period evidently places them in the tradition of scholarly disputation and argument in utramque partem. Refutation, however, has a different purpose and a different audience from scholarly disputation and this has a marked influence on the forms of persuasion used and the use to which they are put. By definition, a refutational sermon is one which proves someone to be wrong, by argument or otherwise. Hyperius defined redargution as 'a destruction or refutation of false and erroneous opinions, which are obtruded of the enemies of truth to deceive the ignoraunt and unlearned'. In rhetorical terms, the aim is to convince the hearers that the speaker's version of the question at issue (the 'controversy' or 'status' of the oration) is the correct one. This aligns it with the aim of forensic rhetoric. Indeed, Hyperius' directing the preacher to 'Cicero in his booke .1. de inventione entretanginge of reprehension', and Quintilian 'touchinge confutation' as these 'doe teach some things not to be refused'. In both these sources, refutation is discussed as the part of a

---


Thomas Conley has defined argument in utramque partem as 'a multivoiced method, which begets controversia, a dialogue in which practical or philosophical formulations are situated in divergent frames of reference, brought into conflict in debate, and tested for their respective claims of probabilitas: Conley, Rhetoric in the European Tradition (1990), p. 37; Controversiae were used as a schoolboy exercise (arguing pro and contra on any issue) in preparation for the serious use of rhetoric in public life and scholarly debate: see Quentin Skinner, Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes (1996), pp. 27-28, 29-30; 'Thomas Hobbes and the Construction of Morality', pp. 20-22. On the philosophical lineage of controversiae, see Michael J. Buckley, S.J., 'Philosophical Method in Cicero', Journal of the History of Philosophy, 8 (1970), 143-154. The OED defines 'to confute' as (1) 'to prove (a person) to be wrong; to overcome or silence in argument; to convict of error by argument or proof'; (2) 'to prove (an argument or opinion) to be false, invalid or defective; to disprove, refute' or (3) 'to confound, render futile, bring to nought'. To refute is defined as (2) 'to prove (a person) to be in error, to confute' and (3) 'to disprove, overthrow by argument, prove to be false'. Argumentation is clearly only a means to refutation. Redargution, the word also used in preaching rhetorics to describe this use is defined as confutation or refutation although the verb 'to redarge' can be used more restrictively to mean (2) 'to confute by argument: Hyperius, The practis of preaching, sig. D4v, f. 20v.

Status theory is a very complex branch of rhetoric and definitions of 'controversy' or 'status' varying greatly between classical writers. As defined by Cicero, the 'controversy' or 'status' of a speech is its main point, or what the speech 'is about': De Inventione, trans. H.M. Hubbell (1949, repr. 1993), I.viii.10, p. 21. Quintilian discusses the definition of status or point at issue and the various types of 'issues' used, especially in forensic rhetoric: Institutio Oratoria, III. VI.
forensic speech in which the claims of the opposition are denied and their arguments answered. Likewise, the preacher of a refutational sermon addresses his hearers as a third party in the dispute, not as the composers of errors, or even necessarily their supporters. His purpose is to convince them that a certain opinion is erroneous: argumentation is merely one possible means to that end. When Humphrey Sydenham preached against Arminian views of predestination, he drew a distinction between a 'debate' and the refutational sermon. Here it is not his purpose to 'convince' the opponent but to 'resolve' the hearers in a truth they already know:

I intend not here a pitcht field against the upstart Sectarie, for I shall met him anon in a single combat: my purpose now is to be but as a scout, or spie, which discovers the weaknesse of his adversary, not stands to encounter. And indeed both the time and place suggest me rather to resolve than debate; and convince, than dispute an errour.

Persuasion through ethos provided a refuter with the means to destroy an opponent's opinion without discussing that opinion in detail. This could be used very effectively to discredit the opponent as a teacher in issues disputed between the Churches. Secular rhetoricians assumed that the appearance of speaking simply and charitably persuaded because it suggested that the speaker was truthful. In the context of sacred rhetoric, it also suggested that the preacher and his Church were teachers of true doctrine. Conversely, if the opponent is shown to speak lies hidden by intricate sophisms or scholarly fraud, then he is not on the side of truth nor can his Church be the true one. Such ethical attacks were allowed by Hyperius in a refutational situation, for which he cited the precedent of Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees:

Indeed he may touch the persons, somtimes also sharply, after which sorte we see the Pharisees to be handeled of Christ: but he must in no wise pretermitte gravitie, whereunto it behoveth a godly zeale to be joyned, and that (as the Apostles speaketh) accordinge to knowledge; finally thorough love he ought to avoyde all offence givinge. (sig. U5r, f. 149r).

39Humphrey Sydenham, *Jacob and Esau*, sig. B3r, p. 5. The two sorts of argument distinguished here are most similar to those used by Erasmus and Luther in their debate over free will. In his *Diatribas de libero arbitrio* (1524) Erasmus argues all positions in order to find one sufficiently probable ('satis probabile'). It is a 'confutational' approach that Luther adopts in his *Assertio, de servo arbitrio*. He asserts the truth of his case and proceeds to refute Erasmus' carefully structured study of probabilities. On the exchange between Erasmus and Luther, see Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*, pp. 120-124; Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle, *Rhetoric and Reform* (1983).
IV

The central place of ethical attacks in the rhetoric of refutation can be shown from a detailed examination of the tracts produced in response to William Crashaw's *Sermon preached at the Crosse, Feb. xiii. 1607*. By the time the sermon found its way into print, the controversy had already begun, as the full-title of the printed version announces that the author will 'justify' his sermon *both against papist, and Brownist*. In his epistle to the reader, Crashaw apologises for the delay in publishing the sermon 'so many wekees expected'. Justified by the authour, both against papist, and Brownist, to be the truth: Wherein, this point is principally followed; namely, that the religion of Rome, as now it stands established, is worse then ever it was (1608), sig. *Ir.

That a refutation, rather than debate, lay behind the sermon's structure is clear from the dedicatory epistle. Crashaw writes not to 'argue' with the adversary, as so many have done in vain, but to 'discover' the 'foulness' of the Roman Church in order to provoke conversions from it:

*Hereupon, wise and godly learned men, have upon great and mature deliberation, thought it fit to spare the labour, (so often formerly spent in vain) and to supersede for a time from arguing any more, the matters so sufficiently already debated, but so insufficiently heard and judged: and have held it a better course (both for their conversion, and settling of our owne) to discover the foulenes & manifold abominations of poperie, both for doctrine & practice: Which if many that be seduced, did but see in the true colors, surely they would strike themselves on the brest, & be ashamed; & hating this darknesse, would long & look for light (sig. ¶2v).*

In his sermon, Crashaw justifies the Reformation by using the metaphors of sickness in his text, Jeremiah 51.9 ('We would have cured Babel, but she would not be healed: let us forsake her, and go every one into his own country: for her judgement is come up into heaven, and lifted up to the clouds'). He interprets the text as the true Church expressing her desire to have helped her obstinate enemies. In the *division*, Crashaw considers four 'particulars': the Church's love and care for her enemies; the incurable state of those enemies; the Church's duty to abandon those who will not be helped and finally, the destruction of Babylon by God. He then distinguishes the literal from the mystical Babylon (sigs. A1v-A2r, pp. 2-3). Crashaw describes the Christian duties to love and care for one's

---

40William Crashaw, *The sermon preached at the Crosse, Feb. xiii.1607. Justified by the authour, both against papist, and Brownist, to be the truth: Wherein, this point is principally followed; namely, that the religion of Rome, as now it stands established, is worse then euer it was* (1608), sig. *Ir.*
fellows, to teach by word and example and to abandon the company of the wicked (albeit while praying for them) as the *uses* to be taken from the literal meaning of the text. Those who refuse to attend public worship without reason are also rebuked because this text insists that the Church must first try to 'heal Babel' (sig. El v, p. 34). Therefore, separatists from the English church have no reason to remain in schism. Crashaw then moves on to discuss the mystical sense of the text. Mystical Babylon he defines as 'the spiritual kingdom of darkenesse' and is 'partly temporarie; which is the Kingdom of Antichrist' and 'partly permanent ... and that is the kingdom of sin' (sig. E4 r, p. 39). The second of these definitions is reserved for a short exhortatory *application* to 'life and manners' at the end of the sermon. It is in considering the first aspect of mystical Babylon that Crashaw engages in a refutation of the Roman church, whose identification with the kingdom of Antichrist he 'will not stand to prove' as it is generally accepted. Crashaw argues that the Roman church has twenty 'wounds', or doctrinal errors and corrupt canons, that were apparent at the time of the Reformation and have not been healed by the Counter-Reformation.

Needless to say, even before it was printed Crashaw's sermon was vehemently rejected by both Catholics and Separatists, as he himself admits in the dedicatory epistle. After its publication, responses were made by both opponents. Henry Ainsworth responded to Crashaw for the Separatists with a refutational strategy both elegant and effective. Crashaw cited the Separatists as people who misuse this biblical text to justify schism, but in his *exposition*, he failed to identify any essential difference between the Protestant / Catholic division and the Protestant / Separatist one. He says that the English Church does not suffer from the doctrinal 'wounds' of the Roman Church, but avoids engaging with the Separatists' arguments that she does. Where Crashaw argues that the Separatists have not sought to heal the English church, with devastating simplicity Ainsworth transfers Crashaw's criterion for Protestant / Catholic polemic to the Protestant / Separatist arena:

*I answer, we have sought your healing, even as by your own doctrine the faithful Jewes sought the cure of Babel: & as your selves have sought the healing of Rome. The means which the Jewes and your selves have used to cure Babel, you shew in you sermon to be three; Instruction, Example, Prayer. By Instruction, you say, laying open their errors, discovering their impieties, and laying before them the excellency of true religion. Thus (say I) have we done with you: witnesse (besids our*

---

41 A similar argument, although less detailed, is made by William Symonds, *A heavenly voyce*, sig. D1 r.
speeches and conferences) the many books of this argument, which are published in print. 42

Ainsworth's answer refutes Crashaw by 'plaine and expresse Texts of Scripture', the strongest and most popular sort of proof. Ainsworth's task had been simplified, however, by the interpretative gap left by Crashaw. The Catholic response was less straightforward. Crashaw was answered by John Floyd (the man who may have converted Theophilus Higgons) in his The overthrow of the protestants pulpit-babels of 1612. 43 Crashaw's argument against the Catholic church could be summarised in syllogistic form. Indeed, Crashaw does this in his epistle to the reader and sets this abstract as the target for responses:

If any should thinke of answere, I desire him let passe all personall rayling, and by-matters, and come directly to the points at issue: which be these;

1. Whether the Church of Rome teach & practice in these xx or xxi. points, as I have charged her withall, or no.
2. If she do, whether they be healed of these wounds as yet, or no.
3. If she be not, then how she can be the true Church, which is so wounded, and will not be healed.

If they doe not teach and practice so, I will yeeld the Cause. And hee that can shew me that either she is healed since, or being not healed, how she can be the true Church, I shall willingly heare him, and thank him (sig. *1v).

The controversy caused by the sermon when it was first preached complicated Crashaw's stance by forcing him to take a defensive position. He needed to bring documentary evidence to show that his opponents were guilty of every charge he brought against them. In his dedicatory epistle he shows how this is dependent on print:

*Therefore to honour the truth, and to cleer my selfe, but much more to shewe that it is no trick nor pollicy of our State (as it is in poperie) to set up men with authority to raile and lie, therby to make our enemies odious; I have bin induced to publish what was said & so to justifie out of their own records what was affirmed of them.* 44

He declares that he has 'spared no cost ... nor time' (sig. ¶2v) in getting and reading Catholic books to substantiate his claims against them. For each of the accusations he makes, he provides detailed bibliographical evidence. The first example of this is a long marginal note

---

42 Henry Ainsworth, Counterpoison (1608), sig. 2f2r, p. 251.
44 William Crashaw, The sermon preached at the Crosse, sig. ¶3r. This technique (using the opponent’s own words against them) was an innovation in Jacobean polemic first used by the priest known as John Bereeley (Lawrence Anderton) in his 1604 Apologie of the Romane Church: Peter Milward, Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age, pp. 151-2.
to the accusation marked with superscript 'C' in the quotation above. Where he has accused Catholics of slandering Protestants, he provides the following proof:

A book was printed in English in the college at Rome, wherein it is affirmed that we take Catholics, and draw upon their legs bootes ful of hot boiling liquor, Feuarden't a learned Frier, yet living at Par, wrote in Latin 7. yeeres agoe, that we revile & reject that prayers to the holy Trinitie; Sancta Trinitas unus Deus miserere nobis. ... Gretserus a Jesuite was suffered to write within these 2 yeares that we rackt and tortured Garnet, even neere to death to make him confesse himselfe guilty of the powder treason, but he did not (sigs. 3r-v).

Crashaw also uses this documentation to bolster the claims of fraternal sorrow demanded by his text while prosecuting his argument against Catholics. Crashaw's sermon is, therefore, an attack on Catholic errors presented as a defence of Protestantism. Each time an error is described by him, he cites its original source and then cites a more recent source to see if this 'wound' has been 'healed'. In each case, it has not and Crashaw accompanies each pronouncement that the error remains with a lament. Therefore, Crashaw is using his documentary evidence to prove his accusations true and the Reformation justified.

Consequently, the only refutational proofs suggested by Richard Bernard that Crashaw uses are those that exploit the weakness of the opponent's case. He quotes Vives, 'a great doctor' among the Catholics, as saying that the Golden Legend is 'so full of ridiculous absurdities, impieties and untruths, that he affirmed him to be a man of a brazen face, and a leaden heart that wrote them' (sig. V1v, p. 154). His primary refutational technique is to show the adversaries contradicting a principle of divinity or Scriptures. To do this, he shows the 'weak grounds' of traditions, customs and decretals on which the opponent's 'build' their arguments, as Richard Bernard suggested. This technique has the effect of treating all statements, devotional, poetical, legendary, ceremonial or legal, as ex cathedra pronouncements on Catholic doctrine, The allowance of these works in print is treated as an allowance of them as doctrine. Crashaw's technique is less scholarly than his marginal citations would suggest but it is more effective as refutation for all that. He makes Catholicism appear monolithic by taking the claim of doctrinal unity at face value. Any form of Catholic practice can be used to discredit official Catholic teaching. Careful pronominalisation is a vital tool in this regard, and one that Crashaw can take from his text. He establishes two camps - they the erroneous Babylonians, we the enlightened Israelites -
and exhorts the hearers to stay on the right side of the line he draws. The careful use of
pronouns builds up the dichotomy between 'us' and 'them' throughout the sermon so that
this line is thickened. Each Catholic work cited is made to represent 'them' and another
example of 'their' faults. 'Their' failure to correct these errors is symptomatic of 'their' lack
of care for the truth.45

Floyd's response to Crashaw is to rebut as many of these individual citations
as he can, in order to destroy Crashaw's credibility as a reporter. Floyd exploits the errors in
Crashaw's citations of Catholic sources and claims that Crashaw wilfully distorts his sources.
When Crashaw said that Catholics make the canon law of greater authority than the
Scripture, he cited the gloss on a papal decretal where he says this statement was made. To
prove that this is still part of current Catholic doctrine, Crashaw said that it has not been
changed in any edition he knows of and that similar, if not worse, things have been said by
Catholics in recent years (The sermon preached at the cross, sigs. I4v-K2r, pp. 72-75).
Floyd responds by insisting that Crashaw has misrepresented the authority of the decretals
and that this particular gloss had been emended in the latest edition. He also claims that
Crashaw must have known this, because this was the edition Crashaw used. As proof that
Crashaw knowingly ignored this, Floyd compares his hesitancy in saying the quotation was
unchanged with the dogmatism of his earlier declarations. Crashaw's apparent prevarication
makes him appear untruthful (The overthrow of the protestants pulpit-babel, sigs. Z2v-Z4r,
pp. 180-3). The objective in most of these interchanges is only to show that the opponent is
untruthful or unreliable.46

Floyd also attacks Crashaw's learning, his ability to interpret Scripture and
his ability to understand the points at controversy between Protestant and Catholics. He
begins his refutation of Crashaw's reading of the text by pointing out that it is cited
incorrectly on the first page of the sermon:

Where it is worth the marking, that (notwithstanding the great exactnes promised by
him in quoting authors) at the first dash, he neyther quoteth right the verse, nor

45The importance of careful pronominalization in refutational writing is an insight taken from Thomas
46Floyd had earlier accused Crashaw of corrupting his sources 'by putting in words of his owne, or leaving
out words of theirs, or joyning together the words that are divided in the Authors into the same sentence,
... or finally, which is his ordinary and common trick, by false translating their sentences into English' near
the beginning of his reply: The overthrow of the protestants pulpit-babels, sig. C2v, p. 20.
words of his text. For the verse is not as he saith the 11. (though the number of passions fitteth well a passionate Pamphlet) but the ninth, which number sacred to the Muses by him fatuously, or fatally rejected, doth seeme to presage, that none of those learned nyne shall have part in his Sermon (sig. H4v, p. 64).

Later, Floyd is ruthlessly sarcastic about the interpretative difficulty of comparing English Catholics to the Babylonian captors of Israel. By this interpretation, it is the English Protestants who have been 'led captyve, kept in prison, who mourn upon the bankes of Babylon, sighing out Geneva psalms by the Thames side' and the Catholics who 'in England rule the sterne of the state, live in mirth, joy and joyllity, & doe wonderfully afflict and prosecute the righteous soules of those good Israelites that they are weary of their lives (sig. L1r, p. 81).

Floyd increasingly refers to Crashaw merely as 'the Bachelor' in order to suggest that he is Floyd's academic inferior.47 Crashaw's zeal in revealing the immorality of the Papal court is turned into a prurient habit of 'scarce uttering one sentence which hath not whores or harlots, or concubynes, or other more shamefull stuffe' which the modest Floyd could not mention (sig. 2K2v, p. 260). Floyd also accuses Crashaw of Puritanism as a means of insinuating that his loyalty to the English Church is unsound. He asks whether Crashaw professes 'his owne religion' or 'the Kings' because there was a time when a voice saying '(Crashaw, Crashaw, go to Geneva) did ring strongly in his eares'. Crashaw's appeal to Brownists not to leave the English Church is meant only to 'draw more and more from Protestancy to their sect' (sigs. N2v-N3r, pp. 100-1). In his address to the students at the Inns of Court (Crashaw being a lecturer at the Temple), Floyd asks them to disown their preacher and his works, as others have done. He claims that the Earl of Salisbury refused to patronise the sermon and that Parliament ordered the letter dedicating Crashaw's The Jesuit's Gospel to them to be suppressed.48

---

47John Floyd, The overthrow of the protestants pulpit-babels, sigs. B3v, S1v, 2Bv, 2C4r, 2H3v, 2Kr, pp. 70, 138, 194, 207, 246, 257. Crashaw was a bachelor of divinity at this stage, so Floyd's use of the term (suggesting he was a mere Bachelor of Arts) is insulting. By 1612, when he replied to Crashaw, Floyd was a professed father of the Jesuit order who had taught philosophy and theology at the English college in Rome. He was reputed to be a man 'excellent learned, as well in philosophy as theology' (Wood) and wrote voluminously before his death in 1649 (DNB). In 1612, however, he was not senior to Crashaw (they were both born in 1572) nor very much his academic superior. His use of this pejorative name does give him the appearance of academic superiority.

48John Floyd, The overthrow of the protestants pulpit-babels, sigs. B3r-v, H1r-v, pp. 13-14, 58-9. No record of a controversy over either of these dedications can be found among the State Papers Domestic, the House of Commons Journal for the 1610 parliament or Proceedings in Parliament, 1610, ed. Elizabeth
Floyd gives this negative polemic strategy a positive, offensive twist by charging Crashaw with slandering Catholics. In doing so, he places his rebuttal of Crashaw in the context of the complaints against his Paul's Cross sermon to which Crashaw admitted in the dedication. Floyd makes a broader polemic strategy of this accusation by presenting Crashaw's work as merely typical of Protestant preaching. Even respected English divines like John Jewel (in his Apology), Lancelot Andrewes (who 'doth often wound' his Latin style, 'worthy of better matter', in his debate with Bellarmine) and Richard Field (sigs. A3v-A4v, pp. 6-8) are guilty of the same behaviour. Crashaw's sermon is made stand for all English refutations even in the text used:

*M. Crashaw* may seeme very sufficiently to have satisfied our desire, who hath gathered these slaughters into heades, & layd those heades, as you shall see, very orderly togethers in his own head, and Sermon, that all their chiefe slaughters, togeather with his, may be cut off, and cleared by one, and that not very long Aunswere. But besides this first use of this Treatise, the same may also serve for an Answere unto many Sermons that are continually made against the Church of Rome in England in *M. Crashawes* rayling tune, falling and rising upon the same notes of falshood; *That the Pope is our Lord God; that he can do more then ever God did*, and the rest. Often also singing unto their false notes the very same ditty of this misapplied text: *We would have cured Babel &c.* By which clamorous rayling, they put their ignorant Auditors into such a rage, & fury against us, that as Erasmus noted long ago, they come from sermons no lesse fierce and fiery, then soouldiers from the warlike speech of a Captaine exhorting them to fight (sigs. A4v-B1r, pp. 8-9).

Further on, Floyd suggests that Crashaw's sermon can be assumed to be comparatively mild because it has been allowed in print, whereas the rest 'of such darke & foule stuffe' has been suppressed 'for very shame' by England's Protestants (sig. T2r, p. 147).

Floyd's strategy is, then, to attack Crashaw's *ethos* and the *ethical* standing of the Church of England more generally. He claims that they are guilty of a 'bitter' and 'railing' style that preachers were advised to avoid. He implies that they use *pathetic* proofs to stir up violent hatred of Catholics, a method appropriate for refuting only bitter enemies. Floyd claims that when 'the persecution is hottest', the Protestant ministers 'seeke to kindle the same fiery impressions of hatred in others, wherewith themselves are inraged' and to do so, conjure up as monstrous errors 'to fright poore men out of their wits, against the faith of

---

Read Foster (1966), 2 vols, vol. 2. STC does note that the preliminaries to *The Jesuits Gospel*, including the dedication to the Lower House, have been cancelled in what appears to be a later issue of the work. Floyd's charge may be true, therefore, but the cause of the MPs' rejection of the dedication cannot be reconstructed.
their Ancestours; the same accusations Crashaw levels against the Roman Church (sig. B1r, p. 9). According to Floyd, then, these sermons are neither controversial (arguing in utramque partem), nor refutational (correcting errors, as he implies the Protestants know these accusations to be false). They are truly polemical, an instrument in the confessional war.

In this exchange, therefore, neither side sought the refutation of erroneous opinions by argument as recommended by Richard Bernard. Instead, both sides aim only to prove that the other is in error. Crashaw defends his sermon by strengthening his attack on the Roman Church through a distorted reading of their texts. His ultimate aim in this is to prove that that Church, carefully constructed as a monolithic body, is fundamentally corrupt. Floyd, in return, attacks the integrity of Crashaw as a speaker, and so attacks the Church of which he claims Crashaw is representative. His ultimate aim is to prove that the Church of England cannot be the custodian of truth because its teachers lie (sig. B2r, p. 11).

Of central importance in this exchange is the ethos of the speaker or writer, his ability to convince the hearers that he is an honest man in full command of the facts whom they can trust as a reliable source of evidence in deciding which side of the debate they will join. Near the end of the twenty 'wounds' William Crashaw found in the Church of Rome, he left one dependent for proof on his ethos. Floyd responded with a devastating attack on Crashaw's credibility:

... yet I dare say (saith he) that for one evill taken out there is another put in, ... This is all the prooffe he brings, or you may expect of him; to wit, that he dares say it, whom you cannot but believe, being (as by this Sermon appeareth) a man so modest, that no wordes are more rife in his mouth then whores, and harlots, not blushing to spend many houres in pulpit upon that subiect; so sincere, that no Author is by him cited without some fraudulent trick to wrest their sayings from a true and playne to some false and slaunderous sense; so loving towards the Church of Rome, that he dothe beat and busy his braynes to devise the most horrible blasphemyes, and barbarous practises hart can imagine to charge upon her (sig. 201v, p. 290).

Nor is this approach to refutation unique to this exchange. The same methods of argument recur throughout the era. A short survey of refutational material from Paul's Cross reveals that attacks on the ethos - wisdom, virtue or good will towards the hearers - of the adversary were considered acceptable within the broad definition of refutational argumentation current among preachers and divines. So too writers recognised
two different targets for refutation - the opponent's arguments and his ethos - and the necessity to answer attacks on both.

The first form of *ad hominem* argument can be taken - by an inversion of Aristotle's description of ethos - to be attacks on the wisdom of the opponent. Writers were often attacked for their lack of knowledge of the Scriptures and Church Fathers or their ability to interpret them. Richard Field accuses Theophilus Higons, a 'poore novice', of citing a spurious work as John Damascene's in order to prove that the Fathers believed in Purgatory, when even Bellarmine admits this work is false. In *The christian's tryumph*, Nathanael Delaune tells Cardinal Bellarmine that he has never known the true meaning of the Creed 'though thou takest upon thee to be a chiefe Rabbi in Israel' because he does not see that the phrase 'I believe' necessarily refers to particular faith, not an implicit faith through the Church. Later in the same sermon, he writes that Bellarmine's 'too great conceit' of himself has put him beside the truth and reeling 'like a drunkard'.

More grievous still were accusations that the opponent deliberately falsified the authorities he cited, either by mistranslation or misinterpretation. Such attacks were aimed at the opponent's virtue, the second component of Aristotelian ethos. This argument must have been of considerable persuasive potency because it is used with great frequency by controversial writers. In *The celestial husbandrie*, William Jackson describes the distorted interpretations of Scripture used to defend Catholic teaching, such as the exclusion of the vernacular from services, prayers for the dead, supererogation and so on, and shows how they contradict the literal meaning of other texts. He goes on to claim that Catholics do not believe that Scripture can lead people in faith and righteousness. William Worship complains that Catholics change the criteria by which they are willing to argue as it suits them. When Scripture no longer supports them, they claim it must be interpreted authoritatively by the Church, and when the ancient Church fathers do not support them they invent others 'as were never yet, in *Rerum Natura*'. Such arguments are a variation on

---


Richard Bernard's recommendation that 'the discovery of the weake and false grounds' of the opponent's arguments be used in refutation, because it is not the 'discovery of the false grounds' that proves the refuter's point but the discovery of the opponent's failure to find sure and honest arguments. In his sermon confuting certain Protestant errors on Christ's descent into Hell, Thomas Bilson cites several Catholic writers guilty of holding that Christ suffered the pains of the damned at his death. This he includes, he says, 'least the insolent sect of Jesuites should take pleasure as they doe, in misconstruing other mens words, and blazing them unto the worlde as erroneous and impious'. Indeed, controversial writers did not hesitate to 'give the lie'. Nathanael Delaune boasts that his refutation of Catholic objections to the doctrine of assurance will 'give Bellarmine the lie, & stop with a wisp Stapletons crowing throate, that they shalbe able to finde nothing henceforth to insult against the Gospell'.

Akin to lying is the accusation of using 'railing terms'. These often took the form of the simplest kind of counter-attack. William Symonds claims that Catholic teachers 'condemn the memory of all godly men, & so are the falsest witnesses that ever trode upon the earth'. This is but one of many accusations (including poisoning communion chalices, theft, treason and fraud) that Symonds brings against the Catholic clergy in what can only be described as a 'railing' speech. These refutational writers clearly did engage in 'railing', as the name-calling and nicknaming so commonly used in these

51 Thomas Bilson, The effect of certain sermons (1599), sig. T2v, p. 140. Accusations of scholarly malpractise were easily made in an age when good editions of Latin works were not always available and when printing-room practice could trip a writer up accidentally. Sir Edward Hoby was guilty of presenting his own inference as Saint Augustine's by not marking where a quotation ended: Sir Edward Hoby, Letter to Mr. T.H., sigs. I2v-I3r, pp. 60-61. He defended himself on the grounds that the printer missed his superscript note to mark the transition and that he had not noticed this in his 're-view'. Indeed, Hoby writes that FToyd's thoroughness in refuting 'made Mee and my Printer allmost fallout, about setting Razis for Razias': Sir Edward Hoby, A counter-snarle for Ishmael Rabschacheh, sigs. E4v-F1r, E2r, pp. 32-33, 27.


53 One of earliest, most effective uses of this ethical refutation is from John Jewel's controversy with John Harding. As part of the preface to his Defence of the Apology, Jewel included a list of the 'certain principall flowers of M. Hardings modest speech' so that the reader can 'judge thereof as thou shalt see cause'. Following two quotations from Harding in which he claims that his writing is 'sober' and 'modest', there is a long list, with reference to Harding's works, of the vituperative expressions he used, his 'scoffs and scorns' and his derogatory nicknames for Jewel and his fellow reformers. Harding is quoted claiming that the truth of God ought not be 'set forth with scoffs' but with 'grave and earnest exhortations' only for his 'performance of the same' to be ironically displayed through his own insulting language: John Jewel, Works, vol III, pp. 138-141.

54 William Symonds, A heavenly voyce, sigs. E1v-E2v.
tracts shows. In his answer to Theophilus Higgon's allegations, Richard Field uses a variety of insulting names to discredit Higgon. All underline Higgon's outlaw status and his scholarly inferiority to Field. Higgon is a 'silly novice' (pp. 284, 331), a 'poore runagate' (p. 306), an 'idle Prater' (p. 324) and a 'prating fugitive' (p. 324). Sir Edward Hoby also insulted Theophilus Higgon by re-naming him 'Theomisus', a name better suited to his apostasy. These names mocked the opponent either with respect to his scholarly credentials or his ethos as a speaker, and so they diminished his credibility. 55

Name-calling was also used to attack the ethos of an opponent by associating him with heretical or schismatic groups. Here the refuter showed that the opponent had no good-will towards the hearers, because he was associated with the hearer's enemies. Thus, Sir Edward Hoby accuses Theophilus Higgon of having been a Puritan before his conversion to Catholicism. This shows that he was always inconstant and disloyal. Higgon replies by accusing Hoby of the same fault. In his Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, Robert Bedingfield dismisses the Catholic doctrine of free will as heretical by equating it with Pelagianism. 56

The most common forms of name-calling in these sermons were draw from the Book of the Apocalypse. References to the Church of Rome and the Papacy as the Antichrist or the Whore of Babylon occur far more frequently than the arguments for and against this identification are rehearsed. Unlike general 'railing terms', these identifications undermined the opponent before the speaker even began to discuss their arguments. The audience is immediately reminded of the reasons for considering the Roman Church inimical to Christianity, so that they will be more inclined to dismiss Catholic teaching out of hand. As the Antichrist had temporal power as well as spiritual, this name was intimately associated with the political threat that the papacy and the recusant English were thought to present. 57 That the papacy will not accept England's independence from it and that Catholics

57The identification of the Papacy as Antichrist also appears in Roger Ley, The bruising of the serpent's head (1622), sig.B3v, p. 8; William Sclater, A three-fold preservative against three dangerous diseases of these latter times (1610), sigs. C1v, D4v; John Whalley, Gods plentie feeding true pietie (1616), sigs. 12v-13v, pp. 60-62. James I had himself identified the pope as Antichrist in A Fruitfull Meditation, containing a plaine and easie exposition ... of the VII, VIII. IX and X verses of the 20 Chapter of the Revelation, first published in 1588, and, more guardedly, in A Premonition to all Most Mighty
are not loyal was often introduced as a digression in purely doctrinal matters to undermine the ethos of that party by denying their good will to the hearers. This is the strategy used by Immanuel Bourne when he cites papal pretensions to political power as an example of their teaching that 'ignorance is the mother of devotion'. William Symonds makes a point for point comparison between the wickedness of Old Testament Babylon and modern Rome according to the second table of commandments. He finds the Roman clergy guilty of teaching disobedience to parents and governors and gives the Gunpowder Plot as a proof of this. The same point is made by Francis Marbury in his 1602 Paul's Cross sermon. George Downname makes the identification with Antichrist in the briefest of epithets that demonstrates fully its refutational function:

Against this part of Christian libertie, which is most comfortable, the Church of Rome (as it well becomes the synagogue of Antichrist) doth by might and manie oppose it selfe: contending not only that we are justified by righteousness inherent; but also that the same obedience, which the Law prescribeth, is in greater perfection required in the Gospel unto justification.58

Given their prevalence in the rhetorical repertoire of sermons and other tracts, it is to be expected that theorists on sacred rhetoric would be keen to describe ethical attacks as a powerful source of persuasion; but the destruction of the opponent's ethos does not occur among the means of refutation they detail. On the contrary, preachers are warned to ensure that they represent their opponents with all charity and fairness. Refutational preaching is inherently adversarial, and this presented problems for the preacher, whose stance should be fundamentally fraternal, even in admonition. It is for this reason that writers on preaching rhetoric warned of the limits a preacher should place on his refutation. These cautions tried to ensure that the argumentative advantages of ethical attacks were not used to the detriment of the charitable stance appropriate to the preacher. Richard Bernard insists that the refuter appear to be a fair-minded speaker. The preacher must ensure 'that

---

58Immanuel Bourne, The true way of a christian, sigs. D1r-v, pp. 17-18; William Symonds, A heavenly voyce, sigs. E2r-v; Francis Marbury, A sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1602), sig. D6r; George Downname, A treatise ... concerning christian libertie, sig. G2r, p. 43.
hee deale faithfully and doe no wrong in contending with an Adversarie'. He should lay out
the opponent's arguments 'truely and briefly ... as either they acknowledge it, br as their best
approved Writers interpret the same'. The refuter should accept the truths held by the
adversary as far as possible 'for this will plainly tell him that we love the truth'. This
scrupulous fairness is of primary importance to the persuasive end of the sermon. The
adversary can make no response and the perception of playing fair will convince the hearers
that the refuter has the stronger argument. So writes Hyperius of Marburg:

The talke of truth ought to be playne and simple. For in case thou doest nothing els then subtely inveigh against subteltie, thy tale will be as much suspected and disliked as their tale whom thou impugnest, and the hearers will judge none other but that there is come before them som noble payre of sophisters, as if they beheld Protagorus and Euathlus on a day appointed brauling in the brabbelinge consistory.

He also insists that the preacher be careful to present himself as a benign, peace-loving
speaker 'leaste he be thought to utter and pronounce any thinge of a corrupt affection ... or
if so bee hee inveigheth over bitterly against any of his adversaries, as though he were more
incensed with hatred of the persons, then with desyre of defendinge the truth.' Preachers
generally apologised for engaging in controversy, and often claimed that they felt obliged
to do so because of the danger they saw threatening the Church.

Yet these concerns for scrupulously fair and scholarly refutation could be at
odds with the ultimate aim of persuading the hearers of the opponent's error. Many of the
points of controversy between Protestants and Catholics were of great complexity and as the
debates between the parties became more clearly defined, this complexity grew. Nor did the
preacher need to confute by argument. According to Richard Bernard, the audience of
refutation sermons could be divided into two groups: those 'which have the truth' and 'those ...
which yet have not made profession of it'. This difference in audience affects the form a

59Richard Bernard, The faithfull shepheard (1621), sigs. N11r-N12r, pp. 281-283. Similar caveats are
listed in the anonymous Officium concionatoris, D4r-v, pp. 31-32; William Perkins, The Arte of
Prophecying, sig. 3K4v, p. 668, Matthew Sutcliffe, De recta studii theologici ratione, sigs. F5v-F6r, pp.
82-3; William Ames, Conscience, with the Power and Cases thereof (1639), sigs. 2K3v-2K4v, pp. 78-80
(3rd. pag.).
60Hyperius, The practis of preaching, sigs. U4v, U5r, ff. 148v, 149r.
61John Jewel, A copie of a Sermon pronounced ... at Paul's Crosse, p. 14; Samuel Collins, A sermon
62Richard Bernard, The faithfull shepheard (1621), sig. N9r-v, pp. 277-8. Hyperius admits only the first of
these groups in his discussion, as he writes that the hearers are to be deterred 'from embracing false
refutation will take, as each audience can best be convinced in different ways. Those already guilty of the error require intellectual persuasion through argument to have their minds changed. Those merely endangered by the error, however, can be persuaded by means that need not expose the hearers to the opponent's arguments nor embroil the preacher in arcane theological disquisition. Instead, the argument can be centred on the *ethos* of the speaker and his opponent, as we have seen. 63

Another factor in the composition of the audience was the degree of learning to be assumed. Where most scholarly works of controversial divinity were written in Latin for an international audience of divines, both allies and enemies, the controversies that began or ended with sermons at Paul's Cross were conducted in English before an audience assumed to have little knowledge of the technical terms of scholastic divinity even if they could judge the translations of Scripture and Fathers argued over. Indeed, writers readily simplified their arguments if they became bogged down in theological jargon. Theophilus Higgons does just this at the end of the crucial arguments in favour of the Catholic Church's arguments for apostolic unwritten traditions, by which Higgons proved the claim that it is the true, visible Church:

> Now for the better instruction of the good Reader, I will expresse my meaning familiarly, by some few particulars in this discourse. As for example; Whereas I had deduced the custome of *Prayers for the dead* from the holy Apostles ... I sayd, *no*; it came not from the Apostles. But how could I justify, and maintayn this assertion; and why should I creditt my private opinion, or the judgement of *Luther*, and his comperees against the testimony of the Fathers, and prescription of all ages? 64

It is in works addressed to this audience, the Protestant English layperson, that the role of *ethical* persuasions became important. Because these hearers and readers primarily need to be reassured that they are on the side with the strongest arguments, the assertions, and premonished to take diligent heed of the infection of hipocrates', rather than persuaded to renounce the errors they already hold: *The practis of preaching*, sig. U4r, f. 148r.

63 This difference is most striking if we compare the audience addressed by John Jewel in his 1560 'Challenge' sermon to that addressed fifty years later by William Crashaw. Jewel addresses himself to an audience in which there were many Catholics or those sympathetic to Catholicism. It is for this reason, I suggest, that he insists on using predominantly argumentative means to convince them of their errors. They are to be won, not warned. William Crashaw, on the other hand, addresses his audience as primarily Protestant. They merely need to be shown that the reasons for their continued separation from the Roman Church are valid. It is outside the scope of this thesis to trace the relative balance of argumentative and *ethical* proofs in Paul's Cross sermons throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras but such a study would be an effective way of charting the process of confessionalisation in England.

64 Theophilus Higgons, *The first motive*, sigs. F7v-F8r, pp. 94-95.
appearance of winning the argument is of greatest importance for the persuasion of the hearers. It is these hearers, the third party in the debate between the refuter and the opponent whose arguments he addresses, that are the actual target of the refutation. It is when the hearers witness their side win the argument that a refutational sermon will have succeeded, and this could not always be effected by argument. When the topics under discussion became truly controversial (in the sense that neither side could claim that the evidence was unambiguously on their side, because of textual or historical or doctrinal obscurities) neither side could gain an argumentative victory. Neither would they admit the problem to be ambiguous: a refutation assumes that the opponent is in error and so neither side can concede any points. It is for this reason that Jewel's 'challenge' became a common rhetorical trope in these sermons. Neither side expected the other would concede, but the challenge to the opponent to refute the speaker on the promise of the speaker's conversion emphasised that speaker's belief in the strength of his position. When the topic under discussion was not truly controversial but was nonetheless of considerably complexity, the same problem arose. The distinctions between the opposing positions could only be described in technical terms which gave the appearance that little of real importance was at issue between the two parties. In these circumstances, a resort to ethical attacks was most effective. They reassured the hearers that their side was winning the argument even when this was difficult to see, or not actually the case at all. Refutational sermons and tracts are

---

65William Crashaw 'challenges' the Catholics to prove their Church 'healed' of its twenty wounds on the promise of his recanting all he had said at Paul's Cross: The sermon preached at the Crosse, sig. L2v, p. 84. In his Paul's Cross sermon, Francis Marbury complained that his obstinate Catholic opponents were arguing with no intention of admitting defeat: A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 13 of June, 1602, sig. B2v-B3v.

66A good example of the growth in complexities of inter-confessional debates are the accounts of these controversies given by Andrew Willet in his Synopsis Papismi, a volume that lists the twenty major points of contention between Protestants and Catholics. Willet scrupulously includes the Catholics' definitions, proof-texts and testimonies from the Fathers, followed by the Protestants' position, similarly backed-up, and lastly the refutation of the Catholics' arguments. Willet's book was first published as a moderately sized quarto in 1592 but by its third edition in 1600, it had swelled to 1,300 large folio pages: see Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed, pp. 13-16. Shorter 'manuals of controversy' are also a feature of the religious controversies of James' reign. These summary volumes were designed to acquaint laypersons with the arguments used by each side in the religious debates and to assure them of the counter-arguments of their own theologians: see Peter Milward, Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age, pp. 177-186. Anthony Champny, A Manual of Controversies (1614), sigs. A1r-A8r, pp. 1-15. Champny assumes there will be a Protestant rebuttal, but he addresses his work to the Catholic reader. A good example of the problem preachers faced in arguing such complex questions can be gained from Thomas Aylesbury's attempt to elucidate the doctrine of Christ's ubiquity in A sermon preached at Pauls crosse, sigs. F1v-F2v, pp. 34-36.
not, then, truly controversial: they do not explore difference in order to reach a satisfactory synthesis. Their aim is rather to assure the hearers that a known opponent is in error. Their function was confessional: they promoted the division between the Churches so that each gained a stronger sense of identity through the 'othering' of the opponent's party.67

To conclude, it may be said that the sorts of arguments employed in the refutations found in sermons and other popular tracts included both those that aimed to undermine the opponent's thesis, through the exposure of faulty logic or theology, and those that aimed to undermine the authority of the opponent as a trustworthy speaker. The latter had advantages of rhetorical force and clarity in the prosecution of refutations before a lay audience and was therefore commonly used in conjunction with, but never to the exclusion of, arguments from logic, rhetoric and divinity. They could just as easily be counterproductive, however, by themselves destroying the preacher's ethos. If a preacher was evidently guilty of slandering an opponent or conducted his refutation too vehemently or with too great a reliance on ad hominem arguments, then he could damage his own standing as a charitable teacher of doctrine. The audience might see him more as a spiteful 'railer' than a fervent corrector of error. By argumentation or by ethical attacks, the refuter risked losing or alienating some part of his audience. What follows will show that converts developed a means for establishing their ethos that was based on the doctrine of conversion and was not dependent on the arguments presented in the refutation itself. In recantation sermons, therefore, a means of refutation developed that relied neither on argumentative nor ethical attacks, so that complex arguments and 'railing' were avoided, making the recantation sermon, somewhat paradoxically, a powerful means of refutation and confessionalisation.

Ad hominem arguments were used in most popular refutations but they were of particular importance to a debate involving a convert, a speaker whose own ethos had already been badly damaged by his actions. It is clear that converts were treated with suspicion by their new co-religionists. Richard Sheldon complained bitterly that the 'Semi-Brownists or fiery Precisianists ... taxe and reproove' converts 'because in their preachings and practises, they are firme and zealous for the maintenance of those articles (Christian and Apostolicall) Canons (Goodly and Godly) to which they have subscribed'. Both these and the Papists 'have their eyes set so narrowly and incessantly upon them and their doings, that the least errour they may commit either in private conversation ... shall be made a mountaine'.

