

## Durham E-Theses

---

### *The Old Testament exegesis of Lancelot Andrewes, William Laud and John Cosin, as representative of the 'Caroline Divines'*

Gray, Melvyn Dixon

#### How to cite:

---

Gray, Melvyn Dixon (2007) *The Old Testament exegesis of Lancelot Andrewes, William Laud and John Cosin, as representative of the 'Caroline Divines'*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1823/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS OF LANCELOT ANDREWES,  
WILLIAM LAUD AND JOHN COSIN, AS REPRESENTATIVE OF  
THE 'CAROLINE DIVINES'

MELVYN DIXON GRAY

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Ph.D.

2007

07 JUN 2007

VOLUME II



## CHAPTER 6

### PURITANS and 'RATIONALISTS'

#### THE PURITANS

##### PRELIMINARY REMARKS

It is not easy to identify the Old Testament work, nor, indeed, many other aspects of Seventeenth Century Puritans, for the simple reason that it is difficult to characterise the 'Puritans' themselves, for they are slippery customers! 'Puritan' in fact describes a wide spectrum of belief and practice, and different Puritans differed from Carolines in different ways (and from some Carolines in different ways than they did from certain others!) – and, of course, they were much given to differing among themselves. The differences covered church order, doctrine, Biblical exegesis, moral teaching, worship – and sometimes we come across surprising concurrence between two apparently warring parties. The waters are muddied further by the personalities of those involved, for there were the pompous and the humble, fanatics and moderates, eirenics and belligerents, emollients and abrasives, ignoramuses and geniuses on both sides, whatever the issue in question.

This makes it difficult to compare and contrast Puritan Old Testament exegesis with that of the Carolines, since (a) the Puritans tended to ignore much of the Old Testament which interested the Carolines; (b) the Puritans placed great stress on individual piety, little on political matters; (c) their most striking

characteristics and beliefs were largely based on the New Testament, for example the tendency of many, particularly Independents/Congregationalists, towards millenarianism, which, with some exceptions noted below, stemmed from readings of Revelation. Another example would be the “Principles of Faith” presented by Puritans to Parliament in 1654; there are sixteen Articles, with 68 Biblical quotations, of which only three are from the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> And it has to be admitted that there was much agreement between the parties on Old Testament interpretation, unexpectedly perhaps, given their divergence in other areas. Even in these other areas, exceptions abound. This is especially true with regard to what has come to be thought the characteristic doctrine *par excellence* of the Puritans: double predestination. Not all Puritans were Calvinists, in this sense, just as some Carolines were. That the situation was more fluid than is generally supposed becomes obvious when, to take just one instance, one reads Greenham on conversion,<sup>2</sup> or learns that so staunch a Puritan as Reynolds was always thoroughly conformist, according to Fuller.<sup>3</sup> Puritanism was a wide spectrum, in fact. Some were known as ‘conformist’, and certainly many were more ‘moderate’ than commonly thought. Greenham can see an example in Moses, who lived and worshipped with the non-Yahwist Jethro: “....if we have the chiefe and principall points of religion with us, although there may be some wants and defects ..... so will the Lord in his due time bestow more blessings upon us, and minister that which is wanting unto us.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Dale, R. W.: History of English Congregationalism (Hodder & Stoughton, 1907), p.323f.

<sup>2</sup> Greenham, Richard: The Workes of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of Iesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, Minister and Preacher Of the Word of God (edited by Henry Holland; London, 1605), p.61f.

<sup>3</sup> Fuller, Church History of Britain (ed. Nichols, London 1842), Vol. III, p.231.

<sup>4</sup> Greenham, *op.cit.*, p.451.



“Puritanism is in fact a state of mind rather than a positive creed, and can therefore cover a wide diversity of popular beliefs.”<sup>5</sup> Thus Bourne, who can still go on to equate Puritanism with “Bibliolatry, Manichaeism and Papophobia”!<sup>6</sup> The nearest we can get to defining common ground of the ‘Puritans’, *vis-à-vis* ‘Anglicans’/‘Carolines’, is that while both accepted the divine inspiration of the Bible, the Anglicans accepted that tradition and reason – when not contradicted by Scripture – were also authoritative, whereas for the Puritan, “Nothing was to be accepted unless it had explicit warrant in the pages of God’s Word.”<sup>7</sup> This is the principle of *Sola Scriptura*, which we examine below. However, Mitchell judges from sermon quotations that the principle was binding on only the strictest of Calvinists; those he describes as ‘learned’ Calvinists added classical moralists and, as the Seventeenth Century wore on, occasional references to the Fathers (perhaps to show that the Carolines were not alone in their patristic learning). In fact, Mitchell claims that the Carolines – except for Laud – rarely quote from the classics, but the Puritans frequently do.<sup>8</sup> We are not quite so sure.....

Some Puritans, as we shall see towards the end of this chapter, could be surprisingly liberal, even ‘rationalist’ (in a contemporary sense). Thus Baxter could write, on the subject of scriptural authority, “Something must be taken on trust from men” and “Tradition is not so useless to the world or to the Church as some would have it.”<sup>9</sup> Not by any means all Puritans saw a bogeyman in the Caroline party, though undoubtedly many, probably most did: “The Anglicanism which he [Milton] and the rest attacked had no existence outside their own fevered imagination; but they took this figment for the real thing, and assailed it with all

---

<sup>5</sup> Bourne, *op.cit.*, p.35.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p.35.

<sup>8</sup> Mitchell, *op.cit.*, p.206f.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in Wakefield, G.S.: *Puritan Devotion* (Epworth Press, 1957), p.13.

the fury at their command.”<sup>10</sup> It was this delusion that led to the unjust trials of Strafford, Laud and Charles, and enabled their accusers to level absurd accusations of treason and papism, as well as succumbing to the temptation to allow the ends to justify the means. And not all Puritans were distracted by pious *minutiae*; John Rainolds, for example, found uncongenial extremists’ abhorrence of names of days of pagan origin, or time-hallowed ‘Roman’ feast-names, like Michaelmas – although “....I acknowledge a godly mind in them that desire to speake in more religious sort....”<sup>11</sup>

## ATTITUDE TO SCRIPTURE

### Literalism

The paramount authority was the Bible. Thus John Goodwin’s major work is 400 quarto pages defending its authority.<sup>12</sup> Arguing that the early Councils could and did err (*pace* the Carolines generally – though Andrewes was not uncritical), Rainolds writes: “Let the Councils then give place to the holy Scriptures, whereof no part is uttered by the spirit of man, but all by the Spirit of God.”<sup>13</sup> All the Bible is totally divinely inspired, and thus to be taken literally as the very Word of God. This was not a distinctively Puritan view: it was held by virtually every Protestant in those days, including the Carolines; Broughton had expressed the Puritans’ difference with the latter, in that the Carolines were willing to accept authorities outside Scripture, provided, of course, that these did

---

<sup>10</sup> Bourne, *op.cit.*, p.56.

<sup>11</sup> Rainolds, John: The Prophetie of Haggai, Interpreted and applied in sundry Sermons By that Famous and Judicious Divine, John Rainolds, D.D. Never before printed, Beeing Very usefull for these Times (London, 1649), p.8.

<sup>12</sup> Goodwin, John: The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted (London, 1648).

<sup>13</sup> Rainolds, John: The Summe of the Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart: Touching Head and the Faith of the Church. Whereunto is attached a treatise intituled Six Conclusions Touching the Holie Scripture and the Church (London, 1584), p.701.



not contradict Scripture, whereas the Puritans tended at the very least to fight shy of extra-Biblical authority. Literalism could enable people to aver, as Dod did, that the Ten Commandments were special, even within Scripture, since they were not written by men – not even inspired men – but “God himselfe did write them with his owne finger; not using thereto either men or Angels, as Instruments.”<sup>14</sup> Broughton, too, is of the same opinion.<sup>15</sup> John Goodwin tells us confidently that after the Flood Noah and his family constituted “the whole world of mankind”.<sup>16</sup> Broughton, that all men are descended from Adam and “those Patriarchs” listed in Gen.5 & 6, I Chron.1 and Lk.3.<sup>17</sup> Modern strictures simply do not apply to these Puritans and their contemporaries, so Selbie’s comment must be taken as purely descriptive: “They [the Puritans] had little or no conception of the Hebrew Bible as the thousand-years-long record of a people’s history, nor did they see in it any movement or development of thought. It was all the Word of God and the work of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>18</sup>

Interpretation based on, e.g. allegory, might be useful to the preacher, but in order to establish doctrine, or to engage in controversy, only the literal (i.e. God’s) meaning could be used. Thus a literal reading of Gen.3.19 can help Smith to condemn usury as unproductive parasitism: “When God set *Adam* his work, he sayed, *In the sweat of thy browes shalt thou live*: not in the sweat of his browes, but in the sweat of thy browes: that is, by the paines and cares, and labours of an other, for he taketh no paines himselfe.....” Furthermore, in Gen.1 God ordered men and beasts to “.....*increase and multiplie*, but he never said unto

---

<sup>14</sup> Dod, John: *A plaine and familiar Exposition of the Ten Commandments, With a Methodicall Short Catechisme* (London, 1632), p.3.

<sup>15</sup> Broughton, Hugh: *Works* (London, 1612), p.52.

<sup>16</sup> Goodwin, John: *The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted* (London, 1648), p.48.

<sup>17</sup> Broughton, *Ten Fathers*, p.1.

<sup>18</sup> Selbie, W.B., in Singer & Bevan (eds.), op.cit., p.407f.

money, increase and multiplie, because it is a dead thing which hath no seede, and therefore is not fit to ingender.”<sup>19</sup> (Thus sidestepping objections that investment, as the modern understands it, is not usury as envisaged in the Old Testament, i.e. the taking advantage of those worse off than oneself, directly and personally.)

The Bible was regarded as a single entity. Broughton’s purported deathbed utterances include: “The substance of the whole Bible is this: viz. That *Christ* is to suffer: And being the first from the Dead, is to give light to the World.”<sup>20</sup> In this, Broughton is representative of the conscious practice of all schools to read the Old Testament in the light of the New, as when he sees the pre-existent Christ: “Moses saw *Christ* the Angell, the God of *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*, in the bush, Ex.3, Deut.33.”<sup>21</sup> Owen, too, finds Christ’s pre-existence confirmed by Mic.5.2; Ps.2.7; Ps.110.10; Prov.8.23.<sup>22</sup> Owen sees the Holy Spirit active in the Old Testament, especially in prophecy and miracles, always with “a respect unto our *Lord Jesus Christ* and the gospel”.<sup>23</sup> Elsewhere he avows that Christians have an advantage over the rabbis, in having a divine guide to the Old Testament, in the New Testament. The rabbis must content themselves with reliance upon the traditions of the superseded Law, the Old Dispensation, thereby rendering themselves far more fallible. Thus, “The sense of the tongue is preserved for us by the 70, and the N.T.”<sup>24</sup> And, “And by the help of the 70, and N.T., we may excel all the Rabbins.”<sup>25</sup> Owen agrees: “The meanest believer may now find out more of the work of Christ in the types of the Old Testament than

---

<sup>19</sup> Smith, Henry: First Sermon on Usury (unpaginated; date unknown)

<sup>20</sup> Broughton, H., op.cit., p.190.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p.18.

<sup>22</sup> Owen, *Works*, Vol.viii, p.320.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., Vol.I, p.136.

<sup>24</sup> His initials and numerals.

<sup>25</sup> Broughton, op.cit., p.52.



any prophets or wise men could have done of old”.<sup>26</sup> Like Cosin and Andrewes, Broughton sees the use of the plural form אלהים as indicating the Trinity<sup>27</sup>, as does ‘Adonai’ (= “my pillars”). On the other hand, Broughton explains that the serpent used אלהים to corrupt the world into polytheism. He values Onkelos (“The other Paraphrasts are of little esteem”), but criticises him for avoiding anthropomorphisms, for “thereby he hath done great mischief” in Christian eyes, by reducing the force of the Old Testament text: “...the Law giveth termes to God from mans body and affections, preparing a faith to the Sons Incarnation”.<sup>28</sup> Much later, Thomas Goodwin writes, “....as Christ in David speaks, Ps.22.”<sup>29</sup> John Goodwin traces the “Gospel” as presented to Adam, then re-presented to ‘covenanters’ such as Abraham, Noah and Moses (to show that the Bible ‘hangs together’ as evidence of its being the Word of God).<sup>30</sup> Confidence in the literal truth of Scripture extends to authorship: Moses was the “first writer of holy Scripture..... He wrote the Law in five books.”<sup>31</sup> Also to the language: “Every book of it [the Old Testament] is written in the tongue, which Adam spake.....but not every chapter and verse.”<sup>32</sup> Broughton holds that until Babel there was only one language – Hebrew.<sup>33</sup> Much later, John Owen is still maintaining that the verbal inspiration extended to the very pointing of the Hebrew (a matter to which we must return below).<sup>34</sup>, which he holds as old as the letters, both being systematised by Ezra.<sup>35</sup> Broughton, too, following the rabbis,

---

<sup>26</sup> Owen, *Works*, Vol.XII, p.129.

<sup>27</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p.697.

<sup>29</sup> Goodwin, Thomas: *A State of Glory* (sermon of 1657) (London, 1657), p.41.

<sup>30</sup> Goodwin, John: op.cit., p.48ff.

<sup>31</sup> Ainsworth, Henry: Annotations upon the five Bookes of Moses, the Booke of the Psalmes, and the Song of Songs, or Canticles (John Bellamie, London, 1627), Preface (unpaginated)

<sup>32</sup> Broughton, H.: op.cit., p.665.

<sup>33</sup> Broughton, *Ten Fathers*, p.2.

<sup>34</sup> Nuttall, G.F.: *Visible Saints* (Blackwell, 1957), p.157f.

<sup>35</sup> Shades of some present-day claims about his ‘authorship’ of the whole O.T.!

was confident that the M.T. pointing was original – possibly at least partly because Rome held that the pointing was a latter rabbinical addition, which gave the *Magisterium* leave to re-point if it so desired.<sup>36</sup> Broughton held that the Massoretes, of whom Ezra was chief, rendered all characters and points accurately.<sup>37</sup> Rainolds, too, defends the integrity of the M.T. stoutly.<sup>38</sup> John Smyth believed that only the original version of the Scriptures was divinely inspired; any translation must be a “secondary Scripture, but much inferior to the originals.”<sup>39</sup> <sup>40</sup> John Owen concurred: translations differ, so it is impossible to say that any is the Word of God. Not only that, but the then extant Hebrew and Greek MSS are all copies, and therefore not themselves the Word of God.<sup>41</sup> But, says Owen, there is enough of it to establish the faith of an uneducated man who can read only English.<sup>42</sup> The Westminster Assembly stated this belief formally.<sup>43</sup> Rainolds concurs, urging that a better translation would be made directly from “the best copies” of the Hebrew text than (*pace* Hart) “best copies of the Latin”.<sup>44</sup>

Although they knew them to be unoriginal, some commentators noted the synagogue cantillation marks, in particular as they applied to the Decalogue. Here, uniquely in the Old Testament, the text is supplied with two sets of accents, one above, the other below the characters. God had caused those who used the Hebrew in their worship – his ancient people – to possess two ways of chanting the Commandments; to Christian commentators, this served to emphasise their critical importance. *Inter alios*, Ainsworth makes something of this, as he puts

---

<sup>36</sup> Broughton, H., *op.cit.*, p.669.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52.

<sup>38</sup> Rainolds, *op.cit.*, pp.246-250.

<sup>39</sup> Dale, R.W.: *op.cit.*, p.200.

<sup>40</sup> Until a decade or two ago, many Twentieth Century ‘Fundamentalists’ would have disagreed violently – so established was the authority of the Authorised Version!

<sup>41</sup> Owen, J., *op.cit.*, p.6ff.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19f.

<sup>43</sup> *Westminster Assembly: Articles of Belief* (London, 1648), Article VIII, p.6.

<sup>44</sup> Rainolds, *Summe*, p.248.



forward the view that in breaking one Commandment one has broken the lot: “....we may also refer the double accents, which most of these ten Commandments have, in the Hebrew Scripture, different from all the Bible besides: which though they serve a twofold manner of reading, the one common as the other Scripture, the other leisurely, and with a long pronunciation, as the Jewes used in their assemblies; yet they may lead us also, to observe a distinction of matter in some, and a conjugation or continued matter in other some”.<sup>45</sup>

So, “For them [the Puritans] the Bible is a revelation given through things which happened in history, and which it exactly records.”<sup>46</sup> And yet ..... and yet cracks were appearing in the cement of literalism as early as Elizabeth’s reign; Broughton says that the story of the agreement of the LXX translators is a fable<sup>47</sup> – which ill accords with his vaunting the Greek version as a God-given guide (*vide supra*). Henry Smith says that “Figurative speeches, must not be construed literally....” in polemical zeal (“this is my body”, “I am the door”, etc.) – though Smith himself could be silly in this respect: a “cup” is mentioned in the NT account of the Last supper, but not “wine” – why, therefore, is the chalice not turned to blood?! (The Carolines might well agree, especially about transubstantiation – though they believed in the Real Presence.)<sup>48</sup> A bit later, Gouge notices discrepancies between the Old Testament text and the quotations in the New Testament. He is not overly worried, however: “The letter of Scripture may be alledged, and yet the Word of God missed, as by all heretiques. And a man may swerve from the letter and yet alledge the true word of God, as the

---

<sup>45</sup> Ainsworth, *op.cit.*, p.77.

<sup>46</sup> Wakefield, G.S., *op.cit.*, p.19.

<sup>47</sup> Broughton, H., *op.cit.*, p.677.

<sup>48</sup> Smith, H., *Treatise on Holy Communion* (London, 1591) – no pagination.

Evangelists and the Apostles did many times.”<sup>49</sup> Much later still, Baxter concurs, distinguishing between doctrine and words expressive of it. He is tolerant of those – who must, it seems, have existed in his day, which is interesting – who cannot accept every part of the Bible as infallible.<sup>50</sup> John Goodwin is perhaps the most radical of Puritans on the Bible, and the nearest to a modern view: salvation, he says, doesn’t depend on “...inke and paper, nor any book or books, not any writing or writings whatever, whether translations or originals.”<sup>51</sup> Towards the latter part of the Seventeenth Century, reason had become a fashionable authority; “We get the impression that the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, still had a central place in the arguments about the shaping of political realities in the Puritan camp.” But cases are increasingly judged by natural law, as well as recognition that political circumstances differ as time goes by.<sup>52</sup> In mid-century, however, John Owen is disturbed by the appendix [of variant readings] to the *Biblia Polyglotta* (of which, on the whole, he approved), since he cannot accept that God would allow his Word to become corrupted.<sup>53</sup>

### The Apocrypha

The Puritans were far from comfortable about the Apocrypha, and bitterly opposed its inclusion in any volume labelled ‘Holy Bible’. Broughton is beside himself with loathing, and dips his pen in vitriol when he mounts a savage attack on the Apocrypha; he sees little of value in it - indeed, seems to hate it: “Such babbling afore God” [Prayer of Manasseh]; “The forged Baruch”; “a trifling Thalmudique fable” [II Macc.]; “...infinite impiety.....penned by some late

---

<sup>49</sup> Gouge, Wm.; *Workes* (London, 1627), Vol.I., p.154.

<sup>50</sup> Wakefield, G.S., op.cit., p.16.

<sup>51</sup> Wakefield, G.S., op.cit., p.18.

<sup>52</sup> Reventlow, G.von, op.cit., p.180f.

<sup>53</sup> Owen, J. *Works*, Vol.IV, p.449.



unlearned Rabbin” [Tobit]; “a trifling fable, most vain” [Susannah].<sup>54</sup> Again, “The Apocrypha every book, have grosse wickednesse and injury in them, against the true holy ..... a Turkey leprous slave might seemly be placed in seat, cheek by cheek, betwixt two the best Christian Kings; as the wicked Apocrypha betwixt both Testaments.”<sup>55</sup> He has a special scorn for Tobit and Judith, returning to attack them repeatedly. More soberly, the Congegationalists’ *Declaration* of 1658 stated: “The Books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of Divine inspiration, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of, then other humane writings.”<sup>56</sup>

### ***Sola Scriptura***

For Jacobean Puritans, less than a century had elapsed since the Bible was first made accessible to the laity. Thus their eagerness to saturate themselves with the Scriptures. They emphasised the importance of private Bible study, as necessary to the Christian life. “For the Puritan, living at a time when the vernacular Bible was still a ‘new thing’ and bought by martyrs’ blood, nothing could dispense with private reading.”<sup>57</sup> This led them to the belief in *sola scriptura* – that nothing should be believed or done that was not expressly enjoined in the pages of the Bible. When Ames wrote a clear and comprehensive statement of Puritan beliefs, he devoted his first chapter to the principle of *sola scriptura*.<sup>58</sup> The principle is regularly followed when engaging in controversy;

---

<sup>54</sup> Broughton, H., op.cit., pp.715-719.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p.651.

<sup>56</sup> *Declaration of the Faith and Order of the Congregational Churches in England* (London, 1658), p.3.

<sup>57</sup> Wakefield, G.S., op.cit., p.15.

<sup>58</sup> Ames, William; *English Puritanisme, Containing the maine Opinions of the Rigidest sort of those that are called Puritans in the Realme of England* (London, 1641).

Henry Smith uses Isaiah as an example of the prophets' railing against the cult, a favourite weapon in the arsenal of the Puritans (and later Nonconformists, to the present day), to ask the *sola scriptura* question about the Roman Mass (and by association Caroline liturgical practice): "Did Christ command you to doe more than he did, and not doe as he did?"<sup>59</sup> This is *sola scriptura* in one short query. One of the best statements of the principle is Dod's, as he condemns Papists who "...have defiled the whole worship of God with their owne intentions and superstition. As by praying for the dead, putting holinesse in meats and dayes, etc. in all which God may and will say unto them: Who required these things at your hands? So in the Sacraments. For in the Lords Supper, the bread must be coniured, and crossed, and kneeled unto, and likewise the wine, or else they think it not sufficiently sanctified: but where hath Gods word commanded any of these things? If they be so needful, then they condemne God for want of wisdom, in that hee could not see it; or if they be not needful, how dare they bee so bold as to adde them to Gods ordinances?"<sup>60</sup> (He then goes on to list many Romish practices, such as the sign of the cross at baptism, "and such trumperie".) Of course, like many of his ilk – Baxter an egregious though not sole exception – Dod (a) misconceives Roman beliefs, tending therefore to tilt at windmills; (b) provides no justification for the *sola scriptura* principle in the first place – though the fact that virtually everyone, including Roman Catholics, believed the Bible the very Word and words of God was doubtless enough to persuade any Puritan worth his salt. Thus one doesn't expect a deal of quotation from the Fathers from Puritans, *pace* Carolines, despite many of them knowing their patristics well enough. They tend to use the Fathers only when it suits them, as

---

<sup>59</sup> Smith, H.: *2<sup>nd</sup> Sermon on the Lord's Supper* (no pagination, nor date)

<sup>60</sup> Dod, J., *op.cit.*, p.71.



when Henry Smith quotes them ten times in order to ‘disprove’ transubstantiation!<sup>61</sup>

*Sola Scriptura* has many ramifications. One is that the Bible doesn’t need the Church’s authentication: it is self-proven. Broughton’s principle of interpretation (probably widely accepted by 1600) is that the Bible is its own witness. Resolving difficulties must be by no reference to literature outside the Hebrew tradition, but by either (a) reinterpretation or retranslating the text; or (b) exploring post-Biblical Jewish wisdom. (This position was attacked by other scholars, who feared the loss of knowledge of classical civilisations. Broughton’s great rival, Lively, was an opponent, scornful of the value of rabbinic learning.<sup>62</sup>) Thus John Owen can describe the Scriptures as not a “private whisper” but a “public testimony”, on the basis of the doctrine of guidance of and illumination by the Holy Spirit, available to all believers.<sup>63</sup> Scripture, indeed, must be expounded by Scripture, not by some ecclesiastical *magisterium* – unless the exposition be solidly based on Scripture, of course.<sup>64</sup> In support of this contention, Rainolds refers us to the Levites in Neh.8.8, וִיבִנוּ בַּמִּקְרָא . The Westminster Assembly upheld the principle.<sup>65</sup>

Not all Puritans, interestingly, were wedded to *sola Scriptura*. The exceptions include Baxter, who declared himself opposed to it (see above).<sup>66</sup> And sometimes those who declared themselves for the principle could unexpectedly agree with the Carolines, like John Goodwin, who also uses what he terms

---

<sup>61</sup> Smith, H., *Treatise on Lord’s Supper* (no pagination nor date).

<sup>62</sup> Firth, op.cit., p.154.

<sup>63</sup> Owen, J.: *Works* (ed.W.H.Gould, London, 1851), Vol.XVI, p.328.

<sup>64</sup> Rainolds, J.: *Summe*, pp.81-100.

<sup>65</sup> Westminster Assembly: *Articles of Belief*, op.cit., Article IX, p.6.

<sup>66</sup> Baxter, Rd. *Vindication of the Church of England in her Rites and Ceremonies, Discipline and Church-Orders* (abstracted from Baxter’s writings, London, 1682), p.32f.

“extrinsecall” evidence,<sup>67</sup> and as Henry Smith asks rhetorically why the Holy Communion may not be celebrated at night, as was the Last Supper. “The Church, which hath discretion of times and places, hath altered both the time, and the place, using the temples in stead of the chamber, and the morning in stead of the evening: for indifferent things are ruled by order and decencie.”<sup>68</sup> - the Carolines’ very point exactly. The question begged, of course, is precisely what are ‘matters indifferent’ – the perennial problem!

## TYPOLOGY

“The Puritan did not regard the Old Testament as less binding than the New, because ..... he believed that it revealed the same God and taught the things of Christ.”<sup>69</sup> In fact, the Puritans seem to be divided over typology, though all accept the phenomenon’s valid existence. Some follow Eusebius in seeing the Old Testament providing types of contemporary society, but others prefer Origen’s view, namely that Old Testament types are of the full revelation in Christ, and thus not directly applicable to later societies. The Carolines, as we have seen, held both positions, not finding them mutually exclusive. (One wonders if an ‘either/or’ mentality is characteristic of Puritan rather than Catholic thought.....?) Henry Smith explains his belief: “When Christ speaks of a new Testament, he implieth, that the ould Testament is fulfilled, the Sacrifices, and Ceremonies of the Law, did signifie Christ before he came, therefore they are fulfilled in his coming, no mo [sic] Sacrifices, no mo Ceremonies, for the truth is come.”<sup>70</sup> So far, the Carolines would agree, but not with Smith’s further

---

<sup>67</sup> Goodwin, J, op.cit., p.31.

<sup>68</sup> Smith, H., op.cit., (no pagination nor date).

<sup>69</sup> Wakefield, op.cit., p.14.

<sup>70</sup> Smith, H., op.cit. (no pagination nor date)



comment: "Sacrifices and Ceremonies are honourably, buried with the Priesthood of *Aaron*, let them rest, it is not lawful to violate the Sepulchers of the dead, and take their bodies out of the earth, as the Witch would rayse *Samuel* out of his grave. Therefore they which retaine Ceremonies, which should be abrogated reliques of Iudaism, or reliques of Papisme, may be sayd to violate the Sepulchers of the dead, and disturb the deceased, like the Witch, which presumed to raise *Samuel* out of his grave." The Puritans, therefore, were just as keen on detecting types as any other contemporary Christian: Sabbath rest presages eternity; the water-giving rock in the wilderness, Christ's blood; the manna, Christ's body; the Passover, Holy Communion.<sup>71</sup> "Moses bringeth *Israel* out of *Egypt*, by the blood of a Lamb, Ex.12.42 figuring the *Lamb of God*, which taketh away the sins of the world, John 1.29."<sup>72</sup> Interestingly, commenting on Ps.75, Ainsworth sees David a figure of Christ,<sup>73</sup> and not of the English monarch, as Andrewes reads in that Psalm and elsewhere.<sup>74</sup>

Some commentators, e.g. Brightman, see a type of the Reformed Church idealised in the Old Testament as Zion and in the New as the New Jerusalem of Revelation. The negative applies too: Rainolds (doubtless with Revelation in mind) finds in Babylon a type of Rome.<sup>75</sup>

One of the most active 'typologists' was a later Puritan, the Baptist Benjamin Keach (1640-1704). In his *Troposchemalogia* he gives a huge list of types of Christ, which includes fifteen people (not only the usual Adam, David, Moses, but also, e.g. Samson, Melchisedek, Elisha) and fifteen things or actions

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Broughton, H., op.cit., p.18.

<sup>73</sup> Ainsworth, H., op.cit., p.114.

<sup>74</sup> *Vide supra*, Ch.2, p.73.

<sup>75</sup> Rainolds, John: *The Prophetie of Haggai, Interpreted and applied in sundry Sermons By that Judicious Divine, John Rainolds, D.D. Never before printed, Beeing very usefull for these Times* (London, 1649), p.3.

(the Ark, sacrifices, the fiery, cloudy pillar *inter alia*), plus other types, e.g. circumcision (which he sees as a type of the casting off of sin in conversion, making one fit for baptism and entry into the new covenant people). He appends a lengthy discourse on the nature of types.<sup>76</sup> This long work consists of hundreds of collections of Biblical verses, many if not most from the Old Testament, with more or less allegorical comment, arranged in parallel columns, concluded with hortatory “inferences” – all very useful to the preacher. An example: “The Church as Anti-type of the Second Temple”, in which he expounds verses from Nehemiah and Haggai about the rebuilding of the Temple as paralleled by the ‘rebuilding’ of the Church by the Reformers. However, Keach is actually discriminating in ascription of types, and doesn’t find them everywhere in the Old Testament. He criticises, e.g., the Jesuit Gretzer, who identified Absalom with Christ and the tree on which he hung as the Cross; Keach calls him “a very daring and Non-sensical Type-maker, to make such an impious Typical Explication. For *Absalom* received just Punishment for his Rebellion against his Father”.<sup>77</sup>

## ANCIENT ISRAEL AND STUART ENGLAND

### Church, rather than State

“They [the Puritans] found a close analogy between their fortunes and those of Israel of old.”<sup>78</sup> So did the Carolines, but with a great difference. The Carolines lived in a realm, a geographical and political entity; the Puritans in a godly community in which national and political allegiances were less important, except as they served clear religious ends. Thus their analogy was the deliverance

<sup>76</sup> Keach, B.: *Troposchemalogia* (London, 1682), pp.413-435.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., from the Appendix *A Learned Discourse of Types, Parables etc.*, section on *Nine Canons or Rules expounding Types*, p.44.

<sup>78</sup> Selbie, W.B., in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.409.



of a chosen people – not now from Egypt and other ancient enemies, but from the Armada, from the Gunpowder, from the military might of Spain, and most of all from the Antichrist, from ..... Rome. The Puritans saw the Old Testament as showing the Lord of Righteousness, with direct commands, great rewards and salutary penalties, all this in association with the idea of covenant relationship involving strict obligations. It is thus easy to understand how in the Civil Wars the Parliamentary forces tended to see themselves as fighting the battles of the Lord of Hosts.<sup>79</sup>

#### **Exodus and Covenant theology**

As a result, the Puritans laid great stress on the Exodus, as the story *par excellence* of God's providential intervention to protect the faithful. Greenham is only one among very many to make the explicit reference.<sup>80</sup> The Exodus was also a pattern for the Christian life, as release from the bondage of sin into the freedom of the Kingdom.<sup>81</sup> The Exodus was followed by the Mosaic Covenant, and therefore the deliverance from Rome must mean that the Reformed Church was in a covenant relationship with God.<sup>82</sup> Ramifications included the emphasis virtually all Puritans placed upon infant baptism, as the sign of the New Covenant, succeeding circumcision in the Old. If baptism were to be restricted to adults, they argued, then the New Covenant must be narrower than the Old, something they could not countenance.<sup>83</sup> Similarly, the Lord's Supper was the equivalent of the Passover (the Carolines agreed) and God would be angered if either ordinance

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., pp.409-412.

<sup>80</sup> Greenham, *op.cit.*, p.63f.

<sup>81</sup> Watkins, O.C.: The Puritan Experience (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), p.23 and p.210.

<sup>82</sup> See Baskerville, S.: Not Peace but a Sword: the political theology of the English Revolution (Routledge, 1993), pp.96-130, for an extended treatment of this topic.

<sup>83</sup> Wakefield, *op.cit.*, p.39f.

were misused or neglected (Gen.17, esp.v.14; Num 9; Deut.27). (However, unleavened bread was ‘ceremonial’ only, so not to be used by Christians.<sup>84</sup> When it came to considering “The Lord’s Anointed”, as in Ps.105.15, for example, the Puritan did not immediately envisage the monarch, as did the Caroline, but ‘God’s people’ (i.e. his own ‘godly’ community): annotation in the Geneva Bible made the point explicitly.<sup>85</sup> John Owen says that the Greek derivation of the word ‘Christians’ means that they are “partakers of a holy unction”, with the rights and privileges of those anointed in the Old Testament; he can thus paraphrase Ps.105.15 as “Touch not my Christians, and do my prophets no harm”. The priesthood of all believers offers sacrifice – of prayer and thanksgiving, good works, self-denial to “kill sin”, and maybe martyrdom.<sup>86</sup> Not only the Exodus inspired thoughts of deliverance. Rainolds sees the same in the Return from the Exile: “.....as the Jewes were long in bondage in *Babylon*, but at length were brought back by *Cyrus*; so our Ancestors were held long under the bondage of the spirituall slavery of *Rome*....”<sup>87</sup> So Rainolds can easily see the rebuilding of the Temple as a type of establishing the Reformed Church, and can devote all of fifteen sermons to the subject!

This covenant relationship with the Lord of Righteousness, indeed the Lord of Hosts, mindful of their own strict obligations and the ungodliness of the world in which they were temporary sojourners, led Puritans always to regard life as a form of warfare against sin, the world and the devil – so were perhaps the more easily moved to actual belligerence when these enemies were portrayed to him personified in Charles, Laud and their party, with their unsound – probably

---

<sup>84</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.435.

<sup>85</sup> McGrath, A: In the Beginning: the Story of the King James Bible (Hodder & Stoughton. 2001, p.47.

<sup>86</sup> Owen, J., *Works*, Vol.xix, p.29.

<sup>87</sup> Rainolds, J: Haggai, op.cit., p.3.



papist - views and tyrannical methods. “Their [Puritans’] whole outlook predisposed them to expect persecution. Thus any attempt at suppression, however half-hearted and limited in practice, tended to confirm and invigorate their view of the world.”<sup>88</sup>

#### **Church polity – *sola scriptura***

How the Church of Christ was to be organised exercised the minds of every Protestant Christian for two centuries after the Reformation; indeed, the subject was arguably the clearest and most potent cause of difference among the Reformers and the generations which followed them. In England, whose Reformation had been led as much by politicians and rulers as by churchmen and theologians, things had not gone as far as on the Continent by any means, to the great satisfaction of some and the great dissatisfaction of others, and the big point of difference was on episcopacy. The spectrum of views ranged from extreme Carolines, like Laud, who believed that the Order was divinely-ordained, through others who accepted that it was merely a hallowed and useful means of governing the Church, down to those who thought of episcopacy as a work of the Antichrist, to be got rid of as completely and as soon as possible. Thus Bayly, more than a century after the English Reformation started, is still complaining: “All the Reformed World is fully agreed to have Episcopacie overthrown, onely some few of the English Church, for their own interest do oppose.”<sup>89</sup> It has to be said at this point that not by any means all Puritans were against episcopacy (e.g. Rainolds, who eventually became a bishop himself), nor were all Carolines convinced of the Divine Right of the Order (e.g. Ussher, Sanderson). The problem facing us in this

---

<sup>88</sup> Oldridge, D.: *Religion and Society in Early Stuart England* (Ashgate, 1998), p.65f.

<sup>89</sup> Bayly, L.: *The Practice of Piety* (London, 1669), p.9.

study is that the arguments are based almost entirely and unsurprisingly on the New Testament and the Fathers, and the principle of *sola Scriptura* was invoked by the Puritans. Andrewes, admittedly, did enlist the support of the Old Testament: if anybody would, he would.<sup>90</sup> This attempt Milton (in younger days an admirer of Andrewes) expressly rejects; no defence of hierarchy can be based on the Old Testament, in his view: only the New Testament may be used in establishing matters of church polity.<sup>91</sup> Now and again, however, one comes across a Puritan trying to do otherwise; Baynes tackles hierarchy mainly on New Testament and patristic grounds, but introduces some discussion of Aaron and his sons.<sup>92</sup> He claims that the Carolines compare bishops *vis-à-vis* priests with Aaron *vis-à-vis* his sons, and says that this is only a matter of degree, not: "...orders different essentially in their power."<sup>93</sup> Priests elected the High Priest [whence came that notion?]. He 'clinches' his argument by stating that Aaron's priesthood is a type of Christ's, and no man's.

Puritans were always interested in the duties and standards of ministers, as well as their status. Greenham emphasises the minister's essential duty, to pray for his people (Carolines would agree). He gives the examples of Moses, Abraham (for Lot), Samuel, Phinehas and Elijah.<sup>94</sup> Rainolds is much opposed to pluralism, which even many Puritans accepted, perhaps reluctantly as a way of making clerical ends meet. He asserts that residence in one's cure is absolutely necessary to the proper discharge of the minister's duties. This he finds in Haggai, supported by Ezek.22.30, where God cannot find a 'minister' through whom he

---

<sup>90</sup> *Vide supra*, Ch.2, p.78.

<sup>91</sup> Wolfe: *Complete Works of John Milton* (Yale, 1953), p.764.

<sup>92</sup> Baynes, Mark: *Diocesan Trials* (London, 1641), p.49.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p.50.

<sup>94</sup> Greenham, R.: *op.cit.*, p.392.



might have prevented the evildoings reported in that chapter.<sup>95</sup> The standards of behaviour required of the godly minister sometimes lend weight to the popular picture of the stern-faced, killjoy Puritan: “Trifles in the Ministers mouth are blasphemies; laughter in him is unseemlie. All will cry and say to them in their infirmities, Art thou become weake also as we?”<sup>96</sup>

Some Independents and Baptists found in the Old Testament support for their rejection of any special ‘order’ of minister, and their belief in the priesthood of all believers. Owen quotes Exod.19.6: “Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests,a holy nation.” Like the Israelites, Christians (being the new Chosen People) are all priests, therefore – though that doesn’t mean they are all qualified to be ministers of the gospel.<sup>97</sup>

#### **Civil authority, and Divine Right.**

We have seen how the Carolines worked out and promulgated the theory of the Divine Right of Kings, which can sometimes appear their defining characteristic throughout the Seventeenth Century – and before and after in some circles too (the last Non-Juring clergyman died in the early Nineteenth Century, in fact). It was probably accepted by many if not most ordinary people (who may well have been content with the personal rule of a well-intentioned monarch, preferring it to that of a group of professional politicians, who themselves represented certain narrow interests in society). Indeed, it was accepted by not a few leading Puritans. Morton is hard to pin down: he wasn’t a ‘pukka’ Caroline; he was Calvinist in theology, but a fervent supporter of monarchy by Divine Right of the Lord’s Anointed. In his work on the subject, he adduces an impressive

---

<sup>95</sup> Rainolds, J: *Commentary on Haggai*, op.cit., p.35ff.

<sup>96</sup> Greenham, R, op.cit., p.399.

<sup>97</sup> Owen, J.: *Works* (ed.Russell,T., London, 1826), Vol.XIX, p.26.

array of Old Testament witnesses: Jer.33.5,6; Hos.13.11; many other quotations, from I Samuel, Judges, Genesis, Daniel, Exodus, Isaiah, II Samuel, Proverbs, Habakkuk, Deuteronomy and the Psalms (as well as the New Testament and some Fathers).<sup>98</sup> John Bodin (“A Protestant according to the city of Geneva”) wrote a treatise in 1648 entitled *The Necessity of the Absolute Power of all Kings*, in which we read that David is the great exemplar, not only as king, but as subject, for he refrained from killing Saul when the latter was seeking David’s death and David was in a position to kill him; David was also the executioner of Saul’s self-confessed killer.<sup>99</sup> Rainolds, famously moderate, is with the Carolines on the divine provision of monarchy as a force for order, referring, as they do, to the lawless society portrayed towards the end of Judges.<sup>100</sup> Slightly earlier, Perkins cannot be faulted on his upholding of monarchy: “God therefore hath given to Kings, and to their lawfull deputies, power and authority not only to command and execute his owne lawes, commanded in his word: but also to ordaine and enact other good and profitable lawes of their owne, for the more particular governments of their people .... And further, God hath given these gods upon earth, a power as to make those lawes and annexe these punishments”.<sup>101</sup>

It is interesting to compare Ainsworth with what Andrewes has to say about certain verses of the Old Testament in this connection. Andrewes makes much of God’s giving “salvation to kings” (Ps.144.10)<sup>102</sup>, but Ainsworth makes no comment at all.<sup>103</sup> On Ps.129.5, there is no indication that Ainsworth sees the

---

<sup>98</sup> Morton, Thos.: *The Necessity of Christian Subjection* (Oxford, 1643).

<sup>99</sup> Quoted in Laslett, P., op.cit., p.324.

<sup>100</sup> Rainolds, J: *Summe*, op.cit., p.671. Cf. Andrewes, Ch.2., p.59.

<sup>101</sup> Perkins, *Works*, Vol.II, p.437, quoted in George, p.216.

<sup>102</sup> Vide supra, Ch.2., p.68.

<sup>103</sup> Ainsworth, H., op.cit., p.185.



Psalm as showing that the King's enemies are God's too,<sup>104</sup> whereas Andrewes takes this to be the burden of the Psalm.<sup>105</sup> On Gen.10.9, Ainsworth disagrees with Andrewes,<sup>106</sup> using the "Ierusalem Paraphrast": Nimrod is certainly God's enemy, but not the king's.<sup>107</sup> Similarly, on Gen.3.14, the serpent is mankind's enemy and God's: kings don't come into it.<sup>108</sup> Andrewes's interpretations are not simply erroneous, however; they emanate from the logic of his position: Since the King is God's agent and representative, it follows that his enemies are also and always God's and mankind's (or at least his own people's).<sup>109</sup>

Many Puritans did not accept the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. It is interesting that in rebelling against the king they were acting according to Roman Catholic doctrine, articulated by Cardinal Bellarmine, but actually long held: "....this principle had its origins in the claim of Pope Gregory VII and his successors that unworthy rulers could legitimately be removed, despite the biblical injunctions to obey the powers-that-be."<sup>110</sup> All Puritans, even the more radical (Separatists, later Independents, later still Congregationalists) looked to Israel at its best (however that might be judged) as the model for Christian societies. This was one of the most important reasons for their interest in the Old Testament, as it was for the Carolines. The Puritans were not at all anarchists: as we shall see below, they believed that citizens must obey the government and magistrates – but what sort of government? And by whom? By the Lord and his saints, was their answer, in contrast to the Caroline view.<sup>111</sup> "The state, in the Puritan's mind, was

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., p.174.

<sup>105</sup> Vide supra, Ch.2., p.75.

<sup>106</sup> Vide supra, Ch.2., p.67f.

<sup>107</sup> Ainsworth, op.cit., p.44.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., p.12.

<sup>109</sup> Vide supra, Ch.2, p.67.

<sup>110</sup> Bradley, I.C.: God save the Queen: the spiritual dimension of monarchy (Darton Longman and Todd, 2002), p.94.

<sup>111</sup> Nuttall, G., op.cit., p.144.

bound to be subordinate to and to minister to the needs and requirements of the Spiritual Covenant, which for him towered above everything else on earth.”<sup>112</sup> This is a huge generalisation – doubtless true of many Puritans, but by no means all. (It was also, incidentally, the mediaeval Roman view, but in the Puritans’ case is part of that development of the separation of Church and state characteristic of modern times – a development utterly un-Caroline, of course.) Annotations in the Geneva Bible, on Daniel, especially 6.22 and 11.36, as well as Exod.1.19,22, teach that kings don’t always have to be obeyed; indeed, it can be a duty to disobey, if in one’s judgement the ruler does not act according to the will of God. (Compare and contrast the Caroline view that even unjust rulers are better than none, and must be obeyed.) Geneva regularly uses ‘tyrant’ to refer to monarchs, suggesting republican sympathies among the exiles who produced it: the Authorised Version never uses the word.<sup>113</sup> Most English Puritans were not republicans, however – not even during the Interregnum, and many would echo Greenham’s sentiments; when commenting on Prov.22.1 he says that a ruler’s or superior’s ‘good name’ is to be gained through “virtuous and godly dealings”<sup>114</sup>. The Carolines agreed. It may be noted that Greenham, Perkins and other early Puritans really represent Elizabethan Puritanism, rather than the fully developed mid-Seventeenth Century variety, when the battle lines were more clearly drawn. They give no hint of republicanism, and retain a belief in the rightness of a civil hierarchy (and not a few of them accepted it contentedly in the Church too).

Like the Carolines, the Puritans dwelt much upon the Fifth Commandment when considering civil authority; the view is succinctly expressed in the *Larger*

---

<sup>112</sup> Jones, R.M.: Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth (Harvard Univ.Press, 1932), p.146.

<sup>113</sup> McGrath, A.: In the Beginning, op.cit., p.142f.

<sup>114</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.70.



*Catechism* of the Westminster Assembly: “By Father and Mother, in the fifth Commandment, are meant not onely naturall parents, but all superiours in age and guifts, and especially such as by God’s ordinance are over us in place of authority, whether in Family, Church or Commonwealth.”<sup>115</sup> (In fact, virtually everything in this treatment of the Ten Commandments is quite ‘Caroline’.)

Dod expounds this Commandment at length,<sup>116</sup> largely dwelling upon duty to superiors. The Seventeenth Century was a highly hierarchical society, as seen by the often violent reaction to such tiny egalitarian groups as the Quakers, Levellers and Diggers, who seemed to be denying – with no Scriptural warrant, N.B. – a universally obvious fact of societal life. He couples ministers with secular officers as worthy superiors: this is a distinctive Puritan idea, a point made by many of their commentators. Their flocks must give ministers financial, moral and prayerful support – and obey them! Dod acknowledges secular government to emanate from the King, whose people are subject to him and his lawfully appointed officers. He departs from Geneva in urging the Caroline view that the first duty of a subject is passive submission, except in the one circumstance, “....that the Prince .... command things unlawful, against the commandement of God; then indeed we must with Saint *Peter* say, *It is better to obey God than man*; but yet so, that we be content to beare any punishment that shall be laid upon us, even to death it selfe.”<sup>117</sup> (Here he uses Daniel as an example.) He is thus just as opposed to rebellion as any Caroline; magistrates are to be obeyed, rogues punished.<sup>118</sup> Outside these formal relationships, reverence

---

<sup>115</sup> *Larger Catechism*, London, 1647, p.35.

<sup>116</sup> Dod, *op.cit.*, pp.166-230.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p.216.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, p.218.

is to be shown to one's social superiors (including persons of senior generations), and *noblesse oblige* should be practised by the latter.<sup>119</sup>

Perkins writes in similar vein. The Commandment applies “....by a figure .... To all those that are our superiors.” These include “Magistrates and Ministers”. He summons Old Testament support: “The kings of Gerar were called *Abimelech*, my father the king, Gen.20.2.” He also quotes Gen.45.8; II Kg.5.13 and 2.12 as examples of superiors’ being addressed as ‘father’.<sup>120</sup> Although Puritans were much against such things in worship, physical gestures, according to Perkins, are quite in order to show reverence to human superiors, since they have scriptural warrant, e.g. rising (Gen.18.2), bowing (Gen.18.2 again), and standing (Gen.18.8; Exod.18.13).<sup>121</sup>

One finds that Puritans often don't concentrate upon topics and Biblical areas which interest the Carolines, and *vice-versa*. Ainsworth, for example, does not treat the Fifth Commandment so extensively as does Andrewes. Nevertheless, it is instructive to compare them once again. When we do, we find an almost total agreement. “This precept is to maintaine the order which God hath set amongst men of superioritie and subjection.”<sup>122</sup> Commenting on Ps.82, he further agrees that this refers to magistrates, “....whose office is the ordinance of God [citing Rom.13.1,2, as Andrewes has] and who are to execute not the judgements of man, but of the Lord, who is with them in the cause and judgement, 2.Chron.19.6, Deut.1.17. In Verse 2 of the Psalm, “gods” means judges, as the Chaldee translateth,” so he deduces that, “This Psalm was spoken to the Magistrates of

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., p.220ff.

<sup>120</sup> Perkins, W.: *The Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ, in the Universitie of Cambridge, M.W.Perkins* (Cambridge, 1605), p.47.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., p.48.

<sup>122</sup> Ainsworth, op.cit., p.75.



Israel.”<sup>123</sup> The agreement extends to the justification of warfare, which the Puritans also saw as supported by the Old Testament, though they tended to emphasise the idea of the ‘just war’: warfare can be holy (Exod.32.29): “....the execution of justice is acceptable to God as sacrifice, 1 Sam.15.18-22.” At this point he tends towards allegory, interpreting Moses’s weariness (Exod.17.8-13) as men’s inability “to endure long spiritual exercises.”<sup>124</sup> [Doubtless something many Puritan preachers had noticed on occasion.....!]

Rather earlier, Greenham was articulating similar thoughts. Both ministers and magistrates – the two both distinguished and coupled, as per Puritan ideology – are to be obeyed. He points out that the Israelites’ ‘murmuring’ in Exodus was directed not against God, but against his servants put in authority over them, Moses and Aaron (the one a ‘magistrate’, the other a ‘priest’, N.B.)<sup>125</sup> Greenham devotes a whole treatise to magistrates. Like some Carolines, he refers to Exod.18.21 on the necessity of delegation, but makes no mention of the monarch doing the delegating, a significantly different emphasis. His other Old Testament references are merely illustrative of the qualities required – or to be avoided – in a magistrate; all aspects of magistracy are viewed through the eye of reason and common morality.<sup>126</sup> Greenham shows how the Carolines had no monopoly of hatred and horror of disorder, by devoting Chapter II of his *Godly Observations* to the subject. “Order must be had in all things.” Interestingly, he sees order as not only emanating from and desired by God, but actually exemplified by his nature: “We shall see an order even in God himselfe: in the Trinitie, though all the persons bee equall, yet there is an established order of the

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., p.125f.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., p.63.

<sup>125</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.61.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., pp.387-389.

second person, of the third person, though not for essence, which is indivisible, yet for better order, of teaching of us to come to the knowledge of God.” Actions are to be done in the proper order (cf. ‘Children of Heli’, serving themselves first, in I Sam.2.)<sup>127</sup>

Some Independents held strongly to the ‘law and gospel’ idea: the New Testament replaces the Old, which is therefore not applicable to contemporary government, since the latter is secular, imposed by men, and not the theocracy of ancient Israel.<sup>128</sup> The Westminster Assembly disagreed: “God, the supreme Lord and King of all the World, hath Ordained Civil Magistrates, to be, under him, over the People....” - and, importantly, goes on to affirm the Magistrate’s authority to supervise the Church.<sup>129</sup> Owen, too, declares that magistrates are charged by God with the welfare of their people, like Mordecai (Esther 10.4) and David (Ps.101).<sup>130</sup>

Their reading of the Fifth Commandment, then, persuaded the Puritans that civil and religious power went hand-in-hand.<sup>131</sup> Like Andrewes, Ainsworth sees this stemming from the Exodus. On Ps.77.21, he refers to “Moses, being their King, and Aaron their Priest,” – just as Andrewes does.<sup>132</sup> This does not necessarily mean that the monarch is to be the single ruler of both Church and State, but John Hopkins can preach thus about James’s accession: “For now the two pieces of wood so long disjoined, mentioned in the 37<sup>th</sup> of Ezekiel we might also say, are made one in the hand of our sovereign; Now is that made one in government, which nature had made one in situation: now the two brethren Joab

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., p.817.

<sup>128</sup> Reventlow, H.G., op.cit., p.180.

<sup>129</sup> Westminster Assembly: *Articles of Belief*, op.cit., Article XXIII, p.38.

<sup>130</sup> Owen, J. op.cit., Vol.XV, p.507.

<sup>131</sup> Collinson, P., in Knox, R.B.: *Reformation Conformity and Dissent* (Epworth Press, 1977), p.73.

<sup>132</sup> Ainsworth, op.cit., p.117.



and Abishai may help one another.”<sup>133</sup> Ferrell comments that the result of this co-operation in II Sam.2 was the fight against a faction hostile to David, the inference being that popery in Britain was now facing a more formidable opposition – with a possible additional implication that the Reformation could proceed further in a Protestant direction.<sup>134</sup>

Reventlow claims that some Puritans did offer strong support for royal supremacy over both Church and State, arguing from Abraham as the first divinely appointed ruler.<sup>135</sup> Some arguments are similar to those in Andrewes’s imaginative and important sermon on the “Two trumpets” of Num.10.1,2.<sup>136</sup> Yet Ainsworth, on the same passage, refers not at all to Moses’s possession of them (crucial to Andrewes); he claims that there were two trumpets “as Aaron had but two sons Priests”. Thus the significance is transferred to the authority of God’s ministers to convene congregations, so “...all meetings of the Church (i.e. Israel) should be sanctified by the word of God and prayer.”<sup>137</sup> His addendum to the *Annotations of Psalms*, “Of the Musick that Israel had in the Temple” reads, “In all the days of solemn feasts, and at the New Moones, there were Priests blowing with trumpets in the houre of the sacrifice; Num.10.10.” James Melville, one of the most obstinate Scottish ministers, takes definite issue with Andrewes over this passage, condemning his interpretation as a subversion of the text.<sup>138</sup> Rainolds, on the other hand, adopts Hopkins’s view: “Every lawfull Prince is the supreme governour of his owne subiectes in things spirituall and temporal.”<sup>139</sup> He adduces many examples in the Old Testament of civil powers’ punishing those who offend

---

<sup>133</sup> Quoted in Ferrell, L.A.: *Government by Polemic* (Stanford Univ.Press, 1998), p.43.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., p.43f.

