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Abstract

Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England.
S. M. Towers

Religious printing in Jacobean and Caroline England and the measures taken to regulate it have not generally been studied as a separate issue. Previous examinations of the control of print publication did not isolate religious works and suggested that even in the 1630's the mechanisms of press control were but intermittently and ineffectively applied. The purpose of this investigation is to examine the surviving evidence in an attempt to measure the effectiveness of press control over a period of four decades. For this reason samplings were made of the religious press for the years 1607, 1617, 1627 and 1637.

Each of the four decadal chapters charts the development of press controls, but the main purpose is to compare texts. This comparison reveals that the licit first editions which contained evangelical Calvinist teachings of unconditional predestination, portrayals of the Pope as Antichrist, and strict sabbatarianism, among other views, accounted for 63% of the sample in 1607 and 71% in 1617, but were not present in the books surveyed for 1637. Thus the content of religious printing changed between the start and finish of the early Stuart period; while William Laud was archbishop of Canterbury, a shift in the nature of religious orthodoxy can be seen in the output of the religious press.

This change was in large part due to the system of press licensing which assigned the task of pre-publication approval of manuscripts to specific licensers. By 1637 religious works which had legal imprints (and in most cases records of entrance and licensing in the Stationers' Registers) can be found advocating novel ceremonies, practices, and doctrines, while books not products of the licensing system - reprints and surreptitious works - reflected the pre-Laudian orthodoxies of evangelical Calvinists. The chronological study is followed by a comparative case study which explores the same problem from a different angle. The publication patterns of the Arminian Thomas Jackson and the evangelical Calvinist Thomas Taylor display complementary curves. Jackson's increasingly strident anti-Calvinist publications flourished in the years of Laud's rule between 1633 and 1640, while, conversely, only one title of Taylor's was licensed and printed during that time. These cases enhance the findings of the larger examination.
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### ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl.</td>
<td>Bodleian Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court-Book C</td>
<td>Records of the Court of the Stationers Company, ed. W. Jackson (1957)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPD</td>
<td>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPV</td>
<td>Calendar of State Papers Venetian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB</td>
<td>Dictionary of National Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td>English Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Folger Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fincham</td>
<td>K. Fincham, Prelate as Pastor (Oxford, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>J. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses: the members of the University of Oxford 1500-1714 (2 vols., Krauss reprint, 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>Historical Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC</td>
<td>Historical Manuscripts Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBS</td>
<td>Journal of British Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEH</td>
<td>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Neve</td>
<td>J. Le Neve, Fasti ecclesiae Anglicanae, or A calendar of the principal dignitaries (3 vols., Oxford, 1854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milward. Elizabeth</td>
<td>P. Milward, Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milward. James</td>
<td>P. Milward, Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO SP</td>
<td>Public Record Office. State Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushworth</td>
<td>J. Rushworth, Historical Collections (7 vols., 1659-1710)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SR  Statutes of the Realm (9 vols., 1810-22)
    Citation of statutes comes from this edition. All will be identified by regnal year, monarch, and chapter.


STC  Revised Short-Title Catalogue (3 vols., 1976-1991)


VCH  Victoria County History

Venn  J. and J. A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I: From the earliest times to 1751 (4 vols., Cambridge, 1922-7)

Wood  Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxonienses...to which are added the Fasti, ed. P. Bliss (4 vols., 1813-20)

A petition to parliament from printers and booksellers in February 1629 described a situation in which religious censorship was perceived as changing the definition of orthodoxy for the Church of England. The petition complained that 'the Bishopp of London [William Laud since July 1628] and his chaplaines have licensed diverse bookes holding opinions of Arminianisme and popery and suppressed others that are orthodoxall, and if any orthodoxall have bene printed such as have printed or sold them they have bene punished for [it] by the highe Comission and their bookes have bene taken from them'. According to this view there was a new hostility on the part of the licensers towards religious materials previously considered orthodox and a growing permissiveness when presented with Arminian and popish opinions.

Pre-publication censorship at this time was conducted by the bishop of London, the archbishop of Canterbury, and their deputies, and as Laud progressed in 1633 from London to Canterbury, so his influence over the licensing process expanded. It was the contention of William Prynne and some other contemporaries that Laud, during the reign of Charles I, was responsible for religiously undermining the Church of England. Prynne claimed that Laud and his chaplain agents, by Laud's instigation or command, had authorised books, treatises, and sermons in defence of popish errors, superstitions, ceremonies, and practices, almost to the total corruption and subversion of England's religion. This was achieved at the expense of books which had previously been allowed into print. 'As he and his instruments prohibited the reprinting of old Orthodox Bookes, so they refused to Licence sundry new ones, especially against Popery and Arminianisme, suppressing them when printed by License of others...'. Prynne's account of the Laudian era and of the indignities
suffered by Laud's opponents provides one of the main sources for claims of censorship during the decade of the 1630's.

In writing of censorship and English literature, Christopher Hill lends support to Prynne's charge of effective censorship in the 1630's. 'As the Long Parliament met in November 1640 the censorship collapsed....The ending of ecclesiastical control seems to me the most significant event in the history of seventeenth-century literature'. Although the work of Frederick Siebert on freedom of the press was published almost fifty years ago and now seems a bit simplistic in its emphasis on the organized effort of the Caroline regime to control the press, remarkably, Siebert continues to exert influence. He stresses the alliance between Charles I and Laud in restraint of religious dissent. 'Dissolving Parliament, he [Charles] sought with the aid of his zealous minister, William Laud, to settle religious questions in his own way. Laud, who succeeded as archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, held political and religious views which coincided exactly with those of the king....He [Laud] was determined to uphold the unity of the state and the uniformity of religion at all costs'. In his reconstruction of the build-up of a system of press controls, Siebert chronicles the efforts of the Caroline regime in the mid 1630's. 'The lesser clergy from the bishops down took an active interest in protecting the purity of the reading matter. The Bishop of London in particular, besides serving on the Ecclesiastical Commissions, superintended the search for unlawful printing in vessels docking at the port of London. The episcopal chaplains and the doctors of civil law bore the burden of the detailed work involved in regulating the press. They acted as licensers, detectives, searchers, and prosecutors. At Archbishop Laud's request, Sir John Lambe assumed direction of these lesser officials, and under propulsion from above he whipped these servants of Church and state into the most efficient regulatory organization of the early Stuart period....' Siebert concludes: 'The Star Chamber
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Decree of 1637, the most complete and detailed regulation of the early seventeenth century, was designed to stop the abuses and evasions which had crept into the operation of the licensing system'. In their recent work on issues of censorship and press control, literary scholars Annabel Patterson and Cyndia Clegg have relied on Siebert to provide background material about the machinery for controlling the press.

Conversely, historians Kevin Sharpe and Sheila Lambert are two who discount the effectiveness of press censorship in Caroline England. In his book on the personal rule of Charles I, Sharpe maintains that 'England in the 1630's was not a country in which men were free to publish or read what they saw fit. Nor, however, was it a realm in which all criticism and dissent were stifled. This was not only due to ineffective censorship. In early modern England, for all the concern with order and hierarchy and orthodoxy, disorder, inversion, and dissent were not only tolerated, but authorized'. In citing instances of controversial religious books which were printed in spite of the Star Chamber Decree, Sharpe argues that 'both Catholic and predestinarian and Presbyterian books circulated as they had throughout the decade'.

It is partly in reaction to the dependence of modern scholars on Siebert's work that Sheila Lambert takes issue with Christopher Hill for magnifying the scope of censorship before 1640 and insists on the importance of an economic analysis of events. In several articles Lambert replaces what she perceives as the prevailing impression of widespread censorship in early-Stuart England with an emphasis on economic and practical factors. For example, she attributes the cause for printing English books in Amsterdam to piracy rather than to sedition. Her case rests on an assertion that Elizabeth, James, and Charles had a concept of censorship but did not intend to suppress all expression of opposition to the crown. Relying on drama to buttress her theory, Lambert
claims that 'students of drama have always known that the censorship was not all-pervasive'. In opposition to many others, she maintains that 'it cannot be too often stressed, the printed word played only a small part in the dissemination of political ideas'. When actually addressing religious printing, Lambert concludes: 'neither side [of the Arminian and puritan controversy] believed in freedom of the press, but we should not extrapolate the well-known special cases, most of which were originally enumerated for purely temporary political purposes, into a crushing weight of bureaucratic censorship intended to stifle all discussion. Books of all complexions were published in the 1630's. Sermons of all complexions were preached and printed'. 'Thomas Jackson and Thomas Taylor were poles apart in doctrine, yet the publishing history of their works is very similar'.

No one can deny that a variety of religious opinions were available even in licensed publications - after all there was a spectrum of beliefs within the Church of England itself. However, in order to evaluate the conflict of interpretation expressed above, it is necessary to examine the content of religious publications from the Laudian period and to compare this with earlier Stuart publications to see if the limits and interpretation of orthodoxy changed over time. Thus the object of this study is to analyse the products of the religious press between 1603 and 1640 so as to ascertain what was allowed to pass through the system at different times and what was produced surreptitiously. In doing so, it is important to consider both press censorship and changing definitions of orthodoxy. The contention here is that, contrary to the view that censorship was but intermittently and inconsistently applied, there was a discernible shift in the products of the religious press between the beginning and end of the early Stuart era, and that this was in part due to the licensing system. It is necessary to emphasize the importance of religious printing in any discussion of
Censorship as it was religion which to a large extent triggered the perceived need for regulation.

Freedom of the press is a complex concept to evaluate. Such freedom fluctuated from year to year, producing variables which pose problems of interpretation. Two of the measurements available for evidence of pre-publication licensing are actually incidental—they are entrance of a title in the Stationers' Registers, an entry which often supplies a licenser's name, and, after 1632, an imprimatur in the book itself. Studies of these types of bureaucratic press controls have traditionally been done by scholars of English literature. Examination by W. W. Greg of entrance in the Stationers' Registers and by F. B. Williams of the incidence of imprimaturs in printed books is part of this tradition in literary studies. Admittedly, until the Star Chamber Decree concerning printing of 1637, there is only ambiguous evidence that the guild of printers and booksellers, the Stationers' Company, required that, before printing, a stationer must be granted permission to own a title by an official of the company, pay a fee, and have the ownership and fee recorded [i.e. entered] in the Stationers' Registers. Still scholars have placed great weight on entrance records. A noted bibliographer in the field of English drama, W. W. Greg also applied his talents to a survey of licensers and to aspects of the entries in the registers. For many years the standard piece on entrance ratios remained an article on 'Entrance, license, and publication' which was published by Greg in 1944. His three separate counts were slanted in the direction of drama; two of them excluded religion entirely. Greg's general conclusion was that 'for the period from 1576 to 1640, the proportion of London-printed books regularly entered in Stationers' Hall was somewhere between 60% and 70%'. In other words, roughly a third of extant books show no evidence that they conformed to the procedures laid down for registration at Stationers' Hall.

A variation on Greg's theme was developed fifty years
later by Maureen Bell; it was the result of her participation in a study of the history of the book in Britain. With the benefits provided by the chronological index in volume three of the revised *Short-Title Catalogue* and by computers, she was able to count London first editions in all disciplines, including religion. Hers was a much larger sampling than Greg's and one which was refined by accounting for books covered by official patent and monopoly. Even so, the results were similar to those reported by Greg, concluding that a sizable number of books surviving from the period before 1640 were never entered in the registers.  

More specific evidence of press control is that relating to pre-publication perusal and approval of manuscripts by select licensers — evidence most often revealed within the entry in the *Stationers' Registers*. However following an order of William Laud as bishop of London in 1632, such permission was required to be reproduced in an imprimatur in the printed book itself. In his landmark survey of imprimaturs in books of the Laudian period, F. B. Williams reported a low incidence of cooperation. Williams did an extensive study of the publications of London printers for 1634 and 1640. Discovering that only 14% of books had imprimaturs in 1634 and 35% in 1640, Williams suggested that this showed 'weary resistance to tightening controls'. By not attending specifically to the years after Archbishop Abbot's death when Laud's influence was at its peak, Greg, Bell, and even Williams convey a picture of lax adherence to press controls for the entire period before 1640. Likewise, none of their studies of compliance to bureaucratic regulations recognizes the special relationship between regulations governing printing and the religious books which to a large extent had generated the desire for regulation. In his work on licensing and censorship in the early Stuart period, Anthony Milton does concentrate on religious printing and argues that 'there remains plentiful evidence that there was an effective tightening of regulations of the printing of
religious literature in the 1630's...'. However even he
repeats the claims that 'despite further proclamations, a
good third of books published still failed to be entered in
the Stationers' Register, and only 30 percent or so of books
carried the imprimatur that was officially required'. Milton
views these statistics and the writings of Lambert as
important to note, but with limitations. 'These are arguments
that tend to offer valuable correctives rather than a
comprehensive analysis of the regulation of print in the
1630s, and there is a very great deal that they fail to
explain'.

Religious works were a major component of the printed
output in Tudor-Stuart England. Stressing the link between
the explosion of Protestantism and the proliferation of
printing presses, Elizabeth Eisenstein considers Thomas
Cromwell's printed propaganda in support of Henry VIII's
actions to be, albeit on a much smaller scale, as 'skillful
as Luther's German friends in mobilizing propagandists and
attracting a large public by vernacular translations'.

Decades before the current fascination with patterns of
readership, H. S. Bennett produced his seminal volumes on
English books and readers before 1640. His depiction of the
early Stuart era was that 'religion was the grand animating
force that caused many books to be written. Besides the
wealth of homiletic, expository and devotional works, a mass
of controversial writing was forthcoming'. Even more dramatic
was his setting for the first half of the sixteenth century
during which Bennett estimated that half the printers's
output was of a religious nature - with the arrival of the
Reformation, the Catholic service-books were simply replaced
by the Book of Common Prayer, the English Bible, and all the
Protestant guides to godly living. 'And as the controversy
between England and Rome grew sharper, both sides eagerly
availed themselves of the services of the printing
presses...'. Patrick Collinson, while cautioning against the
view that numbers are reflective of real taste, still allows
that 'there is no need to labour the point that a high proportion of book production in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England, perhaps half the total, belongs (broadly) to the category of religion'.

Not only did religious matter bulk large in the print shops, but the official response to the press was from the beginning designed to curb religious irregularities. Religion had fueled censorship from the time of the Lollards—thus creating the precedent for ecclesiastical officers to proceed against 'heresy' when it later emerged in print. These methods were thus available in the 1520's when the regime moved to halt the flow of Luther's books. It is one thing, however, to argue for the relevance of restricting a study of government controls to the religious press and another matter entirely to determine what was religious orthodoxy at any given time. Did the stationers' petition cited above accurately signal a shift in emphasis under Charles I and Archbishop Laud which caused a break with the traditions of the Reformation in England or did the English Church remain relatively homogeneous?

The recent historiography of the Protestant Church in early Stuart England reflects a divide between those, like Peter White, who argue that the English Church was a continuing 'via media' between Catholicism and the Reformed continental churches and those like Nicholas Tyacke who instead contend that the Calvinist unity of the Elizabethan and Jacobean church was shattered by the rise of Arminianism in the 1620's. Although Anthony Milton warns that too much significance has been placed on the single issue of doctrines of grace, nonetheless much of the current dissension within historical circles began with Nicholas Tyacke's groundbreaking essay in 1973 wherein he stated that 'religion became an issue in the Civil War crisis due primarily to the rise to power of Arminianism in the 1620's. The essence of Arminianism was a belief in God's universal grace and the freewill of all men to obtain salvation. Therefore Arminians
rejected the teaching of Calvinism that the world was divided into elect and reprobate whom God had arbitrarily predestinated, the one to Heaven and the other to Hell'. Conrad Russell over the years has written in support of this thesis. In introductory remarks regarding Tyacke's essay, Russell wrote that 'the most important way in which Charles reversed the traditions of the Elizabethan political establishment was his decision to open an assault on the main stream of English moderate Puritanism'. More recently Russell has argued that 'the church of England, all through the period [1559-1625], was a deeply divided church, but the division was not between the orthodox and the unorthodox: it was between rival claimants to the title of orthodox, and therefore between rival criteria of orthodoxy'. In the pre-Caroline stage of this contest, what would become known as the 'Anglican' position was clearly in the minority; Peter Lake claims it was not really invented until Richard Hooker. And, according to Russell, 'it took a long time for Hooker's invention to become popular. It did not acquire a claim to be authoritative until accepted by Charles I'.

Tyacke's essay has occasioned much comment, with the most sustained criticism emanating from Peter White in a series of debates with Tyacke. In his monograph published in 1987, Anti-Calvinists, Tyacke persists in his argument, while at the same time also emphasizing the importance of Puritanism. 'That Calvinism was the "de facto" religion of the Church of England under Queen Elizabeth and King James may surprise those brought up to regard Calvinists and Puritans as one and the same. Such an identification, however, witnesses to the posthumous success of the Arminians in blackening the reputation of their Calvinist opponents; until the 1620s Puritan, as a technical term, was usually employed to describe those members of the English Church who wanted further Protestant reforms in liturgy and organization. Only thereafter was the definition of Puritanism publicly extended so as to include Calvinist
For his part, White plays down disagreements over the issue of grace and would see the early Stuart church as inheriting the Elizabethan 'intermediate position between the more "precise" churches of the continent and the Church of Rome' - a 'via media'. White's book expresses the 'conviction that the model of a theological dichotomy between "Calvinism" and "Arminianism" is simply inadequate for understanding either the overall development of doctrine in the Reformation period, or of personal allegiances within it'. His book argues 'that protestations of moderation should not invariably be dismissed as mere rhetoric'.

In an edited volume entitled The Early Stuart Church, Kenneth Fincham distinguishes between historians on each side of the debate. Peter White, and historians such as George Bernard and Kevin Sharpe not in Fincham's collection, 'maintain that official policy in the 1630s represented traditional conformist concerns of obedience and order against unruly puritans and lax clergy and laity'. The chapters by Fincham, Peter Lake, and Tyacke, on the contrary, 'directly challenge this view; instead they see the dominant protestant tradition of the previous sixty years under official attack from a relatively new and less central strand of English protestantism'. Some of the tendencies of this new strand which were apparent by the 1630's included, in addition to the difference about the doctrine of predestination, an emphasis on the ministry as a sacramental priesthood rather than a preaching order; ceremonies, ritual, and common prayer to be preferred to sermons; an attack on sabbatarianism; the relocation of the communion table to a permanent altarwise position at the east end of church - protected by a rail; a lessening of antipathy towards the Church of Rome; cessation of the tendency to equate the pope with Antichrist; and a proliferation of religious images.

The purpose of this present thesis is to elucidate some
of the differences encompassed within that English Protestant Church and then to establish what were the acceptable religious norms at specific dates through a survey of Jacobean and Caroline religious printing - first editions and reprints, legal and fugitive. Although this investigation will involve the examination of literally hundreds of texts, there will also be an attempt to chart the emergence of controls as each regime interacted with religious developments in the church. Examining published religious texts is admittedly an indirect measure of what happened. Since it is not normally possible to observe censorship at work, the method available is to measure the aftermath - which materials actually pass through the system of pre-publication licensing and entrance in the registers. There is always the danger that what is published reflects fashion rather than orthodoxy. But by that reasoning, reprints might be yesterday's fashion - which does not explain why books were reprinted. Judging from the large numbers, there was a demand for reprints - which up until 1637 did not need relicensing. In a sense they reflected what the stationers felt fulfilled market demand while newly licensed and published titles reflected what the regimes would allow.

The results of this survey indicate that by 1637 teaching of unconditional predestination, portrayals of the Pope as Antichrist, and strict sabbatarianism, among other views, had disappeared from the first editions of the legitimate religious press while at the same time novel ceremonies, practices, and doctrines had emerged -to some extent inverting previous orthodoxies. In contrast, reprints and, to some degree clandestine printing as well, reflected pre-Laudian themes. In that sense the stationers' petition to parliament in 1629 was an accurate prophecy of events in the process of unfolding.
II

The focus of the following study will be on the documentary trail of Jacobean and Caroline efforts to exercise control over the printing industry as well as on the content of the religious texts surveyed; very important will be evidence of pre-publication examination and official approval of texts. Addressing in particular the period of the personal rule during the Laudian hegemony, this survey will compare the religious press of that era with that of the preceding three decades. The results should indicate the extent to which religious norms shifted. First, however, it is necessary to consider questions of methodology and terminology. The primary legacy from the Tudors to the Stuarts, in regard to press censorship, was the Star Chamber Decree of 1586. This decree directed that no one should print any book, work, copy, matter, or thing whatsoever unless it 'hath been heeretofore allowed, or hereafter shall be allowed before the ymprintinge thereof, accordinge to th[e] order appoynted by the Queenes maiesties Iniunctyons, And been first seen and perused by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London...'. Article 51 of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559 had additionally provided for the chancellors of both universities to function as licensers. 18 This basically was the pre-publication licensing structure inherited by the early Stuarts, although in practice it was usually the case that the chaplains or secretaries of the bishop of London or the archbishop of Canterbury and the vice-chancellors at the universities would perform the actual work. The best method for identifying the licensor of a religious work in the Jacobean period is through the record of entrance in the Stationers' Registers where the licensor's name is frequently included. By the 1630's this evidence was at times supplemented by proof of approbation, the imprimatur, in the book itself.

However this process of entering a work in the Stationers' Registers applied only to London publications:
books printed in Scotland and Ireland were exempt. So also were books printed at the universities of Cambridge and Oxford where traces of approval by the respective vice-chancellors are exiguous at best. John le Neve supplies lists of university vice-chancellors, but, since their terms were short and not calendrical, individual licensers are still difficult to recognize. At Cambridge vice-chancellors were elected, with their term beginning in November. Oxford vice-chancellors, however, were appointed by the chancellor and took office in July. 

For lack of better information, the Stationers' Registers with their notes of author, title, publisher, company officer, and often licenser as well, have strongly influenced thinking about matters of cooperation within the guild of stationers. There certainly were requirements that stationers present a copy to the master or wardens of the company to confirm that no previous claims to ownership existed: this would secure the company's permission to print and gain protection against future infringement. For this service the stationer was charged a fee. Peter Blayney has established that the actual record of this transaction was the entry in the registers but that for this entrance record another fee was charged; some stationers may thus have elected to cut corners and avoid this additional charge. According to Blayney, 'Certainly before 1622, and probably until 1637 a stationer was not required to spend money on an entry in the register. An entry was an insurance policy: paid for it provided the best possible protection, but the price had to be weighed against the risk.... Entrance was voluntary and its absence is never sufficient reason for suspecting anything furtive, dishonest, or illegal'. Much more suspicious would be the lack of any stationer's name or a false imprint - often a warning that the book had been printed surreptitiously or abroad. In spite of this caveat, an entrance record is one of the measurements used in evaluating each of the books in this survey. Moreover, it is
significant that these fees were part of the relatively sizable overhead costs of printing a work for the first time—costs which cause Blayney to stress the much greater financial rewards to be gleaned from reprints. There is a similar emphasis on the lower costs of producing reprints in the following chapters as it suggests that reprints were a more reliable source of profit than were first editions.

In selecting the four years for this investigation, the year 1637 has been chosen as a benchmark because it was then that a new Star Chamber Decree concerning printing was instituted. Working backwards at ten-year intervals produced the other three years: 1607, 1617, and 1627. Even within these specimen years to be sampled, the number of religious publications proved too great to allow an analysis of each title. For this reason a systematic statistical sampling has been employed as a means of selection; thus only a proportion of books are included. In the chronological index to the revised Short Title Catalogue, the titles are arranged alphabetically by the surname of the author. After isolating all the titles which suggested a religious content for each year (while eliminating Bibles, books of church liturgy, and official ecclesiastical publications such as articles of religion, canons and constitutions, injunctions, and visitation articles), every third title was selected to make up the annual sample. To use the year 1607 as an example: out of a total of 434 books listed for the year, 145 appeared to be religious. To take every third title was to include forty seven titles in the sampling. The forty seven titles examined equal more than 10% of the entire output with 1607 imprints. Because of the numbers involved, it is not feasible to provide lists of all the religious titles printed in the sample years. However the titles which were actually examined are supplied in a list of primary sources for each of the four survey chapters.

The chapter for each survey is accompanied by an appendix listing all the books examined. These titles are
divided between those printed for the first time in England, Scotland and Ireland and those printed surreptitiously in England or abroad; reprints are treated separately but with the same distinctions. The form of the bibliographical description for each of the titles included derives from the major sources in the field of early English printing. The use of closed brackets, parentheses, and elipses is patterned on the revised Short title Catalogue, as are the abbreviations, when used, and the form in which the imprints are recorded. The names of publishers and licensers, when derived from entries in the registers, are transcribed as they appear in Arber. Although licensing is used here to describe that approval which authorities were required to grant before titles could be printed, it is not entirely accurate for the early part of this time period. 'Licensing' is a familiar term, but it might be more correct to describe this process as 'allowing' or 'authorizing' a title for publication. The information from the Stationers' Registers for assigning and transferring reprints concentrates on that which appeared closest to the imprint date and is not always the earliest data appearing in the registers. The spelling of names of persons in dedications is standardized according to the spelling in the Index of Dedications compiled by F. B. Williams. In many cases the copy examined was located at the Folger library; these are designated by 'F copy'. If the Folger lacked a copy, what was available on University Microfilms for STC books has been used; these are designated by the STC symbol for the location of the original copy and by the reel number. If there was no copy available for viewing, the next book on the list of religious publications for the survey year has been substituted. The chapters on the four sample years are followed by one of contrasting case studies - an examination of the printing history of works by Thomas Taylor, a puritan, and of Thomas Jackson, a divine with Arminian sympathies. The trajectory of their writings dramatises the fact that as the fortunes of the former fell,
those of the latter rose.

Printed writings are, of course, just one element in the religious environment of early Stuart England - life in the parishes may or may not be reflected by them. Moreover, the vast majority of sermons was never printed. However we are concerned here with the religious press in England in order to discover whether or not the subjects covered in books printed openly and for the first time reflected a change in outlook on the part of the regime between the survey years of 1607 and 1637. Focusing on religion does not provide a global approach - but by systematically isolating religious titles and examining every third item, one avoids the accusation of being anecdotal. It is important to note that this study concentrates on the content of printed books. The appearance in print of known dissenters does not mean that there was no censorship; censorship was of subject and not of author. Concern here will be with the general evangelical Calvinist interest in predestination, antipopery, and sabbatarianism on the one hand and with the conformist stance on adiaphora (the doctrine of things indifferent), along with ritual and ceremony (rather than sermons) on the other.

It is useful here to have definitions for some of these evangelical Calvinist positions. The Calvinist doctrine of the unconditional double decree of predestination, that God of his mere will and pleasure had elected certain individuals to salvation while reprobating others who as a consequence were damned, came increasingly to be challenged by the belief that this decree was conditional - depending on whether grace was freely accepted or rejected. The Dutch theologian, James Arminius, was one who believed in the conditional nature of predestination, and like-minded divines became known as 'Arminians' although the English movement was largely independent. Tyacke has examined the texts of published Paul's Cross sermons in order to identify views regarding the double decree of absolute predestination. This investigation enlarges on that by initially including all religious
publication and also by searching for other subjects of interest to evangelical Protestants and for issues relating to Catholicism. Fear and hatred of Catholics was a common theme in the Tudor-Stuart period and frequently it was employed by those in authority as a unifying force for a people who embodied a spectrum of religious beliefs. Such feeling was especially aroused by memories of the Gunpowder Plot and suspicions that more popish plots might unfold at any time. Emotional outbursts against Catholics were also triggered by the assassination of the French king, Henry IV, and plans for James to marry his son to a Catholic Spaniard. In its most virulent form, antipopery cast the Pope as Antichrist. Another widespread category of belief was that which insisted on strict sabbath observance and which would allow no exceptions. The entire day was to be devoted to holy activities. The Declaration of Sports in 1618, reissued in 1633, sought to relax the rules and to allow recreation on Sunday.  

Religious censorship in England, and the resulting clandestine printing, date back to the reign of Henry VIII. So also other themes found in works of the Jacobean era surfaced first in the course of Tudor rule. However it is not feasible to attempt a survey of Tudor religious publishing as well. For that reason a Tudor prologue, in part relying on previous studies of Elizabethan religious controversies and publishing, has been prefixed to this thesis. The prologue will relate the efforts of the sixteenth century regimes to implement censorship and enforce press controls and will cite a few products of the religious press which helped to shape such actions.

There remains a wealth of documentation. Statutes of the realm, royal proclamations, injunctions, ordinances, Star Chamber decrees, and royal grants of letters patent all corroborate the attempt of the Stuarts and their Tudor predecessors to control especially the religious content of the press. The Stationers' Registers and the records of the
Court of Assistants of the Stationers' Company also reflect the efforts of the leaders of the industry to enforce the regulations of crown, council, and company which governed printing and bookselling. Petitions and complaints to the Privy Council and to parliament, as well as cases before various courts, illustrate a degree of continuing dissatisfaction on all sides with what remained a fluid situation.
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2. **TUDOR PROLOGUE**

Even with the support of statutes and proclamations to provide a framework for their actions, when it came to the output of the printing press, Tudor regimes were for the most part reacting to events. Henry VIII may have turned to reformers and the printing press when he sought his divorce from Catherine in the 1530's, but a mere ten years earlier his regime had been hastily seeking measures to stem the influx of reformist literature. This was not simply a reformation from above for purely political reasons - the book burnings of works by Tyndale and Luther in the 1520's bear testimony to that fact. There was also what Nicholas Tyacke terms a 'clerical vanguard'. The collaboration of Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer in the 1530's promoted a flowering of evangelical publications. One of the most dramatic examples concerns the Bible itself. Tyndale's clandestine translation of the New Testament in the 1520's was banned and burned, but in the 1530's three English Biblical versions, all partly dependent on Tyndale's work, were welcomed: the Coverdale Bible, Matthew's Bible (1537) and the Great Bible of 1539.¹

In England the fortunes of reformers and their writings veered dramatically with the downfall of Cromwell. A proclamation of 1538 (described below) reasserted the powers of the monarch in printing affairs, and the Act of the Six Articles in 1539 clamped down on religious reform by protecting traditional practices. During the Edwardian period the relaxed printing policies of protector Somerset were succeeded in turn by the increasingly militant 'Protestantism' of the duke of Northumberland. Their cumulative efforts made the reign of Edward VI crucial for the progress of the Protestant Reformation in England, although differences in interpretation, such as that between George Bernard and Diarmaid MacCulloch, remain. Bernard argues for a monarchical church - one originating with Henry
VIII whose 'great achievement was to harness the rhetoric of the continental Reformation to the defence of the royal supremacy'. In this view 'Henry VIII, Elizabeth, James I and Charles I placed secular and political considerations of order above purely ecclesiastical and theological considerations'. Bernard writes of Henrician and Elizabethan ambiguity and ignores the reign of Edward when, according to MacCulloch, the Church of England was in fact permanently shaped. 'And the responsibility for that shaping was in the hands of the one man who remained at the centre of religious policy throughout Edward's reign, Thomas Cranmer'. Even the break caused by the overthrow of Somerset and the ascendance of Northumberland in 1549 did not alter this direction. 'There was an essential continuity of purpose in a graduated series of religious changes over seven years....Thomas Cranmer was the one man who guaranteed the continuity of the changes, and he was chiefly responsible for planning them as they occurred'. The Catholic reign of Mary and Philip reversed the English Reformation by way of reaction to it; their policies generated an upsurge of clandestine Protestant publishing - mainly abroad. The Church of England under Elizabeth in turn provoked press criticism from both recusant and militant Protestant alike. Indeed, Cyndia Clegg stresses the 'ad hoc' nature of the Elizabethan resort to censorship. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there were some dominant trends in the continuing efforts to control criticism, whether in manuscript or printed book, and these need to be explored.

From the beginnings of printing in England, the crown sought to influence the output of the press. As continental reformed ideas spread in England and religion became a divisive issue, English monarchs had to respond to changing conditions in an effort to maintain peace and unity in the realm. The proliferation of printing presses at the same time made it imperative that the crown control the printing and distribution of books. Each successive Tudor monarch had at
his or her disposal an ever-increasing range of statutory and royal precedents to invoke in this struggle to sustain religious harmony. This panoply of precedents can be roughly divided into three general categories.

Medieval statutes designed to control heresy, treason and defamation were already in place and were indeed utilized by the Tudors. Moreover, as the sixteenth century advanced, the crown developed a series of progressively more sophisticated regulations for the pre-publication licensing of books. These regulations fell within the jurisdiction of the prerogative courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. A third avenue, the power of the monarch to influence the economic well being of stationers, was explored along with the other two. Some examples of these three avenues are as follows.

It was the Church which had originally forbidden the teaching of heretical doctrine. In 1401, during the reign of Henry IV, an act of parliament was passed on behalf of the prelates and clergy to deal with the threat from the Lollards. This statute specified that those possessing books or writings of 'wicked doctrine and opinion' must deliver them to the local diocesan. The diocesan might arrest and imprison heretics; those who refused to renounce their heretical opinions would go to the secular court and could be burned. With the spread into England of printing and, subsequently, the reformed religion, the crown increased its vigilance in such matters. In a proclamation dated March 1529 the link between heresy and sedition was emphasized and, within a year, the 'responsibility for censoring books was taken away from the church and given, in effect, to the Council'. [Patricia Took]. This was part of the general trend to include the prevention of heretical printing in the effort to diminish discord, although in 1555 an act of parliament and a proclamation of Philip and Mary drew upon the statute of 1401 to prohibit seditious and heretical books - in the latter case listing also the names of proscribed 'Protestant'
However, under Henry VIII, ecclesiastical jurisdiction was subordinated to that of king and council. Heresy merged with treason.

There had been treason statutes on the books for many years. That of 1352 declared which offences should be judged treasonous. Chief among these were: to 'compass' or imagine the death of king or queen or heir, to support the king's enemies, and to levy war against the monarch. These measures were expanded in 1534 in an act whereby additional offences were declared high treason. These offences included that of maliciously wishing or desiring by words or writing any bodily harm to the king or his family or to publish and pronounce by express writing or words that the king should be heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, or usurper of the crown. Such offenders should be judged traitors.

Although treason statutes in the reigns of Edward VI and Mary tended to maintain a distinction between written and spoken offences, with the written criticism eliciting harsher punishment, the Elizabethan statute of 1571 reverted to the Henrician position by declaring it a treasonous offence to oppose the queen 'by any pryntinge wrytinge cyphryng speache wordes or sayinges'. Elizabeth's attitude hardened still more as a reaction to illicit popish literature. In 1582 the queen proclaimed that Jesuits and seminarians were traitors. There was a need for an updated statutory definition of treason; the outcome was a statute in 1585 which specifically labeled Jesuits as traitors. However, treason trials were long and laborious.

A body of laws which dealt with defamation had origins in the medieval acts of 'scandalum magnatum'. Two statutes from the reign of Richard II prescribed penalties for those who devised slanderous lies and false news against the great men of the realm. In the reign of Mary a statute was enacted which was designed to counteract writings of all sorts that caused discord or rebellion and to stop seditious and slanderous news and rumours about the royal couple.
Punishments included loss of the right hand for writing or printing and loss of an ear for repeating seditious slander. This statute was also designed to include types of activities which were not covered by the treason statute of Edward III.

A similar statute dates from 1581, but it was focused mainly on those who uttered seditious words and rumours against Queen Elizabeth; also, there was a slight increase in the size of the fines and period of imprisonment. Printing, writing, or publishing, or causing so to be done, of any seditious book (not being treason under Edward III) were declared a felony 'without any benefite of cleargie or sanctuarye to be alowed unto the offendour in that behalfe'.

These kinds of charges had limited applicability as they were confined to news and the offending material had to be proven false.

The Tudors thus enacted a series of special felony statutes to deal with the most offensive authors of seditious opinion. These laws were not popular as the punishments seemed to outweigh the crimes. The famous case against John Stubbs, who had written against a possible marriage between Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Alencon, was an example. The book was called in by proclamation in 1579. The queen wanted its author to hang, but the jury would not support this. She had to settle for the amputation of his hand. Felony trials typically concerned authors, rather than printers. The charges made at an assize trial in July 1590 against the puritan divine, John Udall, were a case in point. After being examined by the High Commission in January of that year, he was put on trial for his life - the assize was held at archbishop Whitgift's manor of Croydon. He was accused of a felony. In one of the prepared speeches, the case against Udall was described for the jury: 'First, That he had a malicious Intent in making of this Book [A Demonstration of Discipline]: Secondly, that he is the Authour of it: And Thirdly, That these matters contained in the Indictment are
Felony, by the Statute, 23 Elizabeth, cap. 2 [the act of 1581 against seditious words and rumours]. Legal action taken against the separatist Henry Barrow in 1593 when he was "condemned upon the Statute for writing and publishing seditious books" was likewise designed to exact rigorous penalties for an instigator of discord in the country.  

On the other hand, prosecutions against printers and publishers were generally conducted as the result of violations of the regulations for pre-publication licensing. Philip Hamburger, a lawyer and legal historian, has studied the development of the law of seditious libel and the control of the press in Tudor-Stuart England. After examining cases of seditious libel and trying to reconstruct the government's approach, he has reached the conclusion that most of the action against this kind of printing was taken through the daily administration of the licensing regulations. The tradition within the English Church which required that material be submitted for examination by official licensers before copies could be circulated can be traced back to the anti-Lollardy measures of the early fifteenth century. Even universities were to appoint censors to approve all books before they could be copied by stationers. This pattern of pre-circulation licensing carried over into the age of the printing press. Possibly the earliest instance where a printer was summoned for questioning for not having a book examined first by a diocesan was T. Berthelet in 1526 who printed three otherwise noncontroversial sermons. Immediately thereafter the bishop of London warned an assembly of booksellers that they 'neither print nor cause to be printed any other works whatever...unless first they exhibit the same to the Lord Legate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishop of London'. Imported books must also be so examined.  

The machinery used to combat Wycliffite heresies was thus in place when Luther's books became a threat. However, procedures designed for Lollardy were not necessarily
effective against Lutheranism. As the evangelical movement gained in size and complexity, Henry VIII sought to establish control of the press through king and council. The problem was no longer simply one of foreign books being smuggled into England. Now the native printing industry was developing. A series of proclamations ensued: those relating to distribution were aimed at suppressing individual titles; others elaborated a mechanism for pre-publication regulation and licensing. A proclamation of June 1530 prohibiting erroneous books and Bible translations established a licensing system under royal authority whereby no one should arrange to have a book printed in English concerning the holy scripture 'until such time as the same book or books be examined and approved by the ordinary of the diocese where the said books shall be printed'. The printer had to set the name of the examiner and his own name upon the book or answer to the king. The same proclamation covered books printed abroad and declared that no subjects should 'buy, receive, or have any of the books before named [by Tyndale, Frith and Fish], or any other book being in the English tongue and printed beyond the sea, of what matter soever it be...'.