Converts went to enormous lengths to demonstrate their sincerity. Richard Sheldon swears 'that neither any doubt, or fear of danger' nor fear of poverty nor hope of preferment caused his recantation and the same disclaimer is made by most of those who delivered recantations from Paul's Cross. They also stressed the difficulty of their decision: many were brought up recusant and would now be cut off from their friends and former allies, who, they knew, would lament or even mock their decision. For those who converted more than once, this task was far greater. On his second attempt at a recantation at Paul's Cross, Anthony Tyrell (who revoked his first recantation from this pulpit) admits that his sincerity as a speaker may be hard to credit:

I knowe not howe they may stonde perswaded of my true and faithfull meaning, and the more hardlie they may be incensed against me, when perhaps they shall heare of my former Lybelles and Letters written in defence of the Pope, and all Seminarie Priest, at such time as I was returned unto the Pope again; that having written so vehemently in their behalfe, in reproofe of my selfe and myne owne confessions, with protestations that all that I had doone, was but in deepe hypocrisie & dyssimulation: and now affirming the cleene contrary, may yet suspect me of double dealing, and stand in doubt what to beleive. For if I did saie true then, I must dissemble now: and if I saie true now, I could not but write falshoode then.

---

70 Anthony Tyrrell, *The recantations*, sig. E1v, p. 34. On the loss of Catholic friends, see Tedder, sig. A4r, p 7; Tyrrell, sig. D4r, p. 31. On the numerous conversions and reversions Tyrell made, see Michael Questier, 'English Clerical Converts to Protestantism, 1580-1596', pp. 462-467.
More difficult still were the cases of those, like Higgons, Gee and John Nichols, who converted to and then reverted from Catholicism. Preachers at Paul's Cross described conversion to Catholicism in the starkest terms. Those who did so had been 'in, but not of our Church' and so they were no real loss to the Church because their actions demonstrated their reprobate status. Such a conversion seemed indistinguishable from the sin against the holy Ghost, which both sermons preached on that subject at Paul's Cross defined as a wilful and informed turning away from Truth.71 Far from suggesting any flaws in the English church, preachers insist that conversion to Catholicism demonstrated only the weakness of the convert. John Whalley (who may himself have been a convert for a time) wrote that the Jesuits sought to convert 'simple people, or proud people, or malcontented, or fantasticall people'. As the devil, in tempting our first parents with sophistic arguments, so the Jesuits' successes are through the 'weaknesse of those they have wonne' and not 'the goodnesse of their cause or argumentes'.72

As the Church could not admit of religious or moral reasons for conversion to the adversary, the convert's sincerity was an obvious target for their refuters. Robert Parsons wrote that the reversion of John Nichols to Protestantism was 'noe great noveltie' - he had feigned conversion (to Catholicism) and could do so again. In his Letter to Mr. T.H., Sir Edward Hoby inferred from the details of Theophilus Higgons' debts that his true motives for conversion to Catholicism were financial. Higgons' abandoning of his wife and his lack of piety toward his father (who visited him in St. Omer) are used to diminish Higgons' credibility:

But why should we take it unkindlie at your hands? You use our State no worse, then you did your father, nor our Church more unkindlie, then your owne wife?

71Thomas Bedford, The sinne unto death (1621), sig. F1r, p. 33; John Denison, The sinne against the holy ghost plainly described (1611), sig. IIr, p. 57. Both preachers hesitate on this, but both say that only repentance could distinguish such a fall from the sin that cannot be forgiven.

72John Whalley, Gods plentie feeding true pietie, sig. I2v, p. 60; Whalley appears to admit to a period of apostasy in his dedicatory epistle to the printed version of the sermon, sig. A2r. The dedication is addressed to Alice, Countess Dowager of Derby. Details on Whalley are difficult to find, but a John Whaley matriculated at St. John's College, Cambridge in 1581 and was ordained deacon at Peterborough in 1591. If this is the same man (and no more likely candidate appears in the Athanae Oxonienses or Alumni Cantabrigienses) then Whalley's 'twice seven yeeres' apostasy was after his ordination in the English church.
In view of the questionable *ethical* stance of the convert and the importance of *ethical* proofs to refutational sermons, it would seem unlikely that a convert would make an effective preacher in confuting the errors of the Roman Church. It is equally clear that they were used for just this purpose. The strategy they adopted, however, by-passed the refutational method of arguing against Catholics and instead drew its strength from the unique position of the convert. The convert can cite himself as an example of one who has undergone a spiritual conversion, the result of which was conversion from the Roman Church. The refutation of Catholicism, therefore, lies in these men's experience of it as a sinful state from which the grace of God called them. They mirror in their individual experience the Church's process of Reformation and so simultaneously justify the continued divisions in the Church and assure their hearers that they stand on the right side of that divide.

A closer examination of Theophilus Higgons' recantation sermon shows how this worked.

The first difference between Theophilus Higgons' recantation sermon and the controversial sermons we have examined is noticeable in the text he chose. Higgons preached on Ephesians 2. 4-7 ('But God who is rich in mercy, through his great love, wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead by sins, hath quickened us together in Christ, by whose grace you are saved, And hath raised us up together, and made us fit together in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus, that we might show, in ages to come, the

---

73In his study of clerical conversion, Michael Questier has shown that converts invariably described their experience in the terms of a spiritual conversion, with the denominational change being represented only as an outward effect of an inward change. Catholics and Protestants differ in their teaching on the nature of conversion (Catholics claiming that the will co-operated with God's grace, where Protestants consider man's faculties passive in the process). Converts narrate their experience within the doctrinal framework appropriate to their new affiliation. Converts to Protestantism, then, express their conversion in terms taken from the theology of the Puritan evangelical wing of the Church of England. Grace, working in the sinner, enlightened the understanding and moved the will to repentance and faith in Christ: Michael Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 58-70 and *Crypto-Catholicism, Anti-Calvinism and Conversion at the Jacobean Court*, pp. 54-58. Another arena in which the theology of grace was manipulated for confessional ends was at the Gallows, where confessions of faith were encouraged in the condemned. The undermining of this by condemned priest (who often refused to pray with the minister) made these events impossible to fully 'stage manage': Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 'Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England, *Past and Present*, 124 (1996).

74John Harding comes close to expressing this in his recantation sermon, where he writes that it is 'dangerous to jöyne with them that have burnt God's word ... From whom the holy Ghost by expresse words hath commanded us to depart: as it is writen in the Apocalips, Come away from her O my people that ye be not partakers of her sinnes': John Harding, *A recantation sermon preached in the gatehouse*, sig. D2r, p. 23. Revelations 18.4 was a key text in justifying the continued division from the Roman church (see note 18), which Harding here applies to individuals within the Church.
exceeding riches of his grace, through his kindness towards us in Christ Jesus), a text not
used in controversial divinity. It is, however, a strong proof-text for the Protestant doctrine
of salvation, because it stresses the passivity of man in the process of conversion effected
solely by God's free grace. Ephesians 2 is also an important text on the inclusion of the
Gentiles, those once outside the Church and excluded from the promises God made it, in the
salvific work of grace. The summary of Ephesians in the Geneva Bible gives the following
account of the chapter:

And to the intent they should not glorie in themselves, hee sheweth them their
extreme miserie wherein they were plunged before they knew Christ, as people
without God, Gentiles to whom the promises were not made, and yet by the free
mercy of God in Christ Jesus they were saved.

Higgons uses this text to describe the state of grace under five headings: the author of our
salvation (God); the causes (God's mercy, love and grace); the subjects of this grace (us, that
is, all those dead in sin); the benefits bestowed (vivification of spirit, resurrection of soul and
a place in heaven). Lastly, Higgons will discuss the final cause of all this in God's benignity.
There is little scope for controversy here, and indeed there is little controversial material in
the first part of the sermon where these five topics are discussed. Instead, Higgons uses the
doctrine of grace to explain his apostasy and to establish his ethos. His actual recantation, in
which the details of his faults are recounted, is reserved for the second part of the sermon.
There, Higgons applies his doctrine to himself. By doing so, he presents himself to the
hearers as an example of God's mercy and grace, and he performs, by admitting to his
errors, the duty of acknowledging God's benefits that he enjoined upon his hearers.

Nothing shows the contrast between this and William Crashaw's sermon
more clearly than the margins of the printed page. The margins of Crashaw's sermon are
crammed with detailed references to the books in which the proof of the 'twenty wounds' in

75No printed sermons on this text have been found, so it does not appear to have been a popular text for
preaching. That it was a certain proof-text on conversion and salvation as free gifts of grace and for the
inclusion of the Gentiles in the promise of salvation is evident from contemporary biblical concordances.
William Knight cites Ephesians 2.5 and Ephesians 2.8 as proof-texts that we are saved by grace and not
works: Knight, A concordance axiomaticall (1610), sigs. 2C1v, 2S5v, pp. 302, 490. In his Thesaurus
biblicus, Richard Bernard lists salvation as one of the effects of God's grace and gives Ephesians 2.5-8 as a
proof-text. Ephesians 2.12-13 is also cited as a commonplace on converts from 'out of the Church, as be
brought into the Church: Thus the converted Gentiles: Thesaurus biblicus, (1644), sigs. R2r, H6v.
Ephesians 2.12-13 is also used in defining a convert by Thomas Wilson. So too Ephesians 2.8 is referred
to in defining salvation as the product of Christ's death, not human merit: Thomas Wilson, A complete
Christian dictionary (1612; 8th ed., 1678), sigs. P2r ('convert'), 3Q3r ('salvation').
the Roman church could be found. The Bible, with occasional references to Saint Bernard, the early Fathers and the occasional classical author (Cicero and Seneca, sig. B1v, p. 10) are the only citations in the first, expository section of Higgon's sermon. These references are given in general terms and are integrated in the text, not set in the margin. In one short digression to confute the Catholic doctrine of merits, Higgons is content to refer vaguely to 'the Church of Rome' without giving a specific source (sig. C3r-v, pp. 21-2). When he begins to discuss his own case and to make his recantation (sig. G4v, p. 40) the change in approach is clearly signalled by the fact that all references, including biblical citations, are given in the margin. This is evidently to accommodate the greater number and greater detail of the citations, including references to the works of controversial divinity that featured in his previous motive tract, necessary to this part of the argument.

In the first, expository part of his sermon, Higgons is at pains to make two points: the passivity of man in the conversion worked by divine grace and the impossibility of predicting who will be granted grace. As all men are sinners, God can call any man, no matter how sinful. According to Protestant teaching, conversion is the moment when one's 'election' becomes effective, when one is 'called' from sin and converted to a life of repentance and faith. Man's will is not free to turn towards God by itself. Instead, saving grace turns the will to faith in Christ in whom the sinner is justified. Grace continues to intervene in the convert's life, co-operating with the incipient feelings of godliness by which the sinner is sanctified. The doctrine of final perseverance also dictated that those who were 'effectually called' by God, and so truly converted, would persevere on the path of holiness and ultimately arrive in Heaven. Those who were called were God's chosen. As the reason for grace's intervention ultimately lay in God's eternal decree of election, there was no way of knowing who would be helped by grace. The ambiguity that Higgons exploits, however, is that the most evident examples of God's saving grace are those, like the Gentiles in

Ephesians, who seemed to be excluded from the promise of salvation but who have been called nonetheless. 'Preparedness', by prayer and a godly life, cannot cause the infusion of saving grace and some who believe themselves among the elect persevere in godliness only for a time. Higgons's argument suggests that when God does call manifest sinners, like David the adulterer or Saul the persecutor, the fact that these men were most in need of grace makes them more certain examples of the power of grace in operation. Their conversion resulted in a character change so dramatic that there can be no doubt of its divine cause.

In the first subdivision, proving that God is the author of our salvation, Higgons stressed that this means God alone, so that neither man nor the angels are instrumental causes of salvation (sigs. A4r-v, pp. 7-8). From the second topic (the causes of our salvation in God's mercy, love and grace), Higgons stresses the power of God's mercy to forgive any sin. It is noteworthy that in this section Higgons uses the first person to describe how mercy affects the sinner. As careful pronominalisation was used by Crashaw to distinguish the enlightened from the benighted, so here, it insinuates to the hearers early in the sermon that the author has a claim on God's all-forgiving mercy. Indeed, because mercy can only be expressed through sins, the authors' past sins constitute a pre-condition for mercy:

Now, though it is an evill cause (saith Seneca) which requireth mercy, yet there is no cause so evill, which can despaire of mercy. For as I have the matter of, or for mercy in me (to wit, my sins) so, if I have the means to apprehend this mercy (which means is faith alone) the mercy of God shall bee commended through mine iniquity, and by my owne sinne shall turne to my owne safety (sigs. B1v-B2r, pp. 10-11).

77Much has been written on the New England controversy over 'preparedness' to conversion, in which a godly life is the basis for assurance before actual conversion (although conversion is still solely the work of free grace); Alister E. McGrath, Iustitia Dei (1986), vol. II, pp. 117-119. Many writers have sought such a doctrine in earlier, Puritan writings in England: Norman Pettit, The Heart Prepared (1963); Charles Lloyd Cohen, God's Caress (1986), pp. 77-86; J. Sears McGee, 'Conversion and the Imitation of Christ in Anglican and Puritan Writing', Journal of British Studies, 15 (1976), pp. 22-3. No mention of preparedness has been found by this writer in Paul's Cross preaching on conversion. Rather, the fact that a sinner feels the lack of grace is taken as a sign that they have been given saving grace, because the hatred of sin is the first sign of grace turning a sinner towards God: William Perkins, 'How Repentance is wrought', Two Treatises: ... of repentance, sig. 2Q4r, p. 457. In fact, Perkins clearly states that the 'accusations of the conscience' before conversion are the 'works of the law', not the product of God's grace, and so no part of conversion: A Graine of Mustard Seed, sig. 3H5v, p. 638. Man can only instigate repentance or conversion when he has already been justified but temporarily lapses into sin. Even here, cooperating grace, that assists in sanctification, helps him turn again to God: Perkins, Two treatises ... of repentance, sig. 2Q4v, p. 458; Thomas Wilson, A complete Christian dictionary, sig. P2v (conversion').

78In Repentance not to be repented of, William Hull writes: 'The very word Conversion insinuates our aversion and turning from God. From him we have revolted, to him we are recalled' sigs. B7r-v, ff. 15r-v.
As he will write a little later in the sermon, only the passivity and helplessness of death is an accurate analogy for the state of sin (sig. C2r, p. 19).79

The second cause of salvation is God's love. In describing this, Higgons also hints at the later particularisation of this theme, on which his ethos is based. God's love is the source of his mercy, but he loves men 'more as [they are] elected' and 'more as justified' (sig. B3r, p. 13). God's mercy is evidence of election as this love and mercy work the sanctification which is a testimony to others. Higgons slowly builds up the suggestion that sin and mercy are powerful arguments for election. He presents the Gentiles as an even greater example of God's love than God's chosen people precisely because they were not part of his covenant initially. This implies that it is the outsider, the 'stranger to the covenant' who needs God's mercy most, is the best example of it. In the Gentiles, English and Ephesian, 'the love of God is more spectable, and more commended' because 'hee quickned Us also, when we were dead in sinne' (sig. B4v, p. 16). As apostates placed themselves outside of God's promise, so presumably their calling to repentance and reunion with the Church is a similarly powerful example of God's mercy.

Although our salvation is dependent on the mercy and love of God, Higgons presents grace as the motive force behind it, the means 'moving God' to save us. Every step on the path to salvation is by grace and therefore every step is a free gift from God without effort or merit on our parts. Higgons attributes this argument to St. Paul as the 'thing, which he doth every where inforce' and in a dramatic apostrophe, Higgons salutes Christianity's archetypal convert:

O S. Paul. S. Paul! Vas misericordiae & tuba gratiae, the vessell of mercy, and the trumpet of grace. For, in none, was the mercy of God more expressed, then in thee: and, in none was his grace more exalted, then by thee (sig. C3r, p. 21).

For the final subdivision, on the final cause of God's benefits to us, Higgons divides his treatment of the text into 'a briefe survay of each particular' in the verse and 'a reflection' on its general doctrine. In a striking passage in this 'survey', Higgons cites various

79The same point is made, using Ephesians 2.1 as a proof-text, by Francis Marbury, A sermon preached at Paules Crosse, sig. B8r.
grevious sins with examples of those who had them forgiven. In describing the fear of those guilty of these sins, he uses the first person. As before, grace is described at the ultimate extent of its power to forgive, but here it is Higgons, in the first person, who is testing its extent:

If you require examples, for your better assurance, they are not wanting in this behalfe. I have been an Idolater; so was Manasses. I have been lewd of my body, so was David. I have been overtaken with wine, so was Noah. I have fled from God, so did Jonah. I have denied my Lord, so did Peter. I have persecuted him, in his members, so did Paul. I have despoiled men of their goods, so did the penitent theefe, who was converted upon the crosse. Finally, I am full of iniquity, so was Mary Magdalen: peccatrix, the sinful woman. All these obtained pardon by the grace of God, which they apprehended by faith. He will not, therfore, reject me, that embraced them. They could plead nothing but grace: and this, also, I can plead as well as they (sigs. D3v-D4v, pp. 31-2).80

Next, Higgons considers the 'general doctrine' of his text. He now begins to make 'a transition unto my own particular case'. Higgons makes a close connection between the doctrine and its application to himself to emphasise that his own case is to be understood in the light of the doctrine he propounded. It was 'the consideration' of his case that prompted Higgons to choose his text, because he exhibits those marks of God's care and forgiveness, his 'mercy, love, and grace' described in the text. As he feels these effects 'comfortable, in my selfe' so he would impart them 'willingly' to the hearers (sig. E3v, p. 38).

Higgons insists that all those saved by grace have a duty to God to proclaim it to others. With this, he introduces his recantation as a duty enjoined on him because he is a powerful example of God's grace and mercy. Higgons' actual recantation of his Roman Catholicism, is, therefore, presented merely as the context of his deliverance from sin, a preamble to the story of the reversion to Protestantism that he describes in terms of spiritual regeneration.81

80Reference to 'limiting case' examples of God's mercy is common in the literature on repentance. William Hull cites the Magdalen, David, 'the Cut-throat theifie, the persecuting and blaspheming Apostle, the disloyall and abjuring Disciple, the scraping Publican (afterward advanced to the office of an Evangelist)' as 'comforting' examples of sinners called to repentance: Repentance not to be repented of, sig. B2r, f. 11v. When considering whether someone who 'professed Christ and his religion, yet afterward in persecution denies Christ, and foreswears his Religion' can repent and be saved, William Perkins answers yes and cites Manasseh (2 Chronicles 33.3), Solomon and Peter as examples: Two treatises ... of repentance, sigs. 2R2v-2R3r, pp. 466-7.

81Clerical recantations at Paul's Cross had a fairly standard format in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. They began with an announcement that the speaker has been reconciled to the Church having been guilty of error (and often disobedience to the Queen, having travelling abroad to be ordained), a brief account of the errors the penitent held and what made him obstinate in these errors (Catholic upbringing, for example, is mentioned by Clarke, Tedder and Tyrrell), then the motives that made him suspect his religion, with the details of when, where and why this happened. The penitent then testified to his sincerity in this conversion and his happiness at having been granted God's mercy and enlightenment. Finally, he asked forgiveness of God, the monarch, the Church and the congregation, all of whom he has
Higgons describes his conversion in the terms of sin and redemption. His conversion to Catholicism was a fall from truth occasioned by his sins and was itself a punishment for his sins. These sins were prompted by pride and worldliness, rather than any theological or intellectual failing. Higgons insists that ordinary moral failings in himself, and not any intellectual superiority in the opposition, lay behind his apostasy. He acknowledges the gravity of his error by admitting that it was exacerbated by his 'function, and office, in the Church of England'. His failings as a minister are also expressed as the product of worldliness and pride, rather than intellectual error. He was guilty of 'levity of deportment' and 'prodigall apparell' and did not do 'the work of an evangelist' (2 Timothy 4.5; sig. F2r, p. 43). Higgons is at pains to show that he was not convinced by Catholic doctrine. He draws a dubious distinction between the constant integrity of his faith and the 'clouding' of his understanding through which error gained power over him:

And though these evils did breed a natural alteration in mee (even in my spirits, and in my strength: so that I said unadvisedly in my selfe: it is better for me to die, then to live: Jonah 4.8) yet all this while, I suffered no morall alteration: these things did not prevaile in me unto any mutation of my faith, either by an inward, or by an outward change. Howbeit I denie not, but that (the inferior parts of my soule rebelling against the superiour) my earthly, darke affections might, and did, interpose themselves to eclipse the light of my understanding; the edge whereof was now so dulled, and so abated, that it gave place more easily unto error, then perhaps, otherwise it would have done (sig. F2r, p. 43).

The doubts that prompted his conversion to Catholicism and his subsequent reversion are described merely as the 'event', not the cause of his conversion.

Next, Higgons describes the process of his reversion as a series of benefits from God. In order to be consistent in arguing for his sincerity in both alterations, Higgons has to insist that in the period between his return to England and his recantation he was a genuine Papist. Otherwise, his return would appear to be motivated by worldly concerns, as Sir Edward Hoby claimed his initial conversion was. Higgons has to claim, however, that he was still convinced of his errors while insisting that the Catholics' arguments were not disobeyed or hurt by his actions. He asks for the congregation's prayers. The Elizabethan converts revoke 'errors' that are basically a summary of the points in controversy between Protestants and Catholics. Higgons' recantation is more particular, as his motives for his original conversion were in print: John Nichols, A declaration of the recantation of J. Nichols; William Tedder and Anthony Tyrrell, The recantations; Thomas Clarke, The recantation of Thomas Clarke; John Harding, A recantation sermon preached in the gatehouse.
persuasive. His obstinacy as a Catholic while on his mission is cause by his spiritual infirmity, not intellectual conviction:

Here, now, some wil imagine, that, either in my discession, or in my reversion, or in both, my ends were drawn, rather ab utili, then ab honesto: ... But as the manner of my returne (if it were fit to be exposed in this place) might acquit mee fully, from the suspicion of such an impious device: so they, who had the best experience of my mind at that time, might then see, & will yet confesse, that, in all probability, I framed no such project in my thoughts: but that I was a real, substantial Papist: howsoever some men (led with an honest errour) have seemed to conceive otherwise of my case (sig. F4v, p. 48).

Through the good offices of Sir Edward Hoby, Higgons was made confer with Thomas Morton, Dean of Paul's, one of those whose work he had criticised in his motives tract. The result was his reversion, again presented in spiritual terms as a gift from God: this time, the 'restitution' of 'sight' to his soul. Once God had so enlightened his mind, he could 'bee mollified againe, by the sweet showres' of Morton's 'learned discourse'. His change in opinion was merely the product of his spiritual conversion. Higgons then describes the 'intellectual motives' that prompted his return. His first disagreement was with Catholic teaching concerned the oath of allegiance, which he took and now defends. Taking the oath meant denying papal infallibility and the papacy's power to free subjects from obedience to the monarch. The consequences of these Catholic doctrines being political chaos and tyranny, Higgons then questioned the veracity of those other doctrines (Purgatory, the integrity of Protestant teachers, the ministry and the Church) which had prompted his initial conversion. He now found that it was, in fact, the Catholics who were in the wrong and their teachers who were guilty of sophisms (sigs. G3v-H1r, pp. 54-57).

This recantation of errors, although presented as an 'example' of grace in operation, borrows its arguments from refutational preaching. Higgons quotes the opposition against itself when he cites French Dominicans against those Catholics who claim the oath of allegiance cannot be taken by them (sigs. G2v-G3r, pp. 52-3). He invokes 'principles of divinity' when he infers from the power claimed and exercised by the papacy that it must be antichristian (sig. G3r-v, p. 53-4). He exposes the 'weak grounds' of the Catholics by citing inaccuracy in their sources on some of the points for which he had

---

previously criticised Thomas Morton (sigs. G3v-G4r, pp. 54-5). He also gives a detailed example of Cardinal Bellarmine misrepresenting the opinion of Calvin (sigs. G4r-v, pp. 55-6). Nonetheless, the persuasive force of the statement is not in the arguments used but in Higgons' verification of them through the narrative of his experience of these debates. His encounter with two Dominicans 'not long before my departure out of France' happened because he had 'desired some exact instructions concerning this oath' (sig. G2v, p. 52). He presents it as prompted by his sincere doubts, not as a debating position between two entrenched camps. Experience taught him to doubt the claims to accuracy and veracity of Catholic writers. He claims to have compared 'point to point' Thomas Morton's *Encounter against Robert Parsons*83 and so is 'an ocular witnes' to the former's fidelity 'throughout the whole course of that booke' (sig. G3v, p. 54). Restating the known differences between Protestants and Catholics is rhetorically effective here, where it was not for Crashaw, because Higgons can prove the strength of the Protestant side not by citation but by example: he had tried both sides and found this one true. Having restored his *ethos* as a speaker in the long introductory account of the doctrine of conversion, Higgons becomes an eloquent witness to the doctrinal superiority of the Church of England. His sins lead to his conversion. The mercy of God prompted the repentance that brought him back into the fold of a true, visible Church because that conversion necessarily followed from his membership of the true, invisible Church. He announced his full reunion with the Church of England, to which he has testified by signing the thirty-nine articles.

The final section of Higgons' recantation sermon (sigs. H2r-v, pp. 59-60) is taken up with the standard statement of allegiance to the King and appeal for forgiveness from the sovereign, Church and his hearers. Higgons does not end his sermon as a penitent, however. As his sermon has insisted that his reversion proves his spiritual regeneration, and so election, his closing paragraph ends with a note of exultation. He asks for their prayers as one already blessed, a position of authority that few other preachers claimed:

> Wherefore, I request you, Brethren, to praise God, with me, and for me, who hath thus extended his Mercy, Love, and Grace towards me, when I was dead in sinne. Pray him also, that I may use his blessings, to the honour of his name, and benefit of his Church. Finally, I beseech him for you, and my selfe, that we all may have, for

83Thomas Morton, *The encounter against M. Parsons, by a review of his last sober reckoning* (1610).
the end of our actions, his glory; for the rule, his word; for the fruit of our faith, the salvation of our soules through Jesus Christ our Lord: to whom [etc] (sig. H3v, p. 60).

VI

Anti-popery themes in Paul's Cross sermons were evidently considered important in strengthening the population's resistance to Catholicism. They reinforced the message of popish error and re-emphasised that the Churches were still irreconcilable. In Paul's Cross sermons, however, whether as a digression or the main theme, anti-Catholic arguments were in danger of two rhetorical faults which seriously marred their persuasiveness. A scrupulous even-handed and scholarly debate could risk entangling unlearned hearers in a knot of scholastic subtleties if the intricacies of the issues dividing the Churches were to be properly represented and discussed. A more vehement approach, employing the ethical attacks of refutations in a broader sense, could easily lose the sympathy of the hearers if it was found uncharitable, either because it departed too far from the true nature of the disagreement or by indecorous use of 'railing terms and spiteful provocations'. Recantation sermons were a high risk strategy that could, when successful, effectively insist on confessional boundaries without the danger of these two faults. In a recantation sermon, the preacher need not prove the veracity of the Protestant case through argument (as disputations did) or risk the damages inherent in using ad hominem attacks on the opponent (as in most vernacular refutations). Instead, his experience as a convert provided the proof and suasive force for the statement of confessional differences, while the doctrine of conversion provided the framework within which his ethos as a penitent and preacher could be asserted. Theophilus Higggons' recantation sermon succeeds in this and fully demonstrates both the importance and the difficulties inherent in the delivery of effective refutations of popery from Paul's Cross.
CHAPTER THREE

Preaching on Wealth and Worldliness: Joseph Hall's *Pharisaisme and Christianity* (1608) and Practical Divinity at Paul's Cross

In the first of his three Paul's Cross sermons, delivered on 1 May, 1608, Joseph Hall discusses the topics of charity and justice in Christian dealings. Already a divine known for his publications in 'practical divinity', Hall chose a topic clearly pertinent to this pulpit. He took his text from the sermon on the mount (Matthew 5.20 'Unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven') and from it expounded his hearers' duty to practice charity and justice. This duty he grounded firmly on the prior necessity of a Christian conversion that precludes hypocrisy. The sermon can assumed to have been a success when preached, as it was entered for publication thirteen days later under the title *Pharisaisme and Christianity* and went through two editions in that year.¹ This chapter argues that Hall's sermon makes a significant departure from the rhetorical techniques commonly used in Paul's Cross preaching on wealth and worldliness. This departure allows Hall to clarify the doctrinal basis of *exhortations* to charity, and so it demonstrates the failure of the rhetorical devices more commonly used to reconcile doctrine with practice.

The long shadow of the Weber thesis has fallen over much modern scholarship on Jacobean preachers' pronouncements on poverty and riches. In their search for the Calvinist's 'this-worldly asceticism', many twentieth-century historians have suggested that Puritan preachers were more ready to argue that riches were the rewards of godliness than their 'Anglican' counterparts. So too the Puritans are portrayed as supporters of the new 'harsh medicine' of social control that categorised the poor as deserving or otherwise and

¹*Pharisaisme and Christianity: compared and set forth in a sermon at Pauls Crosse* (M. Bradwood f. S. Machan, 1608; Anr. ed., H. L[ownes] f. S. Machan, 1608). The sermon was reprinted in the first collection of Hall's works (1615). All quotations from Hall's works in this chapter are taken from *Works*, ed. Philip Wynter, 10 vols (1863). The speed with which the sermon was entered for publication may reflect Hall's habit of writing his sermons in full before delivery, though he did not 'tie' himself 'to syllables' in his delivery: *Observations ... in the Life of Jos. Hall*, in *Works*, vol. I, pp. xxxv-xxxvi.
delivered help accordingly. Non-Puritan preachers, on the other hand, have been accused of teaching obsolete doctrines on trading practices and usury in a rapidly changing economy, and so, rather than addressing the problems faced by their society, of simply allowing the church's social policy to become irrelevant.

These issues will be considered here in terms of rhetoric and doctrine, rather than social theory. In this way, it can be shown that the preachers viewed social themes from a perspective very different to that of modern social historians. The preachers at Paul's Cross tackled the problems of economic oppression, fraud and poverty from what they took to be its root - the sin of worldliness - and it is on the basis of appeals from worldliness that arguments about the uses of wealth and the alleviation of poverty were based. Their starting point was not social justice but spiritual renewal, from which social justice (albeit imperfect) would arise. The role of the preacher was not to take the magistrate's place in the regulation of society, but to exhort all men, magistrates and private citizens, to a Christian understanding of the proper uses of wealth and worldly goods. Preaching on wealth and worldliness, and practical divinity generally, demanded that doctrine be applied to the complicated dealings of everyday life without sacrificing dogmatic integrity or realism in the advice offered.

II

Preaching on the uses of wealth was particularly apt for Paul's Cross and many preachers commented on the suitability of these themes to the commercial and professional audience addressed at this pulpit. In the dedication to The marchant, a sermon preached the Sunday before Bartholomew Fair in 1607, Daniel Price writes that he 'fitted the time with this Text'


This is R. H. Tawney's assessment of the social teaching of the English Church in the early modern period in Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. Tawney criticises Weber's thesis as too narrowly focused on religious ideas. According to Tawney, one of the central changes in the development of capitalism was the abandoning of a community-based social ethic: R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (1926; repr. 1990), pp. 179-196.
(Matthew 13. 45-46 'The Kingdom of heaven is like a merchant man, that seeks good pearls, who having found a pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it'), as he was commanded to preach 'at that great Marte'. In A counterpoison against covetousnes, preached at Paul's Cross by Jeremiah Dyke in 1619, Dyke admits that covetousness is a sin that 'hath often bene witnessed against in this place'. At Paul's Cross, calls for generous alms-givings had very definite objects, as collections for charitable purposes were often made after the sermons. The Paul's Cross sermons were themselves the object of charity, and it was traditional to remember their benefactors during the sermons themselves. This catalogue of benefactors was included in the printed version of Samuel Collins' A sermon preached at Paules-Crosse, delivered on All Saints' Day, 1607. Collins writes of the recitation of this catalogue as an obligation on the preacher: It is a 'theame [that] expects my handling' although he 'will not seeke how to apply [it] to the Text'. A similar catalogue of benefactions is recorded in the printed version of Thomas Myriell's The devout soules search, preached at Paul's Cross in 1610.

4Daniel Price, The marchant (1608), sig. ¶2v; Jeremiah Dyke, A counterpoison against covetousness (1619), sig. B3v, p.6.

5In September 1582, John Aylmer, Bishop of London, forwarded a petition from 'certain miserable Captives in Turkey' to the Corporation so that 'by the relief of some general collection to be made at Paul's Cross and elsewhere they might be redeemed out of that hellish thraldom'. In November, Aylmer wrote to the Lord Mayor again and recommended a collection at Paul's Cross for two English captives to the Turks and requesting that the mayor 'appoint some grave and trusty citizens to collect the alms of the well-disposed people, at every gate in Paul's, after the sermon'. In May 1583, 'certain poor Hungarians' were given permission by the Queen to 'gather the charitable alms for their ransom at the sermons at St. Paul's and other churches in the city: Analytical Index to the ... Remembrancia ... eds W.H. and H.C. Overall (1878), pp. 53-54, 129.

6Samuel Collins, A sermon preached at Paules-Crosse (1608), sigs. M3v-M4v, pp. 86-88; Thomas Myriell, The devout soules search (1610), sigs. F8v-G1r, pp. 80-81. In the same manner, a catalogue of the poor helped by the city authorities in the various hospitals during the year was read out during the Spittal sermons. This catalogue is reproduced in Daniel Featley's Primitiae Sepulchri, in Clavis Mystica (1636), sig. Q5v, p. 178. There is a break in Hall's Spittal sermon, The Righteous Mammon, where he read out 'a brief memorial of the charitable acts of the city this last year' when the sermon was first delivered: Works, vol. V, p. 146. There appear to have been problems financing the sermons at Paul's Cross in the late sixteenth century: Millar MacLure, The Paul Cross Sermons (1958), pp. 11-12. 1608, when £480 was handed over to the City Chamberlain (£300 from the will of John Aylmer, £100 from the will of the Countess of Shrewsbury and £80 interest) marked a turning point, however. This was the first capital sum given to the Corporation to finance the sermons and benefactions continued to pour in during James' reign. The allowance given to each preacher per sermon (provided that they did not hold a benefice worth more than £100 p.a.) at the end of the Jacobean period amounted to £2, 5s and 6d, considerably more than was given in most London lectureships (Paul S. Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships (1970), pp. 148-150). This information is taken from notes on Paul's Cross compiled by Mr. P. E. Jones of the Corporation of London Record Office in 1934 (Research Papers 4.13). There is a shorter note on benefactions to the Paul's Cross sermons in Richard Newcourt's Repertorium Ecclesiasticum parochiale Londiniense (1708), vol. 1, p. 5.
Preaching on wealth, charity and the proper use of worldly goods revolved around the consideration of two themes: the Christian's duty to show charity and the moral necessity to practise neither fraud nor oppression in economic transactions. These themes were united through the teaching of St. Augustine on the 'two loves', of God and of the world. The love of God controlled and moderated the Christian's desire for worldly things. Virtuous action necessarily followed the right ordering of desires. Likewise, vice was the necessary result of disordered or inordinate desires for worldly things:

And thus was carnal beauty (a gift of good indeed, but yet a temporary, base and transient one) sinne [when] fully elected and loved before God, that eternall, internall, and sempiternall good: just as the covetous man forsaketh justice and loveth golde, the golde beeing not in fault but the man; even so is it in all other creatures. They are all good, and may be loved well, or badly: well, when our love is moderate, badly, when it is inordinate.

Those who refused to give alms to help their fellows, those who covetously hoarded their goods or who practised fraud in trade were guilty of placing worldly goods above heavenly ones and of placing their trust in money rather than in God's providence. Although fair dealing pertained to the virtue of justice, alms-giving to liberality and moderation in the use of worldly goods to temperance, the common source in God's grace of the disposition to do good, which formed the habit of virtue, meant that all virtues opposed the sins of the worldly. For Augustine, cupidity, the selfish love of the world, is the root of all sins:

Take care that you believe in the unsurpassable truth of the saying that the root of all evils is greed, that is, willing to have more than enough. Enough means whatever is necessary to preserve a nature according to its kind. But greed, which in Greek is called 'philarguria', does not merely have to do with silver or coins from which the word is derived (for it used to be that coins were made of silver or had some silver mixed in). Rather, it should be understood to apply to any object of immoderate desire, in any case where someone wills to have more than enough, Such greed is cupidity, and cupidity is a perverse will.

---

7 Margo Todd has shown that in many respects Puritans and Anglicans shared assumptions about the causes of poverty, its spiritual indifference and the possible solutions to poverty as a social evil. These ideas stem, she writes, from a shared background in Christian humanist ideas. The fundamental assumptions on which these Christian humanist ideas are based, I suggest, is St. Augustine. It is from St. Augustine that seventeenth-century English writers take the notion of worldliness, of which oppression, fraud, covetousness and niggardliness are all results. Although it is certain that Todd is right in saying that Puritans, Anglicans and Christian humanists all believed that the duty of Christians was to 'analyze the causes of poverty in every particular and address the problems at its source', it does not follow that they would have seen these causes in various evil social practices rather than a sinful disposition in individuals: Margo Todd, Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order (1987), pp. 118-175.


9 Augustine, On Free Choice of the Will, trans. Thomas Williams (1993), p. 104. In Loves complaint, for want of entertainment, (1(1610?) preached at Paul's Cross by William Holbrooke in 1609, the various sins of the commonwealth, including sins of fraudulent dealing in the city and oppression of poor tenants...
The Christian must 'use' but not 'enjoy' the things of the world, as an end in themselves. He must, as Hall wrote in *The Righteous Mammon* be 'in the world' but not 'of the world'. The attitudes which secured the Christian against the vices of worldliness were a temperate contentment in what was sufficient to maintain life and social station and a trust in the providence of God for future prosperity. William Perkins includes the desire for worldly things in his consideration of temperance. He writes that goods are either necessary or 'more than necessary, which the Scripture calls *Abundance*'. Necessary goods are those needed to maintain life and social standing, both in terms of present need and certain future needs (such as dowries). What is sufficient for these purposes should be estimated from the example of wise men. In judging what is necessary, we should seek for guidance from God through prayer. Perkins concludes:

Man may with good conscience, desire and seeke for goods necessarie, whether for nature, or for his person, according to the former rules; but he may not desire and seeke for goods more then necessary, for if he doth, he sinneth.

The hypothetical objection of the covetous man is dismissed as follows:

Object. III. We must doe good to the poore, to the Church, to the commonwealth, and we must also leave somewhat to posterity. I answer: we may not doe evill that good may come thereof. Againe, every man is accepted of God, according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not, if there be a ready mind. 2.Cor. 8.12. And the end of a mans calling, is not to gather riches for himself, for his family, for the poore; but to serve God in serving of man, and in seeking the good of all men: and to this end men must apply their lives and labours.

This approach to reconciling the demands of the world with the demands of virtue was frequently used by preachers at Paul's Cross. Jeremiah Dyke's *A counterpoison against covetousnes* gives St. Augustine's definition of covetousness as the desire for more than is sufficient and defines sufficiency as Perkins did:

A man, I take it, may be said to have enough, when he hath such a portion and sufficiencie of these outward things, as that he hath wherewith to live plentifully, as also both to traine up his [children] liberally for the best imployments, and to leave

---


his liberally according to their callings and conditions. I thinke such a man may be
said to have enough, and what is more is of sinne. No sooner doth a man steppe over
the hedge and pale of sufficiencie, but he is presently in the wide, wide, and
boundlesse champain of covetousnesse.

In *The godly merchant*, preached in 1613, William Pemberton describes the contentment
that comes when godliness moderates the desire for worldly things and refreshes the
believer with the hope of salvation. Those who are discontent are so only because of their
worldliness, as 'the want of contentment argueth the want of godliness'. Men complain
'because they have not obtained the true-contenting gaine of piety and godlinesse'. In a
digression in *Antichrist arraigned*, a sermon preached sometime before 1618, Thomas
Thompson argues that sobriety in life was demanded of all people and that this sobriety was
effected by 'the sober getting' and 'sober spending' of goods. In *A caveat for the covetous*,
the only sermon he delivered at Paul's Cross, the famous puritan William Whately gives this
standard definition of covetousness and shows the distrust of providence it entails:

> So then, if any man doe find himselfe to stand so disposed in minde, that having
> enough for the present time, yet he doeth eate up his heart, break his sleepe, disquiet
> himselfe, & turne into gaule, that comfort which hee might have in his life, by this
> unprofitable and overreaching thoughtfulness: Ah, how shall I doe, if a deare yeare
> come? howe, if I have so manie children? how if I live till I be so old, or till I be
> lame or blinde? sure I shall spend all, I shall consume all, I shalbe undone, I shall die
> a beggar, & come to gret want & extremitie, and such like terrible dreams: if any
> man I say stand thus affected, these things doe most rankly savour of
> covetousnesse. 12

St. Augustine's castigation of cupidity, however, did not lead to a
renunciation of all commerce with the world. The Christian was obliged to function in the
commonwealth and do his utmost to preserve whatever flawed semblance of true peace
remained in the earthly city. 13 For this reason, preachers reiterated the magistrates' duty to
enforce society's laws against the fraudulent and oppressive. In *The christian path-way*,
preached at Paul's Cross in 1611, Thomas Cheaste describes the Christian commonwealth in
these terms: 14

---

25; William Wheatlie [Whately], *A caveat for the covetous* (1609), sig. C1r, p. 31.
13 On Augustine's political thought, see R.A. Markus, *Saeculum*, pp. 65-104 and Markus, *Conversion
14 Thomas Cheaste, *The christian path-way* (1613), sigs. B3v-B4r, pp. 6-7. The duty of magistrates to
suppress sin is also declared in: William Jackson, *The celestial husbandrie* (1616), 13v, p. 80; John
Lawrence, *A golden trumpet* (1624), sigs. F4v-G1r, pp. 40-41; Charles Richardson, *A sermon concerning
the punishing of malefactors* (1616) sig. B3v, p. 6; George Webbe, *Gods controversie with England*
O happy, and twise happy, are the people and Common-weale whom God hath blessed with such Magistrates! that Common-wealth and Country is in good estate where the Prince makes good Lawes, the Magistrates execute them, and the people obey them.

Nonetheless, preachers did recognise a clear distinction between their social role and that of the magistrate: it was for them to exhort to holiness, not to legislate or enforce. Denouncing worldliness was, then, the appropriate way for the preacher to advance peace and justice in the commonwealth. Cheaste continues:

There is also another stay of Gods building, or Christian Common-wealth, which must not be omitted, to wit, the zealous and learned Minister, whose doctrine, by warrant of Gods word, must be a rule to guide and direct all their lawes by, otherwise they will be out of square. These Workemen should not be idle in Gods Harvest, For the Harvest is great, but the labourers are few.\(^{15}\)

So confident was Francis Marbury in the morally reformative qualities of preaching and its usefulness to the magistrate that he wrote of it as the only 'effective way' to reclaim London's criminal underworld. They were to be 'marshelled' to hear sermons where 'they shall find allurements to quiet their mind in obedience'.\(^{16}\) Clearly, the use of Augustinian notions of the two cities and the two loves did not mean that preachers advocated, or practised, a withdrawal from the concerns of the community. Rather, preaching was presented and used as the most effective way for them to carry out their role in advancing justice and peace in society.