<sup>135</sup> Reventlow, op.cit., p.209ff.

<sup>136</sup> *Vide supra*, Ch.2., p.72f.

<sup>137</sup> Ainsworth, op.cit., p.61.

<sup>138</sup> Ferrell, op.cit., p.129.

<sup>139</sup> Rainolds, *Summe*, op.cit., p.671.

in religious matters, including Exod.22.20; Lev.24.16; Deut.13.5, 18.20; Num.15.35.<sup>140</sup>

For the Independents, religion was a matter of individual conscience, and magistrates had absolutely no jurisdiction in that sphere: a flat contradiction of the Carolines' view. However, there were still limits, it seems, for they thought that the first table of the Decalogue, at least, should be enforced by law. Ireton, e.g., cites the Old Testament as indicating the need for the authorities to support God's laws, and to punish disobedience to them, whether cultic or moral.<sup>141</sup> However, left-wing Independents, such as the Levellers, refused to accept the Old Testament as authoritative on its own, without the sanction of 'the universal moral law' (though Reventlow makes the point that the Levellers in particular were more of a political party than a Puritan sect).<sup>142</sup> However, even the more extreme Diggers could use the Old Testament when it suited them; in one of Winstanley's diatribes against private ownership, he summons sixteen Old Testament references in support, ranging over Genesis, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk and Zephaniah (plus one from Romans),<sup>143</sup> while in another work some 20% of his citations are from Ezekiel.<sup>144</sup> John Owen can preach a 55pp (2 hrs?) sermon on 'toleration'.<sup>145</sup> Nevertheless, with regard to the more radical Puritans, Jones is right to say that "These men were sworn foes of absolutism, unless it was their kind of absolutism." He cites Massachusetts, where 80% of the population were excluded from the franchise on

---

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., p.670.

<sup>141</sup> Reventlow, op.cit., p.178.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., p.179.

<sup>143</sup> George, C.H., in Cole & Moody (eds): The Dissenting Tradition (Ohio Univ.Press, 1975), p.214.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., p.209.

<sup>145</sup> Owen, J, op.cit., Vol.XV, pp.200-253.



religious grounds, as a prime example of this bias.<sup>146</sup> Closer to home, he might well have referred to politico-religious developments during the Interregnum..... New describes the traditional view of historians until recently (a view he doesn't share) as: "The Puritans were fighting for toleration, though too often they betrayed their historic mission when they were in power."<sup>147</sup>

Many of those Puritans who accepted the royal supremacy could also accept the doctrine of passive obedience, even when applied to religious affairs: "King Ahaz burnt incense in his places; the sonne, Ezekias, did abolish them; the nephew, Manasses, restored them againe; and Josias, his nephew, abolished them againe. Yet the prophets were not moved by these changes to denie their soveraintie in matters of religion."<sup>148</sup> Perkins, earlier, enjoined men to put up with unjust superiors, even their unmerited punishment, as had Hagar endured Sarah's maltreatment of her (Gen.16.6).<sup>149</sup> Sins against superiors include mockery (Hamm, in Gen.9.22), disobedience, even to marrying against parents' wishes (Gen.6.2), and attempting to escape their clutches (Gen.16.6). He takes a swipe against the Papists' claim to absolve people of their loyalty to a monarch, even encouraging them to assassinate their ruler, on the basis that I Sam.26.8,9 argues against this.<sup>150</sup>

Like the Carolines, Puritans considered the other side of the coin of deference – the duties owed to inferiors. Perkins, for instance, examines this, with the curious choice of Dan.3.28 to support: "This condemneth those mothers, which put forth their children to be nursed, having both sufficient strength and store of milk themselves to nurse them." On the other hand, parents and other

---

<sup>146</sup> Jones, op.cit., p.145.

<sup>147</sup> New, J.F.H.: Anglicans and Puritans (A. & C.Black, 1964), p.33.

<sup>148</sup> Rainolds, Summe, op.cit., p.672.

<sup>149</sup> Perkins, op.cit., p.49.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., p.51.

superiors must not be too lenient, for their <sup>151</sup>charges' and inferiors' sakes; they must mind the bad example of David (I Kg.i.5) and Eli (I Sam.2.22). The Westminster Assembly promulgated this view, just as the Carolines did, with an emphasis on responsibilities towards subordinates.<sup>152</sup> Dod, who has much more on relations within the family than do most other commentators on the Fifth Commandment, examines the husband-wife and parent-child relationships, with predictable advice. He also takes pains over the master-servant relationship. In all these, he emphasises 'mutuality', explaining that all stations in life are necessary to the well-being of society, and must work co-operatively, in a complementary, trusting and trustworthy manner.<sup>153</sup>

Gouge, in his *Short Catechisme*, states the reciprocal responsibilities:

“Q. What .... is required in the fifth Commandment?

A. Reverence to all that have any excellency above us, and Obedience to all that have authoritie over us.

Q. Are not superiours bound to any dutie towards their inferiours?

A. Yes: the Law that giveth honour to them, requireth that they carie themselves worthy of honour towards their inferiours.”<sup>154</sup>

The complexity of view on the eve of the Civil Wars is analysed and clarified by Roy Strong: “Both sides of the divide had viewed the monarchy as divinely appointed, but the approach to that divinity was very different. For the opposition, that was valid in terms of the Crown occupying the position of Elizabeth I, an eschatological one of the kings of England as rulers of the Last Days preparing the way for Christ's Second Coming and the vanquishing of the

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., also p.51.

<sup>152</sup> Westminster Assembly: *Larger Catechism*, p.35. (On 5<sup>th</sup> Commandment)

<sup>153</sup> Dod, op.cit., pp.166-230.

<sup>154</sup> Gouge, Wm.: *A Short Catechisme* (unpaginated)



Antichrist of Rome. For the king and his archbishop that divinity stemmed from an analogy of the monarchy to the cosmos, the king and queen as sun and moon raining down their blessings upon their subjects in terms of peace, justice and moral example. Both sides claimed that an imbalance had occurred. The royal view was that political order was the product of the king's power and Charles as an heroic ruler had brought order and civilisation to his people but now his power was threatened by erosion from the populace. The parliamentary view was that certain laws and liberties were derived from immemorial tradition as old and fundamental as the monarchy itself. Any king, they claimed, who attempted to violate them was dissolving the very foundations of society.”<sup>155</sup>

## **WORSHIP**

### ***Sola Scriptura* – no symbols – Commandments I and II**

The Puritans claimed to be concerned about reverence and awe in worship, just as much as anyone (though the opposite was a charge levelled against them, not always justly, by the Carolines). An example is the care they tried to take over preparation for Holy Communion, based on the Passover, “a signe of the Lord's Supper”. Smith notes, from Exod.12.3,6, that four days were to elapse between the selection of the lamb to the sacrificing of it, to allow a period of spiritual preparation, drawing from this the lesson that, “...if they did prepare themselves so before they did receive the figure of this Sacrament, how should we be prepared before we receive the Sacrament it self?”<sup>156</sup> The serious note is maintained by the Westminster Confession: “....delivering the truth not in the enticing words of man's wisdom ..... abstaining also from an unprofitable use of

---

<sup>155</sup> Strong, R.: The Spirit of Britain (Hutchinson, 1999), p.270.

<sup>156</sup> Smith, H.: Second Sermon on the Lord's Supper (no pagination, nor date).

unknown tongues, strange phrases, and cadences of sounds and words; sparingly citing sentences of ecclesiastical or other human writers, ancient or modern, be they never so elegant.”<sup>157</sup> [*O tempora, O mores, O Lancelot!*] Allied with distrust of clever oratory is distrust of the arts in general. This sentiment has Old Testament roots: the people sitting down to eat and drink, and rising up to play (drama), the prohibition of graven images (art); the sorry story of the Israelites’ decadence was due to their self-indulgence and lack of self-discipline in these and other respects.

Thus there was the Puritan inclination towards plainness in worship. “I hate them that hold of superstitious vanities,”<sup>158</sup> thundered Peter Smart, echoing Ps.31.7 on the title page of his rant against Cosin, the published version of his sermon of 1628. Much later, John Milton rails predictably against ritualistic regulations as “dead Judaism”; “for that which was to the Jew but jewish is to the Christian no better than Canaanitish.”<sup>159</sup> Perkins heralds Commandment II as totally prohibitive of images in churches. Some Old Testament examples are excused, e.g. the Cherubim, which were not seen, and were in any case “types of the glorie of the Messiah”. But he uses the Old Testament extensively when inveighing against idolatry, mining its oft-repeated abhorrence of ‘foreign gods’ and bitter condemnation of the Israelites’ propensity for whoring after these. This enables Perkins *et alii* to dismiss the slightest hint of popery out of hand, even associating with papists – including the activities of diplomats engaged on negotiating international treaties.<sup>160</sup> Puritans entertained great suspicion with

---

<sup>157</sup> Noted by Hylson-Smith, *op.cit.*, p.198.

<sup>158</sup> Smart, P.: *Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of Durham, July 7<sup>th</sup>, 1628* (London[?], 1640. Interestingly, Smart says that his quotation is “In the common translation” – yet it is not AV, nor Geneva (since he also gives these).

<sup>159</sup> Wolfe, *op.cit.*, p.862ff.

<sup>160</sup> Perkins, *op.cit.*, p.32.



regard to what many, especially Carolines, held to be 'matters indifferent'. Unbiblical ceremonies are simply not allowed: only ones ordered by God may be used. Thus the jar of manna in the Temple was no abuse, since God had commanded that it "bee reserved as a monument for posteritie, Exod.16.33". This in contrast to the abuse of the brazen serpent and Gideon's ephod, "because they were without God's commandment reserved".<sup>161</sup> Though more concerned with words than ceremonial, Prynne's characteristically hysterical attack on Cosin's *Devotions* is based on the Old Testament. However, his is not a serious treatment of Scripture, but extensive use of Old Testament references as they suit his purpose; it is pure polemic: he has made up his mind already, of course. He was a trained lawyer, after all.....

Naturally, the Carolines fought back, with their formidable intellectual armoury. Arguing against the *Directory of Public Worship* of 1645, which pretended to replace the Prayer Book's formal services with a Puritan-friendly pattern – or suggestions for patterns – of worship<sup>162</sup>, Jeremy Taylor goes to the Old Testament. Moses composed a prayer and a hymn for the Israelites' use; David a great many for use in the Temple; the reformer [N.B.!] Hezekiah commanded the use of David's and Asaph's words in services. Taylor is using the Puritans' arguments against them when he stresses that his is the more scriptural stance: since all Scripture is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (II Tim.3.16, AV) we must surely use any forms of prayer we find in the Bible.<sup>163</sup>

Some assorted points may be made. The Puritans were not devoid of humour, even when treating of serious topics. Baxter: "If I were commanded to

---

<sup>161</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.300.

<sup>162</sup> Much as we are getting now in what passes for Anglican liturgy!

<sup>163</sup> Davies, H.: Worship and Theology in England, 1603-1690 (Princeton Univ.Press, 1975), p.348.

read the Common Prayer in a Surplice and other formalities, I hope if the Church were all in an uproar, and the stools flying about my ears, as the women of *Edinburgh* used the Bishop, I might think it would not tend in that Congregation to order or Edification, to use such Ceremonies.”<sup>164</sup> A serious point follows, though, as he hits a nail on the head: “Were they things of Gods institution, they would not edifie the people till they were prepared to receive them; and therefore that preparation should go first.” Here a lesson Laud and Cosin could have better learnt, but not one needed by Andrewes.

Puritans thought, with some justification, that formalism in worship was wrong, simply because it could distract the individual from the battle against sin in himself, if he was tempted to think that he could win that battle merely by ‘going through the motions’ of religious exercises; thus, it was to be opposed.<sup>165</sup>

Sometimes exegesis can be forced, as when Smith claims that *מזבח* in Exod.27 means “table of the Lord” and not “altar”.<sup>166</sup>

The Puritans stressed the importance of Psalm-singing in the congregation, because of its impeccable Biblical pedigree. There were produced many collections of metrical versions for this purpose: Ainsworth’s, New England 1640, Long Parliament’s 1649 (used until recently in Scotland), and Milton’s versions among them.<sup>167</sup>

### Preaching

Generally speaking, the Carolines tended to place more emphasis on the sacraments than on preaching (though many of them were noted pulpit-masters),

---

<sup>164</sup> Baxter, R.: *Five Disputations of Church Government, and Worship* (London, 1659), p.459.

<sup>165</sup> Oldridge, op.cit., p.70.

<sup>166</sup> Smith, H.: *Treatise on the Holy Communion* (unpaginated, nor dated).

<sup>167</sup> See Selbie, W.B., in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., pp.423-427.



the Puritans taking very much the opposite view. Some even held that sacraments were validated only when accompanied by exposition.<sup>168</sup> Quantity as well as quality was held to be a virtue, as by Greenham: “Two sermons on the Sabbath are not sufficient for a man to feede on all the weeke after....”<sup>169</sup> Of the purposes of preaching, Greenham avers “...the most principall to increase and beget faith and repentance in God’s people”, and supports this by references to Dt.18.18; 33.10; Lev.10.11; Mal.2.6,7; II Chron.36.15; Isa.50.5-8; 53.1; 55,10.11; 57.19; 58.1; 61.1; 62.15. When preaching is not done adequately, “the people for the most part perish”, as seen in Prov.29.18; Hos.4.6; II Chron.15.13; Isa.56.9. Also, public and private reading of the Scriptures are required by Dt.6.6; 11.18; Ps.1.2; Neh.8.8.<sup>170</sup>

Some Carolines were moved to defend their position. Hammond, for example, arguing against Parliament’s *Directory of Public Worship* of 1645, defends the BCP’s small provision for preaching by pointing to the emphasis on catechism as at least as good a way of inculcating the faith, without the danger of the subjective mediation of individual ministers.<sup>171</sup>

It is not easy to generalise about differences of content, though the the Puritans tend to concentrate more upon individual piety and morality than do the Carolines, which may account for their greater use of homely illustrations: Dod is an exponent of these. It is just as hard, if not harder, to generalise about differences in style, but some tendencies are exemplified in individual preachers. Dod is typical in many ways. His references – even on the Ten Commandments – are mainly to the New Testament, with no dependence at all on the Fathers, and

---

<sup>168</sup> New, J.F.H.: op.cit., p.69f.

<sup>169</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.675f.

<sup>170</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.225.

<sup>171</sup> Davies, H.: op.cit., p.346.

his English style is plain. Dod was born in 1549, before Andrewes, and died in 1645, as did Laud – so already in the early Carolines' day there was an alternative tradition to their learned, florid style and use of extra-Biblical authorities. Dod is altogether simpler, more down to earth: "The next and last dutie required in this first Commandment, is to trust in God, with all our hearts, to put our full confidence in him, and relie wholly upon him, and him alone"<sup>172</sup> could be an extract from a sermon preached last Sunday. Many Puritans are not given to quote the Scriptures in the original languages. Dillingham says of Chaderton, "Very rarely in preaching did he use words in any other languages than the vernacular, though he knew a great many"<sup>173</sup> (This, despite Chaderton's being a leading academic.) Greenham used very few Biblical quotations of any kind<sup>174</sup>, compared with the Carolines – and none from the Fathers. Rainolds disapproves of quotations in foreign languages, even the 'learned' ones, citing St. Paul (I Cor. 14.19) and the example of Fathers who "never preached in the learned Hebrew, but in their vulgar tongue". He describes the special circumstances explaining the occasional use of Hebrew or Aramaic in the New Testament.<sup>175</sup> (He does have a lengthy Latin quotation in the first sermon of those published<sup>176</sup>, but a translation is provided at the end of the volume.

The Puritans are generally not so given to masses of references (usually in Latin) to other theological authors as were the Carolines.<sup>177</sup> Some Puritans based their opposition to any authority other than the Scriptures on the practice of the Old Testament prophets; Edward Dering says, "Only God must speak in the

---

<sup>172</sup> Dod, *Ten Commandments*, p.49.

<sup>173</sup> Dillingham, p.13.

<sup>174</sup> Though his editor has supplied many marginal references.

<sup>175</sup> Rainolds, *Haggai*, op.cit., p.86ff.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., p.5.

<sup>177</sup> Stranks, op.cit., p.100.



mouth of all ministers in the present age too.”<sup>178</sup> And Ainsworth: “The Christian Fathers and Doctors, because they are usually cited by expositors abundantly; I thought needless to repeat: and the rather for brevities, which is requisite in annotations”<sup>179</sup> – this prefacing a volume of nearly five hundred pages! On the other hand, Rainolds is not alone in including in sermons lengthy and detailed explanations of the historical background to a passage being expounded.<sup>180</sup>

Puritans’ expositions can be quite as detailed as Andrewes’s, e.g. John Owen’s four folio volumes on Hebrews. Many were just as given to divisions and sub-divisions, and some even more given. Also, like Andrewes, they frequently like to deal with ‘objections’ in the manner of the diatribe.<sup>181</sup> Some Puritans, such as Greenham, his near contemporary, preach shorter sermons than Andrewes – but so do some later Carolines (cf. Laud and Cosin, above). The style is plainer, with not a foreign word to be found, except in editorial margins. Puritans can be analytical, like Andrewes, though the comb is not quite so finely-toothed; an example is Greenham’s sermon on Gen.42, where he takes five non-consecutive verses one by one.<sup>182</sup> Sometimes sermons are imaginative, such as Broughton’s on the Lord’s Prayer, which is based solidly on the Ten Commandments.<sup>183</sup> (This sermon also illustrates a Puritan weakness, when Broughton can’t resist having a go at the Pope, this time for omitting the Doxology.) Another weakness in many preachers was extremely long sermons (Owen, e.g. was noted for these, replete as they were with Old Testament quotations.)

---

<sup>178</sup> Quoted in Morgan, J.: *Godly Learning* (CUP, 1986), p.124f.

<sup>179</sup> Ainsworth, *op.cit.*, *Preface*.

<sup>180</sup> Rainolds, *Haggai*, *op.cit.* A typical example is on p.6, on the Persian dynasty.

<sup>181</sup> Wakefield, *op.cit.*, p.24.

<sup>182</sup> Greenham, *op.cit.*, p.771.

<sup>183</sup> Broughton, *Works*, *op.cit.*, pp.391-399.

Puritan commentaries tend to be homiletic, so may be mentioned at this point. Lengthy commentaries are in fact nothing like so numerous as one might suppose, given the importance of and interest in the Bible, common to all groups in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England. Owen, however, pens nearly 400 pages on Ps.130,<sup>184</sup> while Greenham produces *Meditations on Psalm 119* which runs to 185 folio pages. If we didn't know that David was generally believed to be the author of nearly all the Psalms (and Greenham himself refers to David as "the Prophet"), we might wonder whether Greenham shares a modern view of this Psalm, namely, that it was written by a student. The commentary consists of amplification of each verse, as advice directed to a young man. So we have a difficulty: is this advice appropriate to King David?! Typical Puritan features in the commentary are a concern for individual character and belief, regular sideswipes at popery, and many Old Testament illustrations (Scripture interpreting Scripture: see above). Like its subject, this lengthy commentary can't help being repetitive and somewhat tedious, and one wonders at its motivation.<sup>185</sup> The treatment is similar in his sermon on Ps.16; it is likewise personal and devotional, with little theological argument, and no political comment – but several dismissive comments on "Papists, Anabaptists, Arrians and Familie of love".<sup>186</sup>

## THE SABBATH AND COMMANDMENT IV

A tremendous bone of contention between Puritans and others was the observance of the Sabbath/Sunday/Lord's Day, as it was variously called, or, rather, the manner of the observance. Interestingly, the early Reformers, e.g. Calvin and Tyndale, seem to have been pretty liberal on this matter – more so than

---

<sup>184</sup> Owen, J.: *Works*, Vol.XIV.

<sup>185</sup> Greenham, op.cit., pp.534-719.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid., pp.754-769.



the Catholics, perhaps.<sup>187</sup> But their habits did not prevail long, particularly in England. Obviously, most Biblical evidence adduced in argument was from the Old Testament, given the origin of the idea of sabbatical rest in ancient Israel; and most of the arguments circled around the Fourth Commandment. All were agreed that in some sort this was an ordinance of God, and that it applied to all men: Greenham states that it is not peculiar to the Jews, as it would be if only the Deuteronomy version of the Ten Commandments existed (which gives the Egyptian bondage as a reason). But since the Exodus version refers to Creation, then it must apply to all mankind.<sup>188</sup> And it must be kept.<sup>189</sup> Greenham produces a powerful sabbatarian argument in four treatises.<sup>190</sup> The Sabbath is the high point of the week: "God's market day" - no other ("popish") holy days are to be observed, since they are not ordered by God as the Sabbath is.<sup>191</sup>

Of the Commandments, II, IV and V attracted the most attention by far, from all groups of churchmen. They were in principal in agreement over II, very much agreed on V, but not on IV. Again, generalisation is difficult: Andrewes and some others of his ilk were sabbatarians, and not all Puritans were strict in observance. Some Puritans thought it the most important Commandment, because of its unique features: (a) it begins, "Remember...". This led Perkins to believe that the Sabbath did not originate on Sinai, but earlier, and was probably an aboriginal ordinance; a century later, Keach denies that the Sabbath was ordained in Eden: it was promulgated on Sinai, like the other Commandments. Likewise, he denies that the Patriarchs kept the Sabbath;<sup>192</sup> (b) a reason is given for this

---

<sup>187</sup> Wakefield, op.cit., p.59.

<sup>188</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.190.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., p.189.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., pp.180ff, 457ff, 225ff, 824ff.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., p.181.

<sup>192</sup> Keach, Benjamin: *The Jewish Sabbath Abrogated* (London, 1700), p.32f.

Commandment. Greenham is in no doubt as to why this is so: it is because God foresaw that some people would hold the Commandments merely ceremonial (see below)!<sup>193</sup>

Broughton explains that “Moses gave the Ceremoniall Law; types, shadowes, figures, etc. But Christ came to be the truth and end of that Law, to everyone that believeth.” And this is the nub of the problem. The perennial issue of Old Testament interpretation by Christians is to distinguish between what applied only to ancient Israel and what to later (Christian) generations. Or, as Seventeenth Century writers would put it, what belongs to the universal ‘moral’ law, and what is restricted to the Jewish ‘ceremonial’ law. The Carolines, as we have seen, divided the Commandment, dubbing the principle ‘moral’ and the details ‘ceremonial’.<sup>194</sup> The Puritans, on the other hand, take the view that all God’s injunctions had for the Jews both a moral and a ceremonial force, which in the case of the Ten Commandments, given their provenance, remain totally moral for Christians. Greenham says that “The Sabbath is wholly morall to us, and to our fathers; partly morall, and partly ceremoniall to the Jewes, unto whom every commandement had a ceremonie.”<sup>195</sup> This distinction partly explains why Puritans don’t argue much from the Old Testament about sacraments or church order, since, as Owen explains, Christ put an end to all the Jews’ ‘ceremonial’ laws and customs. So Greenham is confident that “to teach our children commandements of the Lord, appertaineth to us, Deut.6.7, but to bind them upon our hands for a figure, and as frontlets between our eyes, appertaineth to the Jewes: to burie the dead belongeth to us, but to embalme them with spices, who had not so cleere a testimonie of the resurrection, belongeth to the Jewes. Is not

---

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., p.183.

<sup>194</sup> Wakefield, op.cit., p.61.

<sup>195</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.825.



the law of murder as well enjoined us, as to the Jewes? Yet we may eate blood, which they could not. We ought to be as temperate as they, yet we may eate the fatnes of meate, which was forbidden them.”<sup>196</sup> Few Christians, then or now, would disagree, yet the interpretation remains arbitrary; when Greenham declares that, like the Jews, we are bound to have singing in our worship, “but yet not with Organes and such like” he leads one to wonder mischievously how many Puritan churches were equipped with loud cymbals, together with some of the well-tuned variety..... So Greenham, like nearly all Puritans, is convinced that the whole of Commandment IV is of the moral law. In any case, they took ‘ceremonial’ to mean more than a mere ceremony: it was to be taken as a ‘figure’ or type.<sup>197</sup> The Ten Commandments apply to all men, as descendants of Adam. They have not been abrogated by Christ: “If the Sabbath be ceremoniall, then the Lord gave but nine commandements”.<sup>198</sup> Furthermore, the fact that even Gentiles, in the universal desire to worship somehow, have a sense of it, proves that it belongs to the moral law.<sup>199</sup> Dod says the same, the Sabbath is “perpetual”, not ceremonial. (Therefore, Adam apparently needed it.) Commandment IV is just as important as any other Commandment – so breaking it is just as serious an offence as, say, murder.<sup>200</sup> On this basis, the rigour of Puritan observance can be better understood. (Dod mounts an interesting attack on “those who hold every day a Sabbath”. Were these certain Puritans? Or others, using special pleading? Or those keeping ‘popish’ holy days? Whoever they were, Dod is sure that they in fact keep no day a Sabbath! Towards the end of the century, Puritan ideas seem to have changed somewhat; Keach maintains that this Commandment is not of

---

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., p.207.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid., p.184.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., p.188, marginal note.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., p.206.

<sup>200</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.121.

the Moral Law, but a sign of the “Covenant of Works” (i.e. ceremonial). He doubtless remained a good sabbatarian, nevertheless, his interest being to oppose fellow-Baptists who were ‘seventh-day observers’.<sup>201</sup>

This is one of those matters which bring home to us that the Seventeenth Century thought-world was very different from ours. Then it was considered (by virtually everyone, with varying degrees of pleasure) that people are free to do as they like on all of six days, by God’s gracious permission – so they shouldn’t complain that on one day only they are restricted. (Of course, 99% of the people were not at all free on those days, and looked forward to liberty on Sunday!) But the Sabbath belongs to the Lord, says Greenham, and therefore we may not claim it for our own pleasure.<sup>202</sup> There was no need for Puritans to insist upon abstinence from normal daily work: virtually everyone was agreed on that point. Where they differed was over how much of the day was to be given over to ‘secular’ activities, and the nature of those activities. The Puritans were adamant that the whole day must be devoted to religious exercises, since it ‘belonged to the Lord’, and admitted of no secular activities at all.<sup>203</sup> Greenham backs this stance up with a long list of examples of Sabbath-breaking from the Old Testament: Neh.13; Isa.58.13; Jer.17; Exod.3; 16; 34.21; Jer.17.27; Exod.35; Gen.2.3. Dod says that “the Sabbath must be employed in holy exercises” – idleness is a sin, so the Sabbath is not for “bare rest”.<sup>204</sup> He inveighs against “them that be evill occupied” in any of the customary list of enjoyable activities: “The Sabbath is not to be kept by halves.”<sup>205</sup> Dod reminds his readers that the Sabbath, like any

---

<sup>201</sup> Keach, op.cit.

<sup>202</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.187.

<sup>203</sup> As hinted above, this was a peculiarly British notion: Calvin played bowls on Sunday afternoons!

<sup>204</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.131.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., p.132.



other day, has 24 hours – our bed-time thoughts, even our dreams, are not to be of mundane matters. He offers no advice as to how to ensure such strict observance.....

As we have seen, the Carolines agreed wholeheartedly on the need for abstinence from usual business or labour, on the need to attend public worship and to perform private devotions. Where most of them parted company with the Puritans was over recreational pursuits such as dancing or drinking. The logical effect of Puritan rigour in a society in which most people worked hard and long hours on six days out of seven would mean no time at all for pleasurable relaxation (except for the leisured classes). But the logic was promulgated: the Sabbath was a day belonging to God, and therefore man must not lay claim to it, and “not intrude ourselves upon his inheritance”. We must be warned by the example of Achan, Josh.6, who took for himself what was consecrated to God.<sup>206</sup>

Another argument was practical, in that the godly man would need all the Sabbath he could get, according to Greenham. Frequent prayer is desirable, “though not as the Monkes and Friers”<sup>207</sup> – he cannot overcome for a moment his anti-Rome prejudice, which leads him to try to square the circle: he cannot have it both ways – either prayer is frequent or it isn’t, never mind who’s doing it. The same sentiment colours his view of the daily worship of cathedrals and college chapels: though accepting that ideally all days would be Sabbaths (if men had no other calling or worldly responsibilities), he is less than enamoured of the daily worship in these places: “more of custome and fashion, then of faith and conscience in most of those places”.<sup>208</sup> Now, ordinary decent folk can only manage the ideal – Daniel’s seven times a day – on the Sabbath; hence they will

---

<sup>206</sup> Ibid., p.138.

<sup>207</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.675.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., p.186f.

have no time at all for anything else!<sup>209</sup> As we have seen, Greenham can be arbitrary in his judgements. He is in favour of archery and military training (Cf.II.Sam.1) – but not on the Sabbath.<sup>210</sup> Weddings are acceptable on the Sabbath – but accompanying festivities must be kept for another day!<sup>211</sup>

One result of their concentration on the Sabbath was an addition to the Puritans' ammunition against the Roman Catholics, who "have more regard of their Idoll holy dayes, which the Pope hath appointed, than of the Sabbath day, which God hath commanded."<sup>212</sup> The keeping of weekday holy days by the Carolines incurred the same wrath for the same reason.

## MORALITY

The Puritans believed in the total depravity of mankind, only relieved by the grace of God. (The Carolines believed that human beings were flawed creatures, but retaining the God-given faculty of reason, which could co-operate with grace to ameliorate their condition. This led the Puritans to accuse them of Pelagianism.) Rainolds says that all are imperfect – even "the best king", Solomon, built a pagan temple: how was that for depravity, and in one otherwise so exemplary?<sup>213</sup> So great concern for the individual soul's health is typical of Puritan and later Nonconformist preaching. Greenham furnishes several examples. His subjects include humility,<sup>214</sup> a 'good name' (Prov.22.1),<sup>215</sup> and repentance.<sup>216</sup> He meditates on Prov.4.13-23 as a guide to righteous living for 'godly' folk, and

---

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., p.699.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid., p.221.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., p.220.

<sup>212</sup> Dod., op.cit., p.10.

<sup>213</sup> Rainolds, J., *Haggai*, op.cit., p.8.

<sup>214</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.78ff.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., p.69ff.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., p.91ff.

on Prov.14.5-8, on lying. When studying the Old Testament, the Carolines tended to see analogies to society's circumstances, whereas the Puritans found analogies to the individual's life events – especially the crises and the temptations. “For the Puritans, the whole of life was lived as a fulfilment of the Scriptures.”<sup>217</sup> The problem facing the Protestant wishing to make prescription for the individual's circumstances was that casuistry had been a casualty of the Reformation. Protestants had to rely on traditional Roman practice. This was acknowledged freely by later Carolines, especially Taylor, who made casuistry his main area of expertise, but Puritans had to admit it too – though in their case the admission is sometimes rather grudging: Ames likens their mining Roman examples to the Israelites' having to go to the Philistines to have their tools sharpened, for lack of their own means.....<sup>218</sup>

### **The Ten Commandments**

Puritans had “...the absolute conviction that there was no good in man until he had learned to conform with God's revealed intentions”.<sup>219</sup> And the original and supreme revelation of those intentions, physically inscribed by God himself, was the Decalogue. Puritan moral teaching was based firmly on the Ten Commandments, on which they preached much, and produced some extensive commentaries (e.g. Dod's and Perkins's) Broughton can even state that “The New Testament is nothing else, but a Comment upon these Laws”.<sup>220</sup> Perkins shares with the Carolines certain principles with regard to the Commandments. Firstly, that only half their import is negative, every prohibition implying an

---

<sup>217</sup> Wakefield, op.cit., p.26.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., p.114.

<sup>219</sup> New, op.cit., p.24.

<sup>220</sup> Broughton, op.cit., p.705.



opposite, positive injunction (albeit with the *caveat* “The negative bindeth at all times, and to all times: and the affirmative bindeth at all times, but not to all times: and therefore negatives are of more force”). Thus, like the Carolines, he deals with both the negative and affirmative import of each Commandment, as does Dod, who, for example, teaches that the First Commandment enjoins one “to know God, to love him, to feare him, to trust in him”.<sup>221</sup> Secondly, he agrees that the provisions of the Commandments extend to all sins, since the Ten Commandments form “an abridgement of the whole lawe.” Thus, e.g., “hatred is named murther, and to look after a woman with a lusting eie is adulterie”.<sup>222</sup> Perkins is not alone of the Puritans – and others – to aver that God is the absolute ruler, so he can break his own laws if he so choose: “So he commanded Isaac to be offered, the Egyptians to be bespoiled, the brazen serpent to be erected which was a figure of Christ, etc.”<sup>223</sup>

Space does not permit an extensive examination of comments on the Commandments, let alone a comprehensive one; a few notes here and there must suffice.

Dod concurs with Cosin in viewing heresies as breaking the First Commandment – as indeed does “anything whereon we set our delight, or which we esteeme more than God”.<sup>224</sup> On the Second Commandment, Dod offers a review of the sorry history of Israel with regard to ‘graven images’, with several references (e.g. Ps.106.36,37). He inevitably attacks Roman practice: “...no wall, or window, or house, or Church, which was not full of Images....”<sup>225</sup> The seductiveness of image-worship is exemplified by Solomon, whose enormous

---

<sup>221</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.30.

<sup>222</sup> Perkins, op.cit., p.26.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid., p.27.

<sup>224</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.26f. (A point often made in modern sermons – including the present writer’s!)

<sup>225</sup> Ibid., p.58.

wisdom yet did not protect him from his wives' idolatry. The Mass is "an Idoll" because of the idea of transubstantiation – "Worship a wafer?" So is "Popish Crosse" because of perceived belief in its efficacy *per se* against sin and danger. Included under Commandment II are prayers to and worship of Saints, or days dedicated to them; Dod adduces several Old Testament Quotes in support, including Hos.2.13.

On the Third Commandment, Dod refers *inter alia* to the misuse of Scripture, particularly to defend heresy, or treating it with levity. He also inveighs against blasphemy, though he accepts that it is still all right on occasions to swear in God's name, as required by Deut.6.13 and 10.20.

The Fourth and Fifth Commandments have been dealt with above with regard to authority and the Sabbath.

Like the Carolines, Perkins extends the Sixth Commandment's provision to comprehend all manner of uncharitable and negative emotions – anger, hatred, envy; the verbal expression of the same (II Sam.6.20); likewise countenance and gesture (Gen.4.5,6); and, of course, physical assault (Lev.24.19,20).<sup>226</sup> He extends these to cruelty to animals (Prov.12.10), excessive punishment (Dt.25.3), mockery of infirmities (Lev.19.14; II Kg.2.23), and abuse of the defenceless, i.e. the poor, strangers, orphans and widows (Exod.22.21,22; Dt.24.14; Exod.22.26,27; Prov.11.26). But the stability of society must not be disturbed: "This lawe is well transgressed by not killing, when the lawe chargeth to kill", a statement supported by verses which, *par excellence*, require capital punishment

---

<sup>226</sup> Perkins, op.cit., p.52.

Num.35.16,33. This enables Perkins to condemn “popish Sanctuaries, and places of privilege” on the basis of Exod.21.14 and I Kg.2.24.<sup>227</sup>

On the Seventh Commandment, and again like the Carolines, Perkins and other Puritans make it cover all conceivable<sup>228</sup> forms of sexual misconduct, including, *inter alia*, bestiality, homosexual acts – and “riotous and lascivious attire”; also “nocturnall pollutions, which arise of immoderate diet, or unchaste cogitations”.<sup>229</sup> Ainsworth offers similar lists (as does Andrewes) of all manner of sexual sins and impurities, including mental ones (readings back from Jesus’s words in Mt.5.28.<sup>230</sup> More quintessential Puritanism comes from Dod, as he deals with “adulterie, fornication, uncleanness and wantonnesse”, a list which allows him to add, like Perkins, condemnation of modes of dress (Zeph.1.8) as well as gourmandising (Jer.5.12) and oversleeping – though he may have been unusual for his day in including “immoderate use of the marriage bed”.<sup>231</sup> [Doubtless this last does not refer to the sin of oversleeping, but to overindulgence in what he and his learned peers may well have called *quomodo est pater tuus*.....] Maybe ahead of his time, he generally emphasises that the prohibited sinful behaviour is the result of underlying sinful attitudes. And interestingly, *pace* modern perceptions of ‘puritanism’, Dod devotes only a dozen pages – some 3% of his commentary on the Commandments, to this one. (Henry Smith, however, devoted a whole treatise to marriage, with much reference to Genesis, showing how marriage was “the first ordinance which God instituted”; he offers a parallel between Eve’s birth from Adam’s side with the Church, born of Christ’s ‘sleep’ and wounded side; therefore the Church is the

---

<sup>227</sup> Ibid., p.53.

<sup>228</sup> No joke intended!

<sup>229</sup> Perkins, op.cit., p.60.

<sup>230</sup> Ainsworth, op.cit., p.76.

<sup>231</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.267f.



‘Bride of Christ’.<sup>232</sup> Only one woman was created for Adam – therefore monogamy is God’s intention, underlined by the presence of the same number of each sex in the Ark. “Go forth and multiply” was ordered only after Adam and Eve’s ‘marriage’ – which precludes pre-marital sexual relations. Many other points are made which show the Puritan concern for the behaviour of the individual.<sup>233</sup>

Perkins extends Commandment VIII to include, *inter alia*, the non-return of lent goods (Ezek.18.17), the hoarding of a commodity in time of scarcity and selling it at an inflated price, delay in paying bills (Prov.3.28), and – especially – usury (Exod.22.25). In fact, any unjust dealing at all. <sup>234</sup> Dod finds much scope here for the exposition of Puritan values, as he animadverts on gambling, wastefulness, excessive consumption, extravagance, and – a very Puritan touch – idleness. All these parallel the idea of suicide (as he has expounded it on Commandment VI), in that they consist of ‘stealing from oneself’, misusing what God has bestowed, thus becoming a poor, even ungrateful steward. An unexpected censure is upon “a miserable man” who is “a theafe etc. to him selfe”. The ‘Nonconformist Conscience’ has deep roots: Dod objects to enclosure as breaching this Commandment, as is the immoral, though legal, acquisition of goods. Not surprisingly, he puts usury into this category (Deut.23.19; Lev.25.35,36), together with commercial sharp practice (Prov.21.14). More than half the thirty-one pages on this Commandment are taken up before he gets round to actual ‘stealing’ as we acknowledge it.<sup>235</sup> [Of course, this sort of treatment is akin to some modern liturgical and homiletic practice.] Henry Smith wrote a

---

<sup>232</sup> Henry Smith, *Treatise on marriage* (London 1591), p.3.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid., p.15.

<sup>234</sup> Perkins, op.cit., pp.64-67.

<sup>235</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.274f.

whole treatise against usury, admitting reluctantly that usury is permitted if the money is lent to a stranger (Deut.23.20). This is a very small category of debtor. In general, the Anglicans were against usury; the Puritans allowed it with certain stringent conditions attached, such as foregoing recovery of capital if the debtor's circumstances worsened. "Many Puritans accepted the fact of usury, but did their best to purge it of its exploitative quality."<sup>236</sup>

Commandment IX is also extended; Dod includes judging rashly, hypocrisy, and both the omission of telling necessary truth, e.g. "due reproofe" and silence when we should speak up for our neighbour.<sup>237</sup> It also prohibits tale-telling (cf. Doeg in I Sam.22) - definitely a time to keep silent (Prov.29.11)<sup>238</sup> - and boastful exaggeration about ourselves.<sup>239</sup> Perkins, too, lists boastfulness, as well as betrayal of confidence, and accusation of one's neighbour which is just, but made with malice, thinking the worst of people.<sup>240</sup>

The last Commandment, never easy to deal with, attracts only 10 of Dod's 338 pages – at fewer than 3% by far the shortest treatment of the ten. He sees relative values in the order of the prohibitions, from wife first ('house' covers everybody, so doesn't count) down a sort of hierarchy of servants, animals and goods.

When it comes to morality, how far were the Puritans Deuteronomists, believing in the 'reward/retribution' principle? Many think they were. However, Greenham doesn't offer support, preaching that riches are no sure sign of God's favour, nor lack of them of his disapproval.<sup>241</sup> "Wealth was not *prima facie*

---

<sup>236</sup> New, op.cit., p.98.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., p.305.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid., p.307.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid., p.309.

<sup>240</sup> Perkins, op.cit., pp.67-71.

<sup>241</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.61.

evidence of godliness: God blessed Abraham with riches, yet persecuted Job as a mark of special favour. Puritanism made a virtue neither of riches nor of poverty – and the same was true of Anglicanism.”<sup>242</sup>

## MILLENARIANISM

Many, if not most Puritans were very consciously millenarians, living near the Last Days. A theological tradition had grown up around this expectation, with much attention paid to Daniel in the Old Testament, Revelation in the New. Junius’s annotations to the 1599 edition of the Geneva Bible encouraged this interest, as did commentaries (by, e.g. Mede, Brightman and Napier) explaining in detail how the vision and prophecies were to be applied to the Reformation and other recent historical events and present conditions.<sup>243</sup> The Protestant apocalyptic tradition was very strong, but had originated before the Reformation, based not only on Daniel and Revelation, but also on the *Prophecy of Elias*, from the Talmud. This last was available via Reuchlin’s translation of the Babylonian Talmud, c.1520. This *Prophecy* taught that there were to be three ages of the world, viz: (a) before the Law; (b) the Age of the Law; (c) the Age of the Messiah. Possibly because of certain parallels with St.Paul, its Talmudic origin did not diminish its acceptance by Protestants.<sup>244</sup> These ‘Ages’ appeared in 1550, in the English version of *Carion’s Chronicle*: “The sayenge of Helias house.

The worlde shall stande syx thousand yeres and after shalle it falle.  
Two thousand yeares without the Lawe.  
Two thousand yeares in the Lawe.  
Two thousand yeares the tyme of Christ.

---

<sup>242</sup> New, op.cit., p.100.

<sup>243</sup> Spurr, J.: *English Puritanism* (NY St.Martin’s Press, 1998), p.177.

<sup>244</sup> Firth, K.R.: *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979), p.5f.



And yf these yeares be not accomplished oure sinnes shall be the  
cause, which are great and many.”

This version is a christianisation of the Talmud. Whereas the Talmud refers the final sentences to the Age of the Law, when the coming of the Messiah was delayed by the sins of Israel, Protestant Christians thought it indicated that the Parousia would take place within the last 2,000 year period: Melanchthon and Luther believed it would be before 1600. Daniel’s ‘horns’ prophecy was interpreted by Protestants as foretelling both Turkish and Roman Catholic ‘empires’ as enemies in the Last Days: either or both was or were identified by some Protestants with the Antichrist.<sup>245</sup> Such Protestants began to identify the Reformation as the final act of world history. This idea was reinforced by seeing the divisions of the Church after the Reformation as foreshadowed by the divisions of the ‘Old Testament Church’ into Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots and Essenes. The last-named were easily identified with the Anabaptists, because of their known penchant for adult baptism and community of possessions.

It may be noted at this point that not all millenarians were Puritans: Mede and Ussher were among them and wrote on the subject.

In Hugh Broughton’s *Textes*, Chapter 1 accepts Daniel quite literally, with many comments on dates and personal names. Chapter 4 tells us that the queen was actually the king’s mother, “Nitocris, famous in Herodotus, a woman, wife and politicall....” Chapter 12 reveals the purpose of the whole Book: “...how Solomon’s house being extinct our Lords godly house continueth the right....” The prophecies of the succeeding kingdoms and powers are explained in great detail. Broughton’s apocalyptic chronologies are drawn from the usual trio of

---

<sup>245</sup> Ibid., p.16f.

sources – Daniel, Revelation, and *Elias*. His 1596 commentary on Daniel accepts the Jewish interpretation of the four beasts as oppressors of the ancient Jews alone, whereas the traditional Protestant view identified the fourth beast with either the Romans, persecuting early Christians, or the establishment of the papacy. Broughton hoped to win over Jews by respecting their interpretation here, and concentrated his Christian argument on the ‘seventy weeks’.<sup>246</sup> Broughton went to the trouble of translating Revelation into Hebrew, for the perusal of Jews: he regarded the Book as the “Gentile version of Daniel” and hoped to convert Jews with it. “Broughton approached the New Testament as a Talmudist.”<sup>247</sup> Thus Broughton tried to reconcile the Hebrew and Christian traditions of interpretation.<sup>248</sup> Brightman, disagreeing, regarded Daniel as prophetic of the history of the Jews until the Second Coming, and Revelation as doing likewise for the Gentile Church. Many Puritans welcomed Cromwell’s allowing the Jews to return to England after 350 years of official banishment<sup>249</sup> The expectation of the Jews’ conversion was especially strong among millenarians, since they believed that the end-times would only begin when the Jews were converted.<sup>250</sup> This belief coincided with an upsurge of Messianism among European Jews. Leaders such as the Dutch rabbi Menasseh ben Israel held that according to Deut.28.64, the Messiah would come only when the Jews were scattered to every nation on earth – and that must include England. This is indicated by the Hebrew of the verse: קצה דארא - ‘End of the earth’ – ‘Angle-terre’ - England!<sup>251</sup>

---

<sup>246</sup> Ibid., p.156.

<sup>247</sup> Ibid., p.161.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., p.152.

<sup>249</sup> It is known that small numbers of Jews lived in England ‘unofficially’ during the ban.

<sup>250</sup> *Vide, e.g., Owen, J, op.cit, Vol.XV, p.487.*

<sup>251</sup> Nuttall, op.cit., p.145f.

Many English Puritans came to believe that Charles I was the tenth horn on the fourth beast of Daniel, and that his fall would usher in the rule of Christ. This may have gone some way to tempering the dismay that was generally felt at the king's downfall and execution.<sup>252</sup>

## HATRED OF ROME

Undoubtedly, a great amount of Puritan effort went into anti-Roman polemic. This is also true of the Carolines, as we have seen, but the Puritan attitude to Rome was much fiercer than the Caroline firm disapproval, and amounted to a real fear and a real hatred. This was not only a gut reaction, but was backed up by theological argument, so that many Puritans regarded Rome as the Antichrist. Very little of this polemic was based on the Old Testament, but some was. The equation of Rome with Babylon in Revelation, for instance, was quite understandable, even revelatory in itself: the two were identical, to Puritan minds, in their idolatry, which expressed itself particularly in image-worship and persecution of the true people of God. Owen identifies Judah/Israel with England: both were/are in danger of the enmity of Babylon, old and new.<sup>253</sup> He sees France as a danger in this respect, disapproving of "vile compliances": if England is not careful, France will prove her Assyria.<sup>254</sup> Owen swallows the Popish Plot: England may yet be saved, since God revealed the Plot in time: "I say with the wife of Manoah: 'If God would have destroyed us, he would not have shewed us this thing'".<sup>255</sup> This happened because God "hath reserved a remnant among

---

<sup>252</sup> Spurr, *English Puritanism*, op.cit., p.113.

<sup>253</sup> Owen, J, op.cit, Vol.XVI, p.107.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., p.115.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid., p.117.



us”.<sup>256</sup> Henry Smith uses I Sam.15.9, an example of flagrant disobedience to a divine command, to belabour the Romans over denying the chalice to layfolk, when “Christ said “*Drink you all of this,*’ which he saith not of the bread.”<sup>257</sup> Broughton finds Jewish writings valuable to Christians in opposing papal claims to Petrine supremacy: “....the term *Rock* is never an Attribute [sic] in commendation of a Person, but onely the Attribute of God, through all the Bible; so, the Disciples knew it Atheisme to hold Peter a Rock, and of purpose *Petra* the rock, and *Petros* the stone, that may be hurled and tossed, are distinguished, and but in Poetry for verse, *Petros* never, or rarely, is *Petra*: Here Job and the Chaldee Paraphrasts would have kept the Church from Apostasie.”<sup>258</sup> ‘Babylon’ owes more to Revelation than the Old Testament, but is frequently employed to describe Rome. Smart inveighs against “...the Whore of Babylons bastardly brood, doting on their Mothers beauty, that painted Harlot the Church of Rome....”<sup>259</sup> Selbie comments felicitously, “The polemical writers of those days had no buttons on their foils”!<sup>260</sup> Not that sharp thrusts were reserved for Rome alone: anyone who disagreed with some writers could feel the naked points – including fellow-Puritans. Broughton made a savage attack on his rival Hebraist, Lively, on account of the latter’s contribution to the Authorised Version: “30 years professor knew not well the first verse of the Bible”; and, after explaining to the reader that Lively had died: “....a Dutch Preacher .... said, it is marvell, if he die not, when he seeth the grossnesse of his errors”.<sup>261</sup> (We shall see below that barbs also came Broughton’s way.)

---

<sup>256</sup> Ibid., p.119.

<sup>257</sup> Smith, H, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sermon on the Lord’s Supper (no pagination nor date).

<sup>258</sup> Broughton, op.cit., p.665.

<sup>259</sup> Smart, P., op.cit, p.11.

<sup>260</sup> Selbie, W.B., in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.413.

<sup>261</sup> Broughton, op.cit., p.696.

## HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

To speak very generally, the Puritans whose literary remains we have show themselves as learned in Biblical matters as any of their contemporaries, and count among their number some of the foremost Hebraists of their day. Rainolds, for example, rivals Andrewes in erudition; his commentary on Haggai contains hundreds of cross-references, mainly to the Old Testament. Preaching as essential to Christian formation was the chief function of their ministers, and the interpretation of Scripture, the essential task of the preacher, only possible with knowledge of the original languages (as we have seen above).<sup>262</sup> “In their view, learning was the handmaid of religion.”<sup>263</sup> So the Puritans became increasingly keen on having a learned ministry, with sound tri-lingual competence, and extensive knowledge of the Scriptures and familiarity with the works of the early Fathers. More and more graduates entered the ranks of Puritan clergy, until by the middle of the Seventeenth Century the great majority were at least B.A.<sup>264</sup>

In this enterprise, the Puritans benefited greatly from their Protestant contacts on the Continent, who had much to do with their Jewish countrymen, from whom they learnt a lot of their Hebrew and rabbinics. Officially, no Jews resided in England from the time of Edward I to that of Cromwell, so that “During the whole Puritan period (i.e. from mid-sixteenth century to mid-seventeenth century) there were either no Jews at all in England or they were so few as to be negligible”.<sup>265</sup> And those few had no legal status.

---

<sup>262</sup> Wakefield, op.cit., p.22.

<sup>263</sup> Lloyd Jones, G.: The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language (Manchester Univ.Press, 1983), p.144.

<sup>264</sup> Morgan, op.cit., p.103ff.

<sup>265</sup> Selbie, W.B., in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.408.

One of the most noted early Hebraists of our period was Hugh Broughton, whose huge output of major and minor works was nearly all on Biblical, mostly Old Testament topics; the collected works runs to more than 700 folio pages, including *inter alia* his *Concent of Scripture* (a *précis* of the Old Testament), *Observations upon the first ten Fathers* [Adam to Noah],<sup>266</sup> *Positions about the Hebrew Tongue*,<sup>267</sup> and *Textes of Scripture* [commentary on Daniel].<sup>268</sup> Broughton has intimate knowledge of post-Biblical Hebrew and rabbinic learning; instances of his many references are his citing R.Bochai on the meanings of Abel's names (the names of Noah's sons are also significant, e.g. Ham = Cham = hot – therefore his descendants are those who dwell in “Hotte Countries”!)<sup>269</sup> R. “Abrabbineel” (or “Barbinel”) on Seth as the family man *par excellence*<sup>270</sup>; Adam, Abel and Cain all sacrificed “where Abraham offered Isaac, where both Temples were built”.<sup>271</sup> David Kimchi is hailed as “the King of Grammarians”;<sup>272</sup> “Breshith Rabba” is alluded to, together with “Zoar” and “Thal. Ierusalemi,”<sup>273</sup> while “Midras Tillim” tells stories of God's conversations with Adam. “Cabalistes” expound expound אלהים - “El-hem, they be one God, in Bachai upon Gen.1)”<sup>274</sup> Broughton does not trust the rabbis totally, however. “He modified his sources to confirm his prejudices”<sup>275</sup> In other words, he used the rabbis only when they confirmed his Christological interpretations. (We shall see in Chapter 8 that Broughton was not alone among Christian commentators in this respect.) “The Rabbins have great use, and sit much in the Chair of Moses for the

---

<sup>266</sup> London, 1612.

<sup>267</sup> Broughton, *Works*, pp.664-683.

<sup>268</sup> London, 1612.