Thus licensing was clearly under a secular authority, but with a continued reliance on ecclesiastical examiners. A multifaceted proclamation appeared in November 1538 which, among other things, targeted 'naughty' printed books. The king extended regulation to all books, not just those on holy scripture. 'Item, that no person or persons in this realm shall from henceforth print any book in the English tongue, unless upon examination made by some of his grace's Privy Council, or other such as his highness shall appoint, they shall have license so to do; and yet so having, not to put these words cum privilegio regali, without adding ad imprimendum solum, and that the whole copy, or else at the least the effect of his licence and privilege be therewith printed, and plainly declared and expressed in the English tongue underneath them...'. These rules listed marginalia,
prologues, and other additions as matter needing examination. Bishops would be brought in for the examination of books of scripture in English. In 1539 a 'statute of proclamations' appeared which implied that proclamations should be obeyed and observed as if they were made by act of parliament. By the 1540's Henry had begun to decelerate the Reformation. One trace of this was a major statute enacted in 1542 for the advancement of true religion, as set forth since 1540, and the abolition of the contrary - here again Tyndale's translation of the scriptures was forbidden. Of chief importance were provisions for religious books, especially 'as the Kings Majestie shall by his bill assigned allowe and approve, wherunto the same printers shalbe bounde to put the...subscripcon in this forme: by the King and his Clergye, with addicon in the ende of the printers name his dwelling place the daie and yere of the printing of the same'. If the printer omitted this, there would be the same penalties as for unlawful books. An interesting addition surfaced in a proclamation of July 1546 which was directed against heretical books and required printers to identify themselves, the authors, and the dates of publication for all English books, ballads, and plays. The first copy of every publication was to go to the mayor of the town; there should be no additional distribution for two days. This order lapsed upon the death of Henry.

With Somerset as protector, the first years of the reign of Edward VI were characterized by liberation for the Protestant press. According to John King, Somerset directed parliament to repeal all treason and heresy statutes since the reign of Edward I which had prohibited the expression of religious opinion without crown approval. This act freed the press of all the censorship and licensing regulations imposed by Henry VIII. Reformist works were printed. However in 1549 England experienced a period of civil unrest. As a result, in August of that year an act of the Privy Council stated that every book in English must first be examined by one of three
men: Secretary Petre, Secretary Smith, or Mr. Cecil. Thus although Somerset began his rule by eliminating most governmental censorship powers, the Privy Council reverted to censorship after the rebellions of 1549. This plan was rudely interrupted in October 1549 with the fall of Somerset. A few years later, in 1551 under the rule of Northumberland, an omnibus proclamation was issued which lumped unlicensed printers together with vagabonds and players. As part of the attempt to crack down on rumour-mongers, tellers of news, and those printers, booksellers, and players of interludes who threatened the peace of the realm, the king commanded that 'from henceforth no printer or other person do print nor sell within this realm or any other of his majesty's dominions any matter in the English tongue, nor they nor any other person do sell or otherwise dispose abroad any matter printed in any foreign dominion in the English tongue, unless the same be first allowed by his majesty or his Privy Council in writing signed with his majesty's most gracious hand or the hands of six of his said Privy Council'.

Early in her reign, in August 1553, Mary issued a proclamation which ordered her subjects: 'neither...to print any books, matter, ballad, rhyme, interlude, process, or treatise, nor to play any interlude except they have her grace's special license in writing for the same'. Protestantism was either driven underground or into exile. The publishing situation however worsened so rapidly that Mary reinvoked an early statute against heresy and seditious and heretical books. Finally, on 6 June 1558, the crown proclaimed it a capital offense to possess proscribed books against the Catholic faith. These last two measures targeted authors and owners of books rather than stationers. This was a classic pattern of the Tudors: in serious situations they jettisoned the lesser penalties for unlicensed printing and reverted to measures which would garner maximum sentences. One of Mary's last ploys, presumably devised to manipulate the stationers, was to grant them a royal charter in 1557.
This act of incorporation gave the stationers the legal means to act in control of their own trade and to issue ordinances. The company was granted its own arms a few months later; then in February 1560 the Lord Mayor upgraded it to a livery company. Although both crown and company gained from this cooperation, the preamble to the charter states that the incorporation was intended as a remedy to stop the flow of seditious and heretical books, especially those against the faith of the 'Holy Mother Church'. This should not be dismissed as typical charter-language. Printing was now centralized within London, and the regime could enlist the services of stationers in enforcing regulations. Incorporation, however, could do little to stem the influx of imported publications and, if anything, contributed to the traffic in underground publications.  

Thus the officials of the Stationers' Company joined the ecclesiastical licensers and the Privy Council as administrators of printing regulations. Elizabeth confirmed the charter granted by her Catholic predecessor and re-enforced the policy of pre-publication licensing; the refinements added during the course of her reign made the process more practical. With the Act of Supremacy she gained the ability to create what would become the High Commission. Royal Injunctions were then issued in 1559 as part of the Elizabethan settlement. Item 51 provided an elaborate system for pre-publication approval. 'No person shall print any manner of book or paper, of what sort, nature, or in what language soever it be, except the same be first licensed by her Majesty by words in writing, or by six of her Privy council, or be perused and licensed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, the chancellors of both universities, the bishop being ordinary, and the archdeacon also of the place where any such shall be printed, or by two of them, whereof the ordinary of the place to be always one. And that the names of such as shall allow the same to be added in the end of every such work, for a
testimony of the allowance thereof. Regulations were also to cover pamphlets, plays and ballads.

These injunctions were issued by the queen as supreme governor of the church. The rules as outlined in section 51 remained the legal basis for licensing for over twenty-five years, although a Privy Council ordinance of June 1566 did provide stronger penalties and gave wardens of the Stationers' Company additional powers to search for and seize illegal books. This ordinance for the reformation of 'diverse disorders' did not specifically include provisions for licensing, but referred to laws, statutes, injunctions, letters patent and ordinances already in place.

Pope Pius V had excommunicated Queen Elizabeth in February 1570 and Mary Stuart's claim to the throne continued to pose a challenge as well, so the queen was wary of her Catholic subjects. In the early 1570's there were thus several proclamations to seize unlicensed, fugitive tracts popular in the recusant community. A burgeoning underground puritan press added to the crown's worries. Proclamations in 1573 and 1583 considered specifically Protestant works: the Admonition to Parliament and the writings of Robert Browne and Robert Harrison. A cause celebre from this period was the publication of an unlicensed title in 1570 by the balladeer William Elderton; the work allegedly discredited some of the queen's allies. This resulted in an order from the Privy Council to the wardens and company of stationers. The councillors recalled the offending ballad and commanded the company 'that from hence forthe yowe suffer neither booke ballett nor any other matter to be published in print whatsoever the argument thereof shalbe until the same be first seene and allowed either by us of her majesties' pryvie cownsell or by the Commissioners for causes ecclesyasticall there at London.'

It was obvious that the existing system was not accomplishing all it was designed to do. A letter from the Privy Council to the bishop of London in 1577 displayed
examples of books brought to press without his knowledge and admonished him to make diligent inquiry and 'to charge all the printers within the Cittie that they do not print any thing whiche hathe not ben before that tyme printed without making him acquainted therewith, except they shall be warranted thereto either from her Majestie or from her Privie Council'. The authority of the bishop of London was also being challenged from another direction. William Lambard drew up a preliminary plan for restraining printing through a board of licensers. The surviving version, dated 1580, is considered a draft for a parliamentary licensing act and would remove the bishop of London from control of London presses and instead have a 'body of Governors of the English Print' which would include barristers from the four inns of court. Archbishop Whitgift countered in 1583 with a set of articles which again consolidated the responsibility for allowing books with him and the bishop of London. As if these frictions were not enough, the stationers themselves were disputing over patents and privileges. Stationers who did not have lucrative privileges were vulnerable to the temptation to print illegal books.

Elizabeth responded with the Star Chamber Decree of 1586. In regard to licensing, this referred back to the queen's injunctions. However, now all books must be licensed by the bishop of London or the archbishop of Canterbury; only books by the royal printer and law books were exempt from ecclesiastical examination. For practical reasons it was later acknowledged that deputies of the above could do some of the perusing. The names of those appointed by the archbishop were listed in June 1588 in the Records of the Court of the Stationers Company. These censors were thereafter named in entries in the register books of the Stationers' Company. The decree gave wardens or their deputies strengthened powers of search and seizure. There was a rush to register books, even those which had previously been printed and reprinted without entrance. Ecclesiastical
commissioners must now approve those who would be master printers. 21

Provocations continued, but after 1586 there was at least a system in place to counter them. When Richard Knightly and others were censured in Star Chamber for maintaining seditious persons and books during the Martin Marprelate troubles, the charges in 1589 combined unlicensed printing with printing outside of London, Cambridge, or Oxford. The Attorney General cited the proclamation of 1583 against books by Robert Browne and Robert Harrison, another proclamation of 13 February 1589 ordering the destruction of Marprelate publications, and the Star Chamber decree of 1586 in his list of violated regulations. A reminder to the company to cooperate surfaced in March 1596 when members of the High Commission notified the master and wardens of the Stationers' Company that they could not permit any book to be printed unless it was subscribed and allowed to pass the press under the handwriting of the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of London. A different approach was used when Edward Allde printed a popish title without 'authority' in 1597; he was charged in Stationers' Court with disorderly printing. The penalty was relatively severe because of the nature of the material. His press and types were defaced. 22

Political uncertainty at the end of the century only magnified the licensing scandal which transpired. A play about Henry IV by John Hayward was approved by Samuel Harsnet, then chaplain to the bishop of London, and legally printed by John Wolfe. The dedication (supposedly not present for the perusal) and the subject matter were allegedly sympathetic to Essex so that the book was called in and burned. This play and other political messages masquerading as satires and epigrams provoked a stern reaction in June 1599 when Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Bancroft issued what has come to be termed the 'Bishops' Ban'. This order to the master and wardens was designed to correct a number of abuses. It forbade the printing of satires and epigrams, and,
in future, members of the Privy Council must approve English histories. This was another intervention by the Privy Council, in line with the action regarding the ballad in 1570 and then in 1577 the letter to the bishop of London. Moreover, plays, unless allowed by the proper 'authoritie', could not be printed. (It was not until 1607 that the custom materialized whereby the Master of the Revels approved plays for both stage and press). Books by Thomas Nash and Gabriel Harvey were to be confiscated and no longer printed. Any manuscripts approved by the archbishop or bishop must have the signature validated by the master and wardens. Thus officials of the Stationers' Company carried out regulations under the direction of church authorities; the prerogative courts of High Commission and the Star Chamber served as courts of appeal.

There was one other option which the crown could exercise in the campaign to influence the printing industry and the output of the press: this was in the sphere of economics, privileges and monopolies. Although at first England was heavily reliant on imported books from the continent, as the native printing industry developed, so the crown assumed an increasingly protectionist stance. A Henrician act of 1534 repealed a previous statute permitting importation and instead made it a finable offence to buy foreign books already in bindings for reselling. This same act provided that the Lord Chancellor could regulate the price of books and binding; selling at a higher price than this would incur a fine of 3s 4d per book. In 1549 the price of copies of the Book of Common Prayer was set by a proclamation which also specified a ceiling for the cost of unbound books and of books bound in different materials.

Henry VIII also intervened with methods beyond mere protectionism and price controls. He executed a plan by which the monarch would select a royal printer, protect specific titles against piracy, and begin to grant patents for certain categories of printed work which in essence created virtual
monopolies. The first official printer was William Faques in 1504, actually still in the reign of Henry VII. The office passed through R. Pynson, T. Berthelet, R. Grafton and others until Christopher Barker became the royal printer in September 1577. In addition to the more general power and prestige conferred, the royal printer had sole right to print statutes and proclamations. Nevertheless, the records of the Privy Council contain petitions from Barker which complained that certain rogue printers were raiding his territory. Tottel and Denham were frequently cited, but the leader of these commercial pirates was John Wolfe; he preyed upon reprinting rights in the very fields assigned to the queen's printer. These disturbances were symptomatic of the wide discrepancy between the fortunes of the privileged and unprivileged stationers.

The crown concurrently used the royal prerogative to grant special privileges and patents as a way of gaining loyalty from key individuals within the book industry. Although grants to authors were not unknown, letters patent to stationers for a single title were more common. An example from the reign of Elizabeth gave John Day lifetime rights to print The Cosmological Glass by William Cuningham, provided it be perused and allowed according to the injunctions of the same year - 1559. The most outstanding use of this device was to enable a single printer to hold a monopoly over all titles within a category of printing. This is where the highest remuneration was to be found. However these monopolies caused discord within the industry. And by exercising the royal prerogative to favour and control specific printers, the kings and queens of Tudor England created economic problems. At the same time, as William Calderwood has indicated, the grants of monopolies reduced the scope of the books to be scrutinized by licensing authorities and made control of the press that much easier. Although some of these grants of privilege specified the need for perusal and allowance, many did not. Even after the Stationers' Company was chartered,
the privileges remained outside the purview of the Company and its regulatory procedures. The system of monopolies, or book trade patents, as discussed by Arnold Hunt was an alternative to the Stationers' Registers as a means of copyright protection. Because royally granted a patent was based on authority superior to the Stationers' Company. Thus 'the holder of a patent could prosecute his opponent in Star Chamber without having to rely on the Stationers' Company to carry out disciplinary measures'.

Late in his reign Henry VIII issued a series of these patents for broad categories, often by proclamation. Soon after authorizing a translation of the Bible into English, Henry in 1542 gave the haberdasher Anthony Marler a patent to print the authorized translation, which by this time was the 'Great Bible', for a period of four years. Again, after authorizing one standard primer to be printed in both Latin and English early in May 1545, the king later that same month granted Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch the patent to print or cause to be printed 'our' primer. It was no longer legal to print or sell or buy any impression other than those printed by Grafton and Whitchurch. Elizabethan patents included that of John Bodley who in January 1561 received the sole right to print the Geneva Bible for a period of seven years, although the proviso remained that the edition be 'deemed expedient by the Bishops of Canterbury and London'. Another choice patent went to Richard Watkins and James Roberts in 1588 with a twenty-one year permission to be sole printers of almanacs and prognostications. There was a tendency for some of these patents to pass into the hands of the company as a whole. This began in 1583 when the patentees gave a large number of copies [titles] as a gift for the use of the company's poor. Just after his accession, in 1603 King James reassigned a number of patent categories to the company. This became the basis of the English stock.

The company records yield abundant evidence of petitions and laments from both monopolists and their opponents.
Fortunate patentees had royal protection from other printers infringing on their rights of reprint or printing new works in the assigned field. The ordinance for the reformation of disorder in printing of June 1566 had actually contained protection for letters patent. The company upheld these privileges for the first twenty years of its existence. But the capricious shuffling and reshuffling of monopolies caused commercial confusion. A complaint dating from the middle of 1577 enumerated the grievances sustained by reason of these special privileges. It predicted that a large number of printers and stationers would be ruined, and that there was also the threat of excessive cost of books and false printing. Both wardens were listed among the thirty-five stationers said to be damaged by the privileges of others. The strife among stationers between the mid 1570's and mid 1580's in no small part contributed to the perceived need for the Star Chamber decree of 1586. 28

What did the decree of 1586 do for English printing? Some modern scholars would see the economic interests of stationers as eliciting the decree. Sheila Lambert describes the full cooperation of the Stationers' Company with the crown in producing the decree. 'But insofar as there was inhibition on the publication of ideas and opinion in print, economic and practical factors inherent in the small size of the market for books in England were quite as important as the formal censorship'. Others see the desire for additional royal control as the motivating force. Frederick Siebert allows that it was Archbishop Whitgift's suggestions for licensing which were followed and the stationers' patents and authority which were confirmed, but it was still the council which first conceived the plan for the new regulation. 29

Overall, how successful were these intermittent attempts of the Tudor regimes to influence the content of religious printing? The sheer number of measures invoked suggests recurring problems. As the political and religious issues which concerned monarchs changed in character, so also did
their reactions to the press. Much of what happened was improvisational. On the other hand, as William Calderwood concludes in his study of the Elizabethan Protestant press, the cooperation of government, church, and company to 'search and destroy' secret presses in England meant that 'by the end of the period, almost all offensive religious literature had to be printed abroad'. Throughout his work, Calderwood stresses the importance of continental religious thinkers in the sixteenth century book trade in England. Neil Hemmingsen, a Danish Lutheran, provides an interesting example of increasingly effective censorship in the 1580's. Nicholas Tyacke has remarked on the publishing history of Hemmingsen, whose publications were popular in England during the first part of Elizabeth's reign. His views on predestination, however, were decidedly un-Calvinist. An inspection of the entries beside his name in the Short Title Catalogue reveals an abrupt end to English editions after 1580. For a slightly later time period, Peter Blayney compares the incidence of licensers's names appearing in entries in the Stationers' Registers. For three years before March 1596 there were only 20% with licensers's names; after a warning from the High Commission in 1596, the percentage for the next three years was 48%; during the years after the 'Bishops Ban' of June 1599, the percentage averaged 63%. In other words, the requirement for pre-publication licensing was having an effect. Unlicensed works were more frequently printed abroad, Hemmingsen's books disappeared from the English presses, and licensers were named more often in the Stationers' Registers.

The decree of 1586 imposed prerogative control on the stationers' guild in the interests of the members as well as the crown. Intended to reduce the number of presses, it confirmed the authority of company officials to search for forbidden books, and 'it took an indirect step towards protecting stationers' copyrights by forbidding books "contrary to any allowed ordinance set down for the good
governance of the Company of Stationers". It was truly a turning point in the battle fought by sixteenth century regimes to achieve religious censorship.

The religious background of this struggle provides a sense of the diversity of beliefs represented within England as well as the striking continuity between the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. There is no doubt that the main products of the later sixteenth-century legitimate press in England were Protestant devotional works. But there was also a certain number of controversial, apologetical and polemical works in circulation which were more likely to gain attention. Some of these have already been mentioned because they were troublesome. In general, although religious controversies and the resulting publications changed in tenor over the course of Elizabeth's long reign, still, many of the same beliefs reverberated in the religious press of the early Stuarts.

Anti-Catholicism was prevalent. From Elizabeth's earliest days, when John Jewel challenged Catholics, through her excommunication by the Pope in 1570, and continuing into the years of internal threats from Jesuits such as Edmund Campion (executed in December 1581) and external threats from the Spanish Armada, anti-papery was never absent. The terror and distrust of Catholicism evoked by the approach of the Armada recurred in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot nearly twenty years later - the latter event was commemorated annually by fervent sermons into the early 1630's. Hatred of papists was an integral part of the national ideology under Elizabeth and James. Attack literature, kept alive by ongoing printed debates with Jesuit authors publishing abroad, was another common thread flowing into the Jacobean period. Even William Laud was a soldier in this battle.

Both Elizabeth and James enlisted divines to write defences of the English religious settlement. John Jewel was a pioneer with An Apologie, or answer in Defence of the Church of England in 1562, but the genre flourished in the
early seventeenth century as well. By this time the regime
was warding off attacks by zealous Protestants; apologias of
this nature were undertaken early in the reign of James I by
Gabriel Powel and Francis Mason. They relied on 'adiaphora'
or the doctrine of things indifferent, by which ceremonies
and other issues not covered in the scriptures were deemed
indifferent, to be determined by human authority. 34

With the return of the Marian exiles to England, a
schism within Protestant ranks developed. Those most
influenced by the continental Reformed churches felt that the
English Church was insufficiently reformed. The resulting
debates focused on ceremonies and vestments, both considered
reminiscent of popery. The archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew
Parker, faced opposition from clergy who refused to conform
to his Advertisements, issued in 1566, which described the
requirements for ceremonial practice and apparel. There was a
flurry of publishing on all sides of what became known as the
'Vestiarian Controversy'. The zealous element, the puritans,
turned to parliament to support ideas for additional reform.
After the queen intervened and forbade discussion of
ecclesiastical affairs, two men anonymously published An
Admonition to Parliament in 1572 which attacked the bishops.
The Admonition was reprinted in 1617, again surreptitiously.
Underground attacks on episcopal government remained a worry
for Elizabeth and James as well as Charles.

After the permissive ecclesiastical rule of Edmund
Grindal, in 1583 John Whitgift became archbishop of
Canterbury; he initiated a subscription campaign to restore
uniformity of liturgical observance in the Church of England.
Some who were disenchanted with archbishops and bishops were
by now attracted to the presbyterian form of church
organization. Presbyterianism peaked in the 1580's and was
perceived as most menacing to the crown during the period of
the underground press publishing 'Marprelate Tracts'. The
government response was spearheaded by Richard Bancroft, later
bishop of London. John Penry and John Udall were martyred and
the movement silenced within England by the end of the century.

Antipathy to the hierarchy in the Church of England reached an extreme with the separatists - who left the church, often to worship instead in the Netherlands or in North America. Their clandestine literature continued into the next century; attacking separatism, like attacking Catholicism, served as a rallying point for conformists and puritans alike.

Discussion about the finer points of predestination was common during the reigns of the last Tudor and the first Stuart. When the unconditional nature of predestination was challenged by the likes of William Barrett, the resulting Lambeth Articles of 1595 re-enforced the interpretation that predestination was absolute. This was the orthodox position and it remained so into the reign of James I, although the disputes themselves dated from as early as 1566. Calvinism in general was a strong force within the Church of England - its tendency to emphasize both the power of preaching and the absolute nature of the double decree providing a bond between the ecclesiastical regime of James I and its Elizabethan predecessor.

There was arguably a special link between religion and government attempts at censorship. As William Calderwood says: 'From the Queen's Injunctions [really ordinances] of 1566, when the Vestments controversy was at its height and offensive Puritan tracts were being published, control of the press tightened as Catholics and radical Protestants became more adept at clandestine printing and at smuggling their literature into the country'.

The scenario at the turn of the century reflected the cumulative efforts of Tudor monarchs. Thus early statutes against heresy, treason, and defamation, buttressed by Tudor proclamations and additional felony statutes, defined the means by which the crown would deal with 'disorderly' printing. Emerging regulations which concentrated on pre-
publication censorship and the destruction of illegal books enabled monarch and council to control the press through the royal prerogative, although generally with the able assistance of religious examiners. The foundation of the Stationers' Company in 1557, under the Catholic Queen Mary, created a mechanism for routine administration of the various rules and regulations governing printing. As H. S. Bennett remarked, 'By this means the Crown was able to exert pressure as it thought best from time to time, leaving the tiresome and often difficult job of implementing its commands to the officials of the Company'. Royal privileges, letters patent, and the custom of appointing an official printer to the monarch gave the crown additional latitude for influence and interference.

Incessant tampering with the formula for approving materials before publication betrays the frustrations which the crown experienced in its attempts to control the religious press. Even so, the structure was in place. The mechanics of press regulation and the jurisdiction were to be conciliar. The injunctions of 1559 and the order of 1566 were consolidated into the decree of 1586; this decree in turn outlined the rules. It was the bequest to the Stuarts. And it was this decree which endured, serving as the basis for press regulation for the next fifty years. During discussions about the abuses of licensing and printing in parliament early in 1629, John Selden declared 'The refusing the licensing of books is no crime, but the licensing of bad books is a crime, or the refusing to license books because they write against Popery or Arminianism is a crime. There is no law to prevent the printing of any book in England, only a decree in the Star Chamber. Therefore that a man should be fined and imprisoned, and his goods taken from him, is a great invasion on the liberty of the subject'.
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James Stuart was raised in presbyterian Scotland. His mother had been a notorious papist; his wife Anne drifted towards Catholicism while in Scotland. Therefore there was cause for anxiety as well as hope at both ends of the religious spectrum when James became king of England in 1603. The first years of his rule were characterized by a jockeying for position among his subjects. There were two seminal events early in this reign which in turn generated much publishing activity: the Hampton Court Conference of January 1604 and the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, involving respectively Puritanism and Catholicism. Much of the printed material which falls into this sampling of religious titles for 1607 relates to these two occurrences.

James was greeted by much petitioning activity on his arrival in England in 1603, although nothing was as ambitious as the millenary petition which was said to have the support of a thousand ministers. This manifesto was worded in such a way that it did not appear to threaten the royal supremacy but instead encouraged the king to call a conference of learned men to debate the problems of the church. The king complied by convening a group of bishops and deans in January 1604 and including among their number representatives of the puritan element. However even these puritan spokesmen were appointed by the court and their 'foreman' was John Reynolds, a man who, although he believed that the church needed additional reform, nevertheless was one who himself, as president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, remained within the establishment. ¹

The semi-official chronicler of the conference, William Barlow, portrayed it as a defeat and embarrassment for the puritans who were overruled in their efforts to eliminate the cross in baptism and the surplice in worship or to alter the Book of Common Prayer. Likewise John Reynolds failed in his hope of appending the Lambeth Articles to the Thirty-nine
Articles. There were some few points of general agreement. King James supported the claims of the puritans (and others) that England needed a preaching ministry. He promised to limit pluralism and to place greater restrictions on the sale of popish books. Also, there was a consensus that something needed to be done to reverse the lay impropriation of church income. However since neither the universities nor the crown would cooperate in renouncing the income they had acquired, the poverty of the church remained a serious problem.

There were thus few real changes as a result of the Hampton Court Conference: church liturgy and polity remained virtually intact. A new prayer book was issued by royal proclamation in early March, only weeks after the conference; except for an alteration in the section which had permitted lay baptism, it contained additional explanations, not real revisions. The major development was the commissioning of a new translation of the Bible as requested by Reynolds. This would become the authorized version, not published until 1611. In the aftermath of the conference a convocation met and a new code of canons was proposed. These canons of 1604 included measures against nonconformity. Canon thirty-six required all ministers to give unqualified subscription to three articles: to affirm royal supremacy, to accept the Book of Common Prayer as containing nothing contrary to the word of God, and to accept the Thirty-nine Articles. A royal proclamation of 16 July 1604 gave ministers until the end of November to conform to the form of service established after Hampton Court. Modern interpretations of the Hampton Court Conference vary somewhat, with Mark Curtis maintaining that there has been too much reliance on Barlow's court account. While it was true that press licensing was a monopoly of the bishop of London and archbishop of Canterbury and puritan versions of the proceedings might be denied print, it is difficult to view this conference as a comfort to puritans. Patrick Collinson sees the conference and its results as a continuation of the status quo.
Certainly for many of those who had supported the millenary petition, the Hampton Court Conference was a disappointment. The enforcement of subscription which began in 1604 caused more deprivations than the one initiated by Whitgift in the 1580's. Estimates range from seventy-three to almost one hundred as the number of ministers who lost benefices for nonconformity between 1604 and 1609. King James himself, especially in the winter of 1604-1605, sought to purge radical nonsubscribers from his church. For those who refused to conform and to subscribe, the penalties meant loss of their livings. The subscription issue created a wedge between moderate and radical puritans. Moreover, some felt they could no longer remain in England. It was probably no coincidence that congregations in Scrooby and Gainsborough migrated to Holland between 1607 and 1608.

Archbishop Whitgift died late in February 1604. One of the landmark cases in the history of the law of seditious libel resulted from a pasquil pinned to Whitgift's hearse-verse which excoriated the policies of both Whitgift and Bancroft. Some of the same grievances aired at the Hampton Court Conference were here reiterated: ceremonies, pluralism, popish superstition, conformity. Authorship was eventually attributed to Lewis Pickering of Northamptonshire, leader in the aborted movement to return crown and university impropriations to the church. This incident was seen to confirm the growing suspicion that puritans who resisted subscription were indeed a seditious threat to the monarchy. Attorney General Edward Coke as prosecutor produced a restatement of the libel law which created a lasting legal precedent for libel and sedition cases. Tried in Star Chamber in May 1605, Pickering's alleged versifying was deemed a libel against the crown and therefore seditious. This ruling was to have grave ramifications for some of the puritan print publications of the 1630's.

The subscription campaign also met with a resurgence of petitioning activity - the best known of which was by
Northamptonshire gentlemen early in 1605. Sir Francis Hastings drafted their petition and for his efforts paid a stiff price: he was questioned for several days before king and council. By Lord Chancellor Ellesmere his behaviour was termed seditious and tending to rebellion because it united many men against the law. Hastings was dismissed from the king's service, never to regain his public offices. Earlier, in December 1604, prominent puritan divines of Lincoln diocese had pressed their demands on the king, also to no avail. An abridgement of their 'book', subtitled the first Part of an Apologye for Themselves and their Brethren that refuse the Subscription and Conformitie which is required was surreptitiously printed by the press of William Jones in 1605. Another publication, which like the former attacked the official prayer book, was anonymously printed in Middelburg the next year: Survey of the Booke of Common Prayer. 7

However, in the end such puritan dissent was upstaged by recusant activity. When James ascended the English throne the Catholics among his subjects had hoped that he would move towards toleration. The time seemed ripe: after the death of William Allen in 1594, the recusant community had become split. Some elements stressed loyalty in the hope of receiving greater toleration. A movement of secular priests, called Appellants, was then openly critical of English Jesuits. Moreover, at the behest of the Jesuit Robert Parsons, a new position, that of archpriest, was created in 1598 and filled by George Blackwell. Although the titular head of the secular priests, Blackwell's connection with the Jesuits made him suspect to the Appellants. Thomas Clancy writes of a flurry of books between 1601 and 1603, written by Appellants and critical of extreme papal claims. Because James was aware of the rising discontent of radical puritans in his kingdom, he may have been reluctant to offend them still more by showing leniency towards Catholics. 8 Instead he initiated a series of measures to tighten control over the recusant population. A royal proclamation of February 1604
ordered all Jesuits and seminary priests to leave England; by depriving Catholics of their priests, James was clearly undermining their religion. Moreover the treaty of London which ended war between Spain and England in August 1604 failed to contain any provision for English Catholics. In November of that year the collection of recusancy fines was resumed. The ensuing Gunpowder Plot of November 1605, however, which was designed to destroy the government, produced a more serious backlash against Catholicism in England. Parliament in 1606 passed an act which required all subjects suspected of recusancy to take an oath of allegiance to the king, an oath which also denied the pope any authority to depose the king or to authorize any foreign prince to invade his country. This offer to Catholics asked merely for a pledge of allegiance; however it also contributed to the rift within recusant ranks. M. Questier suggests that this oath was 'possibly the most lethal measure against Romish dissent ever to reach the statute book'. To Questier, 'in practice all the different clerical groups were internally fractured by it'. The new pope, Paul V, condemned it twice. Archpriest Blackwell took the oath, but many Appellants did not. 

In his disputes with Catholics, as with puritans, King James employed a policy of splitting off the moderates from the radicals; those who would not take the oath of allegiance or subscribe were punished. Bishop Bancroft had been in touch with Appellant priests and, with Cecil's support, had provided limited access to the presses of London for secular priests to answer Jesuit opponents. Through negotiations at the Hampton Court Conference, James drew some moderate puritans into his camp and then, through the subscription campaign, further separated these moderates from their more radical brethren. His church often rewarded conforming, evangelical Calvinists. Extremists of both Protestant and Catholic beliefs threatened the rights of the monarch as supreme governor of the church; this potential for
subversion had to be forestalled. Loyalty and civil obedience were of prime importance. This rule of divide and conquer, combined with a tendency to balance the competing interests within the leadership of the English Church, did buy peace in the short term. What it also did was to stimulate those representing a range of opinions to present their views in print. The turmoil which resulted from the Hampton Court Conference and the Gunpowder Plot produced waves of publications on a variety of timely religious topics.

The earliest extant edition of a book, if it truly is the first edition as well, can provide the best clues as to what was allowed through the licensing and publishing process in England. Of the thirty earliest editions in this sampling for 1607, twenty-four were openly printed in England, either in London or at one of the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The ecclesiastical licensing apparatus in this year was under the control of the archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft, and the bishop of London, first Richard Vaughan and then Thomas Ravis; it was often the chaplains of the archbishop or bishop or even other clergy located in the London area who did the actual perusing and licensing. The university vice-chancellors, Henry Airay (until July 1607) and then the future bishop of London, John King at Oxford, and Roger Goad followed by Robert Some at Cambridge, would vet manuscripts for their respective presses. The books which had first editions in 1607 and fall into this sampling have been examined to see what they reveal about the norms at this time—especially whether they qualify as apologies for the regime's religious policy or if they expressed more evangelical Calvinist themes such as the double decree of predestination, sabbatarianism, or antipopery. As moderator at the Hampton Court Conference and as the authority who promulgated the canons of 1604, King James needed to explain his actions in the face of mounting criticism. The doctrine of things indifferent, or adiaphora, helped to serve his purpose. By this doctrine ceremonies and other issues not
specifically covered in the scriptures were deemed indifferent, to be determined by human authority. As Stephen Brachlow states, 'the post-Hampton Court radicals contended that it was precisely over the adiaphora issue that the moderate puritan spokesmen had foundered'. Among those men writing to defend the decisions taken by the crown in its campaign against nonconformity were staunch Calvinists. A classic example of this was Thomas Sparke who had stood alongside John Travers at the disputation at Lambeth in 1584, but who in 1607 issued a book in defence of the authorised rites and ceremonies of the Church of England.  

No one defined the royal viewpoint better than King James himself who made clear that ceremonies were indifferent and that those who challenged them were in effect undermining the crown. To those who deplored the plight of silenced ministers, James responded, 'Ministeris by disobedience to the Kings authoritie and ordinances of a setlid churche in indifferent things do prove thaimselfis to be nothing ellis indeid but seditiouse schismatikes...'.  Among the apologists for the regime who attempted to justify the king's program for conformity and peace within the church were Francis Mason, Samuel Collins, Thomas Rogers, and an author known only as A. N.; their material was first published in 1607 and falls into this survey.

Francis Mason delivered a sermon in Norwich in June 1605 which dealt specifically with the right of the church to make canons concerning things indifferent and to expect obedience in the observation of these canons. This sermon was enlarged and published in 1607 with Mason described on the titlepage as a 'sometime fellow of Merton College, Oxford'; it was entered in the registers on 9 April 1607 after licensing by a prebendary of St. Paul's, Zacharius Pasfield. The dedicatee was Archbishop Bancroft, the conformist force behind much of what was decided at Hampton Court and at the succeeding convocation. Mason adopted the approach that some of the ministry were unresolved in their attitude to the Book of
Common Prayer because they did not duly consider the nature of things indifferent and the duty of a subject to his sovereign. Those things which were neither commanded nor forbidden by church law, might be commanded by a sovereign, and his subjects were obligated to obey. 'Therefore God commands us to obey our Prince in things indifferent. But all these things [ie the surplice, the cross in baptism] are indifferent; & therefore in all these God commands us to obey our Prince'. Within the country there should then be conformity. 'Indeed in the same nation, and under the same government it is fit there should be an uniformitie....But diversitie of rites in divers churches independent doth noe harme, where there is an unitie of faith'. Mason concluded this apology for the canons by alluding to the deprivations which were occurring because of vigorous enforcement of subscription. 'And for our Bishops, o what an anguish will it bee to their soules, if those voices which ordained you, be constrained to deprive you. And what a comfort would it be both to them, and to all your brethren of the Ministerie, if we might joine together against the common enemie, and bee linked in everlasting chaines of love one with another...'.

Another of this sort of apologia issued from the pen of Samuel Collins. Originally preached at Paul's Cross on 1 November 1607, this sermon was also licensed by Pasfield, followed by entry on 18 November; it was dedicated to Archbishop Bancroft whose chaplain Collins was. The invitation to appear at the Cross would have been issued by Thomas Ravis, the bishop of London who was also a licensing authority. It is clear from the dedication that Collins was indebted to Bancroft for favours and career advancement. Here also was an appeal for harmony and peace within the church: 'so mine eyes gush out with water, to see there is no religion amongst menne for the most part, but that which is tainted with a spice of faction'. In his sermon Collins included a defence of the practice of subscription. 'So,
antient is the custome of requiring subscription at the hands of the Church-men, to prevent faction once a-foot'. Harsh criticism was directed against the Protestant schismatics; Collins claimed that the puritans were the ones who needed to be regulated. 'They [papists] are not taxed with the same kinds of punishments, because they are not capable of being so punished as those to whom more favour hath been alwaies shewed. They are not silenced, for they never had bin licensed to preach among us.... The short of it is, my deere brethren, though the papists bee troublesome, yet the Puritans must not looke to goe uncontrolled'. This was not to say that Collins was developing anti-Calvinist tendencies for he also criticized the Pelagian for 'If any consent not, the Pelagian as soone as he heares of this Consent, presentlie dreams a dream of his dearling Frewil'. In later years Collins continued his performance as royal controversialist for King James, but mostly in debate with Catholics. Even though loyal to the royal cause, Collins retained his post as regius professor of divinity at Cambridge during the civil war period - a fact which suggests he was still accepted as a Calvinist.  

A work known only by the initials 'A. N.' was directed at hypocritical preachers; it also stressed the need to obey the king in matters indifferent. 'They refuse to subscribe to the King's lawfull authority, in causes ecclesiasticall; to the Articles of Religion, to ye Book of common Prayer, and the orders, rites and ceremonies of our church. Nay they dissent from us in thinges accidentall and ceremoniall. For example sake, the cappe and the surplesse are Adiophora...yet are there many of so perverse a condition that rather then they will weare them, they will lose their livings, and forsake their callings'. This criticism of dissembling 'Bible-bearers' was aimed at those seeming zealous, who yet contained a spirit of hypocrisy, singularity, and schism; it was licensed by William Covell and entered on 22 April 1607.  
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The Suffolk divine Thomas Rogers was another conformist who also served as chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft. Rogers had been publishing on the Thirty-nine Articles since 1585, when the first part of his *English Creede* appeared in print. This work was revised and published at Cambridge with the imprint date of 1607, although the preface date of 11 March 1607 may suggest that it was really 1608. It was a major contribution to the propaganda literature which encouraged ministers to subscribe. As the earlier version was released in support of Whitgiftian subscription, so this one coincided with the Jacobean effort. Rogers's stated purpose was to reassure ministers that nothing had changed and they should be able to subscribe. 'And being unchanged the bookes then of common prayer, and of ordination too,...be well allowed, and authentically approoved: and the said brethren with as good conscience nowe againe, and afresh may subscribe unto all the Articles, even concerning the Booke of common praier...as well as of the Kings supremecie, and of Religion, as afore, often, and alwaies they did'.

The title contained an indication of licensing unusual for a Cambridge imprint of this period: 'Perused, and by the lawfull authoritie of the Church of England, allowed to be publique'. However this book straddled several themes. Although focusing on the Thirty-nine Articles as agreed upon at convocations in 1563 and 1604 and recognizing the need to require subscription, the doctrine represented by the gloss on the articles is decidedly Calvinist. In comparing this edition with the earlier version, Nicholas Tyacke has detected a slight hardening of the Calvinist position. 'While both versions teach the doctrine of double and absolute predestination, Rogers added as an error in 1607/8 that "no certaine companie be foredestined unto eternall condemnation". Furthermore the statement "Christ thus suffered" was altered to read "Christ for his elect hath suffered", so restricting the atonement'. This stiffening on matters of predestination may have been a deliberate
attempt to appease puritans such as John Reynolds who had failed in their aspiration to have the Lambeth Articles incorporated into the Thirty-nine Articles at the Hampton Court Conference.