III

According to theorists on preaching rhetoric, the application of the principles of religion to the circumstances of the hearer's lives and attitudes was effected by *exhortation* (or *adhortatio*) and *dehortation*, twin rhetorical forms that roused the hearers to adopt or avoid a course of action. Rhetors found these forms hard to define, as they were properly neither a


\(^{16}\)Francis Marbury, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse* (1602), sigs. E1v-E3r.
part of an oration or a figure of speech. For J.C. Scaliger, *exhortation* is a form of *deliberatio*, a figure of argument, and includes admonition, consolation and *dehortatio*. For Henry Peacham, *exhortation* is a *form of speech* used 'when we doe exhort our hearer to doe that which is profitable for them'. *Dehortation* 'contrary to that above' is used when 'we would dissuade & reduce our hearers from some thing that is evill'. The *commonplaces* best used in *exhortation* are 'the prayse and expectation of men, hope of victory, hope of rewarde, hope of renowne, feare of shame, examples of all tymes'. Although both writers agree that *exhortation* appeals to the emotion, they also treat it as fundamentally argumentative: it is used to promote or dissuade from an action and gives reasons and arguments for doing so.18

A far greater emphasis was placed on *exhortation* in sacred rhetoric than in general rhetorics of the Renaissance or in their classical models. Examples of *exhortation* were said to be common in Scripture and preachers often noted when the text of their sermon was an *exhortation*.19 Nonetheless, *exhortation* presented problems of definition for English preaching theorists. William Perkins merely noted that *exhortation* 'belongs to' the 'instructive use' of the sermon's doctrine 'whereby doctrine is applied to frame a man to live well in the family, common-wealth, and Church'. Likewise, admonition 'belongs to' the 'corrective use' of doctrine 'whereby the doctrine is applied to reforme the life from ungodlinesse'.20 In *Ecclesiastes*, John Wilkins uses *exhortation* to refer to both Perkins'...
'instructive use' and the persuading argument described by Peacham. As such, it was one of the most important parts of the sermon because 'Act. 13.15 all that was to be spoken is called Exhortation. The chiefe end of an Orator is to perswade, (say the Philosophers) \textit{Finis oratoris est persuasio}.'^{21}

This confusion is clarified somewhat in Richard Bernard's treatment of exhortation. Bernard lists four possible \textit{uses} for the sermon's doctrine: confutation, instruction, reprehension and consolation. \textit{Exhortation} and \textit{dehortation}, Bernard writes, are 'appendices to these'. For each type of use, Bernard gives detailed instructions for the arguments and methods to be used in exhorting or dehorting the hearers. For exhortations on the \textit{use} of instruction (which \textit{use} Bernard defines as 'a practicall conclusion drawn out of a Doctrine' to 'bring the hearers to holiness towards God and righteousness towards men') the following advice is offered:

\begin{quote}
Having gathered the Use, a Minister is to come to the exhortation; wherin note \textit{four things to be observed of him}: First, whom hee is to exhort; and these be two sorts: ...\textit{Secondly}, he must consider of the \textit{motives} to perswade and draw them to the practise, and to continue therein, such as these. ...\textit{Thirdly}, in pressing this duty a Minister must consider how to move and gaine the affections, and the hearers to a love and desire to doe the duty, ...\textit{The fourth} and last thing, which a Minister is to doe (having thus pressed the duty) is to shew them the meanes which they must use. ...\textit{Then}, perswade to the meanes from the easines, from the hope of Gods assistance promised to such as laboure to doe well ... and so forth.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

The \textit{exhortation}, therefore, is the argumentative means by which the hearers are persuaded to adopt attitudes advanced by the preacher, or, in contemporary terminology, by which the \textit{use} is \textit{applied} to the hearers. The arguments of \textit{exhortations} were built on well-defined \textit{commonplaces}, partly derived from classical rhetoric and adapted to scriptural precepts. These \textit{topics} provided the preacher with set arguments in the form of \textit{motives} (arguments to persuade the hearers to follow the advice offered) and \textit{means} (arguments describing how the desired action could be effected).\textsuperscript{23} Hyperius gives an extensive list of \textit{commonplaces} of arguments to be used in \textit{exhortation}, including:

\begin{quote}
Of the commaundement of God, 
Of the promises of God, 
Of the threatnings of God, 
Of the counsell of holy men,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{21}John Wilkins, \textit{Ecclesiastes} (1646), sig. C3v, p. 18. 
\textsuperscript{23}On 'topics' or 'commonplaces of argument', see chapter one, note 9, p. 17.
Of the examples and deeds of the same,
Of comparisons.  

Hyperius also notes that the preacher should not neglect 'the craft or cunning of moving of affections' through the 'the engins of art and grace in speaking'. Affective oratory is, however, secondary in persuasion to argument by *commonplaces*. Niels Hemmingsen describes three types of 'persuasible sermon': the exhortatory, the consolatory and the 'chiding'. The *commonplaces* he suggests for each are remarkably close to those given by Hyperius:

The persuasible Sermon is, whereby wee persuade the hearers, either to doe, to suffer, or to forsake some thinge. The place of invention in this kinde are these especially: the necessitie of the cause, of the commandement, of the vocation, the private and publique commoditie, the dignitie of the persone and the thing. Example olde, newe, Christian, Ethnica. 

Richard Bernard, in the 1607 edition of *The faithfull shepheard*, lists the same topics for persuasion. Having 'laid out' the doctrine of the sermon, the preacher should:

Proove it, and then use persuasions and exhortations thereunto: urge the same by good reasons upon the auditorie to doe it. First, from a commandement affirmative: the approbation thereof with God, with godly men, whose testimonie and sentences heere are to be brought in, yea the sayings of the heathen, touching moral duties. Secondly, promises temporal & of eternall favor mentioned in Scripture, to such as performe that dutie. Thirdly, from the effect & use therof to Gods glorie, profit to a mans selfe & others. Fourthly, set it forth by examples, which both delight the hearers and doe move and teach the ruder sort.

*Exhortation*, then, was the rhetorical means by which the tenets of Christian doctrine were to be applied to the hearers of a sermon, and *exhortation* functioned primarily by arguments drawn from well defined *commonplaces*. The motives to charity most commonly suggested were the praise and reward to be derived from an action; God's commandment that the action be done or avoided; the utility of the action; and the example of good men: pagan and Christian. The means to charity was the avoidance of worldliness through the love of God and neighbour by which the love of earthly things was properly subordinated. Motives to avoid covetousness and worldliness are the transience of worldly goods and the punishment awaiting the covetous.

---

25Niels Hemmingsen, *The Preacher*, sigs. H5v-H6r, ff. 53v-54r. See also *Oratoria Sacra*, a preaching rhetoric by John Clarke appended to *Holy oyle for the lampes of the sanctuarie* (1630), sig. 214r, p. 487.
Preachers at Paul's Cross made use of many arguments common in medieval preaching in their *dehortations* against covetousness.\(^{27}\) Quoting Saint Bernard and St. Paul (1 Timothy 6.9), they warned that riches are snares to trap a man in sin.\(^{28}\) Preachers of the Jacobean age did not hesitate to say that riches were no sign of God's favour, or even that they could be a sign of God's anger. Few rich men enter the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 19.24; Mark 10.25; Luke 18.25) and few of the elect were blessed with worldly goods.\(^{29}\) Lack of charity could be denounced by presenting the punishments God threatened on those who do not help their fellows. In *Dives and Lazarus*, a vivid and dramatic sermon preached at Paul's Cross sometime before 1623, Robert Johnson makes ample use of *prosopopoeia* to represent the encounter between the rich man and the leper at his gate. In this sermon, Johnson asserts with uncompromising certainty that the rich man's gluttony, pride and covetousness damned him where the humility and patience of Lazarus brought him to Abraham's bosom.\(^{30}\) The main source for *dehortations* against covetousness, however, was St. Augustine's treatment on worldliness. Worldliness necessarily led to social injustice and fraud, as the covetous man places his desire for gain over the obligations of charity and justice. The covetous, therefore, invariably break the 'golden rule' to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Worldliness, as it gave rise to covetousness, was the root of fraudulent dealing in trade, oppression of tenants and employees and the illiberality which refused to give alms to the needy. William Whately points out that both those who 'scrape to keepe' and those who 'scrape to scatter and mispend' are guilty of covetousness, so that the prodigall, the ambitious and the sluggard cannot acquit themselves of this sin. Two laws were given to men by which niggardliness, prodigality and all forms of fraud are condemned:


\(^{28}\) 'Tell us, I beg you, holy Paul, what is this snare of the devil from which the faithful soul rejoices to have been delivered?' "Those who desire to be rich in this world" he answers "fall into temptation and into the devil's snare". Does this mean that this world's riches are the devil's snare?: Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons on Conversion*, trans. Marie-Bernard Said OSB (1981), p. 130. This *commonplace* is used by Roger Fenton, *The pisedome of the rich* (1617), sigs. T4r-v, pp. 141-2; Thomas Thompson, *Antichrist arraigned*, sig. C5r, p. 25; John White, *Sermon at the Spittle* (1615), sig. I2r, p. 59; George Bury, *The Narrow Way* (1607), sigs. Elr-v, pp. 33-34.


So then every man is so farre forth covetous as unjust in his dealings. Now all those practises are unjust and unequall, which be not conformable to 2. generall rules set downe in scripture, that by them we might square out all our particular actions. The first is, to doe to everie man as wee would have him doe unto us. ... The second rule is, to serve eache other in love: for love seekes not its owne things [1 Cor. 13.6] meaning only without regard of an other, but doth so equally and indifferently consider another with it selfe, that it would not prolife it selfe with his endammagement.31

Preachers were not slow to stress that the profligate man could be covetous, because he demanded his pound of flesh from others only to indulge himself. Jeremiah Dyke argues that 'though covetousnesse and prodigalitie be two extremes yet often times covetousnesse is but subordinate to prodigalitie' because men 'covetously scrape that together which may be serviceable to their lusts'. In *A sermon against oppression and fraudulent dealing*, Charles Richardson places the blame for rural poverty firmly on the landlords who oppress their tenants in order to support their expenditure. By their ambition 'to buy one degree of honour after another', their expenditure on 'all bravery of apparrell, that they may, at the least, match them of their own ranke', their 'sumptuous building' and 'excessive feasting' (from which the poor 'get but little reliefe in many places') the 'toiling Labourer, who endureth the burden and heate of the day, the poore husbandman and oppressed tenant' are left impoverished. Their hunger is not caused by nature but only 'to bring a full diet to his Landlords table'.32

As caritas directed love away from the self and toward God and neighbour, the inverse of dehortations from worldliness were *exhortations* to justice and liberality: in short, to the duty of charity. In *Of the life or conversation of a Christen man*, a translation of chapters seven to ten of Book III of Calvin's *Institutes* published in 1549, the Augustinian teaching that only selflessness leads to true charity is apparent:

And thys is a token that a man hath muche profited, when, havynge in a maner forgotten ourselves, yea the consideration of our selves set asyde, we bestowe our myndes or desires faythfully upon the Lorde and his commandmentes ... For he that hath learned to beholde God in the doing of all thynge, therwythal turneth away from all vayne thynge. Thys is that deniynge of our selves which Christe, assone as he hath called his disciples, wyth so greate diligence taught them: the whiche after it hath once taken place in the hert: firste leaveth no place either for pryde, or disdayne, or braggyng: and after that, neither for covetousnes, ... nor for other mischiefes, whiche come of the love of oure owne selves. Contrarywyse, where so

ever it reyneth not, there eyther moste fylthy vices, wythout shame, straye aboute: or elles if there be anie outwarde shewe of vertue, the same is corrupt with the naughtyie desire of praise. For shewe me a man (if thou canst), who, except he have according to gods commaundemente forsaken him selfe, wol frely, or for naught, exercise goodnes amonge men.\textsuperscript{33}

Exhortations to charity were also drawn from the commonplaces recommended by rhetoricians. The commandments of Christ; the example of worthy men, including the hearers' forefathers; the utility of charity to church and commonwealth, the praise of charity among men and the rewards of charity promised by God, all provided arguments to exhort the hearers to the proper use of their goods. Drawing on the first of these commonplaces in The Barren Tree, preached at Paul's Cross in 1623, Thomas Adams insisted that Christians were obliged to practise charity and fair dealing.\textsuperscript{34} The most common sources of examples of charity were the Bible and the recent English past. The benefactions to the Church of the pre-Reformation period and the Jacobean belief that in a bygone age landlords practised liberal hospitality and charity allowed preachers to use the recent past as an example and a rebuke to their Jacobean auditors at Paul's Cross. In one of his two undated sermons at Paul's Cross, John Hoskins writes:

Amongst us the compendious course is taken of gathering our credit neere unto us into cloathes, which lay scattered in hospitality before; and in attendants: the City wonders at the Country, that the poore sheepe shoulde eate up men; the Country wonders againe at the Citie, that suits of apparell should devour Servingmen; nor hath this pride turned all mens followers only, it hath likewise banished away affection of charitie.\textsuperscript{35}

When arguing from the praise of charity, preachers invariably cited the reputation of the city of London, famous throughout the world for its charity. This commonplace is used by Thomas Adams in The White Devil, where he proclaims the city's liberality to hospitals and 'the distressed Gospell' and its faithfulness to the Crowne.\textsuperscript{36}

By far the most common argument used to encourage charity, however, was the rewards promised in the next life by Christ in the Beatitudes and in Matthew 25.40

\textsuperscript{33}John Calvin, \textit{Of the life or conversation of a christen man} ([1549]), sigs. C3v-C5r. The quotation given here is from Book 3, chapter vii.2 of \textit{The Institutes of the Christian Religion}.

\textsuperscript{34}Thomas Adams, \textit{The Barren Tree}, sig. 4N6v, p. 958; Charles Richardson, \textit{The price of our redemption} (1617), sig. 14v, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{35}John Hoskins, \textit{A Sermon preached at Pauls Cross} [on Isaiah 28.1] (1615), sigs. H2v-H3r, pp. 52-53.

(‘Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me’). The language of rewards in Scripture was easily adapted to *exhortations* to spiritual or physical exertions that will lead to eternal life. Hall himself made use of this when preaching at Court in 1623. Heaven, he argued, is the ‘best bargain’ and so the Christian should ‘buy the truth, and sell it not’, as his text (Proverbs 23.23) advised. Commercial imagery of this sort was particularly common at Paul’s Cross. In *The godly merchant*, preached at Paul’s Cross on October 17, 1613, William Pemberton used his text (1 Timothy 6.6: ‘But godliness with contentment is great gain’) to argue that ‘wise merchants’ do not use a cover of piety to gain worthless earthly things but practise true piety in order to gain ‘godly contentment’, a far greater good. Daniel Price’s *The marchant*, preached in 1607 the day before Bartholomew Fair opened, exhorts his hearers to imitate the merchant in the parable (who sold all he had to buy the ‘pearl of great price’, Matthew 13. 45-46). A truly wise merchant, he insists, will not risk losing heavenly treasures for the sake of gaining earthly goods by dishonest means.

Exhortations to charity based on these *commonplaces* were, however, complicated by doctrinal and confessional considerations. Direct *exhortations* to works of charity and mercy might suggest that such acts were meritorious before God or that they required God to repay them with the reward promised to the merciful and charitable. The relationship between faith and good works and the grounds on which works were demanded of the Christian was a problematic one for preachers. According to the Protestant doctrine of *sola fide* justification, a sinner is justified by his faith that the merits of Christ’s passion have been imputed to him, making him righteous, through Christ, before God. No actions on his part compel God to grant that faith and no actions prior to justification, however beneficial to the Church or commonwealth, are of any benefit for salvation. Subsequent to justification, any merit in good works (and not all writers agreed they were of any merit) was only *congruous* to the reward God allowed them within the covenant he made with the

---

37 Emma Sian Hebblethwaite lists the most important Scriptural references to rewards and merits and describes the main currents of Protestant interpretation of these passages in her thesis: ‘The Theology of Rewards in English Printed Treatises and Sermons (c. 1550-1650)’, (University of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1992), pp. 6-25.

believer. Works did not 'earn' salvation nor was salvation the reward or 'wages' of a godly life. Once justified, however, the Christian embarks on a process of sanctification through which he 'puts off the old man' of worldly desires and sinful impulses and 'puts on Christ' (Ephesians 4.22-24); that is, he reforms his life in accordance with the example of holiness given by the Saviour. In this process, good works play their part, because it is through the exercise of holiness that the Christian grows in love of God and man. The justified believer fulfils the Law of God, including the duty of charity, through love of God rather than because of fear of punishment.

When laid out in systematic divinity, this teaching created few difficulties. When put in the very different context of exhortations to charity, however, this doctrine caused the preachers considerable trouble rhetorically. The preacher cannot exhort to charity, using the commonplaces of reward or praise as motives, without referring to the unmeritorious nature of those works without faith. As faith is a gift of God, the preacher cannot directly exhort the hearers to it. He can exhort them to seek it, by prayer and repentance, or he can exhort them to search their hearts to see if they truly have the faith they profess. This meant that the motive of reward and praise could not be used independently as the basis of exhortations. While appealing to works of charity, the preacher needed to emphasise at the same time that such acts could not in themselves merit salvation nor would they be a cause of the justification of the sinner before God. This was often said in a caveat that qualified the rhetoric of reward by placing it in the context of justifying faith. Such a caveat is found in the first part of the Homily of Good Works in the second Book of Homilies (1563):

These works the Apostle calleth good works, saying, We are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesu to good works, which God hath ordained, that we should walk in them. [Eph. 2.10] And yet his meaning is not by these words to induce us to have any affiance, or to put any confidence, in our works, as by the merit and deserving of them to purchase to ourselves and others remission of sin, and so consequently everlasting life. For that were mere blasphemy against God's mercy, and great derogation to the bloodshedding of our Saviour Jesus Christ. For it is of the free grace and mercy of God, by the mediation of the blood of his Son Jesus Christ, without merit or deserving on our part, that our sins are forgiven us, that we are

39 Emma Sian Hebblethwaite, 'The Theology of Rewards', pp. 3-36.
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reconciled and brought again into his favour, and made heir of his heavenly kingdom.41

Placing caveats amid *exhortations* in this way evidently diminished the rhetorical effectiveness of the sermon. Direct *exhortations* to aim at the rewards promised the charitable, to earn the praise of men by benefiting Church or commonwealth or to follow the example of charitable forebears all had to be qualified by the dogma that these works, however good in men's eyes, were of no benefit to the doer's soul except in the context of justifying faith. Such qualifications necessarily lessened the rhetorical impact of these *exhortations*. Nonetheless, these caveats were rarely neglected, or even understated, as *sola fide* justification was one of the primary tenets Reformation writers used to distinguish their doctrine from what was believed to be the 'works-righteousness' taught by Papists. The Roman Catholic Church (because it defined 'justification' as the process of being made righteous) taught that the justified believer was capable of good deeds that truly merited rewards from God. This merit *de condigno* was denied by Protestants who separated the event of justification from the process of sanctification.42 Like Protestants, however, Roman Catholic theologians denied that works prior to justification merited grace from God. The differences in doctrine were incorrectly understood by contemporary controversialists, and English Protestant commentators commonly claimed that Papists believed they could earn their justification, and so salvation, by their good works. This they saw as an impious


42The substantial differences between the Protestant and Tridentine positions were between the view of justification either as a process of being made justified (Trent) or an event, subsequently followed by the process of sanctification (the Reformed view) and, following from this, between the view that in justification a person is infused with the merits of Christ (Trent) or merely has them imputed to him (Luther), which merits are subsequently made inherent in the believer through the process of sanctification only completed after death (Reformed). In relation to good works and merit, the Council of Trent's pronouncements do not exclude the opinion of some Catholic theologians that man may merit justification *de congruo*, that is, that God takes his works and the disposition of his heart towards God as being congruous to what would be worthy of justification, though not strictly meriting it. It did not allow that a man could merit justification *de condigno*, that is, in the strict sense of earning it: Alister E. McGrath *Justitia Dei* (1986), vol. 2, pp. 80-90. The evolution of these doctrinal differences is traced by McGrath in *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (2nd ed., 1993), pp. 111-118. After justification, however, Roman Catholic theologians allowed that the works of a Christian did merit rewards from God *de condigno*. Protestants maintained that no works by man could merit rewards *de condigno*, although the justified Christian could do works that were pleasing to God without meriting a reward from him: Emma Sian Hebblethwaite, 'The Theology of Rewards' pp. 2-4.
derogation of the sacrifice of Christ and an arrogant presumption in man's ability to do good. At the same time, preachers were quick to deny Roman Catholics' counter-allegation that *sola fide* justification militated against charity. Citing the record of England's Protestants in works of charity, they denounced as slanderous the accusation that they taught that good works were not demanded by God.

Protestant writers possessed an arsenal of arguments in favour of good works which they employed regularly in sermons at Paul's Cross. Many of these arguments for good works accommodated the problems posed by these doctrinal and polemical issues by taking as their starting point James 2.17-18 ('Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works'), interpreting it to refer to works following from justifying faith. Where James writes that faith without works is dead, this was interpreted to mean that a false faith will not result in the fruits of good works, but that a true and lively faith would motivate the believer to live 'worthy of the calling'. Therefore, to 'show faith by works' was to give testimony before other men of one's faith and to assure oneself that one possessed the true faith that justified. In *The Estate of a Christian*, an undated sermon preached at Gray's Inn, Hall shows his hearers how to judge their regeneration by their works:

> If we be renewed by creation, here must be a clean heart. *Cor mundum crea*, saith the Psalmist, Psalm ii.10. ... But if we plead the closeness of the heart, which may therefore seem impervious even to our own eyes, see what the apostle saith, Eph. ii.10, *We are his workmanship, created unto good works.* The cleanness of the heart will show itself in the goodness of the hands. But if our hands may deceive us, as nothing is more easily counterfeited than a good action, yet our feet will not, I mean the trade of our ways. That therefore from our creation we may look to our regeneration; if we be the sons of God, we are renewed: and how shall it appear whether we be the sons of God? It is a golden rule, *Whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God*.

---

43In the nineteenth of the general errors of Roman Catholics detailed in his *Synopsis Papismi*, Andrew Willet outlines the two positions and uses scriptural and patristic sources to oppose the Roman doctrine. As contemporary preachers did, he also denies that solididian justification leads to the neglect of good works and promises to refute this 'uncharitable slander' in an appendix. This appendix lists the charitable works done in England since the accession of Elizabeth by monarchs, nobles and the Corporation of London: *Synopsis papismi* (1592; Anr. ed., 1613), sigs. 422v, 5N2r-5[n]6r, pp. 1068, 1219-1243.

44This 'slander' by Romanists was itself a popular argument used in *exhortations* to charity by preachers at Paul's Cross. The following preachers all challenged their hearers to refute, by good deeds, the Papists' accusation that their *sola fide* doctrine lead them to neglect charity: Charles Richardson, *A Sermon against oppression and fraudulent dealing*, sig. E2r, p. 27; Samuel Ward, *Balme from Gilead* (1617), sigs. F5r-v, pp. 79-80; William Jackson, *The celestial husbandrie*, sig. N4r, p. 113.

The second prong of this argument relates to the doctrine of sanctification (the process of becoming justified following the initial call). As the believer is sanctified through his endeavours to keep the law of God, the law of charity and the duties of mercy are still demanded of those called by God. Therefore, the commandment of God to do good works remained, albeit with the prior condition of faith.\footnote{William Perkins, \textit{The whole treatise of cases of conscience}, sigs. B2v-B3r, pp. 16-17. At Paul's Cross, this teaching was described by Robert Barrel in \textit{The spiritual architecture}, sig. D2v, p. 20.} So too, the scriptural promises of reward for good deeds, understood to be granted by God's grace and not earned by man through his deeds, could be used as a \textit{motive} in \textit{exhortations} to good works. The desire for heaven is a legitimate incentive to good works, although works should not be undertaken as if they were themselves a means to salvation. Robert Barrell insists on this distinction in \textit{The spiritual architecture}, a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1623. Among the 'upright intentions' that made an action good is:

\begin{quote}
The salvation of our owne soules, which wee must prize more then the whole world. \textit{Mat. 16.26}. \textit{Noli facere nisi propter vitam aeternam, ideo fac, & securus facies}. Have no sinister intention in the doing of thy good workes, but aime therein at thine own salvation, doe them to that end, and thou shalt deale securely. For a true Christian (though he must renounce his owne merit in his well doing and suffering for Christ's sake: yet hee many have an \textit{eye to the recompence of reward}, (with Moses:) \textit{to the crowne of rightousness}, (with Saint Paul:) \textit{and to the glory set before him} (with Christ himselfe:) as a spurre to pricke him forward to well doing, and a cordiall to comfort him in his suffering.\footnote{Robert Barrell, \textit{The spiritual architecture} sig. D4v, p. 24. On the intentions necessary to make a work good, see William Perkins, \textit{The whole treatise of cases of conscience}, sig. B3v, p.18 and William Ames, \textit{Conscience, with the Power and Cases thereof} (1639), sig. M3v, p. 84 (2nd pag.).}
\end{quote}

Fundamental to these arguments is the teaching that saving faith is the only context in which the rewards promised by God could be used as a \textit{motive} to charity. The preaching at Paul's Cross suggests, however, that no rhetorical strategy for reconciling these demands gained currency. Although good works were zealously argued for and their salvific dependence on faith was acknowledged, the two topics were rhetorically dissociated in Paul's Cross sermons. Preachers merely modified the \textit{commonplace} of reward to allow for faith as the only means of justification. When \textit{exhorting} to faith, the \textit{sola fide} principle was
trumpeted. In order to *exhort* to works, however, faith was simply assumed in the hearers. Preachers addressed their hearers as people already motivated by a selfless love of God and continued to use the *commonplace* of reward with scant reference to the dependence of their *exhortation* on the faith of their hearers. Neither did they mention the teaching that faith itself ought to motivate the believer to good deeds.

In *The wisedome of the rich*, preached at Paul's Cross in 1604, Roger Fenton used his text (Luke 16.9 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness: that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations') to argue that the rich should be generous in their alms so that, being friends to the poor, they will be received into heaven after death. The last part of his text, 'That when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations', Fenton describes as 'a motive to any good worke' but the effectiveness of the reward as a *motive* is diminished when Fenton insists that works are only a sign of the faith which bring us to heaven:

But shall good workes purchase heaven? Not by the vertue of the workes; they be but the fruits of charitie; nor by the vertue of charitie, thats but the fruit of faith; nor by the vertue of faith, thats but an instrument to apprehend Christ, who alone by his merits hath made this purchase, and prepared those mansions for us. ... Thus worme-eaten Mammon may procure us an incorruptible crowne, by being an instrument of those *Good Workes*, which are fruits of that tree of Charitie, which springeth from that root of *Faith*, which groweth in our hearts from that seed of the *Word*, which revealeth unto us that *Saviour* of the World, who is the onely author of all these blessings and graces.

The series of subordinate clauses, by which Fenton puts good works in their correct doctrinal context, destroys the simple equation between the use of wealth and the promise of salvation initially suggested in the text. Yet the motivation to charity that systematic divines found in the sincere love of Christ is not used to replace the hope of reward. Instead, Fenton merely presents the 'friends' of the rich standing as witnesses to their goodness on the last day, despite the fact that these witnesses can only 'approve that sentence which shall crowne you with glory'.

In *The Righteous Mammon*, a sermon that draws heavily on the *commonplaces* of Luke 16.9, Joseph Hall is even more forthright in setting his exhortations

---

48 Roger Fenton, *The wisedome of the rich*, sigs. V1r, V2v, pp. 143, 145. The text taken by Fenton was an especially important one in explaining the proper relationship between faith and works. Translating Luther's sermon on the same text, William Tyndale's *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon* (1528) used this text to show that 'fayth the mother of all good workes justyfith us / before we can brynge forth anye worke' and does so 'to make us frutefull' in good works. (Anr. ed. [1537]), sig. A1v. On Luther's influence on the soteriology of the early English reformers, see Carl R. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy* (1994).
to charity within the context of faith. Yet even he does not reorder the *commonplace* of reward to make full use of this context. Arguing that the 'stony hearts' of the worldly make them unable to heed the preacher's message, Hall directs his speech to the converted, of whom he assures himself there were a number in the congregation:

The Maker of all hearts tells us, that the unregenerate man hath *cor lapideum, a heart of stone*: and to what purpose do we, with our venerable countryman, preach to a heap of stones? ... It is for those only whose hearts are not in their bags, to receive the charge from God for their wealth, and to return glory to him by it. To these, whereof I hope here are many before me, must Timothy's charge and my speech be directed. Let these hear their condition first, and then their duty (p. 127).

For much of the remainder of the sermon, Hall argues for the superiority of the heavenly goods awaiting those converted to Christ compared to the transience and untrustworthiness of worldly goods, themes familiar from the *commonplace* of reward.

*Exhortations* to charity were, therefore, warped by the confessional need to stress the non-meritorious nature of works. Rather than making positive use of this stress, however, preachers at Paul's Cross generally did no more than modify the *commonplace* of reward. The demands of faith and works remained separate and the *exhortations* to charity were tinged with 'spiritual commercialism'. In *Pharisaisme and Christianity*, however, Hall had abandoned the *commonplace* of reward and succeeded in reorienting *exhortations* to good works in a way which more faithfully represents the implications of the priority of faith in the scheme of salvation. This sermon's argument for faith and works, both necessary for a truly Christian righteousness, allows Hall exhort his hearers to a more testing demonstration of their faith than was possible in sermons constrained by the unsuitable *commonplace* of reward.

**IV**

In 1608, when Joseph Hall made his first appearance at Paul's Cross, he was best known as a writer of devotional literature rather than for the polemics and apologiae to which he devoted much of his later career. By then, he had already published his *Meditations and Vowes* (1605) and his *Arte of divine meditation* (1606). He continued to write in popular,
devotional genres in the years after his appearance at Paul's Cross, with his Epistles and the Contemplations upon the principall passages of the holie storie (first published in 1612) being among his most successful works. In 1608, Hall became chaplain to Prince Henry and from then on, his career as a divine took on the political aspect it was to retain until his death in 1656. In 1609, he published his first anti-Catholic polemic under the title The Peace of Rome. In 1610, he published A common apologie of the church of England against the Brownists. After the Synod of Dort in 1618, at which Hall was a delegate, he found the Church of England 'sicken of the same disease which we had endeavoured to cure in our neighbours'. From then on, Hall spent much time and ink attempting to hold together the 'Jacobean consensus' in which diversity of opinion was permitted within the limits of the Thirty Nine Articles and the 1604 canons. A man of strict Puritan upbringing and education (at the newly founded Emmanuel College, Cambridge), of unimpeachably Calvinist opinions and of known sympathies with the 'godly', Hall accepted the bishoprics of Exeter in 1627 and of Norwich in 1641. These appointments made him an ideal mediator between the Laudians and Puritans as the two sides drifted further apart. The middle ground on which Hall stood was shrinking by the late 1630s, however, and his own Episcopacy by Divine Right (1640) marked a turning point in this. Bowing to pressure from Laud, Hall allowed the book be altered in ways that made it less conciliatory to opposition at home and to the presbyterianism of the Reformed churches abroad than he intended. In December

---

49 Hall’s Meditations and vowes, divine and morall were first published in 1605 and 1606, when a third century was added. They proved enormously successively and ran into twelve editions by 1621. The arte of divine meditation first appeared in 1606 and had three subsequent editions before 1609. The first volume of Epistles appeared in 1608, the second in the same year and the third in 1610. The Contemplations first appeared in 1612. By 1626, eight volumes had been produced, some going into more than one edition. Hall recorded the details of his career in Observations of some specialties of divine providence in the Life of Jos. Hali, Bishop of Norwich (from his birth to the Convocation of 1641) and Hard Measure (from the Convocation of 1641 and his imprisonment to 1647, almost immediately before his ejection from the episcopal palace in Norwich and retirement to Higham in Norwich). Hard Measure first appeared in 1657 and both pieces first appeared together in the posthumous collection of Hall's unpublished work entitled The shaking of the olive-tree (1659). In the Observations, Hall relates how a friend told him 'how well my Meditations were accepted at the Princes court, and earnestly advised me to step over to Richmond and preach to his Highness'. After his second sermon before the Prince, Hall was made a chaplain: Works, vol. I, pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

51 The peace of Rome (1609), in Works, vol. VIII; A common apologie of the church of England ([1610]), in Works, vol. IX.

52 Joseph Hall, Observations, in The shaking of the olive-tree, sig. E3r, p. 37.

53 On Joseph Hall's political activities in the years before the civil war, see Fincham and Lake, 'Popularity, Prelacy and Puritanism in the 1630s: Joseph Hall Explains Himself', English Historical Review CXI (1996), 856-877; Richard McCabe, Joseph Hall, pp. 17-19.
1641, he suffered imprisonment with the other bishops. Although released in mid-1642, Hall returned to his new diocese of Norwich only to be sequestered of his temporalities in 1643 and ejected from the episcopal palace in 1647. He died in 1656.

The mediating role Hall attempted to play in the ecclesiastical politics of the 1630s was well known, but Hall was perhaps best known by his contemporaries as a 'practical divine', a preacher and writer of handbooks of devotion. Thomas Fuller ranked Hall's writings in this way in his description of Hall as a 'worthy' of Leicestershire:

He may be said to have dyed with his pen in his hand whose Writing and Living expired together. He was commonly called our English Seneca, for the pureness, plainsesse, and fulnesse of his style. Not unhappy at Controversies, more happy at Comments, very good in his Characters, better in his Sermons, best of all in his Meditations.54

Hall's voluminous writings on 'practical divinity' reflect the concern often expressed in his sermons for the application of his teaching to his hearers. Rarely dwelling long on exegetical matters and generally shying away from more meditative or doxological styles, Hall's sermons demonstrate the same concern for the practical exercise of religion that made his Meditations and Epistles so highly prized.55 In his Meditations, he outlined the style of preaching he practised, where the emphasis on the hearer's profit is evident:

The praise of a good speech standeth in words and matter: matter, which is as a fair and well featured body; elegance of words, which is as a neat and well-fashioned garment. Good matter, slubbered up in rude and careless words, is made loathsome to the hearer; as a good body misshapen with unhandsome clothes. Elegancy without soundnesse is no better than a nice vanity. Although therefore the most hearers are like bees, that goe all to the flowers; never regarding the good herbs, that are of as wholesome use as the other of fair show; yet let my speech strive to be profitable; plausible, as it happens: Better the coat be misshapen, than the body.56

Given this concern for the application of religious precepts to social transactions, it is not surprising that Hall is one the very few English writers to have produced a book of casuistry, the quintesessential exercise in practical divinity.57

54Thomas Fuller, The history of the worthies of England (1662), sig. S1v, p. 130. On Hall as a 'Senecan', either in Christian stoicism or prose style, see McCabe, Joseph Hall, pp. 184-206.
55On Hall's preaching style and its affinity to the other genres of practical divinity in which he worked, see T.F. Kinloch, The Life and Works of Joseph Hall (1951), pp. 22-60; Richard McCabe, Joseph Hall, pp. 264-305.
In his works of practical divinity, Hall exhorted his readers to practice moderation in the use of worldly goods as he, and other Paul's Cross preachers, did in their sermons. In *Christian Moderation* (1640), Hall places the virtue of temperance in the context of Christian teaching on the subordination of all things to the love of God.

Moderation is the key to other virtues because 'as nothing comes amiss to that man who holds nothing enough; since the love of money is the root of all evil, 1 Tim, vi.10; so he that can stint his desires is cannon-proof against temptations' (p. 415). To be content with enough for life and social station is the key to Christian moderation in earthly things:

> It is true, there can be no certain proportion of our either having or desiring, since the conditions of men are in a vast difference; for that coat which is too big for a dwarf will not so much as come upon a giant's sleeve; and it is but just and lawful for every man to affect so much as may be sufficient, not only for the necessity of his person, but for the decency of his estate, the neglect whereof may be sordid and deservedly taxable. But, all things considered, he that can cut evenest between want and excess is in the safest, easiest, happiest estate; a truth which if it were duly entertained would quit men's hearts of a world of vexation which now they do willingly draw upon themselves; for he that resolves to be rich and great, as he must needs fall into many snares of sin, so into manifold distractions of cares (pp. 418-9).

Three of the four sermons Hall delivered to the citizens of London dealt to a large extent with practical divinity. In *The Righteous Mammon*, his Spittal sermon of 1618, Hall described the ways in which worldly goods, the 'mammon of unrighteousness' should be treated in order to benefit the soul. In his accession day sermon of 1613, *An Holy Panegyrick*, Hall uses his text (1 Samuel 12. 24,25 'Therefore fear you the Lord, and serve him in truth with all your hearts, and consider how great things he hath done for you. But if ye do wickedly, ye shall perish, both ye and your king') to insist on the need for good works and fair dealing on the grounds that the sins of the people will bring temporal punishments from God. The theme of these sermons and the imagery he employed in them is in keeping with the keen sense of *decorum* Hall manifested in his preaching generally.

---


58 *Christian Moderation* (1640) in *Works*, vol. VI.

In *Pharisaisme and Christianitie* (1608), Hall tackles the paradox between the necessity of good works and the dependence of salvation on faith that created so many rhetorical problems for preachers at Paul's Cross. As his text states, unless the righteousness of Christians exceeds the righteousness of those who merely observe the outward forms of religion, it is of no benefit to them before God. Such righteousness can only be gained by the imputation of the merits of Christ. Hall's sermon integrates the doctrinal demand that good works arise from faith with the hortatory necessity to provide means and motives for the hearers to practise charity and fair dealing. The sermon exhorts the hearers to both a lively Christian faith and to good works by comparing the legalistic righteousness of the Pharisees and the unrighteousness of their motives with the failures of his Christian hearers in both actions and motivation.

Hall uses a comparison to integrate the dehortative and exhortative functions of preaching on faith and works. As the full title of the work announces, the states of Pharisaism and Christianity are 'compared and set forth' (my emphasis). Hall polarises these two conditions of faithlessness and faithfulness, by eliminating the middle ground that was usually occupied by the good pagan and the 'civil honest man'. Hall polarises these states, Hall aggravates the fault of those who fail to show faith by works. The hearers must think of themselves either as Christians, in which case they have both faith and works, or as Pharisees, in which case they have neither faith nor good works. Hall develops the comparison gradually in order to emphasise the degree to which his hearers fall short of the righteousness necessary to enter the kingdom of heaven. This comparison is the main structuring principle of the sermon, because the comparison between Pharisee and Christian shows the righteousness of faith at which the Christian should aim. The more specific

---

60 The good works of pagans and others not motivated by faith were described by the Reformers as good in effect, i.e. helpful to the Church or commonwealth, but not good in the doer because they did not spring from the love of God. They described the good deeds of the pagans as 'splendid sins', for, although they appeared good to men, they still were no more than sins before God: Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (1991), pp. 113-4; William Perkins, *The whole treatise of cases of conscience*, sigs. A1v-A2r, pp. 2-3. The 'civil honest man', constantly rebuked by preachers is one who believes that 'it is sufficient to the pleasing of God, if they live civilly, that is, do justice to every man, and live peaceably, hurting none': William Perkins, *How to live, and that well*, in *Works*, vol. I, sig. 3S4v, p. 482.

comparison between the ancient Pharisees and Hall's hearers applies this theme to the sermon's auditors. The text is divided, therefore, into three questions by which 'Pharisaisme' can be defined and compared: 'Who were the men, what was their righteousness, what wanted it'.

Hall's begins by setting out the relationship between God's law and the Gospel. This theme was of fundamental importance for understanding the nature of faith and works. Protestant commentators insisted that Moses' law did not prescribe a 'works-righteousness'; this was the corrupt gloss of the Pharisees. Instead, the law demanded the assent of the believer's heart. Perhaps the clearest expression of the relationship between the two is given in Melanchthon's _Loci Communes_ of 1521. Taking the text of Matthew 5.20, Melanchthon writes:

> Christ in like manner explains the law, for grace cannot be proclaimed without the law. And he rebukes the interpretation of the Pharisees and Scribes from the beginning when he says that we shall not enter the kingdom of heaven unless our righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees and Scribes. The Pharisees interpreted the law thus: you satisfy the law 'thou shalt not kill,' if you do not kill with the hand .... Christ, however, teaches that the law demands the affections of the heart and not only an external simulation of works. For the law forbade concupiscence. The law even forbade vindication and in the same manner demanded that one love his enemies [Leviticus 19:17].

Rather, Melanchthon continues, both before and after the Gospel, the law serves the same function and that 'proper function of the law is the revelation of sin, or to speak more clearly, the consciousness of sin'. So Hall begins his exposition of the relation of faith and works by declaring that Christ exposes the falsity of the Pharisees' interpretation of the law. In order to demonstrate what their false gloss on the law was, Hall announces that he must first describes the Pharisees and then, by contrast, describe the true interpretation of the law and Gospel with which Christ corrected them.

The Pharisee was a biblical figure whose characteristics were well known by the time of Hall's sermon, as its main source was the Gospels. In the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18.10-14), the Pharisee sought to be righteous before God through the fulfilment of the law. In Hall's phrase, he would 'earn him ... and supererogate him' (p. 62).

---

62 *The Loci Communes of Philip Melanchthon*, trans. Charles Leander Hill, (1944), pp. 151, 162. This doctrine was expounded at Paul's Cross by George Creswell in _The harmonie of the lawe and the gospell_ (1607).
5). The *Homily of Good Works* (1563) uses the same parable to demonstrate the 'wickedness of 'works-righteousness':

The Pharisee gloried and trusted so much to his works, that he thought himself sure enough without mercy, and that he should come to heaven by his fasting and other deeds. To this end serveth the parable; for it is spoken to them *that trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others* [Luke 18.9]. Now, because the Pharisee directed his works to an evil end, seeking by them justification, which indeed is the proper work of God without our merit, his fasting twice in the week and all his other works, though they were never so many and seemed to the world never so good and holy, yet in very deed before God they are altogether evil and abominable.63

The Pharisee was also a figure for hypocrisy. In Matthew 23.13-32, Jesus denounces the scribes and Pharisees as hypocrites and blind guides because they demand that others obeyed the strict letter of the law while they broke it in spirit. Protestant polemicists turned this text against their Catholic opponents. In *The cryer*, preached at Paul's Cross in 1609, Nathanael Cannon used this text to denounce the hypocrisy of Catholic priests. Twice in John Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England* Catholics are associated with the Pharisees: first, for the hypocrisy of their clergy in vowing celibacy while keeping concubines, and secondly, for their hypocrisy in claiming sole power to reform the Church. The Papacy is as likely to reform the Church, Jewel writes, as 'the Pharisees and scribes [will] repair again the temple of God and restore it unto us a house of prayer instead of a thievish den'.64 There were, then, two common interpretations of the 'righteousness' of the Pharisees: a righteousness that arrogantly relies on its own efforts to merit Heaven and a false righteousness, or hypocrisy, which clothes wickedness and injustices in the cloak of religious strictness. To both of these Hall directs his attention.