<sup>269</sup> *Ten Fathers*, p.19.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>271</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.* p.19.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

<sup>275</sup> Lloyd Jones, G., in *DNB*.



bare story. But when they come to their own works to deceive us, they must be judged.”<sup>276</sup> He often repeats the point: “...whilst they follow the Grammatical sense of the Lawe, they may safely be heard: where they speak out of their own brain, they are eight times cursed, Matth.23”.<sup>277</sup> Broughton was not uncritical of the Jewish community, as he had experienced it abroad: “They be rare Jews that understand the Jerusalemy, or the Babylonian specially”.<sup>278</sup> Nevertheless, Broughton owes many of the details in his text and marginal notes to his rabbis, and often takes care to ascribe them, e.g. “Jannes and Jambres are in the Talmud. Men.Per.9.fol.85.”<sup>279</sup> He can summon support from a huge variety of witnesses: when commenting on the stones in Aaron’s ephod (Gen.28.17-20), he refers to the LXX, Targums, Midrash Rabba, Maimonides, R.Eleazar [of Worms], Salomon Yarchi, R.Isaac Karo, and R.Bechaiah. This familiarity with rabbinics spills over into his New Testament work, as when he describes Matthew as given “Talmudicall Skill” by the Holy Ghost, supremely expressed in his first chapter<sup>280</sup> – interesting that some moderns regard this as a midrash. He often refers to the LXX, though can be critical of it (it was a mere translation, after all)<sup>281</sup> And he knows Ethiopic,<sup>282</sup> and his historical and classical authors, as in his *Testimonies of Antient Writers, bringing much light to diverse passages of Daniel: they are taken out of Appian, Strabo, Greek Manuscripts of the Fathers, and Josephus.*<sup>283</sup> But he doesn’t know everything: he is on the right track in saying that Hebrew was the language of the Jews until the Exile, then understood but not actively used, but

---

<sup>276</sup> Broughton, *Works*, op.cit., p.696.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., p.705.

<sup>278</sup> Ibid., p.302.

<sup>279</sup> Ibid., p.52.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., p.693.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., p.225.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., p.204.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid., pp.243-253.

he is unaware that the Hebrew alphabet he was familiar with was not the original orthography of the language: “The characters and points are the same with those, written by God in the two tables”.<sup>284</sup>

Broughton’s great interest in Daniel is due to his millenarianism, and he brings his linguistic talents to bear on the text. In the section “Of the Vision penned in the Iewes proper language”, he has: “Hence [from ch.8] unto the end of Daniel, the visions are penned in the language spoken onely in Daniel’s owne nation. Moreover, the speeches, be full of artificiall tearmes, knowen onely to the Iewes: and some never spoken afore.” He explains the need for these chapters to be in Hebrew, so that the Persians would not discover the prophecy of their fall, and persecute the Jews, nor the Greeks likewise. Nor yet others to discover that only Jews were uniquely good and enjoying divine favour. “Therefore he was not to give such pearles to Hogges: But to write them in the holy tongue: which the Heathen studied not”. He gives much description of how Aramaic and Syriac are used in the Targums, Ezra and the Talmud. The reason why a small portion of the Old Testament is in Aramaic is as a reward for the Chaldeans’ good treatment of Daniel – lions’ dens apart, presumably. This is not to say that Broughton assumes that the language of Babylon was Aramaic, for he knows better: “....the Syriaque tongue...general over the east”. His exegesis is prefaced at length by detailed comments on the names of “the Kings belonging to the image”, with notes on Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew equivalents, plus chronology and a list of the “nobles of Judah”. Puritans were very interested in details of times, names, places, etc. (Or was such interest general in their day?)<sup>285</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> Ibid., p.52.

<sup>285</sup> The above taken from his *Textes*, which is unpaginated.

Broughton long campaigned for a new English translation – but when it was commanded he – possibly the most accomplished Hebraist of them all – was not included among the translators. The reason was almost certainly due to his awkward personality and abrasive conduct towards fellow scholars: he was famously unco-operative, and Bancroft needed to enlist team-players. Broughton responded with typical pique, referring to Bancroft as “unlearned” and “Croft of Bane” and “Banned croft” among similar poisonous epithets.<sup>286</sup> When the translation came out, he ‘panned’ it, finding a thousand errors major and minor. Unfortunately, he was simply running true to form: his feud with his highly competent rival, Lively of Cambridge, towards the end of the Sixteenth Century, engendered many a snide comment such as, “Thalmud Jerusalem, which I think is not yet in Cambridge”<sup>287</sup> (it was, and Lively would know it as well as Broughton). On Zech.2.4, against Lively, Broughton suggests ‘young man’, rather than ‘prophet’ (“as per Thalmudiques”), and adds: “An Ebrew professour should not go against all the Ebrews, that ever professed, and the common judgement of all men”.<sup>288</sup> It is satisfying to add that Broughton had to take it as well as dish it out, if only posthumously, as a much later comment by Walton indicates: “The last *English Translation* made by diverse learned men at the command of King *James*, though it may justly contend with any now extant in any other Language in *Europe*, was yet carped and cavild at by diverse among ourselves, especially by one, who being passed by, and not imployed in the Work, as one (though skild in the Hebrew, yet) of little or no judgement in that or any other kinds of Learning, was so highly offended, that he would needs undertake to shew how many

---

<sup>286</sup> *Works*, pp.346-348.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, p.422.

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, p.580.



thousand places they had falsely rendred, when as he could hardly make good his undertaking in any one.”<sup>289</sup>

Ainsworth was another Puritan Hebraist of note, evidenced in his *Annotations* on the Pentateuch, Psalms and Song of Solomon. He is unafraid of providing detailed linguistic notes, in nine pages of *An Advertisement to the Reader, touching some Obiections made against the sincerity of the Hebrew Text, and Allegation of the Rabbins, in these former Annotations*.<sup>290</sup> He explains Hebrew words throughout his works, e.g. םמׁשׁ is composed of םשׁ , ‘there’, and םמׁ , ‘waters’; on the Fifth Commandment, “The Hebrew word for *Honour* or *Glorie* hath the name of *weightiness*”.<sup>291</sup> Dealing with “Keri and Cethib”, he says: “Above 800 words in the Hebrew Bible have marginall readings”. Some vowels are in the text and margins, so the margin is to be read. Some say this is a corruption of the text, others (including Ainsworth) accept “both of divine Authority”: we think Andrewes would have agreed. He cites םל and םל as alternatives in Gen.21.8, where “ancient English Bibles” read םל , Geneva (“the last set forth by authority” – whatever that may mean) reads םל . In his Hebrew version, Ainsworth finds “...the Hebrew hath both readings, the first in the line, the latter in the margine. And the writing differeth in the eye, (*lo*, not, and *lo*, to himselfe) but hath no difference in the eare. So Moses hearing it of God, did by his spirit write both; and the margine is that which in the Hebrew is noted to be read”. (He infers this from the Syriac.) He cites also alternative readings of II Sam.22.51; Job 6.21; I Chron.11.11; Dan.9.24; II Kg.8.10 (another םל / םל , giving contrary meanings: will he get better, or won’t he?); Ezra 4/2; I Chron.11.20; I Kg.22.48. “....no translation, almost in any language, but

<sup>289</sup> Walton, B.: *The Considerator Considered* (London, 1659), p.5.

<sup>290</sup> Ainsworth, op.cit., following the *Annotations*.

<sup>291</sup> Ibid., p.75.

followeth sometimes the one, sometimes the other; and afterward sometime varieth from it selfe....” Some say, “after some late Rabbins”, that this is due to corruption of the text due to the human fallibility of scribes. Ainsworth doesn’t accept this, since too many of the marginal readings involve letters not easily confused (e.g. י, נ, in the above examples); God would not allow “his Word, in the originall and fountaine thereof, left for a peculiar treasure to his Church in all ages, to be corrupted and depraved, and that in many hundred places, to the scorn of Infidels, and offence of his weake people”. The Scriptures are valueless if corrupt – and on this objection all Old Testament Books must be corrupt. The Jews are very careful of the Scriptures – every letter of them – and won’t allow any copy containing scribal error. They must have been just as careful in ancient Israel, especially in view of the fact that then “they were God’s Church, and had always some good people among them”. Was the text corrupted perhaps by “the captivity of Babylon and calamities then upon the Iewes”? no, this is not reasonable: “What are 70 yeeres to corrupt all Copies?” – especially when written on near-indestructible parchment? Would the godly men of the time – such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, and the prophets Zechariah, Haggai and Malachi<sup>292</sup> – not have kept the Scriptures pure? Furthermore, Jesus berated “Priests, Scribes and Pharisees” for wrong interpretation of the Scriptures: surely he would have been equally hard on them if they had permitted alteration of the Scriptures themselves? Both Jewish and Christian commentators have accepted and treated of both text and marginal readings; if we can’t, “yet ought we not to condemne what we know not, but in humility to seek for further light”. Here Ainsworth offers a wide-ranging survey of Continental versions, including Dutch,

---

<sup>292</sup> Ainsworth obviously considers יצאלם a name.

French, Italian, Latin, with varying Qere/Kethib; mostly not condemning a reading they reject, and often noting it. He points out that ancient versions, too, are inconsistent.

An example of lengthy treatment is his *Of the interpretation of the stone Iahalom, in Exod.28.18.*, catering for the Puritan thirst for detail which may seem trivial to a modern. <sup>293</sup> יָהֳלֹם he translates as “sardonix”, “as I understand the Holy Ghost to expand it, in Rev.21.20”. Revelation takes many Old Testament figures, like the Tabernacle (Ch.4); the 24 Elders (Divisions of Priests and Levites, I Chron.24); the four Living Creatures (Ezek.1. and Num.2); the Lamb slain (Old Testament sacrifice); the Twelve Tribes, of Ch.7. Thus it is likely that Rev.21 is based on the Old Testament, especially when prophesying about the Jews, as in Ch.21, where the Church is actually called “Jerusalem” and the “Tabernacle of God”. The stones are only mentioned in Exod.28 and Rev.21; Ainsworth acknowledges the many and varied translations in the versions, and more or less asks who knows for sure. He is sure that the stone is not a diamond, for this in Hebrew would have been שֹׁמֵר (Zech.7.12; Ezek.3.9; Jer.17.1). He notes that Ezek.3.9 and 28.13 refer to the ephod and use יָהֳלֹם ; Ezekiel also uses שֹׁמֵר - so the stone must be something else! So he looks at the only other such list in the Bible – Rev.21! No ‘adamant’ in Revelation, so would God have given this most precious stone to the Patriarchs, but withheld it from the Apostles? “This were to preferre the Old Testament before the New, the Law before the Gospel, Moses before Christ ..... and to make the holy Ierusalem ..... to be inferior in glory to Moses Sanctuary...” Ainsworth digresses on the nomenclature of the tribal list in Rev.7, which omits Dan. Lists in the Old

---

<sup>293</sup> Also following the *Annotations*.



Testament vary too, due to their being two ‘half-tribes’ of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh: “....after a sort there were thirteene”; sometimes Levi is omitted, as being separate from the others (Num.13); sometimes ‘Joseph’ instead of the half-tribes (Gen.49); sometimes Simeon (Dt.3.3). In Rev.7, Joseph is named, plus Manasseh and Levi – but not Ephraim – so another had to go, “unless hee [the Holy Ghost] should have counted 13 tribes, contrary to the course of the Scriptures, and scope of the matter there in hand”. [What this amounts to is that there have always been thirteen tribes, but only twelve listed at any one time!] We don’t know why one or other tribe is omitted from any list – but at least Revelation is following Old Testament precedent.

This whole exercise exemplifies well: (a) the minute scrutiny of the Scriptures current at the time (especially in an apologia in face of criticism, as here); (b) the belief that of every detail of Scripture had some significance; (c) the consequent confidence that, provided someone with the necessary knowledge and intellectual equipment searched long and hard enough, an adequate resolution of all apparent difficulties was always possible.

Ainsworth knew his LXX, Syriac and Aramaic,<sup>294</sup> as well as the rabbis, whom he can quote almost in passing, as “Pirke R.Eliezer, ch.14” (on Gen.3.14). Another appendix after the *Annotations* is entitled *Of the Hebrew Records*, the public and private records, not in Scripture, but (some at least) alluded to in Scripture (e.g. Job.10.13; I Kg.11.41; 14.19,29), and now lost. Some written between the last prophets and the Christian era remain, e.g. Maccabees, Philo, Josephus. R.Iudah Hannafi gathered many of these, and others added many more; thus arose the Talmuds, “Ierusalemi” in AD 230, “Babeli” in AD 500. Moses

---

<sup>294</sup> He constantly refers to these in his writings.

“the sonne of Maimon” in AD 1200 abridged and simplified the Talmud, omitting the “discourses, fables and disputes”. “Jonathan” paraphrased the prophets, Onkelos the Law. Ainsworth issues a caveat, however: care must be taken when dealing with the rabbis! “When they doe well, they are the best Expositors, and when they doe evill, they are the worst.” And: “There is much bad and good in the Jewish Doctors, as in Christian ones” – we are back to the usual position of Christian rabbinic students, that the rabbis can be trusted on matters linguistic and historical, but not doctrinal. The Puritan Ainsworth, be it noted, does not trust all the Christian Fathers either..... [Incidentally, in these remarks, he does commend the Apocrypha, especially Maccabees, Wisdom and Ben Sira, “for instruction”. He also produces evidence of St.Paul’s using Jewish non-Scriptural material (e.g. his reference to Jannes and Jambres, II Tim.3.8) and even pagan authors, with the obvious implication that later exegetes may properly follow his example.] Owen triumphs over the rabbis, when he alleges their embarrassment at Isa.53. His anecdotal evidence has Manasseh Ben Israel of Amsterdam apparently declaring to a friend of Owen’s: “*profecto locus iste magnum scandalum dedit*”, to which the friend replies, “*Recte, quia Christus vobis lapis scandalum est*”. Owens adds: “Their Rabbins could easily have extricated themselves from all other places of the prophets, if Isaiah in this place had but held his peace”. The rabbinic consensus is that Isa.53 refers to the sufferings of the Messiah (though several noteworthy rabbis, such as Kimchi and Abrabiniel, demurred).<sup>295</sup>

The habit of going to the Old Testament for illustration common to all schools in the early Seventeenth Century shows that many people recognised

---

<sup>295</sup> Owen, *Works*, Vol.IX, p.74.

some sort of affinity between their society and that of ancient Israel. Thus Dod, mentioning David and Uriah, Ahab and Naboth, in connection with murder or suicide as the result of prior sins, such as lust, covetousness and jealousy. (He finds the only two suicides in the Bible, Ahitophel and Judas.)<sup>296</sup>

Greenham explains Old Testament usage to his reader, e.g. "By the heart (I thinke) is meant the more inward and secret thoughts: by the reins are understood the more outward and sensuall affections, as Ps.51.6...."<sup>297</sup> On John 7.15, he wonders at Jesus's knowing the Scriptures so well. His "excellent knowledge" is shown "by his Heb. *Ephathah* , whereas their vulgar speech was Syrian, by his perfect and often quoting of the Scriptures, and the Thalmud in discourse of the traditions of Corban, and other of the gold of the temple etc.....behold, a wiser than Solomon is here."<sup>298</sup>

Not all the Puritan scholars display their achievements to posterity. Dillingham says that Chaderton was a very competent Hebraist, and we know he was an AV translator – but his extant works consist of precisely two sermons..... Much later, Ralph Josselin makes constant reference in his diary to his Hebrew studies. These doubtless influenced his preaching prowess, but we have little other evidence.

Evidence is sometimes indirect; the Geneva Bible was based on the Great Bible, and the translators of both knew R.Kimchi's commentary.<sup>299</sup> Not all students of the Old Testament were professional academics. The York Clergyman Christopher Cartwright, produced *Electa Thargumico-Rabbinica*" and other

---

<sup>296</sup> Dod, op.cit., p.241f.

<sup>297</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.763.

<sup>298</sup> Ibid., p.399.

<sup>299</sup> Greenslade, S.L., in the Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol.III, p.157.



works on Hebrew topics, with much reliance on the rabbis. Fuller,<sup>300</sup> chiefly a historian, yet discusses rabbis' speculations about numbers. John Selden, ardent Parliamentarian, finds much support for his Puritan views in the Hebrew Old Testament.

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

## THE 'RATIONALISTS'

### WHO WERE THE 'RATIONALISTS'?

A major difference between Puritans and others lay in their doctrine of human nature. The Puritan regarded this as having been utterly corrupted at the Fall, so that human nature thenceforward was completely depraved. Others, including the Carolines, believed mightily in the Fall, but regarded it as in a sense incomplete; human nature was flawed, yes, but had been allowed to retain the faculty of reason, which could co-operate with God's grace in the work of salvation. As time went on, more and more people began to accept the power of reason as a major factor – perhaps the major factor - in religion. These people were drawn from various groups or parties, some even from Puritan origins, and in many ways differed among themselves, just as all the other groups did, so they are similarly hard to define. However, we shall look briefly at the few groups which can be identified to some extent.

---

<sup>300</sup> Admittedly, Fuller was a Caroline 'wet' rather than a Puritan.

“The assault upon the Church of England was severe. A religious laboratory was created; and in it religious experiments were conducted of a type and diversity which has not been seen at any other time in the history of the country.” Thus Hylson-Smith, on the ferment that was the Interregnum.<sup>301</sup> He goes on to say that left-wing Puritanism was much influenced by mysticism, holding various theories of the ‘inner light’ which came to take precedence over the Bible, let alone ecclesiastical authority of any sort, or serious learning.<sup>302</sup> This may not be true of most Puritans, but there is enough truth in it to show how things were moving in their ranks. Milton, for instance, whose approach to Scripture, especially perhaps the Old Testament, is tempered by ideas of natural law, like that of the later Platonists and Latitudinarians. These were the early stirrings of an approach which would develop more than a century later into historical criticism. The precepts of the Old Testament are valid as they accord with what Milton sees as “the secondary law of nature and of nations,” which pertains universally in a fallen world.<sup>303</sup> The Carolines, too, were not unaffected. Sanderson is an example, whose work is more moral than dogmatic. He quotes the classical authors a great deal, and, with Ussher and Hall, provides a ‘link’ between the early Carolines and the post-Restoration ‘plain preachers’<sup>304</sup>

*Faute de mieux*, the somewhat anachronistic term ‘rationalists’ is used in this study for these men who to a greater or less extent allowed reason a prominent place in their religious thinking. They include several members of the ‘Great Tew circle’ (especially Chillingworth), the ‘Cambridge Platonists’, the ‘Latitudinarians’ and their precursors, the Quakers – or some of them, and the

---

<sup>301</sup> Hylson-Smith, op.cit., 187.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., p.203 ff.

<sup>303</sup> Reventlow, op.cit., p.163.

<sup>304</sup> Mitchell, op.cit., p.231 f.

dreaded unitarian Socinians, as well as the infinitesimally tiny number, before the Enlightenment, of real atheists. Mostly we shall be concerned with mid- and late century, but it must be remembered that the 'religious laboratory' of the Interregnum was only possible because of some of the thinking that had gone before, as long before as Hales (1584-1656), who has been dubbed the earliest of the 'rationalists' by some. Aubrey says of Hales, "He was one of the first Socinians [sic] in England, I think the first".<sup>305</sup>

### The Great Tew Circle

This group met at the house of Lucius Carey, 2<sup>nd</sup> Viscount Falkland (who had been raised a Roman Catholic): "His home was like a college, full of learned men," writes Aubrey.<sup>306</sup> These were mainly young men from nearby Oxford. They were not a school, though their chief common interest seems to have been the moral aspect of religion; Aubrey again: "...they were wont to say at Oxford that if the great Turk were to be converted by natural reason, these two [Falkland and Chillingworth] were the persons to convert him".<sup>307</sup> Chillingworth was the leading light of the circle,<sup>308</sup> but Trevor-Roper points out that it was a very promising group: "...a somewhat esoteric graduate reading party in the country.....even so, the graduates are rather remarkable".<sup>309</sup> *Inter alios*, they included future bishops (Barlow, Earles, Morley), an archbishop (Sheldon), scholars (Hammond, Hales), poets (Waller, Cowley), a philosopher (Hobbes) and a Lord Chancellor (Hyde, later Lord Clarendon, he of the 'Code'). Chillingworth and Falkland were both killed fighting for the King. Members remained friends

---

<sup>305</sup> Barber, R. (ed.): John Aubrey's *Brief Lives* (Boydell Press, 1982), p.122.

<sup>306</sup> Ibid., p.64.

<sup>307</sup> Ibid., p.72.

<sup>308</sup> Orr: *Reason and Authority* (1967), p.37.

<sup>309</sup> Trevor-Roper, H.: *Catholic & Anglican*, op.cit., p.175.



throughout their lives, regardless of their sometimes differing opinions, even open disagreement. Several were thoroughgoing Carolines (e.g. Hammond, Earles), but with liberal tendencies (they were even accused of Socinianism, which they vehemently denied). However, though they met during the heyday of Laudianism, they were not really Laudians. They accepted Erasmus's distinction of *fundamenta* and *adiaphora*; also Hooker's *dictum*, that all who profess Christianity are members of the Church Catholic. They were thus both universalists and ecumenists; this generosity, extending even to Rome,<sup>310</sup> allowed them to envisage union with other Protestants. Thus, too, they did not accept the divine right of bishops, holding that episcopacy was a 'matter indifferent' – which put the Laudians in the position of the Puritans accused by the former of not recognising sufficient 'matters indifferent' themselves.<sup>311</sup> Most, if not all, were Arminian, but their not being fervent Laudians led to those later in exile distrusting Cosin and his ilk. Not that they did not maintain friendly relations with the Archbishop and his coterie: Chillingworth was Laud's godson, and sent him weekly reports from Oxford on people and events there when he (Laud) was Chancellor.

The Great Tew men were not at the time prolific writers; Chillingworth's book, *The Bible the only Religion of Protestants*, was "their sole visible product"<sup>312</sup> Recent scholarship has tried to study Chillingworth as a Caroline divine. Certainly his churchmanship would qualify him, but his rationalist approach to the Bible, the Church, the sacraments and other matters would preclude him – despite his Caroline horror of disorder and his ardent royalism.<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>310</sup> Hylson-Smith, *op.cit.*, p.162ff.

<sup>311</sup> Trevor-Roper, H: *Catholic and Anglican*, *op.cit.*, p.208.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, p.209.

<sup>313</sup> Orr, *op.cit.*, p.155.

Above all, Chillingworth repeatedly stressed the importance of reason in religious matter, and his abhorrence of coercion. However, although reason is the final arbiter in these and, indeed, all matters, it remains God-given reason: Chillingworth is utterly conditioned by English Protestantism, despite – or perhaps because of – his brief flirtation with Rome in the early '30s.

Earlier, Cherbury had laid down his five “common notions” underlying all religious belief: (1) a Supreme Being; (2) Who must be worshipped; (3) Piety to be expressed in Virtue; (4) Repentance the way to combat Evil; (5) Reward/Punishment after death.<sup>314</sup> It is likely that all members of the circle would have agreed with him.

#### **The Cambridge Platonists**

A later group, smaller but more intellectually cohesive than Great Tew, flourished at Cambridge, including Whichcote, the leader, with Cudworth, Culverwel and Smith. They wrote little, and published nothing in their lifetimes (which in two cases, were short, Culverwel and Smith dying in their early thirties). Their influence was felt through their teaching, and, much later, through posthumous selections and collections of ‘aphorisms’ provided the only real sources of evidence of their teachings.

“They sought a middle way between the Laudians on the one hand and the Calvinists on the other, and they were opposed to the bitter and factious spirit of both.”<sup>315</sup> They were not even either Carolines or Puritans: “Against the first they argued that conduct and morality were of more moment than Church polity; against the latter they claimed that reason must not be fettered; and against both,

---

<sup>314</sup> Pailin, D.A., in Gilley & Sheils, op.cit., p.217.

<sup>315</sup> Cragg, G.R.: The Church in the Age of Reason (Pelican, Hodder, 1960), p.68.

that in the conscience of the individual, governed by reason, and illuminated by a revelation which could not be inconsistent with reason .... lay the ultimate seat of authority in religion”.<sup>310</sup> They were, in fact, very similar to Chillingworth and Cherbury. Whichcote held that basic truths are grounded in the reason of things, “*veritates, quae fundantur in rationibus rerum*”, while Culverwell holds that men do not make laws of nature, but discover them: both the laws and the means to their discovery are gifts of God. Revelation still has a place in the process, for there are truths beyond the scope of human reason (Whichcote).<sup>311</sup> They were thus strongly theistic and Christian. Reason shows that the world is unintelligible except in terms of a holy and wise God. The use of reason and the practice of virtuous living are the two ways in which men can stand in a true relationship with God. Thus the Platonists’ high sense of moral duty. They distrusted over-exact definitions of doctrine and theological speculation into areas which are beyond human understanding, on the basis of insufficient or ambiguous Scriptural and other evidence. However, they were very different from the Deists, in that theirs was a conservative approach, maintaining the full Christian, even Catholic, tradition.<sup>312</sup> What the Platonists were attempting was a synthesis of philosophy and theology, and to marry reason and religion, which, they felt, must be compatible: ‘difficulties’ were to be worked at until they were compatible – one way or another. As hinted at above, they distrusted religious systems (which led Bishop Westcott to write that Whichcote didn’t understand the nature of the Church), together with “elaborately articulated forms of belief” (So in that respect would be generally on the Carolines’ side, one supposes). They looked to Jesus

---

<sup>310</sup> Campagnac, E.T.: *The Cambridge Platonists* (1901), Introduction, p.xiii.

<sup>311</sup> Mullet, in Gilley & Sheils, *op.cit.*, p.227.

<sup>312</sup> *Vide* Cragg, *Church in Age of Reason*, *op.cit.*, p.68f.



for an example of not eagerly constructing religious systems.<sup>319</sup> Campagnac has a felicitous sentence, about Whichcote: “He believed that a system woven by one man could be nothing but a shroud for another, and would only continue to fit the maker, if he never grew”.<sup>320</sup>

For all their emphasis on reason, the Cambridge men, like all ‘Platonists’ everywhere, were to some degree mystics, in that, as indicated above, they held that the highest forms of knowledge cannot be fully acquired or even understood by humankind, reason or no reason. In this respect, they were the Platonic ‘mole’ which surfaces from time to time throughout the intellectual history of Europe; Inge claims that the ‘liberal’/‘broad’/‘Latitudinarian’ tradition of the Church of England hails from Paul and John, representing Platonism at the start of Christianity.<sup>321</sup> On the other hand, they were moved by natural theology, insisting like their successors the Latitudinarians that creation points to the Creator.<sup>322</sup>

Mention of ‘successors’ indicates the success of the Platonists, for all their small numbers and little literary remains, in spreading their word among the generations following them, so that it has been rightly said of them that their movement was “...the most influential in setting the tone, and even the agenda, of academic philosophy, and to a lesser [*sic*] extent academic life as a whole, in the last [*sic, iterum!*] half of the seventeenth century”.<sup>323</sup>

---

<sup>319</sup> *Vide* Campagnac, *op.cit.*, Introduction, p.xvii.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, Introduction, p.xix.

<sup>321</sup> Inge, W.R.: The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought (Longmans Green, 1926), p.11 ff.

<sup>322</sup> Cragg, G.R.: From Puritanism to the Age of Reason (CUP, 1950), p.51.

<sup>323</sup> Hylson-Smith, *op.cit.*, p.295.

### Non-‘pukka’ Carolines

Several noted ecclesiastics were in sympathy with the Carolines, but restrained in that sympathy, so that it is difficult to include them with confidence in their ranks. Perhaps the two foremost of these were James Ussher (1581-1656) and Robert Sanderson (1587-1663). Ussher was noted for his ‘plain style’ of preaching, with few allusions to ‘authorities’. His extant sermons were based largely on the Old Testament. Sanderson’s thirty-five extant sermons were preached between 1619 and 1655. He was curiously given to open each one with “Occasion, Coherence, Division and Summe of the TEXT”; one third of his sermons “*Ad Aulam*” [preached at Court] had Old Testament texts, but all six “*Ad Magistratum*” [to Judges of Assize] had; Of those “*Ad Populum*”, five out of eight; “*Ad Clerum*”, however – none.<sup>324</sup> He occasionally uses Hebrew to make a point (unlike Ussher), e.g. that נשך *Naschock*, that is to *bite*; and נשך *Nescheck*, that is *Usury*....<sup>325</sup>

### The Latitudinarians

All the above groups have been seen as precursors and progenitors of the Latitudinarians of the latter part of the Seventeenth Century and beyond. Chillingworth, to some, seems to have been Latitudinarian from the start, since his appreciation of the Roman Church after his conversion to it in 1628 was remarkably liberal. His reversion to Anglicanism, in a protracted and awkward process, was mainly concerned with examining what Orr calls “Probability versus Infallibility”.<sup>326</sup> Undoubtedly, the Cambridge Platonists were forerunners of the Latitudinarians, many of whom had been taught by them, though some consider

<sup>324</sup> Sanderson, R.: *XXXV Sermons* (London, 1681).

<sup>325</sup> Ibid., p.92.

<sup>326</sup> Orr, op.cit., p.15f – and this quotation is in fact the title of his 3<sup>rd</sup>. chapter.

that the students lacked the profundity and original genius of their mentors. ‘Reason’ to them was more like the exercise of all mental faculties, including ‘common sense’. Like the Platonists, they emphasised morality, and did not care to define doctrine overmuch; unlike the Platonists, however, they were not at all inclined to mysticism.<sup>327</sup>

“The Latitudinarians stood for a temper rather than a creed.”<sup>328</sup> Religious belief had to be reasonable, with simple theological statements, few dogmas, much morality, little recourse, if any, to citations of ‘authorities’ – and definitely no ‘enthusiasm’ [in a XVIIth and XVIIIth Century sense]. This ‘temper’ gradually pervaded the Church of England after the Restoration, as the Andrewesian style went out of fashion, with its densely packed theology and eclectic citations, its high-flown oratory, and the demands it made upon its hearers. “The power of the Anglican pulpit may have been as great as before, but it was a less distinctively ecclesiastical power; it had a more directly practical aim.”<sup>329</sup>

#### **The Rationalists’ lasting legacy**

Both *ante-bellum* Anglicanism and Puritanism were irrevocably changed in the decades after 1660, when the influence of the rationalist groups increased in momentum and eventually caused a radical shift in the mindset of (nearly) all believers. “The revolutionary achievements of science popularised a new metaphysical world-view, destroying the concepts upon which Anglican and Puritan doctrines had been based and from which they had derived their powers of

---

<sup>327</sup> *Vide* Cragg, From Puritanism to Age of Reason, op.cit., p.62ff.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81.

<sup>329</sup> Williams, A.T.P.: The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England (SCM, 1947), p.45f.



persuasion.”<sup>330</sup> Among these concepts was the confidence in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, the ready finding of types in the Old Testament, the dawning awareness that the Old Testament could and should stand in its own right, and the easy and over-speculative application of its texts to moral choices facing individuals and the body politic.

## USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

### Attitudes

All the above is not to say that the Rationalists disregarded the Scriptures – far from it. Dean Inge published 1200 of Whichcote’s ‘Aphorisms’, of which only half a dozen refer directly to the Bible – but among these is: “The world will never be released from the *Superstitions* of the *Roman* Church; till men confine themselves, in matters of Religion, to free Reason and plain Scripture”.<sup>331</sup> (However, he seems to fall into a modern misconception: “*Fear*, is the denomination of the Old Testament; *Believe*, is the denomination of the New”.<sup>332</sup> Boyle (a strange mixture of aristocrat, scientist, conservative theologian and Biblical student, which doesn’t place him in any of the groups we have mentioned) must yet be included as a Rationalist. Yet Aubrey tells us that “At his own cost and charges he got translated and printed the New Testament in Arabic, to send into the Mahometan countries”.<sup>333</sup> Whichcote states that reason is not the sole arbiter, his confidence in Scripture as “clear, full and perspicuous” on all important matters undimmed: the Anglican ‘tripod’ of Scripture-Reason-

---

<sup>330</sup> New, op.cit., p.101, footnote.

<sup>331</sup> Inge, W.R.: Religious and Moral Aphorisms [of Benjamin Whichcote], (London, 1920), Aphorism 1086.

<sup>332</sup> Ibid., Aphorism 1097.

<sup>333</sup> Barber, op.cit., p.48.

Tradition, developed by the Carolines, holds good for Rationalists too, though the emphases may be somewhat different.<sup>334</sup>

A lengthy quote from Whichcote may serve to illustrate the Platonists' view of the Bible, as he distinguished between the edifying and the unedifying in Scripture. Scripture is factually true, but there are many bad examples in it. "Take care how you quote Scripture; for *that* is Scripture for which you have Divine Authority, not *that* which is barely related in the Text. For you have the Speeches of the Devil, and the Advice of the worst of Men related in Scripture, - Scripture is only consider'd in the Truth of Matter of Fact, and that these things were done; but it doth not follow from hence that they are materially Good; No Man must pretend to do as *Ehud* did; because his action is recorded in Scripture: No Man must pretend to borrowing without Intention of paying, as the *Israelites* did; for if they had not extraordinary Warrant, they were to be condemn'd in their practice. So, for us, to curse our Enemies, as we read in the *Psalms* the Prophet did, not knowing in what spirit it was done; it is not warrantable for us to do the like from thence: Neither must we hate any, because the Jews were to hate and to destroy the *Seven Nations*; which they interpreted a Commission to hate *all Mankind but themselves* ..... if you will have Divine Authority, see what is said; and think it not enough that it is barely related in the Book."<sup>335</sup> So the ready and uncritical recourse to Scriptural texts, typical of much argument in the Seventeenth Century, is rejected. John Smith regarded the Old Testament as embodying law – available only "*in scriptis*" – as an earthly, external force, and the New Testament

---

<sup>334</sup> McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, op.cit., p.89.

<sup>335</sup> Quoted in Campagnac, op.cit., p.23.

as embodying true righteousness, emanating from God and infusing the human soul.<sup>336</sup>

Chillingworth opposed the Puritans, who had adopted an infallible Bible in place of an infallible Church, plus some ‘infallible’ doctrines, especially predestination, which he felt left no room for real voluntary morality nor exercise of reason in religious matters. Chillingworth doubts the canonicity of Job and Ecclesiastes, and the prophetic authorship of their eponymous Books. He thinks the parts of the Bible vary in importance<sup>337</sup>; generally, the New Testament is more important than the Old: “Even the psalmist David had less knowledge of divine truth than the humblest New Testament Christian”<sup>338</sup> – not at all a Caroline view! However, the Bible remains the Protestant’s sole authority – if interpreted by use of reason (stated in expressing his concern to end reliance on the Fathers as in any way ultimate authorities).<sup>339</sup> Cragg finds this attachment to Scripture even among later Latitudinarians: “The Bible still held its position as the chief and ultimate court of appeal”.<sup>340</sup> Boyle, who could subtitle his *Excellency of Theology* “The Preeminence of the Study of Divinity, above that of Natural Philosophy”,<sup>341</sup> could state that, “....the Book of Scripture discloses to us much more of the Attributes of God, than the Book of Nature”. Science, for Boyle, does not hold all the answers, e.g. to the life hereafter, or sin and redemption.<sup>342</sup> Ussher agrees that God reveals himself in his Word as well as his works.<sup>343</sup> Furthermore, “....the Doctrine of Scripture is such as could never breed in the

---

<sup>336</sup> Reventlow, *op.cit.*, p.175.

<sup>337</sup> Orr, *op.cit.*, p.103.

<sup>338</sup> *Ibid.*, p.104.

<sup>339</sup> Nuttall, *op.cit.*, p.59.

<sup>340</sup> Cragg, *Church and Age of Reason*, *op.cit.*, p.71.

<sup>341</sup> London, 1665.

<sup>342</sup> Boyle, R.: *Letter*, p.6.

<sup>343</sup> Ussher, J.: *Bodie of Divinitie, or The Summe and Substance of the Christian Religion (inc. 'Immanuel')* (London, 1645), p.5.



brains of man; three Persons in one God; God to become man; the Resurrection, and such like; mans wit could never hatch, or if it had conceived them, could never hope that any man could beleieve them".<sup>344</sup>

#### Literalism defended – and doubted

It will be obvious from the above that many of the men we count as 'Rationalist' retained belief in the verbal inspiration of Scripture, being concerned – as, admittedly, were other parties – in the interpretation and application of the inspired text. Kidder is a good example, writing in the last part of the century a detailed defence of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. This suggests that the defence was needed, as the Enlightenment was taking hold, and the Bible subjected to more sceptical scrutiny than theretofore (Kidder mentions Hobs [sic] and Spinosia [sic]).<sup>345</sup> In an imaginatively erudite manner, redolent of Andrewes, his work answers objections from: Genesis 36.31; 12.6; 22.14; 40.15; 35.21; 20.7; 2.11.12; 10.8; Exod. 16.35; 6; 16.36; Num.21.14; 12.6; Dt. 1.1; 2.2; 3.11; 34 & 34.10. He feels the need to defend the literal truth of the Bible in all instances. What was the serpent like before being caused to crawl on its belly? Well, "....the Serpent's stature, which, 'tis likely, was in great measure *erect* before this time"<sup>346</sup> [one wonders how he knows this....] Why is Moses referred to in the Third Person? Well, if this indicates that he didn't write the Pentateuch, then several Old and New Testament authors must be supposed not to have written their eponymous works. Kidder says that this is just silly, and cites Caesar

---

<sup>344</sup> Ibid., p.9.

<sup>345</sup> Kidder, R.: *A Commentary on the Five Books of Moses, with a Dissertation concerning the Author or Writer of the said Books; and a General Argument to each of them* (2 vols., Wm. Rogers, London, 1694), pp.XXI – LXXIX.

<sup>346</sup> Ibid., Vol.I, p.15.

and Josephus in support of his dismissal.<sup>347</sup> The celebrated ‘problem’ of the account of the death of Moses, in Deut.34? Moses was the greatest of the Prophets, who all foretold many events after their deaths. And it doesn’t really matter if Deut.34 was added as an epilogue to the Pentateuch, anyway, because that’s what it is.<sup>348</sup> Mention of kings in Israel in Gen.36.31? Ussher is not pleased by the suggestion of insertion by another hand. The eight kings are not “Father and Son” (with ‘proofs’). Moses knew there would be kings in Israel, and in Deut.17 “delivers laws concerning the matter” – a circular argument, using the Pentateuch to support itself here, but is that any different from critics’ using it to destroy its own credibility?<sup>349</sup> Place-names which did not apply in Moses’s day? Hebron, for instance? Well, ‘Joshua’ says that לפנים it was not called Hebron, but Kiriath-Arba – but לפנים could mean ‘even before Moses’s time’ and many Old Testament citations can support this (e.g. Ps.102.26; Neh.13.5; Dt.2.20).<sup>350</sup> Occurrence of ‘...as is said to this day, “In the mount of the Lord is shall be seen”...’ (Gen.2.14)? Why should Moses himself not write this, it having become a proverbial saying?<sup>351</sup> [We shall see below that Kidder’s views were contested by his friend Prideaux.]

Ussher has similar concerns, and similar confidence: “God gave Moses the two Tables of the Law in stone, made by Gods own hand, and written with his own finger (Exod.31.18; Deut.9.10,11).”<sup>352</sup> [We have come across this before.] Like commentators of other schools, Ussher finds אלהים proof of the Trinity at

---

<sup>347</sup> Ibid., Vol.I.

<sup>348</sup> Ibid., Vol.I. p.LXXVIIIff.

<sup>349</sup> Ibid., p.XXXIVff.

<sup>350</sup> Ibid., p.XLIff.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., p.LIIIf.

<sup>352</sup> Ussher,J.: *Annales Veteris Testamenti* (London, 1658), p.16.

the Creation.<sup>353</sup> Elsewhere, he produces a list of a dozen Biblical quotes – half from the Old Testament – to prove the essential sufficiency of Scripture.<sup>354</sup> (And he knows what he means by ‘Scripture’ – he takes up a couple of pages listing examples of “errors” in the Books of the Apocrypha.<sup>355</sup> Such confidence in Scriptural accuracy enables Ussher to make his celebrated computations of chronology. He divides history prior to the fall of Jerusalem into five “Ages of the World”: 1. Creation to Noah; 2. Noah to Abraham; 3. Abraham to Moses; 4. Moses to Solomon; 5. Solomon to the fall of Jerusalem. Then comes the sixth Age, divided into Empires: Babylonian, Persian, and Macedonian (by far the longest section – 530 pages, out of a total of some 900).<sup>356</sup>

Unique in Britain<sup>357</sup> was Ussher’s computation of the chronology of world history, for which alone he was afterwards much celebrated (though in his lifetime he was considered expert in many fields, a giant of erudition; Heylyn called him “a walking concordance and living library”.) He used the astronomy of his day to clarify the vagueness of the Old Testament records. Scaliger had got as far back as ‘Nabobassar’, using Ptolemaic and Babylonian computations, but then only the Old Testament availed: authoritative, of course, but frequently unclear. Ussher chose MT over LXX chronology (he even wrote a treatise to demonstrate the LXX an unreliable text). He corrected Scaliger’s estimate of Terah’s age at Abraham’s birth (70 to 130), by reference to Abraham’s mother as Terah’s second wife.

He had problems over irregular motions of the sun (a whole day over Gibeon for Joshua, ‘10 degrees back’ for Ahaz) but decided that these were fairly

---

<sup>353</sup> Ussher, R, *Bodie of Divinitie*, *op.cit.*, p.213.

<sup>354</sup> *Ibid.*, p.25f.

<sup>355</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15f.

<sup>356</sup> Ussher, *Annales*.

<sup>357</sup> The eminent Huguenot Scaliger had completed a similar exercise.



insignificant ‘blips’ which would have been absorbed by the regularity of the sun’s motions over the aeons.<sup>358</sup> Ussher mined rabbinic traditions which suited his results; the earth’s life to date was 6,000 years: 2,000 of Nature, 2,000 after Moses, 2,000 of the Messiah, after *Elias*.<sup>359</sup>

Prideaux, too, can do computations based on ‘facts’ and figures from the Old Testament.<sup>360</sup> However, like Kidder, he applies reason to his examination of the texts; unlike Kidder, his approach is more akin to a modern one. This is clearly seen in his treatment of the ‘difficulties’ in the Pentateuch, ‘difficulties’ we have seen Kidder deal with above. Prideaux notes that there are “several interpolations” in the Pentateuch (rather than Kidder’s “difficulties”): “...that there are such interpolations is undeniable; there being many passages through the whole sacred writ, which create difficulties that can never be solved without the allowing of them”.<sup>361</sup> However, he does not seek to uphold Mosaic authorship at every turn, with ingenious explanation. We shall see below how Prideaux is convinced that Ezra edited nearly all the Old Testament; “assisted by the same Spirit by which they were at first wrote,” Ezra added bits “for the illustrating, connecting or completing” of the sacred writings.<sup>362</sup> Looking at some of the points made by Kidder, we may compare Prideaux’s comments. Ezra composed the last chapter of Deuteronomy (“which could not be written by Moses himself, who undoubtedly was the penman of all the rest of that book”). Gen.36.3 “could not have been said till after there had been a king in Israel; and therefore they

---

<sup>358</sup> *Vide* Trevor-Roper, Catholic, Anglican, Puritan, op.cit., pp.156-161, for extended treatment of the chronology.

<sup>359</sup> *Vide supra*, p.243f.

<sup>360</sup> Prideaux, W.: The Old and New Testament connected, in the history of the Jews (London, 1821), Vol.1, Preface.

<sup>361</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol.2, p.460ff.

<sup>362</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol.2., p.460.

cannot be Moses' words; but must have been interpolated afterwards".<sup>363</sup> Gen.22.14, "In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen": the mount is Moriah, the sentence a saying, so this can only have been written long after the Israelites had possessed the land where Moriah stood. Gen.12.6, 'Canaanites then in the land': this only makes sense if written after Joshua had evicted them. Ezra used place-names as they were in his day, not in Moses's, "for the better understanding of the people". Also, any phrase like "as it is to this day" is not Mosaic.

Sanderson issues a 'modern' *caveat* against too literal interpretation, with too easy application: "Oh beware of misapplying *Scripture*! ..... men take *the words* of the sacred Text fitted to *particular occasions*, and to the condition of the *times* wherein they were written; and then *apply* them to themselves and others as they find them, without due respect had to *the differences* that be between those *times* and *cases* and the present".<sup>364</sup> But we must not think Sanderson more advanced for his age than he was; he is also quite capable of averring such 'facts' as "Marriage ..... instituted in the place and estate of Innocency".<sup>365</sup>

#### **Morality: the Ten Commandments**

The Rationalists were increasingly concerned with the moral aspect of religion, so naturally, when looking at the Old Testament, their attention fixed upon the Ten Commandments, but – and this applied further afield than the fens – "Where the Puritan had affirmed facts, the Cambridge Platonists emphasized values".<sup>366</sup> So we are not surprised to find a differing approach, less concrete, more general. Whichcote declares that "Morals are inforced by Scripture; but

---

<sup>363</sup> Ibid., Vol.2., p.461.

<sup>364</sup> Sanderson, R.: op.cit., p.76.

<sup>365</sup> Ibid., p.227.

<sup>366</sup> Cragg, From Puritanism..., op.cit., p.56.

were *before* Scripture: they were according to the nature of God".<sup>367</sup> So he can say, of the Commandments, that these moral laws were actually already implanted in mankind when delivered at Sinai – otherwise men couldn't accept nor respond to them. In other words, the Ten Commandments were a reminder, not a new announcement. "These have a deeper Foundation, greater Ground for them, than that God gave the Law on Mount Sinai; or that he did after engrave it on Tables of Stone; or that we find the Ten Commandments in the Bible. For God made Man to them, and did write them upon the Heart of Man, before he did declare them on Mount Sinai, before he engraved them upon the Tables of Stone, or before they were writ in our Bibles...."<sup>368</sup> An audacious theory for the time..... Others of the 'Platonists' agreed; Cudworth, for example, says that things are not right or wrong because the Bible says so, but because of the prevalence of universal natural laws. Even God is bound by these. It is easy to see how, while the Platonists were not primarily concerned with Biblical interpretation, their ideas helped to lay the foundations of later criticism: Cudworth again, on the contents of the Bible, says, "They must be capable of being measured by natural goodness".<sup>369</sup> Whichcote suggests that morality is supreme over doctrine and *cultus*, as God himself shows: "God hath rejected his *own* Institutions; when they have been made Final, put in competition with Morals, or made compensation for Morals – Isa.i.11-17. lxvi.3. Mic.vi.7,8. Jer.vii.4,5. Amos v.21. Isa.lxiv.6" [plus some N.T.references] He explains how this can be: "Institutes have their foundation in the *Will* of God; and the matter of them is alterable: Morals have

---

<sup>367</sup> Campagnac, op.cit., p.69.

<sup>368</sup> Ibid., p.4f.

<sup>369</sup> Reventlow, op.cit., p.174.



their foundation in the *Nature* of God; and the matter of them is necessary and unalterable".<sup>370</sup> All this is a far cry from traditional Puritan or Caroline teachings.

It has been noted of Whichcote his "emphasis on interior spirituality rather than the externals of religion, on Christian practice rather than the institution of the Church. For him the core of Christianity was its moral content".<sup>371</sup> This concern with morality as against institutional Christianity meant that most Rationalists, especially the Platonists, did not bother themselves greatly with matters liturgical. Now and again they will mention them, as Cudworth does, when commenting that the Eucharist has its roots in the consumption of portions of the sacrificial victim in Old Testament 'peace' offerings.<sup>372</sup>

#### Israel and England

The Rationalists were less concerned than the Carolines to see Stuart England as a mirror-image of Old Testament Israel, though they could dwell upon the Fifth Commandment in this connection. Sanderson occupies himself with issues of personal morality (on the parts of, e.g., judges and other officials). He can be hortatory: '*Ad Populum*' sermons have some 'grin and bear it' passages, such as, "....comfort for the godly against temporal afflictions" includes their "Eternal Reward".<sup>373</sup> He urges paternalism, a fatherly concern for the poor on the part of, e.g., magistrates. Sanderson comes close to Divine Right at times; he likes the name 'Abimelech' for meaning "The King my Father"<sup>374</sup> and hails the King as the "Chief Magistrate" of the realm.<sup>375</sup>

---

<sup>370</sup> Campagnac, op.cit., p.74.

<sup>371</sup> Hutton, S., in DNB Vol.58, p.473.

<sup>372</sup> Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship*, op.cit., p.96.

<sup>373</sup> Sanderson, op.cit., p.151.

<sup>374</sup> Ibid., p.86.

<sup>375</sup> Ibid., p.90.

Sanderson, of course, had a lot of the Caroline in him. So did Ussher, who provides us with perhaps the clearest Caroline statement on this Commandment: *“What is the meaning and scope of this Commandement? - That the equality of men’s persons and places in whatsoever estate, Naturall, Civill, or Ecclesiasticall, and with whatsoever relation to us, be duely acknowledged and respected; for it requireth the performance of all such duties, as one man oweth unto another, by some peculiar bond, in regard of special callings and differences which God hath made between speciall persons. What be these speciall persons? Either in Equalls, or Superiours and Inferiours, for this Commandement enjoyneth all due carriage of Inferiours to their Superiours; and by consequent also of Superiours to their Inferiours; and likewise by analogy, of equall among themselves, under the sweet relation betwixt Parents and Children, or betwixt brethren of the same family, and the generall duty of honour”*.<sup>376</sup> Again, *“What are Superiours? They be such as by Gods ordinances have any preeminency, preferment or excellencie above others, and are here termed by the name of Parents, 2.kings 2.12. and 5.13. and 6.21. and 13.14. I Cor.4.15. Col.3.22.....”* – which allows Ussher to apply this Commandment generally to society in considerable detail. Magistracy is part of the Law of Nature, and therefore of the “author of Nature”. His defence of Divine Right is almost Caroline, based on the sacral kingship of the Old Testament – but also on “the Testimonies of the Primitive Church, Dictates of right Reason, and opinions of the Wisest among the Heathen Writers”.<sup>377</sup> Also Caroline is his emphases on the king’s responsibilities to God and his subjects, together with the “Obedience of the Subject” (Part II of a major

---

<sup>376</sup> Ussher, *Bodie of Divinitie*, p.256.

<sup>377</sup> Ussher, R.: *The Power Communicated by God to the Prince and the Obedience Required of the Subject* (London, 1661), p.13.

work), except when the king acts against the will of God as expressed in Scripture.

Andrewes builds an imposing edifice on Num.10.1, in his remarkable 'two trumpets' sermon. Kidder does not find in the verse Andrewes's argument for the royal supremacy over Church and State. Like Ainsworth and other Puritans, he says that the trumpets are to be used by the priests alone. That there were two trumpets is accounted for by the fact that Aaron had two sons: "when this number was encreased, the number of Trumpets was also greater, *2.Chron.5.12.*" <sup>378</sup>

#### The Sabbath

The Rationalists were little concerned about the Sabbath; as the century wore on, this matter became less and less the major area of dispute between schools of religion. One who does deal with it is Ussher, in his well over a hundred half-folio pages on the Commandments. He says that the essence of the Fourth Commandment cannot be ceremonial law, since it was written by God, like the rest of the Commandments. However, its detailed provisions are ceremonial, as the Carolines hold. There must be a seventh day set apart from the daily round – but not for idleness <sup>379</sup>! We detect a whiff of Puritanism here, and the whiff is confirmed a few pages later, when we are told that the whole day, not just a part of it, is for religious exercises, public and private; it is strictly not for pastimes and amusements of any sort. <sup>380</sup> Ussher stresses the twin unique points about this Commandment: (1) it is the only one introduced by 'Remember'; (2) it alone carries the promise of long life.

---

<sup>378</sup> Kidder, *op.cit.*, Vol.II, p.239.

<sup>379</sup> Ussher, *Bodie of Divinitie*, *op.cit.*, p.243ff.

<sup>380</sup> *Ibid.*, p.248.



## HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

During the Seventeenth Century, the standard of clerical education steadily rose; by mid-century most clergy – and virtually all academics – were acquainted to some extent with the Scriptures in the original languages, whether or not this was their primary interest. Whichcote relies little on the Old Testament, far more on pagan philosophers – yet he can with ease quote his Hebrew when it suits him. And like everyone else, he reads the Old Testament at least to some extent in the light of the New: “The appearances of God in human *Shape*, under the Old Testament; were Preparations to the appearance of God in human *Nature*, under the New”<sup>381</sup>. The less orthodox ‘Carolines’ and the Latitudinarians were just as well-versed and just as investigative of the Hebrew Scriptures as those of other schools. Cudworth, for example, though best known as a ‘Cambridge Platonist’, was not only Master of Christ’s College for thirty-four years, but also Professor of Hebrew.<sup>382</sup> Ussher readily quotes Hebrew and, indeed, the rabbis. He is acutely aware of Jewish post-Biblical interpretation, which enables him, for example, to identify ‘Jannes and Jambres’ – who would otherwise mystify the New Testament student – as the Egyptian magicians brought in by Pharaoh to oppose Moses and Aaron, and “whose names are celebrated, not only by the Jews in their *Talmudical Treaty of מנחות* (i.e.) of oblation, c.9. where they are called by the names of יוחנן and וממרא [sic] (i.e.) Jochanne, and Mamre, and in the Chaldee Paraphrase, attributed to Jonathan upon, [Ex.1.15. and 7.11.], but also among some heathen writers.....”<sup>383</sup>

Kidder discusses difficulties of translation, with examples of the ambiguity of English versions as opposed to the ‘clarity’ of the Hebrew, in such matters as

<sup>381</sup> Inge, *Aphorisms*, Aphorism 1166.

<sup>382</sup> Inge, *Platonic Tradition*, p.57.