As he commented on the Articles, Rogers elaborated on common errors. He sometimes employed Pelagian as well as puritan (presumably intending presbyterian) beliefs to demonstrate these errors. Examples included: 'That the number of those which be predestinate, may both encrease, and be diminished: so thought the Pelagians'. 'The Puritanes, who among other assurances given them from the Lord of their salvations, make their advancing of the Presbyteriall kingdome (by the putting downe of Bishops, Chancellours, &c.) a testimonie that they shall have part in that glorie, which shall be revealed hereafter'. Interestingly, Rogers called upon the public confessions of continental Reformed churches in Switzerland, Basle, and France to buttress the claim that 'predestination hath bin from everlasting'. One endorsement of the belief in double predestination occurred when in Article 17 he stated as an error that: 'some are appointed to be saved, but none to be damned'. Avoiding the need for securing a license in London, Rogers had this book published at Cambridge. Because it was dedicated to Richard Bancroft and on the titlepage claimed approval by church authorities, it may possibly have had a quasi-official status.

In addition to championing subscription while still conveying a Calvinist message, this book was somewhat unusually anti-sabbatarian. In the long preface Rogers alluded to participation in a dispute in Suffolk; he had caused a sabbatarian book by Nicholas Bownd, dedicated to the disgraced earl of Essex, to be called in by Archbishop Whitgift in 1599. 'It is a comfort unto my soule,...that I have beeene the man, and the meanes that these Sabbatarian errors, and impieties are brought into light and knowledge of the State'. Rogers's motives in this may have been questionable for he had been ostracized by neighboring
Suffolk ministers and could have opportunistically used the Essex connection to embarrass Bownd. The latter's book was published in an enlarged edition in 1606, with a new dedication to Bownd's Norwich diocesan, John Jegon; there was no apparent relicensing involved. This probably provoked Rogers to respond with strong words. 'This Sabbath doctrine of the Brethren, agreeth neither with the doctrine of our church, nor with the lawes, and orders of this kingdome; disturbeth the peace both of the Common-weale, and Church; and tendeth unto Schisme in the one, and Sedition in the other'.

These four works served as apologias for the subscription operation undertaken by the regime in the wake of the Hampton Court Conference and the canons of 1604. Although not in this survey, Gabriel Powel also published a work in 1607 which endorsed adiaphora; it had been printed first in Latin in 1606 and then in English translation the following year. He often acted as one of the king's controversialists. At the start of the reign he had issued two attacks on the petitioning to which English Catholics had been subjecting King James. Then he published a book attacking the pope as 'Antichrist' in 1605; this was a tested technique for conveying the impression of a Protestant consensus against the papal threat. However Powel also became an adversary of one of the great enemies of the pope, William Bradshaw - a puritan who had been disillusioned with the performance of the moderates at the Hampton Court Conference. Bradshaw was one who attempted to persuade parliament to assist the ministers who had been deprived. In the years 1606 and 1607 he and Powel debated in print on matters concerning these unfortunate ministers and on adiaphora. As chaplain to Richard Vaughan, bishop of London until March 1607, Powel was at the center of licensing activity; he even licensed on 3 March 1607 the translation into English of his own Latin work on adiaphora. This was to be his last licensing until the start of 1608. Although there are twelve entries in the
registers which include Powel's name between January and March 1607, there is then a hiatus of nine months. Nevertheless his licensing career did resume under London bishops Thomas Ravis and George Abbot. Bradshaw, on the contrary, had to evade the licensing process; all of the titles attributed to him between 1604 and 1606 were produced secretly in England or abroad.

The work by Powel, however, which falls into this sampling is one which he dedicated to his own mother, Elizabeth Powel, and devoted to the subject of redemption. Powel was still chaplain to Vaughan when this was licensed by Owen Gwyn, an Essex vicar, and entered on 24 November 1606; Vaughan was in a line of Calvinist bishops who were named to the see of London - a tradition which ended with the death of John King in 1621. Powel made a clear distinction between the elect and the reprobate. 'Wherefore our Effectuall calling consisteth of two parts: I. The Outward calling of such as be elect by the publication of the Covenant under the condition of faith, and that of Gods meere grace. 2. Inward Faith wrought in them by ye same grace, which is nothing else but the fulfilling of the condition. The former grace may bee termed the Grace of vocation, and is common to all that are called, Elect and Reprobate. The latter grace may be called the Grace of faith, appertaining only to the Elect'. Powel was also of the opinion that predestination was irreversible. 'For whom God hath once received into favour, having blotted out all their sins and offences, those doth he still preserve in his favour as righteous. So that such cannot utterly fall from grace and perish by no manner of sins, they being and remaining pardoned in them'.

In their writings Mason, Collins, Rogers, and the author of the Bible-Bearer were reacting to specific events and were defending royal supremacy, whether in relation to things indifferent or to convocations and canons or to the right to demand subscription. Their joint aim was to persuade ministers to subscribe or to suffer the consequences. This
goal notwithstanding, when the king's men did touch on matters of doctrine, as Thomas Rogers did in his gloss on the Thirty-nine Articles or Gabriel Powel did in his discourse on redemption, the Calvinist orthodoxy of double predestination became apparent. Powel thus provides a link with another large body of contemporary literature, that which at one point or another taught the doctrine of the double decree of predestination. A joint treatise by John Dod and Robert Cleaver, followed by works of Samuel Hieron, George Meriton, Thomas Tuke and John Pelling, are all in this category.

John Dod was a predestinarian and nonconformist who also espoused radical sabbatarian views; coincidentally Dod was married to the daughter of Nicholas Bownd. In the dedication to a work on the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Proverbs, co-authors Dod and Robert Cleaver lamented the fact that they were not able to be employed again as formerly. The dedication was dated 7 November 1606; it is known that they were at some point deprived and that successors were instituted to their livings in March 1607. This title was entered in the Stationers' Registers in December of 1606, with Gabriel Powel as licenser. Although Dod had been part of the growing puritan opposition after the Hampton Court Conference, he remained in England and was able to have a number of titles published. This work included the doctrine of double predestination. 'They which are righteous men justified by the merites of Christ, and sanctified by his spirit, and obedient to his will in working that which is agreeable to his word, are in state of life everlasting. The life of grace they have possession of alreadie; the life of glory is assured to them by the life of grace: whosoever hath the one can never faile of the other. And therefore it is said that there is no death in that path. They are delivered from the first death, which hath power over all sinfull men, in this world; and they shall never come into the second, which is the portion of reprobates in the world to come'. 23

Similarly, one of the organizers of the millenary
petition, Samuel Hieron, was suspended for nonconformity in 1605. However powerful patrons intervened, enabling him to be restored to his benefice the same year, and, while enjoying the protection of the earl of Pembroke, he continued his writing and publishing. This Devonshire divine published three sermons in 1607 at Cambridge, apparently with the authority of the Cambridge vice-chancellor. The sermons revealed a belief in the Calvinist doctrine of the unconditional will of God and of the double decree. 'This salvation he [David] calleth the Lords (thy salvation) because as for us, it is neither an inheritance which we are borne unto, nor a purchase which by any desert we can compass e, so it is the Lords every way: it is he which hath first prepared it: it is he which hath freely disposed it according to the pleasure of his owne will...'. [There are many graces which shall befall those who shall never be saved.] 'Many a reprobate is gifted with admirable skill in crafts and sciences....So it may be said, he [God] giveth graces to all, but in speciall manner to the elect'.

When he published his sermon on repentance, George Meriton was rector of Hadleigh in Suffolk and, according to the titlepage, one of thechaplains in ordinary to the king. Licensed by Pasfield and entered on 27 May 1607, the doctrine in this sermon was Calvinist double predestination. 'So is it one thing to be penitent, and an other thing to repent. The first may bee in Reprobates, but not the second: and in the elect, the former, is but a degree or step to the latter. The one is an effect of the Law, the other of the Gospell'.

Thomas Tuke, who was one of William Perkins's translators, had preached three sermons in Kent in August 1606, a year before they were published. An unusual entry on 13 March 1607 lists two licensers: Owen Gwyn and Gervase Scarborowe, a London rector. In the third sermon Tuke touched on the subject of good works and double predestination. 'And he that will doe any good worke well, must doe it, not onely in a good maner, & by good means, but also to a good ende....
The maine and highest end of our turning, ought to be the glory of God....The subordinate and inferiour end is manifold. First, that wee may shewe our selues of the number of Christs sheepe.... Secondly, that we may gather assurance to our selves of our eternall predestination, to perpetuall blessednes, and that we are out of the ranke of reprobates, whom God hath rejected, and prepared for the day of evill'.

As already remarked in the section on Samuel Collins, some printed sermons were originally delivered at open-air pulpits -those at Paul's Cross and St. Mary's Spital were famous. John Pelling, the minister who preached at the Cross on 25 October 1607, was chaplain to the Earl of Hertford, who served as the subject of the dedication. In the entry in the Stationers' Registers dated 18 November 1607, the bishop of London [Thomas Ravis] is given as licenser. Ravis would also have been the one to issue the invitation to preach. This was confirmed in the dedication, where the bishop was credited with first requiring the sermon and then perusing and allowing it. There are traces here of support for an exalted royal presence over the church: 'In publique, the king in his kingdomes is immediately under God, [and] over the Church and common wealth, he exerciseth his soveraigne government'. In matters of doctrine Pelling displayed a view of double predestination. 'They are all mankinde; elect and reprobate, all mens actions, words and thoughts, good and bad:....are subject unto Gods providence, they are according to his eternall and immutable decree...'.

One other divine, Edward James, also explicitly distinguished between the elect and the reprobate. By 1607 the courts in York and Nottingham were taking action against those who felt they must separate from the Church of England. Among others, both conforming and nonconforming puritans desired to establish as great a distance as possible from the separatist movement. In a book licensed by Pasfield and entered on 22 May 1607, Edward James addressed the brethren
who had been seduced by the schismaticall Brownists and warned against those who clung to error and chose to forsake the church rather than forego the error. 'For as none could be delivered from the deluge, but such as were contained in Noahs Arke: so can none be saved from eternall death, but onely those who keepe themselves within the Church of God'. He proceeded next to clarify his views by saying: 'this Church being one, yet may it be considered diversly:...as it is invisible, and hidden from the sight of man, it containeth onely those, who appertaine unto God's free election....But the Church, as it is visible...doth containe all those, who in their outward behaviour worship one God:....many of these may be...wicked reprobates, and yet...the Church cannot discerne them, and therefore cannot discarde them, vntill God doth make them manifest'. 28

Two other works articulated a view of predestination, mainly in terms of the elect. The first of these was a treatise by one of the great influences on English Protestantism, William Perkins. Perkins did not concern himself with details of liturgy and so avoided confrontation with church authorities, but his doctrine of temporary faith and his emphasis on the search to prove election to oneself has been termed a defining characteristic of the experimental predestinarian tradition. The posthumous publication which falls into this sampling was edited by Thomas Pierson, a fellow Cantabrigian, a long-term associate of Sir Robert Harley, and a man described by Collinson as the 'apostle of a fervent, experiential protestantism in the Welsh Marches'. Perkins wrote of the elect and stated: 'for God in his eternall counsell, and decree hath appointed and set downe a certaine number of men unto whom hee will give eternall life, and for their cause doth hee spare the whole worlde from daylie destruction...'. 29 The Cambridge printer Legate printed this work, although it was for a London publisher and thus entered in the registers, without licenser, on 23 February 1607.
The last of the predestinarian titles was an anonymous work edited by the schoolmaster Thomas Hayne. The manuscript of this work was brought to the publisher Richard Ockould, who in turn prepared it for publication; once again Gabriel Powel was the licenser. Although the text professed to be a general view of the scriptures, doctrine did intrude. "The Elect, whome God in his mercie hath saved for his righteousnes sake, and not for their deserts, he guideth by the grace of his holy spirit". Thus seven works, including those by Gabriel Powel and Edward James, indicated adherence to the double decree of predestination; two others, by William Perkins and another edited by Hayne, elaborated on the elect and God's unconditional decree. However there were other evangelical Calvinist themes which also dominated in this sampling for 1607.

The dispute in England over sabbatarianism has already surfaced in the preface by Thomas Rogers described above. His opponent Nicholas Bownd and others asserted that the sabbath must be set aside for the service of God because it was so ruled in the fourth commandment and not just because it was part of ecclesiastical tradition. The fourth commandment was thus morally binding. So argued the nonconformist John Sprint when he wrote his propositions for the necessary use of the sabbath. In his list of points in favour of observing the sabbath, Sprint included 'the tenth reason. Because the fourth commaundement of sanctifying one day of 7 is not ceremoniall, but morall and perpetuall: which Christ destroyed not'. This work by Sprint was entered in the Stationers' Registers on 2 February and licensed; once again the licenser was Gabriel Powel. Sprint's book was reprinted in 1635, after the Book of Sports had been reissued, but since reprints did not have to be relicensed, it was still legal.

John Brinsley the elder has been described by Paul Seaver as 'a famous nonconformist who had been curate to Arthur Hildersham, the Puritan parson of Ashby-de-la-Zouch'.

72
This geographic area served as headquarters for reform of the church in the county of Leicester; its ministers were patronised by successive earls of Huntingdon. Brinsley dedicated the first two parts of his True Watch to Henry Hastings, fifth earl of Huntingdon, and his wife Elizabeth respectively. It is the second part which appears in this survey: it was first published in 1607, after licensing by bishop Ravis's chaplain Theophilus Higgon and entrance on 4 July 1607. Brinsley's emphasis here was on the importance of prayer in seeking assurance of God's favour. 'When we are sound Christians, and use to pray in this manner, we shall have a certaine assurance that we are God's children, and in his favour, and such as shall be saved undoubtedly. For this is the Lords seale, and the earnest of our inheritance'. Also castigating popish prayer, Brinsley likened it to 'blinde superstition' and 'vaine babbling'.

As exemplified by Brinsley, anti-papery and anti-Catholicism combined to form another popular evangelical attitude. Emotions were intense because the Gunpowder Plot had engendered a great fear of Catholics. Even Catholics in exile shied away from a defence of the actions of the conspirators, so the literature was mostly a one-sided attack, a view from the Protestant perspective. Catholics were not unanimous about issues such as the power of the pope to encourage the deposing of kings or, in extreme cases, tyrannicide, or the authority of the king of England to demand that English Catholics take an oath of allegiance denying both these papal powers. As already mentioned, one tactic employed by the regime was to split the more militant Jesuits from the lay Catholics and thus to admit the possibility of loyalist Catholics. This policy had its victories – in 1607 the Archpriest of England, George Blackwell, did indeed take the oath of allegiance. Because the passions of the English Protestants were aroused in a way unprecedented since the days of the Spanish Armada, there evolved a tradition of scheduling fervent, anti-Catholic
sermons on the November anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot. The sermon which John King preached at Oxford in November of 1607 was a fitting example of that legacy. Already dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of Oxford, King was well on his way to an influential role in the church, culminating with the bishopric of London in 1611. John King is remembered as one of the Calvinist bulwarks of the Jacobean church. This sermon was a polemic, celebrating divine intervention against adversaries. He argued that 'God is the God of Protestants'.

Printed at Oxford, the sermon could have been licensed by vice-chancellor King himself.

Paul's Cross sermons have already been noted; less is known about procedures for scheduling preachers at another outdoor pulpit, that at St. Mary's Spital. It appears that sermons were delivered there to the mayor and aldermen during Easter week. Robert Wakeman, fellow of Balliol College, gave his on 7 April 1607; it was licensed by Pasfield and entered on 10 June. While debating the points of faith and good works, with the firm conclusion that faith was the route to salvation, Wakeman also blasted the doctrine of popish merits put forth by the disciples of Antichrist.

Venice was excommunicated by the pope and under an interdict for one year, between April 1606 and April 1607. Works by two continental authors who wrote specifically about the dispute between Venice and Pope Paul V fall into this sampling. One of Venice's leading theologians, Paolo Sarpi, was himself excommunicated when he refused to journey to Rome. He had published in Venice in 1606 a treatise attacking this use of excommunication; in 1607 it was translated into English, licensed by John Wilson, and published in London. This was an example of the practice of allowing anti-papal Catholics to be published openly in England. Sarpi used the liberties of the French church, as described by Jean Gerson, to defend the actions of Venice. His writing was directed at a book by Cardinal Robert Bellarmine which had objected to a treatise on excommunication by Gerson. "The Popes can neither
command nor give order in any thing...which concernes temporall matters in the countries and territories under the soveraignty and obedience of the most Christian King; and if so bee they command or determine any thing, the kinges subjects, yea though they bee Churchmen, are not in this respect bound to obey them'.

A French Protestant, Nicholas Vignier, was the other whose condemnation of the excommunication of the Venetians was published in London in 1607 - in this case translated from a Latin version published in France in 1606. The licenser was Gabriel Powel. Vignier's work was directed against another cardinal, Caesar Baronius. Appended to it were copies of the papal bull against Venice and of a brief 'apology' of Paolo Sarpi. This 'apology' listed the difficulties Sarpi was encountering over several books he had published about the Venetian dispute, a list which included the title just described.

In addition to the matters so far discussed, there was a more local event transpiring mainly in Northamptonshire - a serious revolt in May 1607 against enclosures - which received printed comment. Known as the Midland revolt, it was suppressed with the help of local puritan leaders. A sermon by Robert Wilkinson of Pembroke College, Cambridge, was delivered on 21 June before the Lord Lieutenant of the county, Thomas Cecil, earl of Exeter; it was entered on 7 July with license granted by John Wilson. Wilkinson saw his role as that of mediator, an objective person who could recommend a cooling of emotions to all involved. He warned masters not to grind the faces of the poor, and he scolded the rebels for disturbing the peace of the land at the same time that the king was trying to unite two kingdoms into one.

The remaining four earliest extant editions, which were also printed openly in England, are more difficult to categorize: these were pastoral pieces, not polemics. Instead they were part of a large body of literature which offered
edification to Protestants. The first of these, entered in the Stationers' Registers on 1 September 1607, was a sermon preached at Paul's Cross by a G.B., preacher at Alphamston in Essex. No licenser is named. Variously attributed to George Bury or Barry and to G. Brian, this sermon was edited by C.B., who was operating without the author's permission. The sermon's stated purpose was to combat sin. 38

The Scot, William Cowper, was another author who published in 1607. At that time his views were in a state of transition: in 1606 he was one who protested against the introduction of episcopacy into Scotland, but by 1608 he appeared to have changed his mind. In 1612 he was promoted to the bishopric of Galloway. His book, licensed by John Barcham, Bancroft's chaplain, and entered 26 July 1607, was a guide for communion. Cowper charted a middle course between the papists who confused earthly and heavenly things in the Eucharist and the 'carnal professors' who see all as common bread and wine. 'Papists are evill discerners, because they take the signe for the thing signified; the earthly thing for the heavenly....And as for carnall professors, they are also evill discerners...putting no difference between it [bread and wine of the sacrament] and common bread and wine'. 39

Roger Hacket had two sermons published in 1607: the first dealt with the subordinate status of woman and the second with the preparation of the soul. They were licensed by Gabriel Powel. It was in the second sermon that he wrote: 'These thy good workes will assure thy soule that thou art an elect vessell chosen of God; these fruits of thy beleeving faith will witnes to thee that thou art a blessed plant whom Gods right hand hath planted'. 40

Meanwhile a collection of seven previously unpublished sermons of Bishop John Jewel were not entered in the Stationers' Registers. This posthumous publication was made possible by the efforts of the editor I. K., whose identity has not been established. He claimed that he had preserved the manuscripts of these sermons for some time; they had been
passed to him by a friend. The editor attributed his livelihood to Archbishop Bancroft, subject of the dedication. John Jewel was one of the towering figures of the reformation in England; he had been a Marian exile but on his return accepted the bishopric of Salisbury. Thus Jewel became part of the church establishment and assumed the role of leading Elizabethan apologist for the Church of England. Although Jewel had died in 1571, there was great interest in him still and, under the auspices of Bancroft, Jewel's works were collected and published in 1609 in an edition which included these seven sermons. The sermons of 1607 were filled mainly with pastoral concerns or memories of what England had been like under Catholicism. 41

This ends the discussion of books in the sampling which appeared first in England in 1607, overtly, and apparently with the allowance of authority. Other religious titles in English were published secretly in England or abroad; three of these were Protestant. The authorship of a defence of the ministers who refused conformity and subscription to the Book of Common Prayer has been attributed to Samuel Hieron. Only the first volume of this major effort has 1607 in the imprint; it has been assigned to the secret press of William Jones. The other two volumes were printed the next year, volume two in Amsterdam and volume three again secretly by William Jones. These latter two attacked loyal supporters of the king such as Francis Mason and Thomas Rogers. However the volume in this sampling was directed against Thomas Hutton, William Covell, and Thomas Sparke. All three had written to justify the practice of silencing and depriving non-subscribing ministers - Hutton specifically attacking the ministers in Devon and Cornwall. Hieron complained that his adversaries had liberty to write and speak, but that his side had been silenced. He argued that there were so many errors in the Book of Common Prayer that no one should be forced to subscribe to it; surely his majesty must recognize problems of this sort or he would not have authorized a new
translation of the Bible itself. This was much too controversial for legal publication in England; it thus became a clandestine publication. In an article which examines the Star Chamber case against William Jones in 1609, Mark Curtis views Jones as part of the group of puritan propagandists who worked secretly together after the bitter disappointments of the Hampton Court Conference and in reaction to the Bancroftian policy of allowing the Catholic secular clergy to answer their Jesuit opponents in print.

There are two other clandestine Protestant titles in this sampling; they were produced in the Netherlands and written by the separatists Henry Ainsworth and John Smyth. Ainsworth had actually moved to Amsterdam in the 1590's and by 1596 was organizing a separatist church with Francis Johnson. Separatists were eager to get their message into print. The press which they founded in Amsterdam was run by Giles Thorp between 1604 and 1622; understandably Thorp was the printer of The Communion of Saincts by Ainsworth. Arguing for the communion of saints or fellowship that the faithful have with God and with one another, Ainsworth stressed the importance of a true church being 'disjoined in place' while at the same time he wanted communion between sister churches to continue. This was reprinted abroad several times and then entered in the Stationers' Registers for the first time in November 1640; Thomas Weekes was listed as the licenser.

Unfortunately for them, the separatists also became notorious for the number of schisms within their company. Ainsworth and Johnson eventually went their separate directions in 1610. Into this already fractious community arrived John Smyth in 1607. Operating as a member of a separatist congregation at Gainsborough, Smyth had written a book on the principles of the visible church. In Smyth's view the visible community of saints joined together by covenant with God was the only religious society that God had ordained; all others, including cathedrals and parishes, were unlawful. This was a favorite topic of the separatists and
one which was currently under attack by conforming Protestants such as Edward James described above. It was a completely unacceptable viewpoint for episcopal licensers. For this reason Smyth had to rely on his separatist ties to have the work printed by Schilders in Middelburg in 1607. Life with the separatists in Amsterdam proved to be too much for Smyth and by late 1608 he and his followers had formed what was in essence an Anabaptist church. The other religious titles in this sampling which were printed secretly in England or abroad were three relating to Catholic issues. The titles by William Bishop and Philip Woodward were both part of the prolonged battle of the books between English Catholics and English Protestants. Bishop was not a Jesuit, and he objected to the way in which an archpriest, rather than a bishop, had been imposed on English secular Catholics. He also refused to take the oath of allegiance; his 1607 publication had to be printed secretly in England. It was part of a series of attacks on the writings of William Perkins which were in turn defended by Robert Abbot. In his argument Bishop referred to the Hampton Court Conference at which the king confessed that he had not seen one true translation of the Bible in English and that the Geneva version was the worst of all. How can 'all matters of salvation be fished out of Scripture about which there is no certainty?'.

Another running battle was being waged between the apostate priest Thomas Bell and the seminary priest Philip Woodward. This exchange had been complicated by the fact that Bell thought he was debating with Robert Parsons when in truth he was dealing with Woodward. Woodward's response has 'Roane' in the imprint but has been assigned to the press of Auroi and Kellam in Douai. In the dedication Woodward appealed to Chancellor Ellesmere to mediate with the king and allow a conference to be held, similar to the conference which the King of France had allowed when the Calvinists wanted a hearing. Another Douai publication, the anonymous
Instructions for your search into religion, exploited the disagreements between Lutherans and Calvinists to claim that there will never be unity between English Protestants and puritans 'because every man's own spirit is the uncontrolable umpier in all doubts of faith, & apparteth it selfe from each other'. For example, Lutherans detested Calvin for teaching that God was the author of sin. The conclusion was that puritans and other Protestants should become Catholics where all believed the same points of faith.

In summary, it is important to note several characteristics about these titles which made first appearances in 1607: all except one of the twenty one books with London imprints were entered in the Stationers' Registers. This was a remarkable record. Of all of the entries, only those for G. B. and Perkins did not have an official licenser named. However the sermon by G. B. was delivered at Paul's Cross and therefore would have been given at the invitation of the bishop of London. It is understandable why the licenser's name might have been considered redundant. The Perkins's title was a collaboration between the Cambridge press and a London bookseller; perhaps approval by the Cambridge vice-chancellor was implied. Only the Jewel sermons remained unentered, yet they were dedicated to Archbishop Bancroft. The one Oxford and the two Cambridge imprints would have been reviewed by their respective vice-chancellors. As just stated, there was a notable rate of compliance on the part of London stationers: 95% of these earliest extant editions were entered in the Stationers' Registers. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the stationers themselves, as there were almost as many different London publishers as there are authors.

However the licensers are an important element here, especially the licenser who was one of the most active - Gabriel Powel. Powel was chaplain to Richard Vaughan, the Calvinist bishop of London until the latter's death in March
of 1607. The five titles in this survey which Powel approved for publication were all dated February 1607 or earlier; in addition, the first editions in this sampling which were licensed before that date were done by Powell. (The only exception was his own book on redemption which was licensed by Owen Gwyn, vicar of East Ham, Essex.) Powel was an establishment figure who had entered into various debates on the side of the regime. He defended adiaphora and attacked William Bradshaw, but he also criticized the Catholics for petitioning and called the pope 'Antichrist'. And he wrote of the elect and of the reprobate. He may have been the licenser to whom puritans felt they could entrust their manuscripts. He did approve the work of the deprived ministers Dod and Cleaver and an extreme sabbatarian work by John Sprint. However, even though the former two may not have subscribed, their exposition was acceptable Calvinist doctrine. As a licenser Powel seemed to typify the status quo, a Calvinist episcopalian who was, for all that, part of the Calvinist ascendancy. In addition to Owen Gwyn, who licensed two titles in this sampling, Zacharius Pasfield, prebendary of St. Paul's, was another of the active licensers, with five titles. Thomas Ravis, as bishop of London, licensed the Paul's Cross sermon by John Pelling, and his chaplain Theophilus Higgon as well as Bancroft's chaplain John Barcham also licensed one apiece. Gervase Scarborowe, rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, and William Covell, later sub-dean of Lincoln, each licensed one; master Wilson, possibly John Wilson, licensed the final two, but his identity remains unclear.

This concludes the part of the survey which deals with religious titles appearing for the first time in 1607. These provided the closest reflection of the major issues of concern and the opinions on these issues which were allowed to flow through the official apparatus of the government for pre-publication regulation. Authors such as Samuel Collins and Thomas Rogers were openly critical of an influence which
they termed as 'puritan' although the mention of 'presbytery' would indicate that Rogers at least might be glossing nonconformity as tantamount to presbyterianism. A number of these titles had themes which related to current events in church and state. Their contents often defended the role of the king in setting religious regulations for his own kingdom or from interference in temporal matters from the papacy. The four books, or 17%, by Francis Mason, Samuel Collins, Thomas Rogers, and A. N. met the regime's need to justify the Hampton Court Conference, the canons, and the subscription campaign. More numerous were the books printed openly in England which shared a common base in their support for Calvinist evangelical themes. Gabriel Powel and six others (29%) combined to express the double decree of predestination; this number rises to nine (or 38%) when adding Perkins and the Haynes item supporting the immutable decree of election. Titles by the sabbatarian John Sprint and by John Brinsley plus four anti-Catholic polemics created a total of fifteen books or 63% of the twenty four which contained evangelical Calvinist themes. The Wilkinson sermon attempted to mediate a socio-political situation; with the four devotional works it makes five or 21% which served mainly as standard, noncontroversial Protestant fare. Only in the underground Protestant books were nonsubscribing ministers defended and only in the underground Catholic ones was there a challenge to predestination.

As already mentioned this was a time when the fallout from the Hampton Court Conference, the canons of 1604 with the resulting subscription campaign, and the Gunpowder Plot was widespread. The attempt to deprive non-subscribing ministers and to enforce the oath of allegiance on Catholics was still underway. Some extremists were driven to separatism and increasingly emigration to the Netherlands. It was in 1607 that the archpriest George Blackwell took the oath of allegiance and was then reproached by the pope. Change within the episcopacy in England in 1607 was slight, occasioned
mainly by the death of Richard Vaughan, bishop of London, at the end of March. Thomas Ravis was translated to London from the see of Gloucester; Ravis was anti-puritan in his enforcement of church policy, but otherwise a predestinarian Calvinist. Henry Parry became the next bishop of Gloucester.  

In the king's household, positions of religious importance were split. In 1603 James had recreated two offices: the future-Arminian Richard Neile was made Clerk of the Closet, with power to arrange for the rota of preachers before the king in the Chapel Royal, but the Calvinist James Montagu was made Dean of the Chapel Royal. Lancelot Andrewes, who was to exert influence on a future generation of Arminians, was Royal Almoner.  

On the secular front, parliament continued to serve as a vehicle by which puritans hoped to assist the deprived ministers. The ongoing and acrimonious debate concerning the union projected for England and Scotland occupied parliament as well. The riots in the Midlands were obviously also a cause of concern. It was in 1607 that a legal argument by Nicholas Fuller was published surreptitiously. Representing two clients, Fuller had argued that common law protected the liberty and property of subjects from decisions of the High Commission. The Court of Star Chamber attempted to track down those who had conspired to publish this work; the title was included in 1609 in the bill of information concerning the puritan printer William Jones.  

Late in 1607, on 7 December, the Stationers' Company issued an ordinance to tighten control of London printing through stricter regulation of the Stationers' Registers. The wardens were not to enter any book except to those stationers who contributed to all charges of the Stationers' Company, presumably only to members of the company. Likewise, no printer of the company should print any book which was not first entered and registered with the company. Fines, forfeiture, and imprisonment could result from violations.  

This background is best reflected in the earliest extant editions described above. Reprints which fall into this
sampling for the year 1607 are better viewed as providing continuity with the themes and tastes of the past. They did not have to face licensing or relicensing. Presumably reprinted titles already had a track record; stationers guessed which ones were likely to be popularly received. As discussed earlier, reprints were free of the overhead costs charged for titles printed the first time and were on the whole cheaper to produce. They were a dependable source of profits. Only seventeen of the titles in this sampling were reprints. Of these sixteen were printed openly in England—all but one in London itself.

An important sermon by royal chaplain William Barlow had just recently been licensed, by Barlow himself as bishop of Rochester, and entered on 6 October 1606. Delivered on 21 September 1606 and printed that same year, it was reprinted twice in 1607. A representative at the Hampton Court Conference, Barlow had composed an account of its proceedings at the request of an ailing Archbishop Whitgift. This official chronicle painted puritan participation unfavourably; Barlow ably fulfilled his conformist role. Then he served King James again as one of four preachers who at Hampton Court addressed an unwilling audience of Scottish presbyterians. Together the four divines defended the king's power over the church by divine right and the need for godly bishops. Barlow's special charge was to emphasize the antiquity and superiority of bishops. 'The Lord himselfe chose Apostles, that is Bishoppes'. One of his tactics involved grouping papists and puritans together. 'Papists & Puritans will have the King but an Honorable Member, not a chiefe Governor in the Churches of his own Dominions...'. In the dedication to James, Barlow underscored the need for conformity, even in matters indifferent. 'Among the persons Ecclesiastique...unitie in doctrine, unanimitie in affection, uniformitie in obedience to your maiesties Supremacy, whether in matters either absolutely necessary as injoyned by God, or in themselves indifferent, but authoritatively necessary, is
commaunded by your selfe'.

Barlow's was the only reprint which served as a conformist apology for the regime's dominance of the church and its use of bishops to accomplish this end. The next ten titles conveyed more traditional Calvinist evangelical messages; eight of these dealt in part with the subject of predestination. Two ministers whose careers were troubled by religious authorities were Richard Bernard and Arthur Dent. Bernard had been deprived of his living in Worksop, Nottinghamshire, for non-subscription in 1605; he flirted briefly with separatism but then subscribed before Archbishop Matthew in 1608 and returned to the fold. Granted a safe advowson in Somerset in 1612, Bernard's occasional nonconformity was overlooked by James Montagu and Arthur Lake, consecutive evangelical bishops of Bath and Wells. Collinson has written of a Wells-Winchester circle, which included Bernard in Batcombe, Somerset. Bernard's Double Catechism, which falls into this survey, had originally been drawn up for 'Worsopp, Gainsborough, and Epworth' in 1602; the former two congregations had separatists in them. Both that edition and the 1607 revision were said to follow the order of the common authorized catechism and both were published at Cambridge. This version was reprinted in 1609 and then combined with another work and reprinted three times in London between 1612 and 1629. When his catechism addressed issues of salvation, Bernard's doctrine was double predestination. In a question and answer dialogue, election and reprobation were strictly defined. 'Q[uestion]. But as God made all, will so Jesus Christ also save all? A[nswer]. No...many shall be damned, few shal be saved, only the elect, which take hold of Christ by a lively faith. Q[uestion]. Do all men continue in this sinfull and cursed estate for ever? A[nswer]. No: but onely the reprobate, whome God hath not decreed to save:... for the elect, being predestinate to eternall life...are called...and so shall continue, in this estate of grace....Q[uestion]. Are none of the reprobate,
ever in the estate of grace and Gods favour? A[nswer]. No verily, though many of them, endued with the common gifts of the spirit, may in outward appearance, for a time, seeme to be of the elect, in the judgement of the Church. Q[uestion]. Can any of the elect then be ever before God, in the state of damnation? A[nswer]. No indeed. Albeit...they may appeare in shew, to the church, to be none of the elect: yet can they not fall away, wholy nor finally'. 52 Arthur Dent, who like Bernard was the product of puritan Christ's College Cambridge, was rector of South Shoebury, Essex. For his nonconformity in the use of the surplice and the sign of the cross in baptism, in the 1580's Dent had been in trouble with Bishop Aylmer. The dedication to Sir Julius Caesar in Dent's Plaine Man's Pathway was dated 1601, but this was one of many reprints; the book went into twenty two printings altogether. What is striking about the message of Dent is that he specified 'This booke medleth not at all with any controversies in the Church, or any thing in the state Ecclesiasticall, but onely entreth into a controversie with Sathan and sinne'. Yet he wrote in the section describing the contents of his dialogue: 'Thirdly, it sheweth the markes of the children of God, and of the Reprobates, with the apparant signes of salvation and damnation'. 53 Therefore one can assume that the doctrine of double predestination was considered noncontroversial - this from a man who knew first hand the handicaps of nonconformity.

Several reprints which appeared in 1607 date from the early part of Elizabeth's reign. An edition of two concordances which were designed to be issued with some quarto editions of the Geneva Bible and with the Sternhold and Hopkins Psalms also appeared in 1607. The preface to this was signed by Robert F. Herrey and dated December 1578. Herrey promised in the preface that 'I have likewise by themselves placed all...tending to the proving or verifying of any article and doctrine, concerning our Christian faith & religion...Grace, Faith, or Unbeliefe, Predestination, or
The authors of five other reprints also touched on predestination, although their stress was on the elect; reprobates, if included, were generally characterized by different terminology. The Smithfield martyr John Bradford had given his life for the Protestant cause in 1555. During his imprisonment he had gathered together prayers and exercises; the result was *Godly Meditations*, which was finally published in 1562. The reprint in 1607 contained views of the doctrine of predestination held by John Bradford. 'Blessed bee God...which hath blessed us with all manner of blessings in heavenly thinges by Christ according as hee hath elect or chosen us in him before the foundation of the world was laide...and hath predestinate us (or ordained us) through Jesus Christ, to be heires unto himselfe according to the good pleasure of his will...'.

Robert Linaker's treatise first appeared in 1595, but the address to the reader in this enlarged edition of 1607 mentioned that the author had had time and leisure for the past two years and a half, for so long had he been deprived of his ministry after thirty years of preaching. In his section on the deprivation of beneficed clergy, Kenneth Fincham lists Robert Lynnaker, rector in the see of Norwich, who was replaced in October 1605. Linaker appeared to be in the tradition of experimental predestinarians; he referred to more complete treatises for troubled consciences by Greenham and Perkins and ended with a prayer of the martyr, John Bradford. Linaker wrote of the elect and ungodly. 'Praiier is not a common gift, common to all, but a speciall gift proper only to the Elect, as Faith and Repentance....The ungodly have not this gift in truth, or in any good measure'. Also 'there is a sin unto death which cannot bee pardoned, because it cannot be repented of; the sinne against the Holy Ghost:...which no elect Child of God can fall into...all the Elect are by speciall priviledge of Gods favour assured that
they are exempted from the condemnation of the ungodly multitude'. 56

Among the greatest religious bestsellers of the sixteenth century were the books of William Perkins and Henry Smith. Therefore it is no surprise that each should be represented in a sampling of reprints. William Perkins and his leadership of experimental-predestinarian thinkers has been described above. The reprint of his which falls into this survey, the famous Grain of Mustard-Seed, continued the same theme. 'Give all diligence to make thy election sure, and to gather manifold tokens thereof. For this cause observe the worke of Gods providence, love, and mercy...for the serious consideration of them...minister much direction, assurance of Gods favour, and comfort'. 57

The lecturer Henry Smith's reputation as a fervent preacher was widespread. His Three Sermons was first printed in 1599; it contained the statement that 'truely...thou canst not seduce the Elect, for their names are written in the booke of life, and the Lord hath promised, no man shall plucke them out of my hands'. Among the unanswered questions which Smith included were: 'Whether predestination, election, &c. are to be preached unto lay men? What freewill had Adam, and what freewill remaineth unto us? Whether the font, surplesse, cappes, tippets, bels, holy-daies, fasting-dayes, and such like ceremonies, are better observed, or omitted? Whether they which are called Protestants, or those whom we call Puritans, be of the purest religion, and most reformed to the primitive church'? 58

Less popular was an edition of material attributed to Saint Augustine which had been translated and edited by Thomas Rogers and then reprinted in 1607. This compilation had originally appeared in 1581; the dedications within contained that date. This would predate Rogers's work on the Thirty-nine Articles. Rogers was concerned here with corrupt books which were allowed by public authority and not diligently corrected nor forbidden. His concern appears to be
with books which were shabbily translated or with a rash of 'baudie' Italian books which were being translated into English and printed by 'secret papists' because they could easily subvert true religion, and with profane plays. Rogers defended the self censorship he employed by leaving out parts of the work because he thought they had contributed to doubts about St. Augustine as the true author. 'It stood mee upon...to leave somewhat out. For had I not so done,...I should have sayd that our Saviour descended into Hell, that Christ ascended... finally, I should have sayde that we ought to doubt...and so where my purpose was to edifie, I should haue destroyed the soules of the weake with erronious opinions'. The text of the Meditations retained predestinarian teaching. One section was entitled: 'Of Gods bottomlesse predestination and foreknowledge'. Elaboration followed. 'Therfore whom out of many thou hast taken into an holy Temple...those whose names and number is knowne to thee,...who also be written in the booke of life: who canot perish, to whom all thinges worke together for the best, yea very wickednesse it selfe....But a most vile death have the wicked...whom thou diddest foreknow, even before thou diddest make eyther the heaven, or the earth, should everlastingly be damned, the number of whose names...thou knowest'.