Hall introduces the subject of Pharisaism with a long description of the customs and beliefs of the biblical Pharisees, as if they were unfamiliar characters whose 'nature' must now be 'fetched from story'. Clearly, Hall need not have ventured so far for such an exposition. When writing of the same text in his *Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount*, William Perkins used only scriptural references and unnamed Patristic sources to identify the Pharisees.65 Hall uses scriptural sources, early Church historians, notably

---

63 The Two Book of Homilies, p. 285.
Josephus, Eusebius and Epiphanius, and sixteenth-century scholars, including Benedictus Arius Montanus, a Catholic antiquarian and biblical commentator, John Drusius and Joseph Scaliger (son of J.C. Scaliger). In these sources, Hall found the many details of the Pharisees' practices by which he was able to define them as a separate group within Judaism. He could then reconstruct, or re-present them, as a Jewish sect who took a particularly strict interpretation of the law, rather than the figure of the hypocrite familiar from the Gospel.

By 'fetching out of story' the origin and nature of the Pharisees, Hall delays referring to the sins, pride and hypocrisy, for which they were best known. The initial point of comparison between the Pharisee and the Christians to whom Hall addresses his comparison is, therefore, that the Pharisees succeeded in practising a 'civil righteousness' at which his hearers had failed. The 'Jewish niceties' in the Pharisees' practices demonstrate how 'devout, how liberal, how continent, how true-dealing, how zealous, how scrupulous, how austere' they were. Jesus' pronouncement that only those who exceeded these men in righteousness would enter Heaven must, Hall declares, have struck the 'amazed multitude' as a 'paradox'. It is this amazement at the difficulty - the impossibility - of gaining heaven by human righteousness that Hall also tries to provoke in his hearers:

Yea, perhaps yourselves, all that hear me this day, receive this not without astonishment and fear; while your consciences, secretly comparing your holiness with theirs, find it to come as much short of theirs, as theirs of perfection. And would to God you could fear more, and be more amazed with this comparison! for, to set you forward, must we exceed them, or else not be saved? If we let them exceed us, what hope, what possibility is there of our salvation? (p. 9).

Before showing how the hearers could 'go before' the Pharisees in righteousness, Hall presses home the advantage gained on the hearers' consciences and, comparing devotion, discipline and liberalty, he first shows 'how far we are behind them'. The hearers have failed in the outward performance of religion through a complacent reliance on the benefits of the Gospel.

66 The following, most of which are given short references in the margins of the sermon, are Hall's main sources for the reconstruction of 'Pharisaism': Flavius Josephus, Of the antiquities of the Jewes, XVII.iii and XVIII.i; Josephus, Of the warres of the Jewes, II.vii, both in Workes (1602; Anr. ed., 1609), sigs. 2R4r, 2T4r, 3M3r, pp. 439, 433, 617; Epiphanius, Contra Octaginta haereses opus (1578), sigs. b6r-v, pp. 11-12; Benedictus Arius Montanus, Elucidationes in quatuor Evangelia (1575), sigs. H3v-H4r, pp. 62-63; Johannes Drusius, Tribus sectis Judaeorum (1605), sigs. A2v-A3v, C4v-H3v, pp. 41-118; Josephus Scaliger, Elenchus Trihaeresii Nicolai Serarii (1605), sigs. A6r-A8r, pp. 11-15; Catalogus omnium Praeceptorum Mosaica, ed. Stephanus Munsterus ([1533]).
Josephus, Eusebius and Epiphanius, and sixteenth-century scholars, including Benedictus Arius Montanus, a Catholic antiquarian and biblical commentator, John Drusius and Joseph Scaliger (son of J.C. Scaliger). In these sources, Hall found the many details of the Pharisees' practices by which he was able to define them as a separate group within Judaism. He could then reconstruct, or re-present them, as a Jewish sect who took a particularly strict interpretation of the law, rather than the figure of the hypocrite familiar from the Gospel.

By 'fetching out of story' the origin and nature of the Pharisees, Hall delays referring to the sins, pride and hypocrisy, for which they were best known. The initial point of comparison between the Pharisee and the Christians to whom Hall addresses his comparison is, therefore, that the Pharisees succeeded in practising a 'civil righteousness' at which his hearers had failed. The 'Jewish niceties' in the Pharisees' practices demonstrate how 'devout, how liberal, how continent, how true-dealing, how zealous, how scrupulous, how austere' they were. Jesus' pronouncement that only those who exceeded these men in righteousness would enter Heaven must, Hall declares, have struck the 'amazed multitude' as a 'paradox'. It is this amazement at the difficulty - the impossibility - of gaining heaven by human righteousness that Hall also tries to provoke in his hearers:

Yea, perhaps yourselves, all that hear me this day, receive this not without astonishment and fear; while your consciences, secretly comparing your holiness with theirs, find it to come as much short of theirs, as theirs of perfection. And would to God you could fear more, and be more amazed with this comparison! for, to set you forward, must we exceed them, or else not be saved? If we let them exceed us, what hope, what possibility is there of our salvation? (p. 9).

Before showing how the hearers could 'go before' the Pharisees in righteousness, Hall presses home the advantage gained on the hearers' consciences and, comparing devotion, discipline and liberality, he first shows 'how far we are behind them'. The hearers have failed in the outward performance of religion through a complacent reliance on the benefits of the Gospel.

The following, most of which are given short references in the margins of the sermon, are Hall's main sources for the reconstruction of 'Pharisaism': Flavius Josephus, *Of the antiquities of the Jews*, XVII.iii and XVIII.ii; Josephus, *Of the wars of the Jews*, II.vii, both in *Workes* (1602; Anr. ed., 1609), sigs. 2R4r, 2T4r, 3M2r, pp. 439, 433, 617; Epiphanius, *Contra Octaginta haereses opus* (1578), sigs. b6r-v, pp. 11-12; Benedictus Arius Montanus, *Elucidaciones in quatuor Evangelia* (1575), sigs. H3v-H4r, pp. 62-63; Johannes Drusius, *Tribus sectis Judaeorum* (1605), sigs. A2v-A3v, C4v-H3v, pp. 41-118; Josephus Scaliger, *Elenchus Trihaeresii Nicolai Serarii* (1605), sigs. A6r-A8r, pp. 11-15; *Catalogus omnium Praeceptorum Mosaica*, ed. Stephanus Munsterus ([1533]).
Hall's advantageous comparison between the Pharisees and his Christian hearers is, paradoxically, partly taken from that chapter of the Gospel where Christ denounces the hypocrisy of these 'blind guides'. The Pharisees 'keep Moses's chair warm' (p. 9) whereas many of Hall's hearers are idle teachers. The Pharisees were active proselytisers, whereas Hall's hearers 'sit still and freeze in our zeal'. Pharisees read and knew the law, where Hall's hearers leave Bibles unsold in the booksellers' shops, forgetful of how much their ancestors before the Reformation sought out and cherished 'but one of Paul's Epistles (p. 10)'. Their 'holy and wise strictness' in avoiding the presence or company of gentiles is likewise a rebuke to Hall's Protestant hearers, who allow 'Romish Samaritans' to 'haunt our tables, our closet, our ears'. Lastly, Hall notes, the Pharisees paid tithes of everything they had ('not a potherb, but they tithed it'), in sharp distinction from the 'sacriligious patrons' and 'pirates' of the English Church. As Christ pronounced woe on the Pharisees, so Hall pronounces woe on England's church-robbers:

Woe to you, spiritual robbers! our blind forefathers clothed the Church, you despoil it: their ignorant devotion shall rise in judgment against your ravening covetousness. If robbery, simony, perjury will not carry you to hell, hope still that you may be saved (p. 12).

Finally, Hall draws his conclusion from these comparisons between the Pharisees' and England's Christian: if human righteousness cannot earn heaven, how much less will human sinfulness:

Alas! my brethren, what shall become of our gluttony, drunkenness, pride, oppression, bribing, covenage, adulteries, blasphemies, and ourselves for them? God and man reprove us for these; what shall become of us? If the civilly righteous shall not be saved, where shall the notorious sinner appear? (p. 13).

Hall then proceeds to give the reasons for the Pharisees' unrighteousness and their consequent failure to achieve heaven. These he divides in two: their traditions and their practice (later subdivided into hypocrisy and worldliness). Hall here makes explicit the comparison prepared for in references to 'popish Jews' (p. 5) and 'capuchin like' Pharisees (p. 6) earlier in the sermon. Making maximum use of a rash statement by the Jesuit, Nicholas Serarius, Hall asserts that the Pharisees are indistinguishable from modern Roman

67 Hall gives a marginal reference to Nicholas Serarius' Trihaeresium. His use of this citation is somewhat disingenuous. Serarius refutes Beza's accusation that Catholics are like Pharisees (because of their 'works-righteousness' and traditions) by saying that Catholics can be compared to the Pharisees for
Catholics, especially in their teaching on free will, merit and 'full performance of the law'. The traditional teachings (in that they had no scriptural basis) of the Pharisees, as of Roman Catholics, were unrighteous for two reasons. Firstly, by 'planting stocks' that 'God never set', both groups allowed their own teachings to supplant the teachings of Scripture, upsetting the proper order of Scripture and Tradition in the Church (p. 14). Hall describes several of the more ludicrous ceremonies and traditions of each party to this purpose (pp. 15-16). More seriously, however, their traditions masked their direct contradiction of the spirit of law. That free-will, merits and 'full performance of the law' are twice listed as Catholic and Pharisaic additions to God's law (pp. 14 and 17) suggests that 'works-righteousness' was the main point against which Hall aims his comparison between Catholics and Pharisees.

Hall describes the 'main unrighteousness' of the Pharisees as their 'grafting' of 'all holiness and God's service' onto the new practices they have 'planted' in religion. Having created new and superfluous ceremonies in the service of God, they insisted that righteousness could be achieved, and could only be achieved, by the full performance of these rites. Hall builds up the consequences of such an emphasis so that hypocrisy and worldliness become their inevitable outcome. Both Papists and Pharisees attempt to attain heaven by the fulfilment of the rituals of devotion without the inward disposition of holiness. Yet this formality is also a fault of the hearers. With an unmarked transition from the faults of the Papists to the English 'civil honest man', Hall accuses both of having no more than the formal, and useless, righteousness of the Pharisees:

> It is not the outside of thy obedience that God cares for, if never so holy, never so glorious: ... How many are there, which, if they can keep their Church, give an alms, bow the knee, say their prayer, pay their tithes, and once a year receive the Sacrament (it matters not how corrupt hearts, how filthy tongues, how false hands they bear), can say in their hearts, with Esau, *I have enough, my brother!* as if God cared for this thy vain formality (p. 18).

If this were enough, Hall insists, the rigorous lives of the Pharisees would have gained them heaven. Profession alone is an empty sign of faith unless it is accompanied by good works and only by the proof of a sincere profession and active goodness can faith be recognised. Quoting James, Hall challenges his hearers to re-examine their profession, their 'affection to their strictness (referred to in Acts 26:5) and for their sound doctrine and institutions, but that it is the Protestants who are guilty of the Pharisees' hypocrisy: Nicholas Serarius, *Trihaeresium* (1604), sig. H4v, p. 120.
God', and their works to see how far they surpass the merely formal profession of the Pharisees. They must 'ransack' their hearts 'and find sound affection to God ... ransack thy life; and find the truth of works, the life of obedience' (pp. 18-19).

The second form of pharisaic hypocrisy is the ostentatious display of devotion before men. Here both faith and good works are missing and the forms of religious devotion are used to cloak wickedness and oppression. On this point, Hall compares the Pharisees to the citizens in his audience without first making the comparison with the 'modern Pharisees of Rome'. The city's record for charity, partly reiterated during the Paul's Cross sermons in the roll-call of benefactors, is now turned to the citizens' disadvantage as Hall suggests that their more ostentatious displays of charity have been no more than a case of covertly robbing Peter to pay Paul ostentatiously:

This famous city hath in the darkest, in the wantonest times, afforded (and so doth) many that have done God honour, honesty to the Gospel. But how many are there of you that under smooth faces have foul consciences? Fair words, false measures, forsworn valuation, adulterate wares, griping usuries, have filled many of your coffers, and festered your souls: you know this; and yet like Solomon's courteean, you wipe your mouths, and it was not you. Your alms are written in church windows, your defraudings in the sand. All is good, save that which appears not (p. 19).

Lastly, Hall taxes the Pharisees with covetousness and ambition, 'a pair of heinous vices' that follow from each other, because 'it is ambition that blows the fire of covetousness'. In this section, Hall also shows how the efficacy of religiously-motivated good works for the commonwealth is dependent on faith. Without faith, there is no sincere love of God or neighbour and hence there will be worldliness, which inevitably leads to covetousness and oppression. Hall begins by equating the Jewish Pharisees and their modern Jesuit counterparts, comparing how the Pharisees 'swallowed up whole houses of widows' and the Jesuits who swindle young men of their patrimony. Indeed, the Pope, the master of all the modern Pharisees, is ambitious for the whole world (pp. 20-21). Covetousness and ambition are not only found at Jerusalem and Rome, however, and Hall turns his

---

68 In An Holy Panegyrick, Hall's 1613 Accession Day sermon at Paul's Cross, Hall repeats his castigation of those who 'hide great oppressions with the show of small beneficences', Works, vol. V, p. 101. When defining a good work, William Ames is quick to note that obviously charitable works 'almes, the building and endowing of Temples, Colledges, Hospitalls' are not the only good works and are themselves only good insofar as the donors' intentions were good. This definition, he writes, 'serves also to abate the insolency of certaine rich Men, who thinke that they onely do good works; and none but they'; William Ames, Conscience, with the power and cases thereof, sig. A2r, p. 81 (2nd. pag.).
comparison between Pharisees and Jesuits to his hearers. They too are 'true sons of our
great-grandmother' Eve and have inherited her 'sweet tooth' for earthly things. Unjust
gentlemen, citizens and lawyers are accused of Pharisaical covetousness. They have
devoured the livings of orphans, enclosed commons, appropriated the Church's goods and
grown rich by usury, bribery and simony. Even ministers are taxed with covetous desires.
They neglect the spiritual duties for which they are provided with temporal means because
of their covetous desire for yet richer means. Hall's list of covetous sins could be replicated
in many Paul's Cross sermons on the same subjects. From the root of ambition, Hall traces
the particular forms of covetousness in the social ranks he addresses. Once again,
Augustine's definition of sufficiency in earthly things reappears in the context of
dehortations against worldliness. Again, covetousness is cited as the root of all the forms of
oppression and fraud that trouble the commonwealth:

But what is more than enough? what is but enough? what is not too little for the
insatiable gulf of human desires? Every man would engross the whole world to
himself; and, with that ambitious conqueror, fear it will be too little. And how few
Agurs are there, that pray against too much! From hence it is that ye courtiers grate
upon poor trades with hard monopolies. Hence ye merchants load them with deep
and unreasonable prices, and make them pay dear for days. Hence ye great men
wring the poor sponge of the commonality into your private purses, for the
maintenance of pride and excess. hence ye cormorant cornhoarders hatch up a
dearth in the time of plenty (p. 22).

In the closing section of the sermon, Hall frames an exhortation against
covetousness and ambition in the terms of Christian faith. Ambition for heavenly gifts
reorders ambitions for earthly things, so that the solution to the injustices prevalent in the
Christian community is a Christian concern with salvation. The righteousness of the
Pharisees failed both in its regulation of a just society and in the salvation of individual
souls. The Christian righteousness of faith, by seeking the second, eliminates the abuses
which hindered the first of these aims. Hall ends his sermon with an exhortation to a lively
faith, with the implication that both spiritual and civil righteousness can only arise from this
source:

I love not to end with a judgment, and, as it were, to let my sun set on a cloud. We
are all Christians, we should know the world, what it is; how vain, how transitory, how
worthless. We know where there are better things, which we profess ourselves made
for, and aspiring to. Let us use the world like itself, and leave this importunate
wooing of it to heathens and infidels, that know no other heaven, no other God. Or,
if you like that counsel better; Be covetous; be ambitious; Covet spiritual gifts 1 Cor.
xiv.1. Never think you have grace enough; desire more; seek for more: this alone is worthy of your affection, worthy your cares (p. 23).

In *Pharisaisme and Christianity*, therefore, Hall argues that works of value to the commonwealth can only spring from faith, because faith will lead to the right use of wealth. Individual good works not prompted by the love of God are seldom good in themselves and cannot counterbalance the many evil deeds that the unregenerate commit. As it is not a mere profession or an individual good work that proves the presence of faith, so the presence of faith will lead to the sustained practice of good works and the honest dealings necessary to correct social ills. The inconsistency in London's charity argues that the citizens are not truly converted Christians and both topics - the failure to do good consistently and the failure to repent and convert to Christ - are given equal weight in Hall's sermon. This, then, is a practical divinity which neither strays from the duty to preach the gospel nor neglects the duty to apply that message to the hearers.

V

Hall's castigation of the hypocritical benevolence of his London audience confirms many of the findings of modern historians on London philanthropy. Following W.K. Jordan's monumental study of early modern charity, historians have debated the great 'explosion in giving' that Jordan argued occurred in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This, he claimed, was a result of Protestantism and of a growing secularisation, both of which redirected alms from wasteful, indiscriminate 'doles' to the foundation of charitable trusts for more long-term attempts to alleviate poverty. In tones not dissimilar to those used in some Paul's Cross and Spittal sermons, Jordan celebrated the achievement of the wealthy of London in setting up and administering a system of relief to cope with the city's poor. Subsequent studies, however, have criticised the methods used by Jordan and, reassessing his data, have come to less dramatic conclusions. When inflation, rising population and the time-lag between the founding and the fruition of a charitable trust are taken into account,

---

the levels of philanthropy of London no longer seem to have 'exploded'. Although funds from the poor rate and spontaneous 'doles' contributed more than Jordan estimated, the poor relief available in London in the early seventeenth century was inadequate, because resources were sometimes ill-managed and because 'the scale of the challenge, particularly in crisis years like the mid-1590s, ultimately proved too much for the authorities'.

These responses to Jordan correspond with what Hall and other Paul's Cross preachers said in their sermons: the city's charity was good, but less than was needed. It is also clear that Hall and other preachers had grounds for criticising the generous when their generosity was judged by the absolute standards of caritas. Even in the dedicatory letter to his catalogue of benefactions, in which he sought to give solid proof to Papists that Protestantism had promoted and not retarded charity, Andrew Willet includes a castigation on the nature of the citizen's beneficence:

*This Citie is a nursing mother to the whole land, the Chamber, Treasurie and storehouse of the kingdome: like the two golden pipes which conveyed the fatnes of the olive into the golden Candlesticks of the Church. But as the oyle went through golden pipes, so the fatnes of almes-deedes must runne foorth by good and lawfull meanes: Men must not doe wrong, deceive, gather riches by extortion, violence, usurie and such-like, that they may give almes: this were but like Pharisiaical washing of platters, there were within full of briberie and excesse. S. Paul hath given us a good rule for this: We must not doe evill, that good may come thereof [Rom. 3,8].*

These warnings were repeated at Paul's Cross. When listing the particular sins of social estates, preachers drew on the stereotype of the greedy merchant and singled out false weights, faulty goods and breaking the Sabbath as particular faults of the merchant. Yet the preachers' warnings evidence a greater awareness of the merchant's situation than the use of such stereotypes suggests. William Pemberton asks his citizen hearers to 'leave off the 'hurtfull courses' of fraudulent dealing that are 'incident' to the social position of those who

---


71 Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*, sig. SN2v, p.1219. Roger Fenton uses a similar *topos* when he warns his hearers not to make Christ a receiver of stolen goods by dedicating to him, through alms, goods which were gotten through fraud or oppression: *The wisedome of the rich*, sig. T3v, p. 140.
trade by their calling and gain by their trade. William Holbrooke was more direct:
Aldermen, he says, have become synonymous with usurers in the city. This was probably
ture, as usury was practised by many aldermen. For men who often had significant amounts
of money at hand, it was one of the most practical uses of it.72 Richard Stock, preaching on
March 13, 1603, accused the Common Council of the city of aggravating the problem of
poverty in the city by placing a proportionately greater tax burden on the poor. The
aldermen complained about this sermon and Stock was questioned for what he said. Stock's
charge seems to have been justified. Ian Archer writes that in the 1590s 'the relative burden
on the poorer sections of society was increasing' partly because 'a higher proportion of
taxation was being levied in the form of fifteenths, which were much wider in their incidence
than the subsidy'.73 In the same mode, Thomas Myriell echoes Hall when he accuses citizens
of robbing Peter to pay Paul in their support for the ministry. Simultaneously liberal in the
provision of lectureships and recalcitrant in their payment of tithes, the generosity of
London's citizens to the poor, clerical and lay, was double-edged.74 In many sermons at
Paul's Cross, therefore, the citizens are concurrently the target of exhortation and
dehortation, because their actions showed less than consistent liberality.

Hall's sermon integrates these exhortations and dehortations more
effectively than other sermons extant, because he replaced the cumbersome motives from
reward with the comparison of Christianity and Pharisaism. In this way, his sermon best
exemplifies the preachers' view of their social duty in preaching on worldliness and charity.
It was not for them to set out programs for social reform but to appeal to conscience as a
more effective means of promoting just dealing. The faults with which Hall taxes the citizens
in this sermon, 'fair words, false measures, foresworn valuations, adulterate wares, griping
usury' (p. 19) appeared in many Paul's Cross sermons where covetousness and worldliness

---

On changing attitudes to usury between the acts of 1571 and 1624, during which time the legality
of interest and the necessity of a legal limit on interest seems to have become generally accepted, see
Norman Jones, *God and the Moneylenders* (1989). On the centrality of charity and thinking on faith and
works to both conservative and progressive thinking on usury, see pp. 24-46, 145-167.

E2r; HMC, *Salisbury* 12, p. 672. On aldermen as money lenders, see Robert G. Lang, 'London's

73 Thomas Myriell, *The christians comfort* (1623), sigs. H2v-H4r, pp. 52-55. On the controversy over
were condemned.\textsuperscript{75} The same topics appear in Hall's own book of cases of conscience and both preachers and casuists share a common source for their treatment in Aquinas.\textsuperscript{76} More importantly, all these faults were condemned by the city's own courts.\textsuperscript{77} Hall's choice of such commonplaces suggests that it is not individual practices but the covetousness that motivates them that is the primary target of his denunciations. General enough to suggest that this list does include many of the sharp practices common at the time, it is still rather formulaic and was reiterated time and again at Paul's Cross. It is not, then, particular practices in London's markets which interest the preacher, but the sin of worldliness which lies behind all forms of sinful practice in buying and selling. As Hall's sermon integrates the demands of faith and works, it places dehortations against fraudulent dealing in the context of a failure of faith and a consequent succumbing to worldliness. This reveals the secondary importance of the details of covetous behaviour for the rhetorical arguments on worldliness constructed by preachers.

Modern historians of sermons and other tracts on wealth and worldliness have failed to account for the dependence of social teaching on the doctrine of worldliness. Their attempts to prove or discredit Weber's thesis has led them to seek either a religiously motivated social ethic or a flight from social concerns. This analysis of preaching on these topics shows, however, that the two are intrinsically linked because all forms of consistently moral behaviour stem from true godliness. Only those not 'of the world' can do good 'in the world'. The persistence of the motive of reward as a commonplace in preaching on this subject, however, may explain the disjunction between social and spiritual themes observed

\textsuperscript{75}William Holbrooke, Loves complaint, sigs. E2r-E3r; Charles Richardson, A Sermon against oppression and fraudulent dealing, sigs. D1r-D4r, pp. 17-23; William Whately, A caveat for the covetous, sigs. D5r-D7r, pp. 55-59.
\textsuperscript{76}In Book one of his Resolutions and decisions of Divers Practical Cases of Conscience, Hall discusses the lawfulness of raising money by lending at interest, how far one is obliged to reveal the faults in articles offered for sale, how far an oath binds one in buying or how far one is obliged to discover the truth when purchasing goods that one suspects are stolen. In the case of lending at interest, Hall offers no definite answer, because of the many circumstances involved, and instead, very notably, leaves the reader to take as his guide the golden rule of charity. He writes: 'in all human and civil acts of commerce it is a sure rule, that whatsoever is not a violation of charity cannot be unlawful; and whatsoever is not agreeable to charity can be no other than sinful: Works, vol. VII, pp. 268-294, p. 274. Hall offers the same advice in Heaven upon Earth. He argues that if one's conscience is troubled because one lends money at interest, it is best to avoid the practice, regardless of what the law or others advise: Works, vol. VI, pp. 37-8. Aquinas discusses cases of buying and selling in Summa Theologica, 2a 2a, Quest. LXXVII and usury in Quest. LXXVIII.
\textsuperscript{77}London's market regulations are discussed in Hugh Alley's Caveat, eds Archer, Barron and Harding (1988), pp. 5-7.
by modern historians. The *sola fide* doctrine of the Church effectively disabled the rhetorical strategy most commonly used by preachers on this subject. Preachers failed to discover a suitable alternative, so that the themes of faith and works were rhetorical disjoined in their sermons. Only by abandoning the *commonplace* motive of reward could Joseph Hall reconcile the rhetoric of faith and works. Therefore, this chapter suggests that, contrary to R.H. Tawney's argument, preachers in this period did not abandon their duty to advance just social and business ethics. The role of the preacher was not to enforce, but to inform, conscience; to exhort to a conversion to Christ and from worldliness, which would lead to a true difference in the commonwealth. This, for Hall and all those who based their preaching on social matters on Augustinian principles, is not a flight from social problems but the true foundation of social reform.
Critics of seventeenth-century preaching have commonly divided preaching styles along the lines of the political and doctrinal divisions in the Church, associating the plain-style with Puritans and what is now called the 'metaphysical' style with anti-Puritans and Laudians.\(^1\) Although there is some truth in the assertion that a more devotional style of preaching was favoured by those within the Laudian faction and that many Puritans espoused an unadorned style of preaching,\(^2\) such a rigid division simplifies the complex problems that faced the preacher in preparing his sermon. The preacher's most important task was to ensure that his sermon was effective in teaching doctrine and persuading the hearers to practise it. To do so, preachers made more particular uses of the explicatory and rhetorical methods available to them than many modern critics allow. 'Plainness', rather than a 'plain style', was a virtue which most preachers avowed, because it made the preacher a more efficient teacher. Nonetheless, numerous occasions could arise when a ruthlessly unadorned style could impede the preacher's aim of persuading. A learned auditory, for example, might be bored and unmoved by an oration perfectly suited to an unlearned audience. In his *Five sermons in five several styles*, a work often referred to by critics who delineate the Puritan and anti-Puritan styles, Abraham Wright presents five examples of preaching styles: that of Lancelot Andrewes, Joseph Hall, Thomas Cartwright, the Presbyterians and the

---

\(^1\)W. Fraser Mitchell divided sermons according to these criteria in *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson* (1932) and has been followed in this by most writers on the subject. Perry Miller, although acknowledging that there were metaphysical-style Calvinists and plain-style 'Anglicans', writes that sermon styles were 'not a matter of taste and preference; but a party badge': *The New England Mind* (1954), p. 333. Horton Davies describes eleven characteristics of the metaphysical style, which he suggests reflects a common view on rhetoric and approach to Scripture. He includes Calvinists like Joseph Hall as a separate group among those who used the metaphysical style: *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers* (1986).

\(^2\)Contemporaries did note the difference in styles, as seen from the elegy by 'R. B' to John Donne, in which he scoffs at the Puritans who 'humm'd' at Donne's sermons and complaining that he was a 'strong lin'd man' but 'a bad edifier': *Poems, by J. D[onne], With elegies on the authors death* (1633), sig. 3Flr, p. 401. That contemporaries may have categorised sermon styles according to different criteria than those now understood can been seen from the list of commentaries, tracts and sermons appended to William Chappell's *The preacher* (1656), sig. K9r. In this, the sermons of Lancelot Andrewes, Daniel Featley, Joseph Hall, Arthur Lake, William Perkins and even William Whately, among others, are all described as 'elaborate'.
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Independents. This does indeed show that contemporaries recognised some overlap between styles and religious politics. In his introduction, however, Wright insists that a preacher must be able to preach 'to the capacitie and content of any Auditorie', learned or unlearned, and consequently, must be master of all styles. He must, in short, keep decorum:

And therefore upon this account there will appear to be a very great conveniencie, if not necessitie of Humane Learning; especially forasmuch as it is too clear and evident since these Times, that all men will not be brought by the same way of preaching to heaven: some are well satisfied with the plaine easie way of Doctrine and Use; others are not taken with any Sermon, but what is fill'd with depth of Matter, height of Fancie, and good Language. And therefore I think it were not an ill wish for the Church of England, if all her Preachers were Scholars likewise, able to deliver themselves upon any occasion, any way, to take every ear, and prevail upon every minde and fancie.³

Decorum dictated that a preacher's style and theme were 'fit for the hearers ... agreeing to the persons, the time and the place'.⁴ Whatever the style chosen, all writers seem to agree that it was to be determined by the preacher's primary duties to teach and persuade. It was in balancing these two goals that disputes arose.

This chapter examines the issues of rhetoric and teaching as they were described at Paul's Cross. It analyses the arguments for plainness and their relation to the preacher's didactic function. It also suggests that the preacher's self-effacing pose as teacher of the evident truths of religion could conflict with the demands of a learned and increasingly confident clerical estate for proper respect and adequate remuneration. To insist on a rigorously unadorned style, drawing attention away from the preacher's skill and labour, left the preacher one less argument for respect from the laity. Yet to emphasise a preacher's rhetorical skill by adopting an elaborate preaching style was to detract from the preacher's teaching function. The problematic relationship between the preacher and the auditors he taught contributed to the disagreements over the uses of rhetoric in the pulpit. This discussion centres on a sermon which, unique among the sermons preached at Paul's Cross, defends elaborate preaching styles. By abandoning the commonplace justifications of preaching, it reveals the problematic aspects of the relationships between the preacher, his hearers and his text which were central to the disputes about the style of rhetoric appropriate to the pulpit.

³Abraham Wright, *Five sermons in five several styles* (1656) sigs. A2v-A3r.
On April 12, 1618, Daniel Featley, chaplain to the Archbishop Abbot (DNB), delivered *The Spouse her Pretious Borders,* at St. Paul's Cross. In this sermon, Featley used his text (Canticles 1.11 'We will make thee borders of gold with studs of silver') to engage in a spirited defence of the preaching ministry, the need for learned expounders of the Scriptures and the maintenance due the preacher. The occasion on which Featley delivered this sermon is important to an understanding of its manipulation of rhetorical *decorum.* *The Spouse her Pretious Borders* is a rehearsal sermon, that is, a sermon in which the preacher repeats in summarised forms the sermons delivered before the City Corporation during the Easter solemnities. Featley breaks the *decorum* of these sermons by emphasising the preacher's interpretative skill instead of his duty to his hearers.

In his fullest reference to Paul's Cross, John Stow describes the series of Easter sermons which culminated with the rehearsal at the Cross as follows:

And here it is to be noted, that, time out of mind, it hath been a laudable custom, that on Good Friday, in the afternoon, some especial learned man, by appointment of the prelates, hath preached a sermon at Paules Cross, treating of Christ's passion; and upon the three next Easter holidays, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, the like learned men, by the like appointment, have used to preach on the forenoons at the said Spittle, to persuade the article of Christ's Resurrection; and then on Low Sunday, one other learned man at Paules cross, to make rehearsal of those four former sermons, either commending or reproving them, as to him by judgment of the learned divines was thought convenient. And that done, he was to make a sermon of his own study, which in all was five sermons in one.6

The annual series was particularly notable for its inclusion of civic pageantry, as Stow's description points out. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen processed to the pulpit crosses at St. Paul's and St. Mary's Spittal with their wives, wearing violet livery on Good Friday and scarlet on Low Sunday.7 In printing his rehearsal sermon, Daniel Featley preserves many of the details of the sermon's delivery, giving the year, the names of the preachers, the titles and texts of their sermons and his summary of their sermons. No other rehearsal sermon in print

---

5 *The Spouse her Pretious Borders,* in *Clavis Mystica* (1636).
7 For a contextualised account of the pageantry at the Spittal sermons, see James Knowles, 'The Spectacle of the Realm', in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts,* eds Mulryne and Shewring (1993), p. 162-3. The Corporation of London could claim a particular interest in the Spittal sermons, as it held the right to appoint the preachers. Although it claimed the same right for Paul's Cross, the preachers there were appointed by the Bishop of London: *Analytical Index to ... the Remembrancia ...* eds W.H and H.C. Overall (1878), pp. 367-9. On the appointment of preachers to Paul's Cross, see Margaret Cornford, *Paul's Cross: A History* (1910), pp. 40-44. On 24 Sept. 1642, the House of Commons gave the Corporation control over the appointment of the preachers: *House of Commons Journal,* vol. II, 1642, p. 782. Throughout this period, however, the Corporation of London administered the benefactions financing the sermons at Paul's Cross.
for the Jacobean period gives so exact an account of the performance. The four sermons Featley summarises are George Warburton's *Passion Sermon* (on Zechariah 13.7), Joseph Hall's *The Righteous Mammon* (1 Timothy 6:7), Roger Hacket's *Hortus Deliciarum* (Genesis 2.15-17) and Francis White's *The Sacrifice of Thankfulness* (Psalm 4.5). Featley was called upon to rehearse the sermons of men already well-positioned in the Church, which may also have influenced him in recording the details of their sermons in printing his rehearsal. As the praise of the learned minister is central to Featley's argument in this sermon, including these summaries was also necessary to his proof that the learned ministers whose sermons he rehearsed were fulfilling their roles in the Church.

Featley was known to be a keen controversialist, and in the preface to *Ancilla Pietatis* (1625), his own manual of prayers and devotions, he admits that, for him, 'the more perplexed, and intricate the difficulty is, the greater is the contentment in beating out the truth in points of no lesse consequence then difference'. In all his controversies, Featley defended an episcopal, doctrinally Calvinist Church of England. 'A Calvinist always in his heart', according to Peter Heylyn, from early in his career, Featley was most active in opposing the spread of Arminian doctrine in the Church of England. He was instrumental in drawing up the list of objections to Richard Montagu's *A New Gagg for an old goose* handed in to the House of Commons in May 1624. Until 1625, he was a licenser of the press and was implicated in censoring Arminian books. Featley expressed his opposition

---

8John Hoskins published only the 'conclusion' to the rehearsal sermon he delivered in 1614: *Sermons preached at Pauls Crosse and elsewhere* (1615). John Boys merely puts a marginal note in his sermon for the 2nd Sunday of Lent (on 1 Thess. 4.1), to say that 'these observations I delivered in my rehearsal at Paul's anno 1603': *Works* (1622), sig. Xlv, p. 242.

9George Warburton, the least known of the preachers, was chaplain in ordinary to King James and was made rector of Freshwater in the Isle of Wight in 1621. He may be the same man who wrote *King Melchizadech. A sermon preached at the court, at East-Hamsted* (1623). On Joseph Hall's reputation as a writer and cleric, see chapter three, pp. 111-3. Roger Hacket, rector of North Crowley in Buckinghamshire, was 'cried up for an eminent preacher' (DNB). He preached at Paul's Cross in 1591. Francis White was already known as a writer on controversy, having published his *The orthodox faith and way to the church* in 1617. In January 1623, he took part in a debate with Featley against the Jesuit John Fisher recorded by Featley in *The Fisher catched in his owne net* (1624). By then, he was strongly associated with the Laudian wing of the Church, and it was he who consecrated the notoriously elaborate new chapel in Peterhouse, Cambridge in 1632.

10*Ancilla Pietatis: or the handmaid to private devotions* (1626 ed.), sig. A5r.

11Featley's biography was written by his nephew, John Featley, who was Featley's vicar in Acton: *Featlaei Palingenesis: or Doctor Featley Revived* (1660).

12On Featley's Calvinism and anti-Arminian activities, see Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists* (1987) pp. 73, 48-9, 156. On Featley as a licenser of the press and his role in the controversies over Richard Montagu's books, see Sheila Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', *Past and Present*, 124 (1989), pp. 49 and 52. Featley lost the post of licensor owing to a controversy over the licencing of 'schismatic books'. These were Edward Elton's *God's holy mind touching matters morall in
to Arminian doctrines most forcefully in his own writings on the subject. In *Parallelismus nov-antiqui erroris Pelagiarminiani* (1626), he accused Richard Montagu of spreading Arminian doctrine, which Featley termed a form of the ancient Pelagian heresy, in England. This work was translated in the same year and published as *A parallel: of new-old Pelagiarminian error* and, in another issue, as *Pelagius redivivus.* In the 1630s, Featley’s prominent defence of a doctrinal Calvinist Church creating difficulties in the licensing of *Clavis Mystica* (1636), the collection of sermons that includes *The Spouse her Pretious Borders*, and it was censored by Laud’s chaplain, William Bray, before being allowed into print.  

Featley’s defence of Calvinist doctrine was only one, albeit the most politically important, aspect of the Jacobean Church which he defended through controversial writings. In the years prior to the Civil War, he was equally active in opposing Roman Catholic doctrine, and his most famous anti-Catholic work, *The Fisher caught in his own net* (1624), was an account of the conference he and Francis White held with the Jesuit John Fisher. During the Civil War, however, Featley also found himself defending the episcopacy and ceremonies of the Church against radical Protestants. On two occasions in

*tenne commandements* (1625) and the edition of William Crompton’s *Saint Austin’s Religion* (1625) that included *Saint Austin’s sumnes*, the controversial section. Featley was questioned by King James for allowing these books be printed and Featley published James’ objections and his defence in *Cygnea cantio: or learned decisions, delivered by King James a few weeks before his death* (1629). In relation to Elton’s book, he claimed that the author had a good reputation and Featley had not thought him a non-conformist. Only the first fifty-two pages of the work had been ‘perused’ by Featley and licensed. In relation to Mr. Crompton, he said those sections which contradicted the doctrines of the Church, especially on bishops, had been crossed out. Other sections, on the use of the cross in baptism and lay baptism, were allowed as they provided evidence that some of the Church Fathers were also opposed to these. King James then outlined three ‘caveats’ which were to be used in reading the Fathers, which would have mitigated against the inclusion of these errors: *Cygnea cantio*, passim.

13*Parallelismus nov-antiqui erroris Pelagiarminiani* (1626); *A parallel: of new-old Pelagiarminian error* [Anon.] (1626); *Pelagius redivivus. Or Pelagius taken out of the ashes by Arminius and his schollers.* (1626); *A second parallel with a writ of error against the Appealer* [Anon] (1626). This second edition of *Pelagius Redivivus* includes a reply to Montagu’s *Appello Caesarem* (1625). Nicholas Tyacke notes that according to William Prynne, Featley co-authored *Pelagius Redivivus* with William Goad, a delegate at the Synod of Dort: Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 99, n. 55.

14 On Featley’s problems in publishing *Clavis Mystica*, which exists in two states, see William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, (1646), sigs. 2L1v, 2L3v, 2N1r-v, pp. 254, 258, 269-79. Mr Arnold Hunt has conducted a detailed study of the two states of *Clavis Mystica* (forthcoming), questioning whether all the changes made to the text were motivated by the doctrinal shifts in the hierarchy of the church in the 1630s. Only one significant cut was made to the text of *The Spouse her Pretious Borders*, which will be considered later in this chapter, pp. 152-3.

15 *The Fisher caught in his owne net* (1623). An appendix to this was printed as *The Romish Fisher caught and held in his owne net*, 2 pts, (1624). Featley’s other pre-Civil War anti-Catholic writings were *The Grand Sacriilege of the church of Rome, in taking away the sacred cup from the laity* (1630) and *Transubstantiation Exploded: or an encounter with Richard [Smith] Bishop of Chalcedon* (1638).
the early years of the war, he was the target of violent attacks for his 'exact' observation of church ceremonies: at Acton in Middlesex, in 1642, where he lived as rector, and at Lambeth in 1643. Although at first a member of the Westminster Assembly, his defence of episcopacy and his contact with King Charles led to his sequestration in October 1644 and subsequent imprisonment. From prison, he continued his controversies in defence of the Church against both these enemies, writing Roma ruens Romes ruine (1644) against the Roman interpretations of the visible Church, and Katabaptistai Kataptistoi, The Dippers dipt, in 1645, his report of a dispute with Anabaptists in Southwark in 1642. After eighteen months in prison, Featley was given bail to go to Chelsea college, owing to his bad health, and he died there in 1645.

In view of his career, then, it is no surprise that in his rehearsal sermon Featley chooses an unpopular text, takes an unusual approach with it, and uses it to reach conclusions which were themselves controversial.

II

Featley's rehearsal sermon is one of only four sermons delivered at Paul's Cross on a text from the Song of Songs. It is unique among the Paul's Cross sermons of this period in offering an allegorical interpretation of the text, a method out of favour with the majority of Protestant writers on preaching.

Although Christian exegetes had developed various ways of interpreting 'dark places in Scripture', such as the Song of Songs, all of which were based on the premise that the literal meaning of the text held spiritual or religious significations, two very different attitudes to the relationship between the words and their religious meanings can be identified. The first, the allegorical approach often considered typical of medieval exegesis, held that the text had multiple meanings with separate, spiritual senses lying hidden in the words. The other, which may be called the figurative approach, was most closely associated

16Very few sermons at Paul’s Cross during the reign of James I took texts from Canticles. There are only three printed sermons, and they interpret the book as a dialogue between Christ and the Soul or the Church. Thomas Jackson, London’s new-yeeres gift (1609), Thomas Myriell, Christs suite to his church (1613); John Stoughton, The Love-sick Spouse, in Choice sermons (1640).
with the Reformers. It treated the text rhetorically and explained the apparent obscurities of words in Scripture by referring to the use of figurative speech, allegories ('continued metaphors') and parables, by the author of the sacred text. There were no separate layers of meaning in the text, nor were there various meanings. By employing ordinary grammatical procedures (examining the *tropes* and *figures* used, the context of the passage, its speakers and so on) and by comparison with other, less ambiguous parts of Scripture the metaphors could be interpreted within the limits set by the 'analogy of faith' and the fundamentals of doctrine. It is the first of these approaches, that which can be termed allegorical explication, which FeatIey takes. This approach was unusual and, for many writers, discreditable. It was also more difficult to reconcile with the preacher's duty to elucidate Scripture, as FeatIey's *explication* shows.

Beryl Smalley has shown conclusively that throughout its history, Christian exegetes sought to define the limits of allegorical interpretations so that they would not be pursued with too little regard for the literal sense of the text. With the Reformation,

---

17Barbara Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (1979), pp. 77-86. Lewalski presents this as the approach taken by all Protestant writers. It certainly was the approach taken by all the major Reformers and most English writers. It will be argued here, however, that allegorical interpretations had some defenders and practitioners in England: Debra Kuller Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible* (1994), pp. 17-23. On Calvin's use of rhetorical terminology in his exegesis, in preference to the language of allegory, see Richard A. Muller, 'The Hermeneutic of Promise and Fulfillment in Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament Prophecies of the Kingdom', in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Steinmetz (1990), pp. 68-82.

18The definition of allegory as a 'continued metaphor' derives from Quintilian's description of allegory as the figure which 'either presents one thing in words and another in meaning, or else something absolutely opposed to the meaning of the words. The first type is generally produced by a series of metaphors' ['Allegoria, quam inversionem interpretantur, aut aliud verbiis aliud sensu ostendit aut etiam interim contrarium. Prius it genus plerumque continuis translationibus': Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, VIII. vii.44. trans. H.E. Bulter (1920-22; repr. 1966-69), p. 327. In his highly influential *Institutiones rhetoricae* (1522), Melanchthon reformulates this definition and describes allegory as 'a trope of speech, and as such [it is] like a kind of continual metaphor' ['Allegoria est orationis tropus, adeoque quasi quaedam perpewa metaphora']. In his *Elementorum rhetorices, libri duo* (1531) he takes greater liberty with Quintilian, claiming that 'Quintilian calls [it] a continued metaphor' ['Quintilianus vocat perpetuam metaphoram'], Philip Melancthon, *Institutiono rhetoricae* (1522), sig. B8v; *Elementorum rhetorices, libri duo*, in *Corpus Reformatorum*, ed. C. G. Bretschneider, vol. XIII (1846), col. 466.