<sup>383</sup> Ussher, *Annales Veteris Testamenti*.op.cit., p.13.

distinction of gender and accurate rendering of the Hebrew Tense system. Therefore, there is always need for notes!<sup>384</sup> In translations, these are marginal, in commentaries they form a significant proportion of the text, as when, on Dt.1.1, he lingers over בעבר which AV translates “on this side”. He explains that it is actually only “on the side”; it “can be indifferently *eis* and *trans*. He gives many other occurrences of עבר in support, as well as Josephus, who offers ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ. However, in this case, ‘this’ is acceptable, since Moses was on the east bank when it was uttered – not the west, as a later writer would have been! <sup>385</sup> On Exod.16.35, אבלו rendered into English by a past tense can be taken as indicating that Moses couldn’t have written it – but: “Nothing is more common among the Sacred Writers than such an *Enallage* of Tense”. Thus this “Preterperfect” Tense is to be regarded as a “Prophetic Perfect”. He finds other instances where the Hebrew Perfect is translated as a Future (e.g. Ps.22.29; Isa.65.21; Hos.4.10; Zech.12.6). The fact that Moses died perhaps some months before the forty-year manna period expired is no problem, either. “The Jews have a Rule in this case not to be rejected: מקצת וכול : i.e. part of the month is as the whole, and part of the year is as the whole.”<sup>386</sup>

Kidder is adamant that the Scriptures must be available in the vernacular, and that this is a Biblical principle. He cites the account of Ezra’s reading of the Law, which lists names of those “...who caused the People to understand the Law.....gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading (Neh.8.7,8.)” He is on the right track: “The Jews, when they were return’d from their Captivity in Babylon, and had in some measure forgotten their own language, needed such

<sup>384</sup> Kidder, op.cit., Vol.II, Preface, p.XIII.

<sup>385</sup> Ibid., p.XXXI.

<sup>386</sup> Kidder, op.cit., Vol.I, p.XLIXff (on Mosaic authorship of Pentateuch).

an Explication: And hence (it hath been thought) it was that the Targums, or Chaldee Paraphrases, sprang".<sup>387</sup> Nevertheless, scholars and preachers must have recourse to the Hebrew text. Not even the ancient Versions will do, "though I have a great Opinion both of the LXXII"<sup>388</sup> Interpreters (especially on the Pentateuch)". He also acknowledges a debt to the Vulgate, the Syriac and Samaritan versions, and the Targum of Onkelos ("which is generally a Version rather than a Paraphrase), as well as to Josephus, Philo, and "Rabbinical Commentators" – especially Maimonides, of whom: "I am fully of the opinion the Writings of that Jew (next to the Sacred) are one of the greatest Blessings that the learned World hath. And that if young Divines would read his Works with due care, they would arrive at a greater degree of Scripture knowledge than by all the methods which are usually taken. I do not wonder that the *Jews*, when they speak of *Moses Maimonides*, should say, That, from *Moses* to *Moses*, there never was a Man like *Moses*." High praise, indeed. He also values recent versions in Italian, Latin and English. Still, "Nothing would tempt me to alter the Hebrew text, or to depart from it".<sup>389</sup>

In addition to his many other intellectual skills, Boyle is well versed in Hebrew, and sometimes feels the need to remind his readers that he is: "I am not unacquainted with the קרי *Keri*, and the כתוב : nor the תקון ספרים *Tikkûn Soph'rîm* in the Old Testament".<sup>390</sup> Boyle refers to conversations and correspondence with rabbis on Biblical topics,<sup>391</sup> his own avowed method of exegesis may owe something to them: הפוך בה והפוך בה ארי כלי בה" Turn it over,

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., Vol.II., Preface, p.IXf.

<sup>388</sup> Note the unrounded figure!

<sup>389</sup> Ibid., p.XVIf., for all these comments.

<sup>390</sup> Boyle, R.: *Some Considerations touching the Style of the Holy Scriptures* (London, 1661), p.93.

<sup>391</sup> Ibid., p.129.



and again turne it over, for All is in it”.<sup>392</sup> A marginal gloss on ‘Seraph’ demonstrates his learning: “ The Name *Seraphim*, in Hebrew, springs from the root *Saraph*, which signifies to burn or flame: Whence, Numb.21.6, those pernicious Creatures, that our Translators English, *Fiery Serpents*, are styled in the Original, *Hannechasim has-seraphim*.”<sup>393</sup>

In his *Considerations ... of Holy Scripture*, Boyle sets out the main “objections to Scripture” (e.g. contradictions, repetitions) and deals with them rationally, in the process making several interesting points. He recognises the problem of lack of corroborating literature in Hebrew in establishing the precise meanings of the Biblical vocabulary. LXX and Syriac provide proof that Hebrew words and phrases had more meanings than those favoured by later translators.<sup>394</sup> In a manner we regard as ‘modern’, he advocates ‘dynamic equivalence’; he criticises the translators of his day (and earlier) for over-literal versions: “...whereas in those Versions of other Books that are made by good Linguists, the Interpreters are wont to take the liberty to recede from the Author’s words, and also substitute other Phrases instead of his, that they may expresse his meaning without injuring his Reputation: in translating the Old Testament Interpreters have not put *Hebrew* phrases into *Latin* or *English* phrases, but onely into *Latin* or *English* words .... made many things less coherent, or less rational, or less considerable....”<sup>395</sup> Incidentally, he is not alone in his day in referring regularly to Islam, with Qur’anic citations.<sup>396</sup>

---

<sup>392</sup> Ibid., p.139.

<sup>393</sup> Boyle, R.: *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God* (London, 1661), p.10.

<sup>394</sup> Boyle, *Holy Scripture*, op.cit., p.10.

<sup>395</sup> Ibid., p.8.

<sup>396</sup> e.g. ibid., p.155.

Prideaux is very interested in the origins of the Biblical text and its language(s). Ezra edited the Old Testament, so far as its material existed in his day. Resting upon Talmudic and rabbinic support, he says, "This both Christians and Jews give him the honour of" (after Tertullian, Irenaeus, Basil, Clement of Alexandria – but no Scriptural support, except "that fabulous relation" in II Esdras, "a book too absurd for the Romanists themselves to receive into their canon" [so it must have been absurd!]) The material must have existed before Ezra's time, since Daniel presumably had a copy, allowing him to quote both the Law and Jeremiah. And in Ezra 6 the priests and levites are organised as in the Law of Moses.<sup>397</sup> In Neh.8 the people asked Ezra to read the Law – not to have it dictated to him anew. So: "All that Ezra did in this matter, was to get together as many copies of the sacred writings as he could, and, out of them all, set forth a correct edition." Also, as we have seen above, he provided editorial material himself. This we have seen in connection with the Pentateuch, but he is not confined to those Books. For instance, while he is sure that Proverbs is "certainly King Solomon's", Prideaux can happily aver that Chapter 25 must have been added, since it says that it was copied in Hezekiah's time, twelve generations later.<sup>398</sup> The clinching argument for Ezra's editorship lies in the claim that Ezra wrote Ezra, and probably Chronicles and Esther too: "And if the books written by him be of Divine authority, why may not every thing else be so which he hath added to any of the rest, since there is all the reason for us to suppose that he was as much directed by the Holy Spirit of God in the one as he was in the other".<sup>399</sup>

Prideaux explains the 'Tanakh' divisions (by Ezra) with all their Books – with a note about those which came after Ezra's time: I & II Chronicles, Ezra,

---

<sup>397</sup> Prideaux, H.: op.cit., Vol.2, p.443.

<sup>398</sup> Ibid., p.462.

<sup>399</sup> Ibid., p.463.

Nehemiah, Esther, Malachi. Doubtless because lacking Ezra's editorial hand . these Books fall short of "the correctness which is in other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures".<sup>400</sup>

The five Books of the Law were "antiently" divided into 54 sections, for synagogue lection; sections were divided into verses, marked with "two great points at the end of them" – possibly for the guidance of the "Chaldee interpreters". But chapter divisions came much later, introduced by Cardinal Hugo in the Thirteenth Century.

Orthography tends to play a more important semantic rôle in the Semitic languages than in other language families. There was thus great interest in and controversy over Hebrew writing in the Seventeenth Century, even more than that displayed by your average speculative commentator today. Prideaux has much to say on the subject. Ezra wrote the Hebrew Bible "in the Chaldee character", rather than the ancient Hebrew alphabet, since people had become used to it (together with its Aramaic tongue) after the Exile. Prideaux notes that the Samaritans still use the old alphabet, the same as the Phoenician alphabet, from which the Greek was derived).<sup>401</sup> *Pace* (loads of) others, Prideaux says that "There are some, I acknowledge, who strenuously contend for the antiquity of the present Hebrew letters, as if they, and none other, had always been the sacred character in which the Holy Scriptures were written" – and produces in support one of the earliest enlistments of archaeological evidence, in the shape of coins bearing the older script.<sup>402</sup>

However, what about the pointing, then a matter of bitter disagreement? Prideaux accepts, as do all, the pointing of the MT of his day as correct,

---

<sup>400</sup> Ibid., p.446.

<sup>401</sup> Ibid., p.463.

<sup>402</sup> Ibid., p.464.



transmitted from the original penmen by oral tradition (of which more below). But when were the points added? By Ezra? After the Talmuds? He makes several points:<sup>403</sup> (1) Synagogue copies don't have points – so they couldn't have been as ancient as Ezra, or they would have been preserved; (2) Qere and Kethib are always about letters, never points – so the latter cannot be ancient; (3) “Ancient Cabbalists” pay no attention to vowel points – and if they had then existed “these triflers would certainly have drawn mysteries from the one as from the other, as the later cabbalists have done”. (4) The Ancient Versions differ at times: had points existed then, this would not have happened; (5) Neither the Talmuds, nor Josephus, nor Philo, nor yet the early Christian writers, such as Jerome and Origen, who were expert in Hebrew, mention points.<sup>404</sup>

Prideaux concludes that points were added by the Massoretes shortly after Ezra, when Hebrew ceased to be the language of Palestine, replaced by Aramaic, to avoid ambiguity; he illustrates with “pi’el and pu’al without vowels are identical”.<sup>405</sup> Pointing is necessary when a language is dead.<sup>406</sup> He compares this with the Latin conventions of his day, such as placing a circumflex over an Ablative –a, to distinguish it from a Nominative, though everyone knows this was not so written in ancient Rome. The reason why the Talmudists didn't use them is that they were learned men, who didn't need them, whereas the Massoretes were mere scribes and copyists – who did.<sup>407</sup>

Rabbinic learning figured large in the studies of many scholars, of all schools, and Prideaux has much to tell as a result of his own researches. The Jews' oral law takes precedence over the written, he informs his doubtless

---

<sup>403</sup> No joke intended!

<sup>404</sup> Prideaux, Vol.2., op.cit, p.467.

<sup>405</sup> Ibid., p.470ff.

<sup>406</sup> Ibid., p.469.

<sup>407</sup> Ibid., p.473.

astonished readership – astonished, that is, until Prideaux explains that this is precisely the error into which the Church of Rome has fallen, “making nothing of the latter but as expounded by the former” (since both were given to Moses by God on Sinai, according to the Jews). He then produces an interesting *excursus* on the history of the oral law until Christ.<sup>408</sup> Jeremiah delivered it to Baruch, Baruch to Ezra, down to Simeon (he of the *Nunc Dimittis*) and his son, Gamaliel, and down the family line to R.Judah Hakkadosh, who wrote the Mishnah. Prideaux is not convinced: “But all this is mere fiction, spun out of the fertile invention of the Talmudists, without the least foundation, either in Scripture, or in any authentic history for it”. Each generation “added their own imaginations” - “whereby these traditions becoming as a snow-ball, the farther they rolled down from one generation to another, the more they gathered, and the greater the bulk of them grew”. The oral law was only written down when it became too expanded to memorise, and later scholars added to it, until it was collected and arranged into the Talmuds, Jerusalem and Babylon, in AD300 and 500 respectively. There have been several editions since, though the Jews prefer the Babylon version. Prideaux is well aware of successive schools of rabbis, Tanaim, Amoraim, Seburaim, Geonim. Maimonides edited, pruning ruthlessly “descants, disputes, fables, and other trash under which they [“resolutions and terminations”] lay buried in that vast load of rubbish”.<sup>409</sup>

Prideaux approves of the Peshitta, as the most accurate text, the “oldest translation” (apart from the Targums, Jonathan and Onkelos).<sup>410</sup> The Syriac version replaced the LXX for Christians, as Aquila did for the Jews.<sup>411</sup> He likens

---

<sup>408</sup> Ibid., p.436.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid., p.442.

<sup>410</sup> Prideaux, op.cit., Vol.3., p.78f.

<sup>411</sup> Ibid., p.79.

the rather literal Aquila to “rather a good dictionary, to give the meaning of the Hebrew words, than a good interpretation to unfold unto us the sense of the text; and therefore Jerome commends him much in the former respect, and as often condemns him in the latter”. Symmachus is exactly the opposite, while Theodotion takes the middle way (Christians preferred his Daniel to that in LXX).<sup>412</sup> He describes Origen’s work, and other early editions or versions, as well as recent polyglot Bibles.<sup>413</sup>

Unlike Ussher, Prideaux approves of the Apocrypha, regarding at least Tobit and Esther as quite factual.<sup>414</sup> His range of sources is wide: in one place he quotes both Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, together with Strabo, Josephus, Herodotus, Jerome, Eusebius, other Fathers, St.Patrick, *Seder Olam Rabba* and both Talmuds, quoting Hebrew occasionally.<sup>415</sup>

---

<sup>412</sup> Ibid., p.81f.

<sup>413</sup> Ibid., p.83ff.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid., Vol.1., p.43.

<sup>415</sup> Ibid., Vol.1., p.38.



## CHAPTER 7

# THE SCHOLARLY BACKGROUND

## THE MIDDLE AGES

### Jewish scholarship

The enormous Biblical erudition of the Caroline divines and their contemporaries can come as a surprise until it is realised that their way had been prepared for them by Christian scholars during the Sixteenth Century and before. This effort was paralleled and preceded by that of Jewish commentators, and there was much cross-fertilisation, though admittedly mainly from the Jews to the Christians. Jewish scriptural exegesis, based on sound philological investigation, had begun in earnest during the Eighth Century AD, in faraway Babylon. By the Eleventh Century the centre of this activity had moved to Western Europe, principally France, where Rashi (1040-1105) was pre-eminent, and Spain. Very early, some remarkably 'modern' insights were expressed; Abraham ibn Ezra suggested that parts of the Pentateuch were later than Moses, and that Isaiah 40-55 originated in Babylon. In Provence flourished the Kimchi family, principally Moses, whose grammar was soon translated into Latin, and David (1160-1235), who wrote a grammar, dictionary and exegetical works. All these products quickly became standard reference books among Christians. A Portuguese, Isaac Abravanel (1160-1235) was not above relying on Christians such as Jerome for illumination; he was also much influenced by a Fourteenth Century Bishop of Avila, Alfonso Tostado). His method was to provide a general introduction to a

Biblical Book before commenting in detail upon the text. Of German origin, Elijah Bachur (1469-1549) was a populariser who mediated works of the mediaeval Jewish philologists to Christian scholars, and accepted some of the latter as pupils (against the wishes of most of his fellow-Jews).<sup>1,2</sup>

Jewish commentaries were basically literalistic, accepting, for instance, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and Hebrew as the 'primordial tongue'.<sup>3</sup> However, their interpretations did involve midrash as an acceptable alternative to a literal reading.<sup>4</sup> Interpretation could be affected by many other influences, including Aristotle, Arab philosophy and Christian exegetical trends.<sup>5</sup>

#### Christian scholarship

This was patchy and intermittent. Hebrew scholarship was virtually dead in the Dark Ages, reviving in the Eleventh Century. The two leading figures were Hugh of St.Victor (1096-1141) and his pupil, Andrew of St.Victor (1104-1175), working in Paris. Several English ecclesiastics – though not many – acquired some Hebrew from Andrew's works and from Jews. In the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries there was increasing interest in Hebrew exegesis and traditions, again studied largely under Jewish teachers. This could militate against acquiring real competence in Hebrew, due to the Jews' reluctance to teach Christians too much: "Thus, many twelfth-century scholars whom we nowadays call 'Hebraists' did not in fact master the Hebrew language well enough to gain

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information, see Lloyd Jones, W: op.cit., Introduction, pp.1-14.

<sup>2</sup> Mentions in the text and footnotes of this study show that the Carolines (and others) used and quoted these Jewish scholars.

<sup>3</sup> Sirat, C. in de Lange, N. (ed.): Hebrew Scholarship and the Mediaeval World (Cambridge, 2001), p.213.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p.217.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p.219.

direct access to Jewish books and scholarship”.<sup>6</sup> McKane shares this sceptical view, even about Andrew of St.Victor’s expertise. (He also says that Andrew’s concentration on the literal sense – unusual for his day – is yet not to be anywhere near the beginnings of modern historical criticism.)<sup>7</sup> It is probable that the mediaevals were content with a ‘knowledge’ of Hebrew (and, indeed, of other languages, apart from their own vernacular and Latin) which we should regard as superficial.<sup>8</sup> The Orders of Friars of the Thirteenth Century were very keen on Hebrew (their main aim being the conversion of the Jews)<sup>9</sup> and matters improved considerably under their influence. In the late Thirteenth Century Raymund Martini studied the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds.<sup>10</sup> Nicholas of Lyra (c.1270-1340) studied the rabbis so deeply that he was nicknamed “the ape of Rashi”. His own influence, in turn, was considerable, especially in the University of Erfurt, where Martin Luther studied and took Hebrew so seriously that a jingle ran: *Si Lyra non lyrasset / Luther non saltasset*.<sup>11</sup> All this despite the apparent lack of proper textbooks on the language; some teaching aids existed, but they were of a very basic nature.<sup>12</sup> In 1312, the Council of Vienne had ordered the establishments of two teaching posts in each of Greek, Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic at each of Oxford, Paris, Bologna and Salamanca; these were either never instituted or soon collapsed – except in Paris and Salamanca, whose Hebrew Chairs lasted a century.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Olszowy-Schlanger, J., in de Lange, op.cit., p.107.

<sup>7</sup> McKane, W.: Selected Christian Hebraists (CUP, 1989), p.3f.

<sup>8</sup> Daiches, op.cit., p.107.

<sup>9</sup> Loewe, L. article ‘Christian Hebraists’ in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol.8.

<sup>10</sup> Daiches, op.cit., p.107.

<sup>11</sup> Singer, C., in Singer and Bevan, op.cit., p.307.

<sup>12</sup> Olszowy-Schlanger, in de Lange, op.cit., p.107f.

<sup>13</sup> Loewe, op.cit., p.14.



It seems that in the Middle Ages Hebrew studies always needed Jewish help;<sup>14</sup> “The Christian student ....regarded his Jewish informants as an organically living, though theologically fossilized specimen of the personal, domestic, social, jurisprudential, ethical, and speculative realities of ancient Erez Israel.”<sup>15</sup> It must not be thought that Christians were only interested in Biblical matters, however. Much mediaeval interest was in the Kabbalah, as well as the plethora of Jewish scientific, medical and philosophical writings issuing from Spain. Nevertheless, the Christian Hebraists of the Middle Ages made a small but significant contribution to later scholarship.

#### England

Perhaps Lloyd Jones’s most important insight is that, “The study of Hebrew was not introduced into England in the sixteenth century; it was rediscovered. The tradition of Hebrew scholarship, which can be traced back to the Middle Ages, may not have been strong, but it did exist.”<sup>16</sup> It is known that during the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries Hebrew was studied and taught at Oxford and Cambridge, probably by Franciscans at the former, though never to any great extent.<sup>17</sup> St.Victor had a daughter house at Wigmore, where it is possible, even likely, that Hugh’s and Andrew’s studies were continued by pupils.<sup>18</sup> The Franciscan Roger Bacon (1210-1290) is pre-eminent among English Hebrew students (probably not yet ‘scholars’), closely followed by Robert Grosseteste, the scholarly Bishop of Lincoln.<sup>19</sup> As in Europe, Jews were the

---

<sup>14</sup> Daiches, D., op.cit., p.107.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p.10.

<sup>16</sup> Lloyd Jones, op.cit., p.267.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., Introduction, pp.1-14.

<sup>18</sup> Loewe, op.cit., p.12.

<sup>19</sup> Daiches, op.cit., p.107. Also Loewe, op.cit., p.13.

main teachers prior to their expulsion, and there was a strong tradition of Hebrew grammar among English Jews. There are no known MSS, unfortunately, but there are 25 'bilingual' MSS of the Old Testament, probably used in the study of the language. These range from interlinear Latin translations to the mere addition of marginal glosses, but there is also a copy of Rashi's commentary on the Prophets, with Latin translation.<sup>20</sup> It is assumed, therefore, that Englishmen didn't study Hebrew in any great depth. No grammars or dictionaries of the period have been discovered, except a fragmentary one ascribed to Roger Bacon, which deals almost entirely with orthography. There is some indication that attempts were made to describe Hebrew in terms of Latin grammar.<sup>21</sup> The first complete Hebrew lexicon in England was produced at Romsey Abbey sometime before 1450.<sup>22</sup>

## THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

### Europe

Interest in Hebrew waned somewhat during the Fifteenth Century, for a variety of reasons,<sup>23</sup> but revived in Italy (a chair of Hebrew was founded at Bologna in 1488),<sup>24</sup> then Germany, towards its end. The leaders were Giovanni Pico (Italy, 1463-1494) and Johann Reuchlin (Germany, 1455-1522) were particularly interested in the Kabbalah, in which they claimed to find Christian

---

<sup>20</sup> Oszlowsky-Schlanger, op.cit., p.111.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., pp.107-128, for detailed introduction to this period.

<sup>22</sup> Alexander, M. van C.: The Growth of English Education 1348-1648 (Pennsylvania University Press, 1990), p.50.

<sup>23</sup> Lloyd Jones, op.cit., p.18.

<sup>24</sup> Singer, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.313.

revelation. Reuchlin produced what for many of the next generation of students was the standard Hebrew grammar.<sup>25</sup>

The Reformation brought changed attitudes in the early Sixteenth Century, as “....both Catholics and Protestants took up the battle-cry of the humanists enshrined in the motto *ad fontes* and applied it to the Scriptures.”<sup>26</sup> Some eminent translators emerged. Sancte Pagnini (Italy, 1470-1536), Sebastian Münster (1489-1552), Leo Jud (Switzerland, 1482-1542), Immanuel Tremellius (Italy, 1510-1580). These produced Bible versions (in Latin, with close adherence to the Hebrew text), grammars, dictionaries, translations of Jewish commentaries, their own Christian ones and a plethora of other works, not only on Hebrew and the Old Testament, but also on Aramaic, Syriac and the Targums, relying heavily on rabbinical works. There is evidence that the 1611 Translators mined many of these for examples.<sup>27</sup>

For obvious reasons, Protestants developed Hebrew studies more than did post-Tridentine Catholics. The latter faced much opposition from Church authorities to extensive study of Hebrew and rabbinic literature (and even the Greek New Testament). Even Erasmus (who had a little Hebrew) was suspicious, perhaps due to innate anti-semitism. “He persistently refused to accept that the writings of mediaeval Jewish mystics could have any value whatsoever for a Christian”.<sup>28</sup> (However, he helped to establish the ‘trilingual’ college at Louvain.) Luther, on the other hand, was keen on Hebrew learning, and had studied it, though he had no time for the rabbis’ traditions; Melanchthon was an expert

---

<sup>25</sup> Lloyd Jones, p.22f.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p.39.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p.47.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p.32.



Hebraist;<sup>29</sup> Zwingli was proficient in Hebrew, as evidenced by his commentaries,<sup>30</sup> as was Calvin (it is not known where he learnt it, but in his student days in Paris there were several renowned teachers of the language).

Other Genevans known to have been conversant with Hebrew were Bucer, Peter Martyr, Beza and Sturm. Whilst Protestants encouraged Biblical studies, they tended to be opposed to any reliance on rabbinic guidance.<sup>31</sup> The controversies surrounding this area of scholarship aroused interest among German scholars, not a few of whom were attracted thereby to the study of Hebrew and post-Biblical Jewish literature. Johann Reuchlin is often viewed as the ‘father’ of non-Jewish Hebrew scholarship in Europe. He wrote his Hebrew Grammar in 1506, and in 1512 an edition of the seven Penitential Psalms – probably as a ‘reader’ for students of his Grammar. Then came *De accentibus et orthographia Hebraeorum*, an advanced grammar. Bomberg printed his *Rabbinic Bible* in 1517; this was much used by Christians. Thereafter, grammars and dictionaries multiplied.<sup>32</sup> Sancte Pagnini, a Dominican, produced a Latin version of the Bible, probably translated from the Hebrew and Greek, in 1528; it was used by Coverdale in 1535 in what was an amalgam of existing versions.<sup>33</sup> Sebastian Múnster, an ex-Franciscan Protestant, taught at Basel, and was possibly the best Hebraist of his day; he produced more than one grammar, an Aramaic grammar and an Aramaic dictionary, several Hebrew dictionaries, translations of the rabbis, and a Latin-Hebrew polyglot. Over 100,000 volumes of his work had been published by 1600.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Lloyd Jones, p.66.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p.69.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p.71f.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p.71f.

<sup>33</sup> McGrath, A.: KJV, op.cit., p.90.

<sup>34</sup> Yarchin, W.: *History of Biblical Interpretation* (Hendrickson, 2004), p.172.

During the Sixteenth Century it became accepted that all theologians should be well versed in the original Biblical languages. Rome had a chair of Hebrew in 1514.<sup>35</sup> In 1520 the Collegium Trilingue was founded at Louvain.<sup>36</sup> Spain had a long tradition of Hebrew and Arabic scholarship, and at the University of Alcalá (Roman *Completum*), founded in 1500, the first Professor of Hebrew in 1508.<sup>37</sup> It was there that Cardinal Ximenes produced the 'Complutensian Polyglot'. and this work provided an enormously useful tool for the rapidly increasing number of students and scholars wishing to become expert in the Biblical tongues. In France, Germany and the Low Countries, more and more work was being done, on Aramaic and rabbinics as well as Biblical Hebrew, resulting in the publication of Hebrew Bibles, often with 'extras' such as Targums or rabbinic commentaries. The *Antwerp Polyglot*, following upon the Complutensian, proved almost as influential, and included a Hebrew dictionary.<sup>38</sup> François Vatable (d.1547), a Catholic, taught in Paris; he had much rabbinic learning, especially of David Kimchi; he published nothing, but exercised great influence through his students. Another Catholic, the Benedictine Isidore Clarius, produced a new Latin version of the Old Testament. Johannes Drusius (1550-1616), a Protestant from the Low Countries, studied at Louvain and Cambridge, taught Aramaic, Syriac and Hebrew at Oxford, then returned to the Netherlands, to the University of Francker, which soon became a centre of excellence for the study of the Hebrew Bible. He had much rabbinic learning, which he used extensively in his ten commentaries, concentrating on philology rather than theology. Sixtinus Amarna (1593-1629), Drusius's successor at Francker, was

---

<sup>35</sup> Singer, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.313.

<sup>36</sup> Lloyd Jones, op.cit., p.71

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p.71f.

<sup>38</sup> Daiches, op.cit., p.129

renowned for rabbinic learning. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the Dutch polymath who corresponded with and visited Andrewes and other Carolines (of whom he declared himself one at heart), wrote on the Old Testament *inter alia*, like Drusius concentrating on philology in his exegesis.<sup>39</sup> One factor in all this, was discontent with the Vulgate, which started before 1500. This discontent increased during the century, even among Catholics, and the Vulgate was widely disrespected among Protestants by 1600 (though Andrewes is happy to quote it!) An indication of this discontent is the fact that before Tyndale's time, no fewer than 400 vernacular versions of the Bible had been published since 1450.<sup>40</sup>

#### England

Some of the humanists found that their attitude to learning led them to encourage the study of Hebrew and rabbinics. John Colet is a good example of a powerful influence in this respect (though he was not a Hebraist himself), as is Wolsey, who inaugurated Greek and Hebrew lectures at Oxford.<sup>41</sup> Even in mid-century, there was still much opposition (from Reformers as well as Rome) to Hebrew and Greek studies, as likely to lead to heresy. In the middle of the next century Peter Heylyn could write, in typical fashion, ".....those times were so extremely ignorant of them [Hebrew, Greek and Syriac] that the Study of the *Greek* Tongue was sufficient to condemn a man of Heresie; and a small spattering in the Hebrew, made him subject unto some suspicion of *Heretical* Fancies. And so it stood until Reuchlin and *Budaeus* in *France*, *Erasmus* and *Paulus Fagius* in *England*, restored again the Greek and Hebrew to those several

---

<sup>39</sup> For details of all the above, see Yarchin, op.cit., pp.172-174.

<sup>40</sup> Alexander, op.cit., p.99.

<sup>41</sup> Heylyn, op.cit., p.317.



Nations".<sup>42</sup> However, the promoters of the 'New Learning' (More, Colet, Fisher, Wolsey, Erasmus, Latimer, Tunstall *et alii* - not all of whom were proficient in Hebrew) managed to bring about lasting change in this negative attitude of the authorities. "It was through the combined efforts of scholar and patron that Hebrew was rediscovered in sixteenth-century England."<sup>43</sup>

Despite the change, the authorities in England remained strangely more reluctant than those on the Continent to countenance vernacular versions. This may account for the mixed abilities of the translators, Hebrew-wise. Tyndale had some Hebrew, probably learnt in Germany at the beginning of his exile; some say that he learnt it from William Roy, an English friar of Jewish antecedents, in Wittenberg, 1624/5.<sup>44</sup> There is disagreement as to how proficient he was (though Lloyd Jones is convinced that he was indeed very proficient, and agrees that Tyndale deserves the title "father of English Hebraists". Coverdale (1535) was no Hebraist; John Rogers, responsible for 'Matthew's Bible' of 1537, did know Hebrew; Coverdale again produced the 'Great Bible' of 1539. In 1560 came the great Geneva Bible, whose Old Testament was basically a revision of the Great Bible. Coverdale was associated with it, but it is not known whether Whittingham, the scholar behind the version, was a Hebraist. However, there is evidence of at least some Hebrew learning among the group of bishops who produced the 'Bishops' Bible' in 1565, in reply to Geneva.<sup>45</sup>

Hebrew learning spread through schools and colleges, slowly at first, but with increasing momentum as the century wore on. The founders of St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1516 seem to have had such studies specially in mind, for

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p.317.

<sup>43</sup> Lloyd Jones, *op.cit.*, p.110.

<sup>44</sup> Alexander, *op.cit.*, p.100.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p.100f.

their statutes ordained that some students must study Hebrew as well as Greek (itself not yet well established in the Universities), and that a teacher be appointed.<sup>46</sup> About the same time, Hebrew was studied (though maybe not taught) at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and by 1520 several lecturers in Hebrew had been appointed in both universities, gradually establishing a subject which was to be more and more popular until the Eighteenth Century. By 1550 Tremellius, perhaps the leading European scholar, was teaching in Cambridge.<sup>47</sup> After that, one after another, the Cambridge colleges appointed lecturers in Hebrew, so that several, possibly most, had them by 1600. In 1584 Emmanuel was founded; from its inception, all Fellows were required to be competent in Hebrew and Greek as well as Latin. Chaderton led a system of seminars for Bible study, with great emphasis on the Biblical languages; these were attended, *inter alios*, by Knewstubb, Andrewes, Cartwright.<sup>48</sup> Oxford was not so well supplied: before 1600, only Magdalen had a series of lectures (from 1565), though there were usually some dons who taught it, including several Regius Professors of Divinity.<sup>49</sup> Both Rainolds and Humphrey taught it, Rainolds often using the rabbis to confirm his Protestant readings. As we have seen, he was an expert in both Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew, and an AV Translator (but died in 1607). It may be mentioned here that Hebrew was also beginning to be taught in English Catholic seminaries abroad. In 1573 Gregory Martin was appointed to teach it at Douai and Rheims. His controversies with William Fulke are replete with references by both of them to the Hebrew text, and to the rabbis.<sup>50</sup> Regius Professors of Hebrew were appointed to both Universities in 1540. Cambridge

---

<sup>46</sup> Alexander, *op.cit.*, p.78.

<sup>47</sup> Daiches, *op.cit.*, p.129.

<sup>48</sup> Lloyd Jones, p.207ff.

<sup>49</sup> Lloyd Jones, p.207ff.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p.151.

had only two in sixty-five years: Thomas Wakefield, who had taught at Louvain, Tübingen and Oxford as well as Cambridge, reigned from 1540 to 1575, being succeeded by the more famous Edmund Lively, who urged rabbinics on all theological students as essential to the exegete. As an AV Translator, Lively tried to establish the precise meanings of Hebrew words, phrases and idioms by collecting many passages in which each occurred before deciding on the correct meaning. Daiches suggests that this method was probably adopted by the other Translators (including, doubtless, Andrewes, Lively's near-contemporary and one of his few peers as a Hebraist).<sup>51</sup> In *A True Chronologie*, Lively explains his exegetical method as twofold: (a) what we should call *Sitz im Leben*; (b) interpretation. Andrewes would not have disagreed – the problem lies in (b), of course. In this pair's time, their Oxford counterparts numbered seven, but left little published indication of their abilities.<sup>52</sup> Many Continental Protestants also taught, especially at Cambridge, sometimes as deputies to the Regius Professors. Their importance is stressed by those who think that it was due to them that Hebrew was solidly established in England by 1600.<sup>53</sup>

Apart from the Professors, perhaps the leading light in Hebrew and associated studies at Cambridge (and elsewhere) was Hugh Broughton (1549-1612), possibly the leading Hebraist of his day.<sup>54</sup> Over twenty years' residence on the Continent had brought him into contact with Jews, and he became familiar with post-Biblical Jewish exegesis, the Targums and Talmuds. He is noted for using the rabbis to confirm his Protestant views – but shuns them when they don't. He took a poor view of the English translations then extant, especially the

---

<sup>51</sup> Daiches, op.cit., p.153.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p.195f.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p.207.

<sup>54</sup> Many references to him are made in Chapter 6 *supra*.



Bishops' Bible, and demanded a new one. When the King promulgated this, however, Broughton was not chosen to participate, because of his argumentative and combative nature.<sup>55</sup>

It is difficult to tell just how much Hebrew was being studied and taught to any worthwhile degree, but probably more than we have evidence for; Loewe guesses: "The high frequency with which from 1504 onward Hebrew grammars were published (and reprinted) must imply a student market greatly outnumbering the names of those Christian Hebraists known to us as such from their publications".<sup>56</sup> Even these latter form a formidable list. Loewe identifies more than 1,400 Christian scholars whom he would deem Hebraists, flourishing between 1100 and 1890. Impressively, no fewer than 121 of them are Sixteenth or Seventeenth Century Englishmen – nearly 9% of the whole, or more than a third of those operating throughout Europe during those two centuries.<sup>57</sup>

Hebrew began to percolate down to the schools well before 1600. Cranmer had established some Hebrew teaching at Canterbury Cathedral School as early as c.1540; also Henry VIII's *Scheme of Bishopricks* ordered all cathedral schools to teach Latin and Greek, and six of them – including Durham – to teach Hebrew as well. But it seems that these schemes came to naught, so far as Hebrew was concerned. Archbishop Holgate of York founded at least four schools in which Hebrew was to be taught; other newly-founded schools followed suit, though at first it was not easy to find staff competent in Hebrew, and most of them probably did not comply with their founders' intentions in this respect.<sup>58</sup> However, 'Dr.Watts scholars' at Cambridge had to demonstrate some

---

<sup>55</sup> Lloyd Jones, op.cit., p.164ff.

<sup>56</sup> Loewe, op.cit., p.17.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., appendix.

<sup>58</sup> Lloyd Jones, op.cit., p.224ff.

knowledge of all three “learned tongues”; Lancelot Andrewes was one of them, and is said to have had Aramaic too before matriculating.<sup>59</sup> In the late Sixteenth Century, in fact, many schools were teaching Hebrew, but usually not a great deal. There is some evidence of a paradox in the Universities by 1600: not many students studying Hebrew to any great extent, yet its acquisition was held in high esteem, probably already a *sine qua non* of the potential academic or senior ecclesiastic. There was thus apparently no difficulty in finding several dozen Hebraists to help produce the Authorised Version.<sup>60</sup> Richard Mulcaster, first Headmaster of Merchant Taylors’ School, and later High Master of St.Paul’s School, was known as a Hebraist<sup>61</sup> (whom Andrewes revered throughout his own lifetime, to the extent of always having his portrait above his study door). The Bible was not introduced into the school curriculum until the mid-Sixteenth Century. After that, children of Puritans probably studied it more in the home in the vernacular than in the schoolroom, where the text was likely to be in Latin or Greek.<sup>62</sup>

As with the mediaevals, we may be a little sceptical of ‘knowledge of Hebrew’ before, say, 1600; in many cases it was probably not much more than superficial, though there is, of course, plenty of evidence for the existence of scholars of outstanding competence.<sup>63</sup> It has to be admitted that much of the ‘knowledge’ claimed was acquired because of interest in the Kabbalah (of which John Dee was the great exponent in the Sixteenth Century<sup>64</sup>), chronology and apocalyptic, evinced by the many millenarians (e.g. Broughton). The Hebrew

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p.149.

<sup>60</sup> Watson, F.: The English Grammar Schools to 1660 (Frank Cass, 1968), p.527.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p.528.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p.63.

<sup>63</sup> *Vide* Daiches, op.cit., Chs.II and III.

<sup>64</sup> Though its attraction waned by 1600.

letters tended to be invested with magical significance, and *geomatria* (letters representing numbers) flourished.<sup>65</sup>

## THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

### The Buxtorfs

Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) became Professor of Hebrew at Basel in 1591, and did much to develop rabbinical studies among Christians, producing his *Rabbinical Bible* in 1618 (his *Grammar* had appeared in 1605). His *magnum opus* was his *Lexicon Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, begun in 1609, completed by his son in 1639. He also produced a *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* and other important works. His son and successor at Basel, Johannes Buxtorf II (1599-1664) edited, revised and completed his father's works, and produced many treatises and translations of his own.<sup>66</sup> Catholic Hebraism, meanwhile, focused on Biblical, rather than post-Biblical literature. The effort led to the Polyglots, Complutensian, Antwerp and Paris 1628-45. None of these worthy publications were as elaborate as the London of 1657, by Walton *et al.*<sup>67</sup>

### England

It has been seen that many Puritans, as well as Carolines, were massively competent in Biblical, patristic and scholastic learning, with the original tongues. They were also well-read in recent and contemporary Protestant and Roman Catholic works.<sup>68</sup> In 1601 at least one Cambridge college required one year's attendance at the Hebrew lectures before admission as B.A.<sup>69</sup> By 1600 it was felt

---

<sup>65</sup> Lloyd Jones, *op.cit.*, p.181ff.

<sup>66</sup> Box, in Singer and Bevan, *op.cit.*, p.349f.

<sup>67</sup> Loewe, *op.cit.*, p.17.

<sup>68</sup> Rupp, G., in Knox, R.B.: *Reformation Conformity and Dissent* (Epworth Press, 1977), p.120.

<sup>69</sup> Duncan-Jones, A.S.: *Archbishop Laud* (Macmillan, 1927), p.14.



by many that some Hebrew should be taught in schools, so as to ensure its mastery in the Universities. Blebelius's Grammar was probably used in some schools, Buxtorf's in rather more; in 1593, the Puritan John Udall had translated Martinius's Grammar into English, for use in the Universities (with the addition of a dictionary).<sup>70</sup> Most textbooks, however, remained in Latin, and a favoured exercise was the rendering of a Psalm into Latin and back into Hebrew.<sup>71</sup> Later in the century, Laud's statutes of 1636 for Oxford University demanded some Hebrew knowledge from Bachelors of Arts students, possibly as part of their preparation for B.D.<sup>72</sup> In 1640 Regius Professors were appointed to both Oxford and Cambridge, five to each, including a Hebrew chair. At Oxford this chair was associated with a canonry of Christ Church, at Laud's insistence. Soon afterwards, Heylyn tells us, both Hebrew and Aramaic were generally studied.<sup>73</sup> Laud also established a Chair of Arabic at Oxford. In 1646, Cambridge University benefited greatly when Parliament voted funds for the purchase of a valuable Italian collection of Hebrew books which had been imported into London.<sup>74</sup>

Stirrings of 'modern' scholarship before the end of the century mark the beginning of the end of Caroline (and other) approaches to Biblical criticism and exegesis. The influence was felt of, e.g., Vitranga's (1659-1722)<sup>75</sup> *De Synagoga Vetere* and *Observationes Sacrae* (1696) and commentaries on Isaiah and Zechariah. The process had in fact started earlier: Simon had divorced Biblical exegesis from theology proper – not denying the latter, but simply holding them

---

<sup>70</sup> Watson, op.cit., p.525.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p.526.

<sup>72</sup> Watson, op.cit., p.529.

<sup>73</sup> Heylyn, P., op.cit., p.317.

<sup>74</sup> Alexander, op.cit., p.242.

<sup>75</sup> Box, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.363.

different disciplines which do not necessarily coincide,<sup>76</sup> while Henry Hammond has been described as ‘the father of English Biblical criticism’.<sup>77</sup>

#### Some English Hebraists

The large number of Hebraists over the century were interested collectively in absolutely everything in the Bible, investigating and pronouncing on all matters. The predominant interest seems to have been in the Hebrew language itself. Andrewes taught that Hebrew was the original tongue of mankind, universal until Babel, when all others were derived from it. “And that the Greek tongue was derived from the Hebrews, he proveth, because σοφοί and φιλόσοφοι ..... are words plainly derived from the Hebrews, from whence they do borrow their radix and original”. This belief, that Hebrew was the original language of mankind in its monoglot stage (i.e. before Babel) was current in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.<sup>78</sup> Andrewes extols the merits of Hebrew: “For whereas all other tongues, even the Greek, doe shew their beggarlinesse, and argue and shew their imperfection in this, that they borrow words and names from their senior tongues, and because they are fain to make infinite compounds to expresse their minds; but this Hebrew and holy tongue on the other side, borroweth not of any tongue, but lendeth to all; and also consisteth in such simplicity of words, and yet hath such a grace and majestie in every phrase....” He adduces support from the names of beasts bestowed by Adam (and approved by God), e.g. ‘horse’ – “which signifieth a swift Runner”; ‘sheep’ – “the man clothier”; ‘ass’ – “porter”; ‘eagle’ – “a name of the noblenesse of his nature”;

---

<sup>76</sup> McKane, W., *op.cit.*, p.8.

<sup>77</sup> Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship*, p.41.

<sup>78</sup> Lloyd Jones, *op.cit.*, p.236.

‘peacock’ – “a pround [sic] bird”; ‘serpent’ – “subtilnesse or deceivablenesse”; ‘locust’ – “going out in swarms”, etc., etc.<sup>79</sup>

One of the most noteworthy English Hebraists was Gregory Martin (1540?-1582), who taught in Catholic seminaries. He was behind the Douai version of 1610 (his New Testament having appeared in 1582). These were used by the AV Translators, despite their being translation from the Vulgate, not the Hebrew and Greek. This had been Fulke’s (1538-1589) main criticism of Martin’s work. (The two rivals both used the rabbis, and displayed considerable erudition and skill in Hebrew.)<sup>80</sup> Martin also produced a Hebrew dictionary.

The long-lived (1564-1659!) Thomas Morton regularly and strongly maintained the view (in which, as we saw in Ch.6, he was not alone) that the original Scriptures were perfect, and that translations, such as the Vulgate, do not have the same authority. The Scriptures are, of course, the “Perfect Canon of the Old Testament”, i.e. excluding the Apocryphal Books (included by the Council of Trent). Only the MT is an incorrupt text; as is often his way, Morton uses Roman Catholic writers against his Roman “learned adversaries” – Bellarmine, for instance, who says (a) Christ would not have used corrupt texts (so they couldn’t have been corrupted before him), and (b) all New Testament citations of the Old Testament are still to be found in “the Bible of the Iewes” (so have not been corrupted since).<sup>81</sup>

William Gouge (1578-1653) taught Hebrew at Cambridge and Eton; he apparently learned it from a Jew, though who and where this was is not known. John Selden (1584-1654), a lawyer, not a clergyman, had yet extensive knowledge

---

<sup>79</sup> Andrewes, *Apospasmata Sacra, or A Collection of posthumous and orphan Lectures* (London, 1657), p.209.

<sup>80</sup> A full treatment of the relations between Fulke and Martin is to be found in McKane, *op.cit.*, pp.76-110.

<sup>81</sup> Morton, Thos.: *A Catholike Appeale for Protestants* (London, 1610), p.411.



of Hebrew. He wrote much, including on ancient Near Eastern mythology, Hebrew inscriptions, and several works on Jewish law, on marriage laws, Sanhedrin and lawcourts, and other legal matters. He distinguished between ‘laws of Noah’ – of universal application, and laws only obligatory upon Jews.<sup>82</sup>

Brian Walton (1600-1661) was a most accomplished scholar. He was doubtful of the competence of not a few of those who in the Sixteenth Century or earlier had been regarded as “Hebricians”, and not overly impressed by the achievements of many of his contemporaries either: “.....it is the guise of many, as soon as they understand three words of Hebrew, presently they are so conceited of their own abilities that they betake themselves to the writing of *Grammars*....”<sup>83</sup> Walton’s own colossal achievement was the London Polyglot of 1654-57, by far the most elaborate and important of the several Polyglot Bibles. In its columns lie Hebrew, the Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX (inc.various readings), the Vulgate (plus fragments of the Old Latin), Syriac, Arabic, the Targums, the Ethiopic of the Psalms and Canticles, and the Persian Pentateuch, all with Latin translations. Interestingly, the Apocrypha is included. Walton’s *Prolegomena* stands in its own right as an early example of Old Testament Introduction.<sup>84</sup> Associated with Walton in this and other enterprises was John Lightfoot (1602-1675), another highly accomplished scholar. The two collaborated closely on the Talmuds<sup>85</sup>, and in 1655 Walton received Lightfoot’s Syriac Lexicon.<sup>86</sup> Lightfoot has been dubbed “the greatest of all the Christian Rabbinical scholars”.<sup>87</sup> He was

---

<sup>82</sup> Box, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.357f.

<sup>83</sup> Walton, B.: *The Considerator Considered* (London, 1659) [meeting objections to the Polyglot], p.31.

<sup>84</sup> Vide Box, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.359, for more details.

<sup>85</sup> Lightfoot, J. *Works* (ed.J.R.Pitman, London, 1845), Vol.XIII, p.362.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., p.356.

<sup>87</sup> By Box, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.356.

a Puritan parish priest, and Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge, producing many works on rabbinical topics, especially on Jewish traditions about Herod's Temple.

Another Puritan, Thomas Goodwin/Godwyn (1600-1680) anticipated some modern Biblical criticism in his comprehensive survey of the life, institutions, worship and society of ancient Israel, including the Essenes and Jewish parties of our Lord's day.<sup>88</sup> Edward Pococke (1604-91), Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was a brilliant orientalist, having spent six years in Aleppo and acquiring Persian, Ethiopic and Syriac. Laud paid for his acquisition of many valuable MSS, and in 1636 made him first Laudian Professor of Arabic. After three years in Constantinople, he returned to Oxford as Regius Professor of Hebrew, in 1648. A royalist, he was yet allowed to retain his chair. Pococke was much involved in the London Polyglot, and wrote commentaries on the Minor Prophets, with much reference to rabbinic exegesis. He translated Maimonides's commentary on the Mishnah.<sup>89</sup> John Spencer (1630-1695) was Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Dean of Ely. His *magnum opus* is *De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus et earum Rationibus*, in which he explores the pagan origins of Jewish laws and customs – very much ahead of his time.<sup>90</sup>

Richard Kidder (1633-1703) was an outstanding Biblical scholar, with many interesting insights. He is much concerned with apparent inconsistencies and anachronisms in the Pentateuch, but is helped by the rabbis: "Nothing is more common among the Hebrew Doctors that this Saying אין מוכדם, ומאוחר בתורה; i.e. *Non est prius et posterius in Lege*."<sup>91</sup> There are no variations in style in the Pentateuch, though such does exist between other Books: Isaiah's style is "lofty

---

<sup>88</sup> Goodwin, T.: *Moses and Aaron: Civil and Ecclesiastical Rites Used by the Ancient Hebrewes* (London, 1631); also *Works* (London, 1866).

<sup>89</sup> Box, in Singer and Bevan, op.cit., p.353f.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., p.358f.

<sup>91</sup> Kidder, *Works*, Vol.I. p.LXXII.

and sublime”, while Jeremiah’s is “more vulgar and popular”.<sup>92</sup> Richard Simon (1638-1712) worked in Paris. In 1698 he published his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*. As hinted above, this work proved highly controversial, since it denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (*pace* Kidder *et mult.al.*), maintaining that Ezra *et al.* collected and edited oral and documentary traditions to produce the canonical Books of the Old Testament.<sup>93</sup>

The Irish aristocrat and scientist Robert Boyle wrote several works on theological and Biblical subjects. He places great reliance on linguistic competence and investigation of texts. As an example of the care to be taken in translation he cites the “Conjunction Copulative *Vau*, or *Vaf*” [he explains that Jews pronounce Hebrew not only differently from Christians, but also “exceedingly from one another”] which has in addition to its primary meaning of ‘and’, “four or five and twenty other significations (as That, But, Or, So, When, Therefore, Yet, Then, Because, Now, As, Though, etc.)” The context must govern the translator’s choice.<sup>94</sup> Later, the hugely self-educated Benjamin Keach, Baptist pastor and prolific writer, (1640-1704) published a colossal catalogue, *Tropologia*, in three volumes, a cross between a concordance and a Bible encyclopaedia, massively comprehensive and packed with detailed information and reference to Hebrew and Greek.<sup>95</sup> The Non-Juror Hicke (1642-1715), at the end of the century, was noted for his facility in Syriac, as well as his continuance of Caroline virtues; according to his LACT Editor, he translates Heb.5.1 from Walton’s Polyglot about the status of a priest: “ ‘Every high priest among men stands for men in things that are of God’, i.e. every high priest on

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., p.LXXVIII f.

<sup>93</sup> Box, in Singer & Bevan, *op.cit.*, p.363 f.

<sup>94</sup> Boyle, R.: *Holy Scripture*, *op.cit.*, p.64 f.

<sup>95</sup> Keach, B.: *Tropologia* (London, 1681).



earth among men stands in the presence of God to perform Divine offices for them ....”<sup>96</sup>

The above readings indicate the breadth of Hebraists’ concerns. However, their undoubted erudition was frequently employed in a partial manner, to support theological or, more often, ecclesiological or political positions (as in our last paragraph). Some spurious exercises of Hebrew scholarship, tailored to meet specific ends, far outshine any of Andrewes’s in vivid imagination. Such was the etymology of ‘Britannia’ as advanced by John Gordon, a Scottish preacher who accompanied James south after his accession, and soon afterwards became Dean of Salisbury. Keen to provide theological support for the King’s desire to promote union between his two nations, which he was fond of referring to as “Britannia”, Gordon explains, in a sermon of 1604: “We must seek the etymology of Britannia, out of the Hebrew language, which is Brit-an-iah, and doth consist of three words. BRIT signifieth, *foedus*, a covenant; AN, *ibi*, there; IAH, *Dei*, of God. Which three being conjoined in one, do signify, that THERE IS A COVENANT OF GOD, that is, in this Island the covenant of God was to be established”.<sup>97</sup>

Not all exegesis was so far-fetched, of course, as we have seen, but idiosyncratic and tendentious readings are to be found at times in virtually all Seventeenth Century writers, whose main concern was to grind their particular axe or axes. Gordon is not the only delver into etymology – most Hebraists were deeply interested in it, and keen to explain it to readers whom they deemed as agog for such knowledge as were they. Thus Hammond: “Tophet, where these

---

<sup>96</sup> Hicke, *Works* (LACT), Vol.II, p.13.

<sup>97</sup> Quoted in Ferrell, *op.cit.*, p.42.

sacrifices were kept, is by grammarians deduced from תוף *tympanum*, - to drown the noise of the children's cry".<sup>98</sup>

Much explanation was not at all fanciful. Miles Smith (1568-1624), defending marginal readings in the Preface to the Authorised Version, states the problem of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα: "There may be many words in the Scriptures, which be never found there but once (having neither brother nor neighbour, as the Hebrews speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places".<sup>99</sup> One of the most careful Hebraists was Brian Walton. His *Polyglot* was not without its critics, foremost among whom was John Owen; this elicited a long and scholarly reply, *The Considerator Considered*, in 1659, which provides a useful commentary on the *Polyglot*, from the horse's mouth, as it were. Walton defends many specific readings which Owen has contested, frequently quoting or referring to the rabbis. There are chapters defending the integrity of the 'original text'; the validity of the *Polyglot*'s texts; "Keri and Ketif" as original items, not rabbinical additions, but varying readings from ancient documents<sup>100</sup>; *pace* the Papists, the originality of the pointing, in the sense that the Massoretes pointed "according to the true and common Reading" – and thus are of divine origin (otherwise, the text would be unreliable, which is unthinkable, if only because people could then suggest all manner of alternative readings – an insight into modern exegetical practice!)<sup>101</sup> Vocalisation was a vexed question throughout our period, mainly because Protestants and Rome were divided on it. Protestants, agreed with the rabbis that the 'Massoretic' pointing was part of the original text, thus admitting of no alternative readings. Rome, on the other hand, maintained that the pointing

<sup>98</sup> *Works* (LACT), Vol.II., p.493.