Two additional sermons, by George Downame and William Whately, expressed other popular evangelical themes: sabbatarianism and anti-popery. First delivered during Easter week at St. Mary's Spital in 1602, the sermon by George Downame was reprinted in 1607. Although he was yet another graduate of Christ's College Cambridge, Downame's career included support for jure divino episcopacy as well as later opposition to Arminianism; he epitomised Calvinist episcopalianism. There was a note of sympathy for puritans expressed in this sermon. 'Or if a private Christian make conscience of swearing, sanctifying the Sabbboth, frequenting sermons, or abstaining from the common corruptions of the time, he shal straight way be condemned for a Puritane, and
consequently bee lesse favored then either a carnall gospeller or a close Papist'. In addition to this passing reference to sabbath-observance, Downname developed the theme of anti-papery, equating the pope with Antichrist. 'The Lord suffereth Poperie to spread and popish heretikes and Idolatours to goe about, perswading men to an apostasie from Christ, to Antichrist, which they call reconciling men to the Pope and Church of Rome:...But this is done for the tryall of the faithfull and sound Christians'. 60 Downname dedicated this sermon to Sir Henry Killigrew and mentioned Henry's virtuous lady; in 1617 Downname, by then bishop of Derry, was to marry this virtuous lady himself.

William Whately was a puritan whose actions may have spoken more loudly than his printed words. Educated along with noted puritans at Christ's College Cambridge, Whately has been described by Collinson as 'one of the founders of Banbury's puritan reputation'. John Dod was another who preached there. As vicar of Banbury in Oxfordshire, Whately was presented by church wardens on 6 April 1607 for, among other things, preaching against ceremonies. The sermon in this survey is on the redemption of time and had actually been first printed only a year earlier, licensed by Gabriel Powel. Listing the numerous ways in which time was misspent, Whately several times included sabbath-breaking; conversely he listed 'religious observing of the Sabbath' as a correct use of time. Whately introduced a puritan concept when he criticized the way in which Christmas was celebrated as a holiday. 'Thus this time of Christs Nativitie should (if any way) be celebrated, that it might turne to an occasion of more heartie thanksgiving, and more true obedience unto Christ....wherefore if wee will spend a day to Christ, spend it more religiously & soberly than all other daies, not more prophanely and luxuriously'. 61

The five remaining reprints were of a more general nature, not revealing controversial beliefs, but rather serving a devotional purpose. On the other hand, from what is
known about the authors Christopher Sutton, Thomas Playfere, and Joseph Hall, they did fall within the constellation of Calvinist thinkers. On account of his extraordinary preaching ability, Sutton was made a canon of Westminster by James I. His devotional work *Disce Mori* was very popular and went into ten printings between 1600 and 1626. The emphasis was very much on preparation for dying. The discussion of works treated them as a sign of those chosen by God. 'The children of God as they shall differ from the children of this world hereafter so must they differ from them here by good works which do manifest themselves by christian charitie'.

Two Elizabethan sermons delivered by Thomas Playfere at St. Mary's Spital were reprinted in 1607. The sermons had been delivered in Easter week of 1593 and 1595 respectively, before Playfere's 1596 appointment as Lady Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge. The concentration in these sermons was, as expected, on the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, although Playfere did find time to rebuke both the Brownists and the new found ways of puritanism.

Joseph Hall, later Bishop of Norwich, was an extremely important figure in the history of the Calvinist episcopalian element in the Church of England. He had grown up in Ashby-de-la-Zouch where his father was employed under the earl of Huntingdon; this 1607 edition of Hall's book on peace and tranquillity of mind contained a dedication to Henry Hastings, the fifth earl of Huntingdon. However, this work represented Hall's musings on the works of Seneca and other 'heathen' philosophers, and did not involve relevant church issues.

Catechisms were advocated by the preaching ministry because they enabled the laity to understand the sense of sermons. Thus catechisms were popular and frequently reprinted. Bernard's catechism has already been described; another by James Balmford contains a dedication to the wardens, assistants and company of carpenters in London. They had shown charity to the author when he was a poor student at
Oxford. His catechism had as its stated purpose to set down the doctrine of the Lord's Supper more plainly, and that is mainly what it accomplished. The final item in this group of five devotional works was an anonymous compilation of prayers for different occasions. Combined with other useful information for a Christian, A Godly Garden was first issued in 1569. The 1607 edition was published by Thomas Pavier, a London stationer who specialized in the market for sermons and other devotional works.

Only one reprint in this survey for 1607 was a product of the Catholic press - this was a book by the Jesuit Robert Parsons which was printed in St. Omer. The final count of reprints in England, sixteen in all, has one title, the one by Barlow, which was part of the regime's propaganda, eight titles supporting various degrees of predestination and two others, by Downname and Whately, which also dwelt on evangelical Calvinist themes. Five were of a miscellaneous nature. In other words the 17% of earliest editions which supported the regime lowers to 6% with reprints; the 63% with Calvinist evangelical themes matches the 63% for reprints; the 21% for miscellaneous earliest editions is below the 31% for reprints. If there is a pattern here, it is that the proportion of titles espousing Calvinist evangelical themes remained constant. It was the polemics in favour of the regime's policies which went up for newly printed works, and the neutral, devotional works which went down. This reinforces the general impression that the events leading up to and including the Hampton Court Conference, the canons, and the subscription-offensive encouraged both a defensive and adversarial role on the part of the regime. Even the only reprint in this category, the Barlow work, had just been licensed and published at the end of the preceding year; its licensing was no earlier than that for some of the earliest extant editions in 1607.

This completes the survey of religious titles for 1607. In the index to the Short Title Catalogue there are 434 books
listed which had a publication date of 1607. Approximately 145 of these concerned religious topics; an examination of every third title yielded forty seven titles for this sampling. Out of the total number of religious writings in 1607, ninety one (or 63%) were first extant editions and fifty four (or 37%) were reprints. In the sampling itself, thirty (or 64%) were first extant editions and seventeen (or 36%) were reprints. The close parallel between the proportions gives credibility to this method for selecting a cross section of titles to be studied. In terms of works of a religious nature, the figure of 145 out of 434 (or 33%) would be much higher if Bibles and other official religious publications were included when compiling a list of religious works. 67

In 1607 only Amsterdam, Middelburg, Douai, and St. Omer were continental sites for publishing religious books in English. 'Underground' publishing, done in England itself, was also a loophole for both Catholic and puritan authors. Only seven of the forty seven titles were printed abroad or secretly in England. This sampling contains at least one example from each of the four continental cities and one each for the puritan and the Catholic 'undergrounds'. Here again is evidence that the selection is an accurate microcosm of the whole. The university presses offered another possible route for authors, and four books were published there. Richard Bernard's revised catechism, Samuel Hieron's Three Sermons, and Thomas Rogers's work all had Cambridge imprints; John King's sermon was produced at the press in Oxford.

The greatest importance should be attached to the twenty one earliest extant editions which were printed in London; they went through the pre-publication process for licensing and entrance and evidence of such compliance is available. Although issues divided the church, and the campaign to make the clergy conform on the one hand and the Catholics swear allegiance on the other caused dissension throughout the land, clearly there was cooperation on the part of publishers
to have religious titles approved and entered.

Peter Lake and others have written of a Calvinist hegemony, even though there were anti-Calvinists in the Jacobean church. 'The existence of such people [anti-Calvinists] and their silence represent powerful evidence of the extent to which Calvinism had established itself in control of the crucial cultural media of the day and was thus able to suppress overt criticism....Clearly they were not...excluded from preferment. However, the path to preferment did not lie through the open expression of such sentiments'. In practice even occasional nonconformity was tolerated: if a minister was willing to subscribe, he could probably neglect some of the more controversial ceremonies with relative impunity.

In spite of the fact that the church establishment was allowing anti-papal Catholics to publish openly in London and that the king's controversialists were defending the king's right to approve canons, to regulate church practices, and to initiate the subscription campaign against nonconformists and radicals, the common ground of Protestant publication in England remained strict Calvinist dogma. One could support the drive for uniformity, the idea of the royal supremacy, and the divine origin of the bishops. Propaganda in favour of such concepts was encouraged, although disapproval was forbidden. Criticisms of separatists, presbyterians, puritans, Pelagians, Catholics and the pope were allowed, but open support of them was not acceptable. Both sides of the sabbatarian issue, as witnessed in works by Thomas Rogers and John Sprint, apparently were allowed. But one did not attack the vital center of Calvinist belief, belief in absolute and unconditional predestination. There was little trace in these publications of the doctrinal issues which would divide the Protestant English Church at a later date. Douai and St. Omer in France or secret printing in England provided an outlet for Catholic writings which upheld the papal supremacy or complained about King James's treatment of English Catholics;
Amsterdam and Middelburg or the secret press of William Jones did the same for separatists or divines who wanted to defend deprived ministers or concepts of separatism. It was Calvinist episcopalianism which prevailed in the legal religious publications of England.
1607 - NOTES


4) SRP, 41; M. H. Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', History, 46 (1961); Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 49. See also Shriver, 'Hampton Court'.


14) F. Mason, The Authoritie of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning Things indifferent (1607), sig. A2r, pp. 31, 58, 70; Milward, James, p. 15; P. White, 'The "via media" in the early Stuart Church', in The Early Stuart Church, ed. K. Fincham (Stanford, Calif., 1993), pp. 214-5 (where Mason is included in White's stable of Jacobean churchmen exemplifying the "via media").


16) A. N., The Bible-Bearer (1607), sigs. [D1v], [A3r-v].

17) T. Rogers, The English Creede, 2 pts. (1585, 1587); Milward, James, pp. 14-5; T. Rogers, The Faith, Doctrine, and
Religion...expressed in 39 Articles (Cambridge, 1607), sig. [%%%4r]. According to P. Blayney, type evidence plus normal commercial dating practice gives no reason to doubt the 1607 date. However this is disputed by a similar situation with a sermon by M. Wren published in 1627/8: see survey for the year 1627.


19) T. Rogers, Faith, pp. 74, 78, 73, 72; P. White, Predestination, Policy and Polemic (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 150-1: here Rogers's gloss on the Articles is not seen as a Calvinist stance.


28) Collinson, Religion of Protestants, p. 275; R. A. Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts in York (1960), pp. 154-7; E. James, A Retrayt sounded to certain Brethren (1607), sigs. [A2v], [A3r]; Milward, James, p. 51.


35) P. Sarpi, An Apology, or, apologitically Answere (1607), fol. 101.

36) N. Vignier, Concerning the Excommunication of the Venetians (1607).


39) W. Cowper, A Preparative for the new Passeover (1607), sigs. [C5r], [C7r].

40) Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, pp. 60-1; R. Hacket, Two fruitful Sermons, needfull for these Times (1607), p. 32.

41) Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, pp. 61-2; P. White, Predestination, Policy and Polemic, pp. 69-71; J. Jewel, Seven Godly and learned Sermons (1607).

42) Milward, James, pp. 7-8: sustains the Hieron attribution as does the Short Title Catalogue. Curtis, 'William Jones', p. 48 reports this title in a bill of information connected with William Jones. [S. Hieron], A Defence of the Ministers Reasons, for Refusall of Subscription, [Part One] ([W. Jones secret press], 1607), pp. 5, 172; K. L Spruner, Trumpets from the Tower (Leiden, 1994), p. 163: describes one part of A Defence which was printed in Amsterdam, shipped back to England, and then freely distributed in the vicinity of the various bishops, scholars and ministers - evidence of real book evangelism.


45) Brachlow, Communion of Saints, pp. 218-19; Milward, James, pp. 53-4; W. H. Burgess, John Smith the Se-Baptist (1911), p. 99; J. Smyth, Principles and Inferences concerning the Visible Church ([Middelburg], 1607); K. L. Spruner, Dutch Puritanism (Leiden, 1982), pp. 80-1.

46) [W. Bishop], The second Part of the Reformation of a Catholike deformed ([English secret press], 1607), sig. C2r; Milward, James, p. 139.

47) Milward, James, pp. 148-50; [P. Woodward], The dolefull Knell, of Thomas Bell (Roane, 1607), sig. a3r; Instructions for your Search into Religion ([Douai], 1607), sig. [A4v], pp. 19, 69.

48) Fincham, Prelate as Pastor, pp. 215, 217, 231, 287; Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, pp. 21, 60-1.


50) R. C. Johnson, 'Parliamentary Diaries of the early Stuart Period', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 44


53) Brook, Lives of the Puritans, 2, pp. 111-3; J. Peile, Biographical Register of Christ's College 1505-1905 (Cambridge, 1910), 1, pp. 119-20; A Dent, The plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven (1607), sigs. [A4r&v], [Alv].


56) Fincham, Prelate as Pastor, p. 325; R. Linaker, A comfortable Treatise (1607), sig. [A3v]; 1620 edition, p. 127 (again refers to being deprived and silenced in old age for not conforming to ceremonies), pp. 116-7, 157-8.

is fourth; W. Perkins, A Graine of Musterd-Seede (1611), p. 60.

58) Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinists, p. 80; H. Smith, Three Sermons (1607), pp. 49, 54-5.


60) Collinson, Religion of Protestants, pp. 17-9; G. Downname, Abrahams Tryall (1607), pp. 70-2.


62) C. Sutton, Disce Mori. Learne to die (1607), p. 177.


64) J. Hall, Heaven upon Earth (1607).

65) J. Balmford, A short Cate-chisme (1607).


APPENDIX - 1607

A) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED
IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND


STC 4179.5. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to M. Lownes 1 se 1607; no licenser named. Sometimes attributed to George Bury or G. Brian. Dedicated by editor to Sir William Walgrave of Buers.


STC 5933.3 Earliest extant edition in STC; 2 variants in 1607, reprinted 1608 and later in collection of treatises. Ent. to J. Budge and W. Firebrand 26 jy 1607; licensed by Master Barcham. Dedicated to Sir David Murray of Gorthy.

Dod, John (1549?-1645) and Cleaver, Robert (b. 1562?), A plaine and familiar Exposition of the eleventh and twelfth Chapters of Proverbes. London, F. Kyngston f. H. Sharpe,
1607. Examined HN copy, reel 1377.


STC 12592. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Burbye 9 "ja." [fb.] 1607; licensed by master Gabriel Powell.


STC 12981. Earliest extant edition in STC; 2 variants in 1607, revised edition printed in 1640. Ent. to Ockold 25 se. 1606 without author named; licensed by master Gabriell Powell. 1640 edition signed by Hayne as reviser states original author unknown; text expands some of H. Broughton's Con cent of Scripture. Dedicated by Ockould to Sir John Brograve, lawyer.


STC 14435.5. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to S. Stafford 22 my. 1607; licensed by Master Pasfeild.


STC 14611. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.


STC 14985. Only extant edition in STC.


STC 17839. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Clerke 27 my. 1607; licensed by Master Pasfeild. Dedicated to Edmund Sheffield, I Earl of Mulgrave.


STC 19751. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Legat and Waterson 23 fb. 1607 'in full Court'; no licenser named. Dedicated to Sir Thomas Holcroft of Vale Royal.


STC 20147.5. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Cotton 24 no. 1606; licensed by Master Gwyn. Dedicated to author's mother, Elizabeth Powell.

Rogers, Thomas (d.1616), The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion, professed, & protected in the Realme of England, and Dominions of the Same: expressed in 39 Articles, concordable agreed upon by the reuerend Bishops, and Clergie of this Kingdome. Cambridge, J. Legatt, 1607. F copy.


STC 21757. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Welby 5 jn. 1607; licensed by master Wilson. Mention in prelims that 'Printed in Venice by Robert Meietti, 1606'.


STC 23109. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in 1635. Ent. to T. Man (elder) and J. Man 2 fb. 1607; licensed by master Gabriell Powell.

STC 24317. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to T. Crede 13 mr. 1607; licensed by Master Gervase Scarborowe and Master Owen Gwyn. Dedicated to Christiana Mildmay Leveson, wife of Sir John the elder.

Vignier, Nicolas (1575?–1645?), Concerning the Excommunication of the Venetians a Discourse against Caesar Baronius Cardinal of the Church of Rome. Written in Latine and translated into English after the copie printed at Samur 1606. Whereunto is added the Bull of Pope Paulus the fift, against Venice. As also an Apologie of Frier Paul [Sarpi.] London, M. B[radwood] f. C. B[urby,] 1607. F copy.

STC 24719. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Burby 10 de. 1606; licensed by Master Powell.


STC 24951. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to J. Bill 10 jn. 1607; licensed by master Pasfeld.


B) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS – EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS – PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND – PROTESTANT

Ainsworth, Henry (1571–1622), The Communion of Saincts. A Treatise of the Fellowship that the Faithful have with God, and his Angels. Amsterdam, G. Thorp, 1607. Examined L2 copy, reel 982.

STC 228. Earliest extant edition in STC; 6 printings between 1607 and 1640, all in Amsterdam. No entry in Arber until ent. to J. Bellamy and R. Smith 21 no. 1640; licensed by Doctor Wykes and Master Man.

Hieron, Samuel (1576?–1617), A Defence of the Ministers Reasons, for Refusall of Subscription to the Booke of Common Prayer, and of Conformitie [10069.3]. The first Parte,

STC 13395, part one. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Only part one dated 1607, part two, 1608, attributed to J. Hondius, Amsterdam and part three, 1608, to William Jones's secret press.

Smyth, John, Se-baptist (d. 1612), Principles and Inferences concerning the visible Church. [Middelburg, R. Schilders,] 1607. Not available for viewing, used secondary sources.

STC 22877.3. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.

C) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - CATHOLIC


Instructions. Instructions for your Search into Religion. [Douai, L. Kellam,] 1607. Examined L2 copy, reel 1796.


Woodward, Philip (ca.1557-1610), The Dolefull Knell, of Thomas Bell that is a Answer, to his Pamphlet, intituled. The Popes Funeral [1825]. Which he published, against a Treatise of myne called. The Fore-runner of Bels Downefal [25972.5]. By B.C. student in divinitty. Roane, [i.e. Douai, P. Auroi a. L. Kellam,] 1607. F copy.


D) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - REPRINTS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND

Augustine, Saint, A pretious Booke of heavenlie Meditations. Called, a private Talke of the Souls with God. Translated and
purified by Thomas Rogers. (A right Christian Treatise.—
Saint Augustines Manual.) London, [G. Eld?] f. the Company
of the Stationers, 1607. F copy.

STC 945.7. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1581;
11 printings between 1581 and 1640. No entry in Arber until
part ent. to English stock 5 mr. 1620.
Dedicated by Rogers to Thomas Wilson, Secretary of State.

Balmford, James (b. 1556), A short Catechisme, summarily
comprising the principall Points of Christian Faith, somewhat
corrected and augmented. London, F. Kyngston f. R. Boyle,
1607. Examined L copy, reel 871.

STC 1337. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1597; 3
printings between 1597 and 1610. No entry in Arber.
Dedicated to the master wardens, assistants and whole company
of carpenters.

Barlow, William, Bp. of Rochester and Lincoln (d. 1613), The
first of the foure Sermons preached before the Kings
Maiestie, at Hampton Court in September last. This concerning
the Antiquity and Superioritie of Bishoppes. Sept. 21.1606.

STC 1452. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1606; 2
other printings, both in 1607. Ent. to Lawe 6 oc. 1606;
licensed by Bishop of Rochester [W. Barlow himself].
Dedications to King James and to the Ministers of Scotland.

Bernard, Richard (1567-1642), A double Catechisme, one more
large, following the Order of the common authorized
Catechisme, now this second Time published: the Other
shorter. Cambridge, J. Legate, 1607. Examined C copy, reel
699.

STC 1936. Reprint of large catechism first printed at
Cambridge in 1602; altogether 6 printings between 1602 and
1629. Assigned to J. Legatt after decease of father, 2 ja.
1621.
Dedicated to William Cavendish, II Earl of Devonshire.

Bradford, John (1510?-1555), Godly Meditations vpon the Lords
Prayer, the Beleefe, and Ten Commandements. Gathered in the
Time of his Imprisonment. London, E. Allde, 1607. Examined L
copy, reel 1128.

STC 3490. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1562; 8
printings between 1562 and 1633. Most recent ent. to J. Aldee
1 jy. 1578, no licenser named.

STC 6629. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1601; 22 printings between 1601 and 1640. Most recent ent. to E. Bishop 7 oc 1605 'by a full Court'; no licenser named. Dedicated to Sir Julius Caesar.


STC 7103. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1602; no other printings. Ent. to Lownes 19 ap 1602; no licenser named. Dedicated to Sir Henry Killigrew.


STC 11559. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1569; 13 printings between 1569 and 1640. Ent. to Pavier with Bradock's consent 3 mr. 1615 with mention of previous entry to Robinson; no licenser named. See Court Book C, pp. 73, 109.


STC 13231. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1580; 29 printings between 1580 and 1622. No entry in Arber but preface dated 1578; until 1615 all done by Barkers or their deputies. Issued to go with Geneva Bible and Sternhold Psalms. Darlow and Moule incorrectly attribute this to Robert
Harrison, d. 1585?.


STC 15640. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1595; 7 printings between 1595 and 1634. 1595 Dedication to the Earl of Essex not repeated in later editions.


STC 20018. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1595 [1596 for Pathway]; 8 printings of first and 5 of second between then and 1616. Assigned to Law from A. Wise 25 jn. 1603. Dedicated to Elizabeth Spenser Carey, wife of George II Baron Hunsdon.


STC 23477. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1600; 10 printings between 1600 and 1626. First ent. to J. Wolfe 21
au. 1600; Burby joined to him 19 ja. 1601 'in full Court'; 21
au. entry licensed by master Sonybank.
Dedicated to Elizabeth Howard Southwell, Lady of the Privy
Chamber, wife of Sir Robert.

Whately, William (1583-1639), The Redemption of Time, or a
Sermon containing verie good Remedies for them that have
misspent their Time. By M. W. Master in Arts. London, T. Este

STC 25319. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1606; 6
printings between 1606 and 1634. Ent. to T. Man junior and
senior 14 ap. 1606; licensed by Master Powell.

E) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - REPRINTS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY
IN ENGLAND - CATHOLIC

Parsons, Robert (1546-1610), The Christian Directory guiding
Men to eternall Salvation, devided into three Bookes. Lately
reviewed, corrected, and not a little altered by the Author
himselfe. [Anon. Only first book published.] [St. Omer, F.
Bellet,] 1607. F copy.

STC 19354.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC of
smaller work, Book of Christian Exercise, is 1582; 8
printings [all abroad] between 1582 and 1633. Not in Arber.
Not to be confused with Protestant adaptation by E. Bunny.
## EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS -- LONDON IMPRINTS -- LICENSERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Imprint Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Barcham</td>
<td>Cowper (26 jy. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Covell</td>
<td>A. N. (22 ap. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Gwyn</td>
<td>Powel (24 no. 06), *Tuke (13 mr. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus Higgon</td>
<td>Brinsley (4 jy. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharius Pasfield</td>
<td>Collins (18 no. 07), James (22 my. 07), Mason (9 ap. 07), Meriton (27 my. 07), Wakeman (10 jn. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Powel</td>
<td>Dod (5 de. 06), Hacket (9 fb. 07), Hayne (25 se. 06), Sprint (2 fb. 07), Vignier (10 de. 06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ravis</td>
<td>Pelling (18 no. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gervase Scarborowe</td>
<td>*Tuke (13 mr. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[John?] Wilson</td>
<td>Sarpi (5 jn. 07), Wilkinson (7 jy. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed</td>
<td>G. B. (1 se. 07), Perkins (23 fb. 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unentered</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX G – 1607

**EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS -- PUBLISHERS**

**LONDON:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Bill</td>
<td>Wakeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bishop</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bonian</td>
<td>Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Burby</td>
<td>Hacket, Vignier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Butter</td>
<td>Pelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Chorlton</td>
<td>N., A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Clarke</td>
<td>Meriton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cotton</td>
<td>Powel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Creede</td>
<td>Tuke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Ferebrand</td>
<td>Cowper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Flasket</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lownes</td>
<td>B., G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Macham</td>
<td>Brinsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Mann</td>
<td>Sprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Norton</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Ockould</td>
<td>Hayne, ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Sharpe</td>
<td>Dod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Stafford</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Welby</td>
<td>Sarpi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAMBRIDGE:** (Legate) Hieron, Perkins, Rogers

**OXFORD:** (Barnes) King

**SECRETLY IN ENGLAND:** Hieron, Bishop

**HOLLAND:**

- Amsterdam: Ainsworth
- Middelburg: Smyth

**FRANCE:**

- Douai: Instructions, Woodward
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Ainsworth, Henry, The Communion of Saintcs. A Treatise of the Fellowship that the Faithful have with God, and his Angels (Amsterdam, G. Thorp, 1607).


Balmford, James, A Short Catechisme, Summarily Comprizing the Principall Points of Christian Faith, Somewhat Corrected and Augmented (1607).

Barlow, William, The First of the Foure Sermons Preached before the Kings Maiestie, at Hampton Court in September last. This Concerning the Antiquity and Superioritie of Bishoppes. Sept. 21.1606 (1607).

Bernard, Richard, A double Catechisme, one more large, Following the Order of the Common Authorized Catechisme, now this Second Time Published: the Other Shorter (Cambridge, 1607).


Bradford, John, Godly Meditations vpon the Lords Prayer, the Beleefe, and Ten Commaundements. Gathered in the Time of his Imprisonment (1607).

Brinsley, John, the Elder, The Second Part of the True Watch, Containing the Perfect Rule and Summe of Prayer (1607).

Collins, Samuel, A Sermon Preached at Paules-Crosse, vpon the 1. of November, 1607 (1607).

Cowper, William, A Preparative for the New Passeover. Very Profitable [for] Those who are called to the Holy Table of our Lord (1607).


Dod, John, and Cleaver, Robert, A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Eleventh and Twelfth Chapters of Proverbs
Downname, George, Abrahams Tryall: a Sermon preached at the Spittle (1607).

Garden. A Godlie Garden: out of the which most Cofortable Hearbs maybe gathered for the Health of the Wounded Conscience of all Penitent Sinners (1607).

Hacket, Roger, Two Fruitful Sermons, Needfull for these Times: A Mariage Present; A Sickemans Glasse (1607).

Hall, Joseph, Heaven upon Earth: or of true Peace, and Tranquillity of Minde. The Third Edition: purged of many grosse Faults, escaped in the former Impressions (1607).


Herrey, Robert F., Two right profitable and fruitfull Concordances. Collected by R. F. H(erry.) (1607).

Hieron, Samuel, A Defence of the Ministers Reasons, for Refusall of Subscription to the Booke of Common Prayer, and of Conformitie [10069.3]. The First parte, concerning the Holy Scriptures. [Anon.] ([W. Jones's secret press], 1607).


Instructions. Instructions for your Search into Religion ([Douai], 1607).

James, Edward, A Retrayt sounded to certaine Brethren, lately seduced by the schismaticall Brownists (1607).


King, John, A Sermon preached in Oxon: the 5. of November. 1607 (Oxford, 1607).

Linaker, Robert, A comfortable Treatise, for the Reliefe of such as are afflicted in Conscience: Revised the third time, corrected, and enlarged (1607).


Meriton, George, A Sermon of Repentance (1607).


Pelling, John. A Sermon of the Providence of God. Preached at Paules Crosse, the 25. of October. 1607 (1607)

Perkins, William, A Graine of Mustard-Seed, or the least Measure of Grace that is or can bee effectuall to Salvation (1607).


Playfere, Thomas, The Meane in Mourning. A Sermon preached at Saint Maries Spittle in London on Tuesday in Easter Weeke. 1595 (The Pathway to Perfection) (1611).

Powel, Gabriel, The Mysterie of Redemption: or the particular Manner how Man is redeemed from Sinne. With divers sweet and comfortable Prayers (1607).


Sarpi, Paolo, An Apology, or, apologifticall answere, made unto the Exceptions and Objections of Cardinall Bellarmine, against John Gerson, concerning Excommunication (1607).

Smith, Henry, Three Sermons made by Master Henry Smith. I. The Benefit of Contentation. II. The Affinitie of the Faithfull. III. The lost Sheepe is found (1607).

Smyth, John, Principles and Inferences concerning the visible Church ([Middelburg, R. Schilders], 1607).

Sprint, John, Propositions, tending to proove the necessarie Use of the Christian Sabbaoth, or Lords Day (1607).

Sutton, Christopher, Disce Mori. Learne to die. Newly enlarged (1607).

Tuke, Thomas, The true Trial and Turning of a Sinner. Or, three plaine and profitable Sermons (1607).

Vignier, Nicolas, Concerning the Excommunication of the Venetians a Discourse against Caesar Baronius (1607).

Wakeman, Robert, The poore-mans Preacher. A Sermon preached at S. Maries Spittle in London, on Tuesday in Easter Weeke, being April. 7. 1607 (1607).
Whately, William, The Redemption of Time, or a Sermon containing verie good remedies for them that haue misspent their time. By M. W. (1607).

Wilkinson, Robert, A Sermon preached at North-hampton the 21. of June last past upon Occasion of the late Rebellion and Riots (1607).

Woodward, Philip, The Dolefull Knell, of Thomas Bell. By B.C. student in divinitye (Roane, [i.e. Douai], 1607).
In March of 1617 King James embarked on a royal visit to Scotland, the land of his birth; this journey was to consume almost half a year of the king's time, energies, and resources. Although he had assured the Scottish Council that he did not intend to disturb their civil or ecclesiastical government, James's own private agenda included a plan to bring the two countries closer together in religious practices. The very next year the king imposed the Five Articles of Perth on the Scots; these articles involved such controversial matters as kneeling at communion and the celebration of Christmas and Easter. It was perhaps no coincidence that Richard Neile, then bishop of Lincoln, and William Laud, dean of Gloucester, men who were to play a leading role in the ceremonialist and anti-Calvinist developments of the next two decades, were among the ecclesiastical entourage.

In the course of his travels, at St. Andrews on 13 July 1617, the king listened to a sermon delivered by his chaplain Robert Wilkinson. Preaching on the themes of peace and union and boasting of the unity between the churches of England and Scotland against Catholicism, Wilkinson at the same time betrayed concerns over the former struggles between the two countries. 'Popish ignorance of olde time made us enemies, and the Pope who makes Warre and peace (as best may serve his purpose)...did little good to make us friends; but we have now shaken of[f] him, as the Prince of contention and darknesse.... Therefore if it be possible, let us Habitare in uno, all to follow one way, one government, one discipline;...still to hold our grounds, one Gospell, one Faith, one God: that is, if we can, let us all agree in an uniformitie, but if not so, yet let us stil hold the grounds of unitie...yet because we are all of one faith, to hold even our differences in peace, and to doe nothing through
Concerned at the time with the differences between the churches in England and in Scotland, Wilkinson's sentiments can also stand (albeit accidentally) as a description of the state of religion in the English realm of James I in 1617. Within the church hierarchy lurked opposing views on matters as fundamental as the nature of the true church, the scenic apparatus of the divine service and the double decree of predestination. However, on the whole the kingdom was united in the view that the papacy was still the Antichristian enemy. In part this solidarity had been cemented by an event at the beginning of the decade. Early in 1610 the tolerant King Henry IV of France had been slain by an assassin in the pay of Spain. This brought renewed efforts by the regime in England to crack down on recusants and to enforce the oath of allegiance. In a related maneuver, the evangelical and strongly anti-Catholic bishop of London, George Abbot, was elevated to the post of archbishop of Canterbury. With this promotion the two primatial posts in England became securely occupied by men of Calvinist sympathies. In foreign affairs, James became affiliated with the head of the German Protestant union when in 1612 his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, was joined in marriage to the young Elector Palatine, Frederick V.

The archbishops were supported by Calvinists in the important sees of London (John King) and Winchester (James Montagu). In spite of this, the seeds of future discord were planted. From early in his reign King James had also been promoting ecclesiastics of an anti-Calvinist persuasion—some of whom, like Lancelot Andrewes, dean of Westminster, and John Overall, dean of St. Paul's, had been placed late in Elizabeth's reign. Of the three household offices staffed by ecclesiastics, two were held by anti-Calvinists: Lancelot Andrewes was Royal Almoner and Richard Neile was Clerk of the Closet. John Buckeridge, Lancelot Andrewes, Richard Neile, and Samuel Harsnett were bishops by 1611; John Overall joined
them in 1614. It was late in the year 1617 that Richard Neile was confirmed as bishop of the important see of Durham and invested with secular powers not held by his immediate predecessors. The influential bishop of Ely, Lancelot Andrewes, had been a member of the Privy Council in England since 1616. Lines were being drawn between those who supported the drive against Catholicism and those who would have preferred stronger measures against puritans. Although there were few major publications which aroused vehement reactions in the decade before 1617, there were rivalries.

These inner tensions were especially visible in the two universities. Arguments between Calvinists and anti-Calvinists at Oxford spilled over into the royal court in 1615; both William Laud and John Howson had to respond to accusations in the presence of King James. Less is known about Laud's case; he and the archbishop's brother Robert had been in serious disagreement, but in June 1615 Laud was allowed to return to his post at St. John's College, Oxford. However a detailed narrative of the proceedings against Howson remains. Howson, of Christ Church, Oxford, was replying to sixteen charges made by Archbishop Abbot - charges which covered his behavior over a twenty five year period. Howson was blamed, among other things, for being too lax against popery. King James pursued his policy of balancing opposing viewpoints. Although Howson was acquitted of being a crypto-papist, he was reprimanded and ordered to preach against Roman teaching in future. 'Certainly, this hearing ended with the apparent reconciliation of Howson and Abbot, but behind the rhetoric of restored unity there remained serious tensions between Calvinists and anti-Calvinists....[The narrative] makes evident the theological tensions in Oxford University and the doctrinal plurality of the upper echelons of the English Church'.

Nor was Cambridge immune, but likewise harbored internal conflicts; there were already reverberations of Arminian problems. The post of regius professor of divinity was
occupied in sequence by two anti-Calvinists: the first, John Overall, was succeeded in 1607 by John Richardson. God's Arraignemnt of Hypocrites by John Yates, which contained a defence of William Perkins against Arminius, was published at Cambridge in 1615 and again in 1616. Then in the summer of 1616, Samuel Brooke, possibly at the invitation of Richardson, visited Cambridge and publicly defended Arminius, while rejecting the views of Calvin, Beza, and Perkins. In order to curb these types of debate, in December 1616 King James issued directions to the vice-chancellor and heads of the houses of Cambridge University which included the provision that divinity students confine themselves to books agreeable in doctrine and discipline to the Church of England - the fathers, councils, schoolmen, and histories, and 'not to insist too long upon compendiums & Abbreviators, making them the grounds of their studie in Divinitie'.

One publication which did cause controversy in this period between 1608 and 1617 was secular - The Interpreter by John Cowell. Originally allowed and printed at Cambridge in 1607, this law dictionary contained definitions of royal power and the role of parliament which were perceived as absolutist by some in parliament. Thus in March 1610 a parliamentary conference was appointed to report on it. Within days, in order to keep the peace and protect his financial negotiations with parliament, King James decided Cowell had been too bold with the common law; he sacrificed the book by issuing a proclamation on 25 March 1610 which recalled and suppressed it. No other extant edition survives until 1637. The proclamation concluded with a promise for better oversight of the press. 'We have resolved to make choice of Commissioners that shall looke more narrowly into the nature of all these things that shall be put to the Presse, either concerning our Authoritie Royall, or concerning our government or the Lawes of our Kingdome...'.

Shortly after George Abbot became archbishop, in August 1611 the king granted to the ecclesiastical commission the
power to search and seize heretical and seditious books and libels. These powers were reenforced in 1613 and extended to include portraiture. In the 1586 Star Chamber Decree concerning printing it was the wardens of the Stationers' Company who had this responsibility. Sheila Lambert views this transfer as an indication that the company had failed in its policing duties; she points out that the searching functions were then taken over by messengers of the king's chamber acting as pursuivants of the High Commission. This type of supervision was not unprecedented for the High Commission however; as early as 1559 the commission had been assigned responsibility for inquiring into seditious books and heretical opinions. A similar responsibility was recorded in 1584. Moreover, the timing of the authorizations in 1611 and 1613 suggests that it was part of the general anti-Catholic backlash of this period. An item in the state papers for 30 April 1611 predates the instructions from the king; here the new archbishop of Canterbury and the Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical instructed the messengers of the king's chamber to search for and seize Jesuits, seminary priests, popish books, and relics.

The failed parliamentary negotiations of 1610 were followed by the hapless 'Addled Parliament' of 1614, but no other new parliaments met between early 1611 and 1621. The commons had provided a stage for supporters of puritan clergy, so its absence robbed the country of one source of Protestant rhetoric. In any case, after the death of Henry IV problems with nonconformity had been upstaged by worries about a Catholic threat. Proclamations of 1610 and 1611 reiterated the need to enforce the oath of allegiance. So also royal instructions to the episcopate in 1610 and 1611 focused on discovering popish recusants and administering the oath of allegiance. M. C. Questier emphasizes that the most ardent efforts to enforce the Jacobean oath of allegiance, introduced in 1606, began with the death of Henry IV and the proclamation of 1610. Another royal proclamation, that of 8
November 1615, called for a treatise entitled God and the King to be taught to the young. This was part of the general campaign to bring recusants under control and underscored the need for the oath of allegiance; thus one purpose was to season young minds against the pestilent doctrines of the Jesuits. However, on a larger scale, it portrayed the king as drawing his authority from God alone and embodied absolutist theory. The requirement for using this book in study began to appear in visitation articles.  

Nevertheless, the censorship incident with the most dramatic consequences involved ideas which were never printed at all. The deprived Somerset minister Edmund Peacham was convicted of treason on the basis of notes for a sermon which he did not even deliver. In December 1614 Peacham had been deprived for libel against his bishop, James Montagu. The charges escalated when agents of the High Commission searched his house and fell upon the sermon notes which were interpreted as inciting sedition. Peacham was tortured and tried for high treason; though sentenced to death, he actually died in prison.