19The 'analogy of faith' was a rule used in interpretation whose origins lay in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*. Augustine wrote that everything in Scripture tended to the building up of love to God and neighbour and anyone whose understanding of a part of Scripture does not tend to this has misunderstood the Scripture: Augustine *On Christian Doctrine*, Bk I, ch. xxxv-xxxvii, trans. D.W. Robertson (1958), pp. 30-31. This, and the other rules for interpreting Scripture (considering context, speakers, tropes, etc.) are detailed by John Henry Alsted, *Compendium Theologicum* (1624), sigs. G8v-H1r, p. 80-81; Bartholomew Keckermann, *Rhetoricae Ecclesiasticae* (1606), sigs. E1r- E4r, pp. 65-71; William Perkins, *The Art of Prophecying*, in *Works* (1616/1618), vol. II, sigs. 3Lv-3K1v, pp. 654-662.

20On the rise of allegorical interpretation of the Bible, its uses in exposition and preaching and its critics in the early Church and the Middle Ages, see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (3rd ed., 1983), especially pp. 6-24, 32-35 (the Church Fathers) and pp. 93-95 (Hugh of St. Victor).
dogmatic differences made the limitations on the possible interpretations of Scripture more crucial for Protestants. The Reformers' stress on the sufficiency of Scripture for knowledge of salvation led to a concomitant stress on the perspicuity and stable meaning of Scripture. Otherwise, another indisputable arbiter of doctrine would be necessary. In his *Defence of the apology of the church of England* (1567), John Jewel argues that neither the Church Councils or Fathers can be the ultimate judge of Scripture or doctrine, because Scripture, unlike humane authorities, is infallible and itself provides all the information necessary to expound difficult passages:

To come near the matter, wee say not that all cases of doubt are by manifest, and open words plainly expressed in the scriptures; for so there should need no exposition. But we say, there is no case in religion so dark, and doubtful but it maie necessarily be either proved or reproved by collection and conference of the scriptures.  

Allegorical explications of Scripture tended to de-emphasise the perspicuity of Scripture. They suggested that the literal meaning of the words was an insufficient basis for interpretation, a position which made the possible meanings of the text so various that Scripture could not stand as an independently viable arbiter of doctrine. They disregarded literal meanings in favour of continuous metaphorical readings too readily, often misinterpreting the literal text to fit an allegorical reading. Richard Field presents these as the primary causes of the misuses of allegorical interpretation:

The thing wherein Origen offended, was not, that he found out spiritual and mystical senses of the divine Scripture, but because he thought there is no literal, true sense of them, but mystical only; so overthrowing the truth of the sacred history of the book of God. And the fault of many others, in the former times, was that, following him too much, they neglected the literal sense, and over curiously sought out allegories and mystical senses; whereas yet the literal sense alone hath force and power to establish truth and improve error.  

Therefore, Protestants recognised the abuses of allegorical interpretation that disconnected *explication* from the literal meaning of the text, which ought to be the guide

---


and determinant of their *explication*. Many went so far as to disallow allegorical interpretation of Scripture. William Ames, in *Conscience, with the power and cases thereof* allows that allegories 'invented by mans study' may be used in the *application* of a sermon's doctrines to the hearers, because 'if it be lawful to use a Metaphore, it is lawfull to continue the same', but 'allegoricall interpretations of things which have no certaine foundation in Scripture ought not to be propounded as certaine', and he provides seven reasons against this use of allegory in *explication*. Both Hyperius of Marburg and William Perkins place a similar injunction on the use of allegory in interpretation.23

Nonetheless, when approaching texts like Canticles, where the literal level could provide no obviously religious message for the reader, commentators agreed that a *figurative* meaning was to be assumed. In these cases, however, many Reformed exegetes promulgated a method of *figurative* reading which maintained the primacy of the literal sense and asserted the singleness and stability of the meaning of Scripture. There were not various senses of a text in Scripture; there was a single sense which could have more than one reference. Certain passages in Scripture appear at first to hold no 'edifying' message, because the Holy Spirit employed metaphors on those occasions. As metaphors are rhetorical figures, they form part of the grammar of Scripture. Therefore the full literal meaning of the text included the metaphor's transferred sense and its vehicle, and no extra 'meaning' or 'sense' was inferred in explaining them. The 'letter' and the 'sense' of the words (what is signified by the metaphor) combine to form the literal sense. The use of parables and allegories (defined as 'continued metaphors') in Scripture demanded interpretation but this was no more than the examination of the grammar and rhetoric of the text.24 All things necessary for *salvation* were clearly stated in Scripture and described in ways all could understand, so that ambiguous texts could be interpreted by comparison with more

---

24Thomas Aquinas writes: 'The parabolical interpretation is contained in the literal, for by words things are signified properly and figuratively. Nor is the figure itself, but that which is figured, the literal sense. When Scripture speaks of God's arm, the literal sense is not that God has such a member, but only what is signified by this member, namely, operative power': *Summa Theologica* 1. 1 article 10, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (1911), p.18. William Perkins quotes Chrysostom on the interpretation of parables when discussing the interpretation of allegory: *The Art of Prophecying*, sig. 3l6v, p. 660. On the interpretation of types, parables and allegories in Scripture, see Barbara Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics*, pp. 117-124.
perspicuous texts. In this way, the sufficiency of Scripture was retained, as the Bible was self-interpreting.\textsuperscript{25} William Perkins mostly clearly stated this principle in his \textit{Commentary on Galatians}:

But I say to the contrary, that there is but one full and intire sense of every place of Scripture, and that is also the literall sense, sometimes expressed in proper, and sometimes in borrowed or figurative speeches. To make many senses of scripture is to overturne all sense, and to make nothing certen. As for the three spirituall senses (so called) they are not senses, but applications or uses of scripture. It may be said, that the historie of Abrahams familie here propounded, hath beside his proper and literal senses, a spiritual or mystical sense. I answer, they are not two senses, but two parts of one full and intire sense. For not onely the bare historie, but also that which is therby signified, is the full sense of the h\[oly\] G\[host].\textsuperscript{26}

Writers who held this position generally recognised three possible referents for a text, which they termed the historical, moral and typical senses of traditional exegesis without allowing them to be independent 'senses' in the traditional way.\textsuperscript{27} The literal sense was the historical meaning, referring to the characters of the biblical narrative. The moral sense referred the events of the biblical narrative to present conditions, detailing the moral and religious duties demanded of Christians. The \textit{typical} sense dealt with the \textit{types} of Christ and his Church found in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{28}

These three senses could easily be presented as an explanation of the text without inferring various meanings for it. The moral sense was merely the \textit{application} of the text to present times, a duty of the preacher in every \textit{explication} of Scripture. The \textit{typical} sense was merely an explanation of the metaphors used by the Holy Spirit in composing the

\textsuperscript{25}An idea derived from Augustine, \textit{On Christian Doctrine}, Bk II, ch. IX.
\textsuperscript{26}William Perkins, \textit{A Commentarie or Exposition, upon the five first chapters of the Epistle to Galatians}, sig. 2B5v, p. 298.
\textsuperscript{27}The 'traditional' four sense (literal, allegorical, tropological and anagogical) were first described by John Cassian. The Church Fathers used various different formulations for the transferred sense of the text of Scripture, among which were the historical, moral and typical senses discussed here. St. Ambrose recognised sopatic (grammatical), psychic (moral) and pneumatic (allegorical, mystical) senses. St. Augustine's division in effect described four senses: 'the things of eternity which are communicated, the facts of history which are recounted, future events which are foretold and moral precepts which are enjoined or counseled'. St. Jerome gave four meanings for the word 'Jerusalem' which equate with the 'four senses' commonly recognised. There was a historical and a spiritual sense, with the spiritual sense being further subdivided into allegorical, tropological and anagogical senses: Robert E. McNally, \textit{The Bible in the Early Middle Ages} (1959), pp. 53-54.
\textsuperscript{28}Melanchthon wrote that Scripture had one 'sense' and included the interpretation of types in this sense. The moral (tropological but he includes here the anagogical) sense simply meant that the text also provided examples to be followed by the reader, and so was not a separate meaning: \textit{De officiis concionatoris} (1529), in \textit{De arte concionandi formulæ}, sigs. H3r-v. Alsted writes that the Scripture has one 'sense'. He describes the literal sense as 'simple' or 'figurative', the 'figurative' being what had been called the allegorical sense and includes \textit{types}. Scriptural pronouncements fall into four classes, which describe the 'figurative' statements: John Henry Alsted, \textit{Compendium Theologicum}, sigs. G8r-v, pp. 79-80.
Bible. John Donne uses this method in his sermon on Psalm 38.4, delivered at Lincoln's Inn, probably in 1618:

First then, all these things are literally spoken of David; by application, of us; and by figure, of Christ. Historically, David; morally, we; Typically, Christ is the subject of this text. 29

This approach to ambiguous passages in Scripture was easily reconciled with the most popular interpretations of Canticles, and English writers who did not practise allegorical explication continued to use the interpretations, albeit using different interpretative methods, handed down from medieval exegesis. Canticles was primarily viewed as a representation of the relationship between the soul and Christ, an interpretation which reached its fullest form with St. Bernard of Clairvaux's eighty-six sermons on Canticles. 30 As faithful souls collectively constitute the Church, by another interpretation (often intertwined with the first) the book described the relationship between the Church and Christ. This was the most popular interpretation among the English; Henry Ainsworth, Richard Sibbes, William Gouge and Joseph Hall described Canticles in this way. 31 Extrapolating from this, some writers, John Cotton and Thomas Brightman among English commentators, interpreted it as a chronological account of man's relationship to his saviour from Creation to the Last Judgement. 32

Preachers at Paul's Cross who used texts from Canticles also adopted these traditional interpretations and used figurative, rather than allegorical approaches, to their texts. For example, Thomas Myriell, minister of Barnet, preached on Canticles 5.2 (Open to

30On the interpretations of Canticles, see Bernard of Clairvaux, Eighty-Six Sermons in the Song of Solomon, trans. Samuel J. Bales (1895), pp. x-xiv. On Reformation interpretations in particular, see Marvin H. Pope, Song of Songs, with introduction and commentary (1977), pp. 125-128; On the different emphases placed on these interpretations by Protestant and Catholic commentators in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Barbara Lewalski, Protestant Poetics, pp. 59-63. No commentary by an English writer examined to date treats the book as a description of the soul's relation to Christ. Richard Sibbes, however, writes that 'as the whole Church is the Spouse of Christ, so is every particular Christian: and as the whole Church desires still nearer communion with Christ, so doth every particular member': Sibbes, Bowels opened (1639), sig. B3r, p. 5.
31Henry Ainsworth, Annotations upon the five bookes of Moses (1626); Richard Sibbes, Bowels opened (1639); William Gouge, An Exposition of the Song of Solomon (1615); Joseph Hall, Salomons divine arts (1609), in Works, ed Wynter (1863), vol. VIII.
32John Cotton, A brief exposition of the whole book of Canticles (1642); and Thomas Brightman, Commentarius in Cantica Canticorum Salomonis (1614).
me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled') at Paul's Cross in October 1613. He compares the 'bare letter' to the 'shell' and the 'kernell' to the sense within, as Solomon simply uses the 'occasion of his marriage' to describe 'the happy conjunction of Christ and his Church':

The speech indeed is of man and woman, and the bare letter sounds humane love and affection; but this is but the shell, the sweet kernell is within in the sense, where you shall finde more sung of then the love of man to woman, even the love of God himselfe to man.\(^\text{33}\)

By 'breaking' the 'bone of the letter', the preacher and his hearers reach the 'marrow of sense and understanding'. The sense of the words, then, is found by interpreting the metaphors in the text. There are not separate literal and metaphorical meanings, as the 'sense' intended by Solomon and the Holy Spirit is of Christ's love for his Church. In *The Love-sick Spouse*, preached at Paul's Cross in 1623, John Stoughton immediately presents the text as a description of the soul's love for Christ. It is introduced as if the words referred directly to 'the most pure love of the Spouse to Christ.\(^\text{34}\)

This does not mean, however, that all English writers practised figurative interpretation, or that there was total agreement on the ways in which the traditional senses of Scripture were dependent on the letter. Richard Field maintains that there are, in fact, different senses in Scripture, although all are based on, and dependent on, the literal sense:

There is, therefore, a double sense of the sacred words and sentences of Scripture; for there is a literal sense, and a spiritual or mystical sense. The literal sense is either proper, or native, when the words are to be taken, as originally, in their proper signification, they import; or figurative, when the words are translated from their natural and proper signification, to signify something resembled by those things they do primarily import; ... The spiritual or mystical sense of the Scripture is, when the words either properly, or figuratively, signify some things which are figures and significations of other things. This is threefold: allegorical, tropological, anagogical.

Field continues to give the reason for the various senses of Scripture, and to show that admitting different senses need not create uncertainty in the interpretation of Scripture because 'all these are founded upon one literal and certain sense, from which only, in matter

\(^{33}\)Thomas Myriell, *Christs suite to his church*, sigs. A2v-A3r, pp. 4-5. John Stoughton, *The Love-sick Spouse*, sig. H3r, p. 51. In George Webbe's *The bride royall*, preached on Psalm 45. 13-15, Webbe apologises for 'retorting' the Scripture from the 'mysticall marriage, at which it aimeth unto the materiall marriage, at which I aime'. The text 'comprehended a two-fold marriage; The one Literall, the other Mysticall; The one in the Letter, the other in the sense': *The bride royall* (1613), sig. B3r, p. 5.

of question and doubt, an argument may be drawn.35 That this still allows for various meanings, and so various interpretations, of the text, is clear from the closing caveat. These interpretations remain uncertain, and so are not to be used as proofs in argument. Only the literal sense of the words is so indisputably the meaning intended by the Spirit that only it can constitute a proof. Field here describes what Ames and others had condemned as allegorical explications, because he asserts the variety of meanings, not only of referents, in the biblical text. Field's view of the senses of Scripture shows that Featley's use of allegorical explication in his rehearsal sermon was not totally alien to the theories of scriptural interpretation found in the Church of England, even if it was a minority opinion.

III

Featley begins his sermon by arguing for a hidden 'spiritual' meaning in the words and in the explication of his text, he offers an interpretation based on two different 'senses' derived from the words. His introduction stresses that Scripture generally contains a 'varietie of senses' by which the 'treasures' of God's wisdom are 'exposed to the eye of the mind'. Featley does subordinate the literal meaning of his text, as 'intended in the second place', and takes the allegorical sense 'because principally intended' as 'literall' (sig. 2N1r, p. 409), but he does not present these two as one sense. He insists on the layering of meaning throughout Scripture and compares the hidden meanings to the incarnate Word. The divine nature of Christ lay hidden under the human nature, and both inspired and incarnate Word were

35Richard Field, Of the Church, Bk VI, ch. XVIII, pp. 452-3. This seems to be taken from Aquinas. Therefore that first signification whereby words signify things belongs to the first interpretation, the historical or literal. That signification whereby things signified by words have themselves also a signification is called the spiritual interpretation, which is based in the literal interpretation, and presupposes it. This spiritual interpretation has a threefold division. ... Therefore, so far as the things of the Old Law signify the things of the New Law, there is the allegorical interpretation; sofar as the things done in Christ, or so far as the things which signify Christ, are types of what we ought to do, there is the moral interpretation. So far as they signify what relates to eternal glory, there is the anagogical interpretation. ... The multiplicity of these interpretations does not produce ambiguity or any kind of equivocation, seeing that these interpretations are not multiplied because one word signifies several things; but because the things signified by the words can be themselves types of other things. Thus in Holy Writ no confusion results, for all the interpretations are founded on one - the literal - from which alone can any argument be draw, and not from those intended in allegory, as Augustine says. Nevertheless, nothing of Holy Scripture perishes on account of this, since nothing necessary to Faith is contained under the spiritual interpretation which may not be elsewhere put forward by the Scriptures in its literal interpretation': Summa Theologica, Quest. 1, art. 10 (1911 trans.), pp. 17-18.
'conceived by the holy Ghost, and brought forth in sacred sheets' (sig. 2M6v, p. 408). From this he alleges that 'the deeper we dig' in the text 'by diligent meditation, the veine of precious truth should prove still the richer' (sig. 2N1r, p. 409), even to a four-fold level of meaning because:

... as the one consisteth of two natures, humane and divine, visible and invisible; so the other of two senses; externall and internall, externall and visible in the shadow or letter, internall and invisible in the substance or spirituall interpretation: either tropologicall, or allegoricall, or anagogicall, as the learned distinguish (sigs. 2M6v-2Nr, pp. 408-9).

He claims not only that the 'treasures' of 'God's wisdom' are 'exposed to the eye of the mind' by the variety of senses in Scripture, but implies that it is the hidden, invisible senses which generally contain the 'substance' or the 'spiritual' meanings of the words. He also emphatically disagrees with those writers, including many of the most respected writers on Reformed preaching, who maintained that there is a single sense in Scripture:

Surely howsoever some divines affect an opinion of judgement (it is judgement in opinion onely) by allowing of no sense of Scripture, nor doctrine from thence, except that which the text it selfe at the first proposing offereth to their conceit (sig. 2N1r, p. 409).

Featley claims St. Augustine's authority in saying 'that the Pen-man of the holy Ghost of purpose so set downe the words, that they might be capable of multiplicitie of senses'. Having defended allegorical interpretation so vehemently, Featley begins his own explication, which appears to follow the precepts of those who denied a multiplicity of senses, but is, in fact, an allegorical interpretation of the text. He presents historical, moral and typological sense of Scripture, as Perkins and others allowed, but he treats them as independent senses derived from the literal meaning of the text, as Field did.

Featley begins by giving the literal meaning of the words (Solomon's queen is promised borders of gold with studs of silver) and then interprets the words as referring to the Christian Church, to whom Christ promised extensive borders and riches. Having described this as the explication of his text, he proceeds to apply it 'to this present exercise'. To do this, Featley borrows Aquinas' interpretation of the text, taking it to refer to the doctors of the Church who transmit the gold of doctrine to the people, ornamented with the
'silver studs' of their rhetoric and learning. He compares the four preachers to the friends of the Bride and the four borders that ornament her to their sermons, made of the 'gold' of sound doctrine with the 'silver studs' of their learning. So far, then,Featley seems to offer an interpretation of his text that preserves a single sense. He offers a literal sense, a mystical sense and an application.

In the third part of the sermon, the conclusion thatFeatley terms 'the fastening the Borders to the Spouse her neck and breast', he makes good his claim that scriptural texts hold layers of meaning to be uncovered by the preacher. He begins his division of the text by using a variation on the fourfold method of interpretation he had outlined initially as the most thorough approach. He uses the three meanings that figurative interpreters had described as part of the literal sense: the historical, moral and typological readings. He compares the various senses to the parts of a flower, the literal sense 'because it groweth immediately out of the barke and stocke of the letter' is like a bud, the spiritual 'because it is most pleasant and beautiful to the eye of soule' is the blossom and the moral sense, because it is most profitable, is the fruit (sig. 2Q1v. p. 446). He then gives a reading of the text according to each sense and provides an application for each meaning. The typical and moral are both based on the literal (historical) sense, but each sense provides applications to the hearers. Therefore, each reading of the text is presented as an independent 'sense':

For instance, the bud yields this fruit, That it is lawfull for noble and honourable women, especially Kings wives & daughters, to weare rich attire and costly ornaments. The blossome yeelds this fruit, That as Gods goodnesse hath abounded to the Church under the Gospel, so all Christians ought to abound in love and thankfullnesse to him. Lastly, the morall sense, which I termed the fruit, yeeldeth over and above this fruit That what the friends of the Spouse here promise, all godly pastors and people ought to performe, that is, these out of the riches of their learning, they out of their worldly wealth ought to adorne and beautifie the Church and in different kindes make for the spouse of Christ borders of gold with studs of silver (sigs. 2Q1v-2Q2r, pp. 446-7).

According to the figurative method of reading, the moral sense is itself the application of the text. Here, the applications refer to the literal meaning of the text only through Featley's reading of it. Featley is, therefore, treating his readings of the text as if they were themselves

36Thomas Aquinas, In Canticum Canticorum Expositio in Opera Omnia ad fidem optimarum editionem accurate recognita (Parma, 1852-73), vol. XIV, p. 356. This work is now considered spurious, and to have been written by Haymo of Auxerre: see Marvin H. Pope, Song of Songs, p. 243.
texts to be interpreted and *applied*, independently of the literal sense. His imagery makes it apparent that the transferred senses are independent interpretations of the literal reading of the text, as 'bud', 'flower' and 'fruit' all provide 'fruit'. This, Featley explains, is the abundance natural to the tree of life (sig. 2Q2v, p. 448).

When outlining the 'fruit' of the moral sense, Featley makes it even more apparent that he is taking the transferred senses of his text to be independently derived from the literal sense. He rehearses the various interpretations of who the speakers are and chooses that of Origen - the companions of the Bride. The friends of the Church referred to as the friends of the Bride are usually interpreted as either the clergy or the laity. Here, Featley does not choose an interpretation:

> The word in the originall being indifferent to either Interpretation, I will rather be an Electicke, than a Criticke, chuse out of both, than censure either. Admitting then the friends of the Bride to parley with her, what say they? We will. Which we? we of the Clergy, or you of the Laity? ... If it be lawfull for mee to interpose my sentence, I would say questionlesse both: for both are retainers to this Queene, both are friends and servants of this Spouse, both owe homage unto her, both must offer unto her gold, silver and precious stones: we out of the treasury of our knowledge, you of your wealth and substance (sig. 2Q2v, p. 448).

In order to explain how his text can mean that the clergy should serve the Church by their learning and the laity serve it with their wealth, Featley is taking the 'we' to refer to both the clergy and laity, two different interpretations, without integrating them by showing the clergy and laity to be one. His *explication* now has two different referents for the single 'we' in the text, and both are presented as valid. The two different referents cannot be incorporated as the reading would then not make sense. The Church described as the Bride in the Song of Songs is universally taken to be the Church Militant. Hence Featley's description of the endowments promised the Bride. But the Church Militant consists of the clergy and the laity. If the two speakers were combined, Featley's interpretation would mean that the Church Militant gives the Church Militant preaching and maintenance. Featley's

---

37The following examples show that English writers invariably took the Bride to represent the Church Militant. William Gouge describes Canticles as 'a declaration of the blessed and sweet conjunction between Christ and his Church, and of the contract, and espousels made between them, whilst the Church is now militant upon earth': *An exposition of the Song of Solomon* (1615), sigs. B1r-v, pp. 1-2. Richard Sibbes maintains that both the interpretation of the Sponsa as the Church throughout the ages and the Church in every age is valid, because in both cases the Sponsa expresses a desire for closer union with Christ: *Bowels opened*, sigs. B2v-B3r, pp. 4-5. George Webbe uses Canticles 1.5 ('I am black but comely') to argue against 'Katharists, Donatists, Brownists, Separatists' who claim they are members of the invisible Church: *The bride royall*, sigs. C6r-D1r, pp. 27-33.
allegory does not 'quatrate', that is, the different referents of the speaker in the text do not stand in the same relation to the Bride. Christ's relation to the Church under the law is not the same as the clergy and laity's relation to the Church Militant, because clergy and laity are part of the Church Militant. Featley presents this as the interpretation of Aquinas, but this is not what Aquinas says. In order to avoid the discrepancy Featley creates in his explication, Aquinas interprets the speaker as Christ, who promises doctors and doctrine adorned with learning to his Church, and that he uses the plural verb 'as if' taking on himself the persons of the doctors. Aquinas' interpretation does quadrate, as it maintains the relation between the speaker and Bride in both literal and spiritual readings. What Featley is presenting, then, are two different moral senses for his text, each of which must be derived independently from the text.

It is from this reading of the passage, that 'we' of the clergy and 'you' of the laity ought to deck the Church with ornaments of learning and of goods, that Featley begins his close analysis of the text. In effect, he is using the referents he uncovered by his convoluted allegorical reading as the basis for his explication of the text. For example, the first point he developed is that the text reads 'borders' of gold in the plural. For the clergy, this means many borders with studs, that is, many sermons (sig. 2Q3r, p. 449). In essence, then, Featley here offers his 'moral sense' of the text as the foundation for his interpretation of the text itself. By this route he can re-read it so that it can provide precepts for preachers and for the laity on their duties to the Church. In doing so, however, he contradicts the advice given by Richard Field on the employment of the different senses of Scripture. Field allowed arguments 'in matters of question and doubt' to be drawn only from the literal sense of Scripture. Featley, however, bases his application, the argument of his sermon, on his own interpretation of a transferred sense (his 'moral sense' of the text), uncovered by allegorical

---

38 On allegory as 'quatrate', see J. A. Burrow, ' Allegory: the Literal Sense' in Essays on Medieval Literature (1984), pp. 204-206. Burrows points out that literary allegory need not quadrat. In Featley's case, however, the fact that his different readings of the text do not quadrat with one another makes the different 'senses' independent and shows that his exposition is allegorical rather than figurative. 39 Mystice, murenulae sunt perplexa Scripturarum dogmata ex diversis Sanctorum Patrum sententiis inter se juxta. Aurum quippe claritatem significat sensus spiritualis: argentum vero nitorum eloqui designat. Murenulas aureas ergo sponsus sponsae suae facit, cum Christus Ecclesiam suam doctrinis Sanctorum Patrum, sensu et eloqui fulgentibus instruit, atque ad illorum fidem et virtutem imitantandam accendit. Notandum vero, quod dictum pluraliter, Faciemus tibi: quasi enim Christus se personis doctorum conjungit, per quos ipsae murenulae incatenantur, ut istis Ecclesiae ornatur: Thomas Aquinas, In Canticum Canticorum Expositio, p. 356.
Neither does he use other, more perspicuous texts to bolster his argument. It depends solely on his own, faulty, explication of the allegorical senses of the passage.

By attempting to demonstrate the skill of the preacher in 'mining' Scripture for hidden wisdom and new applications, Featley is guilty of bad explication. His allegory is faulty, and so it misrepresents the relation between Christ, his Church and its members, a fault with implications for his argument on the duties of the laity to the Church later in the sermon. His application of the text proceeds from his allegorical interpretation rather than from the literal sense of Scripture, contrary to the advice of writers on allegory. This means that he uses for argument what should only be used for the illustration or elaboration of a theme derived from the literal sense. In short, Featley is guilty of 'wresting' Scripture to uncover the meaning which fits his theme, the fault commonly levelled at allegorical interpreters. Contrary to his own purposes, he seems to vindicate those who disallowed allegorical explications in preaching. Only those skilled in rhetoric, or familiar with the limits placed on allegorical interpretation, could see how tenuously the link between Featley's argument and his scriptural text really was. In this respect in particular, and throughout this sermon, Featley's emphasis on the preachers' duty as interpreters of Scripture is pursued at the expense of the preacher's duty as teachers of their auditors. He does this primarily to enhance the role of the learned minister, an approach which contradicts the decorum of preaching the rehearsal sermon in particular.

From the two other rehearsal sermons in print for this period, the rehearsers' theme was more usually that the preacher's role is not to hunt out new meanings, but to continually repeat the same fundamental points until they were accepted and followed. John Boys delivered the following 'observations' in his rehearsal sermon in 1603:

> ... all our sermons are nothing else, but rehearsals of that old Spittle Sermon (as it were) preached by God himselfe to decayed Adam and Eve, Gen. 3.15. For first, all that is said by Christ and his blessed Apostles in the New Testament, is summarily nothing else, but a repetition and explanation of that one prophecie, Semen mulieris conteret caput serpantis.

Likewise, John Hoskins, in the conclusion to his rehearsal sermon of 1614 on the text Isaiah 62.6 ('You that be the Lord's Remembrancers, be not silent'), writes that the preacher's duty is to repeat the fundamentals of faith, as the Decalogue was continuously repeated by the
prophets. After Christ, when God's word was 'perfectly delivered', 'all Psalms ensuing were like the 105.6.7 rehearsal Psalms, all prayers like the Levites, Nehem. 9. rehearsal prayers, and all Sermons like Stephens, Act 7, rehearsal sermons'. (sig. E4r, p. 31). The preacher is therefore enjoined to preach constantly, the laity to contribute their attention to the preachers and follow the lessons they preach.\textsuperscript{40}

Featley's approach implies a very different role for the preacher. His argument is that the preacher does not merely reiterate the Scripture: he ornaments it. The argument for a multiplicity of meaning allows the learned preacher to present new approaches to known texts, to uncover new applications and so present to the laity, if not new doctrine, then certainly new trappings to old tenets. This is a significant enhancement of the preacher's role, for, according to Featley's formulation, the preacher's first duty is directly to the Word of God, which he presents to the auditory adorned with his learning. Unlike those who merely repeat what had been heard many times, he does not need to apologise for the familiarity of his theme, because if Scripture does indeed contain an endless mine of meanings, each sermon can contain a new way of reading the text. Featley's defence of the preaching ministry, however, disregards their duty to teach, and it is precisely this duty which dictated the precepts on preaching methods and styles which he disregards. For Featley, the preachers' sermons are their gifts to the Church, but the Church to whom they present them is not represented as the visible congregation before the preacher.

\textbf{IV}

In his explication of the text, Featley 'mines' Scripture to uncover the various meanings to be found behind the words of his text. In his application of the text to the clergy he also outlines precepts for preachers on the appropriate approaches to Scripture. This is the second aspect of his defence of the ministry in the sermon. In this section, Featley presents precepts concerning preaching with which almost all the ministers of the Church of

\textsuperscript{40}John Boys, Works (1622) sig. X1v, p. 242. See also John Hoskins, The Conclusion of the Rehearsal Sermon (1615), sigs. F4r-F4v, p. 39-40. All Scripture as the fulfillment of the protoevangelion (Gen. 3:15) is a theme first presented by Heinrich Bullinger in his writings on the Covenant: see J. Wayne Baker, Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant (1980), pp. 55-60.
England, Puritan and Conformist, could agree and carefully avoids those that were controversial. In this way, he presents to the hearers an image of the clergy with a clear, unifying sense of their duty to the Church.

Featley's first observation is that the text calls for borders 'in the plurall number'. This is taken to mean that the clergy must deliver abundant sermons and 'urge precept upon precept, lay linke upon linke'. Using the topos of eloquent speech as flowing water, Featley defends his call for abundant preaching by claiming that conduits or fountains with abundant flows of water are less likely to stagnate. The more sermons that are preached the more 'excellent' each will be. He adds to this argument another which is directly relevant to the rehearser's role:

Howsoever, considering the dulnesse of hearing, and meane capacity of the ordinary hearer, and brittlenesse of memorie in all, I wish those that are of most eminent gifts to dispense the mysteries of salvation more frequently than they usually doe, under pretence of more accurate preparation (sig. 2Q3r, p. 449).

It is notably that this is the only reference to the preacher's duty to his hearers in this section. By taking the image of ornament from his text, Featley avoids referring to the preacher's role as teacher, an issue which was at the heart of the controversies over preaching styles and techniques. Writers across the spectrum of opinion in the Church demanded plentiful preaching from the clergy. The Puritan Samuel Hieron described the name of Preacher as 'the fairest flower' in the clergyman's garland and demands plentiful preaching from ministers. In his Defense of the aunswere to the Admonition, John Whitgift denies Thomas Cartwright's charge that Whitgift thought one sermon a month sufficient. Excusing his boasting, Whitgift claims that he himself has preached as much as any of Cartwright's supporters. The anti-Puritan John Boys writes that 'every Preacher of Christ is a voice; the which one word confoundes all such as being called thereunto, doe neglect their dutie of preaching'. Featley's second rule is that the texts on which sermons were to be preached

41 In Jacob's wel, preached in Canterbury cathedral, John Cleland draws on the classical images of water for the sources of mellifluous speech (by the orators) and knowledge (by philosophers), as well as the image of Scripture as 'the Fontaine of living waters' to criticise Catholics who 'stoppe up' the well of Scripture with 'traditions, Glosses, frothie legends': John Cleland, Jacob's wel, and Abbots conduit (1626), sigs. C4v-D1v, pp. 16-18.
42 Samuel Hieron, The Dignity of Preaching, in Works ([1620?]), sigs. 3G4v-3G5r, pp. 584-5; John Whitgift, The defense of the aunswere to the Admonition (1574), sigs. 3A2r-v, pp. 555-6.
must be take from 'the pure word of God' and not 'Popish legends, not scholasticall subtleties, not moral essayes, no nor sentences of holy Fathers' (sig. 2Q3r, p. 449). This was a point rarely referred to by English writers on preaching, and certainly no sermon at Paul's Cross was based on anything other than a text from Scripture. It can be assumed that this was above question. Nonetheless, Richard Bernard does state explicitly that the preacher's text must be 'taken out of the Canon of Scripture'.

Featley's next point concerns the style of the sermon itself. Firstly, the Scripture must be 'wrought' into 'border of gold', that is, the sermon must be properly prepared and delivered in a clear, orderly way. Again, this was an uncontroversial point among divines before the Civil War. Samuel Hieron claims that when a preacher 'vents raw, sudden, undigested meditations, such as have no manner of coherence, either with the text, or with themselves' the text is rather 'torn, than divided; rather tossed, than handled', bringing the laity to a contempt of preaching. Thomas Fuller's minister 'will not offer to God of that which costs him nothing', and so prepares his sermons well before hand and considers the example of those who can preach without preparation 'rather to be admired than imitated'.

Featley annexes to this another point: that the Scriptures may be adorned by 'observations and sentences of other eminent writers' as 'studs of silver' around the text, but that these should not supplant Scripture. That he writes 'may' rather than 'should' is crucial here, because the 'citing', or 'alleging', of authorities other than Scripture in sermons was controversial. Many Puritan writers considered the display of learning, through the use of quotations in Latin, Greek or English, from the Church Fathers or Pagan poets, to be inappropriate in preaching before most auditories. Quotations from anything other than Scripture might confuse the auditory and risked their conferring on the writings of men the same status as 'proof' which belonged to Scripture alone. For this reason, Samuel Hieron

---

44Richard Bernard, The faithfull shepheard (1621 ed.) sig. F13r, p. 113. See also William Ames, Conscience, with the cases and power thereof, sig. I4r, p. 71 (3rd pag.).
45Samuel Hieron, The Dignity of Preaching, sig. 3G5v, p. 586; Thomas Fuller, The Holy State, sigs. M1v-M2r, pp. 82-83.
46On the different ideas expressed by sixteenth-century preachers on the use of learning in the pulpit, see Barbara Lewalski, Protestant Poetics, pp. 213-226; John Morgan, Godly Learning (1986), pp. 124-128. Morgan rightly states that on this issue, as many others, a 'dichotomous model of puritan/non-puritan relations' is unhelpful (p. 125). Different attitudes to learning were based on different emphases within the general area of agreement on the purposes of preaching.
condemned the use of quotations from Fathers and pagans in sermons, because what 'makes preaching honourable in the hearts of God's people' is not eloquence or embellishments but 'their understanding it, so as that they may feel the sweetness of it, and receive comfort by it'. William Perkins made this point in *The Art of Prophecying*. Although he maintained that sermons were to be well-prepared, the learning that went into preparing them was not to be seen in their delivery:

*Humane wisedome* must be concealed, whether it be in the matter of the sermon, or in the setting forth of the words: because the preaching of the word is the *testimony of God*, and the profession of the *knowledge of Christ* and not of humane skill: and againe, because the hearers ought not to ascribe their faith to the gifts of men, but to the power of God's word.

These arguments did not, in most cases, lead to a complete ban on references to anything other than the Bible. The approach adopted by the Church of England to the Fathers had been established early in the Elizabethan period, as seen in John Jewel's *A defence of the apology of the church of England* (1567). The writings of the Fathers were aids to the understanding of Scripture, and therefore 'we follow them: we embrace them: and ... we most humbly thank God for them'. But their fallibility as men was always to be recognised 'and of themselves, without farther authority, and guiding of God's word [they] are not always sufficient warrants to charge our faith'.

The use of quotations from pagan philosophers and poets created greater problems, as their writings were far more full of 'errors' than the Christian Fathers. Two powerful arguments had been developed by Christian exegetes and were commonly used to justify the use of pagan learning. The first was from Deuteronomy 21.11-13 ('And seest thou among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife, Then thou shalt bring her home to thine own house ... and she shall ...

---

48William Perkins, *The Art of Prophecying*, sig. 3K5v, p. 670. In a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1610, Thomas Myriell accuses those who make use of the Fathers and refuse to cite their sources of false modesty and dishonesty as they effectively claim the ideas quoted as their own: *The devout soules search* (1610), sigs. D1v-D2r, pp. 34-35.  
49John Jewel, *A defence of the apology of the church of England*, p. 239. In the 'Preparatives' to discussing the 'Forged Catholicisme or Universalitie of the Romish Religion', William Perkins gives this account of the limited authority of the Church Fathers and lists commentators, from the early Church to the Scholastics, detailing works considered spurious or heterodox: *The Probleme or Position*, in *Works*, vol. II (1616), sigs. 2S3r-2U1v, pp. 485-506. In a book first published in Heidelberg, 1603 and translated into English in 1635, Daniel Tossanus also details the works of the Fathers which are 'free of error': *A synopsis or compendium of the Fathers* (1635), sigs. ¶1v-a4r.
shave her head and pare her nails'). The pagan arts and sciences were to be 'shorn' of their errors and put to work as the servants of divinity. The second referred to Exodus 3.22 ('But every woman shall borrow of her neighbour ... jewels of silver and jewels of gold and raiment; and ye shall put them upon your sons, and upon your daughters; and ye shall spoil the Egyptians'). Whatever God gave the pagans he allowed to his own people, and they should take the 'gold' from pagan learning for their own use. Consequently, most English writers did not place a complete ban on quotations from the Fathers and pagan poets and philosophers. They did restrict the use of them severely, so that no confusion could arise in the minds of the hearers about the truth as handed down in Scripture and the fallible writings of men. For most Puritans, as for non-Puritan writers, decorum in relation to the auditors determined the use of quotations. William Perkins only allows the use of 'humane testimonies, whether of the Philosophers, or of the Fathers' when they are of use to 'convince the conscience of the hearer'. William Ames writes that 'in the ordinary course of Preaching, among auditors that are unskilfull in such matters' quotations from pagan writers are to be 'altogether ... abstained from'. Quotations from the Church Fathers cannot be used as proofs, or, among 'common Hearers', as illustrations or for 'ornaments sake'. They can, however, be used 'to convince the pertinaciousnesse of some, to refute the slanders of the enemies, and to helpe the weakenesse of others', provided the Preacher makes it clear that he 'is compelled to goe out of the bounds of the Scripture'. So too anti-Puritan writers maintained the preacher should direct his sermon to his auditors, speaking simply when necessary. In The marchant, Daniel Price (later chaplain to King James), uses Christ's parables as a defence of quotations, claiming that as Christ suited his speech to his hearers, so must the preacher:

Which may for ever serve to stoppe the mouthes of those traducing and ignorant Scepticks who vilifie the ingenious endeavours, of the best deserving laboure[s] in Gods vineyard, when they be fitted for the daie, times, place, persons, or other circumstances, with stories of husbandrie from Columella, axioms of philosophie from Aristotle [&c.].

50See Edward Chaloner, Pauls Peregrinations (1623), sigs. Z4v-Z5v, pp. 344-346; Gabriel Price, The laver of the heart (1616), sigs. C7r-C8r, pp. 29-31.
51William Perking, The Art of Prophecying, sig. 3K2v, pp. 664; William Ames, Conscience, with the cases and power thereof, sigs. 2K1r-v, pp. 73-74 (3rd pag.).
52Daniel Price, The marchant (1608), sigs. A2r-v, pp. 3-4. In his epistle to the reader, Henry Greenwood asks that the quotations in Latin and 'other tongues' be treated as 'country Stiles, stepping over them thou losest not the way by them, for their Expositions follow them': Henry Greenwood, Tormenting Tophet (1615), sig. A4v.
The fourth issue with which Featley deals also appears controversial, but again Featley focuses on the aspect of it which was agreed among all parties. This is the question of prose styles suitable to preaching. Again, Featley uses his text as a metaphor for his argument, rather than centring an argument around the literal meaning of his text. The 'studs of silver' must not take the place of the 'borders of gold' or be mixed with them. Art must be applied to divinity, not divinity to art. Featley here returns to the point made earlier in the sermon, that the preacher must use his skills only in the service of the Word, and not to display either his wit or his learning:

We must not make our Scripture texts serve to vent our secular learning, but contrariwise, modestly, and moderately use secular learning to explicate and illustrate texts of Scripture: sentences of Fathers, and other Authors, may be scattered in Sermons, as spangs of silver about the Spouse her border, the border must not be made of them (sig. 2Q3v, p. 450).

As with the last point Featley made, this is less controversial than at first appears. No-one, even those who practised a less 'plain' style than many Puritans might like, claimed that their style or art should be emphasised over the text they expounded. John Boys maintains that the preacher's voice must be 'sweet', but its 'sweetness' is not through eloquence alone. The preacher's voice must 'right divide the word which it sings and sayes; observing time, and keeping itselfe in tune, speaking to the proud boldly, to the meeke mildly, to all wisely'. Even John Donne, the most famous of the 'metaphysical' preachers, sought to 'speake plainly to every capacity' so none would need to ask what he meant when they 'come hither to understand the Apostle from me'.

Featley's stress on agreement between ministers is seen at the start of his 'rehearsal', where he criticises those who have used this exercise to comment adversely on other preachers' efforts. The unity of the ministers in their work is described as one of the ornaments of this Church. Therefore, when Featley begins his rehearsal, he sets rules for himself and others that stress the need for the ministry to support one another.

---

54 Although no reference to criticism of preachers has been found in the rehearsal sermon prior to Featley's, an incident from 1627 is recorded in the epistle to the reader of Thomas Goff's Deliverance from the grave. Goff preached at St. Mary Spittal on the Wednesday of Easter week in that year. In the epistle to the printed sermon, he claims that the rehearser 'rather hunted after prey for his envie' than sought 'to performe the great and pious businesse he undertooke' and so he criticised the style of Goff's preaching. Goff insists that he 'reputed' the rehearser 'a fellow labourer' and gives as evidence of this fellowship his
those who have criticised their fellow preachers of hypocrisy, as he claims they cannot both
love Christ and 'scandalize his ministers'. Flaunting wit and skill is the role of the satirist, not
the preacher (sig. 2N3r, p. 413).