<sup>99</sup> Quoted in Opfell, op.cit., p.159.

<sup>100</sup> p.41.

<sup>101</sup> p.41ff, and p.A3.

of the MT had been done relatively late by the rabbis, and therefore was susceptible to ‘correction’ by an authoritative teaching agency (i.e. the Roman *Magisterium*).<sup>102</sup> As we have seen, Broughton was a sturdy defender of the Protestant view: “The Law vowelled and unvowelled was so at the first: the vowelled for certainty; the unvowelled for expedition in writing: sufficient for ordinary use, while the tongue was in daily use”.<sup>103</sup>

Henry Jessey and seven others<sup>104</sup> produced a hefty *English – Greek Lexicon* in 1661, with a grammatical commentary on Romans, and two items of interest here: (a) a list of New Testament names, with their Hebrew (and often Aramaic) originals; (b) “An Idea of the Hebraick Dialect contained in the New Testament” – a list of idioms and phrases in the New Testament which have Hebrew or Aramaic antecedents. Some sample entries: (i) “Matth.10.32, ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ for ἐμέ, whosoever shall confuse me, it is an Hebraisme; compare the Scripture mentioned with Nehemiah 9.2. here ἐν answereth to the preposition.”<sup>105</sup> (ii) “Matth.5.22, ἔνοχος εἰς γέενναν for τῇ γέεννῃ obnoxious to hell-fire, the preposition εἰς here, expresseth the article of the Dative case ἡ.”<sup>106</sup> (iii) “Heb.6.14, εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, an Hebraisme, by blessing I will blesse thee, that is, by way of emphasis.....”

Goodwin harks back to Andrewes and others when evaluating the anointings of Israelite kings: Saul and Jehu were anointed כֶּסֶף, a cruse, which

<sup>102</sup> Lloyd Jones, in DNB 2004, p.985.

<sup>103</sup> Broughton, *Works*, p.651.

<sup>104</sup> Jos.Caryll, Geo.Cockayne, Ralph Vening, Wm.Dell, Matt.Barker, Wm.Adderley and Matt.Mead.

<sup>105</sup> p.423.

<sup>106</sup> p.426.



showed the brevity of their reigns; David and Solomon בקרן , a horn, presaging long reigns.<sup>107</sup>

## ANCIENT VERSIONS

During the Sixteenth Century more and more knowledge was gained of the Ancient Versions of the Old Testament. Protestants found them lying between the Scriptures proper and the Fathers, so regarded them rightly as containing important lessons for the exegete. During the next century the investigation and assessment of the versions developed until not a few Hebraists were extremely well-read in them, and familiar with their languages, as, for instance, the mid-century correspondence among Lightfoot, Castell and Walton confirms, demonstrating, as it does, an almost uncanny competence in all Biblical and associated languages.<sup>108</sup>

### The Targums

Frequent reference to the Targums is made in sermons and written works, probably because it was assumed that such early and Jewish translators would have by far the best insights into the meaning of the original text. This is borne out by Morton's view, that the Targums have more authority than the Talmuds, though the latter are mines of useful guidance.<sup>109</sup> In some ways, such reliance upon the Targums is surprising, given their paraphrastic nature, even on the Torah, and their extreme concern, especially that of the Palestinian Targum, to

---

<sup>107</sup> Goodwin, *Moses and Aaron*, op.cit., p.13.

<sup>108</sup> Lightfoot, *Works*, letters at the end of Vol.XIII.

<sup>109</sup> Morton, *Catholike Appeale*, p.364.

avoid anthropomorphisms, leading to some awkward and contrived circumlocutions.<sup>110</sup>

### The Samaritan Pentateuch

Hebraists were aware of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which they took seriously as offering valid variants on the original text. Simon, for example, makes use of it. He views it as having the same *Vorlage* as the LXX. (Some others thought it a translation from the Greek.) Simon has doubts about the purity of the Samaritan version, though; he is not at all sure that any Hebrew text, whether MT or even that available to the LXX translators, was not corrupt. This of course opposes the traditional Protestant view – but Simon was a Catholic who felt that his view supports the need for the Church's *magisterium* in Biblical interpretation.<sup>111</sup> Lightfoot and Walton interested themselves in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and corresponded at length on it, elsewhere making many references to it.<sup>112</sup> Lightfoot eventually edited this version, and wrote a geography of Palestine to accompany it.<sup>113</sup> It is remarkable that these scholars were actually able to read the version, and that they knew that it was the original Hebrew script, as Walton explains: “The *present Samaritane Characters* were anciently used among the Jews”. The proof of this is that coins had been found in Jerusalem which predate the Exile and have inscriptions in ‘Samaritan’ characters. Even more remarkable is the fact that Walton's printer, Thomas Roycroft, had a Samaritan font!<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> *Vide* discussions in Oesterley, W.O. & Box, G.H.: A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism (SPCK, 1920).

<sup>111</sup> McKane, *op.cit.*, p.122.

<sup>112</sup> Lightfoot, *Works*, Vol.XIII., pp.348-364.

<sup>113</sup> Box, in Singer & Bevan, *op.cit.*, p.356f.

<sup>114</sup> Walton, Considerator Considered, p.279.

### The Septuagint (LXX)

All Hebraists were familiar with the LXX, and made frequent reference to it, even in sermons. They knew that it was the Old Testament of the first Gentile and Diaspora Jewish Christians, and that very soon it became the only Christian version.<sup>115</sup> Simon has great faith in the LXX, since it both translated and interpreted a consonantal text, according to the ancient view. (And since the Old Latin is a faithful translation of the LXX, it in its turn is more accurate than the later MT: Q.E.D.!)<sup>116</sup> Much earlier, Mede voices common misgivings about the LXX; he suggests, for example, that the LXX increased the antiquity of the first generations in Genesis so that these would compare favourably with “some *Stories of the Egyptians*” – not an altogether implausible suggestion, after all.<sup>117</sup> Later, Walton denies that the LXX is free from error, openly rejecting the traditional account of its creation as “fabulously reported”.<sup>118</sup> Suspicion of its accuracy is reflected in Miles Smith’s Preface to the Authorised Version; he states that it was too hastily done, and too confidently supplies controversial translations.<sup>119</sup> However, at the end of the century, much confidence is still reposed in the LXX. Hicke refers to “....the Septuagint translation, which all learned men know is followed by the writers of the New Testament, even when they recite the words and speeches of our blessed Saviour...” He gives a great list of examples of Greek terms with their Hebrew equivalents, e.g. עֲשֶׂה = ποιεῖν = Vulgate *facere*, meaning ‘to offer sacrifice’.<sup>120</sup>

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., p.61, where Walton points out that it was used more frequently than the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>116</sup> McKane, *op.cit.*, p.126.

<sup>117</sup> Mede, *Works*, p.895.

<sup>118</sup> Walton, *op.cit.*, p.61.

<sup>119</sup> Opfell, *op.cit.*, p.159.

<sup>120</sup> Hicke, *Works (LACT)*, Vol.II., p.59.



### Other versions

We have seen how the London Polyglot and several other works provide evidence of knowledge of the Ethiopic, Persian, Arabic, Coptic and Syriac versions. Given the restrictions on travel and communications, and the comparative lack of any literary intercourse between Europe and the Near East, the competence of some men in the languages of the latter region is striking. Arabic, in particular, seems to have been known to some extent by more than a handful of scholars. Beveridge quotes it. Knowledge extends beyond the purely linguistic: Mede comments on the Muslim habit of removing shoes and covering the head for worship (and with some knowledge of the Arabic terms used).<sup>121</sup> Even Boyle, not a professional in these matters, mentions “Zabians” and gives צבײם and صبين, which presumably he can at least read.

### AVAILABLE SOURCES AND REFERENCE WORKS

During the Sixteenth Century were published many primers, known as “Alphabets” or “Tables”, but many more grammars and many translations of the Old Testament or parts thereof into Latin. These were usually as literal as possible, within the constraints imposed by the grammatical differences between the languages, so that they provided excellent learning aids.<sup>122</sup> The first grammar produced in England was in 1550, by Ralph Baynes. Many others came from abroad: one estimate is that by 1600 no fewer than 146 grammars were available in England, nearly all from the Continent and in Latin.<sup>123</sup> There were, as already noted, both the *Complutensian Polyglot* of 1522, and the *Royal Polyglot* of 1572

---

<sup>121</sup> Mede, *Works*, p.348.

<sup>122</sup> Vide Lloyd Jones, op.cit., pp.248-263.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., p.258.

(virtually a re-editing of the Complutensian). Bomberg's *Biblia Hebraica* appeared in Venice in 1517, closely followed by several others, plus many copies of individual Books, especially the Psalter, Proverbs and Genesis. Several dictionaries were available before 1600, including Aramaic ones. There was only one English one, by Simon Sturtevant of Cambridge (1602) – or, rather, its Introduction, there being no record of the dictionary itself!

Such evidence as exists indicates far less concern with post-Biblical Hebrew literature; much was available, however. The Talmud, many works of a dozen of the most eminent rabbis, plus some less known ones, Kabbalistic works, and legal codes. Many were available in Latin versions. Thrice between 1517 and 1548 Bomberg produced his Rabbinic Bible, i.e. with annotations by leading Jewish scholars.<sup>124</sup>

From lists of books left in the wills of Sixteenth Century scholars and ecclesiastics, it is apparent that many dozens of works in and on Hebrew and Aramaic were in circulation well before 1600: grammars, dictionaries, Hebrew Bibles, Targums, independent Latin translations of the Old Testament, and rabbinical commentaries.<sup>125</sup> At Cambridge, 65 inventories of books, made between 1539 and 1600, contain one or more Hebrew books; at Oxford, 21 inventories, made between 1540 and 1603, contain one or more. (These do not include the many belonging privately to noted Hebraists, N.B.)<sup>126</sup> Some of these collections included far more than just one volume, of course. Judging from a 1605 catalogue of the Bodleian, books available at the time of the AV translation included several Hebrew texts of the Old Testament, the Complutensian and Antwerp Polyglots, Hebrew grammars of Kimchi, Reuchlin and some others,

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., p.261f.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., Appendix III, pp.278-290.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., p.249.

Münster's Aramaic grammar, Tremellius's Aramaic and Syriac grammars, Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan (in the original and Latin translations), some complete Talmud sets and rabbinical commentaries, especially Kimchi and Rashi. Dictionaries were usually appended to grammars, though some separate ones existed, e.g. Kimchi's *Liber Radicum*.<sup>127</sup>

By the middle of the Seventeenth Century, there was a virtual plethora of materials useful to the student and scholar, as well as that fabled animal, "the intelligent layman" (of whom a surprising number, well-versed in the Scriptures and their languages, was about in those days). Perhaps pre-eminent in England was the *London Polyglot* of Brian Walton and others, already mentioned. A very notable addition appeared in 1669: Edmund Castell's *Lexicon Polyglotton*, another watershed achievement in Semitic scholarship; it included Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Samaritan, Ethiopic, Arabic and Persian, the fruits of eighteen years of work, at the reputed rate of sixteen or more hours daily!

Just before the Restoration, there appeared a curious and comprehensive list of scholarly books "vendible in England". Some 1,860 Divinity titles were then available, according to this catalogue, some 20% of them in the "Hebrew Books" section alone, and including, in the language sub-section alone, twenty-five on Hebrew, six on Aramaic and Syriac, four on Arabic, two on Ethiopic, one each on Samaritan, Persian and Coptic. There are also a Talmud, and some rabbis.<sup>128</sup>

All this would not have been possible without the printers' skills and equipment; a relatively young profession, it developed fast during the Sixteenth

---

<sup>127</sup> Daiches, op.cit., p.165.

<sup>128</sup> London, William: *A Catalogue of The most vendible Books in England, Orderly and Alphabetically Digested; Under the Heads of [26 subject areas] etc., With Hebrew, Greek and Latin Books for Schools and Scholars. The like Work never yet performed by any.* (London, 1658).



and Seventeenth Centuries. Hebrew type originated in Italy, among Jews, before Bomberg used it.<sup>129</sup> For a long time, English Hebraists depended on Continental scholars and presses for their books. "At a time when Hebrew printing was virtually non-existent in England, the contribution of the great publishing houses of Venice, Basle, Paris, Ismy, Wittenberg and Antwerp was all-important. The activity of Europe's learned printers was vital for the development of Hebraic studies in this country."<sup>130</sup> Even so, it was claimed (by Fulke) that in 1583 "there were at least 100 Cantabrigian undergraduates with a knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic."<sup>131</sup> There is evidence of lack of Hebrew type in England as late as 1630 (in connection with Wakefield's works).<sup>132</sup> Within a decade or two things had changed for the better, and Lightfoot's correspondence with Walton indicates the existence of presses not only for Hebrew and Aramaic, but also for Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Persian, Coptic and, possibly, Armenian.<sup>133</sup>

## USE OF JEWISH SCHOLARSHIP

"Since the days of Reuchlin and his editions of the Talmud, the study of Hebrew had snowballed from a simple interest in a biblical language necessary for textual reconstruction into a passion for the wisdom and traditions of the first race."<sup>134</sup> We have already seen how both Carolines and Puritans went to the rabbis for guidance, and those we have looked at closely are not alone in early modern England.<sup>135</sup> In this chapter we add a few more cogent examples.

---

<sup>129</sup> Loewe, *op.cit.*, p.16.

<sup>130</sup> F. Lord Jones, *op.cit.*, p.262.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, p.263.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, p.183.

<sup>133</sup> Lightfoot, *op.cit.*, p.370f.

<sup>134</sup> Firth, *op.cit.*, p.152.

<sup>135</sup> For a history of Hebrew scholarship in the Christian West, see Daiches, *op.cit.*, pp88-138 of Ch.II.

Puritans included Lively, who often refers to the Targums and Talmud, as well as late mediaeval Jewish commentators. He is fond of Kimchi's *Liber Radicum*, Elias Levita's *Tisbi*, and Isaac Abravamel's commentaries (all increasingly popular among Christian scholars; Lively describes him as "Doctissimus Hebraeus", Broughton as "The King of Grammarians") and is the first Christian to use the histories of Abraham ibn Daud's *Book of Tradition* and the Second Century *Seder Olam*. "The Church of God," he says, "Is much beholding to the Hebrew rabbis, being great helps unto us for understanding holy Scripture in many places," then adds, interestingly, "As well of the New Testament as the Old."<sup>136</sup> Kimchi's place is supreme among English scholars, though Rashi was more popular among Jews. The former was the only rabbi continuously used by the AV translators,<sup>137</sup> though they made occasional reference to Rashi, Ben Ezra, and other rabbis.<sup>138</sup> They and others probably got these from the works of the Sixteenth Century French scholar, Jean Mercier.<sup>139</sup> Broughton, too, had much intercourse with Jews during his two decades' residence in Germany; he is said to have discussed and debated with them in Hebrew. Thus he was thoroughly conversant with the Targums, Talmuds and rabbinics, all of which he insisted upon as essential tools for the Christian scholar, and employed extensively in his own commentaries.<sup>140</sup>

Far from Puritan, Mede is constantly dipping into Jewish works, and has researched Jewish liturgical practice and other customs. For example, he uses Targ.Jonathan to explain Lev.19.30: " לבית מקדשי תהון אזלין ברחלא Ye shall go

<sup>136</sup> Lively, E.: *A True Chronologie*, quoted in Lloyd Jones, op.cit., p.35.

<sup>137</sup> Daiches, D., op.cit., p.91f

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., p.159.

<sup>139</sup> *Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol.III, p.165.

<sup>140</sup> Lloyd Jones, in *DNB 2004*, Vol.7, p.984.

to the House of my Sanctuary with reverence".<sup>141</sup> On this verse, he also quotes R.Solomon about removal of shoes before worship: "Even here in these Western and colder parts of the world" (!)<sup>142</sup> He refers to the Hebrew, the Aramaic (Targum) and the "opinion of the Hebrew Doctors" in his discussions of the destruction of Rome as symbolised by Babylon in the Old Testament,<sup>143</sup> and in the Apocalypse.<sup>144</sup> Every so often Mede drops in a reference such as "See Buxtorf. Synagog.Judaic.Cap.5",<sup>145</sup> or, "Maimonides Beth Habbechirah chap.7"<sup>146</sup> showing that he has read the leading recent and contemporary exponents of Jewish literature and thought, as well as the classic texts. As we have seen, there was much concern about the details of the chronology of the Bible, both historical and predicted, and Mede was no exception. Dealing with the world's putative life of 7,000 years, he explains that in Old Testament prophecy a "day" was the equivalent of 1,000 years, as confirmed by St.Peter (II Pet.3.8), and, "Testimonies recorded in the *Gemara* or *Glosse* of their *Talmud*, *Cod. Sanhedrin* cap. Kol Jisrael. For these, concerning that of *Esay* chap.2 (Exaltabitur Dominus solus die illo) thus speaks the Talmudical Gloss."<sup>147</sup> His knowledge of Jewish practice can be illustrated by, "Notwithstanding they have no other Memorial of his there than an imitative one only, to wit, a Chest with a Volume or Roll of the Law therein, instead of the Ark with the two Tables". He quotes "Seder Tephilloth, or Form of prayer used by the Jews of Portugal," which includes, "*O Lord our God, the Angels that supernal company, gathered together with thy people Israel here below, do crown thee with praises, and altogether do thrice redouble and cry that*

---

<sup>141</sup> *Mede, Works*, p.349.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, p.348.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, p.902f.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.907-916.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, p.396.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, p.348.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, p.893.



*spoken of by the prophet, Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory. They allude to Esay's Vision of the Glory of God....*" And goes on to aver that angelic presence continues into the Christian Church: "...or have the Angels, since the nature of man, Jesus Christ our Lord, became their Head and King, gotten an exemption from this service?"<sup>148</sup> This after a lengthy invocation of authorities: Josephus, who describes King Agrippa "dehorting [sic] them [the Jews] from rebelling against the Romans in AD70: Μαρτύρομαι ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ Ἅγια καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ *I call to witness your sacred Temple and the holy Angels of God; namely, which encamp there*". He also uses the LXX and Vulgate versions of Ps.138.1,2: "Ἐναντίον ἀγγέλων, *In conspectu Angelorum*" to stress that angels were present in the Temple. Also Eccles.5.1,4,5,6: "neither say thou BEFORE THE ANGEL, it was an error".<sup>149</sup>

More of a Caroline, Morton, too, whose Lib.III of *A Catholike Appeale* deals with the Old Testament and rabbinics,<sup>150</sup> shows how far Christian scholars in England were familiar with classic Judaism by the turn of the Seventeenth Century, when observing in 1610: "...whether we speak of the first edition of that Iewish divinities, which was composed especially out of the Rabbins before Christ, and ended in the yeare 189. called by them *Mishnah*; or of the second enlargement thereof made in the yeare 469. called *Thalmud Hierosolymitanum*; or the last alteration and enlargement of it, begun by diverse Rabbins, called *Babylonicum*....." The knowledge comes in useful in polemic: arguing against Roman claims that prayers for the dead are supported by rabbis, he points out that

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., p.345.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., p.344f.

<sup>150</sup> pp.358-415

at least four Popes had condemned and burnt all copies of the Talmud.<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, the claims are partly based on II Macc.2.43, which is not a canonical Book, says Morton, and therefore the claims may safely be dismissed.<sup>152</sup> Herein lies a clue as to why most Protestant scholars were chary of relying on rabbinic writings beyond a certain point: Rome was happy to use them to support practices and doctrines offensive to Protestant sensibilities, such as transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, private confession and Papal supremacy.

The Carolines were very interested in Jewish liturgical practice, from which they believed they could gain valuable insights. Heylyn uses Ainsworth's researches into the "Rabbins" to provide details of the Jewish Passover ritual,<sup>153</sup> "All of very great antiquity.....from the time of Moses, according to the Samaritan Chronicle".<sup>154</sup> Like most others of his day, he reveres Maimonides as "the learnedest and most exact of all the Rabbins".<sup>155</sup> Bull indicates that the Carolines were particularly aware of the Jewish belief that both written and oral law were given by God through Moses, which may have bolstered their confidence in dealing with the Puritans' principle of *Sola Scriptura*.<sup>156</sup> Bull makes reference to Maimonides on many subjects, and frequently cites Philo, Josephus, and R.Abraham Zachuth.

The Carolines almost certainly felt a great affinity with the rabbis, since their approach to the Old Testament was essentially the same: "...unceasing study of the Torah, searching for its interpretation, particularly when it seemed to have lost its relevance in ever-changing situations. That did not mean altering or

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., p.363.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., p.360f.

<sup>153</sup> Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, p.125.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., p.127.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., p.163.

<sup>156</sup> Vide Bull, *Works* (LACT), Vol.I, p.125.

abandoning Torah; it meant believing that Torah was the revelation of God for all time, and that the solution to any problem lay within the text of Torah itself. Obviously situations arose which could not possibly have been foreseen in the time of Moses, and the problem was to apply the past revelation in the present".<sup>157</sup> This approach is reflected in Andrewes's cry, "It must mean something!" as he delves ever deeper into the difficult or abstruse text, a cry repeated in words to the same effect by others of his school. Another reason for empathy between the Carolines and the rabbis is that in support of interpretations, or when in consideration of 'matters indifferent', there was the same reliance on the religious tradition: "The interpretations were never arbitrary. They took into account the work of previous scholars (hence the importance of tradition in Pharisaic Judaism...."<sup>158</sup> Thus the Carolines' frequent appeal to the early Fathers, and also to later scholars such as the Schoolmen and (selected) Reformation divines, and their penchant for constant citation of these 'authorities' is exactly the rabbinical method; one of the ways of establishing *Halakah* was "....because it could be traced back to a recognised authority in the past, which is why so much rabbinic literature consists of quotations from earlier rabbis".<sup>159</sup> Sometimes the Carolines' interest repaid them unexpectedly, as when Rashi seems to support Andrewes's celebrated interpretation of Num.10<sup>160</sup>, by commenting that " 'for thyself' suggests that they should blow them in your presence as before a king, as it is said (with reference to Moses, Dt.33.5), 'You make them and you

---

<sup>157</sup> Bowker, J.: The Targums and Rabbinic Literature (CUP, 1969), p.40.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., p.41.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., p.44.

<sup>160</sup> *Vide* Ch.2, p.72, *supra*.



use them, and no-one else'. From that which is thine own and not from common funds".<sup>161</sup>

The 'Rationalists' were not to be left out; Boyle notes that even the New Testament can be obscure at times, let alone the Old – but help is at hand, for he acknowledges the debt to scholars of "Rabinical Learning" whose efforts have "already cleared up divers Texts which before were Dark, because they related to particular Sects, Customs, Sayings or Opinions among the then Jews, whose knowledge the Writers o the New Testament do not Teach but Suppose". He presumes that the process will continue till all will be completely understood.

The mid-century lexicographers and those involved in the Polyglot were indebted to rabbis, if only indirectly in some cases. Walton consulted Buxtorf on the Talmud, for instance.<sup>162</sup> Likewise, his assistant, Edmund Castell, cites frequently from the Targums, the Talmuds and mediaeval Jewish writers in his *Lexicon Heptaglotton*.<sup>163</sup>

Despite all this sympathetic expertise, respectful as it was to rabbinic learning, it must be repeated that Christian scholars could not follow the rabbis beyond a certain point without ceasing to be Christian. Though it sounds a little unkind, Lloyd Jones's dictum on Broughton is nevertheless both true and understandable: "He modified his scholarship to conform to his prejudices", when Broughton himself writes that even the great Isaac Abravamel "...is only to be followed when he is on our side".<sup>164</sup> Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Hebraists respected Jewish interpretation as useful guidance on the *sensus literalis* of the text of the Old Testament, but – and it is a big 'but' – they viewed

---

<sup>161</sup> Rosenbaum & Silberman: Targum Onkelos Haphtaroth, Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary, (Hebrew Publishing Company, New York), p.46.

<sup>162</sup> Walton, op.cit., p.62.

<sup>163</sup> Box, G.R., in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.359.

<sup>164</sup> Lloyd Jones, in DNB 2004, Vol.7., p.984.

the Bible as being about Christ, and therefore had to regard the Old Testament typologically, so had to part company with the rabbis sooner or later, finding the *sensus literalis propheticus* of the New Testament writers. “As exegetes and translators, they may have been passionately concerned with the quest for the *hebraica veritas*, but as theologians they could not allow this to over-ride their Christocentric theory of Scripture.”<sup>165</sup>

### THE ENGLISH BIBLE OF 1611

In some ways, the results of English Hebrew scholarship in the early part of our period can best be seen in the work of the Translators who between 1604 and 1611, produced what is arguably the most influential literary text in our language. Several dozen acknowledged experts were involved in its production; some, like Andrewes, were in the first rank of contemporary Hebraists,<sup>166</sup> and this had its effect directly upon the version of the Old Testament, and indirectly upon the fabric of the English language. The Old Testament translation contained many more revisions than the New, showing that Hebrew scholarship had advanced during the past half-century far more than had Greek.<sup>167</sup> The Authorised Version of the Old Testament has 6,637 philological notes. Nearly two thirds offer literal renderings of Hebrew idioms, the rest alternative readings from different MSS. (Deliberately unlike Geneva, there are no historical or theological notes.)<sup>168</sup> The Targums, Talmuds and rabbis were all used by scholars by the time of this translation – sometimes, admittedly, at second hand – and most of the ‘Hebraists’ involved seem to have been conversant with them.

<sup>165</sup> Lloyd Jones, The Discovery of Hebrew...., p.270.

<sup>166</sup> Daiches, *op.cit.*, p.160.

<sup>167</sup> Loades, D.M., in Loades, D.M. (ed.): Word and Worship (Davenant Press, 2005), p.54.

<sup>168</sup> Price, D. & Ryrie, C.C.: Let it Go among our People (Lutterworth Press, 2004), p.128.

And it is assumed that some scholars not involved directly were consulted from time to time. The egregious example is, of course, Broughton, as already mentioned, despite his having written *An epistle to the learned nobility of England* pleading for a new translation, and publishing his own versions of Daniel, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations and Job between 1597 and 1610.<sup>169</sup> Others were less well-known. Such a man, for instance, was Andrew Willet (1562-1621); he was a moderate Puritan, as were some of the Translators, but was perhaps excluded from the companies because of his criticism of James's Spanish marriage proposals. Willet produced a *Hexapla* of LXX/ Targum/ Vulgate/ Tremellius's Latin/ the 'Great Bible'/ Geneva, with notes on selected passages compared with the Hebrew, and the translations of Arius Montanus and Pagninus.

Bancroft's guidelines to the Translators echo those of Parker for the 'Bishops' Bible' of 1568, which had shown even forty years before that literalism was not to be adhered to slavishly: "To note such chapters and places as containeth matters of genealogies, or other such places not edifying, with some strike or note that the reader may eschew them in his public reading." And, "That all such words as soundeth in the Old Translation to any offence of lightness or obscenity be expressed with more convenient term and phrases".<sup>170</sup> Yet the striking difference between the Authorised Version and translations of other literary works is precisely that in all other cases the foreign language is put into English terms, phrases, idioms and syntax, whereas the AV Translators, in seeking to remain as faithful as possible to what they believed to be the divinely-inspired original, deliberately introduced into English many of the Hebrew features they encountered. Because of the unique importance of the Biblical

---

<sup>169</sup> Loades, op.cit., p.53.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid., p.97.



literature, a large number of these features soon became accepted as ‘normal’ English, and have remained so, being frequently and happily used and understood by English speakers, the majority of whom have no idea whence they came. Tyndale and Geneva had done something similar, but it was left to the Authorised Version to develop the process and enshrine its products in the language. This was because, “....the translators tuned their English instruments, as much as possible, to the scale of the original Greek, and, especially, Hebrew syntax”. The best example is the repetitive ‘and’ connecting short sentences or even just simple finite verbs. Also, “it came to pass” for *וַיְהִי*, previously ignored by translators, and soon established as a clear mark of ‘biblical’ English.<sup>171</sup>

The fullest account of such Hebraic influence is given by Rosenau.<sup>172</sup> He identifies more than 3,000 instances of Hebraisms. He gives sixty-nine examples of “idioms and proverbs”, such as the following:

1. השמר אחי אנכי
2. אשון עינו
3. בעור שני
4. נחלים אתה חתה על-ראשו
5. אין כל-תרש תחת השמש.<sup>173</sup>

Rosenau supplies a *caveat*, however, to over-disposition to finding Hebraisms where none exist. Some English archaisms can be mistaken for Hebrew borrowings! Of such are, e.g. “Well stricken in age” [Hebrew: *באים בימים* – ‘advancing in days’] and “Threescore years and ten” [Hebrew: *שבעים* – ‘seventy’]. (In the latter case, maybe the translators were influenced by the French *soixante-dix* – who knows?)

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., p.132.

<sup>172</sup> Rosenau, W.: Hebraisms in the Authorised Version of the Bible (Philadelphia: R. West, 1978).

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., pp.47-57.

The anxiety of the translators to be as faithful to the original as possible, which rendered them prepared even to inject new (Hebraic) idioms into the English Language, extended to syntax as well. Among many examples, Rosenau offers the following:

1. "Nathan the prophet", for נתן הנביא (rather than the English 'the prophet Nathan');
2. combinations of verb and cognate noun, for emphasis, e.g. "dream a dream" (חלם חלום);
3. "And see the land what it is", from וראיתם את־הארץ מה־היא ;
4. Construct and Absolute of the same noun, to indicate the superlative, as in "holy of holies" (קדש הקדשים), rather than English 'holiest place';
5. inclusion of הנה as demonstrative particle, as in "as when a hungry man dreameth and behold [הנה] he eateth", rather than 'as when a hungry man dreams he is eating'.

"The new version tried to create the illusion that the text had always sounded precisely this way .... The KJV did not give the impression of having just been written [Luther's description of an ideal version], even in the seventeenth century. It presented itself as the ancient word of God in formulations hallowed by the patina of age."<sup>174</sup> This is surely due in part to the use of Greek and – particularly – Hebrew expressions, syntax and vocabulary,

---

<sup>174</sup> Price & Ryrie, op.cit., p.128.

including untranslated items such as 'hosanna', so that the AV "sounds ancient, ritualistic, even formulaic".<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., p.132.



## CHAPTER 8

## GENERAL COMMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

## PROGRESSION AND CHANGE THROUGH THE CENTURY

## Andrewes

“Indeed, all the reign of King James was better for one to live under, than to write of; consisting of a champaign of constant tranquillity, without any tumours of trouble to entertain posterity with.”<sup>1</sup> Thus Fuller, with nostalgic hindsight and economy of truth. Nevertheless, for some, particularly the early leaders of what we have called the ‘Caroline’ movement, the times were favourable. Of no-one is this more true than of Lancelot Andrewes, and the favour of the times – meaning, in his case the favour of the King – allowed this able divine to secure his undoubted place as the pre-eminent founding father of his school. Andrewes is the giant who dominates the Anglicanism of the Seventeenth Century, by setting the pattern for the Carolines, throwing the Bible back at the Puritans and tradition back at Rome, appealing all the while to ‘antiquity’, i.e. the Fathers, to establish a Catholic and Reformed orthodoxy in the English Church. So Bayly could describe him as “the semi-god of the neu faction”.<sup>2</sup>

Andrewes’s posthumous influence was even greater than in his lifetime, in that few of his sermons were published before his death, but the ‘96’ that were printed a couple of years afterwards proved the theological bedrock for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuller, *Church History*, Vol.III, p.235. One recalls the Chinese prayer, ‘not to live in interesting times’!

<sup>2</sup> Bayly i.1-2, quoted in Russell, C.: *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Clarendon Press, 1990), p.116.

'Laudians' and Charles I to build on and attempt to put into practice. Other writings, especially the *Preces Privatae*, came into the public domain much later, extending Andrewes's direct influence over later Carolines. "All the Laudians, including Laud himself, though an Oxford man, looked to Andrewes as their mentor, 'our Gamaliel', as they would call him."<sup>3</sup> Not that many resembled him superficially in their manners and methods, perhaps because his spirit in them was "overlaid by the deposit of another generation and hardened by more exacting times".<sup>4</sup> In some ways, then, the traditional use of the term 'Laudians' is misleading, in so far as they were all overt disciples of Andrewes, whose influence outlasted them, extending into the next century, to the last of the Carolines, the Non-Jurors. One simply cannot escape Lancelot Andrewes in any serious study of Seventeenth Century religion in England.

#### The Laudian heyday

Two views prevail in recent historiography. One (Collinson, Ferrell, Tyacke, Russell, Ashton *et al*) see Laud as an 'innovator' who destabilised the Church of England, of which he was not representative; its prevailing consensus was Calvinist, but 'moderate Puritan', conformist and accepting of episcopacy. 'Arminianism' was the *avant-garde* interruption which caused the mid-century crisis, as it fomented an extreme Puritan backlash, resulting in the Civil Wars and the Interregnum.

The other view (White, Sharpe, Hill, Bernard, Davies *et al* – including the Nineteenth Century Tractarians and their heirs) is that Laud & co. were conservatives; that there was in fact nothing new about 'Laudianism', it being just

---

<sup>3</sup> Trevor-Roper, H.: From Counter Reformation to Glorious Revolution (Secker & Warburg, 1992), p.153.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p.153.

a moderate Catholic corrective to the Protestant Reformation in England. Andrewes, Laud and their ilk were representative of a large body of clergy and laity who valued (after Hooker) the *Via Media*, desiring to redress the balances between Word and Sacrament, teaching and prayer, personal piety and public worship, and, in Laud's own case, trying to re-establish the Anglican orthodoxy allowed to slip under the lax rule of his predecessor, the Calvinist Archbishop Abbot.<sup>5</sup>

Both these views seem to ignore other factors, social and economic; what we have, in fact, is the development in the early years of the century of two 'packages' of values: one concerned with the 'visible' Church, royalist, institutional, 'Arminian', 'Catholic' and mainly rural, attracting the naturally conservative loyalties of both the upper classes and the masses; the other promulgating the 'invisible' Church, near- or outright republican, Calvinist, Protestant, congregational and urban, commanding the support of the burgeoning commercial and professional middle class. Even this is a massive generalisation, whose manifold exceptions diminish its usefulness, especially when it is remembered that both parties were small minorities of the population, most of whom, as always, just wanted a quiet life and modest prosperity – which is why, for more than a decade before the Wars, they were content to live under the personal rule of the King, rather than of career politicians.<sup>6</sup>

Much of the hardening of Anglican attitudes during the middle years of the century was reaction to Puritan attack. "Because episcopacy was violently assailed, the virtues of episcopacy were violently asserted. Because the tendencies of Presbyterianism and, much more, of independency, gave greater

---

<sup>5</sup> Both views are well summarised in Fincham, *The Early Stuart Church* (Macmillan, 1993). Also in Oldridge, *op.cit.*, pp.1-3.

<sup>6</sup> It may be claimed wryly that in May 2006 many Englishmen would agree!



weight to lay and 'popular' elements, clerical privilege was harshly defended. Because Puritanism tended to be in opposition to royal and ecclesiastical authority, the indissoluble union of Church and King was made a palladium. Because 'decency' and 'order' were denounced as 'rags of popery' there was irritating persistence in exactness of ceremonial or in the precise arrangement of church furniture."<sup>7</sup> Until shortly after the Restoration, politics and religion were inextricably mixed, influencing each other in public affairs, private practice and individual minds. Thus Davies can speak of "political religion and religious politics" as concepts relevant to the study of the Caroline Church.<sup>8</sup> Though Sommerville's *dictum* is too sweeping, there is much truth in it, as the early decades of the century wore on: "The church acted not only as a spiritual institution, but also as the king's ministry of propaganda".<sup>9</sup>

We have seen how much of that propaganda was solidly based on the Old Testament, or, at least, hugely supported by it, in the minds of its proponents. It seems odd that the same is not true of theological debate, which in fact fades somewhat into the background of the main controversies. 'Arminianism', for example, soon lost its theological meaning, as the 1629 Commons Resolutions show; "...it was used as a gibe at rigid churchmanship, and variations over predestination had little to do with the matter".<sup>10</sup> Given their premises, when it came to theology the Carolines argued rationally and rigorously. What Laslett says of Filmer can be applied to them all: "It so happened that his view of monarchy involved a large amount of history and biblical criticism, both of which must seem to us as unscientific and improbable as does the natural history of the

---

<sup>7</sup> Williams, A., *op.cit.*, p.34.

<sup>8</sup> Davies, G.: *op.cit.*, p.314.

<sup>9</sup> Sommerville, J.P.: Politics and Ideology in England 1603-1640 (Longman, 1986), p.10.

<sup>10</sup> New, *op.cit.*, p.15.

same generation. This is no reason for dismissing Filmer as fantastic whilst we take more seriously the works of men who did not happen to appeal to so much historical or biblical evidence".<sup>11</sup> [He is referring to such as Hobbes, Isaac Walton, Gilbert White, Locke, Bacon and Shakespeare.]

### Revolution and Interregnum

From the point of view of this study, nothing much changes – though much was done - in this otherwise critical period, though we cannot go so far as Williams and say that “The explosion of the Civil War, with all its lessons for the future, was in some respects not more than an interruption, a significant episode, in the history of the Anglicanism of the seventeenth century”.<sup>12</sup> In fact, James I’s dictum, “No Bishop, no King” – and *vice-versa*, of course, as supported by Andrewes – seemed to have come true when the last Episcopal consecration for fifteen years took place in 1644, the Archbishop of Canterbury was executed the next year, and the King four years later. Revenues were seized, Episcopalian priests ejected, cathedrals lost, the BCP proscribed and observation of its Calendar forbidden, so that Sancroft lamented that “The Church here will never rise again”.<sup>13</sup> “It was a devastating assault.”<sup>14</sup> As the Interregnum wore on there was a growing danger of a lapse in the apostolic succession; by 1659 nearly a third of the English sees were vacant. Considerable efforts were made by Charles’s exiled court to get bishops to consecrate, but the latter were reluctant to worsen their and others’ situation by such action (since the Protectorate Government would have

---

<sup>11</sup> Laslett, *op.cit.*, p.21.

<sup>12</sup> Williams, *op.cit.*, p.31.

<sup>13</sup> Spurr, *Restoration C of E*, *op.cit.*, p.3.

<sup>14</sup> Hylson-Smith, *op.cit.*, p.224.

deemed it illegal.<sup>15</sup> Henson's fiercely Protestant view of the century tries to explain this: "In studying the history of the seventeenth century we have to remember that the mediaeval tradition still exercised a potent authority over men's minds .... the notion of orthodoxy as morally right and politically safe .... there was in this respect no substantial difference between Papist and Protestant, Arminian and Calvinist".<sup>16</sup> Right until 1662 the idea of a national Church was both powerful and totally accepted by Englishmen of every religious hue, saving a handful of extreme Independents. The Carolines saw this as utterly in accord with the civil and religious polity of ancient Israel, though others were not so sure. Piety and the Bible remained universal features of public and private life: "...the speeches of Oliver Cromwell read to modern eyes much more like sermons than political addresses".<sup>17</sup> The outcome might have been more propitious for an inclusive national Church had more moderate men on both sides been involved: "...it is tempting to imagine how things might have fallen out if the protagonists at Worcester House and the Savoy had been Hammond and John Angier rather than Morley and Baxter, who were still, twenty years later, brooding on each other's opinions".<sup>18</sup> After all, Presbyterians and Anglicans found common cause against the recently prevalent Independency, Presbyterians were often royalist, Ussher produced a scheme for possible Church polity which could include both Presbyterians and Anglicans (possibly even some Independents), and an 'Association' movement was supported by both Puritans and Anglicans. However, the embittered Laudians were not interested: they could not forget that their misfortunes stemmed from Presbyterian opposition in the Parliament of the

---

<sup>15</sup> *Vide* Bosher, op.cit., Ch.IV, for a detailed account of this situation.

<sup>16</sup> Henson, H.H., op.cit., p.1.

<sup>17</sup> Greenslade, S., in Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol.III, p.190.

<sup>18</sup> Higham, Catholic and Reformed, op.cit., p.308.



1640s, regarded as the *fons et origo* of what to them was the deplorable state of the National Church under the Protectorate (which they did not yet know would be merely a decade's 'interregnum'). "The mild Sancroft could write, 'I look upon that cursed Puritan faction as the ruin of the most glorious Church on earth'".<sup>19</sup> Just as anti-Catholic prejudice had been fuelled enormously and lastingly by Gunpowder Plot, so the Restoration Anglicans had behind them an actual regicide, not just an attempted one; "...the Catholic failure to kill James I [would] appear completely irrelevant beside the Puritan success in killing Charles I".<sup>20</sup> Of the excessive number of ordinands by 1660, "Some of them had spent years in exile or had served as soldiers in the wars or earned their living as doctors or schoolmasters in Cromwell's England, and possibly in consequence were more dogmatic in their Anglicanism than those who had suffered less for their faith".<sup>21</sup> One of them, Henry Coventry, put it thus: "I will never receive the blood of my Saviour from that hand that stinks of the blood of my great master."<sup>22</sup> "The shadow of the late King's death and the memory of a dozen battlefields still lay across the scene."<sup>23</sup>

The great paradox of the Interregnum, so far as the Carolines were concerned, was that their literary output, including some of their most important work, was produced either in exile abroad or 'retirement' in England: The exiles, both at Henrietta's and Charles II's court, and elsewhere, were very much the Church of England in exile, and thought of themselves as such. Among their number were many accomplished men, like Cosin, who would naturally assume high office after the Restoration. At home the leaders were Sheldon and

---

<sup>19</sup> Bosher, *op.cit.*, p.47.

<sup>20</sup> Williamson, *op.cit.*, p.24.

<sup>21</sup> Higham, *Catholic and Reformed*, p.297.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p.312.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, also p.312.

Hammond, both of them learned, devout and energetic, who maintained a certain morale among their followers.<sup>24</sup> “Half or more of the works upon which the reputation of the Carolines divines depended were written or planned during the Interregnum”.<sup>25</sup> No wonder that Bishop Brian Duppa wrote in 1656, “It is a writing age, and the swordsmen having assured the liberty of acting what they please, the pen-men are as venturesome”.<sup>26</sup> The survival of High Church Anglicanism was due in large measure to the concentration of its luminaries on reviving and developing the theological tenets underpinning its practical expression, i.e. the intellectual effort that preceded its political expression under Laud – in a sense, back to Andrewes and his contemporaries.<sup>27</sup> Just as in the early centuries heretics forced the Church to agree and establish her doctrines, so the Interregnum experience caused many fine and devout minds to formulate what has been the classical Anglican corpus of doctrine, attitude and practice,<sup>28</sup> building on the works and example of such as Hooker, Andrewes and Laud. Indeed, “the Interregnum became a golden age of Anglican theology and apologetic”.<sup>29</sup> Even more paradoxically, nothing like it happened in the Puritan camp during its years of ascendancy: “...no other period of seventeenth century preaching demands so much time for its examination and yields so little in return as the Commonwealth period and the works of the non-Anglican divines.....crowding their margins with interminable citations”.<sup>30</sup>

Although the general feeling in 1660 was for the return of the King, the winning of Parliament by the Cavaliers was not a foregone conclusion, and a

---

<sup>24</sup> Bosher, op.cit., p.29.

<sup>25</sup> Higham, F. Catholic and Reformed, op.cit., p.273.

<sup>26</sup> Quoted ibid., p.273.

<sup>27</sup> Hylson-Smith, High Churchmanship, op.cit., p.41.

<sup>28</sup> Until the late Twentieth Century, some would say....

<sup>29</sup> Bosher, op.cit. p.36.

<sup>30</sup> Mitchell, op.cit., p.255.

Restoration with a Presbyterian national Church a distinct possibility (despite Charles's known Episcopalian sympathies). Certainly there was by the mid-1650s a 'Laudian' party. Many young gentry had been or were being educated by clergy dispossessed for their 'Anglican' and royalist loyalties, and this had gradually a powerful social and political effect,<sup>31</sup> though to what extent remains a matter for discussion: "The completeness of the Laudian victory is undisputed; but to what extent this triumph was fortuitous, and to what extent the outcome of an astutely planned strategy, has been a matter for debate. Even more difficult to determine are the exact roles played by the King and his chief minister [Hyde], and the import of the efforts at conciliation which they publicly sponsored."<sup>32</sup> The failure of the Puritan experiment was due, in some opinions, mainly to the fact that the Puritans were never more than a minority, large, vociferous, and, temporarily, highly influential at the centre of national affairs, but a minority, nevertheless. This emerged in the Interregnum in two ways: (a) the extreme reluctance of most magistrates and other officials (including many of the clergy) to enforce Puritan decrees issuing from the centre; (b) the steadfast defiance of the great mass of the people, who wished to maintain their pre-War customs and attitudes.<sup>33</sup> Thus, "....the gap between regulation and enforcement remained quite wide".<sup>34</sup>

#### **The Restoration and after**

It is temptingly easy to draw parallels between the Calvinists returning from Geneva and elsewhere after the Marian exile and the Carolines returning in 1660, equally determined to put their ideas into practice. However, their customary

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p39ff.

<sup>32</sup> Bosher, op.cit., p.144.

<sup>33</sup> *Vide* Durston & Eales, op.cit., Ch.7, pp.210-233.

<sup>34</sup> Parker, K. in Durston & Eales, p.225.



portrayal as unthinking avengers is far from the truth, despite their seeming able and willing to enforce the martyred archbishop's will more than he was able to do in life. "To suggest that Sheldon and his fellow bishops looked on the new Act ['of Uniformity', so called] as a welcome instrument to purge the Church of its Puritan clergy is to misunderstand the Laudian attitude to uniformity."<sup>35</sup> Doctrinal uniformity was never a requirement, only assent to the Creeds and Scripture, together with a common form of worship and a certain minimal ceremonial. This remained the position of the Restoration Carolines, as it had been since the time of Andrewes. In any case, some of the Caroline tenets were decreasingly subscribed to, in particular the central 'Anglican' belief in the divine right of kings. Bishop Williams sagely and succinctly puts it as, "The spiritual temperature fell in Restoration England."<sup>36</sup>

"The restoration of some form of liturgy and episcopacy was a foregone conclusion, and the Presbyterians spent the summer [of 1661] discussing the modifications necessary before they could conform."<sup>37</sup> Episcopacy proved the lesser stumbling-block; in the event, Baxter unsurprisingly declined Hereford, Calamy Coventry and Lichfield, but Reynolds accepted Norwich. But the problem of liturgy – any liturgy – proved insoluble, at least by those luminaries appointed to solve it. So did the knotty question of those many ministers unepiscopally ordained during the Interregnum, exacerbated by the return of so many deprived High Church clergymen reclaiming their 'rightful' cures. The Act of Uniformity brought matters to a head: all clergy were to be episcopally ordained, they must use the BCP and assent to all its contents, and all teachers must be licensed by their Bishop and declare their assent to the BCP. The result

---

<sup>35</sup> Bosher, *op.cit.*, p.271.

<sup>36</sup> Williams, *op.cit.*, p.46.

<sup>37</sup> Higham, *Catholic and Reformed*, p.295.

was that “there was a large number, approaching 2,000, of clergymen who would in principle have continued to serve a national Church, but refused to serve this Church on these terms”.<sup>38</sup> In all, some 700 livings changed hands, and 1,760 ministers were ejected, as were 149 teachers in schools and the Universities.

The rise of the Latitudinarians – the ‘liberals’ of the day – contributed to dim the Caroline twilight further as the century neared its end. “Earlier generations [pre-Enlightenment] had regarded the existence of God as one of the most natural and fundamental beliefs of humanity, and took the view that atheism was puzzling. Why would anyone want to deny what was self-evidently true?”<sup>39</sup> By 1700 plenty of people were ready, if not to deny – and some did – then at least to question the foundations of Christianity. But the legacy of the Carolines was still helping even the Latitudinarians to defend the faith, and: “The correspondence between the teaching of Andrewes at the beginning of the century and that of Tillotson at the end is at least as striking as the difference”.<sup>40</sup>

One thing hadn’t changed at all, really. Patronage was still vital to ecclesiastical preferment. Not ‘Whom you know’ but ‘Who knows you’ was a process cumulative in its effect. The higher you rose, the better you were known in influential circles. And this was not inconsistent with the Old Testament – though, for once, not consciously based on it – in which personalities, rather than structures or defined ‘career-paths’ abound.

---

<sup>38</sup> Spurr, *English Puritanism*, p.130.

<sup>39</sup> McGrath, A., *Twilight of Atheism*, p.77.

<sup>40</sup> Knox, P.B., in Knox(ed), *op.cit.*, p.92.

## STYLE

### The classic Carolines

Mitchell<sup>41</sup> considers the six greatest English preachers to be from the Seventeenth Century: Andrewes, Donne, Taylor – all Carolines – South, Barrow and Tillotson – all to some extent inheritors of the Caroline tradition. There was an enormous thirst for preaching in the early Seventeenth Century, part of “the greatest evangelistic drive before the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century”.<sup>42</sup> What they saw as an over-emphasis on preaching worried the Carolines, who blamed it for the neglect of sacraments and liturgical discipline – yet they themselves, paradoxically, threw up some of the finest pulpit orators of their or any day.

Some think Andrewes and the other Carolines, all under his influence, still mediaeval in their reliance upon a massive panoply of quotations from the Fathers, the rabbis, mediaeval and more recent commentators as well as upon Scripture; this follows the ‘authoritative’ method of exegesis, arguably ‘mediaeval’ (since practised extensively in the Middle Ages), but obtaining to a greater or less extent in all theological schools, Catholic and Protestant, until well into the second half of the century,<sup>43</sup> save for a few small groups such as the Quakers and Socinians.<sup>44</sup>

Reason can be seen as increasing, from very small beginnings, as an important factor in theological thought, Biblical exegesis and homiletic practice almost throughout the century. The Great Tew Circle felt and articulated its stirring before the Civil Wars; *inter alios*, Hales – a moderate Laudian – put it

---

<sup>41</sup> Mitchell, W.F.: English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson (SPCK, 1932).

<sup>42</sup> Davies, G: *op.cit.*, p.126.

<sup>43</sup> McAdoo, Spirit of Anglicanism, *op.cit.*, p.3.

<sup>44</sup> *Vide* Schroder, *op.cit.*, Ch.2, for a detailed account of the Socinians’ theological method.



into words. Hooker had emphasised it earlier, as did Sanderson, though undoubtedly Andrewes, Hammond and Cosin appealed rather to ‘antiquity’. Generally, however, a balance was kept by all the Carolines.<sup>45</sup> Laud, in “Scripture and Reason” holds that Scripture must be regarded as the Word of God when treating of theology, just as grammar is assumed when treating of rhetoric. Faith is a mixed act of the will and the understanding. Natural reason is insufficient to apprehend God. This is where the will comes in (prompted by the evidence of Scripture, of course): believing is better than “over-knowing Christians” (!) Beliefs that are proven leave no room for faith – and encourage arrogance. Denial of the understanding (because we can never understand God) is part of Christian self-denial. Thus again the will must be exercised, submitting the understanding to Scriptural authority, i.e. to God’s self-revelation. Reason can arrive at the “QUOD SIT” (that God exists) but not at all to the “QUID SIT” (what God is).

Andrewes’s style predominated throughout the first half of the century, even among those who were later to modify it. Taylor, for instance, whose early style was “witty”, “giving the impression that history has been ransacked to provide illustrations”.<sup>46</sup> The *Via Media* is promulgated, too: Gunning claims that neither private judgement nor Roman *magisterium* should interpret Scripture, but the interpretation of the early Fathers must be accepted. Quotations from the ‘originals’ abound everywhere; Mede, for example, quotes the Hebrew, Greek (or Latin), then translates. *Pace* Andrewes, he doesn’t quote the Vulgate without indicating this, and usually to make a point of how western translators treated of the original languages.

---

<sup>45</sup> Gilley and Shiel, *op.cit.*, p.171.

<sup>46</sup> Williamson, H.R.: *Jeremy Taylor* (Dennis Dobson, 1952), p.22.

Some elements of the Carolines' preaching style may irritate the modern reader, but were no drawback in their day. For instance, their 'homiletic imagination' – taking what we regard as liberties with the text – had remarkable effect, impressing some truth of orthodoxy upon the auditors. Similarly with the constant quotations which characterised all schools of preachers – only the range of sources differed. But Mitchell rightly claims that this habit, especially in the early Carolines, such as Andrewes, never seems to get in the way of the progress of the sermon, and often does add useful colour, reinforcement and strength to the text; "As used by Andrewes, 'metaphysical' imagery and 'witty' handling of words or phrases never, it is safe to say, were employed without reference to a greater end. In the hands of the ablest preachers of his school, as Laud, Brownrig, Hacket, Cosin, or Frank, there was a definite attempt made to imitate both form and content; the *figura dictionis* led on to the *figura sententiae*...."<sup>47</sup>

#### **'Intellectuality'**

Though many of them, like Andrewes, Laud and Cosin, emerged from the mercantile middle class, and a few, like Taylor, from even humbler stock, they moved among, understood and spoke to the upper echelons of society, including the very highest, as well as the like-educated men in the Universities. This leaves their style open to the charge of 'intellectuality', a characteristic they bequeathed to the Church of England (possibly due to their study of the Fathers?). "They understood the spiritual needs of the Hall excellently, but not many of them had any message for the shop, and the cottage, except that the dwellers therein should, so far as was practicable, model themselves on the Hall."<sup>48</sup> One may

---

<sup>47</sup> Mitchell, op.cit., p.153.