Thus between 1608 and 1617, two major cases concerning the dissemination of contentious ideas were those of Cowell and Peacham and involved the state rather than the church. Most of the events which were to cause open dissension in the country and the church lay in the future. The Thirty Years War had not yet erupted. Nor did the Synod of Dort, which was to bring discussions about Arminianism on to front stage, convene until 1618. Similarly the king's Book of Sports, which challenged the beliefs of strict sabbatarians, was not published until 1618. Yet we know there was already growing religious disharmony, especially at the universities.

What was the situation for religious printing in 1617? What was the result of James's efforts to keep peace among his senior clergy and divisions under control? According to Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, there were virtually no clerical deprivations between 1611 and 1625 - only two
ministers lost their livings. Did James's policy of tolerating "moderate nonconformity" continue to tip the balance in favor of Calvinists? Was there, additionally, a conscious policy of silencing proto-Arminians such as Lancelot Andrewes on theological issues in order to create the illusion of a calm and stable church? Did James's quest for harmony still allow room to maneuver so that he was able to silence the growing ranks of anti-Calvinists by rewarding them with office? Archbishop Abbot, writing to Ralph Winwood in 1613, claimed that Andrewes had agreed to keep his anti-Calvinist views to himself, yet the latter continued to reap rewards. How do the religious publications in 1617 reflect the statement of Peter Lake that "Debate about predestination was effectively stopped, with the result, under James, that the Calvinists were allowed to talk about it and their opponents were not"?

The answers to these questions are best determined by inspecting the publications which appeared for the first time in 1617. The sampling for this year reveals thirty four earliest extant editions, of which twenty eight were published in England or Scotland. Of these, twenty four were printed in London, and, at the universities, two were printed at Oxford and one at Cambridge. Manuscripts for London printing were to be examined first by the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of London, although in practice it was usually a trusted chaplain or local London clergy who did the actual work. The London licensing system was under the control of firm Calvinists: George Abbot of Canterbury and John King of London. The situation in the universities, where vice-chancellors allowed printing, was not as clear since their term of service was short and not calendrical. Arthur Lake, warden of New College, served as vice-chancellor of Oxford between July 1616 and July 1617; he was then replaced by William Goodwin, dean of Christ Church and chaplain to the king. At Cambridge it was John Hill, master of Catherine Hall, who would have served between November 1616 and
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November 1617 and then been succeeded by John Richardson, already described as an Arminian sympathizer; the latter resigned as regius professor of divinity in September of that year rather than be seen to condemn the Dutch Arminians on the eve of the Synod of Dort. 13

What do these first editions suggest about the accepted topics for religious printing in 1617? Do they underscore James's search for a moderate stance within the English Protestant church with an emphasis on uniformity and peace? Do they reflect traditional evangelical Calvinist themes such as the double decree of predestination, virulent anti-popy and staunch sabbatarianism? As earlier mentioned, James's chaplain Robert Wilkinson had argued for peace and unity between the Protestant churches of Scotland and England. Treatises by Samuel Collins and John Boys, although written for different objectives, also contrived to bolster the regime's desire for unity.

Samuel Collins, another royal chaplain, was enlisted as a controversialist in the campaign to defend the king against Catholic writings advocating papal supremacy. It was in October 1617 that Collins, originally a protege of Archbishop Bancroft, was selected to become regius professor of divinity at Cambridge. In this role he replaced John Richardson, the divine with Arminian sympathies who had resigned. At the request of King James, Collins responded to the attack of the Catholic Thomas Fitzherbert on Lancelot Andrewes; his response was termed Epphata to F. T. Here Collins considered the question of papal primacy versus the temporal and ecclesiastical supremacy of kings. To achieve his purpose, he rebutted claims made by Cardinal Bellarmine. He stressed that English Protestants were united in loyalty to their supreme head, the king. 'Doe not the English Puritanes pray dayly for his Maiesty by the title of supreame head and governour? Doe they not set their hand to it, and subscribe their name?'. The origins of the debate about the oath of allegiance and the supremacy of the king over all subjects in his domain.
dated from efforts earlier in the reign to split off moderate Catholics. Collins's effort was both a defensive maneuver to refute allegations of disunity and an offensive one to try to drive a wedge between political and religious Catholics. Johann Sommerville has placed Collins among the ranks of those who supported 'jure divino' episcopacy and the royal supremacy. He certainly should be seen as part of the conformist milieu. However Collins's doctrine must have been congenial even in the puritan Cambridge of the 1640's as he retained his regius professorship there.

Another conformist, John Boys, pursued a career which included loyal service to three archbishops of Canterbury. He has been viewed by Peter White as embodying the concept of the via media - representing a church staving off both papists and schismatics. Boys was dean of Canterbury between 1619 and 1625 and has been rather differently characterized by Patrick Collinson as one in a series of deans espousing 'Prayer Book Protestantism'. In truth Boys's published writings did concentrate on the liturgy. The part of his exposition of the proper psalms for use in the English liturgy which appeared in 1617 included Ascension and Whitsunday. It was dedicated on the titlepage to his friends at Clare Hall, Cambridge - friends who remained unnamed. John Sanford, Canterbury prebendary and chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, was named as licenser. In this work Boys stressed the adiaphoristic doctrine of things indifferent. 'Augustine...doth understand the diversities of ceremonies used in the Church of God...even so there is in the Church one faith, and variety of ceremonies, an unity for doctrine throughout the whole world, but not alwayes in rites an uniformity. So the Church of England determines. It is not necessarie that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one or utterly like, for in all ages they have beene diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times and manners of men, so that nothing bee ordained against Gods word'.

Wilkinson, Collins, and Boys represent a middle ground -
conformists who sought peace. A fourth divine, John Hales, went beyond the others in his pursuit of unity in the church; he actually warned against discussions of predestination. As chaplain to Sir Dudley Carleton in Holland, Hales was sent to cover the negotiations at Dort in 1618-1619 and to report back. It has been said that disillusionment at the synod is what led Hales to 'bid John Calvin good-night'. A graduate of Corpus Christi College in 1603 - a college with anti-Calvinist associations - and then regius professor of Greek at Oxford, Hales collaborated with Sir Henry Savile on the works of St. Chrysostom, themselves an important source for anti-Calvinists. The sermon he preached at St. Mary's Oxford in Easter week 1617, printed at Oxford, was fashioned to expose the abuses of obscure and difficult places of scripture with a recommendation against 'torturing them to extract that out of them which God and nature never put in them'. Hales's biographer suggests that 'in admitting even a small part of the Bible to be incapable of interpretation, Hales showed himself an opponent of the spirit of early seventeenth-century Puritanism...'. Hales went on to warn that it was because the Church of Rome had made its glosses on Scripture canonical that England had to separate. To continue to set up scriptural glosses of its own would cause the Church of England to reach the same point. This reflects the content of James I's directions to the university regarding divinity students which had been sent first to Cambridge late in 1616 and then on to Oxford early in the next year. But it was in his treatment of the doctrine of predestination that Hales foreshadowed some of the measures taken by the regime in the 1620's to silence dissension within the church. Royal directions to preachers of August 1622 prevented those below the level of bishop or dean from preaching on the deep points of predestination, election, and reprobation. Hales preached in 1617: 'Is it not St Pauls owne practise, when having brought in a question concerning Gods iustice in predestination, hee gives no other
answer but this, O man, who art thou that disputeth with God? Is it not his plaine purpose to advise the disputer rather not to make the question, then to require a determination of it at his hands? This was Hales's only extant publication until the 1640's; after Dort he withdrew to a quiet, scholarly life at Eton.

Although Marcus Antonius de Dominis, archbishop of Spalato, also advocated unity and wrote during this period under the patronage of King James, his private vendetta with Pope Paul V and his short-lived conversion to Protestantism made him a unique case. However, even more than Hales, he was an anti-Calvinist. His intention to defect to England had caused a major stir at the court of King James. Beginning late in 1616, the state papers are replete with details of his progress from Venice to London. As de Dominis was readying his writings for the English market, it appeared that changes in them were being requested, presumably by licensers. John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton in February 1617: 'Some of his books in the press were stayed by authority on account of their tenets on jurisdiction'. Two of the numerous titles which were timed for release upon his arrival in England fall into this sampling. The first of these, A Declaration of the Reasons which moved [de Dominis] to depart from the Romish Religion was the first edition of this particular translation; it was printed by Hart in Edinburgh. In this book the archbishop revealed his hope for Christian reunion. 'From the first yeeres wherein I rendered my selfe to be a Clergieman, I fostered an in-borne desire to see the union of all the Churches of Christ: & could never patiently thinke upon the division of the Westerne & Eastern Churches,...I desired earnestly to know the causes of so many and so great Schismes: and to search, if possibly any way could be found out to bind up again all the Churches of Christ in the true & ancient Union'. This same aim of unification was reiterated in a private letter, penned in July 1617, in which he regretted the religious tumults in
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Holland; he wished that controversial subjects were banished, under severe penalty, from popular preachings and that the people should know the fundamental points of agreement, although there should be charity for differing views.  

The archbishop of Spalato preached a sermon in Italian at Mercers Chapel in London at the end of November 1617; it was speedily printed in both Italian and English. The English translation was entered on 20 December and licensed by Dr. Thomas Goad, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot and future delegate to the Synod of Dort. To an Italian audience, de Dominis resumed his explanations for leaving the Church of Rome while also maintaining that the basics in both religions were similar. 'The Religion of both [Roman and Reformed] is in the maine essentials and fundamentals the very same. Both have the same Christ for their Lord and Master; both the same baptisme; both are founded by the same Apostles; both have and professe the same Gospel....But I finde one maine difference betwene them, whence also arise an innumerable other disparities, and it is, that the Pilot, who sits at the sterne of the Romane ship...hath out of his owne capricious conceit devised a new Card, and contrived a new-found Compasse of his owne...'. It was subsequent unhappiness with the strength of Calvinism in the English Church which drove de Dominis to become a double apostate. Pope Paul V died in 1621 and soon thereafter the archbishop of Spalato was on his way back to the Roman Catholic Church.  

Thus it is evident that the five writings which displayed an emphasis on peace and uniformity were composed for different objectives. Wilkinson, Collins, and Boys were conformists who perhaps represented a spectrum of views. But Hales was probably an anti-Calvinist, and de Dominis wrote of a unity which included the Church of Rome. More numerous in this sampling are first editions which expressed popular evangelical Calvinist themes, among them a belief in unconditional predestination and a strong anti-Catholicism. There are thirteen books in which, among other things,
predestination is discussed in various degrees of detail; seven of the thirteen considered the double decree of predestination. Books by Richard Bernard, Thomas Cooper, John Darrell, John Hitchcock, John Moore, Sampson Price, and Thomas Tuke all included Calvinist references to both the elect and reprobate.

The first of these authors, Richard Bernard, had flirted with separatism early in his career, while vicar at Worksop in Nottinghamshire. He was deprived for nonsubscription in 1605 but then lured back into the fold by Archbishop Matthew, before whom he did subscribe in 1608. Thereafter Bernard turned against the separatists upon whom he mounted vehement attacks. However his moderate nonconformity persisted; in 1612 he gained a purchased advowson at Batcombe in Somerset where he flourished under the indulgent supervision of first James Montagu and then Arthur Lake as successive bishops of Bath and Wells, Montagu going on to become bishop of Winchester. Collinson has written of this 'Wells-Winchester connection' which included parish clergymen such as Richard Bernard. 20

Bernard wrote a treatise on the Revelation of St. John which was published in 1617, after licensing by Sanford. Entitled A Key of Knowledge, this book began with no less than five separate dedications. Those dedicatory epistles to common law judges, justices of the peace, military men, and the Christian reader - replete with attacks on recusants and popery - were preceded by a Latin dedication to Arthur Lake. John Hale has included Bernard in his study of military sermons and, although this is not the most dramatic example of Barnard's call to arms, it does strike a militant tone. 'By this booke may we, the reformed Churches ...know...what God commandeth us to doe, for the furthering of our promised future happinesse, in endeavoring the utter ruine of that cursed state of Antichristianisme: kings are to warre against her with the sword, and to burne the whore with fire...'. 21 Bernard credited King James with being the first monarch to
proclaim the Pope as Antichrist. When touching on predestinarian doctrine, he described the book of life: 'for there is another booke for the elect, which is the booke of life,...This booke here is opened, that Gods elect may be seene & knowne...And...for to know a conclusion of all reprobates, all such [that] merrily reioyced at the murthering of the faithfull witnesses and Preachers of the truth, whosoever was not found written in the booke of life, was cast into the lake of fire'.  

The puritan preacher Thomas Cooper was revisiting the scene of an early posting when he wrote The Mystery of Witchcraft. Licensed by Sanford, this book is dedicated to the mayor and corporation of Chester. The bishopric of Chester, created by Henry VIII, was an impoverished and unwieldy diocese and one which harbored a large population of recusants. It also contained significant numbers of residual nonconformists; the latter sometimes were allowed to thrive simply because they might prove useful in the war against popery. Lancashire in particular was an area of deep irreligious. 'It was no accident that the King's Book of Sports [issued first for Lancashire in 1617] originated in Lancashire. The county was famous for its addiction to sport and communal pleasures of the most traditional kind'. Between 1600 and 1604 Cooper had been vicar of Great Budworth, Cheshire, described as a parish where 'the activities of puritan ministers were coutenanced'.  

Cooper himself was a rather shadowy figure. He progressed from his early years in Chester to Coventry, which he then left in 1610 presumably for a London lectureship. A dedication to some of his 'auditors' in a book by Cooper published in 1615 thanks them as 'instruments (beloved) of my settling in the Citie, and exercise of my calling...'. In the title in this survey, Cooper is back in Chester to deal with witchcraft. While discussing the chances of the elect and reprobate against witches, he asked, 'and who are they that are freed from Sathans power, are they not onely the
faithfull? those which are truely elected, eyther Sathan cannot touch them at all, or else his afflictions shall tend to their good:....Not that the Elect may be altogether free from this affliction, but that it shall turne to their good, their soules shall be safe, and they are nothing so often subject thereto as the wicked and reprobate. But specially apprehend we that providence of the Almightie, whereby he hath taken the soule of man into his especiall protection; as having elected us to salvation, before the foundations of the world were laid...'.

A third person with a chequered past who published in 1617 was John Darrell. Although the revised Short Title Catalogue speculates that this attack on Brownists may have been written by a different Darrell than the exorcist, Peter Milward describes its author as a 'former Puritan exorcist, now conforming minister'. One possible piece of evidence that the exorcist and the anti-Brownist were the same Darrell is provided by the end of the dedicatory epistle to the Church of England. 'And that I being by the providence of God cast into the middest of these Separistes, that (towards the Northe[r]n parts) did lately spring up, had thereby many more occasions to moove & prick mee forward to this businesse, then other of my brethren have had'. The John Darrell who had operated as an exorcist in the 1590's and had brought down upon himself the wrath of Bishop Bancroft and his chaplain Samuel Harsnett had been active in Nottinghamshire. Darrell had worked in the parishes of Mansfield, Bulwell and Nottingham - all slightly south of the area around Scrooby which was later to be the site of renowned separatist activity. This criticism of the Brownists was part of the classic argument employed by puritans to fashion a clear distinction between themselves and separatists. Aimed at men such as Barrow, Johnson, Robinson, and especially Ainsworth for his Counterpoyson, Darrell's treatise was in defence of the 'Ministery, Liturgie, and Discipline' of the Church of England. It was entered in April 1617 after being licensed by
the ubiquitous Sanford. While addressing the Brownists's claims to a visible church, Darrell also opened a discussion on the relation of the elect to the church. 'But on the Elect only Christ's love is set....The company of the Elect are meant therefore by the Church. Againe, it is said, He gave himselfe for the Church: thereby also it is cleare by (Church) is meant onely and all the Elect: sith for them alone, and for all them he died, and not for the reprobate'.

A moral discourse composed by a student in the Middle Temple, John Hitchcock, falls into this survey; it was licensed by John Tavernor, secretary to Bishop King, and dedicated to the Earl of Pembroke. Although primarily a book of general instruction 'leading to a perfect knowledge of man', when touching on religious life the author sounded a Calvinist note. 'In respect of the nature of adversitie, wee may easily endure it....2. because it is common to all, though after a divers manner, to the wise and godly as matter of good and instruction, to fooles and reprobates, as occasion of evill and despaire'.

Two other relatively obscure sermonizers had earliest editions published in 1617. The first, John Moore, was minister at Shearsby in Leicestershire. An earlier writing of his, Target for Tillage, was published in 1612 and disclosed that he had taken a stand against enclosures and repressive landlords. These sermons, which were approved by Sanford and entered in January 1617, were by implication Calvinist predestinarian. 'But the highest degree of all [for the elect], of the soules estate, is, at the generall day of resurrection...for then both the body and soule of man shall not onely enjoy the presence of God, but live also with him for ever in heavenly blissse. So likewise the reprobate in this life, and in the life to come have double miseries coupled to their double deaths...and in the life to come they are not onely deprived of the presence of God, but suffer and endure all endlesse and unspeakable torments with the Diuell.
Sampson Price of Exeter College, Oxford, has been identified as a lecturer who was collated to All Hallows the Great by Abbot in 1617. He had delivered sermons at Paul's Cross in 1613 and 1616; the later one has been characterized as Calvinist by Nicholas Tyacke. In this unentered sermon preached near Shrewsbury, Price clearly differentiated between the elect and the reprobate. 'But our eyes at the last shall be open to see God as hee is, and to bee glorified: without this refreshing wee are ever ready to faint. Which striketh horrour into the hearts of reprobates: for their candle shall bee put out, and God shall distribute sorrowes unto them in his anger....The light is sweet, but they must goe to darknesse, for ever to houle there, when the elect shall have all teares wiped away from their eyes'.

In a first edition published in 1617, the remaining divine, Thomas Tuke, also invoked the double decree of predestination. About to be presented to the vicarage of St. Olave Jewry in July 1617, Tuke had his theological discourse entered on 30 May 1617, after licensing by Richard Cluett - London rector of St. Anne and St. Agnes Aldersgate and prebendary of St. Paul's. Both of Tuke's publications in 1617 were dedicated to the man who may have presented him to his living - Francis Bacon, Keeper of the Great Seal. The Discourse which is in this sampling was strictly predestinarian. 'The Godhead of Christ is in us, dwells in us, and we in it;...and for that it doth also susteine and keepe us in this good state, it sets us in. In which respect we may truely say that God is absent from the reprobate, and that they are separated from him....As concerning Gods eternall counsell, and fore-knowledge ...wee were in Christ, and Christ in us, before the foundations of the world were laide'.

Six additional works were less specific about predestination but did relay a belief in absolute election. The first of these was a catechism. By the seventeenth
century England boasted a plenitude of home-grown catechisms, but reliance on continental forms had a strong tradition as well. This sampling contains a title based on the Heidelberg catechism which was unentered in the registers and has been identified only by the initials E. B. The editor claimed in part to follow the Palatine catechism. Preceding the catechism was a short treatise asserting the necessity of catechisms to assist in interpreting scripture as well as to protect against seduction by Jesuits and seminaries. This Calvinist evangelical focus on catechizing was crucial for the spread of the gospel. 'First, should catechizing seeme a base and vile matter in our eyes, which God...hath invented as an ordinance of his to helpe his elect to the faith of Christ?...yet certainly it is Gods foolishnesse, which is wiser then men....[and] I beleeeve, that the Son of God, doth in all ages by his Word and Spirit, gather, governe, and defend a company chosen to eternall life, and that I am a very member of the same, and so shall remaine for ever'. The Scotsman Robert Bruce was the author of the next book, a group of sixteen sermons on the Lords Supper and select scriptures, delivered earlier in Edinburgh. A minority of these sermons were reprints, but eleven had previously been published only in the Scottish dialect, once in 1591, and were now newly 'englished', licensed by Sanford, and entered on 21 January 1617. Bruce had helped to transmit the teachings of his friend Andrew Melville and retained a reputation for presbyterianism: he had consistently attacked Catholics and opposed James's desire to introduce episcopal government into the church in Scotland. Banished from Edinburgh in 1600 and on the move for the next thirty years of his life, Bruce was described on this titlepage only as a minister of the word in Scotland. In the first sermon Bruce declared 'When all men should have died for ever, it pleased him of his infinite mercy to select out of all, and to elect a certaine number out of the lost race of Adam....Christ Jesus our Saviour hath elected us: and
according as his Father in his secret election before the beginning of the world, had elected us, the same Christ Jesus...calleth us, and maketh us partakers of that salvation which he hath purchased'.

The next preacher, Nicholas Byfield, appears to have been a conformable Calvinist who served as a minister in Isleworth in Middlesex; a number of his sermons on the first chapter of the first epistle of Peter were published in 1617. Although the book was licensed by Cluett and entered 14 May 1617, its dedication to Lucy, wife of the earl of Bedford, was dated later, July 1617. In his treatment of the term 'election', Byfield's second definition was: 'There is an Election to salvation, which is the eternall predestination of God appointing certaine men to be vessels of mercy, and to enjoy the glory of heaven'. He continued 'this also may be a doctrine of singular terror to wicked men, that will not bee gathered and call'd by the meanes of salvation...If it be such a felicitie to be chosen of God, what miserie is it then to be reiected of God for ever'?

A further three of the divines in this section were also vehement in their antipopery - thus they serve as a bridge to the titles in this sampling which exhibited similar marked hostility. Samuel Smith, a prolific preacher, was minister at Prittlewell in Essex. This edition of his sermons on the 20th chapter of Revelation, entitled The Great Assize, or, Day of Jubilee, was described on the titlepage as the second impression. The title was entered in April 1615 and licensed by a rector in Essex, Gervase Nidd; nevertheless 1617 is the earliest extant imprint date. This collection combined a potent blend of predestinarian doctrine and antipopery. 'Now if you would know what is heere meant by the Booke of Life, it is the Book in the which all the names of Gods Elect, which in his eternall purpose he hath chosen, be written...If thy name bee written in the Booke of Life, thou shalt never perish...'. 'Let us then ever stand out against the Antichrist of Rome, and as Christ saith,...ioyne not with her
in her false Religion, and Idolatrous service of God, lest you partake of her plagues...'. 33

John Terry's title was printed at Oxford and dedicated to Arthur Lake as vice-chancellor of Oxford and warden of New College, Oxford; Terry had a long-standing connection with New College. As Lake was vice-chancellor for the year beginning in November 1616, he presumably approved this for the press. Terry was known for his anti-Catholic polemics, but he also here included a reference to the elect. 'For whom God electeth in Christ before all worlds, to those by inward and effectuall calling, he giveth a wise and an holy faith, whereby they are made the sonnes of God'. However the main thrust of Terry's piece was to combat Roman Catholic error. In conclusion he wrote: 'as on the one side we are to pray unto God...that he would still deliver us from the wicked doctrines of evill and unreasonable Papists, because they be not the doctrines of faith and truth: so we are on the other side still to pray unto him, that he would cause the doctrine of the Gospell to be published more and more...'. 34

A Paul's Cross sermon by Charles Richardson, preacher at Saint Katherine's near the Tower, completes this group. Sermons originally delivered by him at the Cross survive for 1614, 1616, and 1617; the last two have been included in Tyacke's roster of Calvinist sermons preached there. The Passion Sunday sermon for 1617 contained a dedication to the mayor, sheriffs, and aldermen of London which credited them with hearing the sermon and allowing it by their approbation; it was then licensed by Sanford and entered 12 May 1617. Richardson preached of predestination in terms of the saved and the damned, in the metaphors of sheep and goats. 'There is a World of them that shall bee saved, for them Christ was given: & there is a Worlde of them that shall bee damned....This serveth for the reprooфе of them, that thinke that all shall be saved by the death of Christ. At that day [of judgement] there shall be a separation made betweene the sheepe & the Goats...the Sheep shall... heare a most
comfortable sentence....But the Goates shall...heare a fearfull doome denounced against them'. Preaching on another favorite theme, Richardson referred to the pope as Antichrist: 'and what was it else but ambition, that brought in the Romish primacie, and established the Anti-Christian tyranny, and thereby hath almost undone the Church'? 35

Another Paul's Cross sermon, given by the Ipswich-town preacher Samuel Ward in October 1616, also occurs in this survey. It is in a class by itself as the text went beyond the others in that it assailed Arminianism. Ward, a nonconformist preacher, was over time to present quite a quandary to a series of Norwich diocesans. This sermon was one of the very few titles licensed by Fell, presumably Samuel Fell who was at that time chaplain to James I and prebendary at St. Paul's. The text was didactic. In part Ward was instructing preachers how to preach: 'Be thou propitious, and benigne. Speake good things,...if thou findest desire in trueth, and in all things, bid them not feare and doubt of their Election and calling...assure them thou art the onely Ship and Cabbinet of Orthodoxall Faith, of which if they make shipwracke, by lazinesse and covetousnesse they shall be given over to Poperie and Arminianisme'. Earlier Ward had referred to faith being the firm assurance of a Christian for his estate 'without which certainty ChristIans were of all men most miserable. Popery and Nature, and the old Leven of Pelagius newly worse sowred by Arminius...serve Christians, when they boast of this their confidence,...but such betray themselves with their owne noyse'. 36

Yet another Paul's Cross sermon, this one by Radford Mavericke, begins this next section of six strongly anti-papist titles. Delivered on 15 September 1616 by a 'minister from Ilsington in Devon', this sermon was not entered in the Stationers' Registers. Since the bishop of London was both the selector of preachers for the Cross and licenser for the press, licensing may have been deemed unnecessary for Paul's Cross sermons. In the dedication Mavericke credited the
printer for persuading him to publish. First and foremost Mavericke warned against Pelagians and Catholics. 'The uses hereof may be: first, for reproofe against Pelagians and Semipelagians the Papists, which dreame I know not of what perfection, as though they had beene borne above the Moone...but this heresie though it be ancient, needs no other confutation, then the common experience of all the world'. 37 This preacher was critical of both recusant papists who ran to Rome or Rheims and separatists who preferred Amsterdam.

A work produced by the schoolmaster John Brinsley the elder exemplified how one could bowdlerize popish work for teaching. It was a translation of a series of children's dialogues from the Latin of Evaldus Gallus. In his epistle to the reader, Brinsley confessed how he had censored the original 'for so much as there are sundry speeches unmeete to season the childrens mindes, whereof some are Popish, others profane...those I have for the most part omitted'. 38 This title is listed in the Stationers'Registers for 7 September 1617, but lacks a licenser's name. Brinsley was never strictly conformable and was to be suspended from his position as minister and schoolmaster at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in 1619 or 1620. Joseph Hall, brother of John Brinsley's wife, was one of those divines who accompanied James to Scotland in 1617 and was to be a delegate to Dort the next year. His book on travel which appeared in 1617 was the outgrowth of Hall's participation in an earlier embassy to France led by Lord Hay. Hall admonished travellers against becoming overly influenced while abroad, especially by the enticements of the Roman Church. To prevent this, he advocated freedom to read books and to be aware of the news, to have a world full of presses. 'Neither have the Doctours of the Romish Church...found it any ill policie, to cherish this dislike of bookishnesse in the great; for, whiles the candle is out, it is safe for them to play their trickes in the darke:.... If the light of knowledge might freely shine to the world, Poperie would soone bee ashamed of it selfe, and vanish
amongst the workes of darknesse'. Hall's work was entered on 15 January 1617 after licensing by John Tavernor.

A month later another book which was licensed by Tavernor and decried Catholicism was entered - this being a poem which commemorated the thwarting of the Gunpowder Plot. It was a fresh English translation by the London puritan John Vicars of a Latin poem by Francis Herring, a physician. Composed just after the event, this verse evoked the horror and hatred felt by the English in 1605. In a series of dedications to luminaries in London government and at Christ's Hospital, Vicars gave vent to his outrage. 'To all the Loyall harted Protestants of England, which sincerely love the purity of Christs Gospell, and zealously detest the damnable doctrine of Antichrist'. The verse also was fervent. 'Enclos'd with Clouds of Ignorance and Error/ Rome, Hell and Spaine, do threaten Englands terror/ The Card'nall, Legate, Iesuite, impious Fryers/ Homebred Recusants, Britaines bane desires'. A further anti-Catholic piece, the sarcastic Fiscus Papalis, allegedly translated from an ancient manuscript, claimed to catalogue the indulgences and relics in the seven main churches in Rome. This unentered title is considered the work of the puritan William Crashaw. Professing to give useful information to good English Catholics, it instead ridiculed the plethora of pardons and relics in Rome and accomplished the reverse. The last of these Protestant polemics, entitled Jerusalem's Fall, Englands Warning, was anonymous except for the initials F.S.; even so it was licensed by Bishop King's chaplain, Henry Mason, and entered in the registers on 15 January 1616. This author contrasted the peace of England with the divisions in other countries. He also provided the Gunpowder Plot as an example of how the wicked papists had planned to destroy the royal family, but since God was on England's side, his majesty, his progeny and all that love the Gospel were spared.

It only remains to consider two books printed for the
first time in England in 1617 which were of a miscellaneous character; both were properly licensed and entered. The author of the first, William Whately, was a puritan whose actions may have spoken more loudly than his printed words. Described by Collinson as one of the founders of Banbury's puritan reputation, this vicar of Banbury in Oxfordshire was presented by church wardens for ceremonial nonconformity in 1607 and later. But this didactic wedding sermon concentrated primarily on the duties of married persons, who ought to ensure that 'religion flourish...and bee truely planted in their servants and children, by their care to catechize them, to reade the Scripture, and call upon the name of God in the midst of them'. Anthony Fletcher sees this sermon as a conduct book, contributing to the puritan clergy's propaganda effort for a patriarchal order. The sermon was, however, theologically noncontroversial. The last book comprised an oration made by deputies of the French reformed churches to Louis XIII upon the death of the Marquis d'Ancre. The latter had been slain by a captain of the French king. Here the leaders of the reformed churches pledged their fidelity and the king, in turn, assured them that he would honour existing edicts. Although the text was political in content, the audience in England presumably would be those interested in the fate of the continental reformed religion.

There were no Protestant books in this sampling which were printed secretly in England and the two, by feuding separatists Henry Ainsworth and Francis Johnson, which were printed in the Netherlands were to some extent the product of local circumstances. Ainsworth had been in the Netherlands since the 1590's; he was to become teacher in the church where Johnson was minister. However a schism ensued, and by 1610 the congregation had divided. This first title, however, evolved from Ainsworth's fascination with Hebraic studies; in it the Chaldaic and Greek versions and that of the Hebrews for the book of Exodus were compared. Even though as a separatist Ainsworth had fled England and had to rely on
Giles Thorp in Amsterdam for most printing, in cases such as this where the work was neutral and an erudite exegesis, it was possible to secure permission to print in London. The Annotations was to be licensed, entered, and printed there in 1622.

Modern scholars do not agree on the identity and location of the printer of Francis Johnson's book, A Christian Plea conteyning three Treatises. Once attributed to the separatist Pilgrim Press in Leiden - for example the revised Short Title Catalogue subscribes to this theory - the typographic evidence caused the editors of the standard work on the Pilgrim Press to question such an association. Anna Simoni suggests it belongs instead to the press of Giles Thorp; the author had returned to Amsterdam from his Emden exile by 1617 and thus Thorp would have been a convenient stationer. Keith Sprunger would instead retain it in the Pilgrim Press corpus. Even though there are various contenders, the name and location of Johnson's printer remain unidentified. These treatises of Johnson were against Anabaptists and Arminians. There is hostility expressed against certain practices in the Church of England, but Johnson's work is also an appeal to England for toleration. 'Now to conclude with suit to his Majestie...to vouchsafe us that gracious sufferance, that we may be permitted to live in peace, under his Majesties government, in our owne native countrey: there to observe all the ordinances of Christ given to his church, without being urged to the use or approbation of any remnants of the apostasie of Antichrist...'.

Several derogatory comments about his former assistant in the preliminary matter of Johnson's Plea provoked a heated response from Ainsworth.

However English Catholic authors, experiencing rivalries and conflicts of their own, did share the common goal of supplying religious books to an English community which was denied any legal means of access to Catholic doctrine. As already emphasized, the years before 1617 were a time of
rabid antipopery in England. There were no obvious restraints on the level of protest which could be lodged against the Roman Church and its members. Catholics in England were fined, scrutinized, and their movements monitored. This in turn generated a missionary zeal on the part of religious orders and seminary priests to influence and expand recusancy. The first of the four Catholic books in this part of the survey, the anonymous Chayne of twelve Links, was a translation from the Italian which was secretly printed, possibly at the Birchley Hall Press in Lancashire. The translator's preface was dated October 1605, so although this is the earliest extant edition, it is not a work contemporary with this study. It concerned matters representing the essence of Catholicism: indulgences, pardons, the rosary, and the meritorious nature of good works. 47

A book attributed to Richard Broughton and another by William Staney were both produced by the English Press in Douai. A seminary priest who had been educated first at Oxford and then at the English College when it was at Rheims, Broughton used quotations from leading English Protestants such as W. Whitaker, T. Morton, A. Willet, and James himself to prove that when they debated Catholicism, they were in error. In The English Protestants Recantation, Broughton especially challenged the writing of Thomas Morton, bishop of Chester. This book contained a Latin imprimatur signed by Matthew Kellison, then president of the English College at Douai. 48 William Staney, a Franciscan, published a treatise on penance with three imprimaturs appended. Staney has been identified as the Superior of the English friars in 1614. 49 The last of these continental-Catholic publications, that of the Jesuit John Sweetnam, was entitled S. Mary Magdalens Pilgrimage to Paradise. Sweetnam was a Northamptonshire-man who entered the Society of Jesus in Portugal in 1606. He served in various continental seminaries; his translating skills apparently were so proficient that when the pope commissioned Francis Suarez to defend the papal prerogative,
Sweetnam was delayed from undertaking his English mission in order to assist. He did eventually get to England, but was captured and banished and ended his days as English Penitentiary in Loreto, where he died in 1622. This book, describing a pattern of penance, was printed by the English College Press in St. Omer.  

This sample of earliest extant editions of religious works in 1617 yielded thirty four titles; of these twenty eight were printed in England or Scotland. A breakdown of the contents of these twenty eight books discloses that the vast majority, twenty titles or 71% of the whole, included the traditional evangelical Calvinist themes of predestination and anti-Catholicism - the latter sometimes to the point of equating the pope and Antichrist. Seven of these twenty titles espoused Calvinist teaching on unconditional predestination with mention of both the elect and the reprobate; an additional six contained definitions of the elect although the non-elect were designated by terms other than 'reprobate'. In a further sermon, Samuel Ward preached of the elect and warned, in the same breath, against Arminianism and popery. Six other titles in this class of twenty were predominantly anti-Catholic - two castigated the Catholic villainy of the Gunpowder Plot. Such were the twenty works dealing with Calvinist evangelical themes. The works by Robert Wilkinson, Samuel Collins, John Boys, de Dominis (2), and John Hales were concerned with other subjects; these six make up 21% of the total of twenty eight. Collins defended Lancelot Andrewes against Roman Catholic attacks on the royal supremacy, and the archbishop of Spalato criticized the papacy, but Collins, like Wilkinson, also emphasized the basic agreement among the king's Protestant subjects. Boys wrote on ceremonies from the viewpoint of adiaphora while De Dominis saw a possible union for all Christians. John Hales was unusual among his fellow Protestants in warning against probing the mysteries of predestination. Two miscellaneous titles, one composed by the popular puritan preacher William
Whately and another which reported the current status of French Protestants, complete the picture. Thus twenty or 71% elaborated on issues from an evangelical Calvinist perspective, six or 21% were moderately conformist in expressing opinions congenial to the crown and the church hierarchy, and 7% were nondoctrinal.

No contrast emerges between books printed in Oxford or Cambridge or Scotland and those printed in London. Of the twenty four London first editions, all but five were entered in the Stationers' Registers; the Brinsley item was among those entered although the entry supplied no licenser's name. Seven different licensers are part of this survey. John Sanford and Thomas Goad were chaplains to Archbishop Abbot while Henry Mason was chaplain and John Tavernor secretary to Bishop King. Both Richard Cluett and Samuel Fell were prebendaries at St. Paul's and Gervase Nidd appears to have been a rector in nearby Essex. Even though this is a higher percentage of unentered titles than the 5% for the survey year of 1607, there does not seem to have been any doctrinal difficulty with the five or 21% which were not entered in the Stationers' Registers. The catechism by 'E.B.' and Fiscus Papalis were for all practical purposes anonymous, but the sermon by Mavericke had been presumably approved by Bishop King as part of the Paul's Cross process and that by Wilkinson was delivered before King James. Although Sampson Price preached this particular sermon near Shrewsbury, he had previously been an invited guest speaker at Paul's Cross and was no stranger to the system. His publisher, John Barnes, had entered other publications written by Price. This pattern may speak to an uneven importance attached to the act of entrance in the registers or perhaps even to the unreliability of entrance records as they have been preserved. Books by Catholic authors were all printed secretly or abroad and the two titles by separatists were printed in the Netherlands.

The backdrop for these publications was that of
relative, if superficial, calm, although as the events of 1617 transpired, more and more disturbing elements loomed on the horizon. This was an abnormal time as the king was on the road much of the year. The visit to Scotland generated friction between the two churches as James became increasingly determined to bring the kirk into line with the Church of England. He was to inflame Scottish presbyterians, and actions of those in the royal entourage - Laud's use of the surplice and the view of the king kneeling at communion - alarmed Scottish observers. By the end of the year the king was well aware of the resistance in the Scottish assembly, resistance which he vowed to break. The next year he pressured the General Assembly of the Scottish Kirk to enact the Five Articles of Perth. David Stevenson argues that these articles, requiring commemoration of holy days and kneeling of communicants to receive the sacraments, drove radicals to hold private religious meetings. What they also did was to bring discussion about ceremonies to the forefront in England as well as in Scotland. As part of the royal propaganda effort, writings published in 1618 by the Calvinist Thomas Morton, bishop of Chester, and the Arminian John Buckeridge, bishop of Rochester, stressed ceremonial uniformity. These men, ironically, were to confront one another at the York House Conference in 1626; here their assignment was damage control. In the diocese of Chester, Bishop Morton had been encountering obstinacy not only from recusants which he sought to deflate by lightening the restrictions about the sabbath, but also from nonconformists who refused to subscribe. After a conference with the latter, Morton produced a treatise in which he defended the use of the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling when receiving the sacrament; he prefaced his work with an epistle to the nonconformists. Before King James on Passion Sunday 1618, John Buckeridge preached on prostration and kneeling in the worship of God; his beliefs were of a much higher ceremonial kind than were Morton's. While the Scottish
disagreements perhaps served to reawaken the controversy within the church concerning ceremonies, they also raised the issue of observation of festivals. The Boys book on the proper psalms to be used in the liturgy for Ascension and Whitsunday, although written slightly earlier, may have been part of this. As a punitive measure no doubt provoked by resistance to the Five Articles of Perth, in January 1618 King James authorized proclamations through the Scottish Privy Council for observing the Christian festivals in Scotland. These holy days were Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday; this was a direct challenge as acts of the Scottish parliament made against Easter and Christmas were yet unrepealed. So also, such insistence on the observance of feast days was likely to offend those who believed instead in a strict observance of the sabbath.  