Featley's description of the last of the Spittal sermons shows how the
preacher might charitably redescribe a sermon that he thought inaccurate. In Francis White's
sermon, The Sacrifice of Righteousness, the text (Psalm 4. 5 'Offer the Sacrifice of
Thankfulness and put your trust in the Lord') is used in part as an appeal for charity. White
claims that as we send up 'the savours of good workes' to Heaven, it will 'distill downe againe
like sweet waters upon our heads' (sig. 2P4v, p. 440). The use he makes of this explication
of his text is that those who were beneficent to hospitals, colleges and other charitable causes
have their good deeds doubly restored to them in the 'continuance of their good name on
earth' and an 'immacessible crown in heaven'. Obviously, if this is an accurate record of
what was spoken, it does suggest that the preacher came perilously close to preaching the
merits of good works. By 1618, Francis White was strongly identified with what later became
the Laudian party in the Church of England, and so he stood in the opposite faction to
Featley.55

It appears thatFeatley did 'rehearse' faithfully what White said about good
works, becauseFeatley added a lengthy note (sig. 2P6v, p. 444), explaining that the 'grave &
learned Divine' dealt with difficult topics which the unlearned might misunderstand.Featley
held it 'requisite' to illustrate Francis White's intended meaning more fully, as Featley
understood it partly 'out of the writings of this most learned speaker, partly out of his own
words in his private conference with me'. The amendments simply outline the orthodox
Calvinist view that works must be considered according to whether a person is in a state of
grace, that their principal cause is God, and that they must be considered good only as
'improved' by the merits and intercession of Christ. Likewise, when the summarised version

'courteous imparting of my notes to him many dayes before' to help in his rehearsal. Goff cites this attack
as his reason for publishing the sermon, so that 'divers readers' can judge whether 'this sermon deserved
the censure of that one rehearser': Deliverance from the grave (1627), sigs. A2r-v.
55White had acknowledged Bishop Neile, the leader of the 'Durham House group' as his patron. Later, in
the 1620s, White was a licenser of Richard Montagu's Appello Caesarem, and a disputant on Montagu's
side in the York House Conference on Montagu's Arminianism: see Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists,
pp. 44, 108, 171-180. On the motives of reward in preaching on good works, see chapter three of this
of Francis White's sermon unwisely suggests that works can appease the wrath of God (sig. 2P6r, p. 443), Featley's note explains that God's anger, as a chastisement to his chosen, may be appeased by repentance, prayers and other good works, but God's wrath as judgement on man's sins was appeased only by Christ's sacrifice, so reasserting the orthodox view of God's justice and providence. That Featley should go to the effort of repeating a sermon which he thought was open to heterodox interpretations and then append a correcting note to it, with graceful defences of the preacher at fault, would suggest that he took few liberties with the sermons he rehearsed, but indeed 'repeated' them as near to the original as possible. Featley's note is, however, clearly aimed at what he considered doctrinal inaccuracies or ambiguities in Francis White's sermon. This is evident from the way the censor of Clavis Mystica dealt with this note. All but the first sentence was complete removed.56 Where Featley wrote:

In this argument this grave & learned Divine expatiated through his whole discourse: of which I may say as St. Peter doth of St. Pauls Epistles, Our beloved brother, according unto the wisedome given unto him, thus spake of these things (in divers passages of his Sermon) in which some things are hard to be understood; which that the unlearned and unstable might not wrest, as they doe the sayings of the most orthodoxe Divines I hold it requisite, ... thus to illustrate his meaning, and to clear the truth (sig. 2P6v, p. 444).

The censored copy reads:

In this argument this grave and learned Divine expatiated, alluding many remarkable passages out of the ancient Fathers: namely, out of Saint Chrysostome.

It then proceeds to cite references and give quotations from the Church Father on how works can be said to appease the wrath of God. These are not, as the opening sentence suggests, simply a repetition of the marginal references given in the sermon, but additional proofs justifying the position that Featley had sought to confute gently.

A comparison with Joseph Hall's printed version of The Righteous Mammon also shows that Featley's rehearsals are faithful to the original sermons. In the main, Featley merely condenses Hall's sermons, omitting only repetitions used for emphasis,

---

56Both copies of Clavis Mystica held in the University Library, Cambridge (shelf-mark E.9.7 and G*.2.24) are uncensored. These were compared with two censored copies, one from the British Library (shelf-mark 475.c.3) and the Bodleian Library (shelf-mark F.1.11.Th). To judge whether the changes made to this sermon are typical of the changes made throughout the work necessitates a thorough study of both states of the work, as conducted by Mr Arnold Hunt (forthcoming).
scriptural examples and *proof-texts* and digressions. Featley also retains much of Hall's phraseology. Where Hall writes:

> It is no bragge to say that no nation under Heaven since the Gospel looked forth into the world, ever had so many, so learned teachers as this Iland hath at this day. Hierome said of old to his Paulinus, *Ne Hierosolymis et de Britannia aequaliter patet aula coelestis*: Heaven is open in Britaine as in Hierusalem. It holds well, if you take it for a prophetical comparison between Jerusalem as it had beene and Britaine as it should bee. Jerusalem the type of God's Church upon earth in the glory of all her legall magnificence, was never more blessed then this church of ours: for the Northern part of it beyond the Twede, we saw not, we heard not of a congregation (whereof indeed there is not so great frequence) without a preaching minister; and though their maintenance hath beene generally small, yet their paines have beene great, and their sucesse surable: And now, his sacred Majestie in his last yeres journey (as if the sunne did out of compassion goe beyond his tropick line, to give heat unto the Northerne Climate) hath so ordered it, that their meanes shall be answerable to their labours: so as both Pastors and People professe themselves mutually blessed in each other, and bless God and their King in their blessednesse (sigs. B1r-B2r, pp. 11-13).

Featley renders of this passage as follows:

> And I am perswaded that no Nation under heaven ever had more sufficient *Timothies*, to instruct all sorts of men in the wayes of salvation, than this our Land: so that what Jerome spake sometime of *Britaine* is now most true, comparing it with *Jerusalem* as it had beene; *De Hierosolymis et de Britannia aequaliter patet aula coelestis*. For the Northen parts, since his sacred Majesty in his last journey (as if the Sun did out of compasion goe beyond his tropicke line to give heat to that climate) visited them, are better provided of Preachers, and maintenance for Preachers, and both Pastours and people professe themselves mutually blessed in each other, and blesse God and their King for their blessednesse (sig. 202v, p. 424).

Featley is, therefore, a faithful rehearser, following his own rules and loyally supporting his fellow ministers by accurately presenting their sermons. He demonstrates that the preachers of the English Church are indeed adorning the Church with 'studs of silver'. He demonstrates their unity by pronouncing uncontroversial opinions on preaching methods and by faithfully recounting, in spite of his disagreement with one of them, the sermons delivered in the preceding week.

Featley also praises the preachers and their sermons through very elaborate and emphatic comparisons. In introducing the sermons, Featley describes in a histrionic way his search for a comparison for the preachers 'running *upon foure feet*', drawing attention to their rhetorical skill as well as his own. He presenting himself both as Cicero, the orator reluctant to take on his task, and as Apelles the artist, whose skill failed where chance succeeded. In the most demonstratively artful way, Featley describes his search for a novel comparison for his four speakers, claiming that wherever he looks, *Heaven, Hell or Earth,*
every aspect of nature comes in fours has already been over-used in rhetorical comparisons, until, with a dramatic claim to have abandoned the search, he presents the comparison he has found - the text of his sermon:

...so after much labour taken in devising an embleme, and portraying a lively draught of these foure Speakers, at last, unsatisfied with any, I threw downe my pensill upon my worke, and behold, quod ars non potuit, casus expressit, I find here casually in my Text what I had so long sought for, similitudines auri, golden resemblances, to wit, borders of gold with studs of silver for, as Aquinas teacheth us, the gold mystically signifieth the Spirits meaning, the studs of silver the Preachers art; gold representeth the precious doctrine they delivered, silver the perspicuity of their speech, and bright lustre of their stile (sig. 2N3v, p. 414).

This impressive defence, however, places the emphasis in Featley's sermon on the figure of the preacher rather than on the doctrine they delivered. As such, it was fundamentally at odds with the role of the preacher usually presented in the rehearsal sermon. In the other rehearsal sermons extant, the rehearser insisted that the preacher's duty was to repeat the essentials of faith, even at the expense of the orator's aim to persuade by pleasing. Unlike other orators, the preacher should almost disappear from the oration, striving not merely to hide art but to conceal the speaker, so that all attention becomes focused on the words pronounced. Many preachers attest to their dislike of auditors judging preachers by their style and treating them as orators rather than teachers. It was a common complaint among Paul's Cross preachers that, contrary to their wishes or their intentions, their auditors paid more attention to the style than the subject of the sermon. In the epistle to the reader appended to Loves complaint, for want of entertainment (1609), William Holbrooke writes that 'the pulpit is a place not for a man to shew his wit and reading in, to worke upon the eare by'. Roger Ley, in The scepter of righteousness (1619), complains that 'men come to heare sermons as they heare musicke: to delight the eare, to see a mans skill, to passe their censure, and there is an end.' In the epistle to the reader of his sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1609), George Benson claims that the only way he could have delivered all the material he had planned in the time available was to 'drawe my speech into knots and borders, and set my words checkerwise for the delight of the eare only'.57

57William Holbrooke, Loves complaint, for want of entertainment [1610?]), sig. A4r; Roger Ley, The scepter of righteousness, in Two Sermons (1619), sig. E3r, p. 37 (mispag. 38); George Benson, A sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1609), sig. A2r.
Yet the preacher’s self-effacing pose contrasts with the enhancement in social position which the Reformed emphasis on preaching gave to the clergy. John Morgan writes:

That clergy continued to be ranked just below the gentry in contemporary social analyses seems to indicate success in the maintaining of status, despite the reduction of the church’s independent power in the Reformation. As well as a doctrine of calling, it was the appropriation of, and the ability to maintain as secluded from the general population, a specific type and body of learning, that sets off the godly ministers even from godly laymen.\(^{58}\)

This, however, is not how contemporaries saw the situation, and complaints about the low esteem in which the clergy were held were common at Paul’s Cross, as elsewhere. They were badly paid and scorned by the public, their sermons were censured by the unlearned, and they dared not risk reprimanding the great. The most common argument for greater respect for the minister was based on their role as preachers: As they were God’s ambassador, so they should be treated with the respect proper to the messengers of the King of Kings.\(^{59}\)

Concurrently, then, preachers both demanded respect for their rhetorical skill in delivering the message of God and demanded that no attention be paid to that skill. The agreed precepts on preaching (which Featley describes), by focusing on the relationship between the preacher and the audience, created a tension around the use of rhetorical skill and learning which could not be resolved.

Featley’s approach to his text shifts the focus from the relationship between the preacher and the auditory to the preacher and the Scripture. If the preacher’s function is to uncover the hidden meanings of Scripture and adorn them with learning, then there is no need to apologise for a heightened rhetorical style. The defence of a plain, inconspicuous style of preaching rested on the necessity that the hearers understand the doctrines propounded. Again, Samuel Hieron is among the most forceful writers on this point:

For how shall a Minister be truly said to give knowledge of salvation, if he lay up his speech in such a mist of words, that the meanest and shallowest amongst the hearers cannot understand it? Such a kind of preaching is rightly compared to a Trumpet giving and [sic] uncertaine sound, at the hearing wherof no man can tell how or

\(^{58}\)John Morgan, Godly Learning, p. 92.
\(^{59}\)William Ward writes that ‘the ministers of the Word were never lesse accounted of in any age’: Gods arrows (1607), sig. E4r; Robert Johnson complains that ministers are ‘condemned and despised’: Davids teacher (1609), sig. C3r. Gabriel Price urges that ministers should be respected for what they preach because they are ‘the messengers of the Lord’ who do ‘but their masters message & no more’: The laver of the heart (1616), sigs. C2r-v, pp. 19-20.
when to *prepare himselfe to the batall*: so if he which speaks in publike, doe speake in such high termes and obscure phrases, that ordinarie men cannot conceive what he intends, ... how shall they prepare themselves to fight against Satan?60

Those like Hieron who argued for a 'plain' style, shorn of all rhetorical devices, also argued that the vehemence of the preacher, the 'testimony of the spirit' evident in what he said, would be itself sufficient to demand emotional assent in the hearers, rendering conscious, rhetorical strategies aimed at moving affections superfluous. Intermingling Pauline injunctions against a 'grand style' in preaching, 1 Corinthians. 1.17 ('For Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect') and 1 Corinthians. 2.13 ('Which things also we speak, not in the words which mans wisdom teacheth: but comparing spiritual things with spiritual'). William Ames describes how the 'testimony of the spirit' and the preacher's vehemence should be sufficient to persuade:

The manner of working in all these must be such that it have no ostentation of humane wisdome, or an entermingling of carnall affections, but the demonstration of the spirit everywhere manifested. 1 Cor. 1.17 & cap. 2. 14.13. Not with skill of speaking least the Crosse of Christ should be made of none effect. Not with excellancy of speech or wisedome: Not in parswading words of mens wisedome but in spirituall and powerfull demonstration. Not in words which mans wisedome teacheth but which the holy Spirit teacheth, for it is the word of the spirit, the word of life which is preached to edification of God which is by Faith: unto which if any thing be not fitly spoken or done, it is as vaine as hay and stubble. 1 Cor. 3.12.61

Featley describes preachers as servants of Scripture primarily, rather than as teachers: their duty is to uncover the wisdom found in the Word and ornament it with human eloquence. The preacher's learning is, then, at the service of Scripture, and soFeatley makes no mention of the duty of the preacher towards his hearers or the function of his learning in their 'edification'. By redescribing the preacher as the servant of Scripture in this way, Featley avoids the question of the place of rhetoric in the teaching of the Christian religion. It is presented in this sermon neither as a teaching aid nor an impediment to teaching, but as the means by which the clergy show their care for the Church and fulfil their function as the ministers of the Word. The question this begs, of course, is what kind of

---

61 William Ames, *The marrow of sacred divinity* (1642), sig. X3v, p. 160. Peter Auksi has traced the history of the arguments for a plain style, through the use of these Pauline precepts, in *Christian Plain Style* (1995). Debora K. Shuger has studied the issue of vehemence in moving the emotions of the hearers without recourse to mellifluent or 'grand style' speech in *Sacred Rhetoric* (1988).
Church is being so served by the preachers, because no mention is made of the preacher's duty to the other half of the Church Militant. When Featley moves on to discuss the duties of the laity to the Church, the incoherence of his *explication* becomes more apparent, exposing the shallowness of a defence of the ministry which merely evades the question of the preacher's duty to his hearers.

V

The rehearsal sermon was a civic occasion, and all accounts agree that it was one where the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, dressed in their velvet livery, were present as representatives of the City as well as patrons of the preachers whose sermons were repeated. The sermons rehearsed had a degree of generic coherence. The passion sermon was almost invariably a meditation on the central mystery of Christianity. The Spittal sermons, delivered before the Corporation and the orphans of Christ's Hospital, included in their themes references to the charity of the City as well as *exhortations* on the right use of wealth, as Hall most notably demonstrates in his digression on trading ethics in *The Righteous Mammon*. Therefore, Featley rehearsed sermons known to deal with doctrine and ethics, and in particular, the duty of the wealthy citizens to make proper use of their wealth by making friends with 'the Mammon of Unrighteousness' and offering 'the sacrifice of righteousness', as expressed in two of these sermons. As charity is the theme of the Spittal sermons, so the preacher is the theme of the rehearsal sermon, because the Rehearser's function is to comment on his fellows. Featley's text, taken from the book which English writers usually interpreted as referring to the Church, was a way in which he could unite these themes of the uses of wealth and the duty of preaching.

Arguments for the support of the ministry, although more than common in Paul's Cross sermons, were particularly prone to controversy and the controversy surrounding it involved the Lord Mayor, one of Featley's auditors, in particular. Although the clergy of London were, generally speaking, better off financially than those in many rural areas or in other towns, they claimed, and were correct in claiming, that they received
far less than a tenth of their parishioners' profits. In London, where wealth was generated by overseas trade, by new industries and by rents, tithing presented huge problems. An accommodation reached under Henry VIII, that Londoners should pay two shillings and nine pence in the pound on the rents of their houses, was generally evaded in the seventeenth century. Aldermen in particular were accused of such evasions, and so it was particularly difficult for ministers to see why, since an Act of Parliament of 1546, disputes over tithes should be settled by the Lord Mayor's Court. Attempts in Parliament in 1604 and 1614 to raise London tithes were defeated.62 Jacobean preachers placed their condemnation of the whole system of clerical maintenance, their complaints against tithe evaders, corrupt lay patrons and impropriators, within the larger framework of the doctrine of sacrilege. To take away goods given the Church, including the means to support the clergy, was to make secular use of sacred things. The corrupt patron, by demanding covert payments for a presentation, acted like Judas selling his master.63 In Nehemiah 13.11-12, the hearers were reminded, 'all Judah' brought 'tithe of corn and the new wine' into the treasury following the prophet's complaint. In Zechariah 5.4, thieves and oath-breakers were cursed, a fate awaiting those who stole and broke their vows by neglecting tithes.64 The corrupt patron or impropriator was guilty of Achan's sacrilege (Joshua 6:19-7:25).65 The example of the Israelites in Exodus 36, whose generosity in building the Ark of the Covenant had to be curtailed, an example frequently coupled with the statute of mortmain in 1279,66 showed how the generosity of those not blessed with the Gospel contrasted with the niggardliness of the hearers, in spite of God's blessings. Sacrilege robbed God primarily, and was punished by him. Consequently, denunciations of those who held back Church goods, by

---

65 Gabriel Price, The laver of the heart (1616), sig. E3v, p. 120; Samuel Gardiner, A sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1607), sig. D4v.
66 On the statute of mortmain (which forbade the donation of land to the Church without prior royal permission) and its effect on ecclesiastical property, see Robert E. Rodes, Jr., Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church: Edward I to the Civil War (1982), pp. 43-46.
representing these acts as sacrilegious, appeared not as demands by the clergy on the laity, but as the promulgations of God's commands. As the loss of revenue made the Church less able to attract educated men, it was also claimed that clerical impoverishment would lead to a greater lack of preachers, and so the laity would suffer.67

The laity had a counter-argument against the accusations that the system of clerical maintenance was sacrilegious. They claimed that the maintenance of the clergy was not dictated *jure divino* but was a matter of positive, human law. The law of tithes, upon which so much of the preachers' argument rested, was part of the ceremonial law of the Old Testament annulled by Christ. So too was the sacredness of objects in the Temple of Jerusalem, and so these precepts had no impact on clerical temporalities in Christian kingdoms. Advowsons (the right to present a clergyman to a benefice) were treated as near as possible like real property even before the Reformation. Those who held appropriated lands or tithes once belonging to monasteries could also justify this by arguments from law, as these changes had been instituted by statute law. The fact that many parishes had commuted tithes for a fixed payment that, following the inflation of the sixteenth century, was far less than a tenth of the value of parishioner's goods led to a clash between the two views of tithes. Those who held that a tenth was due by the law of God opposed those who maintained that parish custom dictated, by common law, what parishioners were to pay their ministers. By writs of prohibition, over which controversy raged between Archbishop Bancroft and Chief Justice Coke between 1606 and 1608, the laity claimed that the customs regulating tithes were a matter of common law and so they were to be tried in the lay courts.68 In April 1618, the same month as Featley's rehearsal sermon, the question of tithes resurfaced with the publication of John Selden's *History of Tithes*, where the clergy's

---

67 That sacrilege will ultimately lead to a loss of preachers was argued in the following sermons at Paul's Cross: Immanuel Bourne, *The rainbow* (1617), sig. G4r-v, p. 47-8; Robert Johnson, *Davids teacher* (1609), sig. C3v; Gabriel Price *The laver of the heart*, sigs. I4r-I5r, pp. 120-122. The same argument was made by John Jegon (1550-1618) in an undated sermon at Paul's Cross: Lambeth Palace Library MS. 113, ff. 36v-38r. As the sermon refers to the controversy over *tithes*, it is more likely to date from after 1606.

68 On tithes as customary exactions, see Robert E. Rodes, *Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church*, p. 14; on advowsons as real property, see pp. 34-35; on the implications for the balance between secular and clerical authority of lay appropriations, see p. 82; on the controversy over prohibitions and the jurisdiction of clerical and lay courts, see pp. 108-110. On the continued controversy over tithes during the Civil War, see Margaret James, 'The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-1660', *History*, XXVI (1941); and Martin Dzelzainis, ' "Undoubted Realities": Clarendon on Sacrilege', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990).
representing these acts as sacrilegious, appeared not as demands by the clergy on the laity, but as the promulgations of God's commands. As the loss of revenue made the Church less able to attract educated men, it was also claimed that clerical impoverishment would lead to a greater lack of preachers, and so the laity would suffer.67

The laity had a counter-argument against the accusations that the system of clerical maintenance was sacrilegious. They claimed that the maintenance of the clergy was not dictated jure divino but was a matter of positive, human law. The law of tithes, upon which so much of the preachers' argument rested, was part of the ceremonial law of the Old Testament annulled by Christ. So too was the sacredness of objects in the Temple of Jerusalem, and so these precepts had no impact on clerical temporalities in Christian kingdoms. Advowsons (the right to present a clergyman to a benefice) were treated as near as possible like real property even before the Reformation. Those who held impropriated lands or tithes once belonging to monasteries could also justify this by arguments from law, as these changes had been instituted by statute law. The fact that many parishes had commuted tithes for a fixed payment that, following the inflation of the sixteenth century, was far less than a tenth of the value of parishioner's goods led to a clash between the two views of tithes. Those who held that a tenth was due by the law of God opposed those who maintained that parish custom dictated, by common law, what parishioners were to pay their ministers. By writs of prohibition, over which controversy raged between Archbishop Bancroft and Chief Justice Coke between 1606 and 1608, the laity claimed that the customs regulating tithes were a matter of common law and so they were to be tried in the lay courts.68

In April 1618, the same month as Featley's rehearsal sermon, the question of tithes resurfaced with the publication of John Selden's *History of Tithes*, where the clergy's

---

67 That sacrilege will ultimately lead to a loss of preachers was argued in the following sermons at Paul's Cross: Immanuel Bourne, *The rainebow* (1617), sig. G4r-v, p. 47-8; Robert Johnson, *Davids teacher* (1609), sig. C3v; Gabriel Price *The laver of the heart*, sigs. I4r-I5r, pp. 120-122. The same argument was made by John Jegon (1550-1618) in an undated sermon at Paul's Cross: Lambeth Palace Library MS. 113, ff. 36v-38r. As the sermon refers to the controversy over prohibitions, it is more likely to date from after 1606.

68 On tithes as customary exactions, see Robert E. Rodes, *Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church*, p. 14; on advowsons as real property, see pp. 34-35; on the implications for the balance between secular and clerical authority of lay impropriations, see p. 82; on the controversy over prohibitions and the jurisdiction of clerical and lay courts, see pp. 108-110. On the continued controversy over tithes during the Civil War, see Margaret James, 'The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-1660', *History*, XXVI (1941); and Martin Dzelzainis, 'Undoubted Realities': Clarendon on Sacrilege', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990).
entitlement to the literal tenth by divine right was denied through a lengthy discussion of Old Testament and medieval law. Selden used the two shilling and nine pence charge on rents in London as an example of maintenance which was not strictly speaking a tithe, but which was often called one.69

Arguments over tithes and maintenance were arguments about law - God's and man's. This is best shown in Thomas Jackson's Londons new-yeeres gift, preached on Canticles 2.15 at Paul's Cross in 1608. There are, he says, three sorts of 'sacrilegious persons':

Whereof the first are corrupt patrones, or (more truly I may call them) Latrones of Church livings, ... if the purse be emptie they may be packing, but if that be full, or they be content to parte with house, glebe-land, tithe of Patrones land, as corne, wood, such a one is a Clarke for the nonst, though he lacke latine, conscience, honesty and all, and if the carefull bishopp refuse to admitte, he shall heare of a Quare impedit by and by. ... The second are all unconscionable Tythers, who by fraud or colour or law, as by pretended customs and compositions, or by their chargeable prohibitions, bring the suite into the common law, where Judge, Plaintiff and Jurie, are (I will not say partiall) but almost parties, seeing it hath beene, is, or may be every ones case; ... The last sort, are the greedy and Harpie-like devourers of sacred things, praying upon their Patrimony who pray for them ... Oh that these Foxes were taken away, that conspire to make a beggerly Clergie, and that some honourable Parliament might eternize it selfe, with this renowned Title, to all Posterities; The Parliament, that restored Impropritions; untill which time, it is unseasonable and unreasonable, to complaine of the ignorant, or to crave a learned Ministerie.70

Preachers, therefore, bolstered their arguments by warned their hearers not to take refuge in the law, for the punishment of sacrilege would come from God. In The Temple, preached at Paul's Cross in 1624, Thomas Adams appeals to his hearers not to 'justifie' the way they 'robbe the Temple of the due salary', because by 'imploring mercie' they may be saved but 'by justifying the Injurie, you cannot but be lost'.71 Sampson Price, in Londons warning by

---

69Selden argues that a literal tithe - a tenth of natural increase given to the incumbent - need not be, nor ever was, paid, but that sufficient means for the clergy was legislated for in canon and common law and he uses the two shillings and nine pence paid in London as an example of this: The Historie of Tithes (1618), sigs. b3v-c2v, pp. viii-xiv, sigs. 2H2r-v, pp. 243-4. The implication of Selden's argument, though one he disavows with many pious disclaimers, is that the maintenance of the clergy is dependent on 'human positive law' and so can be reduced or discontinued completely. See Christopher Hill, The Economic Problems of the Church, pp. 136-137. On the controversy that arose following the publication of Selden's History of Tithes, see David Sandler Berkowitz, John Selden's Formative Years (1988), pp. 35-39.

70Thomas Jackson, London's new-yeeres gift (1609), sigs. H1r-H2v, ff. 25r-26v. The writ of Quare impedit was served on a bishop who failed to institute the man presented by the patron of a living to the benefice: see Robert E. Rodes, Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church, pp. 35-37.

71Thomas Adams, The Temple, in Works (1630), sigs. 4P1v-4P2r, pp. 972-3.
Laodicea's lukewarmnesse (1613) warned that families who alienated Church lands would be blighted by God, an argument famously published by Henry Spelman in the same year:

But that rule of Sacrilege shall holde, Quae maligne contraxit Pater, luxu peiori refundet Haeres; That which the Father hath wickedly scraped together, the sonne shall more wickedly scatter abroad. It is the cause of the ruin of so many great Families in this kingdom.72

By pursuing their argument in this way, however, preachers risked denouncing the law of the land as irreligious, and therefore they frequently placed conciliatory qualifications after these rigorous denunciations. In A sermon of simonie and sacrilege (1604), Roger Fenton hedges his oration with claims that what he preaches is 'neither newe, nor to my knowledge controversall'. Fenton claimed, however, from Proverbs 20. 25 ('It is a snare for a man to devour that which is sanctified, and after the vowes to enquire'), that the tenth, even if not due jure divino, was vowed to the Church in the Middle Ages and remains with the Church and that those who renege on this now can only have the sin of sacrilege forgiven if they make restitution. Yet even the restitution which Fenton says will satisfy God is not the full tenth; to demand that 'were a bootlesse exhortation'. Instead, he asks his hearers to 'bring in some measurable proportion, and it shall bee easier for you in the day of judgement'.73

Featley evades these debate about clerical maintenance by placing less emphasis on the doctrine of sacrilege alone. He describes the duties of the laity to the Church, the Spouse of his text. As he had used his text to avoid the controversial aspects of preaching styles, so he uses his text to provide metaphors for the financing of the clergy by means of which he can avoid the questions which plagued other preachers on this issue. This

72 Sampson Price, London's warning by Laodicea's luke-warmnesse (1613), sig. C4r, p. 19. In his De non tenerandis eclelesiis (1613), Sir Henry Spelman argued that it was sacrilegious to alienate tithes and ecclesiastical livings from the Church; that this law had not been annulled by Christ but reaffirmed by him and by the Apostles; that only those with some ecclesiastical authority, such as the King, university colleges or cathedral chapters, had the right to hold impropriations. More famously, through an exposition of Psalm 83 and Proverbs 20.25, he says that a family sacrilegiously holding revenues given to the Church will not prosper. In his later work, The History and Fate of Sacrilege, published posthumously by an unknown editor in 1698, Spelman traces all those families who profited by the dispoliation of the medieval Church, most of whom had not prospered. On Spelman's studies of sacrilege, see Graham Parry, The Trophies of Time (1995), pp. 157-166.

73 Roger Fenton, A sermon of simonie and sacrilege (1604), sig. C11v, p. 62. Andrew Foster argues that the clergy's demands for better maintenance, and in particular for their rights to tithes, is itself a sign of their increased confidence under James I. In 1606, George Carlton's Tithes examined and proved to be due to the clergy by Divine Right, was the first post-Reformation work to make this argument. Andrew Foster, 'The Clerical Estate Revitalised' in The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642, ed. Kenneth Fincham, (1993), pp. 139-160.
may appear to be a more conciliatory approach than that taken by other preachers at Paul’s Cross, but Featley’s avoidance of the doctrine of sacrilege is only in favour of a different, and less accommodating, view of the duty of the laity towards their ministers. The impoverishment of the Church is not a single failing by the laity, but a complete abnegation of their responsibility, because, according to Featley, the support of the ministry is the function of the laity within the Church. He presents it as the primary, indeed, the only requirement of lay members of the Church. Featley’s rehearsal has shows the clergy performing their duty to the Spouse. He then delivers precepts for the laity on their duties:

Although it properly appertaines to our skilfull Bezaleels and Aholiabs to make borders and chaines for the Spouse, yet you are to contribute at least to the making of them: it is your duty to bring into her wardrobe jewels of gold, and jewels of silver, and jewels of raiment, It is not enough to love God with your strength, you must honour him also with your substance. ... Where can you better bestow your wealth than upon the Church, which receaveth of you glasse, but returneth you pearle, ... receaveth from you earthly trash, returneth to you heavenly treasure? (sig. 2Q3v, p. 450).

Featley gives the laity only a subsidiary role in the life of the Church: they finance the Church but play no part in it. This formulation of the role of the laity in the Church lay at the root of the London disputes over financing the Church. No one disputed that the clergy should live by their ministry, nor that appropriate means of maintaining them should be provided, as even the Common lawyers, traditional foes of clerical jurisdiction, disallowed customs which did not provide some tithes.74 Nor were Londoners slow to provide for their clergy by other means. Paul Seaver has shown that Londoners were enthusiastic supporters of the lectureship system which grew up in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This system gave the laity a measure of choice and control over the preacher, because the lecturer was supported by voluntary payments that could be withheld if the parish was unhappy with the preacher.75 It is the clash between the resurgent clerical profession’s demand for independence as a separate, self-regulating ‘estate’76 and the

---

74 On the common lawyers’ support for ‘proper’ clerical maintenance, see Robert E. Rodes, Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church, pp. 218-221.
demand of the laity for a greater say in the provision of preaching within their parishes which motivated the disputes in London. In essence, these debates were about the basis on which the clergy were paid, and consequently, their responsibility to their parishioners, rather than about how much was to be paid to them.

In describing the duties of the clergy and laity as he does, however, Featley's sermon creates a difficulty in describing the Church itself. The Church Militant, the aspect of the Church described in Canticles, meant the clergy and the laity. When Featley applies his text to both the clergy and the laity, however, he reifies the Church, not as the 'community of the faithful', but almost as an 'institution', to be considered independently of its members. The clergy and laity are apportioned duties towards what is, in effect, little more than a metaphor in the text. Featley's emphasis on ornament rather than repetition in this sermon has allowed him to argue for the dignity of the united, learned, preaching clergy of the Church of England, but has done so at the expense of a clear view of the role of the preacher to his hearers, the other half of the Church Militant. Featley's stress on the duty of the laity to the Bride of Christ gave him an argument for the maintenance of the clergy directly from Scripture, unhampered by the counter-arguments formulated on the doctrine of sacrilege. In doing so, Featley has confined the laity's role to financing the Church, understood as the clergy. He demands of them only the 'earthly trash' which the clergy can transform into 'heavenly treasure'. As the duties of the laity to the Church are understood to refer to support for the clergy, the duties of the clergy to the Church have not been understood to refer to the laity. They adorn the Scripture, but it is not stated how this should benefit the laity. The system of lectureships in London clearly showed that the laity considered the clergy's duty to teach the laity their primary function in the Church. By representing the clergy's duty as being to the Church, Featley neglects their responsibility to the laity. They may exchange 'earthly trash' for 'heavenly treasure' at the hands of the clergy, but no mutual obligations bind them together.

Reformation, and the importance of educated preachers in this redefinition stands, even if this cannot be regarded as part of a 'professionalisation'. On the importance of education in defining the status of a preaching ministry, see John Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 79-94.
To conclude, Daniel Featley overturns the *decorum* of the rehearsal sermon in two ways. First, he employs an allegorical interpretation of his text, contrary to much of the received wisdom on preaching current in the English Church and exceptionally among the sermons preached at Paul's Cross during James I's reign. In so doing, he presents the preacher as a learned expounder of Scripture, who uncovers meanings hidden behind the words of the text. The rehearsal sermon in particular emphasised the preacher's duty to repeat the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, clearly stated in Scripture, to the hearers. Secondly, Featley's sermon places the preachers whose sermons he repeats in the foreground, artfully drawing attention to their rhetorical skills. Again, the rehearsal sermon's theme emphasised the preacher's duty to reiterate the fundamentals of faith at the expense of art, so that the duties of religion are made evident to the hearers. Featley's breach of *decorum* in these ways is undertaken in order to present more forcefully the central theme of his sermon: that the ministers of the Church of England are learned men, united in their understanding of their duty in the Church. As they are seen to perform this duty, so the laity are exhorted to fulfil theirs.

Featley's description of the duties of clergy and laity, however, makes the relationship between them problematic. The problems raised by the use of rhetoric and learning in the pulpit centred on the preacher's duty to teach, and by teaching, to persuade. Although there was broad agreement in theory on what styles were appropriate before which auditors, significant disputes arose in practice. Featley redescribes the preacher as the servant of Scripture rather than the teacher of his congregation. By these means, he justifies his elaborate, allegorical interpretation and his emphasis on the learning and rhetorical skill of the preachers whose sermons he rehearses. Doing so, however, dissociates the preacher from his hearers, leaving the *explication* of Scripture to appear almost an end in itself. The laity's role is also left ill-defined. They merely provide maintenance for their preachers, as if no other religious obligations were placed on them. It is the preacher's obligation to them as teachers which the laity of London most forcefully demanded and which the writers on
preaching most sought to effect. More importantly, Featley's highly questionable interpretation of his text has allowed him to avoid discussing the mutual obligations of clergy and laity. By continually referring to the metaphors in the text, Featley reifies the Church, and in so doing he pursues his theme without considering that the clergy and the laity together comprise the Church on earth. By these terms, Daniel Featley's defence of the preaching ministry in *The Spouse her Pretious Borders* renders the preacher's learning and rhetoric pointless and he provides no adequate substitute for their functions as aids to teaching and persuasion. In overturning the *decorum* of the rehearsal sermon, he succeeds only in undermining his own theme, proving rather that plainness in preaching, however conceived, was the soundest justification for a learned ministry.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Interpretative Basis of the Paul's Cross Jeremiad: Types and Examples in Prophetic Preaching.

The Jeremiads preached at Paul's Cross are unlike the other sermons examined here in the wealth of critical attention that has been lavished on them. These Jeremiads or 'national warning' or 'prophetic' sermons have been clearly classified as a sermon genre and scrutinised for their disclosures about the 'habits of thought' that governed contemporary ideas on God's relation with the English nation.¹ As often happens, however, critics' attention has remained fixed in the furrow ploughed by Perry Miller fifty years ago, when he claimed that New Englanders' belief that they had undertaken an 'errand in the wilderness' was demonstrable from the Jeremiads preached to examine its failure. The cross-currents from this theory have resulted in a vigorous debate about seventeenth-century beliefs in the Englishness of God, the chosenness of the American settlers and the nature of the covenant with God by which a people became God's 'most favoured nation'. The providential basis of the Jeremiad has also been examined to reveal the preachers' interpretation of temporal afflictions (plague, famine and war) in

¹Unlike many of the types of sermons discussed in this thesis, the category Jeremiad has not been taken from contemporary usage, but from present critical debate. The term 'Jeremiad' was not used in the seventeenth-century to describe these sermons, nor do they define a type of sermon that fits this description. (The OED gives 1780 as the earliest use of the word.) Sacvan Bercovitch notes that 'New England Puritans' sometimes referred to this genre as 'the political sermon' but cites no example: Bercovitch, The American Jeremiad (1978), p. xv. The present writer has not found this usage in earlier English preaching. It is clear that Perry Miller identified the 'New England Jeremiad' as it is currently understood: The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (1939; repr. 1954), p. 472. Michael McGiffert has paid close attention to the popularity of the Book of Hosea for similar purposes in Jacobean England and so has added the 'Hosead' to the list of sermon categories: Michael McGiffert, 'God's Controversy with Jacobean England', The American Historical Review, 88 (1983). Patrick Collinson has emphasised the important of the preacher's use of Old Testament prophetic models and so uses the term 'prophetic sermons', a looser but more accurate title: 'The Protestant Nation', in The Birthpangs of Protestant England (1988). In a more recent article, he has suggested the use of 'Paul's Cross prophecy' to describe these sermons, a term adopted by Alexandra Walsham in her very full study of Paul's Cross providential preaching: Patrick Collinson, 'Biblical Rhetoric', in Religious Culture in Renaissance England, eds McEachern and Shuger (1997), p. 27; Alexandra Walsham, 'Aspects of Providentialism in Early Modern England', (University of Cambridge Ph. D., 1994), pp. 239-279. Because this chapter will attempt to identify the rhetorical aims of these sermons, the term 'prophetic sermon', the least prescriptive of the current terms, will be used.
ways that suited the political and ideological needs of their hearers. It has also been argued that the 'national morality' sermon could lead to divisions within a national Church. God provided peace, plenty and preachers for the godly, but they were enjoyed by all members of the institutional Church. So too the godly would suffer the punishments meted out to the whole nation if God lost patience with England's sinners, unless he chose to 'ship away' his 'Noahs' to New England, as Thomas Hooker suspected he would. The emphasis placed on this theme from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the outbreak of the Civil War made a united address of the Jeremiad's theme to a truly national Church less and less possible.

The weight of interpretation on these sermons is, therefore, very considerable and the interpretative span within which the argument is generally conducted spreads over a century (from England's Marian Exiles to New England's crisis over the 'Half-Way Covenant'). In this chapter, no such expansive argument will be attempted. Instead, some of the central features of the Jacobean prophetic sermon, as conducted at Paul's Cross, will be examined in detail in order to re-assess the interpretative basis on which the prophetic sermons' characteristic account of God's dealings with the nation rests. From this, it will be apparent whether current interpretations of the genre are firmly founded. This re-appraisal of the prophetic sermon will be confined strictly to the parameters of this thesis. The conclusions may not be relevant to sermons preached elsewhere before or after the Jacobean period. The method of rhetorical analysis used is applicable to other prophetic sermons, however, where it may produce similar results.

This chapter will concentrate its discussion on a prophetic sermon by the popular London preacher, Thomas Adams. It will be argued that Adams' choice of the

---

2Alexandra Walsham, 'Aspects of Providentialism', ch. 6. In her study of the pamphlets produced after the 'Fatal vespers' in Blackfriars, London, 1623, Walsham has shown how providential topoi were manipulated by both Catholic and Protestant writers to show how the accident showed God's providential care for either group: Alexandra Walsham, '“The Fatal Vesper”: Providentialism and Anti-Popery in Late Jacobean London', Past and Present, 144 (1994).


Edomites, a nation rejected by God and emphatically presented as such, as an example to his hearers argues that the comparison between the auditors at Paul's Cross and the original auditors of the prophets' warnings is much looser than has been thought. The later part of Adams' sermon, in which he applies the lesson of his text to individual repentance and conversion, will be shown to reveal a far simpler, catechetical concern in prophetic sermons than is often allowed by modern critics. In short, this chapter will argue that the prophetic sermon deals with nothing grander than the ordinary themes of 'law and Gospel', justice and mercy. Adams' sermon accuses his hearers of presumptuous security and warns them that they need to be roused from their sin and complacency. Prophetic sermons are a species of the 'reprehensive' or 'corrective' sermon, a genus in which the sins of the hearers are denounced. Correction also meant the exhortation of the hearers to repent and reform and consequently, it required the presentation of means and motives to these ends. The comparison between England and other nations thoroughly destroyed by an angry God provides strong motives for repentance. The examples of the ancient peoples punished in the Bible showed that no nation is at liberty to sin without risking divine affliction. The same providential justice by which God punishes wicked individuals dictated that he punished the nation that was sinful and that tolerated sin.

II

The prominence of prophetic sermons in the secondary literature on early modern preaching is due primarily to the writings of Perry Miller. In The New England Mind, Miller argued that New England settlers considered themselves sent by God to provide an example of pure religion to the Old World. They were to act, in the much quoted words of John Winthrop, as a 'Citty upon a Hill'. From the late sixteen sixties and seventies, however, preachers denounced the settlers' failure to live up to this task in sermons drawn almost exclusively from the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The most controversial aspect of Miller's thesis was his claim that New England saw itself as
bound to God by a 'national covenant', in which the nation was granted temporal
rewards or made suffer temporal punishments for its obedience or disobedience to God.
This idea was most fully explored in his later work, *Errand into the Wilderness*. In this
study, Miller describes the New Englanders as believing that God had given them an
'errand' to act as an example of Reformation to Europe. This idea acted as a means of
uniting the colonists to their 'mother country' in the early years of the colony. In
England, Cromwell's toleration of the sects and, later, the restoration of monarchy, along
with the antinomian crisis at home, made New England re-examine this 'errand'. The
conclusion they reached was announced by their preachers in Jeremiad after Jeremiad.
New England had lost its way and the colony would be punished for its failure to live up
to its exemplary calling. As Sacvan Bercovitch succinctly put it, Miller used the Jeremiad
as 'the proof text of his interpretation' of the New England experience. In a sense,
Bercovitch took up Miller's mantle, and in various articles and in his book-length study
of the Jeremiad, he both defended and modified Miller's interpretation of the New
Englander's *Weltanschauung*. For Bercovitch, however, the American Jeremiad is
inherently optimistic, because the Errand assumes a special relationship between the
people and God. Bercovitch argues that the 'errand' on which New Englanders were sent
was one of spiritual and social regeneration and that the Jeremiad was meant to spur on
New England by castigating its failures.

Miller's original theory and Bercovitch's revisions have, in turn, been
challenged. Theodore Dwight Bozeman interprets the Jeremiads as fundamentally
conservative and designed, not to encourage this-worldly reform, but to promote a
return to the piety of the first generation. Stephen Foster argues that the Jeremiad's
prevalence in New England can be explained by the immediate circumstances of the
controversy over the Half-Way Covenant and has dismissed some of the grander claims
made for the form. Foster also paid careful attention to the Old English context of

Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad*, p. 4, pp. 1-30, (esp. pp. 6-22). (See also David Minter, 'The
argument in Francis Bremer's *To Live Exemplary Lives: Puritans and Puritan Communities as Lofty
Puritan New England, an area previously neglected. Other writers have recently turned to the Jeremiads and Hoseads of Jacobean and Caroline England to find the origins of the 'New England Jeremiad'. In particular, Michael McGiffert has sought the origins of the 'national covenant', thought characteristic of New England Jeremiads, in the Hoseads of Jacobean England. As McGiffert's definition of the prophetic sermon pertains directly to some of the Jacobean texts discussed in this chapter, his definitions will be used as a starting point in reassessing the genus.