<sup>48</sup> Stranks, op.cit., p.280.

justly add, "...and to know their place *vis-à-vis* the Hall, and keep that place with all due deference."

"It was perhaps to offset this intellectuality that Andrewes furbished his altar at Ely and John Cosin lit his candles at Durham."<sup>49</sup> Maybe they were conscious of this characteristic (some would doubtless be proud of it), but not fully aware of its dangers. "In the best of them there was a certain donnish remoteness from ordinary men that generally disabled them from grasping the wider issues involved in the political issues of the day. In their lack of contact with the hopes and frustrations of seekers after truth, less intellectually able than themselves, they were often too ready to equate awkward gestures and stupid words with a stubborn temper rather than with confused thinking, and thus they alienated when they should have helped. Laud and his team had more drive but little more understanding; what they did have, in contrast with some of their predecessors, was an enhanced sense of their duties in the secular sphere and of the status and authority of the Church."<sup>50</sup>

Prolixity, by modern canons, was a general tendency of writers of all schools: none had a monopoly. (John Owen's commentary on Hebrews runs to four folio volumes!)<sup>51</sup> Other examples have been noted above in this study. Thus virtually all writers practised their craft at greater length than appeals to the modern reader, and this feature is paralleled in their sermons. Dod is a good example of a non-Caroline in this respect. And it must be admitted that one not seldom gets the impression that homiletic style, including the verbosity, is just showing off; Mitchell may be forgiven for thinking of the Puritan Richard Benfield that, "...it is apparent that the preacher multiplied examples out of

---

<sup>49</sup> Higham, *Catholic and Reformed*, op.cit., p.140.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p.198.

<sup>51</sup> Wakefield, op.cit., p.24.



several ancient authors rather to illustrate his reading than to enforce his point, or inculcate any fresh lesson”.<sup>52</sup>, <sup>53</sup>

#### **The later Carolines**

“He did not have that smooth way of oratory as now. It was a shrewd and severe criticism of a Scottish lord, who, when King James asked him how he liked Bishop Andrewes’s sermon, said that he was learned, but he did play with his text, as a monkey does who takes up a thing and tosses and plays with it, and then he takes up another, and plays a little with it – here’s a pretty thing, and there’s a pretty thing!’ ” Thus John Aubrey, whose first sentence shows how preaching was changing in the latter part of the century, towards the ‘plainer’ style, and more emphasis on reason rather than ‘authorities’, Scriptural or other.<sup>54</sup> In 1600 the Puritans were basing themselves on the Bible alone, other ‘Anglicans’ on tradition and reason as well, following Hooker. Then Andrewes and the early Carolines took the Puritans on on their own terms – the Bible – as well as using the Fathers. The Puritans tended away from the Old Testament and the Fathers, and many of them became increasingly rationalistic or mystical (the Cambridge Platonists were both). The Anglicans too moved in reason’s direction, beginning with Chillingworth and the Great Tew Circle; in time, these spawned Latitudinarianism, so that by 1700 disagreements (e.g. on Church government) were being articulated on the grounds of reason more than anything else.

This is not to say that the appeal to ‘authority’, so characteristic of Caroline style, utterly vanished. It remained after 1660 an important technique in sermons and controversy, albeit in more modest form with the passage of time,

---

<sup>52</sup> Mitchell, op.cit., p.204.

<sup>53</sup> A bit like this thesis, in fact!

<sup>54</sup> Barber, op.cit., p.20.

until scientific and philosophical developments put it out of fashion. The later Carolines didn't altogether lose their touch in the dissection of Scripture, as practised by such as Andrewes half a century and more before them; they can do him proud when it suits them. Knox points out that the decline in citation of 'authorities' in later Seventeenth Century sermons did not indicate ignorance or inadequate study: "...on occasion....preachers such as Tillotson could still deploy all the resources of the patristic and classical armoury" and goes on to say that, "The dependence upon persuasive argument rather than upon weighty authority did not mark a change of belief but was an attempt to sustain the same belief by a shift of method".<sup>55</sup> By the end of the century many preachers were uncomfortable with atonement theories, but still accepted sacrifice as ordained of God in the Old Testament, not just the practice of a primitive culture.<sup>56</sup>

It remains true that Seventeenth Century England witnessed a serious interest in theology at many, even all levels of society. People were knowledgeable on the subject, especially on the Bible, which they were keen to hear expounded: "The chief reason for the greatness of the seventeenth century preachers lay in the fact that it was the age of great hearers".<sup>57</sup> So much so, that it was said that in other countries England was known as 'the Preaching Isle'.

---

<sup>55</sup> Knox, op.cit., p.97.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p.105.

<sup>57</sup> Osmond, P.H.: Life of Isaac Barrow, p.46.

## THE BIBLE

### Familiarity with the Bible

“It was literally the possession of the mind of every person who counted for anything.”<sup>58</sup> One result of much study of Scripture is improved recognition of Biblical references. In an age when men’s conversation was peppered with such allusions, mixed with references to classical authors and, increasingly, to English and Continental sources, it was vitally important to distinguish between the wisdom of God and the wit of men in ascribing not only validity but also authority to a statement.<sup>59</sup> The ‘peppering’ was ubiquitous. Fuller, answering complaints that the official account of the Hampton Court Conference was written by Dean Barlow of Chester, and thereby biased in favour of the ‘Anglicans’, writes: “When the Israelites go down to the Philistines to whet all their iron tools, no wonder if they set a sharp edge on their own, and a blunt one on their enemies’ weapons”.<sup>60</sup> As he was pursuing into the City the five MPs who were leading the Commons agitation against his policies, a paper was thrown into Charles I’s carriage; it read: “To your tents, O Israel!”<sup>61</sup> How many people today would recognise Sheba’s cry of sedition in II Sam.21 (with the unwritten ‘What portion have we in Charles?’)? Or Israel rebelling against Rehoboam in I Kg.12.16? (To the Carolines, Jeroboam’s Israel was a type of the Interregnum, plunged into apostasy as well as rebellion).<sup>62</sup> Fuller again, this time praising the Authorised Version: “These [the Translators], with Jacob, ‘rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well’ of life, Genesis xxix.10; so that now even Rachels, weak

---

<sup>58</sup> Jones, R.M., op.cit., p.24.

<sup>59</sup> Greenham, op.cit., p.225.

<sup>60</sup> Quoted in Dale, R.W.: History of English Congregationalism (Hodder & Stoughton, 1907), p.183.

<sup>61</sup> Hutton, W.H.: The English Church from the accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1903), p.97.

<sup>62</sup> What I haven’t found – perhaps surprisingly – is any opponent comparing Rehoboam’s conduct with that of Charles and Laud, indicating that they all asked for what they got.



women, may freely come, both to drink themselves, and water the flocks of their families at the same”.<sup>63</sup> Heylyn, in passing: “The great work of Unity and Uniformity between the parties went forwards like the building of Solomon’s Temple without the noise of Axe or Hammer”<sup>64</sup> – rather a rosy view of the Laudian reforms. The Speaker of the House of Commons, addressing the King in 1661: “Thanks be to God, the Flood is gone off the face of this island. Our Turtle Dove hath found good footing”.<sup>65</sup>

The interest of the ‘ordinary’ man in the Bible is reflected at higher level in the minuteness of scholars’ examination of texts. Mede, for instance, much concerned with Daniel’s ‘70 weeks’, pores over נַחֲמֵךְ (Dan.9.24) with much detailed discussion on a point that would probably not figure at length in even the most arcane commentaries nowadays.<sup>66</sup> We simply don’t read the Bible like this any more, searching every detail for meaning, in a fundamentally rabbinic manner. Also, we no longer have the need for literal readings to support polemic: “The search for texts that would be conclusive in debate encouraged a minute familiarity with the Bible,” says Cragg. There is both good news and bad news in this procedure, for Cragg adds, rather acidly and unsympathetically, “....it still remains a marvel that men could know the Bible so well and understand it so little”.<sup>67</sup>

### **Literalism**

In the Preface to the AV Miles Smith writes, “The original thereof being from heaven, not from earth; the Author being God, not man; the enditor [sic],

---

<sup>63</sup> Fuller, *Church History*, Vol. III, p.246.

<sup>64</sup> Heylyn, *Works*, p.251.

<sup>65</sup> Bosher, *op.cit.*, p.225.

<sup>66</sup> Mede, *op.cit.*, p.697.

<sup>67</sup> Cragg, *op.cit.*, p.7.

the holy spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets; the Pen-men such as were sanctified from the womb, and endued with a principall portion of God's spirit....."<sup>68</sup> represents not only the official position on the inspiration of Scripture, but the view of almost everyone, high and low, clerical and lay, there being few exceptions to total acceptance of the Bible as the revealed Word of God. Some of the extreme radicals during the Interregnum rejected it, most particularly Winstanley, leader of the Diggers, who insisted that the Bible was factually untrue, but used its stories extensively as metaphors for aspects of his political and social programme. (Also Hobbes, of course, whose 'Leviathan' caused much dismay mid-century.)<sup>69</sup> The fact remains that most Christians at the time were 'fundamentalists', though many entertained a few niggling reservations about inconsistencies in the Bible (whose reconciliation gave rise to the ingenuities of commentators like Kidder<sup>70</sup>) and the human element in its composition. Unsurprisingly, it was the 'rationalists' who heralded something like the modern view; Boyle, for example, says, "For we must not look upon the Bible as an Oration of God to men, or as a Body of Lawes, like our English Statute-Book, wherein it is the Legislator that all the way speaks to the people, but as a Collection of composures of very differing sorts, and written at very distant times...."<sup>71</sup> With regard to inspiration, Boyle points out that many utterances in the Bible are not by priests or prophets, but by "Souldiers, Shepherds and Women, and such other sorts of persons from whom witty or

---

<sup>68</sup> Quoted in Opfell, p.147.

<sup>69</sup> Hill, C.: The World Turned Upside Down (Penguin, 1972), pp.142-146.

<sup>70</sup> *Vide supra*, Ch.7, p.329f.

<sup>71</sup> Boyle, R.: Holy Scripture, op.cit., p.16f.

eloquent things are not (especially when they speak *extempore* ) to be expected".<sup>72</sup> And, succinctly: "All is not Scripture that is in the Scripture".<sup>73</sup>

How literalist were our Carolines? As long ago as Origen,<sup>74</sup> commentators had entertained doubts about the possibility of certain passages being taken literally, e.g. Gen.1-11. At first sight, most Seventeenth Century commentators seem to accept passages like this as true history – Filmer, e.g., based much of his ‘evidence’ for Divine Right on Adam as father of the human race - but did they knowingly ‘preach from the myth’ as our own contemporary preachers often do? Did the sophisticated, erudite, yet practical and worldly-wise minds of Andrewes, Laud, Cosin, Taylor and other prominent Carolines entertain a literalist view of every single part of the Old Testament? Or find in some parts the God-given pictures on which the Christian ideology was to be solidly based? There are hints in their work that the latter was probably the case. Donne explains carefully that the ‘literal’ meaning of a passage may not be its apparent ‘plain’ reading, i.e. that metaphor and allegory have a place in many parts of the Scriptures. “The literall sense is always to be preserved; but the literall sense is not always to be discerned: for the literall sense is not always that, which the very Letter and Grammar of the place presents, as where it is literally said, *That Christ is a Vine*, and literally, *That his flesh is bread*, and literally, *That the new Jerusalem is thus situated, thus built, thus furnished*: But this literall sense of every place, is the principall intention of the Holy Ghost, in that place: And his principall intention in many places, is to expresse things by allegories; by figures; so that in

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p.17. [Not politically correct, wasn't Boyle!]

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., p.19.

<sup>74</sup> *On First Principles* (ed.Butterworth), New York 1966, quoted in Yarchin, op.cit., p.323.



many places of Scripture, a figurative sense is the literall sense.<sup>75</sup> Andrewes makes a plea for use of reason, at the same time as he examines and dismisses 'rational' objections to the creation story.<sup>76</sup> He is not utterly literalist: "....it were absurde to say, that God should speak after the manner of men, with an audible sound of words; for it were vain and to no end, to speak when there were none to hear" – the Bible puts it like this so that we may comprehend.<sup>77</sup>

The Carolines were suspicious of fanciful readings, unless they edify without ignoring or losing the true import of a passage (which may itself be twofold, as we have seen above). Donne again: "Though it be ever lawfull, and often times very usefull, for the raising and exaltation of our devotion, and to present the plenty, and abundance of the *Holy Ghost* in the *Scriptures* .... To induce the *diverse senses* that the Scripture doe admit, yet this may not be admitted, if there may be danger thereby, to neglect or weaken the literall sense it selfe. For there is no necessity of that *spiritual wantonness* of finding more than necessary senses; for, the more lights there are, the more *shadows* are also cast by those many lights .... So when you have the *necessary sense*, that is the meaning of the holy Ghost in that place, you have senses enow, and not till then, though you have never so many, and never so delightful".<sup>78</sup> None of this, of course, forbids sweeping metaphors like Hall's "The Church was an *Embryo* till *Abrahams* time; In swathing bands till *Moses*; In child-hood till *Christ*; a man in Christ [sic: no italics], A man full-grown in glory".<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> *Sermons*, ed. Potter & Simpson 1953, Vol. vi., p. 62; quoted by Gardner, H.: The Business of Criticism (OUP 1959), p. 137.

<sup>76</sup> Andrewes, *Apospasmata*, p. 3f.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>78</sup> *50 Sermons* (1649), p. 322; quoted by Gardener, op. cit., p. 139.

<sup>79</sup> Hall, *Works*, p. 444.

Luther had not been over-literalist;<sup>80</sup> he did not regard all parts of the Bible as of the same worth.<sup>81</sup> The same has been said of Calvin and some other Reformers. Following the Fathers, Aquinas and his disciples had identified three possible ‘meanings’ of a Scriptural passage, viz: (1) *littera* (the wording itself); (2) *sensus* (the historical context); 3 *sententia* (the theological and/or moral content. The Carolines respected both Schoolmen and Reformers, and accepted these views – though they were not alone in this. There is evidence that the Carolines knew and agreed with Aquinas’s statement that “nothing necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual sense of Scripture, which Scripture does not somewhere deliver manifestly through the literal sense”. Thus Donne can preach that “The interlineary glosses, and the marginal notes, and the *variae lectiones*, controversies and perplexities, undo us: the Will, the Testament of God, enriches us; the Schedules, the Codicils of men, begger us .... That Book is not written in the Balthazars character, in a *Mene, Tekel, Upharsim*, that we must call in Astrologers, and Caldeans, and Soothsayers, to interpret it”.<sup>82</sup> <sup>83</sup> Hales agrees: “....he that wilfully strives to fasten some sense of his own upon it, other than the very nature of the place will bear, must needs take upon him the Person of God, and become a new inditor of Scripture: and all that applaud and give consent to any such, in effect cry the same that the people did to *Herod, The voice of God and not of man*. If he then that abases the Princes Coin deserves to die, what is his desert, that instead of the tried silver of God’s Word, stamps the name and

---

<sup>80</sup> *Vide* Box, in Singer & Bevan, op.cit., p.344.

<sup>81</sup> Famously, he declared James ‘an epistle of straw’.

<sup>82</sup> *XXVI Sermons* (1660), p.15; quoted by Gardner, op.cit., p.138.

<sup>83</sup> Nor, nowadays, feminists, liberationists, Marxists, vegetarians...nor any other of the ‘reader response’ fantasists!

character of God upon *Nehushtan*, upon basebrassen stuff of his own (2 Pet.1.20)?”<sup>84</sup>

There was much common ground on the Bible among all parties.<sup>85</sup> The tragedy of the Seventeenth Century is the seemingly (to us) unnecessary concentration on difference, an inability to disengage from those of alien opinion, to live and let live, to agree to differ, to accept ‘matters indifferent’. There is much common ground, yes – but also a gulf between all parties and ourselves, as Hill puts it in another context: “A Quaker of the early 1650s had more in common with a Leveller, a Digger or a Ranter than with a modern member of the Society of Friends”.<sup>86</sup>

#### Centrality of the Bible

Chillingworth’s *magnum opus*, rationalist as he was, bore the title *The Bible the Religion of Protestants*, in which the erstwhile Catholic put up a robust defence of the unique place of Scripture in the Reformed Churches. A little later, Taylor was writing that only Scripture can be our rule of faith and practice, since it is written, and therefore designed by God to be unalterable. Thus, Roman doctrines are to be accepted only insofar as they are congruent with Scripture. Taylor accepts that much must have been done and said by Jesus which was not recorded, but that what is recorded has been recorded for our guidance.

In the curious work which purports to be an account of a debate between Charles I and the Marquess of Leicester, Cartwright emphasises the need to confute heretics’ use of Scripture by Scripture, and claims support from R.Eliab

---

<sup>84</sup> Hales, *Golden Remains*, op.cit., p.14.

<sup>85</sup> A trivial but telling example is that absolutely everyone agreed that Balaam was an arch-‘baddy’!

<sup>86</sup> Hill, op.cit., p.14.



ben Moses (cited by Selden): כל העתקה שאין לה סיוע מן הכתוב היא בטלה "All interpretation [of Scripture] which is not grounded upon the Scripture is vain".<sup>87</sup> And - *cave precatorem!* - "...that which we hear, must be tried by that which we read [i.e. the Bible]."<sup>88</sup> And the steady confidence in the reliability of Holy Writ: "We doe not lay that the Scriptures throughout in every part of them are easie to be understood, but they are so in things necessary unto Salvation".<sup>89</sup>

Virtually everybody agreed that to read the Bible in its original languages was essential to the educated Christian, whether clerical or lay. Boyle, for instance, maintains that "scarce any but a Linguist will imagine how much a Book may lose of its elegancy by being read in another tongue than that it was written in, especially if the Languages from which and into which the Version is made be so very differing as are those of the Eastern and these Western parts of the world".<sup>90</sup> Such an accomplishment rapidly became *de rigueur* for any aspiring cleric, who was expected to know his Bible inside out, if nothing else; George Herbert, in his classic, *The Country Parson*, says of his ideal (rural, N.B.) clergyman, that, "...the chief and top of his knowledge consists in the book of books, the storehouse and magazine of life and comfort, the Holy Scriptures".<sup>91</sup>

## THE OLD TESTAMENT

### Its importance

The minor role played by discussion of doctrinal issues in this study is due to the inevitable pre-eminence of the New Testament as the Scriptural base for the

---

<sup>87</sup> Cartwright, op.cit., p.116.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., p.147.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., p.147.

<sup>90</sup> Boyle, R: *Holy Scripture*, op.cit., p.7.

<sup>91</sup> Quoted by Greenslade, S.L., in *Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. III, p.189.

controversies of the Seventeenth Century. The Old Testament proved useful for other matters, such as politics and personal ethics, on which there was perhaps more agreement. “The New Testament provided prime evidence on all religious questions, while the Old Testament was particularly valuable in delineating the relationship between the church and the commonwealth.”<sup>92</sup>

Nevertheless, the Carolines were fiercely anti-Marcionite. The Old Testament remained essential to understanding the New, to find God’s direct and detailed commands concerning worship and morality, to find Christ pre-figured and predicted, to find patterns of life for the individual, the nation and the Church which were in accord with God’s will. Andrewes set the standard, as usual, for the dangers as well as the felicities of the Caroline position. “And always through the discordant noises of the court and the sweet harmony of his own spiritual life, there sounded the ground bass of the Old Testament Scriptures, conditioning alike his worship and his thought. An unwavering faith in a righteous God, and a sad tendency to equate King James with the Kings of Israel who had served that righteous God, made him at once sublime in his spiritual strength and strangely remiss in his political acumen.”<sup>93</sup>

All stemmed from the Carolines’ view of inspiration. The doings of an ancient Middle Eastern people could have no import for contemporary England and its very different social, geographical, material and political circumstances – unless the record of that earlier community was indeed the Word of God, which had import for all men everywhere in all ages. Thus the Carolines – like nearly everyone else in their day – would happily echo Andrewes’s rabbinical words on

---

<sup>92</sup> Sommerville, *op.cit.*, p.189.

<sup>93</sup> Higham, *Lancelot Andrewes*, *op.cit.*, p.42.

every part of Holy Writ: "It must mean something!" Thus, for example, their many examinations and expositions of the Ten Commandments, especially since they were the only part of the Bible physically produced by God himself. Law was to be discovered, not made: 'natural' or moral law, laid down by God, and explicitly found in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament.

Thus, too, were the Laudians able to interpret their sufferings just before and during the Interregnum in the light of the Exile in Babylon, which, like all else in the Old Testament, was held relevant to their circumstances. Likewise, their relief and rejoicing at the Restoration was pre-figured: " 'When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream.' The words came often and naturally to the men who had waited for the Restoration and known the bitterness of hope deferred. It is small wonder that the text was a favourite with Anglican preachers, both eminent and obscure."<sup>94</sup>

The Carolines were not ignorant men. Andrewes is aware of the sort of questions pursued by later exponents of 'historical criticism', but it appears that he doesn't think them worth pursuing, since 'canonical' is all that matters!<sup>95</sup> Whitby enunciated the principal of interpretation as *SECUNDAM ANALOGIAM FIDEI*: where apparent contradiction or ambiguity occurs, "...that sense must necessarily obtain which is repugnant to no other paragraph" - for his day, typically optimistic. (Whitby was an Anglican, but a non-conformist sympathiser.) Robert Boyle distinguishes between the Word of God and the words of men, in an early version of the modern approach. He recognises the mixture of genres within some Books of the Old and New Testaments, especially

---

<sup>94</sup> Cragg, *From Puritans to the Age of Reason*, op.cit., p.1.

<sup>95</sup> *Vide supra* Childs's comment, Ch.5, p.188.



the recurrence of what he terms “historical elements”. He admits that there are ‘bad bits’ in the Old Testament, but holds that not every word nor verse is divinely inspired, but rather the whole passage or episode: this will always be found to be wholesome – more sceptical than his contemporaries, more optimistic than we. He bases his belief on St.Paul’s words: “All things co-operate for good to them that love God”.

At the Restoration, the influence of the Old Testament readings of the Carolines was still strong; a returned exile, Kentish rector John Rowland, could preach: “Moses and Aaron must be together, the King and the Priest, the Crown and the Mitre, the Prince’s Sceptre and the Bishop’s Crozier....”<sup>96</sup> Even towards the end of the century, divines were still holding tight to the Bible. Writing c.1690, when the Enlightenment was taking hold, Sherlock maintains that reason is the supreme arbiter of truth. Scripture is reasonable; otherwise, he says, he shouldn’t believe it – and he does believe it. Certainly one must not try to ‘interpret’ Scripture which one does not find credible by distorting its plain meaning, in order to make it suit one’s reason.

### Typology

Hooker had stated that the Old Testament predicts Christ, and that the New Testament confirms this prediction. Defending the choice of two Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, Sparrow says: “This Choice may be to show the Harmony of them; for what is the Law, but the Gospel foreshewed? What other the Gospel, but the Law fulfilled? That which lies in the Old Testament as under a Shadow, is in the New brought out into the open Sun: Things there prefigured

---

<sup>96</sup> Boshier, op.cit., p.166.

are here performed”.<sup>97</sup> Taylor writes on baptism: “...so sure as the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, so sure are our sins washed in this holy flood; for this is a Red Sea too; these waters signifie the blood of Christ, these are they that have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb”.<sup>98</sup>

Sometimes the Carolines emphasised such continuity between the Old and New Testaments, as concerning, e.g., sacrifice, altars and priesthood; sometimes discontinuity, as concerning, e.g., the sabbath. Opponents were not slow to point out that the Carolines’ problems with using the Old Testament to defend their liturgical practices stemmed from their own insistence – useful in the matter of sabbath observance – that the ‘ceremonial law’ of the Old Testament had been abrogated by Christ and his New Dispensation, and that only ‘moral law’ continued to be valid. In reply, Joseph Mede teaches that where there is no New Testament rule, we must go to the Old, as the Apostles and Evangelists did, in, e.g., equating baptism with circumcision, and continuing a system of authorised ministers.<sup>99</sup>

#### **‘Matters indifferent’**

From Andrewes onward, how far did the Carolines really regard liturgical practice and Church government as ‘matters indifferent’, when they took so much trouble to explore the Old Testament and find in it (as did the New Testament writers and the Fathers, in their view) the scriptural, God-given origins of their practices?<sup>100</sup> Certainly, ‘matters indifferent’ (therefore subject to Church and State authorities) were defended stoutly with reference to the Scriptures,

---

<sup>97</sup> Sparrow, Anthony: *Exposition of the Book of Common Prayer* (ed. Newman, 1839), p.26.

<sup>98</sup> Taylor, *A Discourse on Baptisme*, op.cit., p.10.

<sup>99</sup> Lake, P., in Kunze, B.Y. & Brautigam, D.D. (eds.): *Court, Country and Culture* (University of Rochester Press, 1992), p.165f.

<sup>100</sup> *Vide* Lake, P., in Kunze & Brautigam, op.cit., p.160.

especially the Old Testament, as having divine sanction. Some say that the Laudians in particular were trying to have their cake and eat it. Actually, the Carolines were establishing the classic 'Anglican' approach to theology, liturgy, Church order and morality as based on the tripod of Scripture, tradition and reason; however, "While they could and did appeal to all those sources of legitimacy and authority the ways in which they did so and the element in the trilogy which predominated in their arguments varied from subject to subject".<sup>101</sup>

#### **Note on scholarship and method**

The Carolines' erudition was formidable, yet limited in its application. The type of education offered by Oxford and Cambridge encouraged pedantry, excellent memory, acquisition and retention of knowledge, and attention to detail; also, "a relish for plays on words that may be forgiven in the undergraduate but become tiresome in middle age. His education taught Laud how to find the correct classical, biblical or patristic text rather than the truth .... The footnotes counted as much as the text, if not more. Correct citations and precise details were valued more than the right conclusions. His education taught him to worry about the small things: if they were right then the whole would automatically be correct .... Learning .... a game of erudition, with truth on the side of the biggest battalions of citations, that somehow grew into an Armageddon between the forces of right and wrong".<sup>102</sup> That dictum on Laud applies approximately to all the Carolines – but also to many of other schools, as we have seen. The intensity of this kind of education was what allowed them to have easy recourse to Biblical texts, which they tended to use almost as second nature with great frequency.

---

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., p.173.

<sup>102</sup> Carlton, op.cit., p.6.



When not directly quoting, they are alluding; thus Duppa, on the Christian at prayer: "... the Soul leaves behind it the earthier parts, as *Abraham* left his Servants behind him at the foot of the Mountain, while he ascended to the top of it to sacrifice".<sup>103</sup> Prayer is not usually "by Rapture" – "for the Angels were not seen to fly up the Ladder, but to mount by degrees".<sup>104</sup> And on the power of prayer: "...remember that Moses's Prayer prevailed more against *Amalek*, than *Joshua's Arms*".<sup>105</sup>

Their education caused them to investigate and often become familiar with the Versions, particularly the Septuagint, to which they turned for enlightenment which they could not gain from the Hebrew alone. They were also led to master languages other than the accepted 'learned' ones. Thus several of the Carolines knew Arabic, from Andrewes in 1600 to Beveridge in 1700. (Laud was not among them, but did found a Chair of Arabic at Oxford.) Their enquiring minds led them to some surprisingly liberal if tentative suggestions, as when Sparrow says, "...I see no reason, but that they [the Apocryphal Books] may be read publickly in the Church with Profit, and more Safety than Sermons can be ordinarily preach'd there", and goes on to all but suggest that these Books be regarded as canonical.<sup>106</sup>

### The Psalms

The Psalms occupy a specially valued place in most exegetes' thinking, and were immensely popular among the Carolines, who, in many of their writings, cited them more than all other Scriptural Books put together. This may

---

<sup>103</sup> Duppa, B., op.cit., p.5.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., p.7.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., p.45.

<sup>106</sup> Sparrow, op.cit., p.31.

conceivably be due to the authorship of the Psalter – for, apart from a few ‘Psalms of Asaph’, was it not written through the agency of their great hero-king himself, whom they venerated as the supreme type and exemplar of the ideal English monarch? In the Books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles they could read of David’s exploits and the events of his life and reign, but in the Psalms (save those ‘of Asaph’) they could read his very words and benefit both from his wisdom and, in their minds, his status as a prophet, uttering God’s Word. This appealed hugely to the Carolines, though their appreciation, compared with that of others, was only a matter of degree – if that – and certainly not of order. It appealed to their royal masters, too. Not for nothing does James I, in his *Basilikon Doron*, a treatise for the instruction of his heir, promote their study: “....the Psalmes of David are the meetest schoole-master that ye can be acquainted with....”<sup>107</sup> Their royal chaplains repaid their confidence; preaching before the King on the Isle of Wight in October 1648, “during the late Treaty”, Duppa chose Ps.42.5 – *Why art thou cast down, O my soule, and why art thou disquieted within me?* and follows Athanasius in recommending this Psalm to those in trouble – which the King certainly was.<sup>108</sup> In his seven extant sermons, Laud cites the Psalms 69 times. In Chapters 1-3 above, there are some 23 Psalm quotes from Andrewes’s sermons, as opposed to 94 from elsewhere in the Old Testament – roughly a quarter; in his *Preces Privatae* 71 as opposed to 63 (and on Sunday 46 as against 24 – twice as many!).

---

<sup>107</sup> McIlwaine, C.H.: The Political Works of James I (Harvard, 1918), p.15.

<sup>108</sup> Hammond et 22 alii 1623-1670, p.1.

### The Authorised Version

The Geneva Bible was disliked by the 'Anglicans', not because it was a poor translation (it wasn't) but because of its Calvinist and seemingly republican annotations, undermining the notion of the divine right of kings.<sup>109</sup> Thus they (and the King) ensured that the new version deliberately omitted marginal notes other than for philological elucidation, even when those might support the 'Anglican' position. This spurred the translators to be content with possible ambiguities in the text, even pointing them out in what marginal notes were allowed, to indicate variant readings, and to try to help the English text speak for itself: "...the feeling that the King James Bible has always given its readers that the words are extraordinarily freighted, with a richness which few other texts have ever equalled".<sup>110</sup> Perhaps Fuller was right, when he attributed much of the success of the AV to the number of experts involved: "not being too many, lest one should trouble another; and yet many, lest, in any, things might haply escape them".<sup>111</sup>

### CONSENSUS

"People thought and lived in the seventeenth century in the framework of religion and expressed themselves through theological terms..."<sup>112</sup> which were all too often used in support of partial and strongly held positions, as when Richard Heyrick, Puritan Warden of Manchester collegiate church wrote to Parliament in the mid-1640s about 'true' Presbyterian Christians (as against moderates), "There

<sup>109</sup> McGrath, A., *The KJV*, op.cit., p.148.

<sup>110</sup> ..... A., op.cit., p.77.

<sup>111</sup> Fuller, *Church History* Vol. III, p.246.

<sup>112</sup> Higham, *Catholic and Reformed*, op.cit., p.204.



are seven thousand at least that have not bowed their knees to Baal".<sup>113</sup> This sort of thing abounds in the contemporary literature, and has traditionally led historians to produce clear statements such as "Anglicanism did not distinguish between Church and State, whereas Puritanism did. A one-kingdom theory collided with a two-kingdom view",<sup>114</sup> statements that contain much truth, but give the impression that the groupings of the time were easily identifiable as well by their differences from one another as by their internal cohesion and unanimity of opinion and purpose.

We have already, in Chapter 6, indicated the falsity of this impression, and how the situation was immensely complex and fluid; some find almost as many Christianities as Christians!<sup>115</sup> The Georges agree (speaking of ceremonies, but applicable to all areas of religious thought and practice): "... Too much rather than too little has been said; too many students have tended to draw lines of demarcation too sharply between opinion and opinion and group and group and have too generally made absolutes of what are actually only relatives".<sup>116</sup> Anglican writers find clear distinctions between Carolines and Puritans on most matters, including Biblical exegesis; so do Nonconformist historians of Dissent. In this study, we have found instead a remarkable consensus on many issues where it might not be expected (on the divine commission of the monarch, for example). The consensus extends to Biblical study and methods of exegesis; even the results of exegesis show at least similarities and at most complete agreement, at least between individuals on both

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., p.224.

<sup>114</sup> New. op.cit., p.47.

<sup>115</sup> *Vide* Lake, P & Questier, M. (eds.): Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church 1560-1660. Introduction.

<sup>116</sup> George, C.H. & K.: The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation 1570-1640 (Princeton University Press, 1961), p.350.

‘sides’, on the sabbath, for instance, and the second Table of the Commandments. The Carolines were in many ways – especially in the realm of speculative theology – more liberal than most Puritans, whose theology tended to be, in Campagnac’s memorable phrase, “all too formal and too complete”<sup>117</sup>; those who disagreed with them would perhaps have said that in other areas the boot was on the other foot. (A prime example is Laud, who never argued on points of theology, rarely even stating his own positions, and most of his supporters followed suit.)<sup>118</sup> But there were too many exceptions and shades of opinion to make more than unsatisfactory generalisations; unfortunately, to gain preliminary understandings, these have to be made.

Surprising concurrences occur; two examples must suffice: “Cromwell’s notion of calling was as brittle a theory of Divine Right as King Charles’s had ever been.”<sup>119</sup> (The difference, as often between Puritan and Anglican approaches, was that Cromwell’s belief was subjective, Charles’s – and his supporters’ – objective.) “All forms of civil obligation .... were commonly held to be deducible from the Fifth Commandment.”<sup>120</sup> This was as obvious to the Puritan as to the Caroline. Equally surprising differences within a general tradition also occur; again, two examples: Andrewes, Mede, Thorndike, Overall and Heylyn, *inter alios*, viewed the Eucharist as the continuation of Old Testament sacrifices, whereas Laud and Taylor, *inter alios alios*, regarded it as mainly a memorial of Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross.<sup>121</sup> “Many of the clergy might support Laud’s ritual reforms and yet be Calvinists in their theology.

---

<sup>117</sup> Campagnac, *op.cit.*, Introduction, p.xiii.

<sup>118</sup> Oldridge, *op.cit.*, p.22.

<sup>119</sup> New, *op.cit.*, p.28.

<sup>120</sup> Sommerville, *op.cit.*, p.15.

<sup>121</sup> Hylson-Smith, *High Church Tradition*, *op.cit.*, p.85.

Puritans could uphold the execution of the King, and yet be essentially Arminians.”<sup>122</sup> The spectra were wide.....

Sometimes all parties could seem out of kilter with the majority of people. “The arid learning and confused syllogisms of their treatise [‘SMECTYMNUS’] were as much out of tune with the passionate intensity of the times as Bishop Hall’s mild worldliness and academic snobbery.”<sup>123</sup> However, when these leaders of opinion got away from their bickering on points of principle, and academic arguments, the resemblances in their spiritual lives, their devotions and their personal behaviour are remarkable. “The differences in thought and outlook were unmistakable, but the quality of faith was strikingly similar.”<sup>124</sup> A last word to George Herbert: “All truth being consonant to itself, and all being penned by one and the self-same Spirit....”<sup>125</sup> What was true of the Bible was true of its readers; when they didn’t get in his way, the Holy Spirit produced many beautiful Christian lives in a turbulent age.

## CHURCH AND COMMONWEALTH

### Order

Disorder was the chief abomination of the Carolines, which underlay and underpinned all their attitudes, teaching and practice. This was a profoundly theological position, based largely on their reading of the Old Testament, which seemed to them to be a record of God’s will for order, from Creation through the

---

<sup>122</sup> Cragg, From Puritanism to the Age of Reason, op.cit., p.4.

<sup>123</sup> Higham, Catholic and Reformed, op.cit., p.201.

<sup>124</sup> Jones, R.M., op.cit., p.7.

<sup>125</sup> Greenslade, S.L., in CHB, p.189.



Commandments, the organisation of the Israelite nation and its cultic arrangements, to the pronouncements of the prophets. They saw society as an organic whole, with members who work to the common good, not (as since the Interregnum) merely as a collection of individuals, each seeking his own good, and setting interest groups, including social classes in competition, to the detriment of the masses.<sup>126</sup> “There may be some good in a political theory that conceives the function of government to be to secure equal justice for all, rather than a fair field of combat for warring interests.”<sup>127</sup> Thus their belief “that order was a thing ‘highly pleasing to God’, the prime virtue without which no Church or State could survive. The ordered beauty of worship, the ordered efficiency of one’s practical living, and, sustaining it all in the secular sphere, an ordered hierarchy of rule, in which all from king to commoner had rights and duties to perform – all these were reflections on earth of the ordered harmony of Heaven”.<sup>128</sup> This led most Carolines to be surprisingly tolerant as they made and kept “...the old political point, as good for Catholics as for extremist Puritans: errors in faith could be tolerated as long as they didn’t threaten the order of the kingdom. The idea of blowing up parliament, needless to say, stepped over the line.”<sup>129</sup> Even Laud – especially Laud – believed that, and, to his own mind at least, acted upon it. It was just such an incident as the Powder Plot that unsettled them and made them nervous of the temper of the times, so that such an eirenic character as Andrewes could spout his most uncharitable words as a result. The

---

<sup>126</sup> The view is set out comprehensively in Bourne, *op.cit.*, pp.114-127.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p.142.

<sup>128</sup> Higham, *Catholic and Reformed*, *op.cit.*, p.50.

<sup>129</sup> Nicolson, *op.cit.*, p.109.

Carolines felt, with some justification, "...the sense that order is no more than a taut and anxious skin drawn over the bubbling chaos below".<sup>130</sup>

### Divine Right of Kings

'Divine Right' was not a new idea – the reverse, in fact: it was probably the most ancient and persistent theory of kingship, a thread not only running throughout the 'Dark' and Middle Ages (as Figgis outlined), but stretching back through the Classical world to the ancient civilisations of Persia, Egypt and Mesopotamia. Outside this Near Eastern and European tradition, the theory appears often enough in places as far apart as China, Nepal, Japan, parts of sub-Saharan Africa and the pre-Columbian Americas as to suggest that until modern times in Western civilisation it was near-universal. What the Carolines did was to study and codify the theory to suit it (in their view) to their own place and time, and give it a respectable Christian pedigree, based solidly upon the Old Testament. This Old Testament model of royal authority was not an English invention, but widespread among early Protestant countries: "There can be no doubt that the rediscovery in the historical books of the Old Testament of the 'godly prince', and the argument therefrom *a fortiori* to the authority of the Christian sovereign, was one of the most important and significant themes of the Reformers, Lutheran, Calvinist and Anglican."<sup>131</sup> *Cuius regio, eius religio* had, after all, been an accepted principle of national religious allegiance for a long time in Europe.

We have seen how James I regularly preached the doctrine in speeches and writings, especially in *The Workes of the Most High and Mighty Prince, James of*

---

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., p.112.

<sup>131</sup> Sykes, N: Old Priest and New Presbyter (CUP 1957), p.3, quoted in Bradley, op.cit., p.97.

1616 and how his son echoed it at his trial and even on the scaffold. We have seen, too, how frequent and numerous are the Old Testament comparisons with the English monarch, comparisons which go back well into the previous century, when the boy-king Edward VI had been compared with Josiah, drawing inevitable parallels between the discovery of the 'Book of the Law' in the Temple and the production of the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549. Both were seen as ridding their realms of idols. Such was the stuff of Cranmer's coronation sermon, his lead being frequently followed in English pulpits.<sup>132</sup> Canon 1 of 1640 declares the official line: "The most high and sacred order of kings is of divine right, being the ordinance of God himself, founded in the prime laws of nature, and clearly established by express texts both of the Old and New Testaments. A supreme power is given to this most excellent order by God himself in the Scriptures, which is, that kings should rule and command in their several dominions all persons of what rank or estate soever, .... For subjects to bear arms against their kings, offensive or defensive, upon any pretence whatsoever, is at least to resist their powers which are ordained of God; and .... they shall receive to themselves damnation."<sup>133</sup> James had maintained that kings were called 'gods' by God himself: Andrewes (and doubtless many others) agreed publicly, though when preaching on Ps.82 (a regular Caroline text) he can also apply it to Parliamentarians!<sup>134</sup> thus, just as it is blasphemous to question God's actions, "it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do..."<sup>135</sup> Interestingly, Andrewes's argument becomes somewhat circular, in that his theory helps us to understand creation: "...so doth God here borrow his manner of

---

<sup>132</sup> Bradley, op.cit., p.97.

<sup>133</sup> Davies, E.T.: Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1950), p.94.

<sup>134</sup> *Vide supra*, Ch.2, p.55f.

<sup>135</sup> Davies, E.T., p.22.



doing from a Prince, which is the greatest thing for what is in our conceit (more forceable to the speedy execution and through [sic] dispatch of a thing) then [sic] a Princes straight commandement, and mandate....”<sup>136</sup>

‘Divine Right’ was a widespread idea, accepted by many pre-Civil Wars Calvinists, which gave them the classical Cranmerian dilemma: how to avoid supporting a monarch who seems to be trying to demolish the ‘pure’ Protestantism their conscience bade them follow? They “thus effectively disabled themselves from adopting a more critical stance”.<sup>137</sup> As matters progressed towards and into the Interregnum, they were able in large numbers to come out of the woodwork. Even amongst those Puritans of republican inclination (by no means all, or even the majority), ‘Divine Right’ was accepted by some, since they held that it doesn’t necessarily refer to a king. Thus Baxter (not by any means an arch-republican) can dedicate his work to Richard Cromwell, as “...an Officer of the Universall King”.<sup>138</sup>

Some modern commentators hold that supporters of Divine Right actually laid the foundations for modern politics, including the abandonment of their own position, in that they won the battle against clericalism (of both Roman and Presbyterian varieties) and theocracy (as in the Interregnum experiment), firmly establishing the temporal power, be it monarch or elected assembly (or both) as supreme in all matters of secular life. “To set it [the State] free from ecclesiastical control it was needful to claim Divine institution for its head. But when this purpose was realised, and independence attained, the state, secure in its new-found freedom, may develope [sic] principles of politics without

---

<sup>136</sup> Andrewes, *Apospasmata*, p.15.

<sup>137</sup> Davies, J.: *The Caroline Captivity of the Church* (Clarendon 1992), p.301.

<sup>138</sup> Baxter, R.: *Church Government*, Epistle Dedicatory.

reference to theology".<sup>139</sup> Despite its being essentially an anti-clerical theory, Divine Right had to be supported by the clergy themselves. The Carolines agreed with both Bellarmine and Knox, at almost opposite ends of the Reformation spectrum, "that only the spiritual power can give the authoritative decision as to whether men were bound in conscience to obey their rulers. The question as one of conscience must be decided by the spiritual authority .... None but the clergy could meet the Pope [and, one may add, Knox] on his own ground".<sup>140</sup>

The Carolines never saw the monarch as a self-willed despot; as the Interregnum proceeded, and Cromwell assumed more and more dictatorial power, many came to share their view (if not its theological basis). "The feeling steadily grew that if indeed there were to be rule by a single person it were better to be by a King, bound by the laws of the constitution and the tradition of the centuries."<sup>141</sup> The great 'let down' of the Carolines (as of Cranmer before them) was the nature of the monarchs they held to reign as of divine right, from James I, to Charles I and Charles II, to James II. Perhaps they pondered on the prophetic criticism of Saul, David and Solomon.....The Carolines knew perfectly well that their monarchs were not ideal 'godly princes' – not even Charles I, of whom Laud is said to have observed sadly that he was "A mild and gracious prince, who knew not how to be or to be made great".<sup>142</sup>

Many commentators hold that Divine Right was the defining characteristic *par excellence* of the Carolines. It survived the Interregnum unscathed: Jeremy Taylor, as Bishop of Down and Connor after the Restoration, was preaching it

---

<sup>139</sup> Figgis, J.N.: Theory of Divine Right of Kings (CUP 1896), p.162.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., p.206.

<sup>141</sup> Higham, F., Catholic and Reformed, op.cit., p.267.

<sup>142</sup> Hutton, op.cit., p.3.

earnestly and clearly, with all the enthusiasm of an Andrewes or a Laud. So, too, of course, was Cosin, now Prince Bishop of Durham. There is still the constant recourse to the Old Testament, as by Taylor: “ ‘Divination and a wise sentence is in the lips of the king,’ saith Solomon, ‘and his mouth shall not err in judgement.’ ”<sup>143</sup> Divine Right was not generally accepted by the mass of the people before the Civil Wars, but it became so at the Restoration, and remained so until its sudden evaporation in 1688. Even the Latitudinarians were enthusiastic for it. Thus the Anglican hostility towards Nonconformists, expressed supremely in the ‘Clarendon Code’, as being those who had conceived, encouraged and perpetrated regicide – or, at any rate, their direct heirs.<sup>144</sup> “The antipathy to Nonconformists was compounded of many elements, but hatred of their political opinions was probably stronger than any other single factor. The religious claims of dissenters might be dismissed as preposterous, but what made them so dangerous were the consequences which had followed in the realm of politics. It was as rebels – see Andrewes in Chapter 2 above - actual rebels in the past, potential rebels in the present – that the churchmen of the Restoration feared and hated the Nonconformists. Even after the Revolution [i.e. 1688], ‘Jack Presbyter’ was a figure whom loyal churchmen felt it necessary to watch carefully and resist wherever possible.”<sup>145</sup>

John Nalson published *The Common Interest of King and People* in 1678 (written after Filmer, but published before him). He is very utilitarian in the main, though abruptly uses Dan.4 to back up previous arguments based on ‘natural law’. He is more rationalistic than Filmer, though both are in advance of their

---

<sup>143</sup> Quoted by Williamson, op.cit., p.145.

<sup>144</sup> Cragg, *From Puritanism to Revolution*, op.cit., p.159f.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., p.166.



time. In the latter part of the Seventeenth Century, the supporters of Divine Right clung to the position for some time after it had ceased to be sustainable, perhaps – though doubtless unconsciously in both cases – for the reasons Figgis gives: (a) “Men do not desert a belief, until some time after its main purpose is fulfilled”;<sup>146</sup> (b) “The mass of mankind will never be convinced, that it is useful to maintain in power a government, which is oppressive beyond limit. But they may be persuaded that it is their duty to do so. If acuter minds have come to the conclusion that a revolution is always inexpedient, the only method of making their opinion practically effective will be by inducing the vulgar to believe that it is always iniquitous. This was the great source of strength of the upholders of Passive Obedience, as the plain teaching of the Gospel.”<sup>147</sup> [Such observations do not, of course, apply to Andrewes, Laud and their contemporaries – or even to Cosin, but to those Carolines whose formation had taken place during, after, or at least not long before the Civil Wars.]

So Divine Right remained “the distinguishing badge of the Church of England” – until 1688, that is. Cragg, *inter alios*, maintains that its sudden collapse, brought about by events, was because it had in fact become obsolete. It had served its purpose in defending the State against the twin dangers to the national state and commonwealth of the international clerical control of Rome, on one hand, and Genevan-inspired Puritanism on t’other. Now (1688) neither was a threat, or at least a threat that could not be dealt with adequately by other means. And for some time by then the classic position had been subtly altered, in that the monarch was still held to be Defender of the Faith, but not its Definer. He must enforce it, but the bishops must define it.

---

<sup>146</sup> Figgis, op.cit., p.162.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., p.164f.

### The national Church and its Governor

The idea of a national Church was almost universal at the start of the Seventeenth Century; only a very few early Separatists would have not thought it a necessity. "In this period, church secession was in itself generally regarded as disruptive, subversive and radical, for religious groups which broke away from major state-supported churches threatened to dissolve the bonds of a social and political order held together by religious sanctions and by universal membership of a single Church in each political society. This interpenetration of Church, State and society was particularly marked in post-Reformation England and Wales, a polity with a highly-developed state control of religion and a consequent mingling of the roles of subject and church member."<sup>148</sup> No surprise, then, to find that the title page of the 'Great Bible' indicates unambiguously the harmonious operations of Church and State under God and the King.<sup>149</sup> The Carolines believed that Church and State formed one single society, which made their position on the monarchy intelligible. The English Presbyterians held a doctrine of 'two societies', Church and State independent of each other, but their Scottish co-religionists, in their Sixteenth Century *Books of Discipline*, indicated strongly that secular government could only operate according to principles laid down by the Kirk, and to promote the interests of the latter.<sup>150</sup>

Church/State equivalence occupied the minds of more than the Carolines. Sir John Strangeways, M.P., - no Caroline, he - speaking in the Commons as Members debated the abolition of bishops, said: "If we made a paritie in the

---

<sup>148</sup> Mullett, M., in Gilley and Sheils (eds.), op.cit., p.188.

<sup>149</sup> McGrath, *KJV*, op.cit., p.97.

<sup>150</sup> Figgis, op.cit., p.194ff.

Church we must at last come to a paritie in the Commonwealth".<sup>151</sup> This democratic spectre haunted the Parliamentary worthies every bit as much as it terrified their opponents, and none but a tiny few extreme Independents thought that the doings of the Church and the doings of the State were utterly separable matters which impinged not at all on each other, any more than they had been in Israel – and the Carolines had been supremely successful in implanting the idea that Israel was England's model: Viscount Falkland, when an MP, had once quite naturally and unexceptionally said, "He is a stranger in our Israel who knows not....."

Andrewes's 'two trumpets' sermon<sup>152</sup> is the supreme argument from Scripture for the divine right of kings to govern both State and Church. Richly imaginative in his initial reading of the trumpets as two, and both given to the secular, divinely appointed ruler, he builds on this adroitly, elegantly, learnedly and comprehensively an apparently solid and unassailable intellectual case, the theology of the principle of Divine Right. It is a triumph of his art: the 'two trumpets' would fix themselves in the minds of his hearers and remain there long after the sermon figured only faintly in their memories - such being the way with sermons - as his unique facility for spotting resonances undetected by others puts a magnificent *coup de théâtre* in his capable hands.

## SCYLLA AND CHARYBDIS

Throughout the Seventeenth Century the Carolines/Laudians/'Anglicans' waged a continual struggle against the twin and opposite adversaries of the Puritans/Calvinists/Nonconformists on the one hand, and Rome on the other, a

---

<sup>151</sup> Higham, *Catholic and Reformed*, op.cit., p.88.

<sup>152</sup> *Vide supra*, Ch.2., p.71.



struggle marked on both sides sometimes by bitterness, especially mid-century, sometimes by eirenic overtures and generosity. Out of it emerged the fully-fledged *Via Media* of classic Anglicanism, the foundations of which had been laid by Hooker.

### **The Puritans**

The early years saw a gradual increase in the influence of the anti-Puritan party, from mild beginnings. James was at first inclined to see the Puritans in the light of the republican-minded Presbyterians of his Scottish experience, whereas the Englishmen, such as Andrewes, were concerned with their doctrine of predestination, other Calvinist traits, lack of decent ceremonial and their perceived disdain for the sacraments and prayer in their concentration upon preaching as the main component of worship. The English churchmen of this school easily brought James round to their way of thinking, though his instincts were more eirenic towards the Puritans as he found them in England, i.e. more compliant and respectful than their fellows north of the Border.<sup>153</sup>

One gets the impression from the writings of both parties that the existence and nature of the bishop's office was the most serious cause of dissension, rather than any doctrinal matter, not excepting predestination (which in any case several prominent non-Puritans held according to the Calvinist teaching). The early 'Carolines' (Jacobean, in fact, such as Andrewes) did not proclaim episcopacy as of divine right; this view only took hold as the years passed. Laud certainly held it, as probably did Cosin, and others till late in the century. However, it soon became a barrier to ecumenical relations with other Protestant Churches, such as

---

<sup>153</sup> Ferrell, op.cit., p.14.

did not exist in 1600. At the beginning of the century, episcopacy was a theological issue, of concern to a few controversialists on each side, but during the Personal Rule, Charles and Laud made it a highly political one by using the bishops and the Court of High Commission as a means of governing while Parliament was in abeyance. "What was a specialised question of ecclesiastical order became confused with an experiment in authoritarian government .... The Puritans could have counted on little support for their attack on the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession had there not been the more concrete matter of fines in the ecclesiastical courts."<sup>154</sup> Even when Parliament did sit, the sizeable Episcopal contingent in the Lords was hostile to most of what a Puritan-inclined Commons wished.

After the Restoration, as Bosher points out, bishops were no longer an issue. "By 1660 criticism of Episcopal government seemed an unsavoury pastime, with horrid associations of religious and political anarchy, and bishops could now claim the indulgence with which the lesser of two evils is regarded."<sup>155</sup>

A perennial problem was disagreement over sabbath observance. The puritans were always at pains to stress that the Lord's Day was not just one of rest (*pace* the wording of Commandment IV) but for spiritual exercises, public and private – and for nothing else, least of all enjoyable entertainments, "else our Oxe and our Asse keepe as good a Sabbath as we".<sup>156</sup> Admittedly, the Carolines were in broad agreement, though most of them (Andrewes the egregious exception) held that these exercises need not occupy the whole of the day. The Puritans were much

---

<sup>154</sup> Williamson, *op.cit.*, p.32f.

<sup>155</sup> Bosher, *op.cit.*, p.146.