After igniting these bonfires, en route home via Lancashire James became aware of the hostility provoked by strict sabbatarianism. As mentioned above, Thomas Morton as bishop of Chester felt that recusants were benefitting from more general dislike of sabbath restrictions. Thus Morton attempted to combat such antagonism by setting conditions which permitted a certain liberty of recreation after divine service. This action in the diocese of Chester evolved into the king's Declaration of Sports in 1618. The Declaration was to be read by all clergy, although James later reneged when he gauged the magnitude of the opposition. Nonetheless, his directive betrayed the potential for division within the English Church on this matter also. In addition, the admonitions of John Hales against the dangers of delving into predestination and of Samuel Ward against Arminianism in a sense prefigured the polarization of the future. This sort of dissension was to expand as a consequence of English participation at the Synod of Dort. Already by December 1617 Dudley Carleton was receiving reports that the king approved the Prince of Orange's efforts, in the interest of unity, to
use legal means to put down the Arminians and to call a national synod. A few days later the same informant, Edward Harwood, wrote of an Arminian agent trying unsuccessfully to gain access (through various bishops) to the king. 'Those who favour that party oppose the synod'. The English contingent at the Synod of Dort was unified in its moderate Calvinism and was supported in this by both Abbot and the king, yet its participation did encourage public discussion in England about predestination and atonement. On the other hand, the resulting canons, even though Calvinist and the product of English negotiation, were never made binding for England. 54

One major reason why the Dort canons were never ratified was that in his foreign policy the king had moved towards consideration of a Spanish Catholic bride for Prince Charles. In 1617 there were already intimations that such a Spanish match was likely. A Carleton correspondent mentioned on 20 December that the match was again being discussed. That same month a movement was launched to call a parliament which would grant supply so that the king would not need a lucrative Spanish marriage. The puritan Andrew Willett was later taken into custody for his role in this. A Spital sermon preached on Easter Monday and attended by the Council included criticism of the Spanish Match for which its author, Dr. Page, was reprimanded. 55 This development in royal foreign policy served to help realign the official position of the church: the irenic Arminians gave James the support which he coveted, while many of the Calvinists were driven into new bouts of antipopish extravaganza. As events unfolded in Bohemia, and James did not go to the rescue of his daughter and Calvinist son-in-law, the divisions intensified.

But all of this was to be in the future; even though publications reflected a Calvinist near-monopoly, in 1617 James's policy of preferment of opposing sides continued. A lineup of Lenten preachers for 1617 survives for the Spital, Whitehall, and Paul's Cross. In addition to confirming that Page did indeed speak on Easter Monday, this list also
demonstrates a fair split between the factions. The roll call of names of those who preached at Whitehall was illustrative of the royal policy of including all sides: the Calvinist bishop of Winchester, James Montagu, and the Arminian bishop of Lincoln, Richard Neile, both preached before the king left for Scotland; the Arminians Buckeridge and Overall and the Calvinists Bayly and Lake preached later. Various chaplains completed the roster: George Meriton, Edward Gee, and Anthony Maxey were among them. The Paul's Cross sermons for Good Friday and the Sunday following Easter do not survive, although an April entry in the state papers referred to a different Paul's Cross sermon, by Drope of Magdalen College, as controversial because he said that 'kings might steal by borrowing and not paying, and by unjust impositions'.

This equal treatment of constituencies was likewise reflected in the movements within the episcopacy. A seasoned bishop, John Thornborough, was translated to Worcester in February. Although criticized for nepotism and a disregard for his preaching responsibilities, Thornborough has also been labeled a Calvinist bishop who did not practice strict supervision of nonconformists and who was patronized by Pembroke. Francis Godwin was confirmed at Hereford in November. His administration was of a much more conformist character, and he has been judged the strongest enforcer of the Book of Sports. The other promotion was that of the anti-Calvinist Richard Neile from Lincoln to Durham. The two newly elected to the episcopal bench in 1617 were Nicholas Felton to Bristol and George Montaigne to Lincoln. Both these men had been Lenten preachers at Whitehall earlier that year, both had been chaplains to King James (proof once again of Fincham's finding that many new Jacobean bishops had been chaplains to James), and both were consecrated on 14 December. In her summary of Jacobean episcopal appointments, Lambert categorizes Felton as a non-Arminian. Collinson reports him a moderate Calvinist who was also a friend and protege of Lancelot Andrewes. Montaigne was, of course, in
the Arminian camp. The balancing act of preferments and promotions continued, but it was a balance of people, not of expressed views. 58

The situation in 1617 was thus ostensibly one of relative uniformity within the English Church at the same time that battle lines were being drawn for the future. First editions still embraced popular evangelical Calvinist topics, although there was a smaller contingent of writings which also stressed the need for conformity in an attempt to prevent open dissent. How do reprints in this sampling contrast with these earliest editions? Reprints were distinctive because such titles already had a track record, and stationers could forecast which ones were likely to be popularly received. In addition, reprints were on the whole cheaper to produce than titles which had to be set in type for the first time; they were a dependable source of profits for publishers and did not have to pass through pre-publication regulation. Of the nineteen reprints identified for 1617, sixteen were produced in London and the remaining three belonged to the Pilgrim Press of Leiden. Of the sixteen with London imprints, all but one left some trace in the Stationers' Registers.

Three of the English publications — by Egerton, Fulke, and Ursinus — were evangelical Calvinist works of the sixteenth century; a fourth title, by Richard Mocket, was one of the few religious publications of this period which quickly fell into disgrace. While a London lecturer in 1584, Stephen Egerton, a famed figure in English puritanism, had been suspended for refusing subscription; according to B. Burch he also spent time in prison during the 1590's. By 1598 he had found a niche as preacher at St. Anne's Blackfriars where he remained until his death in 1622. From there he had helped to launch the campaign for further reformation of the church upon James's accession to the English throne. His bestselling catechism was entered in 1593 although the earliest existing edition is the fifth which is dated 1597;
the reprint in 1617 was called the twenty fifth edition. In it Egerton depicted God and predestination as follows: 'He hath appointed some men (called therefore his elect or chosen) to eternall glory, & others to eternal fire'.

The Cambridge puritan William Fulke, a Hebrew scholar, was much involved in the defence of Protestant translations of the bible against the seminarians who in 1582 at Rheims produced a Catholic translation of the new testament. Thomas Cartwright had been charged with confuting the Rheims edition; Fulke brought out a justification of the Protestant ones in 1583. The first extant reprint of Fulke's defence, directed against the work of seminarian Gregory Martin, was not until this edition of 1617. In terms of authenticity of biblical text, Fulke's argument was that those in Rheims depended on the vulgate Latin while the Church of England's translations came from the original Greek. In considering salvation and works, Fulke maintained 'that God should command under paine of damnation, that which is impossible to be done, is no absurditie, seeing for them whom God will have to be saved, he provided another way of their salvation, than by keeping the Law, namely the redemption of Christ. As for the reprobate, void of God's grace, say you (if you dare) that they are able to keepe the Law without grace, or without grace have so much as any will to desire to have grace'.

The last of these earlier Protestant leaders is Zacharias Ursinus whose lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism appeared in multiple Latin and English editions. There were as many as five editions of the English version printed at Oxford, where it was considered a standard text. So rigourous was its Calvinism that in January 1630 Archbishop Harsnett allegedly banned the works of Ursinus within York province. Ursinus's demarcation between election and reprobation was standard Calvinist fare. 'The parts of predestination are, Election and Reprobation. Election is the eternall, unchangeable, free, and most iust decree of God, whereby hee hath decreed to convert some to Christ, to preserve and keepe
them in faith and repentance, and by him to give them eternall life. Reprobation is such a decree of God, as whereby he hath decreed to leave some according to his most iust iudgement, in their sinnes, to punish them with blindnesse, and damnation, and condemne them, being not made partakers of Christ everlastingly....The Elect, when they are once indeed come unto the Church of the Saints, they may sometimes fall from it, but wholly and finally forsake it they never can'.

A curious affair was that involving a Latin publication of Archbishop Abbot's chaplain in 1616. Containing the standard elements used in worship within the Church of England for the edification of a foreign audience and quickly reprinted a year later, Mocket's Doctrina, et Politia Ecclesiae Anglicanae ran into trouble with the regime. Since the book was allegedly considered by some to be unsatisfactory in parts, the king ordered all copies burned in 1617. Details are speculative. Peter Heylyn later asserted that the offense was as follows: 'But that which I conceive to have been the true cause why the Book was burned, was, that in publishing the 20th. Article, concerning the Authority of the Church, he totally left out the first Clause [which gave the church the power to decree rites and ceremonies and the authority in controversies of faith]'. Mocket was also accused of slighting the royal prerogative when he allowed the archbishop of Canterbury the power to confirm the election of bishops in his province. A modern commentary by M. Screech suggests that it was Mocket's weakness as editor, proof-reader, and translator which caused the difficulty. 'By omission especially, Doctrina et Politia...could leave foreigners less aware of the reality and scope of the Royal Prerogative than if he had produced meticulously the Articles of Religion and had translated with scrupulous accuracy the 1604 Prayer Book as it stood'.

This title had been legally licensed by another of Abbot's chaplains, Thomas Goad, and entered on 17 June 1616. Mocket
was so humiliated by his disgrace that he declined rapidly and expired in July 1618.

The next eight reprints in this sampling all included treatments of the elect, although some also displayed sentiments about the sabbath and the Roman Church. Two Essex clergymen, Arthur Dent and Samuel Smith, between them were responsible for three of these titles. Dent, rector of South Shoebury, had had difficulty with his diocesan Aylmer during the subscription disputes of the 1580's. Although Dent died in 1607, no less than four of his works were reprinted in 1617; The plainemans Path-way to Heaven was in its thirteenth surviving printing (cited as the sixteenth impression on the titlepage), and A Sermon of Christs Miracles was in its fifth (cited as the seventh). In his dedication to Sir Julius Caesar in the former book, Dent wrote: 'This booke medleth not at all with any controversies in the Church, or any thing in the state Ecclesiasticall, but onely entreth into a controversie with Satan and sinne'. Yet the subtitle read: 'Wherein every man may clearely see whether hee shall bee saved or damned'. In additional dedicatory comments Dent explained 'it sheweth the marks of the children of God, and of the Reprobates: together with the apparent signes of salvation and damnation'. Later in the book he said: 'The ground-worke of our salvation is laide in Gods eternall election, and in respect thereof it standeth fast and unmoovable: as it is written'. These statements suggest that in 1601 when the title was originally licensed by William Barlow and entered, such ideas about election and reprobation were normative. In Dent's second book, similar themes prevailed. '...If the Lord had not decreede in his secret counsell to save them [the very elect] that they should never fall away, they [false Christs] would also deceive them. Whereby wee may bee admonished, that seeing wee are in the last age of the world, that fearefull times are at hand, wherein false Christs shall arise and deceive many....And is not Sathan now strong in the hearts of the reprobates, that
they will teach false doctrines'? Dent also wrote disparagingly of the 'malignant church of Rome', a constant refrain for him.

The second Essex minister also had a first edition in this study; this was Samuel Smith who preached at Prittlewell. In the reprint of his exegesis of the first Psalm, the metaphor of sheep and goats, already used by Richardson, appeared. 'There are two sorts of men in the world, Good & Bad, Sheep, and Goats, Elect and Reprobate: and here in this world they live together, but after death in the last Judgement, there shall be two places appointed for them; one on the right hand, another on the left; one in honour, the other in shame; one in joy and comfort, the other in feare and horror. And as wicked men in this life could never abide the company and society of the godly...so [at] the great day of account...the sinners shall not appeare in the assembly of the righteous, but shall bee severed and sundred by the great shepheard of the sheepe, the Judge of the whole world'. Later Smith referred to 'our Election before the foundation of the world'. The fourth reprint which included a discussion of the double decree of predestination - the only reprint in this sample with no trace in the registers - was a sermon addressed to prisoners by William King. 'But more briefly & strictly the word of God hath two sorts of hearers: Elect and Reprobate. The Elect say with Peter...Maister to whom shall we goe: thou hast the wordes of eternall life. The Reprobate say...this is a hard saying, who can heare it; can mortality put on immortality? can this corruption put on incorruption? can Christ be God and man? can God beget a Son?..'.

A reprinted collection of meditations and prayers by a sixteenth century figure, John Phillips, contained allusions to the elect and chosen. He prayed 'and when thou shalt come to iudge the quicke & dead be not revenged on me by eternall damnation, but take mee amongst thine elect, into the blessed state of salvation'. Or, 'O God, thou didst raise Jesus
Christ from the dead, and set him on thy right hand,...which he by his most painefull agony...and most painfull death purchased for his chosen and elect'. A reprint of the popular Six Sermons by Henry Smith also falls into this survey. In these Smith was not overly concerned with the fine points of election, referring to the chosen as follows: 'For the Lord because of his covenant doth alwayes provide for his chosen although they bee but a remnant, like the gleaning after the harvest...'.  

As popular as Henry Smith's prodigious supply of sermons was the Practise of Piety by Lewis Bayly, who had recently been named bishop of Bangor. His book rates as an even more successful bestseller and boasts forty nine surviving printings between its first appearance in 1612 and 1640. Although fractious in his relationships with colleagues, Bayly was well regarded by puritans for this attempt to teach a Christian how to 'walk' that he may please God. Relying on St. Paul's teaching, Bayly wrote: '1. That our Election is of Gods free grace. 2. That we are iustified before God by faith onely, without good workes'. In 1612 Bayly had been chastised for blaming the decay of religion on popery in the Council. In discussing the sabbath Bayly wrote: 'And that this day, which godlesse and prophane persons spend in their owne lusts and pleasures, I as one of thy obedient servants may make my chiefe delight to consecrate it to thy glory and honour ...that ceasing from the workes of sinne, as well as from the workes of mine ordinary calling, I may...feele in my heart the beginning of that eternall Sabbath'. Antipopery was a persistent theme with him here also. He commented for example that 'our Church hath...most iustly abolished the tyrannous & Antichristian abuse of Popish auricular confession, which they thrust upon the soules of Christians, as an Expiatory Sacrifice'.

Although very much in the tradition of the Gunpowder
Plot sermons of Protestant deliverance, those by Daniel Dyke have remained relatively unexamined by scholars. They were preached before the princess Elizabeth, daughter of James I, while she boarded with the Haringtons at Combe; the dedicatory epistle to her is likewise signed at Combe. From the author's claim to have been a daily eyewitness to Elizabeth's many peerless endowments and the fact that the sermons were entered as early as May 1606, it seems likely that Dyke was with her during the crisis or soon thereafter. Thus these are some of the earliest sermons to commemorate the events of 5 November 1605. Nonetheless the first extant edition dates from 1616. An unsigned prefatory letter recommended these 'treatises on deliverance from the Romanists [who] eate their God, and kill their King'. Dyke himself preached of the 'Popish Traitors...[who] fought against God, who was on the side of the Parliament House....And that he which made not onely the earth for his elect here to fight in, but the heaven also hereafter to triumph in, will sooner suffer heaven and earth both to perish, then any of those his elect...'.

The last four London reprints are devotional and not controversial. Although two of the authors, Robert Harris and Samuel Hieron, were otherwise known for their puritan piety, Christopher Sutton was not, and the Paul's Cross sermon of Richard Wimbledon was actually pre-Reformation. What all these writings had in common was enormous popularity. For the period before 1640 there were eight surviving printings of the sermon, Absaloms Funerall, given by Harris as a visiting preacher at Banbury, and eleven of Hieron's Doctrine of the Beginning of Christ. Some of Hieron's other works had been so critical of the episcopal establishment that they were published in the Netherlands. This one instead was described in the 'advertisement to the reader' as a short catechism; in it Hieron defined the duties of distinct groups such as rich and poor men, young and aged persons. Sutton's treatise existed in eight printings; it was basically advice on how to
imitate the life of Christ. The sermon by Wimbledon, first delivered in 1388 and surviving in twenty one printings between 1540 and 1635, has been described as the 'most famous sermon ever presented at Paul's Cross'. Its enduring allure may have been that it traced backwards in time the English tradition of preaching God's word.

The last three reprints were all products of the fledgling Pilgrim Press of Leiden. This separatist press began operations in 1617 with funds provided by Thomas Brewer, a merchant. He was assisted by several printers, the best known of whom was William Brewster. The press published about twenty titles before it was precipitously terminated in 1619, the result of bibliographical detective work done by Dudley Carleton as ambassador to the Netherlands. During its brief duration, the Pilgrim Press provided a constant source of irritation to the Jacobean regime. As Carleton reported in September 1619, 'this Brewer, and Brewster,...having kept no open shop, nor printed many books fit for public sale in these provinces, their practice was to print prohibited books to be vented underhand in his majesty's kingdoms'. Carleton went on to express his desire that the States General would take action to prevent this sort of inconvenience hereafter. Eventually such efforts did contribute to a tightening of the printing laws in 1621, with specific wording to restrict the export of printed works abroad which might cause difficulties with other states.

An exposition of the ten commandments by John Dod and Robert Cleaver was reprinted at Leiden in 1617. John Dod, another Banbury preacher, was a nonconformist. Frequently called "Decalogue Dod" on account of his work on the ten commandments, Dod was married to the daughter of Nicholas Bownd; both men were staunch sabbatarians. Co-author Cleaver, whose name was absent from this titlepage, was less well known although he also preached in Oxfordshire and was silenced for nonconformity. This exposition contained criticism of the ceremonial requirements of papists which by
implication also condemned several practices of the Church of England. Appended to their work was an anonymous catechism, now attributed to Cartwright, with a rigid Calvinist explanation of the double decree of predestination. Although these components were appealing to puritans, nevertheless this book was not obviously subversive. Of nineteen extant editions between 1603 and 1635, this was the only one which was printed abroad. In discussing this and other sabbatarian works, Collinson concludes: 'but what survives from the press suggests that there was a lull in controversy before the topic was revived by James I's Book of Sports in 1618'. If anything this Leiden printing probably represents the piracy of a lucrative bestseller rather than a seditious printing. These and a few others were noncontroversial works, but, according to Keith Sprunger, 'the rest of the Brewster-Brewer books came out anonymously without any hint of the printer or place. The early imprinted books were intended as a screen of respectability for the little printing shop. However, by sending out samples of their printing style which could be identified with them, they left typographical tracks which allowed experts to trace the rest of the books back to them'.

By contrast the other two reprints were books considered polemics, even subversive, and therefore not the kind that could be printed in England. These were An Admonition to the Parliament and An Abridgement of that Booke by the Lincolnshire ministers. The Admonition was previously only printed secretly in England; its origins dated back to the dissatisfaction of religious reformers with the results of the parliament of 1571. This joint manifesto, composed by Thomas Wilcox and John Field and secretly printed in 1572, was 'more outspoken than anything that had yet been published by protestants against protestants in England. It was a polemic of the highest order'. As Tyacke says: 'with the Admonition to Parliament in 1572, bishops as such came under attack. By now English Puritanism had acquired a Presbyterian
dimension, which it was never again completely to lose'. The authors purported to expose those popish abuses which remained in the English Church and prevented godly ministers from subscribing. 'The Lord bishops, their suffragans [etc]...thrusting away most sacriligiously that order which Christ hath left to his Church,...having denied the power thereof, entring not in by Christ, but by a popish and unlawful vocation'. The ramifications of this challenge were manifold. It was called in by proclamation on 11 June 1573. The presumed authors, Field and Wilcox, were imprisoned, albeit briefly, in Newgate, and a schism erupted in the book trade between those sympathetic to the dissemination of the manifesto and those trusted to enforce the rules of search and seizure. 72

The last title in the survey was another chapter in the on-going subscription saga. Originally produced during the early Jacobean crackdown on nonconformity, this apology for those Lincoln ministers who had refused to subscribe was first printed by the secret press of William Jones and was not printed openly in England in the period before 1640. This Leiden printing is the first extant reprint. Here the argument was that 'in our own Church the purity of doctrine hath been already dangerously corrupted, and sundry popish errors broached, by such as have been the most hot maintainers of our conformity with papists in their ceremonyes'. Most specifically the ministers were not agreeable to the surplice, the cross in baptism, or to kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper. Included were the numbers of those preachers in various counties who had petitioned for the removal of certain ceremonies before the parliament of 1604. 73 In light of James's campaign to introduce ceremonies into Scotland, this reprint must have been especially unwelcome.

Thus the categorization of the sixteen reprints produced openly in England, in all cases actually in London, is as follows: seven (Egerton, Fulke, Ursinus, Dent (2), S. Smith
and King) covered, at least in passing, the subject of the double decree of predestination. An additional four by Philips, Henry Smith, Bayly, and Dyke when they addressed predestination, did so mainly in terms of the elect; moreover the Gunpowder Plot sermons by Dyke were violently anti-Catholic. Likewise, Bayly and Henry Smith included charges against Catholics, and both weighed in with sabbatarian sentiments as well. So eleven, or 69%, embodied themes of importance to an evangelical Calvinist, if not puritan, audience. The Latin work of Richard Mocket is "sui generis" in that while it attempted to make available the centerpieces of the English Protestant church, it slighted, perhaps accidentally, the royal supremacy. The other four titles, or 25%, were devotional works by celebrated writers, printed mainly for Protestant edification. Many of these reprints were a cash cow for the publishers. From William Calderwood's study of the Elizabethan Protestant press, it is possible to recognize three authors in this sampling of reprints who were considered to be among the most popular writers of the sixteenth century - Henry Smith, William Fulke, and Arthur Dent - and two titles - those by Wimbledon and Ursinus - which are on Calderwood's list of the thirty bestsellers. In addition the books by Bayly, Sutton, Egerton, and even the sermons of Robert Harris, rank among those most often printed in the Jacobean period. Sixteen of the nineteen reprints in this study, 84%, were produced openly in England; this figure closely approximates to the 82%, or twenty eight of the thirty four earliest editions. There were no Catholic reprints however - all the non-English reprints were of the Pilgrim Press. In summary: from a total of 431 titles with 1617 in the imprint, at least 164 (or 37%) indicated a focus on religious topics. Examining every third religious book produced fifty three titles of which thirty four were earliest extant editions and nineteen were reprints. A comparison of counts for earliest extant editions and reprints in this survey for 1617 yields one slight deviation.
Although Calvinist evangelical writings accounted for 69% of reprints and 71% of first editions, 25% of reprints were essentially devotional but 21% of first editions, while similarly noncontroversial, also placed a conformist emphasis on broad-based Protestant agreement. Still the percentage of new titles with Calvinist evangelical themes is slightly larger than the 63% found in the sample for 1607 when compelling issues arising from the Hampton Court Conference and the subscription campaign inspired a number of works which concentrated on defending royal religious policy.

As already stated, in this survey evangelical Calvinist interpretations held a virtual monopoly. Apart from Hales, when the subject of predestination came up, it was presented in a Calvinist way. This mirrors the findings of Tyacke in his study of published Paul's Cross sermons in which those that mentioned the predestinarian question 'took an orthodox Calvinist line before the 1630's'. So also until the next year when the Book of Sports was issued, strict sabbatarian views were largely unchallenged. There appeared to be no limitations on the antipathy which could be expressed for Catholicism. On the other hand, Tyacke reports that 'from 1611 until 1618 no work directed specifically against Puritanism, either in its nonconformist or presbyterian guises, is recorded in the Stationers' Registers as being licensed for the press'.

Works in support of Catholicism or separatism could not be printed openly in England and Scotland. Criticism of episcopacy was similarly not allowed. The separatist press reprint of The Admonition was one of the offenses which led to the destruction of that press, which in turn provided the major example of government interference with printing in this period. Stronger arguments for ceremonial conformity were taking their place alongside traditional Calvinist evangelical works; the numbers of the former were to grow with the defences of Morton and Buckeridge in 1618. The influential and moderate Calvinist bishops James Montagu and
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Robert Abbot would die in 1618. Soon thereafter, in 1619, John Overall compiled visitation articles for Norwich which not only became the model for ardent ceremonialists, but also included auricular confession. Before this time, as Lake has summarized, 'the existence of such people [anti-Calvinists] and their silence represent powerful evidence of the extent to which Calvinism had established itself in control of the crucial cultural media of the day and was thus able to suppress overt criticism...the path to preferment did not lie through the open expression of such sentiments'. Later Lake concludes: 'the Spanish match and the drive towards war with Spain served to overturn the careful balance of the mid-Jacobean period. It served to politicize once again differences of religious opinion by giving them a direct relevance to policy options now of crucial interest to the King. The public agitation against the Spanish match,...served to reawaken in James his latent fear of a populist Puritanism....James was impaled upon the anti-papal rhetoric which had often been used to legitimate his regime and which he had often enough employed himself'. In consequence, the favouring of moderate Calvinists, which had been effective in stifling anti-Calvinist opinions, would diminish, and the emphasis on conformity would prove no empty threat to the reform-minded. 77

However from the sample for 1617 it appears that if unregulated reprints reflect audience taste and market forces, and earliest extant editions indicate what was the norm for publications presumably going through the system, then Protestant works designed for an evangelical Calvinist public continued to make up the majority of religious printing. There was just a slight deviance with a sprinkling of first editions combining pastoral messages with messages of uniformity. Even if opposing forces within the church were hardening in their views at the same time that the king's policy in Scotland, as well as on the continent, would cause him to abandon previous pressure on the Arminians to remain
mute, this was not yet obvious from the record of titles published in 1617. There was, of course, some delay between the vetting of manuscripts and actual release in print, but even so only the work by John Hales which questioned the wisdom of presuming to define predestination and the sermon of Samuel Ward which linked Arminians and papists prefigured the split within the church of the 1630's. James's pose of religious tolerance and moderation would later be tested and uniformity gain on purity of faith. However the answer to the question posed earlier as to whether or not James's policy of favouring moderate Calvinism and tolerating moderate nonconformity tipped the balance in favour of Calvinists is in the affirmative. Evangelical Calvinists prevailed in religious literature - even in 1617 they were still benefitting from the censorship of the upwardly mobile anti-Calvinists and continuing to dominate the market with publications in accord with their beliefs.
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APPENDIX - 1617

A) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND


Substitutes for STC 1837 which was not available.

STC 1955. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Kingston and Weaver 8 mr. 1617; licensed by master Sanford.
Dedicated to Arthur Lake, Bishop of Bath and Wells.


STC 3467. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. along with first part to Aspleye 9 ap. 1616; licensed by master Sanford.
Part one is dedicated to Thomas Wotton, II Baron Wotton.


STC 3773. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to master Man and J. Man 7 se. 1617; no licenser named.


STC 3925. Partial reprint. 2nd part (11 sermons) ent. to Master Man 21 ja. 1617; licensed by master Sanforde.
Dedicated to Adrian Moore, Haberdasher and Merchant, and his wife Marie by editor.

Byfield, Nicholas (1579-1622), Sermons upon the first Chapter of the first Epistle generall of Peter. London, E. Griffin f. N. Butter, 1617. F copy.

STC 4234. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in 1637 as part of STC 4212. Ent to Butter 14 my. 1617; licensed
by master Cluet.
Dedicated to Lucy Harington Russell, wife of Edward III Earl of Bedford.


STC 5561. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other issue in 1628. This is a defence of L. Andrewes's answer [STC 604] to Cardinal Bellarmine's Apology. Dedicated to King James I.


STC 5701. Earliest extant edition in STC; reissued once in 1622. Ent. to N. Okes 17 jn. 1616; licensed by master Sanford. Dedicated to the Mayor, Corporation, etc. of Chester.


STC 6286. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to W. Jones 4 ap. 1617; licensed by master Sanforde. Possibly by a Darrell who was not the exorcist? Dedicated to the Church of England.


STC 6999. Only extant edition of this translation. Latin edition had appeared in 1616. It and a different translation ent. to Bill a. Barrett 20 de. 1616; licensed by master Sanford.


STC 7004. Only extant edition of an English translation in STC. Latin edition appeared the same year. This was ent. to Bill 20 de. 1617; licensed by master Doctor Goade.

France. Reformed Churches. The Oration made unto the French King by Deputies of the Synode of the reformed Churches upon

STC 11305. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to N. Newbury 3 
jn. 1617; licensed by master Tavernor.

Hales, John, Canon of Windsor (1584-1656), A Sermon preached 
at St Maries in Oxford. Concerning the Abuses of obscure 
F copy. 
Substitutes for STC 12483 which is not available. 

STC 12628. Only extant edition in STC. 

Hall, Joseph (1574-1656), Quo Vadis? A just Censure of 
Travell as it is commonly undertaken by the Gentlemen of our 

STC 12705a. Earliest extant edition in STC; 2 editions and a 
variant, all in 1617. This copy is a variant of earliest 
edition. Ent. to Butter and Fetherston 15 ja. 1617; licensed 
by master Tavernour. 
Dedicated to Edward Denny, I Earl of Norwich. 

Herring, Francis (d. 1628), Mischeefes Mysterie: or, Treasons 
Master-peece, the Powder-plot. Tr. [in verse], and very much 
dilated. By J. Vicars. (The second Part.) London, E. Griffin, 
1617. F copy. 

STC 13247. Only extant edition of this translation in STC. 
Latin edition had appeared in 1606; 3 printings of Latin 
between 1606 and 1609 and a different English translation in 
1610. This was ent. to Weaver 21 fb. 1617; licensed by 
master Tavernor. 
Dedicated to Sir John Leman, Lord Mayor, William Craven, 
Alderman, and Mr. Richard Heath, Treasurer of Christ's 
Hospital, by translator. 

Hitchcock, John (fl. 1617), A Sanctuary for honest Men. Or an 
Abstract of humane Wisdome. [A moral discourse.] London, E. 

STC 13530. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to T. Norton 29 
no. 1616; licensed by master Tavernor. 
Dedicated to William Herbert, III Earl of Pembroke. 

Mavericke, Radford (b. 1561?), The Practice of Repentance. Or 
F copy.


STC 18057. Earliest extant edition in STC. 2 issues only, both dated 1617; second issue differs only in inserted dedication to Sir F. Greville. Ent. to G. Edwardes 3 ja. 1617; licensed by master Sanford. Part 2 dedicated to Elizabeth Fiennes Turpin.


STC 21491.7. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Pavier 15 ja. 1616; licensed by Master Mason.

Smith, Samuel, Minister in Essex (1584-1662?), The great Assize, or, Day of Jubilee. The second impression, corrected. (A Fold for Christs Sheepe.) London, N. Okes, 1617. F copy.

STC 22847.7. Earliest extant edition in STC; 10 printings between 1617 and 1638. Ent. to Okes 28 ap. 1615; licensed by
master Doctor Nidd.


STC 23912. Only extant edition in STC. Dedicated to Arthur Lake, Bishop of Bath and Wells.


STC 24315. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Griffin 30 my. 1617; licensed by master Cluett. Dedicated to Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans.


STC 25035. Earliest extant edition in STC; 5 printings between 1617 and 1628. Ent. to Jackson and W. Bladon 14 no. 1616; licensed by master Fell.


STC 25296. Earliest extant edition in STC; 3 printings between 1617 and 1624. Ent. to N. Bourne 15 mr. 1616; licensed by master Doctor Nid.


STC 25652. Only extant edition in STC although it was also issued in 1617 as part I of Three Sermons. No entry in Arber. Dedicated To King James I.

B) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - PROTESTANT

Ainsworth, Henry (1571-1622), Annotations upon the second Book of Moses, called Exodus. [Amsterdam, G. Thorp,] 1617. F copy.


C) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - CATHOLIC


STC 4932.5. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. A&R 228. Translator's preface dated 20 Oct. 1605, and an earlier edition of the first part was apparently printed then.


Part an answer to T. Morton [STC 18176.] Imprimatur dated July 1617, signed by M. Kellison. Dedicated to English Protestants.

Staney, William (d. ca. 1626), A Treatise of Penance, with an Explication of the Rule, of the third Order of S. Frauncis. Whereunto is added, the Epistle and Annotations upon this Rule, of Fa. Peter Gonzales. By F. W. S(taney.) Douay, [P. Auroi f.] J. Heigham, 1617. F copy.
Substitutes for STC 23100a which is not available.


D) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - REPRINTS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND


STC 6615. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1608; 5 printings between 1608 and 1617. Ent. to J. Wright 17 no. 1607.


STC 6631. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1601; 22 printings between 1601 and 1640. Most recent entry was to E. Bishop 7 oc. 1605. Dedicated to Sir Julius Caesar, Judge.

Dyke, Daniel, the elder (d. 1614), Certaine comfortable Sermons upon the CXXIV. Psalme...for Deliverance from the late Gunpowder Treason. Preached before the Lady Elizabeth her Grace, at Combe. London, W. Stansby f. H. Fetherstone, 1617. F copy.

STC 7396. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1616; 3 printings between 1616 and 1635. Ent. to W. Yonge 20 my. 1606; licensed by Master Gabriel Powell. Assigned to H. Fetherston 31 oc. 1608. Dedicated to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia.


Fulke, William (1538-1589), A Defense of the sincere and true Translation of the holy Scriptures into the English Tongue.

STC 11431a. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1583; 5 printings between 1583 and 1633; two variants in 1617. Assigned to T. Adams by R. Newbery as 'Fulkes Answere to the Remish testament' 4 de. 1604; assigned to master Adames by mistres Bysshopp 14 mr. 1611. For dispute over rights to this work c. 1619, see Greg, Companion, pp. 57-9; Arber I. 39-40. Responds to STC 17503. Dedicated to Queen Elizabeth.


STC 13401. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1606; 11 printings between 1606 and 1638. Ent. to S. Macham 19 mr. 1608; licensed by Master Etkins.


STC 14997.7. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1616; 6 printings between 1616 and 1636. No entry in Arber.

Mocket, Richard (1577-1618), Doctrina, et Politia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. [Anon.] Londini, ap. J. Billium, 1617. F copy. This substitutes for STC 17872 which is not available.

STC 17992. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1616; this issue is the only other printing. Ent. to Bill 17 jn. 1616; licensed by master Doctor Goade. See Court-Book C, p. 86.


STC 19873.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1588; 4 printings between 1588 and 1626. Hugh Jackson's copies


STC 22758. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC of this collection is 1602; 9 printings between 1602 and 1624; it is also included in Twelve Sermons with 3 printings between 1629 and 1637. Most sermons ent. much earlier; assigned by widow Burby to Borne 16 oc. 1609.


STC 22840. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1614; 11 printings between 1614 and 1638. The third and fourth editions were both printed in 1617; of these the third edition contains 3 variants. Ent. to N. Oakes 15 my. 1614; licensed by master Doctor Nidd. Dedicated to Robert Rich, II Earl of Warwick, and his wife Frances; date changed to 20 de. 1617.


STC 23487. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1602; 8 printings between 1602 and 1634. Ent. to Burbye 7 no. 1601; licensed by Master Doctor Barlowe. Assigned by mystres Burbye to N. Borne 16 oc. 1609. Dedicated to Elizabeth Howard Southwell, wife of Sir Robert, Lady of the Privy Chamber.
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STC 25835. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is ca. 1540; 21 printings between 1540 and 1635. Eleventh and twelfth editions both printed in 1617.

E) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - REPRINTS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - PROTESTANT

Dod, John (1549?-1645), and Cleaver, Robert (b.1562?), A plaine and familiar Exposition of the Tenne Commandements. With a Catechisme. [Leiden, W. Brewster,] 1617. F copy.

STC 6973. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1603; 19 printings between 1603 and 1635. This is the only edition which was printed abroad. No entry in Arber before this time although catechism ent. to T. Man 6 se. 1604. Dedicated to Sir Anthony Cope, I Bt.

Field, John (d. 1588), and Wilcox, Thomas (1549?-1608), An Admonition to the Parliament. (An Exhortation [etc.] - A second Admonition.) [Leiden, W. Brewster,] 1617. F copy.

STC 10849. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1572; 3 printings between 1572 and 1617, all done secretly or abroad. No entry in Arber. Reprints 10392 and 4713 also.


STC 15647. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1605; 3 printings between 1605 and 1638, all done secretly or abroad. No entry in Arber.
APPENDIX F - 1617

EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS -- LONDON IMPRINTS -- LICENSERS

Dates supplied from entries in Stationers Registers

Richard Cluett: Byfield(14my. 17), Tuke(30 my. 17)

[Samuel?] Fell: Ward(14no. 16)

Thomas Goad: de Dominis(20de. 17)

Henry Mason: F. S.(15ja. 16)

Gervase Nidd: S. Smith(28ap. 15), Whately(15 mr. 16)

John Sanford: Bernard(8mr.17), Boys(9ap. 16), Bruce(21 ja. 17), Cooper(17jn. 16), Darrell(4ap. 17), Moore(3ja. 17), Richardson(12my. 17)

John Tavernor: France(3jn. 17), Hall(15ja. 17), Herring (21fb. 17), Hitchcock(29no. 16)

Unlicensed: E. B., Brinsley, Mavericke, Papal Exchequer, Price, Wilkinson
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EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS -- PUBLISHERS

* = several publishers

LONDON:

W. Aspley: Boys, Wilkinson
John Barnes: Price
J. Bill: de Dominis
W. Bladon: *Ward
N. Bourne: Whately
W. Butler: Richardson
N. Butter: Byfield
G. Edwards: Moore
H. Fetherston: E.B., Hall
E. Griffin: Herring, Tuke
R. Jackson: *Ward
W. Jones: Darrell
F. Kingston: Bernard
T. Man: Brinsley, Bruce
N. Newbery: France
G. Norton: Papal Exchequer
T. Norton: Hitchcock
N. Okes: Cooper, Smith
T. Pavier: F. S.
W. Stansby: Mavericke

CAMBRIDGE:

C. Legge: Collins

OXFORD:

Lichfield and Wrench: Hales, Terry

SECRETLY IN ENGLAND:

Chain

SCOTLAND:

Edinburgh: de Dominis

HOLLAND:

Amsterdam: Ainsworth
Leiden: Johnson

FRANCE:

Douai: English Protestants, Staney
St. Omer: Sweetnam
Ainsworth, Henry, Annotations upon the second Book of Moses, called Exodus ([Amsterdam], 1617).

B., E., A Catechisme or briefe Instruction in the Principles and Grounds of true Religion (1617).

Bayly, Lewis, The Practise of Piety (1620).

Bernard, Richard, A Key of Knowledge for the opening of the secret Mysteries of St Johns Revelation (1617).

Boys, John, An Exposition of the Proper Psalms....The second Part explaining the Psalms on Ascension and Whitsunday (1617).

Brinsley, John, the elder, Pueriles confabulatiunculae: or childrens Dialogues. [Tr. from Evaldus Gallus.] (1617).