A prophetic sermon is usually understood as one in which the prophecies of the destruction and captivity of the Old Testament kingdoms of Israel and Judah, as described in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, are applied to the situation of the preacher's auditors. The example of Israel is thought to be applied to the English by the use of a simple analogy, which McGiffert has called the 'Israelite paradigm'. By a 'simple simile', the preacher compared God's dealings with the Israelites, in the mercies he granted them - giving them the law, protecting them from their enemies and so on - and in his punishments of their failures to live up to the covenantal agreement between them, to God's dealings with England and England's ingratitude. Both nations were found to be blessed by God and both were found to have been ungrateful and sinful in return. God punished the Israelites with plagues and famines, just as England periodically suffered from plague and harvest failure for its sins. The Israelite nation was twice sent into exile and ultimately destroyed. If the analogy of God's dealings with Israel and England is to stand - and God never changes - then the English can expect a similar judgement, unless they repent. McGiffert writes:

It took no theological profundity to make or grasp the argument from the paradigm: England in this simple simile was like Israel in being God's most favored nation, in superiority of spiritual and temporal goods, and accordingly in magnitude of debt. The mode of payment of the debt was set by the Judaic moral law: the paradigm enjoined a rule-based morality and a law-abiding piety. Shortcomings would be penalized by afflictions proportioned to the default and

6Michael McGiffert, 'God's Controversy with Jacobean England' and 'Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism', Harvard Theological Review, 75 (1982). Although McGiffert has added to a neglected area in the literature, his argument has been seriously challenged (see below). The development of covenant theology, an extremely complex branch of Reformation theology, has been charted by David A. Weir, The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought (1990).
dealt to the nation generally. The ultimate sanction was the doom of Lo-Ammi — not my people. To stay in God's grace, the nation must sent to the school of the law to learn the three R's of practical divinity: repent, reform, return.

From the simile flowed an equally simple syllogism: God dealt so with Israel; we are like Israel: God does and will deal so, or very like, with us.  

This clearly is the basis of the prophetic sermons, but it is also a simplification. The analogy with Israel would seem to be the defining feature of the prophetic sermon, because the comparison with England rests on the 'most favored nation' status shared by both nation, demonstrated by God's actions towards these nations. Yet many prophetic sermons, as will be shown, use exactly the same argument about England's sins based on a comparison with a nation that God did not choose. Like much of the writing on prophetic sermons, McGiffert's account has here stretched the 'simple simile' beyond its interpretative limits. In what follows, two aspects of the 'Israelite paradigm' will be questioned. Is the analogy by which the comparison is made a 'simple simile'? If so, has that simile been interpreted correctly?

McGiffert's argument about the expression of a Jacobean theory of a 'national covenant' in these sermons rests on his interpretation of the 'Israelite paradigm' he has described. Although his theory has been much criticised, critics have not fully accounted for its failure and for the propensity of prophetic sermons to give rise to such interpretations. McGiffert claims that English preachers thought England like Israel in its unique position as God's favoured nation and provided many comparisons to show the similarities in God's dealings with both nations. The 'simple simile' was, in effect, that England was like Israel in that both were nations especially chosen by God for his providential care and protection and that this could by proved by historical comparisons. Under criticism, McGiffert has admitted that preachers do not speak of England as specially chosen as a nation. In a communication to the American Historical Review answering criticisms voiced by Richard Greaves, McGiffert agreed that he exaggerated the 'special relationship' with God posited by English preachers. He accepts that his interpretation of a key passage in John Downname's Lectures upon the Four First Chapters of Hosea was incorrect. Downname does not consider the message of Hosea as

addressed to the English nation but to all members of the invisible church. There is no mention of a 'covenant of works' for the gentiles, a covenant that McGiffert had earlier claimed was applied to the reprobate members of the English community by Downname. He still maintains, however, that 'the paradigm did in fact elevate England as God's most favoured and therefore most obligated modern nation'.

McGiffert had argued from his interpretation of Downname's Lectures on Hosea that preachers used the 'national covenant' as a means of explaining the special relationship between God and England. The 'national covenant', first connected with Jeremiads by Perry Miller, is an agreement between God and a nation (of saints and sinners mixed). Like the Covenant of Works made between God and man before the Fall, it promised temporal prosperity and functioned on a strictly quid pro quo basis - if man obeys God's commandments, he would live in perfect happiness. With the Fall, the Covenant of Works became impossible for man to fulfil and, like the Mosaic law with which it was identified, served only to condemn. The Covenant of Grace, promised the Patriarchs and fulfilled by Christ's sacrifice, releases man from the obligations of the Law. But the Covenant of Grace is made only with God's elect. The 'national covenant', it is argued, applied the Covenant of Works to the corporate sphere of the political community and left the New Dispensation of grace the preserve of God's chosen. Reprobate English men and women were promised temporal comforts in exchange for obedience under the Covenant of Works, while the elect were promised eternal life under the Covenant of Grace. Through these twin covenants, preachers could promise and threaten their mixed congregations. That a 'special relationship' was thought to exist with God is the only reason for supposing that a 'national covenant' is referred to in

---

8American Historical Review, 89 (1984), 1217-1218. It is difficult to see how McGiffert's argument can stand at all once the re-interpretation of Downname is taken into account. God's 'special, though not exclusive bond' with England can more easily be explained in rhetorical rather than theological terms. It provides an exaggerated account of England's indebtedness as a spur to repentance. As John McKenna has shown, there were many political reasons why God might be called English: 'How God became an Englishman', in Tudor Rule and Revolution, eds. Guth and McKenna (1982), pp. 25-43. Immanuel Bourne, The rainebow (1617), sig. 12r-14r, pp. 59-63. Bourne's distinction between temporal and eternal covenants, with the promise to Noah as the 'sign' of the temporal covenant is very similar to the account of covenant theology given by Wolfgang Musculus: Common places of christian religion (1563), sigs. P6v-Q1r, ff. 120v-121r.

these sermons. The word 'covenant', however, does not occur as a common expression in Paul's Cross prophetic sermons. The only instance of its use noted by this writer is in Immanuel Bourne's The Rainbow and this example contradicts McGiffert's analysis. Bourne explains that God made two covenants with creation, one temporal and one spiritual. The spiritual covenant was the Covenant of Works in the Garden of Eden but became the Covenant of Grace with the announcement of Christ's coming in the Protoevangelion (Genesis 3.15). The temporal covenant is a promise of preservation made with all living creatures on the earth. Bourne's temporal covenant and the Covenant of Works cannot be conflated and so they cannot be made agree with the 'national covenant' described in modern criticism of the Jeremiad.

Critics of McGiffert, most notably Theodore Bozeman, have also questioned the sharp disjunction he makes between Jacobean thinking on God's covenants with the individual and the community. Bozeman has convincingly shown that the 'transit from the individual ... to the corporate plane ... was a Presbyterian commonplace, a basic reflex of thought', so God could 'endow an entire folk, in its capacity as a church, with a saving compact'.10 Patrick Collinson has supported Bozeman's recognition of the looseness with which these topics were dealt in the seventeenth century. He writes:

Just as 'country' could mean a number of things in early Stuart public rhetoric, so these preachers moved imperceptibly between their address to the individual, to the Church, to the nation, and to covenanted groups and remnants within both Church and nation. In principle, the entire baptized nation (and other Christian nations) stood covenanted in the same way, by the same gracious bond, as the individual is bound.11

Both Bozeman and Collinson have mentioned the importance of the visible Church as a corporation encompassing the nation's saints and sinners that was nonetheless bound to God by a saving compact. Bozeman in particular (p. 400) gives an example from Thomas Cartwright in which Church, nation and individual are included in a discussion of God's saving covenant. But McGiffert's work has shown that God's dealings with the

---

11 Patrick Collinson, 'Biblical Rhetoric', p. 27.
elect cannot be used to explain his dealing with a 'mixed' community of saints and sinners, which he may abandon for its sins. God threatened to abandon the Israelites in the Book of Hosea, chapter four. The history of the Jewish people in the first century A.D. showed that God did exclude them from his temporal protection and his New Covenant. So too, the Church of Ephesus was threatened with the loss of its 'candlestick' (the light of the Gospel) in Revelations 2.5, which showed that even a visible church was not bound eternally to God. Yet the Israelites do represent the Church, because God's declared his salvific plan through his covenantal promise to be their god (Genesis 9). Their history represented the history of God's invisible Church, from its wanderings in the desert of the world to the arrival at the Promised Land and the New Jerusalem. The Israelites are, in short, the source of examples for God's behaviour towards his elect, his Church and his national, visible Churches. But it is clear that the examples provided by the biblical history of the Israelites cannot all be read to refer to all of these groups simultaneously. At the root of critical disagreement over Jacobean understanding of the nature of the nation's relation with God is a failure to distinguish between different sorts of comparisons. Critics have failed to distinguish between Israel as a type of the invisible Church and Israel as an example of a sinful people, or national, visible church.

From very early in the Christian tradition, certain actions of the Israelites have been read as types fulfilled by the Christian church. Crossing the Red Sea, for example, was a type of baptism. So too, the Passover was a type of the 'New Covenant' made on Holy Thursday and perfected on Good Friday. So Israel is both a type of the individual Christian's pilgrimage and of the militant Church's wanderings on

---

12 Sampson Price preached a Paul's Cross sermon on this text and its threat of a 'famine of the word' and printed it as Ephesus warning before her woe (1616).
13 Few historians of the Jeremiads had used the word type to describe this comparison, but they are clearly reading it in this way. On the strength of these studies, Barbara Lewalski has included the 'Israelite paradigm' among the types used by seventeenth-century preachers. She writes that the comparisons are 'more than analogies' but 'genuine recapitulations in the domain of God's Providence, wherein he deals with his new Israel as he did with the old'. Although Lewalski's work on the use of types in the Reformation and seventeenth century is extremely lucid, the rather loose use of the word 'type' to describe these comparisons is unhelpful. Even if these comparisons are 'genuine recapitulations' in history, they are not types, as Lewalski's own definition (quoted below) shows. Types of the New Dispensation (the Church) do not find their fulfilment in a single nation, even one included in the New Dispensation and no preacher could make this claim, even for polemic reasons, without suggesting that God's elect were only in England: Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric (1979), p. 131.
earth, hence the 'reflex of thought' between individual and Church in early-modern reference to biblical Israel. *Types* are not ordinary similitudes and are not ordinary rhetorical figures. A *type* is an event in history designed by God to refer to something in the future. It is not a comparison made with hindsight, but a comparison planned by the Creator in advance and recognised after its fulfilment. Barbara Lewalski defines typology as follows:

Typology ... was recognised as a mode of signification in which both type and antitype are historically real entities with independent meaning and validity, forming patterns of prefiguration, recapitulation, and fulfilment by reason of God's providential control of history. In precise terms, typology pertains to Old Testament events, personages, ceremonies, and objects seen to foreshadow and to be fulfilled, *forma perfectior*, in Christ and the New Dispensation. 14

If Israel is sometimes a *type* of the Church, in its eternal aspect as a community of the elect, then it is so because God planned the correspondance. In general, *types* only have Christ or the invisible Church as their *antitype* because these are the instruments of God's providential plan. Typology is closely associated with the prophecies of the Bible because the *antitype* 'recapitulates' (that is, repeats and fulfils) God's promise made in the *type*. As the end of the world promises victory to the invisible Church, the recapitulations of God's promises to his Church are slowly being fulfilled. Nonetheless, it is always the case that the *types* of the Church, and the promises made through those *types*, are subscribed by the canon of Scripture. 15 In his monumental study of the literary aspects of biblical study, Matthias Flacius Illyricus defined a *type* as follows:

Typus, sunt vel actiones, vel res aut etiam personae, quae olim ad hoc ipsum à Deo propositae sunt, ut futura quaedam depingat. ut, Agnus Paschalis, Summus sacerdos, Tabernaculum, Serpens suspensus, & similia innumera exprimunt Christum: euctio populi ex Aegypto, redemptionem generis humani: vagatio per desertum, vitam Christianum in hoc Mundo. 16

---

15On biblical typology, see R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (1959); Jean Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality* (1960). On typology as 'recapitulation', in the sense both of 'summing up' and of 'repetition' see K.J. Woolcombe, 'The Biblical and Patristic Development of Typology', in *Essays in Typology* by G.W.H. Lampe and K.L. Woolcombe (1957), pp. 42-49. Even in the middle ages, when exegetes employed typology extensively, making 'almost any person or place, animal or object' in the Old Testament a *type*, *antitypes* were still confined to Christ, the Church and the BVM: Robert B. Burlin, *The Old English Advent* (1968), pp. 17-22.
16Types are actions or things or even persons, which have been set forth by God at some point in the past, so that besides these things themselves, He might depict some things that have yet to be, such as the Paschal Lamb, the High Priest, the Tabernacle, the raised serpent, and innumerable other similes express Christ: the exodus of the people from Egypt, the redemption of the human race; the wandering through the wilderness, the life of the Christian in this world: Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Clavis*
Of the types of Christ given by Flacius here, it is noteworthy that three of the four are interpreted as such in the New Testament itself (Christ is described as the Lamb of God in John 1.36, as a high priest in Hebrews 5 and as the serpent raised in the wilderness in John 3.14). Two eminent ecclesiastical historians, Jean Danielou and R.P.C. Hanson, have shown how early in the Church's history these typological interpretations were established and how soon the number of types were fixed. Hanson writes:

It is clear then that there existed in the early Christian Church a corpus, more or less definitely limited, of types taken from the Old Testament and used for illuminating the Christian gospel; this corpus must have been in large part inherited from Jewish liturgical forms, though it would necessarily have been added to and modified to meet the needs of preaching the gospel of the Christian church. Further, Christian typology must have had from the beginning a peculiar character of its own, in that it was a fulfilled typology, that is to say, it saw each of the Old Testament types as ultimately no more than prophecies or pointers to the reality which had taken place in the Christian dispensation.¹⁷

That types were fixed and limited at an early period, and that these types are fulfilled, that is, they find their antitypes within scriptural events or prophecies, means that a typical relation could not be created by an exegete or preacher. Richard Bernard includes 'typical places' among the comparisons and similitudes from which 'doctrines' may be drawn, but he places them in a distinct category and gives only their well-established interpretations. John Wilkins gives several examples of types, but includes for each the New Testament reference that established its transferred sense:

So those place concerning the Brasen Serpent, Numb. 21.9. John. 3.14. Jonah in the Whales belly, Jonah 1.17. Mat. 12.40. Abrahams two wives and sonnes, Sarah and Isaac, Hagar and Ishmaell, Gen. 21. Galat. 4.22. The law concerning the muzleing the Oxe that treats out the come, Deut. 25.4. 1 Cor. 9.9. In all which there is some typicall allusion primarily intended.¹⁸

Israel acts as a type of the invisible Church only in some of its actions and it was as a

---

¹⁷R.P.C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 67. Jean Danielou gives a detailed account of the use of particular events - the Exodus and crossing of the Red Sea - as types in the evangelists and the early Fathers: From Shadows to Reality, pp. 153-226. Hanson, who approaches this topic from the Protestant viewpoint, disagrees with Danielou's claim that the evidence for such early agreement about typology shows them to be a manifestation of the Church's unwritten tradition. Instead, he seeks the origins of Christian typology in Rabbinical exegesis. Both writers agree, however, that the types used in the Christian church were agreed upon very early in the Church's history.

type of the Church that Israel was covenanted to God on Sinai. No other nation can
claim 'most favoured nation' status on the same basis unless that nation is prepared to
suggest that it is comprised solely of God's elect, which is clearly a claim no preacher
could make.19

That Israel contained some not marked out for salvation (the sons of
Abraham 'according to the flesh', Galatians 4) does not prevent its acting as a type of the
Church, for types do not have to display one-to-one correspondences. (The points of
correspondence between Christ and paschal lamb or the fiery serpent are few indeed).
The fact that the Israelite nation is a 'mixed' community of elect and reprobate does,
however, cause endless problems for modern critics who miss the complexities of
seventeenth-century preachers' interpretation of 'Israel'. Miller, McGiffert and others
have made the 'simple simile' between England and Israel much more than that: they
have stretched the comparison into a one-to-one correspondence, so that every aspect of God's compact with the
English nation, so that both must be covenanted to God and both must be marked out as
a 'chosen people'. They have stretched the comparison into a one-to-one correspondence, so that every aspect of God's compact with the Israelites, be it typical or
exemplary, is applied to England. If 'England' and 'Israel' were simply equated by
Jacobean preachers, then 'England' would signify the invisible church, the individual
Christian and the visible church and nation. This would create only confusion; as indeed
it has among critics. The 'Israelite paradigm' used by Jacobean preachers for God's
dealing with England is just that: an example of God's dealing with one people as a
people. The typical signification of Israel is used by preachers only when they speak of
the visible Church, some of whose members are English. In prophetic sermons, however,
Israel is compared to England by an exemplum, or example, a far looser form of

19The claim, by William Haller, that John Foxe thought that the English were the elect nation has been
refuted thoroughly by several scholars: William Haller, Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation
(1963); Richard Bauckham, Tudor Apocalypse (1978), pp. 12-13, 177-180. Katherine R. Firth, The
Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645 (1979), pp. 106-110; V. Norskov Olsen, John
Foxe and the Elizabethan Church (1973), pp. 40-48; Patrick Collinson, 'Truth and Legend: the Veracity of
John Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in Clio's Mirror, eds Duke and Tamse (1985), pp. 31-54. Elsewhere,
Patrick Collinson has clearly shown that this use of the definite article (the elect nation) effectively
implies that preachers excluded other nations from God's redemptive plan, rather than merely including
comparison with obvious exhortatory uses. Flacius Illyricus described the *example* as follows:

Exemplum est plerunque, cum alienum aliquod factum aut dictum casusve nostro simile aut dissimile proponitur, aut alioqui aliquid alici nostre Regulae descriptioni aut ideae correspondens, quo id illustratur. Sic Christus productit pro exemplo inconstantiae in vera pietate uxorem Loth. Lucae 17 & Iacobus Heliam, ut declaret efficaciam precum.20

*Examples* are usually treated as rhetorical proofs and consequently, as means of persuasion.21 In preaching rhetoric, biblical *examples* were treated as a means of applying a scriptural text to the hearers. John Wilkins writes that an *example* 'hath the force of a rule, All of them being written for our learning'. Niels Hemmingsen encouraged the use of *examples* from the Bible and 'true historie' because by these the preacher 'may not onely teach the hearers true godlines, but also the forme of living according to their kynde of calling'. Thomas Wilson writes that 'the historye of Goddes boke to the christian is infallible' and so 'the rehearsall of such good thinges as are therin conteyned,' will 'move the faithfull to all upright doinge and amendmente of their lyfe'.22 *Examples* were among the *motives of exhortation*, that is, the arguments to be deployed in stirring up the hearers to amend their ways. Critics rarely point out how often modern and non-biblical examples are used in prophetic sermons. For example, in *The lands mourning for vaine swearing*, Abraham Gibson discusses recent providential punishments of oath-swearers and cites the severe punishments for swearing administered by a variety of ancient peoples. Richard Bernard includes *examples* of God's punishment as an important means of reproving sin under the 'use of

---

20 The example is, in most cases, when some deed or word or state of affairs is set forth like or unlike to our own, or otherwise anything corresponding to some description or form of our rule by which it is illustrated. So Christ brings up Lots wife as an example of inconstancy in true piety (Luke 17) and James [used] Elijah, so that he could declare the efficacy of prayer: Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Clavis Scripturae*, sig. 206r, col. 334.

21Cicero treats the *example* as a 'topic' of argument by which the audience are persuaded: *De Inventione*, I.xxx.49, trans. H.M. Hubbell (1949; repr. 1993) pp. 88-91. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* describes the *example* as a *figure of thought* by which an argument is made more plausible: *Rhetorica ad H erennium*, IV.xlix.62 trans. H. Caplan (1954; repr. 1989), pp. 382-25. Quintilian's definition of the *example* as a type of artificial proof (along with argument and indications) proved most influential: *Institutio Oratoria*, V.ix.1, trans, H.E. Butler (1920-22; repr. 1966-69), vol. II, pp. 194-5.

22John Wilkins, *Ecclesiastes*, sig. C2r, p. 15; Niels Hemmingsen, *The Preacher* (1574), sig. D4v, f. 20v. Not every incident in the Bible was meant to be exemplary, of course, and both Wilkins and Hemmingsen warned against the 'private' and 'extraordinary' actions of biblical characters being used as *examples*. Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553), sig. 2C1v, f. 101v. The persuasive power of *examples* is also insisted on by Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (1593), sig. C1v-C3r, pp. 186-189.
Reprehension'. That any instance of divine punishment can function as an example is clear from the advice he offers:

_Ninethly_, the punishments inflicted immediately by God or by his law commanding to be inflicted the punishment appointed by the laws of the Land, by the Ecclesiasticall lawes, yea, and the punishment thereof among the Heathen. And heerewin to bring in the examples of punishment inflicted by God and by men, either in Scriptures, or in true stories, or instances at home by observation, or knowne to us by faithfull relation. Heere presse eternall punishment in _Heb1.23_.

In summary, seventeenth-century preachers do not compare England to Israel by the 'simple simile' that both are God's 'most favoured nations', but by the simple simile that both have sinned against God's law and will be punished. It is in the actions, not the persons, that the comparison is made, and it is sustained throughout these sermons on the level of an example only, not a type. When Thomas Adams wrote that England and Israel are 'right Parallels', it is patently a misinterpretation to read this as an identification of England with Israel, as Adams qualifies this statement by showing the two 'fit in Theologickal comparison'. They are not the same; yet both are set on a parallel course of disobedience and sinfulness. The warning of the 'Israelite paradigm' is that unless England breaks off in a new direction, it will suffer the destruction visited on Israel and Jerusalem.

That sinful actions, rather than covenantal promises, are the basis of the comparison in the 'Israelite paradigm' is seem from the frequent substitution of other, unchosen nations in the paradigm in place of Israel. It is an essential part of the debate over the Jeremiad that Israel's status as God's chosen people makes it uniquely suitable as an example to Christian churches. After all, God's blessings of the Israelites with peace and prosperity is an essential component of the covenantal reading comparing these prophecies to England. A review of prophetic preaching at Paul's Cross clearly shows that any nation or city could be used as the basis for a 'prophetic' appeal for repentance according to the same commonplaces used in the 'Israelite paradigm'. As McGiffert recounts, one of the most popular alternatives to Israel as an example of God's

---

23Richard Bernard, _The faithfull shepheard_ (1621), sig. P2r-v, p. 311-2; Abraham Gibson, _The land mourning for vaine swearing_ (1613), sigs. F4v-F5r, pp. 72-3.
24_England's Sicknesse_, sig. 2C1v, p. 302.
threatening a sinful people was Nineveh. The Ninevites, as proselytes, cannot claim to be a nation covenanted to God as the Israelites were. Yet the comparison with Nineveh's sins is frequently made by preachers. The destruction of the Old Testament cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 19) and the plagues of Egypt (Exodus 7-11) all provided examples of the punishment meted out to sinners by an angry God.

Likewise, the second chapter of Revelations sent a chilling warning to the new Christian churches that seventeenth-century preachers could show to have been realised: the seven churches so warned had all paid for their failure to amend and were lost to Turks and Infidels. Even more recently, the Thirty Years War threatened to return all of Germany to papal domination. The fall of any nation or city can teach England the danger of sinning. All these themes are brought together by John Hoskins in an undated Paul's Cross sermon on Isaiah 28.1, where he writes:

When such things are at their highest pitch, dreame not of stabilitie, which had wee rather, learne at the charge, and by the stripes of others a farre off, or that the Lord should come, and bring the doctrine of destruction to our doores? I know your answere. Understand then, that Egypt and all Asia now in servitude, many great cities and mightie Kingdoms made habitations for Dragons, & Courts for Ostriges, and the fairest flowers of all histories trampled under feet, may teach England to forsake her surfetting.

In summary, therefore, it is not Israel's chosenness but her sinfulness, especially her ingratitude in prosperity, that is the basis of the comparison with England.

---

25 Michael McGiffert, 'God's Controversy with Jacobean England', pp. 1155-1156; Alexandra Walsham has shown the popularity of the Ninevite example, as seen in the ballad The repentance of Nineve that great cite and Lodge's and Greene's A looking glasse for London and England: 'Aspects of Providentialism', pp. 267-271. Patrick Collinson has referred to a Lutheran preacher who used the example of Nineveh to show that God would have all men saved: Patrick Collinson, 'Protestant Nation', p. 22. This does suggest that the Ninevites had an ambiguous status, because they were proselytes.

26 Nathanael Cannon, The cryer (1613), sig. C1r, p. 9; Thomas Jackson, London's new-yeeres gift (1609), sig. E4v, f. 16v. The advantage in using Nineveh as an example is, of course, because the city was saved by the people's timely repentance.

27 Thomas Barnes, The wise-mans forecast against the evill time (1624), sig. C1r, p. 9; Sampson Price, Ephesus warning before her woe (1616), sig. Bv, p. 2; Thomas Sutton, England's Summons (1616), sig. C6v, p. 32, E1r, p. 53. Robert Milles compares the 'crying sins' of Sodom (pride, idleness and greed) with those England finds them equal, although he shies away from making explicit the analogy between the two: Robert Milles, Abrahams suite for Sodome (1612), sigs. C3r-D7v.

28 Thomas Jackson, London's new-yeeres gift, sig. E4v, f. 16v; John Jones, London looking backe to Jerusalem (1633), sig. D2v, p. 28; Thomas Sutton, Englands Summons, sigs. E1v-E2r, pp. 54-55. Sampson Price preached two prophetic sermons at Paul's Cross on the second chapter of Revelations, that make the same comparison between England and the 'backsliding' Ephesians and the lukewarm Laodiceans as is made between England and Israel in Jeremiads and Hoseads: Sampson Price, Ephesus warning before her woe; London's warning by Laodicea's luke-warmnesse (1613).

29 Thomas Barnes, The wise-mans forecast, sig. C1v, p. 10.

30 John Hoskins, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse (1615), sig. I4r-v, pp. 63-63. The same argument is urged by Thomas Barnes, The wise-mans forecast, sigs. C4v-D1r, pp. 16-17.
used in prophetic sermons. Israel is the most common example used because Israel afforded the greatest range of examples. Having been given God's law there were more ways for them to offend: where much is give, much is expected in return. Any nation can be temporarily blessed by God, be it heathen or holy, and any nation can be punished for its sins, because no people has a licence to sin with impunity. Again and again, preachers emphasise these truisms, as they gave force to the examples. So too, they employ a strictly providential reading of human history. Although God works through secondary causes, his justice is unfailing. Preachers constantly urged that the cause of a nation's afflictions is its sins.

England's blessings, so constantly rehearsed in these sermons, do not, therefore, prove England's chosenness. Babylon, Tyre, Nineveh and Sodom had all enjoyed peace and prosperous trade and had all been punished by an angry God for their ingratitude. The paradigmatic basis of prophetic preaching does not, therefore, argue that a special status was awarded to Jacobean England by her preachers. Her blessings, in being greater than those of many contemporary nations, merely argued the gravity of her sins and made more imminent the threat of judgement hanging over her. Critics have clearly seen, and given varying degrees of attention to, the fact that the stated aim of the preachers is to provoke repentance. If we examine the commonplaces of the prophetic sermon in this light, a simpler explanation for the use of biblical examples can be found.

31 In what is probably the most cogent article on English prophetic preaching, Joy Shakespeare shows how the example of Israel's ingratitude was used by the Marian exiles to explain the reversal in the fortunes of the Reformation and, following Elizabeth's accession, as an exemplary warning of what would be the result of any future apostasy: 'Plague and Punishment', in Protestantism and the National Church, eds Lake and Dowling (1987).

32 Lancelot Dawes, Gods mercies and Jerusalems miseries (1609), sig. C6r; William Hampton, A proclamation of warre from the lord of hosts (1627), sgs. B3r-v, pp. 7-8; John Jones, London looking back to Jerusalem, sgs. B3r-v, pp. 13-14; Thomas Sutton, Englands Summons, sig. D7r, p. 49.


34 The extent of England's blessings is almost a standard formula in these sermons: Immanuel Bourne, The rainbow, sgs. G2r-v, pp. 43-4; William Hampton, A proclamation of warre, sgs. B4r-C1r, pp. 9-11; Thomas Sutton, Englands Summons, sgs. E2v-E3r, pp. 56-7. That these blessings equal those of Israel and excel most other nations (especially those convulsed by the Civil Wars or the Thirty Years War) is also often asserted: Thomas Fuller, A sermon intended for Paul's Crosse Upon the late Decrease of the Plague (1626), sgs. E4v-F1r, pp. 32-3; John Jones, London looking backe to Jerusalem, sig. E3v, p. 38. So too, London's particular advantages are often listed: see John Hoskins, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse (on Isaiah 28.1), sgs. K1v-K2r, pp. 66-7.
The characteristic emphasis on repentance found in prophetic preaching can best be recovered through a detailed analysis of a single prophetic sermon. Therefore, the rest of this chapter will be devoted to a close reading of Thomas Adams' *The Gallant's Burden*. By following the structure of the sermon and the relative emphasis given to the themes presented, we can reach a better understanding of the uses to which the *commonplaces* of prophetic preaching were put. From this perspective, the rhetorical function played by the biblical *example* used becomes clear.

*The Gallant's Burden*,

preached on the twenty-ninth of March, 1612, was the first of five sermons Thomas Adams delivered at Paul's Cross. Although Adams is known primarily as a popular London preacher, he did not begin his ministry there and was vicar at Willington in Bedfordshire at the time of this sermon's delivery. He may have been anxious to use the opportunity afforded by such public sermons to gain patronage, as *The Gallant's Burden* was entered in the Stationer's Register on May 1, 1612, only five weeks after it was preached. By 1619, Adams had been promoted to rector of St. Bennet's, Paul's Wharf, where he remained, despite sequestration in 1642, until his death in 1652. Adams is a writer whose preaching skills and popularity are increasingly being recognised by modern critics. Horton Davies writes that 'no other preacher can rival Donne for popularity or rhetorical gifts'. Since the nineteenth century, Adams has been rather quaintly titled the

---

35 *The Gallant's Burden* proved very popular. Three quarto editions were published, in 1612, 1614 and 1616 and Adams placed the sermon first in his *Works* of 1629/30. All quotations from Thomas Adams are from the 1629/30 edition of his *Works* (T. Harper f. J. Grismond).

36 Adams' first post was the perpetual curacy in Northill, Bedfordshire (1604-1611) and he was the first known graduate to hold the post: 'Elizabethan Churchwardens Accounts' eds Rev. J.E. Farmiloe and Rosita Nixseaman, *Publication of the Bedford Historical Records Society*, 33 (1953), p. ix. Sometime between 1610 and 1612, he became vicar of Willington in Bedfordshire and in 1614, vicar of Wingrave in Buckinghamshire, a benefice he kept until 1636. He was lecturer in St Gregory's-under-St. Paul's from 1618 until 1623 (*DNB, Alumni Cantabrigienses*). Adams' next Paul's Cross sermon, *The White Devil*, was preached on March 7, 1612 and entered on April 28, just two months later. Although he continued to publish regularly up to 1619, his works were not usually entered with such speed. On Adams' career, see Vincent Cabell Flanagan 'A Survey of the Life and Works of Thomas Adams' (University of Pennsylvania Ph.D., 1954), pp. 37-78.


'Prose Shakespeare of Puritan Theologians', but his life and writings, especially his literary borrowings from Donne and Hall, clearly show that he was, broadly speaking, more 'conformable Calvinist' than Puritan.  

The text Adams chose for his first oration at Paul's Cross was an enigmatic one from the book of Isaiah 21, verses 11 and 12, ('The burden of Dumah. He calls unto me out of Seir, watchman, what was in the night? Watchman, what was in the night? The Watchman said, The morning cometh and also the night: if ye will ask, inquire, return and come'). Although there was little agreement on the exact meaning of the passage, the themes of impending calamity, scorn and repentance, which Adams combines from various interpretations, were all prominent in the common explications available. A threat of calamity is the interpretation of the passage given in the Geneva Bible, which glosses the line 'the morning cometh' with the explanation that the prophet 'describeth the unquietnes of the people of Duma, who were night and day in feare of their enemies, and ever ran to and fro to enquire newes.' The theme of repentance and the figure of the Edomite are prominent in the Authorised Version's description of these verses as 'Edom, scorning the Prophet, is moved to repentance.' The relevance of the verses for penitential purposes was, therefore, well known, and made it suitable for a Lenten sermon.

---

39 On the origins of this comment, attributed to Robert Southey by Grosart in his entry on Adams in the DNB, see Flanagan ‘A Survey of the Life and Works of Thomas Adams’, pp. 17-20. Horton Davies includes Adams among the ‘Calvinist’ metaphysical preachers like Joseph Hall: Like Angels from a Cloud, pp. 45-88; on Adams in particular, see pp. 174-180. Chapter four of this thesis has questioned the wisdom of classifying clergyman according to perceived stylistic similarities and Adams’ inclusion in the study of metaphysical preachers, with such unlikely companions as Lancelot Andrewes and Archbishop Laud, exemplifies the difficulties with this method. Adams’ style is far more individualistic than that of most of the preachers studied in this thesis, with the obvious exception of John Donne. Yet his style is the product of a rather concentrated use of several figures (many of them associated with Euphuistic prose) commonly used, though to a lesser degree, by other preachers. Adams makes frequent use of alliteration, proverbs and elaborate similes (particularly drawing on ‘unnatural natural history’). He also makes frequent use of ‘figures of sound’ and particularly paronom (balancing clauses which have the same sound pattern), which he often intensifies by alliteration. On Adam’s prose style, see Flanagan, ‘A Study of the Life and Works of Thomas Adams’, pp. 233-268; on Adams’ borrowings from Hall and Donne, pp. 284-320. On the characteristics of Euphuistic prose, G.K. Hunter, John Lyly: the humanist as courtier (1962), pp. 257-297.


41 Only two other seventeenth-century printed sermons on this text have been located: Richard Love’s The Watchman’s Watchword (1642) and John Shower’s An Exhortation to Repentance and Union among Protestants, or A Discourse upon the Burden of Dumah (1688). Adams’ Latin tag Quo brevior, eo obscurior, seems to follow Calvin’s description of the text as ‘so much the more obscure, by reason of the briefnesse of it’ (A commentary upon the prophecie of Isaiah. translated ...C[lent] C[otton] (1609), sig. T2r, p. 207.

42 Millar MacLure writes that ‘Lenten sermons were important’ at Paul’s Cross, ‘and prominent
passage, John Downname gives a full account of both these interpretations:

Some suppose these words to be the Dumeans, who, in regard of the great dangers and fears they were in, having set a watchman to keep sentinel, night and day; as vers. 8. were ever and anon, calling on him, to tell them whether he descried ought, or no, whereby they might be endangered. ... yet, there are not a few, who understand them, as spoken, either by the Dumeans, or Idumeans, to the prophet Esay himself; and that either in scoffing manner, by way of derision, as if they had said, You Prophet, that profess your self to be a warder, and to watch for the good of your people, What tidings have you for us? What say you to the calamities, that other of your fellow-Prophets, have so oft said should befal us? You threaten us with nights of affliction and heaviness; but we enjoy fair day-light of prosperity, peace and liberty.43

Adams too begins by giving this context for the passage he has chosen. Dumah stands 'betwixt Chaldea and Arabia', as verses 1-10, 'the burden of the desert of the sea' describes a vision of the fall of Babylon and verses 13-17, 'the burden upon Arabia' describes its fall. In this context, the 'burden of Dumah' must also represent a prophecy of calamity to come. In order to relate this theme to his audience, however, Adams needed to create an analogy between the situation so enigmatically described and that of his London auditors.

In the dedication to Sir William Gostwicke of the quarto edition of The Gallant's Burden, Adams introduces the main argument of the sermon. He claims that his primary aim is not to teach an audience already familiar with the tenets of Christianity but to rouse them from their complacency. As he states in the epistle dedicatory of the quarto edition, his audience's 'understanding' is better than their consciences:

There is some light in our Minds, little warmth in our Affections: So against Nature is it true in this, that the essential qualities of Fire, Light and heat are divided; and to say, whether our light of knowledge be more, or our heat of Devotion lesse, is beyond me.44

ecclesiastics preached there every Lent: The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642 (1958), p. 13. Peter McCullough has shown that Lent was the most important season for sermons at court, before and throughout Elizabeth's reign: Peter Eugene McCullough, 'The Sermon at the court of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603', (Princeton University Ph.D., 1992), pp. 14-16, 104-107. Of the nineteen Jacobean Paul's Cross sermon preached on prophetic texts only three can be identified as Lenten sermons. Accurate dates are not known for another three. The other thirteen are evenly spread through the year, so that the prophetic sermon cannot be closely identified with this season.

43John Downname, Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament (2nd ed., 1651), vol. 1, sig. 8Vlr. See also Matthew Poole, Annotations upon the Holy Bible (1683, 4th ed., 1700), sig. SZ4r.

44Thomas Adams, The Gallants Burden. A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse. the twentie nine of March, being the fift Sunday in Lent, 1612 (1612), sig. A2r.
Adams clearly assumes that his audience is already well catechised and lacking only the heat of devotion. Yet at the beginning of *The Gallant's Burden* he complains that the people's sins have turned the pulpit from a 'mercy-seat' to 'a tribunal or bench of judgment'. So wrapped up in sins are his hearers that Adams exclaims 'nothing but the thunders of Sinai, and scarce those, can waken us from our dead sleep'. Near the end of the sermon, he reassesses his congregation, and this time he polarises them as good or evil:

I know there are some *names in Sardi*, some that make Conscience of their wayes; the same aire is drawne by men of as contrary disposition, as is the opposition of the two Poles: that I may say of the lives of this City, as one doth of *Origen’s* writings, (*Ubi bene, nemo melius; ubi male, nemo pejus,* ) Those that are good, are exceeding good, and those that are evill are unmeasurably evill: nothing was ever so unlike itself (sig. B6r, p. 23)

This changing representation of the moral state of his hearers stems from Adams' evident assessment of his hearers as a 'mixed' auditory, that is, one in which both godly and backsliders, learned and ignorant are found. This is the type of congregation most commonly found in England, according to William Perkins and Richard Bernard.

Perkins described the approaches to be taken with a text's *application* in terms of the audience before whom it was delivered. He delineated seven types of auditories, from the ignorant and unteachable to the believers, the fallen and, lastly, the 'mingled people'. As the fallen were to be stirred up to contrition by having the harshness of God's law explained, so the believers and those merely 'fallen in manners' must have the rigours of the law commuted by the promises of Christ in the Gospel. The 'mixt people', Perkins says, 'are the assemblies of our Churches' and to these 'any doctrine may bee propounded, whether of the law or the Gospell' provided both teachings 'be made to those persons for whome it is convenient', that is, the Law to the unrepentant and the Gospel to the humbled. Likewise, Richard Bernard describes five types of hearers from the 'ignorant but willing to bee taught' to those who 'shew forth the fruits of sanctification' and advises that a 'mixt company, as our Congregations for the most part be' 'should be 'dealt withall everyway as in the former particulars hath been
declared'.

Bernard also provided an example of how such an audience should be addressed in The Shepheards Practice, an addition to the 1621 edition of The faithfull shepheard. This addition is of great importance to our understanding of prophetic preaching. The Shepheards Practice is itself a sermon, in which the prophet (the speaker) is presented as an example to the preacher of the way to teach a mixed congregation, showing 'the Law to the stubborne, to breake their hearts; and the Gospell to the repentant, to comfort their spirits'. The text for this sermon is Hosea 4.1 ('Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Israel; for the Lord hath a controversy with the Inhabitants of the Land; because there is no truth, no mercy, nor knowledge of God in the Land'). Hosea 4.1 is the text around which Michael McGiffert based his definition of the English Hosead, rightly pointing out the popularity of the text in the Jacobean period. Of the eight Jacobean Hoseads that McGiffert identified, three were preached at Paul's Cross and two of those, George Webbe's God's controversie with England (1609) and Thomas Sutton's England's Summons (1613) were preached on Hosea 4.1-3.

Bernard's 'use of instruction' from Hosea's example to his clerical readers is worth quoting at length:

That all the Ministers of Christ must learne this poynt of godly wisdome, thus to divide Gods word aright unto their Auditories; to preach mercy to whom mercy belongeth, and to denounce judgement freely against the rest. This course the very nature of the Word bindeth unto, if we consider the Law and the Gospel: the necessity of the Hearers, being now a mixt company of good and bad, of Elect and Reprobate, and of true Nathaniels and Ananiasses, sincere and hypocrites: for it keepeth the one sort from presuming that they securely perish not in sinne, and the other from despairing, being humbled truely for sin.

So too Isaiah in the eighth and ninth chapters of his book provides the same example, so that these readings demonstrate this to be a broad understanding of the function of prophetic preaching, not merely of Hoseads.

Adams' auditors, he says, are

---

48'To prophesy' meant both to foresee and to interpret. In his famous letter about the prophesyings, Archbishop Grindal explained to Queen Elizabeth that 'that exercise of the Church in those days St Paul calleth prophetiam, and the speakers prophetas ... as it doth sometimes, signify prediction of things to come, which gift is not now ordinary in the church of God; but signifieth there, by the consent of the best
misinterpreting the words of their preachers and he sets out to reassign the messages of justice and mercy:

If men stumble into the Church, as company, custome, recreation or (perchance) sleepe invites many, they feede their eyes with vanities; if any drops be admitted unto their eares, they are entertained under the nature of conceits: Judgements (they think) be none of their lessons, they will not suffer their consciences to apply them: Mercies they challenge and owne, though they have no right to them (sig. A3r, p. 5).

Once repentance has been provoked by the rigours of the Law, Adams will apply the comforts of the Gospel. So the first half of the sermon denounces the sins of the people, a denunciation balanced in the second half with the promise of salvation reserved for the truly repentant.

That God's justice will be executed when his mercy has been neglected is a theme that runs through prophetic preaching as consistently as the use of Old Testament examples. An image commonly used at Paul's Cross to express God's patience is of an unbent bow. God is ready to strike, but delays to allow men to repent.

The image vividly suggests that the hearers are already guilty of the faults that deserve punishment although the punishment has not arrived. Both commonplaces are found in John Hoskins sermon on Isaiah 28.1:

... mercy belike hath got the victory, and all the weapons in the Armory of heaven, are become like a rainebow, a bow indeed, but without an arrow; with a full bent, but without a string, the wrong side being alwaies upwards, as it we shot at him, not hee at us ... But he is the Father of mercies, the motive of showing mercy is within him, but the motive of executing judgement and revenge is within him in our provocation: you reade him not called the Father of judgement.

Where critics have claimed that the prophetic sermon preaches repentance in a way that...
separates the 'sheep from the goats', seventeenth-century practice and theory clearly shows that it was designed to preach repentance to sheep and goats, as the congregation could not be unmixed.