<sup>156</sup> Greenham, *op.cit.*, p.825.

mindful that this one day in seven was “the sabbath of the Lord thy God” – a man might follow his calling and pursue his pleasures on all the other six days, after all.<sup>157</sup> Sabbatarianism was prevalent among the clergy and many of the laity (if only in lip-service) throughout the century, which is why the ‘Book of Sports’ antagonised so many people unnecessarily; thus the matter was one of the most important single factors in the righteous indignation of the Puritans before the Civil Wars.

Another major stumbling-block was the nature of worship, which encompassed many matters – church furniture, ceremonies, formal liturgy and ‘free’ forms, the relative places of preaching and sacraments, the robes of the ministers, etc. Much of the argument found its focus in the Book of Common Prayer. Addleshaw maintains that the Reformers and their immediate heirs did not understand the implications of the BCP. It was left to the Seventeenth Century divines to appreciate it fully – and the Carolines were always its stout defenders. “Under their hands a protestant service book was transformed into a catholic liturgy; they discovered its beauties; they loved it and were ready to die for it.”<sup>158</sup> The Laudians knew the impossibility of enforcing doctrinal agreement, but they saw the desirability of minimal uniformity of practice in reducing strife within the Church of England, especially in the contentious ‘matters indifferent’. They did think they had the Bible on their side in this; after explaining that Christian worship was actually a proper development of the Jewish, Heylyn writes: “As for the circumstances and out-parts of *worship*, he [Christ] left them in the state he found them, that is to say, to the disposing of the *Church*, in whose power it was to institute such *rites* and ceremonies, as might apparently conduce

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., p.826.

<sup>158</sup> Addleshaw, op.cit., p.63.



to the increase of piety, and to the setting forth of God's praise and glory. Himself<sup>159</sup> had given a personal and most exemplary obedience to the Church of Jewry, conforming to such *rites* and ordinances (wherein there was no deviation from the Law of God, as had in former times been settled by the power thereof. And therefore had no cause to think, but that a like obedience would be yielded in the after Ages, unto a *Church* of his collecting; a *Church* conducted in those points which pertain to godlinesse, by such a visible co-operation of the Holy Ghost: especially considering what a fair example of *conformity* he should leave behinde him".<sup>160</sup>

Part of the problem was the number of extremists on both sides. We have seen examples, but it may be mentioned here that the Carolines were concerned at the unorthodox, even heretical positions adopted by some of their opponents. Such was Sir John Vane – a Durham lad – who tried to get his fellow-Puritans to abandon Biblical legalism for a message that 'inner light' plus the Scriptures would produce a third and true influence on one's life, and his complex theology of the three possible natures of man: natural righteousness, disobedience to God, and voluntary submission to God's will – all implied in the story of Adam.<sup>161</sup>

## Rome

The great bogeyman of the century was Rome. Even a 'rationalist' like Boyle is in its thrall. When showing that a portion of Scripture can mean more in one age than in another, he claims that our Lord's command at the Last Supper to

---

<sup>159</sup> Was Heylyn Irish?!

<sup>160</sup> Heylyn, *Ecclesia Vindicata*, op.cit., p.194.

<sup>161</sup> Patrick, J.M., in Cole and Moody, op.cit., pp.100-106.

drink all the wine (a howler, of course<sup>162</sup>) but omits 'all' with the bread must have seemed irrelevant to early Christians, "...but We that live in an Age wherein the Cup is deny'd to much the greater part of the Communicants, are invited not only to Absolve the Recording of this Peculiarity, but to admire it."<sup>163</sup> Q.E.D., as he might have said in his laboratory.

Both James I and Charles I favoured reunion with Rome, but only on certain conditions, principally that the Pope give up the right to depose a heretical monarch – which was never likely to be acceptable to the Vatican.<sup>164</sup> The Carolines concurred, and added conditions of their own of a doctrinal nature. However, the most unfair accusation of the Puritans against the Laudians was that they were crypto-papists. Most of their literary output was a defence of the Church of England against Rome – but "Their crime, in Puritan eyes, was that they contrasted it [the Church of England with Rome] not totally, blindly, rhetorically, but critically; and criticism can be the beginning of dialogue, even respect. How much safer to declare the Pope Antichrist, and shut out the critics, as the Calvinists had done at Dordt! Was not that, after all, *mutatis mutandis*, what the Catholics had done at Trent?"<sup>165</sup> In the popular imagination it is often forgotten or ignored that the Carolines were every bit as opposed to the Rome of their day as to the Puritans/Presbyterians/Independent sectaries/ Nonconformists. In fact, it can easily be argued that they were more so. "The royalist authors have the Pope on the brain. Whoever be their immediate antagonist, the Pope is always in the background, and it is against him that the long struggle is

---

<sup>162</sup> 'all' is plural, referring to the disciples, not the wine; surely Boyle's Greek was not that deficient? Perhaps he simply hadn't checked the Greek.

<sup>163</sup> Boyle, *Holy Scripture*, op.cit., p.82.

<sup>164</sup> Davies, G., op.cit., p.205.

<sup>165</sup> Trevor-Roper, H., *Anglican, Catholic and Puritan*, op.cit., p.69.

waged.”<sup>166</sup> Meeting Roman claims and criticisms was a prime duty of any prominent churchman through most of the century. “Bishops believed it to be incumbent upon them to read and refute these [post-Tridentine Roman Catholic] writings and throughout the century they were continually involved in controversy with the Church of Rome.”<sup>167</sup>

Popular suspicion, dislike and fear of Rome was near-universal. The strong opposition to Charles’s wooing of the Infanta, then his marriage to another foreign Roman Catholic found support in the Old Testament, in the post-Exilic purging of ‘strange wives’, as well as Solomon’s acquisition of foreign wives. Such alliances imported idolatry, and the application to the contemporary situation was obvious to many Puritans, and maybe others besides.<sup>168</sup> And it is certain that a major, perhaps the most important factor in the gaining of popular support by the Puritans and Parliamentarians was their playing the ‘no popery’ card, in association with profiting by existing secular grievances against the Established Church.

## LEGACY

There is a remarkable parallel between the Interregnum and the present day, with regard to the decline of Anglicanism, with hostility from without and argument about its very nature from within, just as the Carolines then saw the ‘obvious’ parallel between their situation and the Babylonian Captivity.<sup>169</sup> Not

---

<sup>166</sup> Figgis, op.cit., p.179.

<sup>167</sup> Knox, in Knox (ed), op.cit., p.96.

<sup>168</sup> McGrath, KJV, op.cit., p.168f.

<sup>169</sup> *Vide* Askew, R.: Muskets and Altars (Mowbray, 1997), Preface, p.viii.



only during that sad time, but before and, to some extent, after, “one purpose runs through their works, a purpose of restoration, not of producing something new; nor do they emasculate Christian truth by trying to reconcile it with the spirit of the age .... Instead of attempting to create a scientific system of theology on the plan of Suarez or Calvin, they take seriously the claim of the English reformers to be returning to antiquity. They turned to the Fathers....”<sup>170</sup> – and learnedly and thoroughly examined the Biblical record, in both Testaments, and the Apocrypha.

“The thing which bound them together was a common attitude, rather than a common theology or a common teacher.” Thus Stranks explains how Taylor had much in common with the Platonists and Latitudinarians, yet was too ‘Catholic’ to be one of them; and how he had his differences with Sheldon and Duppa, but quite definitely remains a ‘Caroline’ like them.<sup>171</sup> *Via Media* has become the Anglican way for Taylor *et al.* Long before him, it was proclaimed by Hooker, who found it repeatedly the satisfying – and true – position between Rome and extreme Protestantism. In dealing with Scripture, he is much opposed to the Roman view of Scripture as ‘insufficient’, so that the *magisterium* can and must add (and overrule?), and to the Puritan view that Scripture prescribes everything, and that nothing must be believed or done that is not plainly authorised in Holy Writ. And after Taylor, Beveridge is very satisfied that the Church of England has got it right, its doctrine consistent with that of the Apostles, as evidenced in Scripture. He restates the *via media* of Anglican doctrine and practice: “Traditions of men .... contrary to the Word of God .... to be abhorred; and all traditions of men not recorded in the Word of God .... not necessarily to be

---

<sup>170</sup> Addleshaw, , op.cit., p.24 and p.25.

<sup>171</sup> Stranks, op.cit., p.285.

believed.” In controversies, Scripture cannot decide, since both sides claim its support in their differing interpretations of the text; Church teaching decides.

Thus the Carolines laid the foundations for the Church of England as she has been known ever since their day; they produced the seminal – even if no longer read – works of her distinctive theology, developed the *Via Media* into a positive doctrine rather than a compromise, and secured the ‘tripod’ of scripture, tradition and reason on which (ideally) rest all her approaches and attitudes, and maintained and reinforced her government. This is why Trevor-Roper can write: “Even in failure, he [Laud] left behind him a model which has become permanent in the historic English Church.”<sup>172</sup> The religious genius of that English Church has been to embody and encourage the best attributes of the English character, and base them on sound Christian teaching; she has also an understanding of human frailty and a desire for comprehension that still seems to her to justify her standing as the national Church. That genius we owe to the Carolines, who “....believed and constantly asserted that within traditional Anglican limits a wider range of belief and practice was possible than in any other religious settlement, and later history has not disproved their claim. Because of their stand, the Church of England, alone among post-Reformation bodies, remained constant in its refusal to commit itself to a rigid system of doctrine and practice, and preserved that tension of authority and freedom, of variety and order, which is its unique heritage in the Christian world.”<sup>173</sup>

That was written in 1951. Whether the tension still holds half a century later is arguable, as the exercise and the acceptance of the authority have become far

---

<sup>172</sup> Trevor-Roper, H., From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution, op.cit., p.140.

<sup>173</sup> Bosher, op.cit., p.277.

weaker than the Carolines would have envisaged as desirable or even possible for a national, established Church.

The Anglo-Catholics ‘appropriated’ the Carolines in the Nineteenth Century, but many, even most commentators are now agreed that the modern Anglo-Catholics are of a different ilk from the Carolines, who would hardly approve of their blatant, even servile aping of Rome in almost all matters of doctrine and liturgical practice. “It may, indeed, be claimed, with very little hesitation, that, if the Non-juring schism, the suppression of Convocation, and the system of political appointments to the episcopate, had not intervened, there would have been no necessity for the Oxford Movement.”<sup>174</sup>

The liberalising of the ecumenical attitudes of all the mainstream Christian Churches over the last half-century gives substance to a hope expressed in 1913: “It is, in fact, from [the Carolines] that the Church of England inherits her position of unrivalled opportunity for advancing the reunion of Christendom – standing firmly, as she does, on the solid foundation of the Bible and antiquity, with her arms, not folded in self-complacent isolation, but outstretched to their widest reach, not wholly out of touch with Rome on the one hand, or with the non-episcopal Protestant bodies on the other, and with a cordial welcome for any friendly overtures made by the Orthodox Churches of the East.”<sup>175</sup> But, we wonder, can that hope still be entertained, now that Caroline ideas are neither known nor, when known, much heeded?

We end this study with Florence Higham’s sublime epilogue to her *Catholic and Reformed*:

---

<sup>174</sup> Osmond, Cosin, op.cit., p.359.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., p.361.



“Thus throughout the century the Anglican Church grew to maturity, buttressed by the scholarship of the universities, nurtured by the prayers of the faithful, tested by the sufferings of the years of adversity and in quieter days adorned by lives as fragrant as the English countryside, of saints in the Anglican manner, sober men, not given to excess. The loyal, if at times grumbling service of innumerable vestry-men kept in seemly order the fabric and furnishings of their parish church, and the work of the craftsmen often still survives, to give joy to a generation less aware of the beauty of holiness. The poetry of Donne and Herbert and Traherne, the rich prose of Sir Thomas Browne and Izaak Walton, the devotions of Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, and the measured counsel of the *Practice of Piety* or the *Whole Duty of Man* gave to seventeenth-century Anglicanism a character and appeal that has seldom if ever been surpassed. How often the Church fell short of her calling in the turmoil of politics and through failure of Christian compassion these chapters of her story indubitably show; yet something had emerged worthy of man’s devotion, a faith and worship and a practice in well-doing that have given to the Anglican branch of Christendom its own spiritual insights and the validity of a living Church.”

*Amen*

## APPENDIX I: THE CAROLINE SCHOOL

Andrewes, Laud and Cosin found in the Old Testament justification for the things they held dear. Each almost a generation apart from the next before and/or after him, Laud influenced Cosin, and was one of his patrons, while Andrewes formed them both. These three men were pre-eminent in their school<sup>1</sup>, which included many divines through the century. In their day these divines were dubbed 'Arminians' (or worse!) by their opponents; since then, they have been variously known as 'Caroline', 'High Church', 'Laudians' and 'Anglicans'. All these terms are in some sort inadequate: 'Anglican' is anachronistic (though 'Anglian' had been used occasionally by Continental Roman Catholics), but may be excused because these men established the general principles of what has become typical Anglican theology, ecclesiology and approaches to liturgy, faith and morals. 'Caroline' is also somewhat anachronistic when applied to such as Andrewes and Bancroft, who were rather Elizabethan and Jacobean divines; 'High Church' they certainly were, but so were many other notable divines of their day, especially in the earlier decades of the century, who did not share most of their teaching and practices; Laud himself was of course a 'Laudian' and so was Cosin, but Andrewes wouldn't have been, and Taylor wasn't, since the term has as much to do with active politics, civil as well as ecclesiastical, as with theological position. 'Arminian' is least satisfactory; though many of the school were undoubtedly of something like this religious ilk, the "something like" is an important qualifier; the truth is, we simply don't know how far most of them were. We judge

---

<sup>1</sup> It has to be admitted that, although Taylor does not figure large in this study, Hylson-Smith (op.cit, pp.161f) holds him the most outstanding of the Carolines, due to the quantity, quality and influence of his devotional writings, especially *Holy Living* (1650) and *Holy Dying* (1651).

‘Caroline’ the most acceptable term, since it was during the reign of Charles I that their influence and output were greatest, and during that of Charles II that they seemed finally to triumph, though the triumph was relatively brief, and their influence on Church and State – especially the latter – much reduced from what it had been prior to the Interregnum. The party increased rapidly in importance during the second and third decades of the century to a position of dominance which it held for over a decade before and during the ’30s. They were never in a majority, but nor were their active opponents. Most clergy and laity were ‘silent’. However, by 1641, there were thousands of ‘Caroline’ clergy and laity, to judge by the number of deprivations later in the decade. Andrewes, Laud and Cosin had a horde of humble imitators, and not a few able and highly-placed ones who shared their convictions to a greater or less degree – some even developed them to further extremes. The literary remains of several dozen of these provide widespread corroboration of the views of the three examined in detail.

Quotations in the original Biblical languages and Latin abound, though Hebrew ones become less frequent in time. Quotations are usually translated. Word-play was much in fashion in the early years. Andrewes, as we have seen, was a past master of it, enjoying his puns and wisecracks; he was not alone. The later Carolines – perhaps because of the difficult, even tragic nature of their times – generally lack Andrewes’s sense of humour, and only occasionally indulge themselves in his word-play.

Carolines constantly cited ‘authorities’, though this habit decreased over the years, as did other features. In the early years the ‘Carolines’ went to the Old Testament for nearly everything except Christian doctrine – though sometimes for that as well. Towards the middle of the century the balance was slowly tipping



away from the Hebrew scriptures – indeed, for some Carolines, had tipped; they became less inclined to mine it for theology rather than for examples of piety (or impiety) and the telling phrase.

The Carolines didn't idolise their heroes, knowing them all to be flawed, and willing to say so. Frank, in a Lenten sermon, expresses this vividly: "Who can look upon Noah's drunkenness, Lot's drunkenness and incest, David's adultery and murder, Solomon's carnality and idolatry, Adam's fall in Paradise, and the angels' in heaven itself, and not fear his own poor, easy, brittle earth?"<sup>2</sup>

The Carolines held the Bible the absolutely indispensable rule-book and textbook for Christian, Church and society. Its problem is that it requires interpretation. But human interpretation can lead to error, even on the part of the Fathers (!), whom the Carolines revered as impeccable 'authorities'. Basil said that "Sell all thou hast and follow me" applies to all Christians; Hales comments that "where all are sellers, none could be buyers!"<sup>3</sup> Reliance upon the Old Testament had to be defended, even in the believing Seventeenth Century. How can the Old Testament be redundant, Mede asks, when the New Testament writers constantly 'prove' their points by reference to it – baptism after circumcision, Sunday after Sabbath, Christian ministerial Orders after the Israelite priesthood, *inter alia*? We must go to the Old Testament to discover God's direct commands, together with the detailed practices of his faithful people, when these are not forthcoming – as so often they are not - in the New Testament.<sup>4</sup>

We are in 'pre-critical' times when we find Buckeridge beginning a sermon of 1617 with, "The author of the Psalms is David".<sup>5</sup> Likewise, a little

---

<sup>2</sup> Frank: *Sermons*, LACT I, p.413.

<sup>3</sup> 'Hard texts' in *Golden Remains*, p.20.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p.342.

<sup>5</sup> Buckeridge, Anthony: *Works*, p.A3.

later, Hammond, telling us that David wrote the Psalms, Solomon Proverbs.<sup>6</sup> Not that human authorship mattered all that much, since Seventeenth Century Christians of whatever hue believed in the verbal inspiration of Scripture. Boyes can say that the Ten Commandments are particularly special in Scripture, because God Himself spoke them, and God Himself wrote them.<sup>7</sup> Literalism can be of enormous help to the Caroline preacher, of course, finding meaning in details of the Old Testament, e.g. "Saul was anointed with a 'vial' of oil, to intimate the brittleness and shortness of his kingdom; but David with a 'horn', to signify the continuance and strength of his."<sup>8</sup> However, these men sometimes considered how best to 'understand' Scripture: some, e.g. Hammond, often depart from complete literalism when it provides problems.

Typology was supremely important. "In the volume of the book it is written of Me,' etc., i.e. either in the whole book, or in every folding, every leaf of this book, - thou shalt not find a story, a riddle, a prophecy, a ceremony, a downright legal constitution, but hath some manner of aspect on this glass, some way drives at this mystery, 'God manifest in flesh.' Thus Hammond. Events and personalities of the 'Christ Event' are foreshadowed, e.g. the Resurrection in Job.19.23-27.<sup>9</sup>; the Red Sea a type of the waters of baptism, in which sins, like the Egyptians, are washed away<sup>10</sup>.

The cross between typology and 'application' which the Carolines made their own was the identification of Stuart England with ancient Israel, particularly though not exclusively with the Davidic/Solomonic united kingdom. The

---

<sup>6</sup> *Works*, LACT I, p.34.

<sup>7</sup> *Exposition of Last Psalm*, p.88.

<sup>8</sup> *Frank; Sermons*, LACT I, p.152.

<sup>9</sup> *Hall; Works*, p.147.

<sup>10</sup> Taylor, Jeremy: *A Discourse on Baptism, its Institution and Efficacy upon all Believers, Together with a consideration of the Practice of the Church in Baptizing the Infants of Believing Parents, And the Practice Justified* (R.Royston, London, 1652), p.10.

Israel/England parallels stayed in the minds of many during the Interregnum. In 1660, William Towers, a Northamptonshire clergyman, can happily preach Charles II as “a persecuted David.” That the old comparisons – and their doctrinal implications – were still very much alive and kicking would soon be apparent, with all that that would entail to the cost of many who were not so convinced of them. Undoubtedly most royalists wanted to put the clock back, and not a few thought they could. The burden of Towers’s sermon is that kingly power resides in one person, and he cites monarchs as various as David, Solomon, Jehu and Nebuchadrezzar.<sup>11</sup> This brings us fairly and squarely to the characteristic doctrine which the Israel/England parallel caused the Carolines to preach: the so-called ‘Divine Right of Kings’. Quite simply, the King is appointed by God; Bramhall quotes Prov.8.15: “By me kings reign and princes decree justice.” And Diggs (on David): after the Bathsheba affair, when “he had abused *Uriah’s* wife, and contrived the death of so gallant a man”, David confesses (Ps.51.4): “Against thee, thee only have I sinned” – not against Uriah nor Bathsheba nor anyone else whose trust he may have betrayed by his infamous conduct, but only God, “because there was no Tribunal amongst men to which he was responsible.”<sup>12</sup> The king has to delegate his authority, as did Moses (Exod.18.13-26) and Jehoshaphat (II Chron.19.5).<sup>13</sup> The doctrine of Divine Right persisted as one of the most characteristic features of Caroline thought, so that Beveridge, e.g. regards kings as divinely appointed, to rule according to God’s will: “They are all but His deputies or vicegerents in their respective kingdoms and provinces, His ministers, to execute His laws and judgements.” (Prov.8.15,16 and Ps.2.10,11.)<sup>14</sup> Yet it

---

<sup>11</sup> *Hammond & 22 alii*, in Durham University Library, Cosin Collection, N.IV.30/12.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>13</sup> *Bramhall: Works, LACT* III, p.359.

<sup>14</sup> *Works, LACT* I, p.454.



suddenly evaporated in 1688, leaving the few Non-Jurors to retain it in some sort, rather pathetically, into the next century, when it fizzled out altogether.

The necessary corollary to royal authority was subjection of the people, and the Carolines were acutely aware of the need to preach this. Diggs states that democracy is not the will of God. Those who propose it are wilfully misinterpreting Scripture, as in, "...the people.....persuaded to take upon them God's Prerogative, and to usurpe his language, Ps.82.6, *We have said, ye are Gods.*" After the Restoration, passive obedience is preached: "Princes are like the bond of wedlock, once make them fathers of our country, and we take them for better, for worse; we may persuade them, we cannot compel them without breach of divine precepts; once make them be the Lord's anointed, and it is sacrilege to touch them, I mean unfittingly."<sup>15</sup> The Carolines acknowledge only one exception to the rule: one may disobey the King when he commands something contrary to the laws of God. "The guard of Saul refused justly to slay the priests of the Lord; and Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, to worship Nebuchadnezzar's golden image."<sup>16</sup> However, God can withdraw his favour, as from Saul.<sup>17</sup> The Carolines stoutly defended the King as Supreme Governor of the Church of England, 'proving' from Scripture that this was the only proper arrangement. "Lesser than God onely, from whom he immediately receives his power over all men, and all sorts of men, Priest and people, in all causes Civill and Spirituall."<sup>18</sup>

The Caroline vision was of a Church in which devout and learned clergymen were deservedly respected and heeded as essential to the household of

---

<sup>15</sup> Hickes: *The Case Stated*, p.5. One is moved to wonder whether Nell Gwyn and other ladies of the Court had by token of the adverb committed *lèse majesté*.....!

<sup>16</sup> Bramhall: *Works*, LACT III, p.351.

<sup>17</sup> Hammond: *Works*, LACT I, p.125.

<sup>18</sup> Buckeridge: Sermon of 1617, on Ps.95.6 The clergy: as teachers

faith. They did not limit them to a preaching function. Christian ministers are not only to rule and teach, but must also be priests – otherwise they would be inferior to the Jewish priesthood, and that cannot be. “Priests therefore they must be, otherwise the ministers of the Gospel are of a rank and order much meaner in many respects than that of the *cohens* or ministers of the law.”<sup>19</sup> In his *Of the Primitive Government of Churches*, Chapter VIII,<sup>20</sup> Thorndike traces bishops and priests back to the Old Testament; Beveridge tracks the threefold ministry back to the Israelite priesthood: Aaron (then the eldest son in subsequent generations) approximates to the Bishop; the ‘Sons of Aaron’ to priests; the Levites to deacons; Thorndike declares that the Apostolic Succession via the laying on of hands stems from Moses (Deut.34.9).

Together with episcopacy, liturgy provoked most of the opposition faced by the Carolines. To start with, they honoured sacred physical space: “Mede, Walter Balquancall, John Yates, Foulke Roberts, Peter Heylyn, and John Pocklington were all able to present a vision of an unbroken succession of houses and habitations claimed by and provided for God amongst his people, stretching from the earliest times in the Old Testament, through the tabernacle and the temple, to the Christian churches of the present.”<sup>21</sup> Christian worship had Jewish antecedents. Heylyn writes that it inevitably grew out of Jewish practice. Some synagogues became Christian churches, just as the Sabbath became Sunday.<sup>22</sup> The Fathers saw Melchisedek’s offering of bread and wine to Abraham as a type of the Eucharist – and they “were as afraid of idolatry as any of the Protestants.”

---

<sup>19</sup> Hicke: *Works*, LACT II, p.227.

<sup>20</sup> *Works*, LACT I, pp.36-39.

<sup>21</sup> Lake, P., in Kunze, B.Y. & Brautigam, D.D. (eds.): *Court, Country and Culture* (University of Rochester Press, 1992), p.167.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p.194f.

(!)<sup>23</sup> The Carolines held to a sacrificial doctrine of the Eucharist.<sup>24</sup> Mede points out that 'memorial' is much spoken of in the Old Testament with regard to sacrifices, e.g. in Lev.2,5,6,24.<sup>25</sup> Taylor produced a major work on baptism, asserting that its roots lie deep in the Old Dispensation.

Jewish worship is examined by many Carolines, especially its set forms; Frank, e.g., looks at synagogue worship for the roots of 'Hosanna', as an acclamation intermittent to a litany of prayers. It is thus respectable to use established forms and formal liturgy. These were actually less controversial than the Carolines' insistence upon ceremonial involving physical actions, and wrote much on the subject, finding considerable support in the Old Testament for their views. Outward uniformity was important only as an expression of beliefs, attitudes and feelings. Thus Buckeridge refers to the prophets' message about God's loathing ritual observance unaccompanied by proper intention and conduct. Nevertheless, outward ceremonial is essential in public worship, and Buckeridge cites Abraham (Gen.17.3,17), Moses (Dt.9.18), David (I "Paral".21.17), Solomon (I "Paral" 6.13), Elijah (I Kg.18.42) and Daniel (Dan.6.10) – plus many New Testament examples. Kneeling is actually ordered by God (I Kg.19.18, by inference; Isa.45.23)<sup>26</sup>

Cosin said, "Puritanisme and Popery, the Scilla [sic] and Charybdis of antient piety."<sup>27</sup> The Carolines established a respectable theology for the Church of England, avoiding both these extremes. Thus much of their work was polemical, or, at least, apologetic. The Puritan emphases in worship were

---

<sup>23</sup> Hicke: *Works*, LACT II, p.119.

<sup>24</sup> Stranks, *op.cit.*, p.137f.

<sup>25</sup> In *Reverence of God's House*.

<sup>26</sup> *1617 Sermon*, p.12.

<sup>27</sup> Cosin: correspondence, in Durham University Library, COS.1.21.



opposed. "Hearing, indeed, is a good part of Christianitie, but it is but a part....."<sup>28</sup>; Frank takes on the Calvinist view of grace by quoting Isa.55.1. Much Caroline comment consists of an aside in a sermon, an excursus in a theological work, or an occasional writing, perhaps epistolary, saving most of their effort for their defences against and attacks upon Rome. Sabbatarianism was a problem. On the Fourth Commandment the Carolines distinguished between the 'moral' and the 'ceremonial' law. "The moral part, which alone was still in force (the ceremonial part having been abrogated by Christ) simply contained the injunction to give due and convenient time to the worship of God. What constituted due and convenient time and the nomination of specific days and times for divine worship was a matter for the relevant human authorities – the Church and the Christian magistrate – to decide."<sup>29</sup> N.B.: Laudian anti-sabbatarianism was not typical of previous divines (Andrewes e.g., was quite sabbatarian) Although constantly accused of 'popery', the Carolines fought fiercely against it, though little of this effort was based on the Old Testament.

The Carolines were immersed in the Old Testament; they all knew their languages, and were eager to inform their people about the Scriptures, to explain difficulties, to find applications and to inspire reverence for the Word of God. They would examine the Hebrew text, instructing their congregations on the language, and extracting lessons from it. Reliance upon the verbal inspiration of scripture, coupled with detailed knowledge of Hebrew, enabled Caroline preachers to produce many homiletic points, e.g. that the plural form of אֱלֹהִים (Gen.1.1) shows the eternal existence of the Trinity (supported by *faciamus*).<sup>30</sup> Beveridge emphasises that it is plural, not dual - a strong hint of the Trinity in the

<sup>28</sup> Buckeridge: *1617 Sermon*, p.10.

<sup>29</sup> Lake, in Kunze-Brautigam, op.cit., p.161.

<sup>30</sup> Hammond: *Works*, LACT I, p.299.

Old Testament. The Carolines did not confine their studies to the Massoretic Text as they had it. They were familiar with and regularly had recourse to the Septuagint, the Peshitta, the Targums, Talmud and rabbis, the Fathers and pagans. They knew and approved of the Apocrypha, though didn't delve much into it, let alone quote it, probably because of its associations with Rome and the trouble they had with false accusations of 'popery'.

## APPENDIX II : PRIMARY SOURCES CONSULTED

Adams, Thomas: Workes (London, 1630)

Ainsworth, Henry: Annotations upon the five Bookes of Moses, the Booke of the Psalmes, and the Song of Songs, or Canticles. John Bellamie, London, 1627.

Ames, Wm.: The Marrow of Sacred Divinitie, drawne out of the Holy Scriptures (London, 1642)  
English Puritanisme, Containing the maine Opinions of the  
Rigidest sort of those that are called Puritans in the Realme  
Of England (London, 1641)

Andrewes, Lancelot: Sermons (LACT); Preces Privatae (LACT); Minor Works (LACT)  
Apospasmata Sacra or A Collection of posthumous and orphan  
Lectures (London, 1657) (Preface by 'T.P.' [//])

Aubrey, John: Brief Lives (London 1677)

Bayly, Lewis: The Practice of Piety (London, 1669)

Barber, R. (ed.): John Aubrey's Brief Lives ( Boydell Press, 1982)

Baxter, Richard: Vindication of the Church of England In her Rites and Ceremonies, Discipline and Church-Orders (abstracted from Baxter's writings) (London, 1682)

Five Disputations of Church-Government, and Worship  
(London, 1659)

Bayly: The Unlawfulnesses and danger of Limited Episcopacie

Baynes, Mark: Diocesan Trials (London, 1641)

Benefield, Sebastian: Works

Commentary on Amos (Latin) (London, 1615)

Beveridge: Works (LACT)



Boyes, John: An Exposition of the Principal Scriptures used in our English Liturgie Together with a Reason why the Church did chuse the same  
(Felix Kyngston, London, 1610)

An Exposition of the Proper Psalmes used in our English Liturgie Together with a reason why the Church did chuse the same  
(Wm. Aspley, London, 1616)

Exposition of the Last Psalm

Notes on the Final Revision of the Authorised Version, edited by  
Allen, W. (Allen Lane, 1970)

Boyle, R: Some Considerations touching the Style of the Holy Scriptures  
(London, 1661)

Some Motives and Incentives To the Love of God (etc)  
(London, 1661)

Excellency of Theology or The Preeminence of the Study of Divinity, above that of Natural Philosophy (London 1665)

Bramhall: Works LACT

Brightman: Predictions and Prophecies Written 46 yeares since; Concerning The three Churches of Germanie, England and Scotland, Foretelling the miserie of Germanie, the fall of the pride of Bishops in England by the assistance of the Scottish Kirk,  
(London, 1641)

Brightman: The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes (ed. Burn), Methuen,  
4<sup>th</sup> Ed'n, 1949

Broughton, Hugh: Observations upon the first ten Fathers (London, 1612)  
Textes of Scripture; commentary on Daniel (London, 1612?) Concent of Scripture.  
The Works of the Great Albionian Divine Renown'd in Many Nations For Rare Skill in Salems and Athens Tongues And familiar Acquaintance with all Rabbinical Learning, Mr. Hugh Broughton.  
(London, 1662)

Buckeridge Funeral sermon for Lancelot Andrewes, 1626.

Works (LACT)

A Sermon preached before His Majestie, Touching Prostration and Kneeling in the worship of God, To which is added a Discourse concerning Kneeling at the Communion (London, 1618)

Cartwright: Conference between the late King of England, and the late Lord Marquess of Worcester, Together with a Vindication of the Protestant Cause [by Cartwright - "which the necessity of the King's Affaires denied him Oportunity to Answer"]  
(London, 1651)

Chillingworth: Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation  
Works

Cosin, John: Works LACT Vols 35-39

Digg(e)s, Dudley: The Unlawfulness of Subjects taking up arms against their Sovereigne (London, 1647)

Dod, John: A plaine and familiar Exposition of the Ten Commandments, With a Methodicall Short Catechisme (London, 1632)

Dorman, The Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes (2 vols)

-- Lancelot Andrewes: a Perennial Preacher of the Post-Reformation Church of England (Fenestra Books 2005)

Duppa, Brian: Holy Rules and Helps to Devotion (Written in the Time of his Sequestration) (London, 1679)

Ferrar, Nicholas: Concordances or Harmonies of the Scriptures

Frank, Mark: Works in LACT

Fuller: Church History of Britain (ed. Nichols) London 1842 (3 Vols.)

Worthies of England

Holy State and Profane State (ed. Nichols) London, 1841

Sermons

Lives and Deaths of Moderne Divines (London 1651)

Geneva Bible –1560 edition

Goodwin, John: The Divine Authority of the Scriptures Asserted (London, 1648)  
[NB Marginal notes in Latin]

Goodwin, Thos.: Works (London, 1866)

Moses and Aaron. Civil and Ecclesiastical Rites Used by the Ancient Hebrewes; observed, and at large opened, for the

Clearing of many obscure Texts throwout the whole Scripture (London, 1666)

Gouge, William: Workes (London, 1627)

England's Preservation

Short Catechisme

Greenham, Richard: The Workes of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of  
Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, Minister and Preacher  
Of the Word of God  
(edited by Henry Holland; London, 1605)

Hales, John A Tract concerning Schisme and Schismaticks, wherein is briefly  
Discovered the Original Causes of all Schisme (for R.B., London,  
2<sup>nd</sup> impression, 1642)  
Golden Remains of the ever Memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eton  
Colledge etc. (Robert Pawlet, London, 2<sup>nd</sup> Impression, 1673)

Hall, Joseph: A Plain and familiar Explication (by way of Paraphrase) of all the  
Hard Texts of the whole Divine Scripture of the old [sic] and New  
Testament [sic] by Jos. Exon. (Nathaniel Butter, London,  
1633)(dedication to King Charles I)

The Works of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, with a Table newly  
added To the whole Worke (John Havilland, London, 1628)

Hammond: Works LACT

Hammond and 22 alii 1623-70

Hewison, P.E. (ed.) Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Writings (Carcanet Press,  
1995)

Heylyn P: History of the Sabbath

Cyprianus Anglicus (London, 1668)

Ecclesia Vindicata (London, 1657)

Hickes, George: Works LACT

Isaacson, Henry: An exact Narration of the Life and Death of the late  
reverend and Learned Prelate, and painfull Divine, Lancelot  
Andrewes, Late Bishop of Winchester. (London, 1650)

Jessey, Henry (and 7 others (Jos. Caryl, Geo. Cockayne, Ralph Vening, Wm. Dell,  
Matt. Barker, Wm. Adderley & Matt. Mead): Greek – English Lexicon (with 'Idea  
of Gk & Heb dialects')

Josselin, Ralph: Diary (Camden Society, London, 1908)



Keach, Benjamin: Tropologia, or a Key to Open the Scripture Metaphors  
(London, 1681)

Troposchemalogia: Tropes and Figures; or, a Treatise  
Of the Metaphors, Allegories and express Similitudes  
Etc. contained in the Bible of the Old and New Testaments  
(London, 1682)

The Jewish Sabbath Abrogated, or The Saturday  
Sabbatarians Confuted (London, 1700)

Kidder, Richard: A Commentary on the Five Books of Moses: with a Dissertation  
Concerning the Author or Writer of the said Books; and a  
General Argument to each of them.  
(2 Vols, Wm.Rogers, London, 1694)

Knappen, M.M.: Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries (Peter Smith, Gloucester,  
Massachusetts, 1966)

Laslett, Peter: Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer  
(Blackwell, 1949)

Laud Wm: Works LACT Vols 57-66

Lightfoot, John: Works: ed.Pitman, J.R., 1845, as The Whole Works of  
John Lightfoot, D.D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge,

London, William: A Catalogue of The most vendible Books in England, Orderly  
and Alphabetically Digested; Under the Heads of [26 subject  
areas] etc. With Hebrew, Greek and Latin Books for Schools  
and Scholars. The like Work never yet performed by any.  
(London, 1658)

Mall, Thomas: A Cloud of Witnesses, Or, The Sufferers Mirrour (collected from  
The writings of Ward and Foxe) (London, 1665)

McIlwaine, C.H.: The Political Works of James I (Harvard, 1918)

Mede, Joseph: The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede,  
B.D., Sometime Fellow of Christ's College in Cambridge,  
corrected and Enlarged according to the Author's own Manuscripts.

- Richard Royston, London, 1672

(Bk.I dedicated to Charles I; Bk.II to Wm.Laud, when Archbishop)

Montague, Rd: A New Gag for an Old Goose (1624)

Morton A Catholike Appeale for Protestants (London, 1610)

Of the Institution of the Sacrament (London, 1631) [very anti-Roman]

Nalson, John: *The common interest of king and people: showing the original, Antiquity and excellency of monarchy, compared with aristocracy And democracy, and particularly of our English monarchy: and That absolute, papal and Presbyterian popular supremacy are utterly Inconsistent with prerogative, property and liberty.*  
(London, 1678)

Overall: *Works* (excerpts from several tomes of, e.g. biography of others, editions of Hooker's Works, etc.)

*Convocation Book*

Owen, John: *Works* (ed. W.H. Gould, London, 1851)

Peel, A.: *Tracts ascribed to Richard Bancroft* (Cambridge, 1953)

Perkins: *The Works of That Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ, in the Universitie of Cambridge, M.W. Perkins* (Cambridge, 1605)

Prideaux H: *The Old and New Testament, Connected in the History of the Jews and Neighbouring Nations, from the Declensions of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ.*  
(18<sup>th</sup>. Edition, 4 Vols., Baynes & Son, London, 1821.)

Rainolds (Reynolds): - *Works*

*The Summe of the Conference between John Rainoldes And John Hart: Touching the Head and the Faith of The Church, Whereunto is attached a treatise intituled Six Conclusions Touching the Holie Scripture and the Church* (London, 1584)

- 
- *The Prophetie of Haggai, Interpreted and applied in sundry Sermons By that Famous and Judicious Divine, John Rainolds, D.D. Never before printed, Beeing very usefull for these Times*  
(London 1649)

Sanderson: *Works*

*XXXV Sermons* (London, 1681 [but written by 1667])

Smart, Peter: *Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of Durham, July 7<sup>th</sup>, 1628 (contra Cosin)* (London?, 1640)

*SMECTYMNVVS* (Simon Marshall et al): various writings, mainly rebutting the protests of the eponymous collective, and including Andrewes's *Episcopacy*  
(in response to letters from Peter Moulin); Thomas Underhill, London, 1641

Smith, Henry: treatises on marriage, usury and the Lord's supper

Smith, John: Discourse on Legal Righteousness and the Righteousness of Faith  
(Jewish / Talmudic / Kabbalah exegesis)

Spark, R. & Seddon, J.: Of Catechising and Catechism for Children  
(Oxford, 1588 – translation of Heidelberg Catechism, 1562, with additions)

Sparrow: A Rationale or Practical Exposition of the Book of Common Prayer  
(7<sup>th</sup>.Edition, London, 1722)

Story GM(ed): Lancelot Andrewes: Sermons (1967)

Taylor, Jeremy: A Discourse on Baptisme, its Institution and Efficacy upon all Believers, Together with a Consideration of the Practice of the Church in Baptizing the Infants of Beleiving Parents, And the Practice Justified (R.Royston,London,1652)

Thorndike: Works (LACT)

Ussher, James: Works

Annales Veteris Testamenti (London, 1658)

Body of Divinitie or The Summe and Substance of the Christian Religion, Immanuel (London, 1645)

The Power Communicated by God to the Prince and the Obedience Required of the Subject (London, 1661)

Walton: The Considerator Considered (commentary on London Polyglot)  
(London, 1659)

Westminster Assembly: Articles of Religion (London, 1648)  
Larger Catechism (London, 1647)

Wilson: Works LACT

Wotton: Tracts of the Anglican Fathers, Part III: Andrews and Bancroft  
(Painter, London, 1839)

Author? An Accompt of all the Proceedings of the Commissioners of both Perswasions (etc) (1661 Conference) London, 1661

Author? A Petition of Peace (etc) (with a near contemporary handwritten addendum "With a fforme of Divine Service, or Liturgy, Comonly called M.Baxters Liturgy" (London, 1661)

Author? Declaration of the Faith and Order of.....the Congregational Churches in England (London, 1658)



### APPENDIX III : SECONDARY SOURCES CONSULTED

Addleshaw, G.W.O.: The High Church Tradition (1941)

Alexander, M. van C.: The Growth of English Education, 1348-1648  
(Pennsylvania University Press, 1990)

Ashley, A.: England in the Seventeenth Century (Penguin, revised 1960)

Askew, R.: Muskets and Altars (Mowbray, 1997)

Baskerville, Stephen: Not Peace but a Sword: the political theology of  
The English Revolution (Routledge, 1993)

Baskin, J.R.: Pharaoh's Counsellors: Job, Jethro and Bala'am in Rabbinic and  
Patristic Tradition (Scholars Press, 1983)

Blench, J.W.: Preaching in England in the late 16th and 17th Centuries  
(Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1964)

Bloch, Marc: The Royal Touch (Dorset Press, New York, 1989)

Bobrick, Benson: The Making of the English Bible (Weidenfeld & Nicolson,  
2001)

Bolton FR: The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland (SPCK 1958)

Bosher, R.S.: The Making of the Restoration Settlement (Dacre Press, 1951)

Bourne, E.C.E.: The Anglicanism of William Laud (SPCK, 1947)

Bowker, J.: The Targums and Rabbinic Literature (CUP, 1969)

Braaten, C.E. & Jensen, R.W. (eds.): Reclaiming the Bible for the Church  
(T & T Clark, 1996)

Bradley, Ian C.: God save the Queen: the spiritual dimension of monarchy  
(Darton Longman and Todd, 2002)

Braithwaite, W.C.: The Beginnings of Quakerism (Macmillan, 1923)

Brightman: The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes (ed. Burn), Methuen,  
4<sup>th</sup> Ed'n, 1949

Brown, Colin: Christianity and Western Thought, Vol.I (Apollos, 1990)

Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol.III From Reformation to Present

- Campagnac, ET: The Cambridge Platonists (Oxford, 1901)
- Carlton, C: Archbishop William Laud (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987)
- Chadwick, H. & Ward, A. (eds.) : Not Angels, but Anglicans (Canterbury Press, 2000)
- Chadwick, O: The Reformation (Penguin, 3<sup>rd</sup>.edition, 1972)
- Cole, C.R. & Moody, M.E. (eds.): The Dissenting Tradition (Ohio Univ. Press, 1975)
- Costello, W.T.: The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth Century Cambridge (Harvard Univ.Press, 1958)
- Cragg, G.R.: From Puritanism to the Age of Reason(CUP, 1950)  
The Church and the Age of Reason (Pelican, Hodder, 1960)
- Daiches, D: The K.J.Version of the Eng.Bible (University of Chicago, 1941)
- Dale, R.W.: History of English Congregationalism (Hodder & Stoughton, 1907)
- Daniel, Evan: The Prayer Book: history, language & contents (Gardner, Dartons & Co., 1905)
- Daniell, D.: The Bible in English (Yale Univ.Press, 2003)
- Davies, E.T.: Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1950)
- Davies, G.: The Early Stuarts 1603-1660 (Oxford Clarendon Press; 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.1955)
- Davies, Horton: Worship and Theology in England, 1603-1690  
(Pinceton Univ.Press, 1975)
- Davies, Julian: The Caroline Captivity of the Church (Clarendon, 1992)
- DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY, 1897 and 2004
- De Lange, N.: Hebrew Scholarship and the Medieval World (Cambridge, 2001)
- Dorman, Marianne: The Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes (2 vols., Pentland 1992)
- Lancelot Andrewes: a Perennial Preacher of the Post-Reformation Church of England (Fenestra Books 2005)
- Duncan-Jones AS: Laud (life)(Macmillan, 1927)
- (Durstun, C. & Eales, J. (eds) The Culture of English Puritanism 1560-1  
(Macmillan, 1996)
- Ferrell, L.A.: Government by Polemic (Stanford Univ.Press, 1998)

- Figgis, J.N.: Theory of Divine Right of Kings (CUP, 1896)
- Fincham: Early Stuart Church (Macmillan, 1993)  
Prelate as Pastor (Clarendon, 1990)
- Firth, K.R.: The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645  
(Oxford, 1979)
- Frere, W.H. Lancelot Andrewes (Lecture to Church Historical Society, 1897;  
SPCK 1899)  
English Church of Elizabeth I & James I  
Lancelot Andrewes as a representative of Anglican principles
- Gardiner, S.R.: Laud (in Dictionary of National Biography, 1892)
- Gardner, Helen: The Business of Criticism (OUP, 1959)
- George, C.H. & K.: The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640 (Princeton Univ.Press, 1961)
- Gilley, S. & Sheils, W.J. (eds): A History of Religion in Britain (Blackwell, 1994)
- Grisbrooke: Anglican Liturgies (1958)
- Hall, B.: The Great Polyglot Bibles (1966)
- Hart, A.Tindal: Clergy and Society 1600-1800 (S.P.C.K., 1968)
- Hensley Henson, H.: Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century  
(John Murray, 1903)
- Hewison, P.E. (ed.) Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Writings (Carcenet Press, 1995)
- Higham, Florence: Catholic and Reformed (SPCK, 1962)
- Lancelot Andrewes (SCM, 1952)
- Hill, C.: The World Turned Upside Down (Penguin, 1972)
- Hoffman, J.G.: John Cosin, 1595-1672, Bishop of Durham and Champion of The Caroline Church (UMI Dissertation Services, 1997)
- Huntley, F.L.: Bishop Joseph Hall 1574-1656, a biographical and critical study  
(D.S.Brewer Ltd, Cambridge, 1979)
- Hutton, W.H.: The English Church from the accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1903)
- Hylson-Smith, K.: The Churches in England from Elizabeth I to Elizabeth II  
(Vol.I, 1558-1688, SCM Press, 1996)



High Churchmanship in the Church of England C16 to C20  
(T & T Clark, 1993)

Inge (ed) Aphorisms [re Whichcote] (London 1930)

- The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought  
(Longmans, Green, 1926)

Johnson, Margot (ed.): John Cosin (Durham Turnstone Ventures, 1997)

Jones, R.M.: Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries  
(Macmillan, 1914)

Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth  
(Harvard Univ. Press, 1932)

Joyce, J.W: Convocations of the Clergy (Gregg, 1967, republished)

Kantorowicz, E.H.: The King's Two Bodies: a study in mediaeval political Theology (Princeton Univ. Press, 1997)

Kamesar, Adam: Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible  
(Clarendon, 1993)

Kilmister, C.A.A.(ed.): When will ye be wise? (Blond & Briggs, 1983)

Knappen, M.M.: Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries (Peter Smith, Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1966)

Knox, R.B.: Reformation Conformity & Dissent (Epworth Press, 1977)

Kunze, B.Y. & Brautigam, D.D. (eds.): Court, Country & Culture  
(University of Rochester Press, 1992)

Lake, P. & Questier, M., (eds): Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church 1560-1660

Laslett, Peter: Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer  
(Blackwell, 1949)

LIBRARY OF ANGLO CATHOLIC THEOLOGY [LACT] (Oxford 1841 and later)

Lloyd Jones, G.: The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language  
(Manchester Univ. Press, 1983)

Loades, D.M. (ed.) : Word and Worship (Davenant Press, 2005)

Loewe: article in Encyclopaedia Judaica, on Christian Hebraists.

- Lossky, N: Lancelot Andrewes, Preacher (Clarendon Press, 1991)
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid: Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490-1700  
(Penguin, 2003)
- McAdoo HR: The Spirit of Anglicanism (A. & C.Black, 1965)
- The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology (Longmans, Green & Co., 1949)
- McKane, W.: Selected Christian Hebraists (CUP, 1989)
- McGrath, A.: In the Beginning: the Story of the King James Bible  
(Hodder & Stoughton, 2001)  
The Twilight of Atheism (Doubleday, 2004)
- McIlwaine, C.H.: The Political Works of James I (Harvard, 1918)
- McManners, John (ed.): The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity  
(OUP, 1990)
- Middleton, A.: Fathers and Anglicans (Gracewing, 2001)
- The Peculiar Character of Anglicanism (Prayer Book Society, undated)
- Milton, A.: Catholic and Reformed (CUP, 1995)
- Mitchell WF: English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson (SPCK, 1932)
- Moody (ed): The Dissenting Tradition (Ohio Univ.Press, 1975)
- Moorman, J.R.H.: A History of the Church in England (A.&C.Black, 1952)
- More P E & Cross, F.L. Anglicanism SPCK 1952
- Morgan, J.: Godly Learning CUP, 1986)
- New, J.F.H.: Anglicans and Puritans (Adam & Charles Black, 1964)
- Nicolson, Adam: Power and Glory (HarperCollins, 2003)
- Nineham, D.(ed.): The Church's Use of the Bible (SPCK 1963)
- Nuttall, G.F.: Visible Saints (Blackwell, 1957)
- O'Day, R. & Heal, F.: Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800  
(Leicester University Presss, 1981)
- Oesterley, W.O.E. & Box, G.H.: A Short Survey of the Literature of

Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism (SPCK, 1920)

Oldridge, D.: Religion and Society in Early Stuart England (Ashgate, 1998)

Ollard & Spens (eds) English Theologians (London 1924)

Opfell, Olga S.: The KJ Bible Translators (McFarland, 1982)

Orr: Reason and Authority (Clarendon Press, 1967)

Osmond, PH: Cosin [life] (Mowbray, 1913)

Ottley, R.L: Andrewes (Methuen, 1894)

Overton, J.H.: Andrewes (in Dictionary of National Biography, 1892)

Owst, G.R.: Literature and Pulpit in Mediaeval England (Cambridge, 1933)

Packer, J.W.: The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643-1660  
(Manchester University Press, 1969)

Parker JH: An Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer (1877)

Partridge, E. & Potter, S.: English Biblical Translation (Andre Deutsch, 1973)

Pearsall Smith, L.: The Golden Grove (Clarendon Press, 1930)

Peel, A.: Tracts ascribed to Richard Bancroft (Cambridge, 1953)

Price, D. & Ryrie, C.C.: Let it Go among Our People (Lutterworth Press, 2004)

Procter & Frere: History of BCP (Macmillan, 1902)

Reventlow, H.G.: The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World  
(SCM Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1983)

Roberts JD: From Puritanism to Platonism in 17<sup>th</sup> Century England (Hague 1968)

Perry, C.G.: The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643-1660, with special reference to Henry Hammond (Manchester, 1969)

Robinson, H.W.: Ancient English Versions of the Bible (Oxford, 1940)

Romer, J.: Testament: the Bible and History (Michael O'Mara Books, 1988)

Rosenau, Wm.: Hebraisms in the AV of the Bible (Philadelphia: R. West, 1978)  
(original 1903)



Rosenbaum & Silberman: Targum Onkelos Haphtaroth, Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary (Hebrew Publishing Co., New York, 1947)

Rowell, G.: The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism (IKON, 1992)

Rupp, G.: Just Men: Historical Pieces (Epworth, 1977)

Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition  
(Cambridge, 1947)

Russell, A.T.: Memoir of the Life and Work of Lancelot Andrewes (1860)

Russell, C.: The Causes of the English Civil War (Clarendon Press, 1990)

(ed.): Origins of the English Civil War

Sangster, P.: A History of the Free Churches (Heinemann, 1983)

Savage, Pam: 17<sup>th</sup> Century Knutsford (Intec Publishing, 2003)

Schama, S.: A History of Britain, Vol.II: The British War 1603-1776  
(BBC, 2001)

Sharp, K. & Lake, P. (eds.): Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England  
(Macmillan, 1994)

Schroder, K.: The Birth of Modern Critical Theology (SCM, 1990)

Shuckburgh, E.S. (ed.): Dillingham, W.: Lawrence Chaderton, D.D.  
(Macmillan & Bowes, Cambridge, 1884)

Singer, C. & Bevan, E.R. (eds.): The Legacy of Israel (Oxford, 1928)

Smalley, B.: The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Blackwell, Oxford;  
3<sup>rd</sup> edn, 1983)

Smyth, Charles: The Cambridge Puritans (Cambridge Review, 1<sup>st</sup>.Feb., 1947)

Sommerville, J.P.: Politics and Ideology in England '1603-1640 (Longman,  
1986)

Sparrow, W.J.: Archbishop Bramhall (1927)

Spurr, J.: The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689 (Yale, 1991)]

English Puritanism (NY St Martin's Press, 1998)

Stanwood, P.G. & O'Connor, D: John Cosin: a Collection of Private Devotions (Oxford, 1967)

Story GM(ed): Lancelot Andrewes: Sermons (Clarendon Press, 1967)

Stranks, C.J.: The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor (SPCK, 1952)

Strong, R.: The Spirit of Britain (Hutchinson, 1999)

Sykes, N.: The English Religious Tradition (SCM, 1953)

Taliaferro, C. & Teply, Alison T. (eds): Cambridge Platonist Spirituality. (N.Y. Paulist Press, 2004)

Trevelyan, G.M.: England under the Stuarts (Methuen, 21<sup>st</sup> Ed., 1949)

Trevor-Roper, H.R.: Archbishop Laud 1573-1645 (Macmillan, 1940)

Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans in C17th Century  
(Secker & Warburg, 1987)

From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution  
(Secker & Warburg, 1992)

Tyacke, N.R.N.: Anti-Calvinists (OUP, 1987)

Usher, R.G.: The Reconstruction of the English Church (Publisher unlisted, 1910)

Wakefield, G.S.: Puritan Devotion (Epworth Press, 1957)

Wakeman, H.O.: History of the Church of England (Rivingtons, 1897)

Ward, A.: Translating for King James (Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1969)

Watkins, O.C.: The Puritan Experience (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972)

Watson, F.: The English Grammar Schools to 1660 (Frank Cass, 1968)

Wedgwood, C.V.: The King's Peace 1637-1641 (Collins, 1955)

Welsby, P.A.: Lancelot Andrewes SPCK 1958

Whiting, C.E.: Nathaniel Lord Crewe (SPCK, 1940)

Williamson, Hugh Ross: Jeremy Taylor (Dennis Dobson, 1952)

Williams, A.T.P.: The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England (SCM, 1947)

Wolfe: Complete Works of John Milton (Yale 1953)

Wotton: Tracts of the Anglican Fathers, Part III: Andrews and Bancroft  
(Painter, London, 1839)

Yarchin, W.: History of Biblical Interpretation (Hendrickson, 2004)



**PAGE  
NUMBERING  
AS ORIGINAL**

## APPENDIX IV : BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES<sup>1</sup>

### AINSWORTH [1571 – 1622]

Educated: poss. Cambridge, but prob. not graduate.