Byfield, Nicholas, Sermons upon the first Chapter of the first Epistle generall of Peter (1617).


Collins, Samuel, Epphata to F.T. Or, the Defence of the Bishop of Elie (Cambridge, 1617).

Cooper, Thomas, The Mystery of Witch-craft (1617).

Darrell, John, A Treatise of the Church. Written against ... Brownists (1617).

Dent, Arthur, A Sermon of Christs Miracles....The seaventh impression (1617).

Dent, Arthur, The Plainemans Path-way to Heaven....The sixteenth impression (1617).

Dod, John, and Cleaver, Robert, A plaine and familiar Exposition of the Tenne Commandements. With a Catechisme ([Leiden], 1617).

Dominis, Marco Antonio de, A Declaration of the Reasons which moved M. A. de Dominis to depart from the Romish Religion. Written in Latine, and now tr. [by] (W. S.) (Edinburgh, 1617).

Dominis, Marco Antonio de, A Sermon preached [30 no. 1617] in
Italian. In the mercers Chappel in London, to the Italians in that City. First published in Italian and thereout translated (1617).

Dyke, Daniel, the elder, Certayne comfortable Sermons upon the CXXIV. Psalme...for Deliverance from the late Gunpowder Treason. Preached before the Lady Elizabeth her Grace, at Combe (1617).


France. Reformed Churches. The Oration made unto the French King by Deputies of the Synode of the reformed Churches upon the Death of the Marquesse d'Ancre. Tr. out of the French Copie (1617).

Fulke, William, A Defense of the sincere and true Translation of the holy Scriptures into the English Tongue. Whereunto is added a briefe Confutation of Cavils, by divers Papists (1617).


Hall, Joseph, Quo Vadis? A just Censure of Travell as it is commonly undertaken by the Gentlemen of our Nation (1617).

Harris, Robert, Absaloms Funerall. Preached at Banburie (1617).

Herring, Francis, Mischeefes Mysterie: or, Treasons Master-piece, the Powder-plot. Tr. [in verse], and very much dilated. By J. Vicars. (The second Part) (1617).


Hitchcock, John, A Sanctuary for honest Men. Or an Abstract of humane Wisdome (1617).

Johnson, Francis, A Christian Plea conteyning three Treatises ([Leiden], 1617).

King, William, The straight Gate to Heaven. A Sermon (1617).

Lincoln, Diocese of, An Abridgement of that Booke which the
Ministers of Lincolne Diocesse delivered to his Maiestie. Being an Apologie for [those] that refuse the Subscription and Conformitie which is required ([Leiden], 1617).

Mavericke, Radford, The Practice of Repentance. Or a Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse (1617).


Moore, John, A Mappe of mans Mortalitie...Whereunto are annexed two consolatory Sermons (1617).


Phillips, John, The perfect Path to Paradise. Containing Praiers, and Meditations for several Occasions. Also a Summons to Repentance (1617).


S., F., Jerusalem's Fall, Englands Warning...of Gods Word (1617).

Smith, Henry, Six Sermons preached by Maister Henry Smith (1617).


Smith, Samuel, The great Assize, or, Day of Jubilee. The second impression, corrected. (A Fold for Christs Sheepe) (1617).

Staney, William, A Treatise of Penance, with an Explication of the Rule, of the third Order of S. Frauncis. Whereunto is added, the Epistle and Annotations upon this Rule, of Fa. Peter Gonzales. By F. W. S(taney) (Douay, 1617).


Sweetnam, John, S. Mary Magdalens Pilgrimage to Paradise. By J. S. of the Society of Jesus ([St. Omer], 1617).


Ursinus, Zacharius, The Summe of Christian Religion,


Whately, William, A Bride-bush, or a Wedding Sermon. [Init. W. W.] (1617).

Wilkinson, Robert, Barwick Bridge: or England and Scotland coupled. In a Sermon. Preached before the King at Saint Andrewes (1617).

That the Church of England would be transformed was not obvious in March 1625 when King James died. Change, when it came, was to be gradual. The transfer of power from James I to his son Charles I was peaceful; even the court favourite, the duke of Buckingham, retained his primacy. One of Charles's first proclamations, designed to protect university printing of Latin texts from foreign piracy, had actually been crafted in his father's reign. Why then, in a sermon delivered in Oxford little more than a year later, did the divine, 'Silver Tongue Sydenham', preach of gall in the pulpit and wormwood at the press and warn that civil wars were as dangerous in matters of religion as of state? He went on to speak of 'the Protestant, the wounded Protestant, who hath beene now so long crucified betweene the non-Conformist and the Romanist, that at length hee is inforced to flye to Caesar for sanctuary, and in the very rescue and Appeale...falls into the hands of Thieves, two desperate cut-throates and enemies to the Truth, and him, the Pelagian and the Arminian'.

Why was the peace of the church seen to be imperiled?

Sydenham's lament was a thinly-veiled reference to the Appello Caesarem of Richard Montagu - a book published in 1625 to defend its author from the puritan attacks of John Yates and Nathaniel Ward. Montagu had earlier sought in A Gagg for the new Gospell (1624) to defend the English Church from Catholic criticisms. In so doing, however, he had been deliberately ambiguous about points such as absolute predestination and had labelled those who believed in such Calvinist points as puritans. More generally, he had sought to reduce the religious differences between England and Rome. Montagu's stance in turn caused his enemies to label him an Arminian and Papist. A split emerged within the church which involved the court and parliament as well.
James himself had certainly experienced difficulties with both pulpit and press. Although he had supported the moderate Calvinists who represented England at the Synod of Dort, the results of this negotiation were never made binding for England. In addition, the foreign policy increasingly pursued by the king was deemed imprudent by his more zealous Protestant subjects - to them it was a policy too soft on Catholicism. James's earlier encouragement of ardent anti-papal polemic had ceased. In the early years of the Thirty Years War there was dissatisfaction because James did not intervene aggressively against the Spanish on behalf of his daughter Elizabeth, married to the Calvinist Elector Palatine. Instead he pursued the illusion of achieving a 'Spanish Match' for his son Charles. For many English Protestants, frustration over these policies brought about an intensified interest in foreign war news and an explosion in anti-Spanish rhetoric. James's response was to issue proclamations in December 1620 and July 1621 which were designed to limit speaking and writing on matters of state.

Smarting from the continued criticism which radiated from the pulpit, James reacted by promulgating 'Directions concerning Preaching' in August 1622. Through this instrument he sought to regulate clerical preaching on matters of state and on the doctrine of predestination. Bishops and deans and learned men in the universities were allowed freedom in their sermons. The rest of the clergy must not 'presume to preach in any popular auditorie, the deepe poyns of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacity, resistibility or irresistibility of Gods grace'. So also they were not 'to declare, limit, or bound out by way of positive doctrine...the power, prerogative, jurisdiction, authority, or duety of soveraigne princes, or otherwise meddle with theis matter of state'. Additionally, no preacher should 'fall into bitter invective and undecent raylinge speeches against...papists or puritans'. Instead James suggested they deliver "homilies of obedience". The restrictions on
afternoon sermons were severe; indeed they practically prohibited preaching altogether'. The Book of Homilies and the Catechism were recommended for afternoon teaching. To make the situation even more worrying for English Calvinists, these 'Directions' were preceded by a suspension of the penal laws against recusants. All of this was a major alteration of James's previous religious policy. Not only had the Dort canons of 1619 endorsed 'the unconditional nature of the double decree, of election and reprobation, subsequent to the fall of Adam', but such Calvinist teaching had until now been regular pulpif fare at Paul's Cross and elsewhere. Now these matters were for the learned only, not for the popular pulpit. Thus James was seen to be silencing his critics both on topics touching predestination as well as in expressions of anti-popery.

Nonetheless, such measures did not halt the flow of newsbooks and pamphlets, often printed abroad. The Star Chamber Decree of 1586, which had provided for the regulation of the printing industry and the enforcement of such regulations through the Court of the Company of Stationers, had not offered protection against foreign printing. A proclamation against disorderly printing was issued in September 1623; it reiterated the provisions of the 1586 decree, but also attempted to stop the import of books which, to circumvent the regulations, had been printed outside the realm.

This was followed on 15 August 1624 by a 'Proclamation against Seditious, Popish, and Puritanicall Bookes and Pamphlets'. Not only were puritan books now included, but a detailed licensing apparatus was described. It was here reiterated that, before printing, all books or pamphlets touching on matters of religion, church government, or state must be first perused, corrected and allowed under the hand of the archbishop of Canterbury or York, the bishop of London or the vice-chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge. This same licensing provision applied to materials brought into the
Thomas Cogswell, although aware that the lack of effectiveness of James's 'Directions' was an early warning to Charles of what he could expect when he assailed Calvinist orthodoxy, also emphasizes that the 'Directions' turned out to be only temporary. Once the threat of a 'Spanish Match' had abated, there was a rush of anti-Catholic literature beginning in 1624. Contributors to this genre included men such as Isaac Bawgrae, George Carleton, Joseph Hall, Thomas Taylor, and John Wall; their works received proper licenses and entrance in the Stationers' Registers. 

It was also in 1624 that A Gagg for the new Gospell by Richard Montagu appeared; this had no dedicatory material and was not entered in the Stationers' Registers but, according to the titlepage, was 'published by authoritie'. As already mentioned, Montagu's ploy was to distance the Church of England from the Calvinists within in order to make it less vulnerable to Catholic attack. He suggested, among many other points, that predestination was not absolute and indicated that Calvinists were actually puritans. There was a strong, negative reaction in the House of Commons in 1624. Montagu caused the situation to worsen by issuing a sequel, Appello Caesarem, the very next year. It was only after much editing, in large part accomplished by Montagu's friend and 'literary agent' John Cosin, that this text had been approved. According to Montagu's correspondence with Cosin, it was the bishop of Durham, Richard Neile, who had passed the manuscript to King James. James, in turn, had involved Francis White, dean of Carlisle, in examining and editing the manuscript; when White finally granted an approbation, Montagu was delighted even though White's position did not qualify him as an official licenser. However this book was licensed by no less than two authorities, both named in the entry of 18 February 1625: Dr. Thomas Worrall, chaplain to the bishop of London (George Montaigne) and Francis White,
dean of Carlisle. The entry in the Stationers' Registers was made by Matthew Lownes - not only the publisher but also the company warden. In addition the printed book included an imprimatur from White, in English and dated 15 February 1624/5, which established official approbation. No amount of official endorsements could calm the emotions of Calvinists who saw this as an Arminian attack on the church's orthodoxy. Even the role of the pope as Antichrist had been questioned. Richard Montagu, moreover, claimed the support of King James for his two works. This is not difficult to explain. James had become disenchanted with those in the puritan ranks who constantly attacked his foreign policy and thus was willing to tolerate such an attempt to marginalize the puritan influence within the English Church. As Peter Lake has demonstrated, Montagu's books were 'designed to emphasize points of agreement with Rome and to challenge the pope's identity as Antichrist in an effort to bolster James's opposition to the religious war he so feared. Secondly, they were designed to reactivate his fears of Puritanism, this time organized around not the issue of presbyterianism but of key Calvinist doctrine....This would serve to encourage James's existing tendency to dismiss as Puritan those people clamouring for war and denouncing the Spanish Match in pulpit and parliament'. 8 Although James died before the Appello was produced, the publishing process continued nonetheless. It was to have serious repercussions. The words of Humphrey Sydenham (above, page 1) used to illustrate the growing dispute within the church in 1626, refer specifically to Appello Caesarem and the fact that in defending the church from both Papists and nonconformists, Montagu had fallen into the company of two enemies to the truth, the Pelagian and the Arminian. Sydenham's other opinions will be discussed later.

With the specific assignment of overseeing a debate on the writings of Richard Montagu, the duke of Buckingham was authorized by the king to convene a conference at his residence, York House, in February 1626. In addition to the
lay attendees, both Arminian and Calvinist divines took part: the former led by Bishop Buckeridge of Rochester, ably assisted by John Cosin and Francis White, and the latter led by Bishop Morton of Coventry and Lichfield and John Preston. At the second session Montagu himself was present. The conference was inconclusive and failed to halt the divisions in the church now being fueled by Montagu's writings. Nicholas Tyacke has seen the York House Conference as 'the approximate point at which the circle of clerics patronized by Bishop Neile of Durham emerged as the effective spokesmen of the English Church'. The Arminians were now in the ascendancy.

Outside York House, the critical response to Montagu's books was overwhelming. Figures such as Henry Burton, George Carleton, Daniel Featley, William Prynne, Francis Rous, Anthony Wotton and John Yates attacked Montagu in print. Many of these books show no evidence of licensing and subsequently ran into difficulty; one work by Matthew Sutcliffe was said by Prynne to have been seized in the press. After parliament ended on 15 June 1626, these authors lost their protection.

To stem this tide of polemic, Charles took drastic measures on 14 June 1626 when he issued a 'Proclamation for the establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England'. Instead of being issued with the advice of the Privy Council, this proclamation claimed to have been made with the advice of bishops. In this it was stated 'that neither by Writing, Preaching, Printing, Conferences, or otherwise, they [subjects and especially church men] raise any doubts, or publish, or maintain any new inventions, or opinions concerning Religion, then such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, heretofore published, and happily established by authority'. Contemporary as well as modern interpretations of the target of this proclamation differ and
will be discussed later; Peter White argues that at least it did silence Richard Montagu. Meanwhile, the military situation was deteriorating. Charles's uncle, the king of Denmark, was defeated at Lutter, and Charles wanted to send him assistance. Parliament in the sessions of 1625 and 1626 would not grant adequate supply to finance war; the king dissolved parliament in June 1626 and postponed calling another for almost two years. In September 1626 the Privy Council approved Charles's request to levy a forced loan as an alternative to parliamentary supply. With the Privy Council behind him, Charles was able to enlist Archbishop Abbot in the campaign to use the church hierarchy to explain to the populace why the church and country needed peace and quiet and why the crown needed to collect the loan. Heylyn claims William Laud as the author of the resulting document, but in it Abbot dutifully endorsed the arguments used to explain that the king had assisted the church in its need for peace by recently issuing a proclamation, and now the king needed the help of the church in preaching peace and unity at home. These Instructions to the Bishops contended that parliament had encouraged the king to go to war, but then denied him the resources he needed. 'This upon their [parliament] perswasions, and promises of all assistance and supply, wee readily undertooke, and effected, and cannot now be left in that businesse but with the sinne and shame of all men. Sinne, because ayde, and supply for the defence of the Kingdome,...such as are advised and assumed by Parliamentary Counsell, are due to the King from his People, by all Law both of God and men...'. The cover letter which accompanied the Instructions was signed by Abbot and dated 26 September 1626.

The controversy surrounding the collection of the forced loan helps to set the stage for the publishing events of 1627. As described, there had been a recent strengthening of prohibitions and regulations for the control of printing, all of which were to be applied to any religious topics before
licensing. It is with books published for the first time in 1627 that the effects of these controls are most evident. Of the thirty six earliest extant editions in this survey of religious books for 1627, twenty six were printed in London and one each at Oxford and Cambridge. London licensing was under the supervision of the bishop of London, the Arminian sympathiser George Montaigne, and the archbishop of Canterbury, the Calvinist George Abbot. They and their chaplains offered competing opportunities for licensing; in the words of their contemporary the earl of Clare, 'what Canterbury stopps from the press, London letts go'. However relatively early in 1627 Abbot began to fall from favor and after July was actually sequestered; this served to stymie his chaplains as well. Although William Juxon, one of Laud's proteges, served as vice-chancellor of Oxford for a two-year term between July 1626 and July 1628, it appears that under the chancellorship of the earl of Pembroke Calvinism was still too powerful for Juxon to suppress. Conversely, Cambridge under the chancellorship of Buckingham actually enforced the proclamation of June 1626 which, in Tyacke's words, muffled Cambridge Calvinism; royal control there was so strong that the only Cambridge imprint in this survey was actually granted license by Charles I. 13 On the whole, however, the king was able to exploit the medium of print for his own propaganda through licensed, published sermons which conveyed his political message. The causes célébrés in this struggle were the political sermons of Robert Sibthorpe and Roger Maynwaring, delivered in response to the Instructions to the Bishops. First editions of both fall into this survey for 1627.

When he preached an assize sermon on 22 February 1627, Robert Sibthorpe, Vicar of Brackley, Northamptonshire, was complying with the king's Instructions. In his dedication Sibthorpe claimed 'the Prince pleads not the Power of Prerogative, nor the leading of Presidents, so much as Pietie for Religions protection, the States occasion, and the
inevitable Necessitie of the Season...'. In the text Sibthorpe was uncompromising in his support for the king's right to impose the loan. 'First, That Christian Liberty hath not freed us from Civill Obedience; but that Christians are bound in duty one to another, especially all Subjects, to all their Princes, according to the Lawes and Customes of that Kingdome.... Subjects are bound...to yeeld a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one; yea and in that passive obedience, there must bee still actually retained, fidelitie, free from conspiracie, although they had power and opportunitie for it...'. Sibthorpe invoked the support of 'more moderate moderne Divines' such as Luther, Calvin, Beza, Cranmer, bishops of England and ministers of the reformed churches as all acknowledging 'in this particular, That if a Prince impose an immoderate, yea an unjust Taxe, yet the subject may not thereupon withdraw his obedience and dutie; Nay hee is bound in conscience to submit, as under the scourge of his sinne'. As Glenn Burgess has demonstrated, this contributred to the controversial nature of the sermon. Previous claims of divine right had been more hypothetical. This claim applied specifically to the forced loan and confused theological and legal issues. 14

As this sermon was eminently pleasing to the king, Charles went directly to the top and suggested that the archbishop of Canterbury approve it for printing. Even after Abbot had engaged in a written debate with William Laud, the archbishop was still troubled by what he regarded as dangers to the liberty of the subject; he denied it a license. As Burgess says, 'Abbot made clear that it was its encroachment on the domain of law that bothered him most about the sermon.... What Abbot objected to was the use of vague theological doctrine to override the law'. In his diary Laud claimed that on 24 April 1627 he first received the 'exceptions' which Abbot had exhibited against Sibthorpe's sermon. A few days later Laud, who had supported the monarch in this case, was made a privy councillor. Abbot claimed that
in any case licensing was chaplain's work, and King James had never asked him to do it. Probably at the end of April 1627, Laud next contacted Bishop Montaigne of London with the king's command that Montaigne should read Sibthorpe's sermon in conjunction with Bishop Neile of Durham, Bishop Buckeridge of Rochester, Bishop Howson of Oxford and Laud himself and decide whether it was fit to be printed. The outcome was an approbation bearing Montaigne's signature. Thus we find bishops of Arminian sympathies acquiescing under pressure for church support of the royal prerogative. This was the same circle of bishops named by the king in October to exercise the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury after Abbot was sequestered.

Sibthorpe's sermon was entered in the Stationers' Registers on 10 May 1627 and was listed as approved by the bishop of London. For good measure an English imprimatur was added on the verso of the titlepage: this stated that the sermon was read and approved as agreeable to the ancient doctrine of the primitive church and to the doctrine established in the Church of England. The imprimatur was signed by Bishop Montaigne of London and dated 8 May 1627. Even Worrall, Bishop Montaigne's chaplain who had co-licensed the Appello Caesarem and was later said by Abbot to have been of 'no very tender Conscience [and] apt to approve and subscribe his name hand over head to any copy submitted to him', had been wary of becoming involved. Worrall escaped censure, but Abbot's refusal contributed to the justification for sequestering the archbishop from all his ecclesiastical offices and jurisdictions in July 1627. The king was intent on using the licensing process as a tool for his own propaganda: if Archbishop Abbot was reluctant, then Bishop Laud and Bishop Montaigne were willing and able to assist.

However, the two sermons delivered before the king by his chaplain, Roger Maynwaring, in July 1627 were to prove even more contentious. Maynwaring preached of the king's divine power. In the first sermon he stated 'The power of
Princes then, is both Naturall, and Divine, not from any consent or allowance of men.... Assemblies [were not ordained]...to contribute any Right to kings, whereby to challenge Tributary aydes and subsidiary helpes; but for the more equall Imposing, and more easie Exacting of that, which, unto Kings doth appertaine, by Naturall and Originall Law, and Justice; as their proper Inheritance annexed to their Imperiall Crownes, from their very births'. For his words Maynwaring was later impeached in parliament. Why was he the one to be punished? He was one of the most prominent of the preachers who had used the pulpit to aid 'arbitrary government'. He had espoused the idea that subjects could be compelled to contribute without common consent. In addition, as Burgess charges, he used the language of divine right not in its proper place, but to undermine the role of the common law. 17

The Maynwaring title was entered by the publisher Richard Badger in the Stationers' Registers on 7 November 1627 as under the hand of the bishop of London; its title-page boasted: 'By His Maiesties Speciall Command'. Yet to achieve this an amount of maneuvering had been necessary. Information about the erratic way in which this title was approved emerged during the parliamentary session of 1628. The case in parliament concerned not just the content of Maynwaring's sermons in which he had supported the idea that public good should rule over private rights and that the king could tax without consent, but also the irregularities involved in licensing the book. The Commons began by considering all these issues. Then, on 12 June 1628, it assigned the matter of determining who had allowed printing to the House of Lords. Richard Badger testified that he had received the two sermons from the author with the bishop of London's authorization and then received a manuscript title, also directly from Maynwaring, which he proceeded to print as written. There was no separate warrant from the king. The case now centered on the bishop of London and what authority
he had to claim permission from the king.

On 14 June 1628 Maynwaring received his sentence in front of the House of Lords; the peers immediately thereafter pursued the investigation of the bishop of London who had allowed the sermons to be printed. In his defence, Bishop Montaigne claimed to have received a letter from the bishop of Bath and Wells [Laud] saying that the king wanted to see the sermons published. Montaigne had arranged to have the king's permission put on the titlepage so he would not be held responsible. Laud confirmed that the king had indeed ordered the sermons to be printed; the investigation ceased at that point. Maynwaring was removed to prison, and, on 24 June 1628, King Charles issued a proclamation calling in and suppressing all copies of his sermons. Although part of Maynwaring's punishment was to be disabled from holding any ecclesiastical offices, by as early as 6 July the king was arranging his pardon; later that same month Charles had Maynwaring presented to the living of Stanford Rivers, Essex, formerly the living of Richard Montagu. King Charles sacrificed Maynwaring's book, but it was a price he was willing to pay. It was no small coincidence that the subsidy bill was not sent up to the House of Lord's until 16 June - two days after Maynwaring had been impeached. Abbot had been brought back from disfavour to assist with supply and with the Maynwaring case.

Although Sibthorpe and Maynwaring were the most notorious participants in this nationwide public relations campaign, there were probably many unpublished political sermons preached in response to the Instructions. Another pair of published sermons associated with the king's forced loan offensive which carry the imprint date of 1627 and fall into this sampling were more hypothetical and did not refer to the forced loan. They were composed by royal chaplains: Isaac Bargrave, dean of Canterbury, and Matthew Wren, master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Isaac Bargrave delivered his sermon before the king in
March 1627 on the anniversary of Charles's inauguration. It was dutifully licensed by Worrall, entered on 28 March 1627, and, in addition, had on its titlepage: 'By his Maiesties speciall Command'. Bargrave equated rebellion with witchcraft: 'Rebellion is as the sinne of Witch-craft, and stubbornesse as the wickednesse of Idolatry'. In conclusion he said, 'Let us pray for our selves, that wee may resist all sinne, especially presumptuous sinne, especially Rebellion, The sinne paralell to Witchcraft and Idolatry. And let us pray for our King, that wee long and constantly obeying Him, and Hee long and constantly obeying God; may live and prosper in the favour of God, and the love of his subiects...'.

Although Bargrave did not specifically mention the forced loan, some of his contemporaries interpreted his sermon as being ominous nonetheless. In a newsletter of 7 April 1627 from Joseph Mead, parts of Bargrave's sermon were quoted, with the following editorializing: 'he imputeth rebellion to those who refuse this loan, and much urged obedience.... In these passages you may see the reason, I think, why the sermon was commanded by the king to be printed'. A response written by Thomas Scott survives only in manuscript; it also suggested that the Bargrave sermon with its stress on absolute obedience to the will of the king, even if such will be unlawful, was very dangerous. Although Bargrave, like Sibthorpe and Maynwaring, made a political choice to support the forced loan and thus the absolutist claims of Charles, there is no hard evidence that any of the three were Arminian in doctrine. The same cannot be said of the last preacher, Matthew Wren.

A protege of Lancelot Andrewes, Wren also had connections with Bishop Neile and the Durham House Group. But it was as one of Laud's most zealous lieutenants in the 1630's that his fame as a militant Arminian was to grow. Wren's sermon was preached before the king at Whitehall. The licensed manuscript for this product of the Cambridge press survives today at Trinity College, Cambridge; it bears an
undated license from Charles himself which specified: 'Let this Sermon be printed'. Moreover the printed titlepage contains 'Printed by command'. 23 Wren stressed the need for obedience, with the threat that not to obey the king is akin to disobeying God. 'It shews us now that next after himselfe, our God provides for Kings as for himselfe...In a word, sets so much by them, [kings] whom he sets over us, that for us now not to be abundantly Right towards them, is to be extremely Wrong towards God, to faile the one, is to be false to the other; to defraud the one, is to defie the other'. In this sermon Wren actually had a religious as well as a political agenda. His thinly-veiled criticism of those who did not bow was followed by an expression of concern about the communion table: 'the Table of the Lord, and the House of the Lord, and the Presence of the Lord, would you know how we (some of us) regard it, or what difference we put betwixt it and any other places?'. This interest in bowing and in the communion table may comprise an early printed salvo for the Caroline altar policy. Because the sermon was delivered on 17 February, it has been considered the first of the four major forced loan sermons. However the titlepage information stating that the seventeenth was a Sunday would indicate that this sermon was given in 1628 rather than 1627; thus it is the last of the four. 24

Two other divines who were to stir up opposition in parliament while enjoying protection and promotion from the regime were John Cosin and Thomas Jackson; each published a title in 1627 which falls into this survey. In spite of strong negative reaction to them, both men were to become college heads - Cosin as master of Peterhouse, Cambridge in 1635, and Jackson as president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1631 - and later, first Jackson and then Cosin, were to become deans of Peterborough. John Cosin's compilation, A Collection of Private Devotions, was actually to be viewed by many as popish. As chaplain to the Arminian bishop of Durham, Richard Neile, Cosin was at the center of
the Durham House group. H. Trevor-Roper, in writing of the diocese under Neile as a model for implementing the high church ideals to be associated with Arminianism, casts Cosin as 'the most aggressive of all the new 'Arminian' clergy'. In addition, Cosin's ties to Richard Montagu made the two virtually literary accomplices. Not only did Cosin facilitate the printing of Montagu's books, but there is evidence that Montagu contributed to the Devotions as well. A manuscript letter from Montagu to Cosin at the end of 1626 says: 'I have sent you halfe the calendar and all the Saints whose days I found there briefly related'. A published letter to Cosin of 12 January 1627 indicates that Montagu was 'dispatching your calendar sheets'. The Devotions was entered in the Stationers' Registers on 1 March 1627 and was licensed by the bishop of London. Although published anonymously, the book contained an imprimatur with an approbation dated 22 February 1626/7 and signed by Montaigne.

Cosin was above all a liturgical scholar; in the Devotions he had compiled material which supplied private prayers to complement the common prayers of the church. Although an epistle in the second printing indicates that the book was done for a friend - and one explanation would have Cosin drawing up these devotions at the request of the countess of Denbigh, Buckingham's sister - years later John Evelyn repeated Cosin's alleged account of the affair. According to this, when Henrietta Maria arrived with her French ladies at the English court, they all had their books of hours and breviaries for religious exercises, while the English ladies trifled away their leisure with young gallants. Therefore Charles supposedly called on Francis White to see if there might not be found prayers in the 'ancient liturgy' for the English court ladies, so they might also appear devout. Cosin was thus commissioned. When his manuscript was passed by the king to the bishop of London, the latter so liked it that he gave the license himself. Cosin always claimed that he had contributed nothing novel
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and that all came, as described on the titlepage, from the practice of the ancient church called the Houres of Prayer, published by the authority of Queen Elizabeth, and collected from the scriptures, ancient fathers, and divine service of the English Church.  

Nonetheless, the resulting 'primer' was redolent of popery. Primers had virtually disappeared from the English Protestant landscape in the 1570's due to the growing popularity of the Book of Common Prayer. To restore this format in Caroline England, which associated primers and books of hours mainly with recusants, smacked more of revolution than revival. Although the first printing may have been a coterie printing for 'private' court distribution and was possibly only of two hundred copies, three additional, corrected, commercial printings were done in 1627, probably averaging about fifteen hundred copies each. Distribution of the court printing did reach a sympathetic audience. As regards this first and 'private' printing, Montagu in July 1627 complained of the scarcity of copies; he had wanted three copies but had to settle for only one. Similarly a manuscript order of daily devotions, in Francis Windebank's hand, has references to relevant pages in the private printing of Cosin's Devotions.  

Nevertheless, copies of the earliest printing came into the hands of hostile readers. Cosin's Devotions became the talk of the town. Joseph Mead, writing to Martin Stuteville in March 1628, distinguished between the private and public editions of the book and termed Cosin 'a most audacious fellow...scarce a protestant'. The earl of Clare, in a letter to Bishop Williams, included Cosin's book, referred to as the 'Seven Sacraments, inspired by the countess of Denbigh', in his list of recent publishing scandals. Criticism sprang from many sources. Francis Nethersole was among those in the parliament of 1628 who advocated action against Cosin. He referred to the disingenuous cover-up wherein later printings of the Devotions in 1627 eliminated some of the more
offensive parts and added an apologia from the printer, taking responsibility for the errors. Nethersole directed a similar written account to Secretary of State Conway. Even in the waning days of parliament in February 1629, Mr. Cosin's 'horary' was included in a list of books of popery.  

There were numerous controversial sections in the Devotions. Cosin had divided the day into seven canonical hours for prayer, a pattern suggestive of Catholicism. His contemporary critics were quick to assert that although the Orarium of 1560 had such a division, by the time of the Preces Privatae of 1564 the midday prayers had been dropped and only matins and vespers were retained. Likewise the calendar of saints was seen as too close to the Catholic calendar. The section on prayers for the dead was eliminated in the second printing, the one which followed the private printing; at the same time the epistle from the printer was added. In this epistle the printer, Robert Young, insisted that the author did not intend to produce 'an apish imitation of Romish superstition...[but rather a means by which the reader could] be assisted with divine grace, obtained by continuall prayer'. This 'apologia' was deemed unnecessary and dropped from later editions in the more favourable climate of 1635 and 1638. Cosin was seen as advocating seven sacraments instead of the two accepted by the church of England: baptism and the lord's supper.  

Additionally Cosin's treatment of the fourth commandment and of auricular confession was bound to inflame some of his audience. In the section on offenders against the fourth commandment, Cosin wrote: 'They that under a pretence of serving God more strictly than others (especially for hearing and meditating of Sermons,) doe by their Fasts, and certaine Judaizing observations, condemne the joyfull Festivitie of this High & Holy day, which the Church allowes, as well for the necessary recreation of the Body in due time, as for spirituall exercises of the soule'. In his precepts for the church, Cosin included 'to disburthen and quit our
consciences of those sins that may grieve us, or scruples that may trouble us, to a learned and discreet Priest, and from him to receive advise, and the benefit of absolution'. This was accompanied by a marginal reference to the visitation articles of Andrewes and Overall which included auricular confession; Cosin had served as secretary and librarian to Overall and was eternally loyal to the man. 30

Arguably the most agitated response to all this came in 1628 in unlicensed pamphlets from those two 'barking libellers', William Prynne and Henry Burton. They of course rejected the Devotions for the religious grounds just mentioned, but indulged as well in colorful sketches of licensing escapades. Prynne, in his attack on the 'Couzening Devotions', related an emotional tale of a loose paper, containing only instructions from Richard Neile to the bishop of London which ordered him to license the Devotions. In this version the work was licensed, although unread and unseen. Burton's account also expressed suspicions that the license and manuscript were separated. Cosin was clearly on the defensive as a result of all the criticism. Attempts to defuse the attacks, which summarized his answers to the various charges, are reprinted in the Cosin correspondence. In an amusing letter to Cosin written in November 1627, Richard Montagu consoles him: 'Ill toungs will follow you there, as me here, and malignant Puritans persecute you...though their edge is taken of both for you and me, by 2 sermons which I knowe you have seen, or shall see, of Dr. Manewayrings, which is but rebated to be more incensed...'. 31

The next controversial figure, Thomas Jackson, was a doctrinal Arminian whose publications continued some of the same themes articulated by Richard Montagu before he was silenced. Jackson's publishing history is the subject of a separate chapter. The work of his which falls into this survey, A Treatise of Holy Catholike Faith, had actually been composed years earlier when it had been delivered as
catechism lectures to students at Pembroke College, Oxford. In the dedication Jackson credited the late Daniel Birkhead, a colleague of his and Cosin's in the diocese of Durham, with having read the treatise and made recommendations. It was entered in the registers on 4 November 1626, after approval by Montaigne's chaplain Worrall. Jackson's argument was that 'the present visible Church of England retaines the Holy, Catholike Faith, which the Romish church hath defiled; and by defiling it, hath lost that true union with the primitive and Apostolike Church, which the visible Church retaineth'. Described as chaplain to the king on the title page, Jackson's views were still cautiously phrased. When he tangled with issues touching on predestination, Jackson relied on ambiguity and the claim that some had unnecessarily made that subject too complicated. In the course of discussing the true church, Jackson complained of those who '...have intangled this article or point of Beliefe, necessary to all that hope to be saved, with intricate and unnecessary questions concerning Predestination or Election, with which I doe not meane to trouble the Reader'.

This treatise was part one of book twelve of Jackson's on-going commentaries on the Apostles Creed. A much more seminal event in 1627 was the licensing on 4 October, by a 'Dr. Wilson', of book six of these commentaries: A Treatise of the divine Essence and Attributes. This book was deemed contentious by many when it was published in 1628, most famously for the comments which Jackson included in the dedication to the earl of Pembroke. As chancellor of Oxford, Pembroke was in a position to provide critical support for Jackson's aspirations there - hence the dedication. The doctrine in the book allowed for an element of contingency and free will in the working out of predestination and thus challenged orthodox Calvinism; this will be addressed in the chapter on Jackson. However the infamous bit in the preface gained much immediate attention. Jackson said, 'it is not so unusuall, nor so much for mee to be censured for an Arminian,
as it will be for your Lordship to be thought to patronize Arminianism'. One response was typified by Samuel Ward, Lady Margaret professor at Cambridge, who in a letter to Archbishop Ussher in May 1628 wrote: 'Dr. Jackson hath lately set forth a book of the Attributes of God; wherein, in the preface to the earl of Pembroke, he doth profess himself an Arminian, ascribing to the opposites of Arminius, as I conceive, that God's decrees, before the creation, take away all possibilities of contrary events after the creation'. In an anonymous, unlicensed publication of that same year, Henry Burton bewailed the fact that authors such as Cosin and Jackson had influence for approving or prohibiting books. 'We hope and pray, that [parliament] will take such order, that instead of Popish and Arminian Bookes, Orthodox bookes may be freely published by Authority'.

The role of parliament was indeed key for those in opposition to the types of writings listed above. The 1628 parliament was voracious in its appetite for action against the authors of those books perceived as supporting absolutism, popery, and Arminianism; the foregoing authors were all under suspicion. In March 1628 the staunch puritan Robert Harley proclaimed: 'I will add another to Montagu, no less dangerous. Tis one Doctor Jackson. They would introduce popery. They pretend they are the reformed religion and Church of England. They do introduce a supremacy. They are possessed of churches amongst us. This new way is to bring in popery. Let there be a committee named to consider of the books of Cosin, Sibthorp, and Maynwaring'. Maynwaring's impeachment was to be the harshest punishment, and his book was called in by proclamation, as was Appello Caesarem a few months later. The method by which the crown was exploiting the licensing process for its own purposes was threatened if parliament met. This was circumvented when Charles dissolved parliament in 1629.

In the meantime, the six books described above illustrate the most effective means of using the
approbation/licensing process to protect writings congenial to the regime. These books were entered in the Stationers' Registers with the licensing authority of the Arminian sympathizer Bishop Montaigne of London (as with Sibthorpe, Maynwaring, and Cosin) or of Montaigne's chaplain Worrall (Bargrave and Jackson). The Wren book was produced at Cambridge with permission of the monarch himself. The additional safeguard of including an imprimatur signed by the bishop of London in the book can be observed in the Sibthorpe and Cosin cases. Another precaution, to proclaim on the titlepage that the book was printed by special royal command, was employed in the Maynwaring, Bargrave, and Wren books. These examples provide evidence of the procedures utilized by the regime to protect its supporters while at the same time fully complying with the regulations. Suspicions about the licensing of Montagu's two books, followed by the many unlicensed rebuttals to Montagu, had dramatized the desirability of strengthening pre-publication control. In so doing the crown also sought means to delay or halt the publication of any criticism from the other side. The fact that archbishop Abbot was sequestered just after his two busiest chaplains, Daniel Featley and Thomas Goad, had ceased much of their licensing activity also contributed to an altered licensing scene in London.

Philip Olander calculates that Featley and Goad together had been responsible for some six hundred recorded authorizations, more than any other two licensers up until 1626. In that year Featley is listed in the Stationers' Registers as having licensed twenty five titles; Goad appears in twenty two entries and Worrall in nineteen. By contrast in 1627 Featley has only two, Goad has one, and Worrall has thirty three. According to Anthony Wood, Featley was irritated by the way he had been treated when Abbot suspected him of suffering from plague, so he ceased serving as Abbot's chaplain. In any case, Featley's marriage had been revealed and he withdrew to his wife's residence. In September 1626
Montagu reported in a letter to Cosin that Goad had left the archbishop's service and been replaced by Mr. Jeffrey of Pembroke Hall; Jeffrey went from six entries in the Stationers' Registers in 1626 to fifteen in 1627. The real slack, however, was taken up by Montaigne's chaplain, Thomas Worrall. Although Worrall was presumably Arminian in sympathy and was at the very center of the licensing operation, at times he seemed to be almost careless in granting permission to publish; his master Montaigne was also seen as somewhat too permissive. During the first seven months of 1628 Worrall did most of the religious licensing, but this ceased after July when Laud was named bishop of London, and Montaigne was moved to Durham. Worrall's last entry in the registers was in October of 1628. Olander summarizes the situation as follows: 'Changes in personnel had been necessary to avoid the embarrassing situation in which the government's own licensers were promoting books written against the peace of the church'.