Throughout the sermon, the themes of justice and mercy, repentance and forgiveness are the primary focus of Adams' *The Gallant's Burden*. The sin on which he focuses is itself central to this theme, because the sin of presumption is the result of misapplying the comforts of the Gospel without undertaking the rigours of repentance and amendment of life. The metaphors to be of central importance to the exposition of the text are immediately introduced in the division at the start of the sermon. Adams says that the text forms a 'map' and a 'moral'. The 'map' is made up of an 'inscription' (Dumah, the name of the country) and a description of the scene (the mountain, representing security, the vigilant watchman and the scornful Edomite). The moral is formed by a question, an answer (that 'the morning cometh and also the night', a 'resolution' and 'advice'. Adams keeps his explication close to the literal meaning of the text, and the division can easily be represented schematically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inscription</strong></td>
<td><strong>Question ('Watchman, what was in the Night' &amp;c.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resolution ('If you will ask, inquire')</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Country (Dumah)</td>
<td><strong>Advice ('return, come')</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain (Mount Seir, Security)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman (The prophet, Vigilance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edomite (who 'calls to me out of Seir', Scorn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adam retains a sense of drama by interpreting the text as a dialogue between the prophet and the Edomite, who is calling to him from Mount Seir. He also keeps the personal and the public aspects of his theme united. He provides the uses for each section of the text as they occurs in his explication. Each section of the text, however, goes one step further in explaining the public relevance of the text, and so the themes are developed in parallel throughout.

Adams begins by explaining the 'map' of Dumah which he finds in the 'Inscription'. He explains where Dumah is, and therefore who the first speaker in the text
is, the Edomite, and the second speaker, the prophet. Dumah, he explains, is a shortened form of 'Idumea', the home of the descendants of Esau, the rejected brother of Jacob and the paradigmatic figure of the reprobate (Romans 9.13). The second part of the 'Inscription', the burden, is described in two aspects - to the prophet who bears it and the people who suffer it. It is around the metaphoric reading of 'burden' that the argument of The Gallant's Burden hinges, and Adams refers back to it repeatedly throughout the sermon. Adams uses various meanings for the image of the burden: as the word of God is given to the prophet (or minister, his modern counterpart) it can be a burden to him until he is relieved by God of the duty to preach. It is a burden to his hearers, who are the ones to suffer the judgement he announces.

The burden that Adams discusses in this sermon is that of presumptuous security, the disastrous illusion that one is safe when one is in gravest danger. This was Dumah's case and this is the case of England and England's Christians. The burden of sins, Adams goes on to argue, may seem light to those who ignore their consciences. The devil makes the burden of sins seem light to fool the sinner and God may do the same to confound the reprobate. God's chastisements, in their commonplace form (borrowed from the Book of Revelations), do not now afflict England: 'the fire of

---

51 The various meanings of the word 'burden' available to the preacher from the Bible are outlined in Thomas Wilson's A complete christian dictionary: A burden is 'Some heavy thing which doth load or grieve us ... labour and servitude ... The Doctrine or Commandements of Christ. Mat. 11.30 'My Burden is light. So it is to the regenerate, to whom the Commandements of Christ are not grievous, because they are led by the spirit, and have their sins forgiven them; but to the unregenerate, they are as a grievous burden ... Prophesies and foretellings of grievous calamities ... Imperfections and wants which appear in our duties ... legal ceremonies; or human traditions imposed on mens' consciences ... A divine threatening ... The office of magistracy ... Sin': A complete christian dictionary (1612; Anr. ed., 1678), sig. K4r.

52 Adams' discussion of presumption and the differences between it and the lawful assurance of the elect seems to owe much to Perkins' writing on the topic in A Discourse of Conscience: Wherein is set down the nature, properies and differences thereof (1603), in Works (1616/18), vol. I, sig. 3A1v, p. 548. Adams deals with the same issue in his Commentary or Exposition upon the second epistle by St. Peter, 2 vols (1633), vol. 1, sigs. T3r-V3r, pp. 209-221.

53 This sequence of punishments - plague, famine and war - borrowed from the Book of Revelations is a very topical in prophetic preaching for insisting on the imminence of divine punishment: Abraham Gibson, The land mourning for vaine swearing, sig. G8v-H2r, pp. 96-8; William Hampton, A proclamation of warre, sig. A4v, p. 2; Thomas Jackson, London's new-yeeres gift, sigs. C4v-D1r, ff. 8v-9r. Both Gibson and Sampson Price, in London's warning by Laodicea's luke-warmnesse (sig. F3r, p. 41) include the death of Prince Henry among these providential punishments and harbingers of destruction. The worse threat of which the hearers are warned is the 'famine of the word', as prophesied against the Ephesians in Revelations chapter two: Daniel Donne, A sub-poena from the star-chamber of heaven. A sermon preached at Pauls Crosse the 4 of August 1622 (Augustine Mathewes f. John Grismand 1623), sig. G8v, p. 96. Thomas Fuller, A sermon Upon the late Decrease of the Plague, sigs. E4v-F1r, pp. 32-3; Sampson Price, Ephesus warning before her woel, sigs. I3r-I4v, pp. 61-64.
Pestilence is well quenched, the rumours and stormes of Warre are laid, the younger brother of death, Famine, doth not tyrannize over us' (sig. A3r). Complacency, or in contemporary terminology, security, is the burden described in this text and sermon, and it is England's greatest danger because it militates against repentance. Adams clearly states, at this early stage in his long sermon, that it is through England's presumptuous security that the analogy with Edom is made:

If you thinke I speake too bitterly, I would to God it were not worse then I speake: I would your reformation would convince us of shame, and give us cause to recant this in the Pulpit. This turns the Message of Edome upon us; the Burden of Dumah, the Burden of England: We cast from our shoulders the Burden of the Law, God layes on us the burden of Judgement (sig. A3v, p. 6).

The Burden of Dumah is that they do not believe the disaster foretold by the prophet. Adams develops the exemplary nature of his 'map' further. Mount Seir is described as a fertile mountain with a prosperous city. By reciting the history of the peoples who conquered and controlled it, Adams demonstrates the falseness of their security, even in a strong city built on a mountain. The Horites lost Mount Seir through God's will; the Edomites built a 'strong city' there, but it has since, like all great cities, 'been dissolved to dust and rubbish'. The lesson is apparent: no mountain or city is 'able to grapple with the wrath of God, or buckle with his Judgements (sig. A4v, p. 8). A commonplace of prophetic preaching underlines this point:

The world hath gloried in her severall ages, of many goodly Cities; Niniveh, the pride of Assyria, Troy, the pillar of Asia, Babilon, more a Region than a Citie, Carthage graced with 17 tributary Kingdomes; and let not Jerusalem be shut from both the glory and sadnesse of this relation. May we not say of them all now (Etiam periere ruinae) That little of them is dissolved to nothing: Thus God cooles and damps the glory of Israel; Go you unto Calneh and see: and from thence goe unto Hamath the great: thene go downe to Gath of the Philistines: be they better than those Kingdomes, or the border of their lands greater than your border? (sig. A4v, p. 8)

As the Edomite's security was the 'burden' they bore, so Adams asks his hearers if security 'be not our Burden & Miserie'. England, like the Edomites, is surrounded by enemies and can ill-afford presumptuous complacency:

The burden of Dumah is Warre, Mount Seir fears it not: if the booke of our hearts lay open to be read, I think our feare of warre is less then theirs. God grant our presumption, our securitie be not as great (sig. A5r, p. 9).

Adams cites the suffering of the French in the 'uncivill civill warres' and the 'unquiet
bread long eaten in the *Low-countries*, to remind his audience that their time of persecution might also come (sig. A5r, p. 9). The Papists merely 're-hearten' themselves to overthrow England, and the London hearers are reminded of the persecutions under Queen Mary to bring the insecurity of the present peace closer to home. Security, then, is not to be considered in terms of physical defences, nor economic advantages. As God afflicts sinful nations, so he succours and protects those who trust him. England's 'helpe standes in the name of GOD, not in Forts and Swords' (sig. A5v, p. 10).

As the nation is threatened by a complacent acceptance of its security, so the wealth and security of the individual can threaten the health of the soul. Adams returns to the individual level to exhort his hearers to trust in God, not 'thy Mount Seir', because 'every wicked soule hath her Mount Seir to trust in' (sig. A5v, p. 10). Adams unites the promise of spiritual and public peace, showing the two to be interdependent, in an *exhortation* that is one of the most eloquent passages in the sermon:

You had, and shall have peace, whiles you pursue it with righteous endevours; whiles you guide all your actions by the line of the Sanctuary, and steere your Attempts by the compass of the Gospell: Plentie shall spread your Tables, whiles Charitie takes away, and gives to the Poore. These holy courses, shall make you continue, in despite of Hell and Rome; your Mountaine shall be hedged about with the Mercies of God and your children shall defie their Enemies in the Gates. (sigs. A5v-A6r, pp. 10-11)

In the next division of the sermon, Adams outlines the *uses* and *observations* from the text before he proceeds to *apply* it directly to his hearers.\(^5^4\) He does this through his description of the Watchman (the careful prophet) and the Edomite (the scorner). Adams reads the text as the prophet foretelling war against the Edomites and they, in scorn, call him a watchman. But the term is appropriate nonetheless, since the duties of the prophet (and the minister to whom he is compared) are similar to that of the watchman (sig. A6r, p. 11). In considering 'the Edomite, and his

---

\(^5^4\)Both Richard Bernard and John Wilkins distinguish between the parts of sermon in which a preacher points out the various *uses* and *observations* to be made from a *doctrine* and his actual *application* of those uses to the hearers. Both writers admit that the distinction is one often missed in preaching theory and practice, but insist that to do so is to omit a forceful, immediate application: Richard Bernard, *The faithfull shepheard* (1621) sig. P10r, p. 327; John Wilkins, *Ecclesiastes*, sig. C1v, p. 14. Although the *application* is never omitted, few of the sermons examined demarcate the description of *uses* from the *application* itself, but instead move seamlessly from one to the other. That Adams separates each is a function of his theme: he must clearly establish the comparison, show its exemplary nature and then apply the lesson to his hearers.
Question' (sig. B1r, p. 13), Adams singles out four sorts of 'Edomites' - atheists, epicures, libertines and 'common profane persons'. He inserts what is effectively a 'prose character' of each to portray four vividly contemporary sorts of scorning Edomite.

Using characters allows Adams both describe a sin and apply his description to the hearers. It also signals the first important shift in the terms of comparison between England and Dumah, as Adam begins to concentrate the analogy on his hearers to make good the application to them. Till now, England had been compared to Dumah, because both nations are burdened with the presumptuous security that delays repentance. The only exception to this is when Adams wished to distinguish two scorners of England's ministers. The first are profane 'Edomites'; the second he calls Israelites (sig. B1r, p. 13).

It is unlikely that he uses this term to distinguish the 'saving remnant' within the English church: rather, Adams use the term sarcastically to refer to self-proclaimed Israelites. These zealot scorners are, he says, 'sick of a wantonness in religion, so hot about the question de modo, that the devil steals the matter of religion from their hearts'. Now, however, Adams describes four social types within England who are Edomites. If we push these comparisons to their logical conclusions, we are left with an image of England as a nation of Edomites which only contains some Edomites (the four types of specified sinners) and some troublesome, over-heated 'Israelites'. Which group represents the nation? To which category do the rest belong? Clearly, Adams is not trying to create a coherent allegorical reading of the Edomites in his text but is keeping the comparison fluid. This allows him to manipulate the analogy to suit the immediate needs of different parts of the sermon. The Edomite, he announced in the division, is a scorners. Insofar as England's complacency towards sinners at home and Papists abroad is

---

55 As Adams' Characters are usually embedded in his sermons and rarely captioned separately as such, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether they are simply particularly vivid examples of descriptio or whether they are modelled on the Theophrastan Character. In this case, not all critics are agreed that these four descriptions can be considered Characters, but they are included in A Bibliography of the Theophrastan Character in English by Chester Noyes Greenough, prepared for publication by J. Milton French (1947, republ. 1970), p. 20. Adams borrowed many of his Characters from Joseph Hall and used the Character in a similar way. The close affinity between Adams and Hall is clear from Margaret Bellasys' amalgamation of Hall's Characters with those Adams creates in Diseases of the Soule (1616) in her 'Characterismes of Vice', BL Add MS 10309. 75 of the 155 pages of the manuscript are taken up by these characters: Lambert Ennis 'Margaret Bellasys' Characterismes of Vices', PMLA, 56 (1941). On Adams' borrowings from Hall see Vincent Cabell Flanagan, 'A Survey of the Life and Works of Thomas Adams', pp. 273-283.
a scorning of the prophet's warnings, then all England is Dumah. Insofar as particular individuals live lives of sinful independence from God and his law, then they are Edomites. The troublesome 'Israelites' do not ignore the prophet, and so cannot be coupled with the other scorers, but insofar as they despise their ministers, they are placed rhetorically close to them. For the rest of the sermon, Adams uses the comparisons with the Edomite as a spur to repentance, changing the terms of the analogy according to the varying demands of preaching justice and mercy to a mixed congregation. This manipulation of the terms of comparison is a mainstay of the prophetic preacher's technique, and it is by means of the fluidity of definition that the preachers were able to use Old Testament examples only so far as they were pastorally useful. Patrick Collinson writes:

It might otherwise be called a confusion of themes, but probably there was not confusion, rather a 'greatly satisfying harmonization.' If there was confusion (for who, in Hosea and in the derivative Hoseads, was 'Israel,' who 'Judah,' who were 'my people,' 'them,' and 'us'?), the preachers were in control of the confused categories and applications of their own rhetorical agenda, turning them to their own instrumental as well as rhetorical advantage. The essential point is the strong, organic connection between the self and society.  

Following the vivid description of the Edomites, there is another abrupt division as Adams signals the half-way mark in his discourse. Having described the problem of security and showed its relevance to the audience, Adams must now insist that they take the message of the final part of the text and apply it directly to them. This is marked by a change in tone, for now the negative cause and results of the 'gallant's burden' are counterbalanced by the prophet's answer, in which he offers the comfort of a 'resolution' and 'advice'. So we are told that we move from Mount Seir to Mount Zion through the prophet's answer, which points the way to salvation, offers advice on how to get there and exhorts the hearers to follow. The sharp reprimands of his answer (that the night comes) are balanced by lyricism in the 'advice,' as Adams offers his audience an 'easier, second half'.

---

56Patrick Collinson, 'Biblical Rhetoric', p. 27. The quotation by Professor Collinson is from Theodore Bozeman, 'Federal Theology and the National Covenant'. Professor Collinson considered this ambiguity a means by which the preacher could use the biblical example to refer both to the nation and the small number of elect among them (n. 50). I believe it also allowed them to evade the question of election in their attempt to provoke repentance in all or any of the hearers.
The prophet's answer, that 'morning cometh, and then night', is divided into 'four circumstances', each of which shows the brief time that the Edomites have left before judgement befalls them. For God's chosen, however, a brief time of affliction will be followed by endless happiness. After considering each circumstance, Adams exhorts 'ye Edomites, that flout our presagings of a Night' to repent. He reminds them of the examples of Solomon, Samson, Belshazzar, even Job, and asks them to consider 'what ever flourished and had not a night?' (sig B4r, p. 19). Characteristically, however, the warning is not restricted to a distinct group of Edomites with whom the sermon's hearers might assure themselves they have nothing in common. All England is guilty of Edom's presumption and the same threat hangs over the whole nation:

*We had our Morning at the first preaching of the Gospel: it now flourisheth with us, as at high Noone: Who shall say the Evening will not follow, or our Sunne is without setting?* (sig. B4r, p. 19).

For the righteous, however, time is measured differently, because they follow the timetable set by the Sabbath, where the evening is before the morning. Again, Adams shifts his comparison, this time in order to give comfort: including his hearers among the chosen, he says that 'our night is irksome, but short', where 'their Morning is short, their Night everlasting' (sig. B4v, p. 20).

Critics have suggested that the 'Israelite paradigm' allowed preachers to divided their hearers implicitly between elect and reprobate or to assume that all their hearers were elect and all absentees reprobate, so that a clear line between Israelites and all others could be seen in their sermons. Adams' sermon shows that this is not the case: rather, the line of demarcation was as fluid as the need to provoke penitence or administer comfort demanded. The division between elect and reprobate was one that

---

57 Michael McGiffert is particularly guilty in this respect: 'Covenant, Crown, and Commons', p. 45. In several articles, Patrick Collinson has given varying degrees of support to the idea that a division of community into self-consciously godly and ungodly camps was partly a result of this type of preaching, but has left the question open: 'Protestant Nation', pp. 23-27; 'The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful', pp. 56-7; 'Biblical Rhetoric', pp. 33-36. As a rhetorical explanation for the *commonplaces* Professor Collinson has identified can be posited, it is fair to suggest that, if these sermons did lead to a bifurcation of the community, it was because the hearers solidified the fluid comparisons by which preachers used the Israelite paradigm to provoke penance. This would be (although the topic needs further investigation) an example of the failure of preaching rhetoric to get across a more charitable, and challenging, message than the hearers wished to accept.
preachers were not supposed to make because, like all Christians, they were prohibited from speculating about the fate of their fellows. While knowing that all men would not be saved, the preacher could not assume that any of his hearers were beyond redemption. Until the hour of death, repentance is not impossible, and so the duty to provoke repentance in all those sinners who might be saints was the central and never-ending duty of the preacher. This is the duty that they carry out in prophetic sermons, as was clearly seem from Richard Bernard’s interpretation of Hosea chapter four.

Whether all preachers in every context were true to this principle is difficult to determine. The evidence from Paul's Cross, where preachers addressed hearers they did not know, shows them speaking only in general terms when they apply the example of a biblical nation to the individual Christian. Adams clearly treats his hearers are both saints (insofar as they are repentant and godly) and sinners (insofar as they are sinful and presumptuous). They are both Edomites and Israelites. Although they have ‘a face of Religion, and lookes of profession, making towards Jerusalem’, the sins of Edom are also ‘the sins of England’ (sig. C1r, p. 25). Repentance is the main theme of his sermon, Adams says at the end of his exhortation, and that repentance is never too late:

Let us onely fear least our want of Repentance hinder this. I should have earst observed it, as a materiall instruction from this place, I could not find a fitter time to insert it, then here, to draw your comming with more alacrity. There is a reservation to repentance, even to abhorred Edom: let the sonnes of the profanest Esau repent, and they shall not be forsaken of mercy: Return and come and your night threatned shall be made a joyful morning (sig. C3r, p. 29).

By a strictly predestinarian reading of this passage, of course, the rejected ‘abhorred Edom’, will not be granted the ability to repent and so will be damned. To read the passage this way, however, is to miss the exhortatory use Adams makes of the comparison. Exhortation functions by presenting to the hearers motives and means for undertaking the task in question and comparisons can be used to present these motives more vividly. This is what Thomas Adams does here. In the quotation above, Adams uses an exaggerated (though not unsound) example of the promise of salvation held out to the penitent. This is, then, one of the motives to repentance that Adams presents to his
hearers, as was the description of the short time granted the wicked and the joy promised the godly. So too, it may be argued that the exaggerated accounts of God's favour to the English nation are not statements of abstract, theological or political theory; they are motives for repentance. The *topos* tells the hearer that God has blessed England because he has placed some of his saints there and exhorts them to believe that they are numbered among those chosen. In his *exhortations*, the preacher was supposed to be as vehement and forceful as possible. Even his tone of voice was expected to express urgency. Richard Bernard writes that 'to bee loud in Doctrine, and low in Exhortation' is 'very inconsonant, disgracefull to the speaker, and distastfull to the hearers'. Adams exhorts his hearers by placing the choice between day and night before them. He asks them to prove themselves Israelites, as if assuming they are and asking only for the proof, *(ubi signa?*) Where are the signes to it?* (sig. B4v, p. 20).

Adams' emphasis on repentance, then, is far from unusual in prophetic preaching. That this is the main theme, and primary purpose, of these sermons is clear from the frequency with which it is stressed. Abraham Gibson tells his hearers that if they repent now, God will have compassion 'according to his promise, his promise without exception, either of time, or of persons, or of sinnes'. John Fosbrooke exhorts to the same process of repentance and amendment described by Adams in *England's warning by Israel and Judah*. Repentance, too, is the conclusion of William Hampton's sermon:

Now for a conclusion: All that hath beene spoken, may serve as a strong motive, to stirre us up with speed to tume unto God, that hee may tume unto us, and turne from us this fearefull calamitie; Let us repent heartily, and cry unto him mightily, to spare us, to be mercifull unto us.59

In the last division of his sermon, Adams maps out the path of repentance through the prophet's 'resolution' and 'advice' to 'inquire, return, come'. In this section, Adam frequently addresses his hearers in vivid *exhortations* that mark out

---

the pastoral concerns at the heart of the sermon. He elaborates on the 'enquiry' by which this process is started. The 'where' is in the Scripture, for 'where should a people enquire but at their God? (sig. BSv, p. 22)' 'The 'how' is with 'humility, Reverence and a desire of knowledge' and the 'when' is now. Having found the way, the audience must follow the route of true repentance. But this repentance is slow to happen, Adams says, for England's sins are ingrained 'negligent sinnes, security sinnes, contempt sinnes, presumption and hard-heartednesse sinnes'. Worldly things have become England's gods, despite God's blessing. Fathers, brothers and magistrates are called upon to impose discipline on those whom too much ease has led to dissolution, but the true medicine is not merely laws, but true repentance, abandoning sins and endeavouring never to sin again.

That God would punish the whole commonwealth for its sins and its toleration of sin was a commonplace argument throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Elizabethan Homilies declared that penury, dearth and famine were caused by God's anger at the vices of the community. For Calvin, one of the reasons for enforcing 'discipline' in a Church was to prevent the wrath of God descending upon it for allowing flagrant, public sins. Harro Höpfl describes this as 'the "wrath-averting" view of discipline' and considers the fear of divine vengeance behind it as a common sixteenth-century view. John Downname's Lectures on Hosea, the major source for the Hoseads preached at Paul's Cross, shows the providential base of prophetic sermons. The community's failure to conduct itself justly is taken as God's reason for punishing it, and so sin is the cause of the Israelites' afflictions:

And wel were it, if hee that curseth did beare the punishment of his owne sinne himselfe alone; but it is otherwise: for where cursing aboundeth, it causeth the Lord to proclaim a controversie with the whole land, and to inflict upon it his heaviest judgments. The which as it should forcibly restraine men from this horrible sinne, because thereby they make not onely themselves, but also their deare country liable to grievous punishments; so also it should move Christian magistrates to bee carefull in the suppressing of this vice, seeing where it aboundeth, there the whole country lyeth open to Gods fearefull plagues.

---

60The Two Books of Homilies appointed to be read in churches, ed. J. Griffiths (1859), pp. 85-6, 166, 299, 497.
62John Downname, Lectures upon the foure first chapters of Hosea (1608), sig. 2G1v (2nd ser), p. 98.
This concern with a communal obligation to obey God's law is certainly present in Adams' appeal to the magistracy, but his aim is also more immediately pastoral. He clearly exhorts householders and magistrates to punish and suppress sin, but the emphasis is not on the communal need to 'avert' God's wrath, but on the duty to promote godliness in individuals. Not punishing sins is a dereliction of duty by those with the responsibility of promoting godliness in their inferiors. Adams calls for the punishment of sins to encourage penance:

Fathers and Brethren, helpe: Pitty the miscarrying soules that have no mercy on themselves: our Words are thought aire; let your Hands compell them to the service of God. The word of Information hath done his best: Where is the rod of Reformation? Let Moses Rod second Aarons word (sig. C1v, p. 26).

The last part of the prophet's advice is interpreted by Adams as 'coming' to God by a holy life. Only want of repentance hinders us from coming to God, and any sign of repentance will cause the 'night threatened' to become 'a joyful morning'. Adams asserts that God will forestall punishment, but can only be approached through Christ, and in the most rhapsodic passage of the sermon invites his audience to 'behold him with the eyes of Faith, standing on the Battlements of Heaven, and wafting you to him. He exhorts them to 'come freely, come merrily, come with speed' (sig. C3v, p. 30).

Hesitation is caused by the concern for worldly things, and is 'vile' and an 'indignity' to the saviour. This indignity is described by parable in a 'prodigal son' story about a gallant. This figure has already been used as the epitome of all the failings that the minister finds in his auditors. By using this story, which gives the repentant gallant a happy ending, Adams dramatises a happy conclusion for those who take the advice offered in his sermon. The easy, conversational style of this anecdote allows Adams to quieten the tone of his sermon after so much vehement denunciation and exhortation, and prepares for the note of gentle encouragement on which the sermon ends. The prayer with which The Gallant's Burden closes draws together the sermon's central concerns, restating the terms of the exhortatory final sections, yet expressing the quiet comfort of the help Christ holds out for the repentant. Christ is a friend 'more able,
more willing, more certaine' than any other. The preacher simply finishes by praying:

That Jesus Christ put into our mouthes a tongue to Enquire, into our hearts a purpose to Returne, into our lives a grace to come home to holinesse, and himselfe (sig. C4r, p. 31).

IV

In this chapter, the most studied form of Jacobean preaching, the prophetic sermon, has been re-examined in order to simplify the perspective from which it is viewed. It has been argued that the weight of interpretation on these sermons, much of it back-dating to Jacobean England concerns first expressed in late seventeenth-century New England, has hampered our understanding of the form. An attempt has been made to recover and to assess contemporary Jacobean understandings of the themes and use of the prophetic sermon. Among these, a concern to preach the fundamental message of repentance to a mixed congregation, to whom the lessons of both Law and Gospel must be applied, has been found to be central to the prophetic sermon. Through a reading of Thomas Adams' *The Gallant's Burden*, the use of the *commonplaces* of prophetic preaching - such as the threat of impending disaster (from invasion or natural calamities) and God's hatred of sin, the reluctance of the people to repent and, most importantly, the comparison with the peoples of the Old Testament - can be shown to serve a simpler pastoral function than is often attributed to them. This simpler interpretation, taking as its starting point the mixed congregation comprised (as far as the preacher is concerned) of saints and potential saints, can be shown to account for the particular stress on collective responsibility to God. Although all will not repent, the preacher is obliged to preach to all as if they will, just as magistrates and householders are obliged to chastise and govern all as if preparing all for salvation.

In short, the prophetic sermons preached at Paul's Cross do not presuppose a 'national covenant' or any kind of special relationship between God and England. Nor do they use the idea of covenant to divide the community between elect and reprobate, implicitly or explicitly. They were designed to *exhort* the hearers to
repentance by the most forceful means available - the threat of destruction and the promise of salvation - and assume for the purposes of their sermon that both options were available to their mixed congregations. Much of the published work on prophetic preaching has failed to take account of the stated primary aims of these sermons or the interpretative bases of the preachers' explications of Old Testament examples. Because of this disregard for the norms of preaching rhetoric, the themes of prophetic sermons have become misrepresented by critics. These interpretations have, in turn, proved unstable foundations for the theses on social and intellectual history which they have supported. It is hoped that the importance of rhetorical analysis to the interpretation of prophetic sermons is evident from this discussion.
CONCLUSION

It is difficult to draw conclusions from a study in which the development of a method of analysis has been at least as important as any individual insights that method may produce. Broadly speaking, however, in the five chapters of this study, the examination of some fundamental structuring principles of seventeenth-century preaching rhetoric has been shown to aid the interpretation of sermon texts. In chapter one, it was shown that a sharp division between explication and application was generally used by preachers of political sermons. This division allowed the preacher to compare contemporary events with those of biblical histories without 'wresting' the Scripture by referring it too closely to secular concerns. In chapter two, the use of ethical proofs in controversial preaching is shown to have been unsatisfactory, so that the use of converts delivering recantation sermons can be explained and the rhetorical strategy by which they contributed to the confessionalisation of England becomes clearer. Chapter three argues that the ambivalence over the use of worldly goods found in Jacobean sermons and commented on by Weberian historians can be accounted for through an understanding of homiletic exhortation. English preachers continued to use the reward God promised the charitable as a 'motive' against worldliness, but they failed to reconcile this 'motive' fully with the sola fide doctrine of the Church. Chapter four uses the elaborate style of Daniel Featley's The Bride her Pretious Borders (1618) to demonstrate the didactic basis of discussions of preaching styles in the Jacobean period. The choice of style was dictated as much by the needs of the congregation as by the personal choice of the preacher. Even Donne's avowed aim was to 'speake plainly to every capacity'. Chapter five controverts the current understanding of the 'Jeremiad' as a literary form that betrays a belief in England as a covenanted nation or in an identifiable saving remnant within the nation. It argues that the interpretative basis of these prophetic sermon has been misunderstood. Biblical examples used by preachers have been conflated with biblical types drawn from similar texts. A careful examination of the use of biblical comparisons in these sermons reveals a more mundane theme and a more subtle integration of doctrine with rhetoric than critics have allowed.

By interpreting these sermons in the light of other preachers' practice and according to the criteria established by the writers of preaching manuals, I hope to have avoided anachronistic methods of examination. Many modern studies of early modern preaching are built on inadequate foundations: too few of the rhetorical handbooks are thoroughly examined and their precepts are rarely compared with the practice of a broad sample of sermons. The influence of traditional interpretations and well-established commonplaces on any individual preacher's prosecution of a theme is seldom considered.

One proper conclusion from these observations, then, is that much work remains to be done. We possess no bibliography of Jacobean or Caroline sermons, so that we do not know exactly how many sermons are extant from the various pulpits, even for London; nor do we know how many biblical commentaries originally delivered as sermons have survived. As a result, we do not know how many sermons were preached on particular texts nor can we identify them, even for key texts like the thirteenth chapter of Romans. The closer study of particular commonplaces and proof-texts must wait on such a work.

At the level of prescriptive theory, there is a similar lack of basic research. As yet, we lack a history of English Reformed preaching theory. We do not yet know the genealogy of the 'doctrines and uses' system, or of the preaching genera agreed upon in England, or of the codification of the various 'uses' to be made of doctrines. A comparison between the various rhetorical handbooks from the sixteenth and early seventeenth century on such questions would give us a better understanding of the different methods available to the preacher, so that the influences on England's most famous preachers can be fully understood. In rhetorical studies generally, the study of structure has been neglected in preference to the study of ornament. But rhetoric has five parts and invention and disposition are of equal - if not greater importance - to the suasive end of the oration than the third. Because sermons are studied by very few scholars, this emphasis has led to acute neglect of the particular features of preaching rhetoric.

If there is a single point concluded from this study, it is that seventeenth-century preachers practised a rhetorical art whose basic principles we have examined but scantily. As a result, we have misinterpreted their writings.

---

2 Alan Fager Herr's bibliography of Elizabethan sermons (1940) is the only study of the earlier period. For the Jacobean and Caroline periods, however, the Register of Paul's Cross sermons, originally compiled by Millar MacLure, is the only bibliography available. Peter McCullough's study of court sermons included a calendar of Elizabethan court sermons: Peter E. McCullough, 'The Sermon at the court of Elizabeth I'. His forthcoming study on court preaching during Elizabeth's and James' reign continues this calendar into the seventeenth century.

3 Ian Green's history of sixteenth and seventeenth-century catechisms, The Christian's ABC (1994), has provided many valuable insights into the pastoral use of doctrines also found in sermons. His forthcoming works on Bibles and prayer books (Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England) and on methods of religious instruction more generally (Religious Instruction in Early Modern England) promise to be of great help in placing preaching commonplaces in context.
APPENDIX A

Additions to the Register of Sermons preached at Paul's Cross, 1603-1625

May 1, 1603

'Low Sunday'. John Boys delivered the rehearsal sermon. The text of the sermon is not extant but Boys reused the material in his Works and included a marginal note saying that 'these observations I delivered in my rehearsal at Paul's anno 1603'. Boys' theme is the one typical of rehearsal sermons: the preacher's duty to repeat the fundamentals of the faith. All preaching, he writes, is a repetition of the protoevangelion ('that old Spittle sermon (as it were) preached by God himselfe to decayed Adam and Eve'): Works (1622), STC 3452, sig. X1v, p. 242.

August 9, 1607

George Creswell, Minister. Creswell took Galatians 3.17-20 as his text and sola fide justification as his theme. The promise made to Abraham is the same promise fulfilled in the Gospel, so that the promise of the Gospel preceded the Law of Moses. We are justified freely by faith and the rigours of the Law serve only to show us our sins. 'By way of application', Roman Catholic teaching on faith and works is 'found to be a meere novelty': The harmonie of the lawe and the gospel. In a sermon at Paulscrosse, the 9. of Aug, 1607 (1607), STC 6038.

November 17, 1611

Francis Tomlinson, Chaplain to Lord Ellesmere, Chancellor of England. A rather uninspired sermon on vocations. Tomlinson took Jude 1.1-2 (the opening salutation of the epistle) as his text and divides the text into a discussion of Jude, who delivers the salutation and those who receive it. In his consideration of Jude, Tomlinson
discusses the Christian's duty to be worthy of that calling. The recipients of Jude's salutation are referred to as 'called' and so the application to the hearers, and most of the rest of the sermon, relates the doctrine of vocations to the hearers. The Christian has duties according to his particular callings in the community and according to his calling 'to knowledge of God and salvation': The holy salvation of the blessed apostle saint Jude. Preached at Pauls crosse the seventeenth of November, Anno Dom. 1611 (1612). STC 24111.

November 5, 1614

William Goodwin, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford and Dean of Christ Church (DNB). A Gunpowder Plot sermon that combines many of the characteristics of the Prophetic sermon. Goodwin's text was Ezekiel 24.2 and he used it to show how 'God was ever gracious, Jerusalem was ever incredulous ... ever rebellious'. The text is a 'Register and a record' of God's justice in destroying the sinful city and his mercy in comforting Israel in exile (f. 7r). The application enjoins the hearer to remember God's judgements and mercies (particularly November 5) and to remember that his elect suffer persecution in their war against the wicked of this world, particularly the Pope and treasonous recusants: Dr. Williams' Library MS 12.10, ff. 7r-16r.

March 24, 1619

The Register notes that John Chamberlain recorded a 'poore sermon' on the accession in this year. This must be the sermon delivered by John Harris on Ecclesiastes 10.17. The preacher cannot be identified. It is unlikely that the preacher of such a 'poore sermon' is the John Harris, later Regius Professor of Greek, who, according to Wood, was considered 'second to St. Chrysostome' by Henry Savile (DNB). This may be the same John Harris, preacher, listed in the STC as the author of The destruction of Sodome, a sermon preached to the House of Commons in 1628 (STC 12806). The manuscript copy found in Lambeth Palace Library is clearly a presentation copy. It
contains a dedication to George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, and considerable care was taken in its production. It is written in a clear, very neat hand and the format closely mimics a printed book: Lambeth Palace MS 447, item 1.

October 14, 1623

Arthur Lake, *A sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, Anno 1623.* The text (Luke 18.7-8 'And shall not God avenge his own elect ... I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless, when the son of man cometh, shall he find faith on earth?') is used cleverly to contradict antinomianism. A close relationship between the invisible and visible Church operates through the liturgy and sacraments. On this basis, Lake claims that the Church Militant's prayer for help in affliction (as described in his text) can be identified with the public prayers of the visible Church. A marginal reference to Wisdom 2 as 'this dayes epistle' (p. 535) dates the sermon to October 14, the day on which Wisdom 2 is the first lesson for evening prayer (*Book of Common Prayer*): *Sermons with some religious and divine meditations* (1629), STC 15134.

November 16, 1623

Robert Barrell, Minister of Maidstone in Kent. Taking the metaphor of building from his text (Matthew 7. 24-27), Barrell spends much of this sermon describing the true Christian and the true Church and distinguishing them from the hypocrite and the Roman Church, who build their hopes on human merits and manmade rituals: *The spiritual architecture. Or, the balance of Gods sanctuary. A Sermon preached at Pauls crosse the 16. of November, 1623* (1624), STC 1498.

1623

John Stoughton's *The Love-sick Spouse* is dated ante-1640 in the *Register of Sermons*. The identification of Emmanuel College Library MS 96, item 9 and Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson. E. 158 item 3 as copies (the Emmanuel MS an
incomplete copy) of this sermon means that it can now be dated to 1623. No date is given in the published version: *Choice sermons preached upon selected occasions* (1640).

**Undated sermons:**

Dr. Jegon. This is assumed to be John Jegon (1550-1618), Bishop of Norwich. While vice-chancellor of Cambridge (1596-99, 1600-1), Jegon 'vigorously maintained the rights and privileges of the University against the town'. As bishop of Norwich, he was 'unpopular, partly on account of the rigour with which he sought to enforce conformity, partly because his liberality was not proportionate to his reputation for wealth' (*DNB*). It seems plausible, therefore, that this is the Dr. Jegon who chose clerical maintenance and the 'double honour' due to bishops as his themes when preaching at Paul's Cross. Jegon's text was 1 Timothy 5.17-20 and he used it to defend tithes and to refute Presbyterianism. The reference to those who 'canvasse the canons against consistorie jurisdiction' in regard to tithing (f. 37r) suggests that the sermon may date from around 1605-8, when the controversy over writs of prohibition between churchmen and lawyers was at its height. As this controversy rumbled on for many years, however, the sermon could date from then until Jegon's death in 1618: Lambeth Palace MS 113, item 2.
incomplete copy) of this sermon means that it can now be dated to 1623. No date is
given in the published version: *Choice sermons preached upon selected occasions*
(1640).

**Undated sermons:**

Dr. Jegon. This is assumed to be John Jegon (1550-1618), Bishop of Norwich. While
vice-chancellor of Cambridge (1596-99, 1600-1), Jegon 'vigorously maintained the
rights and privileges of the University against the town'. As bishop of Norwich, he was
'unpopular, partly on account of the rigour with which he sought to enforce
conformity, partly because his liberality was not proportionate to his reputation for
wealth' (*DNB*). It seems plausible, therefore, that this is the Dr. Jegon who chose
clerical maintenance and the 'double honour' due to bishops as his themes when
preaching at Paul's Cross. Jegon's text was 1 Timothy 5.17-20 and he used it to
defend tithes and to refute Presbyterianism. The reference to those who 'canvasse the
canons against consistorie jurisdiction' in regard to tithing (f. 37r) suggests that the
sermon may date from around 1605-8, when the controversy over writs of prohibition
between churchmen and lawyers was at its height. As this controversy rumbled on for
many years, however, the sermon could date from then until Jegon's death in 1618:
Lambeth Palace MS 113, item 2.
APPENDIX B

Glossary: Terms used in Preaching Rhetoric

The Text:
When preachers refer to their text, they mean the quotation from Scripture on which they preach. Preachers will often begin their sermon by reciting the text.

Exordium:
A survival from classical rhetoric, though it is not invariably used in preaching. This is the introduction to a speech, the aim of which is to gain the good will and attention of the hearers. It often contains an explicit appeal to the hearers for their attention. It can also be used to introduce various themes to be developed in the sermon.

Explication:
The preacher has two tasks to fulfil in his sermon, the first of which is to explicate or explain the meaning of the text on which he preached. In their explications, preachers often relied very heavily on Patristic interpretations or on the interpretation given by the leaders of the Reformation. The first part of this task is the opening or unfolding of the text.

The Explication and the Application (see below) of the text are best understood as the twin functions of the sermons, as they do not necessarily (and quite often do not) form its structure, nor are they always clearly marked out in the sermon.

Opening the Text:
In opening the text, the preacher showed the hearers its biblical context before he began to discuss it in detail. He would describe the scope and aim of the text. The scope shows what the
speaker of the text wishes to communicate within the biblical context. The aim defines the text's argument: what it should communicate to those reading the Bible.

In describing the scope and aim, preachers were often obliged to give a detailed account of the text. They answered both grammatical questions - by whom, to whom and about what the text was spoken - and literary questions about genre (is it part of a history, poem or prophecy?) and style (is it meant literally or metaphorically? is it a figure of speech?). If necessary, the preacher might discuss different translations of the text (and their relative merits) or different interpretations of the text. They might draw comparisons between the text and other parts of Scripture with similar themes. This was called the collation or collection of places and was an important way of proving the accuracy of one's interpretation of a particular text.

Division:
In the division, the text was broken up into several sections and the main points the preacher wished to develop from each section were summarised. These sections of the text were then dealt with in detail in the main part of the sermon. Consequently, the division of the text also describes the structure of its argument and is therefore akin to partitio in classical rhetoric.

Doctrine:
Doctrine was the term used to describe the abstract proposition or principle found, explicitly or implicitly, in each part of the text once the preacher had opened and divided it. Presenting the doctrines was always described as an important part of the sermon because it taught the hearers what they needed to know of the faith. It was also important because the connection created between the text (as the preacher interpreted it) and the doctrines he raised was the preacher's proof that the advice he gave in the sermon was derived from the Bible.
Confirmation:

*Confirmation* simply meant proving the argument developed in each *doctrine* or in the sermon as a whole. Proof was primarily by comparison with other parts of Scripture (*collecting places*) or with the interpretations of other writers (especially the Church Fathers) or by grammatical or dialectical argument (e.g. definitions, etymologies, comparisons, etc.). *Confirmation* is rarely a separate section in the sermon. Various proofs of the preacher's interpretation are usually embedded throughout the sermon.

Application:

The *application* of the text was the second function of the preacher in delivering his sermon. In the *application* the preacher showed how the abstract doctrines he extracted from his scriptural text related to the hearers' actions or concerns. The text could be made relevant to the circumstances of the sermon's delivery by reference to similarities between the occasion (especially on religious or civic festivals) or the place (e.g. the Court) of text and sermon. Even if not applied to the occasion, the text was almost always applied to the 'life and manners' of the people in terms of moral and social precepts.

Uses:

The *application* of a text to the hearers' religious or social attitudes or duties was also described as showing the *Uses*, because the preacher showed the hearers what 'use' they were to make of the abstract *doctrines* he had discussed. Preachers who practised a very bare style (so that the structure of their sermons was very obvious) were often described as using the method of *Doctrines and Uses*, because they first presented the *doctrines* and then the *uses*. This method is basic to much seventeenth-century preaching and can be seen at work in the sermons of preachers who practised a more highly figured style.

Various types of *uses* were set out in handbooks on preaching. The *Use of Instruction* and the *Use of Confutation* gave the hearers information about the Church's...
teaching so that they would be informed against the misinterpretation of Scripture by heretics. The Use of Reproof denounced the moral failings of the hearers by showing how their actions contradicted the precepts of Scripture. The Use of Consolation showed how the doctrines in the text provided the hearers with comfort in the face of anxieties, such as a troubled conscience, or afflictions. Preachers tended to choose the one or two uses most pertinent to each doctrine they presented or else give one general use for the sermon at the end.

Exhortation:
The exhortation is where the preacher seeks to rouse up his hearers to follow the advice he presented in the uses. It functioned by targeting either the intellect by logical argument or the affections by the figures of 'grand style' rhetoric. The arguments of exhortations were built on commonplaces of argument, partly derived from classical rhetoric and adapted to scriptural precepts in the form of proof-texts from the Bible. These commonplaces provided the preacher with set arguments in the form of motives (arguments to persuade the hearers to follow the advice offered) and means (arguments describing how the desired action could be effected). In preaching rhetorics, affective oratory appears to be secondary in persuasion through argument by commonplaces. It is very common to find exhortations at the end of a sermon, although they are also found following the uses interspersed in the body of the sermon.

The final exhortation is often clearly differentiated from the rest of the sermon by the use of figures of speech suggesting vehemence or strong emotion, such as exclamation (O London! O England!); apostrophe (change in address from the 3rd to the 2nd person); optatio (the expression of a wish or a prayer). Consequently, in the final exhortation a 'higher' or 'grander' rhetorical style is often used.

Prayer:
The vast majority of sermons end with a prayer. Sometimes this takes the form of a recapitulation of the sermon's text as a prayer to the Trinity.
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