Translated the Bible into English while in Amsterdam,<sup>2</sup> as leader of a separatist congregation.

### AMES, William [1576 – 1633]

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge; Fellow.

Strict Calvinist; 1610 left for Low Countries as leading theologian of group of 'occasionally conformist Congregationalists'; observed Synod of Dort 1619; 1622 Professor of theology, Friesland.

Works: *English Puritanisme, Containing the Main Opinions of the rigidest sort of those that are called Puritans in the Realme of England; An Accompt of all the Proceedings Of the Commissioners of both Perswasions* (etc);

*A Petition for Peace* (etc) (with a near-contemporary handwritten addition "With a fforme of Divine Service, or Liturgy, Comonly called M.BaxtersLiturgy") - prolix, but massively allusive to all parts of Scripture, even more than BCP, and including Psalter; *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*; influential works on ethics, inc. *Conscience*.

### BANCROFT, Richard [1544 – 1610]

Educated: Christ's & Jesus Colls, Cambridge, where between 1580 and 1590 he led opposition to Puritans (though not himself anti-Calvinist).

Treasurer St.Paul's 1586; Canon Westminster 1587;

Bishop of London 1597; led anti-Puritan party at Hampton Court Conference; laid down rules for AV translators (though he had earlier opposed the exercise); Archbishop of Canterbury 1604. 1604 Canons largely his work.

Opposed Presbyterians; assisted in re-establishment of episcopacy in Scotland.

---

<sup>1</sup>For much of these I am indebted to the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography [DNB] (1894 and 2004), the New Encyclopaedia Britannica (15<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1994) and the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (ed. Cross, F.L. & Livingstone, E.A., 1984).

<sup>2</sup> Greenslade, in Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol.III, p.188.

**BARROW, Henry [1550 – 1593]**

Educated: Clare Hall, Cambridge.

Courtier, then (1580) became strict Puritan and separatist; imprisoned with Greenwood 1586; charged with sedition 1590, eventually hanged.

Works: *A True Description of the Visible Congregation of Saints; A Brief Discovery of the False Church.*

**BARROW, Isaac [1614 – 1680]**

Educated: Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Fellow; ejected as royalist 1643; Chaplain of New Coll., Oxford 1643; in 'retirement' 1645-1660; reinstated to Fellowship, also of Eton, and Rector of Downham, Cambs., 1660; Bishop of Sodor & Man 1663; of St. Asaph 1669. Firmly Caroline, but tolerant/moderate. Noted for benevolence, founding schools, building churches; excellent pastor.

**BARROW, Isaac [1630 – 1677] (nephew of above)**

Educated: Trinity Coll., Cambridge.

BA 1648; Fellow 1649; ordained 1660, after travels in Europe and Near East; Prof. Greek, Cambridge 1660; Lucasian Prof. Maths 1663; 1669 resigned Chair in favour of student Newton, then devoted himself to divinity.

Royal chaplain 1670; Master of Trinity Coll., Cambridge 1673; Vice-Chancellor 1675.

Works: *Lectiones Geometricae*; Euclid's *Elements: The Whole Fifteen Books*; other mathematical treatises.

Noted as a preacher.

**BAXTER, Richard [1615 – 1691]**

Educated:

Ordained 1638; Rector Kidderminster 1641 – 1660 – hugely successful pastoral and preaching ministry;

A 'liberal' Puritan, especially with regard to scriptural authority; also in other ways: believer in limited monarchy, supported Restoration, but opposed episcopacy (though would have accepted a limited form).

Leader of Puritan party at Savoy Conference: tedious and frequent contributions were counter-productive, irritating 'Anglicans'

Persecuted for 20 years, imprisoned 1685; leading Nonconformist after 1688.

Works: huge output of more than 200: devotional manuals, pastoral handbooks, and controversial writings: *Aphorismes of Justification* (1649); *The Saints' Everlasting Rest* (1650); *The Reformed Pastor* (1656); *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (posthumous autobiographical material, 1696).



**BEDWELL, William [1561/2 – 1632]**

Educated: Trinity Coll., Cambridge.

Rector St.Ethelburgh's, London 1601; Vicar of Tottenham 1607.

Noted as mathematician and Arabic scholar ('father of Arabic studies in England'); AV Translator.

Works: translations into Arabic of St.John's Epistles, and other parts of New Testament; also mathematical works. MS of his Arabic Lexicon used by Castell in his *Lexicon Heptaglotton*.

**BEVERIDGE, William [1637-1708]**

Educated: St.John's, Cambridge.

Vicar of Ealing, 1661; of St.Peter, Cornhill (City), 1672; Canon of Chichester, 1673; of St.Paul's, 1674; Archdeacon of Colchester, 1681; Prebendary of Canterbury, 1684; Bishop of St.Asaph, 1704.

Works: several sermons, esp. a celebrated one on the BCP; *Canons of the Greek and Latin Churches; Excellency and Use of the Oriental Tongues*. NB: early support for Sheldon and Sanderson; a devout and very conscientious parish priest; pastorally-minded Archdeacon; declined Bath & Wells, for "would not eat Dr.Ken's bread" (he was a fairly loyal latter-day Caroline); a founder of SPCK; with Dean Stanley (whom he appointed) promoted use of Welsh translations of Bible and BCP. Noted in his day chiefly as an orientalist.<sup>3</sup>

**BOIS (BOY[E]S, John [1561 - 1644]**

Educated: St.John's Coll. and Magdalen Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow of St.John's 1580; ordained 1583; lectured in Greek; Rector of West Stow 1591; of Holt, nr.Cambridge 1596; resigned Fellowship on marriage; AV Translator, and rep. of his Company on final revision committee; assisted Savile on Chrysostom edition; Preb. Ely (appointed by Andrewes) 1615.

Works: not prolific; notes on Chrysostom work; valuable notes on proceedings of AV revision committee.

**BRAMHALL, John [1594-1663]**

Educated: Sidney Sussex, Cambridge.

Rector of St.Martin's, York, 1617; of South Kilvington, Yorkshire, 1618; Prebendary of Ripon, 1623; of York, 1632; Treasurer of Christ Church, Dublin, 1633; also Archdeacon of Meath; Bishop of Derry, 1634;

---

<sup>3</sup> Box,G.H., in Bevan,E.R. & Singer,C.(eds.): *The Legacy of Israel* (Oxford, 1928), p.350.

Greatly assisted Strafford in Ireland; impeached and imprisoned, 1641-2; in exile, 1644-1660 (Brussels, Ireland, various locations in the Low Countries); Archbishop of Armagh, 1660. Staunchly Caroline.

Works: mainly polemical, responding to various positions; 7 books of arguments against Hobbes.

NB: protégé of Laud and Toby Matthew. T.S.Eliot thought him the link between Andrewes's generation and Taylor's, especially in Ireland.<sup>4</sup>

### **BRIGHTMAN, Thomas [1562 – 1607]**

Educated: Queens' Coll., Cambridge. Fellow 1584; BD 1591; Rector of Hawnes (Beds). Apocalypticist – mainly based on Revelation.

Works: Commentary on Song of Songs; minor apocalypticist writings.

### **BROUGHTON, Hugh [1549 – 1612]**

Educated: Magdalene Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow St. John's 1570; Christ's 1572; Prebendary of Durham 1578; Rector of Washington 1580; moved to London 1583 (where he held daily Bible readings and discussions in Hebrew with his students) to Germany 1589; unsuccessfully sought bishopric of Tuam; remained in Germany until last two years of life, when was chaplain to English-speaking community at Middelburg, Holland. "Most proficient Hebraist of his day"<sup>5</sup>; campaigned for a new English translation of the Bible - though abrasive personality cost him his place among AV translators (whose work he unsurprisingly criticised). Apocalypticist.

Works: *A Concoct of Scripture* (1588) – defence of authority of Bible (attacked by Lively and Rainolds); *Treatise of Melchisedek*

Translations and commentaries on Daniel, Ecclesiastes, Job, Lamentations and Revelation. Summary paraphrases of Job (in dialogue form) and Ecclesiastes.

### **BUCKERIDGE, John [1561?-1631]**

Educated: St. John's, Oxford.

Fellow of St. John's (and tutor to Wm. Laud), 1589; BD, 1592; Chaplain to Earl of Essex, 1595; Chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, 1596, also Rector of Farnbridge, Essex; Rector of Kilworth, Leicestershire, 1599, and D.D.; Archdeacon of Northampton and Prebendary of Hereford, 1604 (royal appointment); Vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate (succeeding Andrewes), 1605 (royal appointment); President of St. John's, 1606; also Canon of Windsor (royal appointment); Rector of Southfleet, Kent, 1610; Bishop of Rochester, 1611; of Ely, 1628.

Works: *De Potestate Papae*, 1614 – response to Bellarmine.

---

<sup>4</sup> McCafferty, J. in DNB.

<sup>5</sup> Lloyd Jones, G., in DNB.



NB great early (formative?) influence on Laud, who nominated him as his successor at St.John's. More 'Catholic' than Andrewes, e.g. holding that ceremonial "must not be admitted as an indifferent thing".<sup>6</sup> Preached at Andrewes's funeral, and (with Laud) edited Andrewes's XCVI Sermons, at the King's command.

**CARTWRIGHT, Christopher [1602 – 1658]**

Educated: Peterhouse, Cambridge.

BA 1620; Fellow 1625; clergyman in York.

Works: many sermons; 'Correspondence' between King and Marquess of Worcester; *Electa Thargumico-Rabbinica* and other works on Hebraic Matters (as Hebraist, places much reliance on rabbis)

**CARTWRIGHT, Thomas [1535 – 1603]**

Educated: St.John's Coll., Cambridge (left on Mary's succession 1653).

Fellow of Trinity Cambridge 1558; retired to Ireland 1565-67;

Lady Margaret Prof. at Cambridge 1569 ; proto-presbyterian (Whitgift's chief opponent in the university); deprived 1570, left for Geneva; returned 1585, arraigned before Court of High Commission, but acquitted, 1590-92; drew up Millenary Petition 1603.

Widely regarded as most able and learned of C16th Puritans: designated leader of party at Hampton Court, but died before it was convened.

**CASTELL, Edmund [1606 – 1685]**

Educated: Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge. (Aged 15 when went up!)

Fellow of Emmanuel; BD 1635; DD and Fellow St.John's, 1661;

assisted Walton with *Biblia Polyglotta* of 1659, largely responsible for the Samaritan, Syriac, Ethiopic and Arabic versions; also great friend of Lightfoot; Chaplain to King 1666; Preb.Canterbury and Prof. of Arabic at Cambridge, 1667; later held three successive livings, in Essex and Bedfordshire.

Works: *Lexicon Heptaglotton* his *magnum opus*; minor works, inc. some poetry.

**CHADERTON, Lawrence [1536 – 1640 (!)]**

First Master of Emmanuel, Cambridge (college founded by Sir Walter Mildmay, for express purpose of providing a college for Chaderton to head<sup>7</sup>, to train Puritan ministers. One of the four Puritan representatives at

<sup>6</sup> Quoted by McCullough, P.E. in DNB.

<sup>7</sup> According to Chaderton's biographer, Dillingham, at any rate.



the Hampton Court Conference. Friendly with several notable Carolines, e.g. Bancroft; not against episcopacy; AV translator.

**CHILLINGWORTH, William [1602 – 1644]**

Educated: Trinity Coll., Oxford.

Fellow 1628; became RC 1630, went to Douai, but returned 1631, declaring himself Protestant again 1634; most notable member of Great Tew circle; rationalist – ‘no higher authority than reason.’ Royalist army chaplain; captured & died in captivity.

Works: *Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*

**DIGG(E)S, Dudley [1613–43]**

Educated: University College, Oxford.

Fellow of All Souls’, 1632; called to Bar at Gray’s Inn, 1641, but then left for Oxford and the King’s defence.

Works: *The Unlawfulness of Subjects Taking up Armes against their Sovereigne* - published posthumously in 1643; very popular; reprinted 3 times, lastly as late as 1679. Also pamphlets and poetry.

NB: noted as a royalist political writer.

**DOD, John [1549? – 1645 (!)]**

Educated: Jesus Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow; Rector in Oxfordshire, 1580-1600; suspended for nonconformity, 1604; various activities; Rector of Fawsley, Northants., 1624. Noted Hebraist.

Works: several on Biblical topics; *A plaine and familiar Exposition of the Ten Commandments, With a Methodicall Short Catechisme.*

**DOLBEN, John [1625 - 1686]**

Educated: Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford.

Fought as royalist, severely wounded; deprived of Studentship 1648; ordained 1656; Canon of Christ Church and DD, and Oxfordshire Rectory, 1660; Preb. St.Paul’s 1661; Archdeacon of London, Dean of Westminster and Vicar of St.Giles’, Cripplegate, 1662. Bishop of Rochester 1666; Archbishop of York 1683. Staunch Caroline, noted preacher.

**DUPPA, Brian [1588-1662]**

Educated: Westminster (taught Hebrew by [then Dean] Andrewes,); Christ Church, Oxford.

Student (Fellow) of Christ Church, 1607 (?); Fellow of All Souls' 1611; travelled widely in France and Spain; Junior Proctor, 1619; Chaplain to Earl of Dorset, 1625; in possession of 3 Sussex livings by 1627; Dean of Christ Church, 1628; Vice-Chancellor, 1632-3; Bishop of Chichester, 1638; of Salisbury, 1641; of Winchester, 1660.

Works: *Holy Rules and Helps to Devotion*, plus several occasional prayers and sermons.

NB: not a typical Laudian (though supported Laud's election as Chancellor of Oxford in 1630). Sermon style reminiscent of Andrewes. Very active – though quietly so – during the Interregnum, as the senior Caroline bishop living in England.

### **EARLE, John [1601 – 1665]**

Educated: Christ Church & Merton Colls., Oxford.

Fellow 1620; member of Great Tew circle; tutor to Charles I; Chancellor of Salisbury 1643; exiled 1644. Dean of Westminster 1660; Bishop of Worcester 1662; of Salisbury 1663.

Works: *A Peece of the World Discovered; in Essayes and Characters.*

Latin translations of *Eikon Basilike* Hooker's *Laws*.

Tolerant of Nonconformists: opposed Five Mile Act.

### **FELL, John [1625 – 1686]**

Educated: Christ Church, Oxford; elected Student 1636 (aged 11!).

Ordained 1647; ardent royalist: deprived of fellowship 1648, but conducted BCP services throughout Interregnum; 1660 royal chaplain & Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Vice-Chancellor 1666; Bishop of Oxford 1676.

Works: editions of classical authors, New Testament and Fathers;

*Interest of England Stated; The Vanity of Scoffing.*

Thorough Caroline in all respects.

### **FILMER, (Sir) Robert [1588-1653]**

Educated: Trinity College, Cambridge (for two years: didn't graduate). Called to Bar 1613.

Knighted in 1619 (before his father), he was a Kentish gentleman and landowner, much involved in local affairs. Passionate royalist, and imprisoned for alleged royalist activity 1643-45.

Works: (*inter multa alia* on political theory and English history) *Patriarcha*, in which he vigorously promulgated Divine Right.

NB: longtime friend of P. Heylyn.



**FRANK, Mark [1612-64]**

Educated: Pembroke, Cambridge.

Fellow of Pembroke, 1634; ordained 1639; BD 1641; held several college offices; deprived 1643; Chaplain to Archbishop of Canterbury, Canon of St.Paul's, and Archdeacon of St.Alban's, 1660; DD (by royal mandate), 1661; Master of Pembroke, 1662.

Works: Sermons published in 1679 – reminiscent of Andrewes in liveliness and imagination of scriptural interpretation, but somewhat simpler, according to changing fashion of the day.

NB: keen royalist.

**FULKE, William [1538 – 1589]**

Educated: St.Paul's, & St.John's, Cambridge, then 6 years at Clifford's Inn of Court, studying law.

Fellow St.John's 1564; deprived for involvement in vestments controversy, with Cartwright; reinstated, Lecturer in Hebrew 1567; Master of Pembroke 1578; Vice-Chancellor 1581.

Works: about 30 polemical and mathematical works, including criticisms of Martin's work.

**FULLER, Thomas [1608 – 61]**

Educated: Queens' Coll., Cambridge. MA 1628;

Curate St.Benet's, Cambridge 1630-33; Rector of Broadwindsor, Dorset 1634-41; BD 1635; Preacher, Chapel Royal, Savoy, 1641; royalist, left for Oxford 1643; army chaplain; London 1646; living of Waltham Abbey, Essex, 1649; London living 1652; Cranford 1658; DD 1660..

Works: *Holy State, Profane State;* *History of the Worthies of England;* *Church History of Britain.*

**GOODWIN, Thomas [1600 – 1680]**

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge.

Vicar of Trinity Church, Cambridge, 1632; in Holland, 1639-40; became Independent; Master of Magdalen Coll., Oxford, 1649 – 1658; chaplain to Cromwell; member of Westminster Assembly.

Unusual Puritan, in that (a) his views were Arminian; (b) he anticipated some modern Biblical criticism.<sup>8</sup>

Works: 5 vols, published posthumously.

---

<sup>8</sup> Wakefield, p.4.



**GOUGE, William [1578 – 1653]**

Educated: Eton; King's Coll., Cambridge.

BA and Fellow, 1598; taught Hebrew (learnt from Jews); ordained 1607; Preacher, St. Anne's, Blackfriars, 1608; Rector, 1621; also 1621, imprisoned for 'treasonable' writings; DD 1628; royalist, but enthusiastic member of Westminster Assembly, holding Presbyterian system *de iure divino*.

Works: about a dozen devotional publications.

**GREENHAM, Richard [1535? – 1594?]**

Puritan Rector of Dry Drayton; encouraged Robert Browne; conscientious Pastor, especially of the poor.

**GUNNING, Peter [1614 – 1684]**

Educated: Clare Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1633; deprived 1646, but continued to conduct BCP services in London during Interregnum; Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge 1660; Regius Professor 1661; Bishop of Chichester 1669; Of Ely 1674; with Cosin, leader of Anglicans at Savoy Conference. Possibly wrote BCP prayer 'All Sorts and Conditions of Men'.

Works: not prolific. *The Paschal or Lent Fast*.

**HALES, John [1584-1656] (The 'Ever Memorable')**

Educated: Corpus Christi Coll., Oxford.

Fellow of Merton 1605; Lecturer in Greek 1612; Fellow of Eton 1613; Chaplain to Brit. Ambassador to Holland 1616. Laud's chaplain and Canon of Windsor 1639; deprived of these 1642, of Eton fellowship 1649; NB: observer at Synod of Dordt, when he was turned off Calvinism. Not a 'pukka' Caroline, though much in sympathy. Was accused by some of Socinianism, because of his repeated appeals to "faculty of reason" – broadminded and eirenical position generally.

Works: wrote little; *Schisme and Schismatics*; *Golden Remains* (collected items published posthumously).

**HALL, JOSEPH [1574 – 1656]**

Educated: Emmanuel, Cambridge (after private tuition, due to lack of parental funds).

Fellow of Emmanuel, 1595; Suffolk living, 1601; DD 1610; Dean of Worcester, 1616; Bishop of Exeter, 1627; of Norwich, 1641; imprisoned, 1642-3; deprived, 1647.

Works: early satires: 3 books of "*Toothlesse Satyres*", 1597, 3 of "*Byting Satyres*", 1598<sup>9</sup>. 46 extant sermons, and several polemical works.

NB: a moderate Caroline; lifelong Calvinist in theology; despite apparently 'sound' controversialist writings, was regarded with some suspicion by Laud and co. His work *An Humble Remonstrance* (on the divine right of episcopacy) provoked the 'SMECTYMNUS' protest.

### **HAMMOND, Henry [1605-60]**

Educated: Eton; Magdalen, Oxford.

Fellow of Magdalen, 1625; Ordained 1629; Rector of Penshurst, Kent, 1633; DD 1639; Archdeacon of Chichester, 1642; Chaplain to the King, 1644 (attended him in Carisbrooke and elsewhere).

Works: *A Practical Catechism*, and occasional publications during Interregnum helped greatly in keeping Anglican spirits up. *Paraphrase and Annotations on all the Books of the New Testament*.

NB: Probably the *de facto* leader of the Anglicans left in England during the Interregnum, ably abetted by Sheldon. "Hammond was the philosopher and theologian of the underground Church of England."<sup>10</sup> He has also been described as "the father of English biblical criticism"<sup>11</sup>. According to Trevor-Roper, he recovered the intellectual Arminianism of Andrewes after the political Arminianism of Laud.<sup>12</sup> Had been a member of the Great Tew group. But for his early death, he would almost certainly have achieved high office.

### **HARRISON, Thomas [1555 – 1631]**

Educated: Merchant Taylors' and St. John's Coll., Cambridge. (Thus exact contemporary, schoolfellow and fellow-undergraduate of Andrewes – and regarded as second only to him in learning.)

Fellow of Trinity Coll., Cambridge; noted Hebraist; AV Translator.

<sup>9</sup> Also *A Censure of Travell*, which shows that Hall would have disapproved mightily of the 'gap year', undertaken by those too young to benefit from it!

<sup>10</sup> Hylson-Smith, op.cit., p.164.

<sup>11</sup> Perry, C.G.: *The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643-1660*, with special reference to Henry Hammond (Manchester, 1969), p.89.

<sup>12</sup> Trevor-Roper, H.: *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans in the Seventeenth Century* (Seckker and Warburg, 1987), p.227.



**HARSNETT, Samuel [1561 – 1631]**

Educated: King's Coll. and Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.  
 Fellow of Pembroke & ordained, 1583; Schoolmaster 1586-7; Jun.Proctor 1592; Chaplain to Bp.Bancroft 1596; Prebend.St.Paul's 1598; Archdeacon of Essex 1603; Rector of Shenfield 1604; Master of Pembroke 1605; Vice-Chancellor and D.D., 1606; Vicar of Hutton 1606; of Stisted 1609; Bishop of Chichester 1609; forced to resign Mastership on Fellows' complaints 1616; Bishop of Norwich 1619; Archbishop of York 1628.  
 NB Strong supporter of Arminian Baro at Cambridge; loyal Caroline.

**HENCHMAN, Humphrey [1592 – 1675]**

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge.  
 Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge; BD and Preb.Salisbury, 1623; Rector in Northants, 1624; Wilts 1631; DD 1628; deprived of all preferments during Interregnum; Bishop of Salisbury 1660; of London 1663; possibly wrote *The Whole Duty of Man*.

**HERBERT, Edward (First Baron Herbert of Cherbury) [1583 – 1648]**

Ambassador in Paris 1619.  
 Rationalist; member of Great Tew circle; regarded as a forerunner of English deism.  
Works: *De Veritate* (1624); *De Religione Laici* (1645); *De Religione Gentilium*

**HERBERT, George [1593 – 1633] (brother of Edward)**

Educated: Westminster; Trinity Coll., Cambridge.  
 University orator 1620; ordained priest 1630; Rector Bemerton.  
 Friend of Nicholas Ferrar; famed for his poetry – one of 'Metaphysical Poets' with, e.g., Donne.  
Works: *A Priest to the Temple* (manual of pastoral care); *The Temple: Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations* (published posthumously by N.Ferrar)

**HEYLYN, Peter [1599-1662]**

Educated: Hart Hall, Oxford; Magdalen, Oxford. Fellow of Magdalen, 1618; became protégé of Laud, remaining ever afterwards devotedly loyal



to him; Chaplain to King, 1630; Prebendary of Westminster, plus a living, 1631; DD 1633; Rector of Houghton, Durham – immediately exchanging it for Alresford, Hants (nearer London), 1633; deprived of his 2 livings, 1644, later ‘compounding’, and lived relatively comfortably on the proceeds during the Interregnum.

Works: *History of St. George*; *History of the Sabbath*; *A Coale for the Altar*; several polemical treatises; *Cyprianus Anglicus* (life of Laud); *Ecclesia Restaurata*; *Aerius Redivivus*; *Ecclesia Vindicata* (more or less ‘Works’ from 1630s and ‘40s). All erudite and scholarly, but highly partisan.

NB: Several copies of *Ecclesia Vindicata* bear different dedications – including to Cromwell and Richard Cromwell as well as Charles II! Was Heylyn hedging his bets in the ‘50s? Or was he simply not so keen on the Stuarts as might be supposed? (Cf. Laud’s opinion of ‘greatness’ of Charles I).

### **HICKE, George [1642-1715]**

Educated: Northallerton Grammar School, North Yorkshire; St. John’s, Oxford, and Magdalen, Oxford.

Fellow of Lincoln, 1664; Ordained 1665; DD 1679; Vicar of Barking 1680; Dean of Worcester, 1683; Deprived 1690, as Non-juror; Consecrated Suffragan Bishop of Thetford 1694 (by Non-juror bishops).

Works: Anglo-Saxon Grammar; other philological works. *Jovian* and several other works on sacraments and Church order.

NB: noted philologist, especially in Anglo-Saxon and other ancient north-west European languages. Spent last years in insecurity and relative poverty, dependent upon patrons.

### **JOSSELIN, Ralph [1616 – 1683]**

Educated: Cambridge.

Ordained 1639; curate of Cranham, Essex, 1640; Rector of Earl’s Colne, Essex, 1641; moderate Puritan, opposed regicide – possibly royalist.

Works: diary, with valuable information about life in the Interregnum.

### **JUXON, William [1582 – 1663]**

Educated: St. John’s Coll., Oxford.

Rector St. Giles, Oxford, 1615; President of St. John’s, 1621, later Vice-Chancellor; friend of Wm. Laud. Chaplain to King; Dean of Worcester 1627; Bishop of Hereford 1632; London 1633; Lord High Treasurer 1636; resigned 1641; attended Charles at execution, and deprived, 1649; Archbishop of Canterbury 1660.

Works: Memoirs edited & published 1869.

Much respected by Churchmen of various opinions.

**KEACH, Benjamin [1640 – 1704]**

Educated: self-educated, to an amazingly high level.

Baptist in Bucks; imprisoned twice, fined and pilloried, 1664; moved to London 1668, and ordained there; pastor of London chapel. Calvinist.

Works: more than 50 published works, inc. *Tropologia*. *Tropschemalogia*. *Sabbath Treatise*.

**KEN, Thomas [1637 – 1711]**

Educated: Winchester and Hart Hall, Oxford.

Fellow of New College 1657; pastoral cures, then taught at Winchester 1672; ordained 1661; Prebendary Winchester 1669; royal chaplain 1679; Bishop of Bath & Wells 1685; imprisoned, with 6 other bishops, for opposing Declaration of Indulgence, 1688; 'Non-Juror' 1689; deprived 1691; in retirement wrote many hymns.

Works: (apart from hymns) *Manual of Prayers*.

Pious, austere, celibate life; v.much in Laudian tradition.

**KIDDER, Richard [1633 – 1703]**

Educated: Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge.

BA 1652; Fellow 1655; ordained 1658; Huntingdonshire living 1659; ejected 1662; Prebendary of Norwich 1681; royal chaplain, and Dean of Peterborough 1689; Bishop of Bath & Wells 1691 (having declined at least half a dozen preferments). Competent in Hebrew and other oriental languages; Latitudinarian, with Nonconformist sympathies.

Works: *Demonstration of the Messias*; *Commentary on the Ffive Books of Moses*; *A Plain and Familiar Discourse concerning the Lord's Supper*.

Also published a vast number of tracts and sermons.

**KNEWSTUB(B), John [1544 – 1624]**

Educated: St.John's Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow; BD 1576; Rector of Cockfield, Suffolk 1579; Puritan rep. at Hampton Ct.Conference.

Published little.

**LIGHTFOOT, John [1602 – 1675]**

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge.

Rector of Stone, Staffs., 1626; of Ashley, Staffs, 1630; moved to London 1642; Rector of St.Bartholomew's, 1643; Parliamentarian and Presbyterian, member of Westminster Assembly; Rector of Gt.Munden,



Herts, 1644; Master of St.Catherine's Hall, Cambridge 1650; DD 1652; assisted Walton with Polyglot Bible; reluctantly conformed 1662; Preb. Ely 1668.

Noted for rabbinic learning, in which he was among the foremost scholars in Europe.

Works: many, mainly on OT and rabbinic topics.

**LIVELY, Edward** [1545? – 1605]

Educated: Trinity Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow of Trinity; Regius Prof.Hebrew; Preb.Peterboro' 1602; Rector of Purleigh, Essex 1605; chaired 1<sup>st</sup> Cambridge Company of AV Translators.

**MARTIN, Gregory** [1540? – 1582]

Educated: St.John's Coll., Oxford.

Became RC; eminent Hebraist, but in Douai Version of 1610 (used by AV Translators) used only Vulgate as text (as in New Testament of 1582).

Works: include Hebrew dictionary.

**MEDE (Mead or Meade), Joseph:** [1586 – 1638]

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1613 and remained for rest of life.

NB: Like Hales, not an altogether 'pukka' Caroline, though shared many of their views, and dedicated works to Charles I<sup>13</sup> - and Laud. Not really a party man, and tolerant of others' opinions – except for Roman Catholics: regarded the Pope as Antichrist. McAdoo claims him as a precursor of the Cambridge Platonists.<sup>14</sup> Millenarian, polymath, and considerable Biblical scholar.

Works: *Clavis Apocalyptica* (millenarian teachings); *Of the Name Altar; The Apostasy of the Latter Times*.

**MORLEY, George** [1597 – 1684]

Educated: Winchester, and Christ Church Oxford.

Rector of Mildenhall, Wilts, 1641; present at Westminster Assembly 1643; deprived 1648, went abroad; Dean of Christ Church 1660; Bishop of Worcester 1660; preached Coronation Sermon; prominent at Savoy Conference 1661; Bishop of Winchester 1662; patron of Ken. Writings few and mainly occasional.

NB Moderate Caroline – theology Calvinist.

---

<sup>13</sup> See Bibliography.

<sup>14</sup> McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism* (op.cit.), p.83.



**MORTON, Thomas [1564-1659 (!)]**

Educated: St.John's, Cambridge.

Fellow, 1586; ordained 1594; Yorkshire living, 1598; D.D., 1606;

Several chaplaincies to aristocrats, then Dean of Gloucester, 1607;

Dean of Winchester, 1609; Prebendary of York, 1610;

Bishop of Chester, 1616; of Coventry & Lichfield, 1619; of Durham, 1632; deprived, 1646 (after two periods of imprisonment)

Works: *Apologiae Catholicae* (against Rome); *Catholick Appeale* – which became almost the official statement of the Church of England.

N.B.: Not a 'pukka' Caroline, mainly due to his moderate Calvinism, but of very 'conformist' views nevertheless.

**MO(U)NTAGUE, Richard [1575-1641]**

Educated: Eton; King's, Cambridge.

Fellow, 1597; Assisted Savile with edition of Chrysostom;

Chaplain to Bp.Bath & Wells (James Montagu!) & Prebendary of Wells, 1608 Somerset living, & Fellow of Eton, 1610; royal living, 1613; Royal chaplain, 1615; Dean of Hereford, 1616; Archdeacon of Hereford and Canon of Windsor, 1617; another royal living, 1623; Bishop of Chichester, 1628; of Norwich, 1638.

Works: *Appello Caesarem*; *A New Gagg for an old Goose*, inter alia.

N.B.: According to Fuller, "Very sharp the nib of his pen, and much gall in his ink"(!)<sup>15</sup> Erudite, but aggressive and caustic propagandist in defence of the *Via Media*: 'Montagutian' applied briefly to the Carolines due to controversy over his writings in 1626 (*New Gagg*.... Led to Parliamentary inquiry and Buckingham's York House Conference (Montague exonerated by a bishops' tribunal). "Principles backed by courage"<sup>16</sup> – like Laud.

**MOUNTAIN / MOUNTAIGNE, George [1569-1628]**

Educated: Queens' College, Cambridge.

Fellow, 1591; ordained, 1593; Chaplain to Earl of Essex;

Junior Proctor, 1600; Norfolk living, 1602; another, and D.D., 1607;

Master of Savoy & Chaplain to James I – and a third living, 1608;

Dean of Westminster, 1610; Bishop of Lincoln, 1617; of London, 1621; of Durham, 1627; appointed Archbishop of York, 1628, but died before enthronement.

Works: few; no published sermons.

N.B.: Not in 'inner circle' of Carolines (Heylyn, e.g. didn't think much of him); a 'court bishop', with the usual Jacobean episcopal faults and virtues.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted by Higham in *Catholic and Reformed*, p.97.

<sup>16</sup> MacAuley, J.S., in DNB.

**NEILE, Richard [1562 – 1640]**

Educated: Westminster and St.John's Coll., Cambridge.  
 Chaplain to Burghleys; DD 1600; Rector of Cheshunt; Dean of Westminster 1605; Bishop of Rochester 1608; of Coventry & Lichfield 1610; of Lincoln 1617; of Durham 1617; of Winchester 1628; Archbishop of York 1632. Patron of Wm.Laud & John Cosin. Not a scholar.

Works: visitation articles and other episcopal papers.

**OVERALL, John [1561 – 1619]**

Educated: Trinity, Cantab.

Fellow, 1581; several college preferments; ordained 1591; Vicar of Epping 1592; Regius Prof. 1595 – leading anti-Calvinist in University; Queen's Chaplain, 1598; Master of St.Catherine's, Cambridge, 1599; Lincolnshire parish, 1602, also Dean of St.Pauls; Herts. parishes, 1603 & 1605; Bishop of Coventry & Lichfield, 1614; of Norwich, 1618. No major works extant.

N.B.: schoolmate of Boyes; not a noted preacher (preferred to lecture in Latin!) Major participant in Hampton Court Conference; AV translator, member of Andrewes's Westminster Company.

**OWEN, John [1616 – 1683]**

Educated: Queen's Coll., Oxford. MA 1635.

Left Oxford 1637 due to objections to Laud's reforms; Dean of Christ Church 1651; Vice-Chancellor 1652; led Independents after Restoration; turned down invitation to be President of Harvard; highly esteemed by modern 'Puritans', e.g. Packer, who describes Owen as "one of the greatest of all English theologians".<sup>17</sup> And R.T.Jones: "the greatest Independent of his generation".<sup>18</sup>

**PATRICK, Simon [1625 – 1707]**

Educated: Queens' Coll., Cambridge.

Ordained Presbyterian 1648; Anglican 1654; Vicar of Battersea 1658; Rector of St.Paul's, Covent Garden 1662; Dean of Peterborough 1679. Bishop of Chichester 1688; of Ely 1691.

Prominent and sincere Latitudinarian, albeit with Caroline tendencies, e.g. his royalist sympathies during Interregnum; supported SPCK and SPG.

---

<sup>17</sup> Quoted in Hylson-Smith, p.203.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p.258.



Works: controversial treatises against Nonconformists and RCs; Commentaries (10 vols) on OT; *The Parable of the Pilgrim* (like 'Pilgrim's Progress' – though not influenced by it); *Mensa Mystica*, on Eucharist; *Aqua Genitalis*, on baptism.

**PEARSON, John [1613 - 1686]**

Educated: Eton, Queens' Coll., Cambridge.  
Ordained 1639; royalist, lived quietly in London during Interregnum; Master of Jesus Coll. Cambridge 1660; of Trinity 1662; Lady Margaret Professor 1661; championed episcopacy at Savoy Conference 1661; Bishop of Chester 1673; patristic scholar, regarded as possibly most erudite divine of his (very erudite) day.  
Works: *Exposition of the Creed*; *Vindiciae Epistolarum S. Ignatii*; several minor works, mainly apologiae against Nonconformists and RCs.

**PERKINS, William [1558 – 1602]**

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge.  
Fellow 1584;  
Moderate Calvinist, "the greatest Puritan theologian of all"<sup>19</sup>  
Works: many popular books/tracts on Puritan devotion; *Reformed Catholike*; *De Praedestinationis Modo et Ordine*; *An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer*

**PRIDEAUX, Humphrey [1648 – 1724]**

Educated: Westminster, Christ Church Oxford. B.A. 1672. Elected Student.  
Several benefices; Preb.Norwich 1681; BD 1682; D.D. 1686; Archdeacon of Suffolk 1688; Dean of Norwich 1702.  
Low Churchman, Latitudinarian, tolerant of Nonconformists.  
Works: *Life of Mahomet* (in fact a treatise against deists); *The Old and New Testaments Connected in the History of the Jews*.  
Taught Hebrew and rabbinics at Christ Church. Friend of Rd.Kidder.

**PRIDEAUX, John [1578 – 1650]**

Educated: Exeter Coll., Oxford.  
Fellow 1601; ordained 1603; chaplain to Prince Henry; BD 1611; DD and Rector of Exeter Coll., 1612; Chaplain to King after Prince's death; Rector of Bampton, Oxon, 1614; Regius Prof., 1615; Canon of Christ Church 1616; Vice-Chancellor 1619; Rector of Chalgrove (Oxon) &

---

<sup>19</sup> According to Wakefield, p.3.



Preb.Salisbury,1620; Rector of Bladon (Oxon) 1625; of Ewelme (Oxon) 1629; Bishop of Worcester;1641.

Good scholar; royalist; not Arminian.

Works: many, on a wide variety of theological topics.

### **PRYNNE, William [1600 – 1669]**

Educated: Oriel Coll., Oxford.

BA 1621; called to Bar, 1628.

Colossal output of militant Puritan polemic over most of lifetime – at least 200 books and pamphlets! Imprisoned 1633; also pilloried, maimed, fined, deprived of degree and expelled from Bar. 1637 maimed, fined, imprisoned, branded. 1641 restored to degree and Bar, and paid compensation by Parliament. Supported prosecution of Laud, his *bête noire par excellence*, energetically, viciously, vengefully and at times questionably. Managed to fall out with both Presbyterians and Independents during Interregnum – and the Army to boot! However, ardent royalist by time of Restoration, when appointed Keeper of the Records at the Tower.

### **REYNOLDS, Edward [1599 – 1676]**

Educated: Merton Coll. Oxford.

Preacher of Lincoln's Inn 1622; not Puritan, but sympathetic; member of Westminster Assembly 1643; took Covenant 1644; Dean of Christ Church 1648-50, again 1659; tried reconciling parties at Restoration; Bishop of Norwich 1661.

Works: many sermons and brief devotional works: very popular long after his death.

### **REYNOLDS (Rainolds/Renolds/Reinolds!), John [1549 – 1607]**

Educated: Corpus Christi Coll., Oxford.

Fellow 1568; Reader in Greek 1573; resigned 1578, taught at Queen's Coll; Dean of Lincoln 1593; President of Corpus 1598; Chief Puritan speaker at Hampton Court Conference 1604; AV translator (Prophets); accepted limited episcopacy. According to Fuller, conducted lengthy feud with brother William, a Jesuit. (John had been RC, William Puritan!) Much respected for his great learning.

### **RUTHERFORD, Samuel [1600 – 1661]**

Educated: Edinburgh

Professor of Humanity 1623 – deprived 1626 for pre-nuptial misdemeanour (!) Minister in Dumfries 1627; deposed by Court of High Commission 1636; Prof. Divinity, S.Andrew's 1639; Principal 1647;

member of Westminster Assembly 1643, and stayed in London for four years to defend Presbyterian cause.

Works: *A Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* (against Jeremy Taylor) (1649) [Much OT used]; several minor works, of controversial nature.

### **SANCROFT, William [1617 – 1693]**

Educated: Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1642; deprived 1651; royal chaplain 1660; Master of Emmanuel 1662; Dean of Durham 1663; of York 1664; as Cosin's secretary he oversaw revision and publication of 1662 BCP; Dean of St. Paul's 1664 – much co-operation with Wren in rebuilding after Fire; Archbishop of Canterbury 1678; imprisoned (with 6 other bishops) for opposing the Declaration of Indulgence 1688; became leading Non-Juror, dismissed 1690.

### **SANDERSON, Robert [1587 – 1663]**

Educated: Lincoln Coll., Oxford.

Fellow 1606; ordained 1611; Lincolnshire Rector, 1618; a second Lincolnshire living, Boothby Peynell, 1619; Prebend of Lincoln, 1629; Royal chaplain, 1631; Leicestershire living, 1633; Regius Professor, Oxford, 1642; deprived, 1648 (retained living), by 1658 reported poverty-stricken; Reinstated at Oxford, also Bishop of Lincoln, 1660; Moderator of Savoy Conference, 1661. drafted Preface to 1662 BCP (and possibly wrote 'All Sorts and Conditions of Men' prayer, and General Thanksgiving) Not 'pukka' Caroline, though fervent royalist.

Works: sermons, lectures, treatise on logic, inter alia. *Nine Cases of Conscience Occasionally Determined.*

### **SAVILE, Henry [1549 – 1622]**

Educated: Brasenose, Oxford.

Fellow of Merton 1565; much travelled abroad, collecting manuscripts etc; Greek tutor to Queen; Warden of Merton 1585; Provost of Eton (though not ordained) 1596; AV translator; *magnum opus* edition (8 vols) of works of St. John Chrysostom, 1610-13; helped found Bodleian Library, and chairs of geometry and astronomy.

### **SHELDON, Gilbert [1598 – 1678]**

Educated: Trinity Coll., Oxford.

Fellow of All Souls' 1622, Warden 1636; member of Great Tew circle; royal chaplain; deprived 1648, briefly imprisoned; with Hammond, leader of Anglicans in England during Interregnum. Reinstalled at All Souls'



1659; Bishop of London 1660; dominated Savoy Conference 1661; Archbishop of Canterbury 1663.  
Independent of mind, and courageous: criticised court immorality; devoted pastor. Laboured to maintain Laudian principles in Church of England.

;  
**SKINNER, Robert** [1591 – 1670]

Educated: Trinity Coll., Oxford.  
Fellow 1613; BD 1621; DD 1636;  
Bishop of Bristol, 1636; of Oxford 1641; of Worcester 1663

**SMITH, Henry** [c.1560 – 1591]

Noted preacher, even “something of a Puritan counterpart to Lancelot Andrewes in the art of preaching...”<sup>20</sup>

**SMITH, Miles** [1568? – 1624]

Educated: Corpus Christi Coll., and Brasenose Coll., Oxford.  
BD 1585; DD 1594; Preb. Hereford 1580; of Exeter 1595; 1612 Bishop of Gloucester. AV Translator; did final revision of OT (with Bilson), and wrote Preface. Puritan inclinations.  
Works: a volume of sermons.

**SMYTH, John**

Educated: Christ’s Coll., Cambridge. Fellow 1579.  
Lincoln lectureship; 1592 in London; imprisoned for not conforming; Separatist pastor in Gainsborough, 1602; left for Holland 1607, taking congregation with him; believed only original Scriptures inspired.

**SPARKE, Thomas** [1548 – 1616]

Educated: Magdalen Coll., Oxford.  
Fellow 1569; BD 1575; DD 1581; Archdeacon of Stowe (Lincs) 1575; Rector of Bletchley, Bucks, and Preb. Lincoln, 1578; Puritan rep. at Hampton Ct. Conference.  
Works: several and polemical works. devotional

---

<sup>20</sup> Wakefield, p.3.



**SPARROW, Anthony [1612 – 1685]**

Educated: Queen's Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1633; deprived 1644; Archdeacon of Sudbury 1660; President of Queens' 1662; helped redraft BCP 1662; Bishop of Exeter 1667; of Norwich, 1676. Loyal Caroline all life.

Works: *Rationale or Practical Exposition of the Book of Common Prayer.*

**STILLINGFLEET, Edward [1635 – 1699]**

Educated: St. John's Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1653; Rector of Sutton (Beds) 1657; of St. Andrew's Holborn 1665; Archdeacon of London 1677; Dean of St. Paul's 1678; Bishop of Worcester 1689; Latitudinarian.

Works: *Irenicum* (proposing union of Anglicans and Presbyterians); *Origines Sacrae* (authority of Scripture), and several other works on philosophy and doctrine.

**TAYLOR, Jeremy [1613 – 1667]**

Educated: Cambridge

Ordained 1633; Fellow of All Souls', Oxford 1635 (Laud a patron); living of Uppingham 1638 (Juxon another patron); with Charles at Oxford 1642; DD 1643; captured 1645, retired to Wales, set up a school, and wrote; chaplain to Viscount Conway, in Ulster, 1658; Bishop of Down & Connor 1660.

Works: *Holy Living*; *Holy Dying*, among many others on doctrinal matters.

NB Expert casuist; revived interest in this, neglected by the English Church since Reformation.

**THORNDIKE, Herbert [1598 – 1672]**

Educated: Trinity Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1620; ordained 1627; Rector Barley (Herts) 1642, but ejected 1643; deprived of fellowship 1646; reinstated to both 1660; Prebendary of Westminster 1661; staunchly Caroline.

Works: *Discourse of Government of Churches*; *Of the Right of a Church in a Christian State*; *Of Religious Assemblies and the Public Service of God*; *of An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*; also assisted Walton in producing the London Polyglot.

**TILLOTSON, John [1630 – 1694]**

Educated: Clare Hall, Cambridge; later Fellow.

'Watcher' at Savoy Conference, 1661 – on Nonconformist side;

Dean of St.Paul's 1689; Archbishop of Canterbury 1691;  
 Latitudinarian Low Churchman, hated Rome, favoured Nonconformists  
 (proposed union with all main Protestant bodies save Unitarians)  
Works: Sermons, published in four vols. posthumously.

**USSHER, James [1581 – 1656]**

Educated: Trinity Coll., Dublin.  
 Ordained 1601; Chancellor of St.Patrick's Cathedral 1606; first Professor  
 Of divinity in Dublin 1607; Bishop of Meath 1621; Archbishop of  
 Armagh 1625; after Irish rebellion 1641 remained in England, trying to  
 effect reconciliation between Anglicans and Dissenters.  
 Not really Caroline: friendly with Laud, but Calvinist; vastly learned  
 Member of Westminster Assembly 1643 – but probably did not attend  
 often, if at all, like other Anglicans. Not easy to 'pigeonhole': friendly  
 with Laud, but not thoroughgoing Caroline, in that although a royalist, and  
 one who venerated and appealed to antiquity, he was Calvinist re  
 predestination, strongly anti- Rome, and less than passionate about  
 uniformity - maybe something of a Latitudinarian (?)  
Works: many, on diverse topics, inc. patristics, doctrine, Biblical subjects  
 and Irish history.

**WALLINGTON, Nehemiah**

'Mechanical' preacher in London; separatist.

**WALTON, Brian [1600 – 1661]**

Educated: Magdalene Coll., & Peterhouse, Cambridge.  
 Ordained 1623; Rector St Martin's Orgar, London 1628; loyal Laudian,  
 deprived 1641; briefly imprisoned, then retired to Oxford; Bishop of  
 Chester 1660.  
Works: edited the 'London Polyglot;' 6 vols in 9 languages, 1653-57.  
*Biblia Sacra Polyglotta; The Considerator Considered* (reply to  
 J.Owen's criticisms of the Polyglot.)

**WALTON, Izaak [1593 – 1683]**

London ironmonger (born in Staffs) c.1614. Friend of his vicar, J.Donne.  
 Royalist, lay Caroline, vestryman, biographer; retired from business 1644;  
 maintained cordial relations with many eminent ecclesiastics, esp.Morley  
 and Herbert, as well as Donne.  
Works: *The Compleat Angler*; biographies of Hooker, Donne, Wotton,  
 G.Herbert and Sanderson.



**WARD, Samuel [1570? - 1643]**

Educated: Christ's Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow of Emmanuel 1695; assisted Ussher with patristic researches; Fellow of newly-founded Sidney Sussex Coll, 1595; BD 1603; DD and Master of Sidney Sussex Coll., Cambridge 1610; King's Chaplain; Arch-Deacon of Taunton & Preb.Wells 1615; Preb.York 1618; C of E rep. At Synod of Dort 1619; Lady Margaret Prof. 1623.

AV translator (Cambridge Apocrypha committee); worked especially on Prayer of Manasseh and I & II Maccabees.

Moderate Puritan: strong Calvinist, but royalist and refused to take Covenant and was imprisoned for this in 1643.<sup>21</sup>

"He turned with the times" and "was imprisoned in S.John's College, Cambridge"<sup>22</sup>

Works: several on theological topics.

**WARD, Samuel [1577 – 1640]**

Educated: St.John's Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow of Sidney Sussex 1599; Town Preacher of Ipswich 1603 – 1633; BD 1607; several times prosecuted for nonconformism; in Holland from 1635.

Works: many, defending Puritan views.

**WARD, Seth [1617 – 1689]**

Educated: Sidney Sussex Coll., Cambridge.

Fellow 1640; Maths. Lecturer 1643; opposed Solemn League & Covenant 1644, and deprived; Prof. of astronomy, Oxford 1649; Fellow of Wadham 1650; DD (Oxon) 1654; Principal of Jesus Coll., Oxford 1657; DD (Cantab) and President of Trinity Coll., Oxford 1659; not statutorily qualified for the Trinity post, he resigned 1660; Preb.Exeter 1660; Rector of S.Lawrence Jewry, Upplowman (Devon) and Dean of Exeter 1661; Rector of St.Breock (Cornwall) and Bishop of Exeter 1662; Bishop of Salisbury 1667; declined Durham 1672. An original member of Royal Society; approved of relaxing Conformity requirements, yet very severe on Nonconformists.

Works: on astronomy and philosophy; also sermons.

**WHICHCOTE, Benjamin [1609 – 1683]**

Educated: Emmanuel, Cambridge. Of Shropshire gentry.

Fellow 1633; ordained 1636; BD 1640 Provost, King's Coll. 1645; DD 1649; Vice-Chancellor 1650; dismissed 1660; parish clergyman,

---

<sup>21</sup> Knappen (ed), p.37.

<sup>22</sup> Both from Fuller, *Worthies of England*, Vol.I, p.488.



Milton, nr. Cambridge, St. Anne's Blackfriars 1662; St. Lawrence Jewry 1668. Theological liberal; via pupils, founding father of 'Cambridge Platonists' and later Latitudinarians.

Works: none published in lifetime; posthumous collections of sermons and other papers.

### **WHITGIFT, John [1530 – 1604]**

Educated: Queens' Coll. & Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Fellow Peterhouse 1555; ordained 1560; Lady Margaret Prof. of Divinity 1563; Regius Prof. and chaplain to Queen, 1567 – chief opponent of Cartwright in the university; Master of Trinity 1570;

Vice-Chancellor 1570; Dean of Lincoln 1571; Bishop of Worcester 1577; Archbishop of Canterbury 1583; ceased appeasement of Puritans, secured large measure of ecclesiastical conformity, then did not persecute.

Works: polemic writings against Puritans.

### **WILKINS, John [1614 – 1672]**

Educated: Magdalen Coll., Oxford.

Vicar of Fawsley 1637; several chaplaincies to noble families;

Parliamentarian, who took Covenant, but respected and liked by royalists for his wisdom and moderation. BD and Warden of Wadham 1648; DD 1649; Master of Trinity Coll., Cambridge 1659; deprived 1660; Rector of Cranford (Middx) and Preb. York 1660 – and probably Dean of Ripon; Rector of St. Lawrence Jewry 1662; Vicar of Polebrook (Northants) 1666; Preb. Exeter 1667; of St. Paul's 1668; Bishop of Chester 1668.

Lenient with Nonconformists.

Works: sermons; treatises on theological, philosophical and scientific topics.

### **WREN, Matthew [1585-1667]**

Educated: Pembroke, Cambridge;

Chaplain to Andrewes (Bp. Ely) 1615; President of Pembroke 1616; King's Chaplain 1620; Accompanied Prince of Wales and Buckingham to Spain 1623; Prebendary of Winchester 1626; Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, 1625; Dean of Windsor 1628; Bishop of Hereford 1634; Bishop of Norwich 1635; Dean of Chapel Royal 1636; Bishop of Ely 1638; incarcerated in Tower 1642-1660, then reinstated.

Works:

NB one of the fiercest Carolines. Uncle of Sir Christopher Wren.