One sermon in this survey serves as a bridge between those which underwrote views popular with the rising church hierarchy and crown and those which expressed views of a more traditional Calvinist inclination. A Paul's Cross sermon of Henry Valentine, delivered on 31 December 1626, responded to the appeal of the regime for peace and quiet in the church; it was designed as a year-end prayer for a new year of rest and an end to discord. Noah's Dove was entered in the registers on 25 January 1627 after licensing by 'doctor Harris', presumably John Harris who served as prebendary of St. Paul's and possibly as chaplain to Bishop Montaigne. The author was lecturer in St. Dunstan's in the West, the parish of John Donne. The sermon alluded to the philosophy behind the proclamation of June 1626 for peace and quiet in the church, stressed adiaphora, and warned against too much preaching. 'The Churches peace consists in three things. In 1. Unity of doctrine. 2. Unity of Discipline. 3. Immunity and liberty of profession'. And as for Ceremonies in vestures,
gestures, or any ritual observances, (though I thinke them to bee like the Meridian, variable according to the difference of times and places:) yet it is agreed on all sides, that the Church cannot be without the use of some Ceremonies; and if any, then those which by Antiquitie and Custome are established, unless some publique and notable inconvenience inforne the contrary'. The Protestants needed unity to stand up to the papacy as there had been more paper wars between Lutherans and Calvinists than by them both against the papists. Valentine also emphasized the duty of prayer. 'There is a time to preach, and it is but a time; there is a time to speake, and a time to keepe silence...but as for prayer it is a duty, omnium horarum, for all times and seasons.... Nay, the Reprobate at the day of iudgement, when they can doe nothing else, will pray; but it is to the Mountaines to fall upon them & cover them'. Not only did this conformist write of 'reprobates' but he handled other Calvinist themes as well. St. Augustine was contrasted with Pelagius: 'And the very same day that Saint Augustine that glorious light of the Church, and the Defender of the Faith, was borne in Africke, Pelagius that Heresiarch was borne in Wales...'. These words led to a section which sounded like a critical allusion to Arminianism. 'Many there are who examine the Articles of Faith by the Principles of Nature, and thinke by the mists of Reason to discover the mysteries of Religion: what they cannot conceiue, they condemne; what they cannot comprehend, they reprehend for absurd and foolish'. It is revealing that Valentine dedicated this sermon to Sir Thomas Fanshaw, one of the recorded opponents of Montagu and Arminianism in the parliament of 1626.  

Thus it is clear that books expressing Calvinist evangelical themes still managed to become properly authorized and published; some of the first editions of these fall into this sampling for 1627. There are traces of the double decree of predestination, anti-Arminianism, anti-Catholicism, denial of the smear campaign to label opponents
of official policy as 'puritans' and defences of sabbath observance in these writings. One such book which embodies several of these causes, including a strong endorsement of the double decree of predestination, had been licensed by Daniel Featley; this is The Doctrine of Faith by the 'fiery Jacobean lecturer of Dedham, John Rogers'. It was entered in February 1626, but the earliest extant edition is dated 1627 in the imprint. 'Wee have a marke of our election when we come to beleeve, and not before: they therefore that have it, let them rejoice in it; they that have it not, let them never bee quiet, seeing till then, if they have lived under the meanes, they carry the marke of a reprobate. 2. Wee must ascribe nothing to ourselves for our faith, but to Gods free mercy, and Christs merit, and bee thankefull to God in Christ Jesus for it'. 'It is called Faith of Gods elect,...a rare jewell bestowed on none but Gods deare ones, such as he ordained to salvation before the world; not such faith as reprobates may have'. 'Puritanism is a term used by those who no longer understand the proper observance of religion.... For as the meanes and mercies of God abound, so the abominations of our Nation abound more and more: as horrible contempt of God and his Word, prophanation of his holy name, and Sabbaths...hating the wayes of God, and calling it Puritanism when men make conscience to walke in them'. Rogers was a nonconformist who, although not punished for his publications, according to Prynne was among those divines who were brought into High Commission and troubled or silenced for a time. He was also said to have encouraged his parishioners not to pay the forced loan. 37

A son-in-law of George Carleton published an apologia for bishops which also included a reference to predestination. Not listed in the Stationers' Registers but dedicated to George Carleton, Thomas Vicars's sermon centered on the coat of arms of the bishop of Chichester; in so doing Vicars sought to locate an acceptance of episcopacy in the writings of Calvin. 'I am sure that learned and godly Calvin,
although he speake much and inveigh greatly against the tyrannicall pride and pompe of the Prelates and Byshops in Poperie; yet he did never dislike of the calling it selfe, but doth confesse it to be of GOD, and to be of an ancient standing in the Church ...wherein he saith there was alwayes one selected out of the presbyters and set over them as an overseer or Byshop...'. However this sermon also incorporated a recognition of the double decree. `...Now they are called elect and reprobate. Both these living within the borders of the Church...do both of them heare the Preacher, and receive the word, but with different successe, for to the one it is the favour of life unto life, and to the other it is the favour of death unto death'. 38

Another unregistered work which went into greater detail was a compilation of four sermons by the Suffolk preacher, William Ressold, a graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. `But thus he [God] marrieth the Elect unto himselfe, as God himselfe doth witnesse by his Prophet Hosea. Therefore it followes, these can never totally depart from him....for the Regenerate are never brought to that extremitie, as to contemne God, and utterly to despaine of God: for this is proper to the Reprobates onely. Therefore faith it selfe cannot wholly be lost, and consequently the Regenerate never totally fall from God'. 39

Two other earliest editions touched on the issue of predestination although, in so doing, discussed it in terms of the `elect'. William Guild was a minister in Aberdeen who, like others, was caught in the middle of the royal struggle with the Scottish church. His Scottish publication, Compend of the Controversies of Religion, was primarily an attempt to refute papal doctrine, but he included a chapter on unconditional predestination. `Wee were not predestinated unto lyfe, for our fore-seene good workes, as the cause; but unto good workes, as the fruits, and that of meere grace.... Note then, That this golden chaine of Salvation, can never bee broken, as long as the first linke there-of, which is our
election, is kept sure in the Lord's owne hand: so that whom hee hath predestinated to glorie, hee shall keepe sure unfallen, finallie and fullie...'. Guild contrasted the wicked and the godly. 'For the soules of the godlie after their separation from the bodie, are in rest: but the soules of the wicked suffer punishment, untill the bodies of the one ryse to eternally see, and of the other unto eternall death...'.

Also not English was the other author - the Huguenot Philippe de Mornay who remained loyal to France while also seeking unity between the various reformed churches in Europe. His Three Meditations appeared posthumously in English for the first time in 1627, although they had been composed years earlier. Mornay could be a polemicist at times, but these meditations were not especially disputatious. In the third sermon he commented: 'the childe whom hee [God] cherisheth, the childe for whom he keepeth an inheritance, that heavenly inheritance whereof hee maketh us coheires, with that Well-beloved in whom he is well pleased.... He hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himselfe, according to the good pleasure of his will.' This work was not properly entered in the registers; on the whole publishers of translations which had been previously printed in foreign languages abroad did not always abide by the licensing and entrance requirements.

All five of the above works, by J. Rogers, Vicars, Ressold, Guild, and de Mornay, contained commentary on predestination; only one, that by Rogers, went through the London process of entry in the Stationers' Registers with a licenser named. That work had been licensed earlier, before the proclamation of 1626, by D. Featley and was entered to Nathaniel Newbery; Featley and Newbery had often collaborated in the production of Calvinist works. Guild's work was printed in Aberdeen, but Vicars, Ressold, and de Mornay were unregistered even though printed in London. Technically these
latter three were in violation of the 1626 proclamation which in essence banned discussion of predestination in an attempt to secure peace and quiet in the church; the scope of the proclamation did not extend to Scotland so the book by Guild was presumably exempt. The following three pieces were even more provocative in that they specifically denigrated Arminianism.

Licensed by Goad's successor, John Jeffrey, was an attack on Arminian doctrine by William Pemble. This posthumous work, *A Plea for Grace*, was entered in September 1626 to John Bartlet, a publisher known for producing Calvinist works. It was edited by Richard Capel, the deceased author's tutor at Magdalen College, Oxford. The dedication by the editor was to the Eastington, Gloucestershire Justice of the Peace, Nathaniel Stephens, who in 1627 was appointed loan commissioner, but who refused to serve or advance money himself. Capel thundered: 'Bookes are more necessary in a state than arms: Arms are to defend us from the invasion of foes, bookes are to preserve us from the infection of errors; enemies can but kill the body, errors endanger the soule. There are crept into the Churches, a number of false opinions; some that oppugne, others that obscure the grace of God'.

Pemble was arguably a puritan as was George Walker who wrote a preface for this work stating that he had read it while in the press and thought it necessary for those times. He referred to that 'new upstart sect of Arminians...[who] have joyned hearts and hands in many...errors with the Papists, our enemies'. He continued: '...the maine errors of Arminians and Papists, and their most grosse absurdities about universall grace, and mans free will, and power in working his owne salvation, is truly related'. Pemble himself listed the erroneous articles of the Arminian faith, errors which included a belief that God desired salvation for all mankind and that Christ died for all men alike. He then attempted to define the differences between the elect and the
reprobate. 'Thus then both the Elect and Reprobate resist: but the Elect for a time; the Reprobate finally. The difference is from God. The Reprobate neglect and cast off him: Wherefore in justice he neglects and casts off them, leaving them to follow their own wills, and the counsells of their reprobate mind'. Written post-Dort and pre-Montagu, Pemble's work, presumably with its later prefaces, was licensed by John Jeffrey who seemed to be emerging as the licenser most sympathetic to Calvinist evangelical works. Jeffrey had held the lectureship of Trinity church in Cambridge from the time it was vacated by Richard Sibbes until 1624; this popular pulpit competed with the university sermon held every Sunday at Great St. Mary's. By the autumn of 1626 Jeffrey had become chaplain to Abbot.

The pulpit had long been an influential organ of public opinion; that at Paul's Cross was the most eminent of all. Preachers there were selected by a variety of means: often they were simply young men fresh from university, but bishops preached there during sessions of parliament, and Lady Margaret professors in divinity were required to preach every two years. Appointed by the bishop of London, these preachers could function as a mouthpiece for announcements of public policy. The sermon preached there on 11 February 1627 followed on the heels of another Paul's Cross tradition: that of public penance and recantation. On that day the 'Familist' John Hetherington was forced, by decision of the High Commission and Archbishop Abbot, to read his offences and recant. Stephen Denison then responded with a confutation. Among the Hetherington offences had been contempt for the sabbath; Denison upheld the observation of the sabbath as part of the moral law. Moreover he included an attack on 'Arminian wolves'. 'Wee have Arminian Wolves, which make a bridge betwene us and Popery....[and Anabaptist wolves] which jumpe with the Arminians in conditionall election upon foreseene faith or workes, in denying the doctrine of reprobation in the true sense therof, in maintaining
universall redemption of all...sorts, in maintaining the
doctrine of free-will, in defending and pleading for falling
from grace, or the totall Apostacy of Saints...'. In April,
after the work had been licensed by Jeffrey and entered in
the registers, Sir Henry Martin requested that Robert Harley
gain permission to dedicate the printed version to the king.
In the resulting dedication Denison wrote: 'I finde that I
have stirred up to wrath against my selfe the most part of
all factions in England by this publike Sermon, which I made
in the defence of Gods eternall truth...'.

The sermon preached by Humphrey Sydenham at Oxford on 9
July 1626 appeared in print for the first time with 1627 as
the imprint date. Reissued that same year with four sermons
printed in 1626, The Athenian Babler had its first entry in
the Stationers' Registers as part of Five Sermons. The latter
was entered on 19 May 1627; the licenser was Worrall. On the
surface, especially given the date of delivery, the Babler
appears to be a rendering of the theme of peace and quiet in
the church - the proclamation had been issued only weeks
earlier. 'A mutiny or rent in an army is the Souldiers
passing bell, Death followes, or dispaire of victory....And
it speeds no better in a devided Church, where Scismes and
Factions like so many rents and breaches, have hewed-out a
way to her overthrow and ruine....[Let there be] no more
warre in her members, no more Bablings in their tongue, no
more venome in their Penne, to the great advantage of the
Adversary, whose artillery is ready'. However Sydenham's
interpretation of the troubles included the warning quoted at
the beginning of this chapter that the Protestant, caught
between the nonconformist and the Catholic, is forced to fly
to 'Caesar' for sanctuary, and in the rescue and appeal,
falls into the hands of the enemies to the truth, the
Pelagian and the Arminian. Did Sydenham fear that Arminians
would gain influence in the attempt to defend the English
church and to distance it from nonconformist as well as
Catholic? He must have been referring to Montagu's Appello
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Caesarem - thus writing in potential breach of the proclamation. 46

In this year, after the forced loan had been introduced in the wake of Danish losses against continental Catholics, and while the Duke of Buckingham was preparing for an expedition to rescue Huguenots, anti-Catholicism was alive. Most of the earliest editions in this survey exhibited evidence of such emotion; the following seven authors were especially outspoken. None was more vehement than Henry Burton whose first edition of The Baiting of the Popes Bull falls into this survey. A lecturer at St. Matthew's Friday Street, Burton produced his work in response to a papal bull of May 1626, a bull which underscored the need for English Catholics to refuse to take the oath of allegiance to the king. Dedicated to King Charles, Burton's book served as a warning to the king that he must take stronger measures if the Catholics in his kingdom were to be prevented from rebelling against crown and country. There was the usual indulgence in anti-Catholic vitriol - casting the pope as Antichrist - but it was in the special epistle to the Duke of Buckingham that Burton was most controversial. Burton suggested that as the king needed money so desperately, he should take it from the Jesuits in the country. Buckingham was entrusted with the responsibility of protecting the crown, church, and true religion, and he was charged with searching everywhere, including his own household, for Jesuits who should then be treated as traitors. After licensing by Jeffrey, this book was entered to the printer William Jones in the Stationers' Registers on 26 April 1627. In spite of the legal entry, the bishop of London suppressed the sale and publishing of The Baiting of the Pope's Bull; as early as 20 May 1627 the masters and wardens of the Stationers' Company were instructed by the Privy Council to seize all copies. 47

This case quickly became a topic of conversation. The defence on the part of the licenser was that the epistle had
been added later and therefore was not included in the licensing. A letter to Joseph Mead reported: 'There is much ado about Mr. Burton's "Baiting of the Pope's Bull," at least the epistles and admonition after, (that Antichrist would arm English catholics against the sovereign) which it is said Dr. Jeffrey saw not, and therefore could not license'. Apparently Abbot shared responsibility as in a letter of 1 June 1627 to John Williams, bishop of Lincoln, John Holles stated: 'My Lord of Canterbury hath been questioned for lycencing the printing of Burtons booke, the booke he avows, the epistle he never saw'. When eventually brought before the High Commission in October 1628, Burton pleaded that the proclamation and injunctions concerned booksellers and printers, not authors; his Baiting of the Bull was licensed, and if his other controversial books were not, it was by default of the printers. Writing many years later about this case, Burton referred to his book being 'licensed too casually', but claimed that in spite of the presence of Neile and Laud in the examination, he was sent home without censure. 

The bishop of Aberdeen, Patrick Forbes, was another Scot who had to chose between native tradition and the introduction of episcopacy; Forbes was rewarded for his conformity with a bishopric in 1618, although he later had to struggle with his conscience over the greater threat to the church from Charles I. Forbes was hostile to all aspects of Catholicism and his book in 1627 reflected this viewpoint. Printed in Aberdeen by Edward Raban and dedicated to Anne Campbell Gordon, Eubulus was a response to a 'Romish rhyme' which had been published much earlier. Originally composed thirteen years beforehand, only a few manuscripts of Eubulus were planned for circulation. The work would have remained buried except that others encouraged Forbes to make it more public, now, in a time of renewed strife. Forbes wrote of 'Antichrist's deceit'; he also argued that, contrary to the Catholic charge, Protestants, puritans, Calvinists, and
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Lutherans were not separated but were instead one body. 

Unlike Paul's Cross, where the bishop of London generally selected preachers for sermons, it is not as clear what the procedures were for appointing preachers to deliver Easter week sermons at St. Mary's Spital. What seems most likely is that the Court of Aldermen selected the preachers for the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday after Easter; certainly the mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs were in attendance at the Spital sermons. The one which falls into this survey was delivered by Thomas Goffe on the Wednesday in Easter week, 28 March 1627; it was licensed by Worrall a month later. Goffe's main problem appeared to be with an unidentified critic, a fellow minister whom he referred to as 'the rehearser' when he detailed his problems in the epistle to the reader - composed while readying the sermon for publication. John Stow explained that after a sermon was preached on Good Friday at Paul's Cross and three sermons preached at the Spital during Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Easter week, 'then on low Sunday, one other learned man at Paules Crosse, made rehearsall of those foure former Sermons, either commending or reproving them, as to him by judgement of the learned Divines was thought convenient'. This explains the role of the 'rehearser' which in Goffe's case caused much distress. The criticism from the rehearser seemed to be more about style than substance. The theme of most Spital sermons was the resurrection; this one is called Deliverance from the Grave. If there was any doctrine expressed here it was anti-papist. Goffe railed against the mass, beads, penance, the Pope, and Jesuits. 'Let superstition and Idolatry, whose hereticall doctrine of meritorious works raise walls for Hornets to inhabit, out of blind devotion: let them open their eyes...'. 

Published at Oxford and dedicated to the university was a book by George Hakewill which was a response to Bishop Godfrey Goodman. In his Fall of Man, Goodman had argued that mankind was in decay. Hakewill, on the contrary, believed
that the modern age excelled over all that had gone before it. However, Hakewill's persistent anti-Catholicism was also evident in this work. On the subject of Antichrist, Hakewill suggested that the likeliest candidate to answer that description was the bishop of Rome, who took upon himself the power of the emperor in the imperial city. On the last page Hakewill stated that 'Whatsoever I have written in this or any other booke, I humbly submit to the censure of the Church of England'; the vice-chancellor of Oxford between July 1626 and July 1628 was Laud's devotee, William Juxon, although the pervasive influence of the Calvinist chancellor, Pembroke, rendered Juxon almost powerless. 51

There were several other religious writings appearing for the first time in 1627 which also displayed anti-Catholic rhetoric. The one first edition in this sampling which was published in Ireland was also a tirade against Catholicism, but it was written to promote the authority and supremacy of the king over that of the Pope. Christopher Sibthorp was a justice in Ireland, which explains why his Surreplication was printed in Dublin by the Society of Stationers. This is but one work in a series of disputes which he carried on with an anonymous popish adversary. Sibthorp maintained that neither Pope nor ecclesiastical minister of any kind had the power to compel a king to his religion. 52 Three sermons delivered earlier in Oxford by Christopher White of Christ's Church concentrated on various forms of oaths. His main point was that Roman Catholics did not believe in keeping oaths with heretics -therefore a king's subjects may turn against him if he angers the Pope. 53 It is possible that this work was considered timely because of the papal bull of May 1626 which had so antagonized Henry Burton. Although printed in London, this title remained unentered in the registers.

A work by Francis Rous combined anti-popery with an attempt to prevent those who led saintly lives from being categorized with the derisive term 'puritan'. In addition to his study of law and his role as a member of parliament,
Francis Rous was also much interested in theological matters. He was one of those who published an attack on Richard Montagu's work in 1626. Later, in the parliament of 1628-1629, Rous was to complain of Roger Maynwaring, Arminianism, and popery. In *The onely Remedy* in 1627, Rous wrote of deliverance from Catholic threats of the past, from the Spanish Armada and the gunpowder treason. He went on to deplore the use of the word 'puritan': 'of late brought into fashion by the devil - when a Saint is called a Puritaine. And though King James...tied the propriety of this word to Anabaptists & their Sectaries, it is now diverted to Saints, even to those that doe not walke in the broad way of common, and sociable vices, and especially if they goe somewhat higher than civil and naturall Righteousnesse'. 'Wherefore let men take heed, that they cast not upon themselves, the title of folly or madness, When they call a Saint a Puritane'. 54 The entry for this title in the Stationers' Registers was made on 24 May 1627; it stated that the license was granted by Worrall.

Another divine who was disturbed at distortion of the concept of puritanism was Timothy Rogers, described as a preacher at Much-Tey, Essex. In his dialogue with parishioners, *Good Newes*, Rogers as pastor said that '...this holy life is the path-way to heaven; which the divell therefore opposes with all his might...the sleights hee useth for these purposes are...by discouragements, buzzing into mens minds, that if they once begin to live thus, then they shall be counted, and called Puritans; no body will care for their company; their rich friends will frowne upon them, they shall bee disgraced, scorn'd and mocked...'. 55 Like Rous's book, this one was entered in May 1627, but it was licensed by Doctor Harris -presumably the same licenser as the Harris who approved Henry Valentine's work.

A parish sermon delivered in November 1626 by Samuel Kenrick was dedicated to the prosperous merchant Sir William Courten, descendent of Huguenots and discoverer of Barbados;
it was entered in March 1627 after licensing by Worrall. Although Kenrick was obviously concerned about the 'home-bred dissentions of our State and Kingdome', he urged preachers to tell the truth, even if they were then hated for it. He deplored enmity among the people, 'for we exceed the Papists a degree: they counted this truth to bee a matter of debate: so doe wee: they accounted it to be but Inken Divinity: but we repute it Inken enmity; and so befoul the sincerity of it with the scumme of Puritanism in the lowest degree of our disdainfull teene'.

One title in this survey was unusually specific to a certain time and was published only once: this was the Edinburgh printing of Sir William Cockburn's treatise on the abuses of tithing. Dedicated to the commissioners appointed for the reformation of these abuses, *Respublica de decimis* was no doubt calculated to support the proclamations issued for Scotland early in 1627 which made provision for commissioners to work out a settlement of the tithing issue.

Other licensed books for which the earliest extant editions are dated 1627 are more difficult to categorize; these were works of Protestant devotion and edification which were not obviously controversial. Funeral sermons delivered by Hannibal Gamon and Thomas Gataker, two devotional works of John Wall, and three other works - by Thomas Carter, by a versifier identified only with initials 'S.P.L.', and an anonymous polemic against drunkenness - complete this section on first editions printed openly in Britain.

In a sermon preached at the funeral of Frances Robartes in August 1626, Hannibal Gamon extolled the virtues of his patron's mother. Chaplain to the first Lord Robartes, Gamon referred to the deceased as 'this Elect lady'; the language of this sermon is Calvinist. Although Gamon was summoned to the Westminster Assembly, he apparently did not leave his remote parish in Cornwall to attend. Gamon's funeral sermon was licensed by Worrall and entered, but that by Thomas Gataker was not. Since funeral sermons were more ephemeral
than other sermons and therefore less likely to be reprinted, there was less motivation for a stationer to protect his property through entry in the registers. However, in the example which disproves the rule, Jeroboam's Sonnes decease, the sermon delivered by Gataker at the funeral of the child of one of his wife's relatives, was reprinted in 1637. Gataker, who did take part in the Westminster Assembly, was also a staunch Calvinist, but this sermon was concerned mainly with the tragic loss of a child.  

**Evangelical Spices**, a sermon preached by John Wall at Christ Church, Oxford, mentioned God's 'elect children', but the major emphasis was on the importance of prayer which was to be received as the smoke of incense. Wall was a chaplain to Bishop Williams of Lincoln and had contributed to the anti-Catholic barrage after the collapse of the 'Spanish Match'. Although this first sermon had been licensed by Worrall and entered on 21 March 1627, another title, The Seraphins Wings was unregistered. This latter is a compilation of six sermons delivered in Westminster and Oxford in 1623; it was dedicated to Bishop Williams and expressed nothing controversial. Perhaps this was the result of the 'Directions to preachers' of the previous year, although brief, passing references to 'the golden chaîne of our salvation' and 'Gods decree which is before time' betrayed orthodox Calvinist beliefs.  

Thomas Carter's work of Protestant edification was licensed by Featley before its registration in August 1626. Carters Christian Common Wealth; or, domesticall Duties deciphered enumerated duties for all walks of life: wives, parents, children, masters, and servants. The anonymous (although initialed S.P.L.) set of forty one divine odes, in verse and licensed by Docter Harris, relied on George Buchanan's paraphrase of the first twenty Psalms. Later, in the ode for the 37th Psalm, appeared: 'God fosters those who harmlesse be/ And what they have his grace assures/ Their birth-right too by his decree/ Beyond the date of daies
endures'. The final title, *A looking Glasse for Drunkards*, was anonymous and unentered; it focused on the evils of drunkenness. 59

These were the thirty two titles published openly in the realm of Charles I. There were also four titles published in English abroad in this survey for 1627: one Protestant title in the Netherlands and three Catholic ones in France. The first of these is a book identified only as being by Ez. W.; the date 1627 appears alone in the imprint, but the printer has been identified as the widow of J. Veseler in Amsterdam. It was she who the following year wed J. F. Stam, printer of many Protestant English Bibles. The work consists of letters written between a Catholic son, in Douai, and his Protestant mother. An enlarged, completely anonymous edition which appeared the same year, printed secretly in England, mentioned that 500 Dutch copies had been printed of the shorter version. It is not obvious from the content why this was an 'underground' publication. Perhaps this was simply a commercial venture, undertaken for the same English market as were the English Bibles. The anti-Catholic invective of the mother had a decidedly militant flavor - guaranteed to appeal to a nation involved in anti-Catholic operations. 'Shall not God avange his own Elect, which cry day & night unto him, though hee heare them longe, I tell thee hee will avenge them speedily...'. 60 The other overseas publications were Catholic.

All printed in France, three Catholic first editions fall into this sample. The work by Richard Smith was the first English translation of what verges on being a hagiography of Lady Magdalen, Viscountess Montagu. As the bishop of Chalcedon, Richard Smith functioned as the bishop for all English Catholics. He spent much of his time shielded in the Catholic household of Anthony Browne, second viscount Montagu and grandson of the above. This book had been written much earlier and concerned itself with events during the early years of James I. In his attempt to fulfill the
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duties of a bishop, Smith was to grow so unpopular with English lay Catholics that by 1627 they were actually requesting that the English government intervene.  

The other two Catholic first editions in this sample were coincidentally both directed at writings of James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh. Paul Harris, although his Briefe Confutation was published in St. Omer, probably spent most of his life in Ireland. In this book he attacked a sermon on the universality of the church of Christ which had been preached by Ussher before King James in 1624. Ussher had specifically excluded papists from his world view, although he had admitted others such as members of the Greek church. Harris pointed out the many differences between the English Protestants and the Greeks - among which were differences over works, baptism, free will, number of sacraments, relics, saints, and auricular confession. By contrast, Harris concluded that the Catholics and Greek Orthodox really had only one dispute, that over the supremacy of the pope.

The Irish Jesuit, William Malone, had been involved in a series of confrontations with Archbishop Ussher. This reply of his to Ussher, printed in 1627, probably in Douai, restated his view that it was the Roman Catholic Church which continued the church of antiquity. One of the tactics which Malone employed was to stress the differences between the various branches of Protestantism; for example, he elaborated on the disagreement between Protestants and puritans over Christ's descent into hell. '...The Protestants maintaine that by the words of our Creed...the humane soule of Christ is signifed to have really and locally gone downe into the place of Hell...and the Puritans fight for the contrarie, affirming most stoutly that...Christs soule leaving his bodie, ascended immediatlie up to Heaven...'. Among the claims he sought to validate from the church fathers were confession, prayer to saints, holy images, and the belief that 'man hath free-will, and that for his meritorious workes he receiveth, through the assistance of Gods grace, the
blisse of everlasting happinesse.' Malone also exploited division within the Church of England on the subject of Antichrist: in a footnote citing English Protestants who did not equate the pope with Antichrist, he quoted Richard Montagu 'in his Appeale unto Caesar professing not to believe the Pope to be that Antichrist'.

These are all the surviving earliest editions which are part of the sampling for 1627 - thirty six of them. Of these Matthew Wren and George Hakewill had their books printed at Cambridge and Oxford respectively; Wren's was actually approved by the king. Two books were published in Aberdeen, one in Edinburgh, and one in Dublin. Subtracting these six and the four continental leaves twenty six books with London imprints, of which seven are not found in the Stationers' Registers; a hefty 27% thus did not comply with regulations. There is no obvious pattern among these seven books. The stationers who would have been responsible for entrance were varied and provide no real clues. While the funeral sermon by Gataker and the translation of de Mornay's meditations were formats which often eluded the registers, on the other hand de Mornay joined with Ressold and Vicars are three of the six books explicitly outlining points of predestination; Guild's, the fourth, was printed in Scotland. However on the whole these seven books were no more contentious than a few, like those by Pemble and Burton, which did receive license. The dearth of motive calls the import of the surviving records themselves into question: the fact that only Gataker's work was reprinted in the pre-war period suggests that stationers did not want to bother with entrance if they saw no need to protect their property. Whether or not such works were approved by a licenser remains unclear.

It is the nineteen titles which left a trail in the Stationers' Registers which contribute information about the licensing situation in London. The bishop of London licensed the three titles most objected to by members of parliament - those by Robert Sibthorpe, Cosin, and Maynwaring. Eight
others were approved by Montaigne's chaplain Worrall: although some of these, for example Bargrave's and Jackson's works, were congenial to the regime, others by Sydenham and Kenrick touched on the terms 'Arminian' and 'puritan' in ways injurious to the peace and quiet of the church. The licenser identified only by the surname Harris licensed three titles, and the residual licensing of Featley was responsible for the writings of John Rogers and Thomas Carter. The most intriguing licensing was that done by John Jeffrey, Goad's successor in Abbot's service. He licensed the anti-Arminian works of Denison and Pemble and the controversial work of Henry Burton. However, all the works licensed by Jeffrey in 1627 were entered on or before 5 May; it appears that although he was the licenser of choice for Calvinist works, he was probably also handicapped by the sequestration of Abbot in July. A feature of his licensing, which also once again reveals the haphazard nature of the process, was the fact that both Denison's and Burton's works had received license without their preliminary material. Denison was still searching for permission to dedicate his sermon to the king after entrance, and Jeffrey's excuse for approving Burton's work was that he never saw the offending epistle.

Since the policy itself was unclear, from these results it remains difficult to determine whether the Proclamation of 1626 was directed at Arminian or Calvinist books or both and how successful it was. Montagu wrote in June 1626: 'Now that the Proclamation is held to be against me...'. And, in truth, although there were three separate printings of Appello Caesarem in 1625, it was not again reprinted, and discussions with Cosin in February 1625 about reprinting A Gagg with additions led nowhere. Prynne, also writing in 1626, not surprisingly interpreted the proclamation as an effort to keep back 'scismaticall, Arminianizing, and Romanizing spirits' but saw it instead as exploited by those very elements. 'Who then are those who violate and transgresse this godly Proclamation? Those who under pretence and coulour
of it, doe labour to suppress and quell the truth, and Doctrine of our Church, contrary to his Maiesties good intent'? 64 No one better summarized the situation in the months following the proclamation than the earl of Clare who saw two rival systems in place before Abbot was sequestered. Writing at the beginning of June 1627, John Holles could comment: 'but they say my fellow Burton (for he was Prince Harries clark of the closett) shall be accounted with; the counsellor-fyed bishops prosecute him: what Canterbury stopps from the press, London letts go, witnes my Lady of Denbighs booke, complied by Cosens of the 7 sacraments, Sibthorps prerogative sermon vyz'. Nonetheless even after Abbot began his house arrest, anomalies persisted. A sermon (not in this survey), preached before the king in August 1627 by Henry Leslie, expounded predestinarian views and was published at the request of Pembroke's brother; it was licensed by Worrall and entered 22 September 1627. On the other hand, the Arminian work of Thomas Jackson, A Treatise of the divine Essence (also not in this survey) was to be licensed on 4 October 1627. 65

Because of conflicting contemporary accounts, the confusions surrounding this measure persist. It is important to remember that the original draft of the proclamation was specifically aimed at Richard Montagu and the Arminians. However, the published version was interpreted by Bishop Neile and his group to mark the abandonment of doctrine taught at the universities since Elizabethan times - a general silence which would benefit the Arminian minority. The attempts of the Jacobean 'Directions to preachers' in 1622 and the Caroline proclamation of 1626 - episodes in the continuing effort to still discussions of controversial religious issues - clearly did not accomplish what they purportedly were designed to do. Thus it was considered necessary at the end of 1628 to issue the royal declaration prefacing the reprinting of the Thirty-nine Articles which forbade even members of the university community to touch
"curious points on which the present differences lie'. It was probably only after Abbot's death that the Caroline measures provided a clear path for suppressing controversial Calvinist opinions. 66

It remains to summarize the subject matter of the earliest editions in this survey of thirty two titles printed in the British Isles. Six titles, (or 19%) were directly connected with the aims of the regime: they were licensed by the bishop of London or his chaplain or the king himself and some displayed imprimaturs; others were printed at the special command of his majesty. Similarly, six titles (19%) included Calvinist predestinarian themes and three (9%) actually ventured a criticism of Arminianism. Seven titles (22%) were distinctly anti-Catholic and two (6%) were concerned with the way in which Calvinism had been rechristened 'puritanism'. Combining these four categories of evangelical Calvinist thought produces a total of eighteen titles (56%). The remaining eight titles (25%) were concerned with a single issue (Cockburn) or were simply works of Protestant devotion although four (Gamon, Wall (2) and S.P.L.) of the latter (13%) adopted Calvinist language. Adding this 13% to the 56% of evangelical Calvinist works brings the total of Calvinist works to 69%.

These earliest editions, especially the ones subject to the restraints imposed by controls on licensing and entrance, provide the best portrayal of contemporary currents and events. As indicated in the political sermons described above, the political setting in 1627 was dominated by the issue of the forced loan. After parliament was disbanded in 1626 without allocating sufficient resources, the Privy Council during that September approved the levy of a forced loan. They would raise money quickly in order to aid the king's uncle, the king of Denmark, who had suffered severe setbacks in the continental wars. The following three months were devoted to public relations efforts to sell the idea of the loan. It was difficult from the beginning, and a number
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of leading peers had objections. The king became obsessed on the subject; in the end he did indeed seem to link compliance with the loan to the loyalty of his subjects. Except for the part of the year when the country was preparing for a second front, the Duke of Buckingham's expedition to aid the Huguenots against France, most of the political landscape in 1627 was obscured by the issue of collecting the loans.

This is not to say that the issues of the church did not also have a high profile. The downward spiral of Archbishop Abbot's influence at the same time that William Laud's star was rising presents a paradigm of what was happening in England in 1627. Abbot had refused to license the Sibthorpe sermon in the spring of 1627 and by July he had been removed from all High Commission business and was asked to choose the residence in which he would be sequestered. The Duke of Buckingham wanted Abbot out of power before he left for war. Abbot's two chaplains, Featley and Goad, who had been doing the lion's share of licensing between them, were reduced to only three registered licenses for all of 1627. Their replacement in Abbot's establishment, John Jeffrey, did no licensing after 5 May 1627. On 9 October the king appointed the Arminian bishops Montaigne, Neile, Buckeridge, Howson, and Laud as a commission to exercise the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury. 67

William Laud was indeed becoming ubiquitous. Even though still only the bishop of Bath and Wells, Laud was instrumental in making arrangements for the licensing of the Sibthorpe and the Maynwaring sermons in support of the forced loan. Laud's obsession with influencing the products of the printing press may explain why he was in such close contact with Bishop Montaigne of London. He had preached at the opening of parliaments in both 1625 and 1626; in September 1626 he had succeeded Lancelot Andrewes as dean of the Chapel Royal. On 29 April 1627 Laud, along with Bishop Neile of Durham, was sworn of the Privy Council by special command of the king. In July Laud was receiving greetings from the vice-
chancellor and heads of colleges at Cambridge because in the absence of their chancellor (Buckingham), Laud was to take them into his care. Upward mobility within the church itself was highly reflective of the emerging ascendancy of the Laudian party. With only one exception, all movement into bishoprics between the York House Conference in 1626 and Laud's nomination to the bishopric of London in July 1628 was achieved by Arminians or clerics in Laud's camp. Francis White went to Carlisle in December 1626; Theophilus Field (patronized by the Duke of Buckingham) was sent to St. David's in July 1627; Richard Neile was nominated to replace Lancelot Andrewes at Winchester in November 1627; George Montaigne and John Howson were successively sent to Durham during the first half of 1628; John Buckeridge was nominated for Ely in April 1628; and Richard Montagu was awarded Chichester in July 1628. The only exception in this spate of appointments was that of the Calvinist Joseph Hall who was nominated to be bishop of Exeter in October 1627 while the Duke of Buckingham was out of the country.

This was the backdrop for new titles faced with the vagaries of licensing and entrance: a shunned and finally sequestered archbishop on the one hand but, on the other, the hovering possibility of a parliament to counteract the emergent power of anti-Calvinists in the London licensing structure. In addition the High Commission or the Privy Council could act to interrupt the distribution of materials after publication. How do reprints relate to this situation? Because cheaper to produce than books printed for the first time, reprints were expected to bring in good income and were thus a barometer of popular taste; they were not subject to the same rules for entrance or licensing. In striking contrast to the first editions, all of the twenty two reprints which are included in this sampling originally were entered in the Stationers' Registers and all bear London imprints. Most of them expressed evangelical Calvinist themes - eight actually mentioned, at least in passing, the world of
the elect and reprobate governed by the immutable double decree of predestination.

The second edition of William Prynne's Perpetuitie of a regenerate mans Estate, printed by the puritan William Jones, appeared in 1627, as did the third edition. This title had been part of the attack literature which emerged in 1626 as a response to Montagu's Appello Caesarem. Unlike similar titles by men such as Henry Burton, George Carleton, Daniel Featley, Francis Rous, Anthony Wotton and John Yates, this was actually entered and licensed, by Daniel Featley in April 1626. The complaint in parliament by Michael Sparke in April 1628 would indicate that it was the second printing which finally ran into difficulty with the authorities. A summons, dated 11 October 1627, was sent on behalf of the High Commission to the benchers of Lincoln's Inn, requesting that a student, William Prynne, appear before the 'consistory in St. Paul's' on the 25th of October in regard to a book; Montaigne, Laud, and John Donne were among the signatories on the document. Other books apparently were also involved; William Sparke and William Jones were also to be summoned. Although the entry in the Stationers' Registers is dated 7 April 1626 (and presumably the licensing was done before that day), there was reference in all editions of Prynne's text to the proclamation for peace and quiet in the church. This proclamation was not issued until 14 June 1626. Prynne claimed that most of the books attacking Montagu had already been published before the proclamation; he chose to construe the king's action as a way to 'keepe backe you and all other factious, scismaticall, nouellizing, Arminianizing, and Romanizing spirits...'. At least some of the lengthy preliminary sections must have been added after the licensing. Prynne denigrated Montagu, while calling on the beliefs of men such as King James to back up his stand, and he stated the purpose of his book 'where it is largely proved, that there is an election of particular men unto eternall life: that this election is absolute and
irrevocable; and that true faith, grace, regeneration, justification and sanctification are the fruites of election, and proper only to the elect of God...'.

The compilation of Five Sermons preached by Humphrey Sydenham which falls into this survey is a reprint, on continuous signatures, and dated 1627. One sermon, The Athenian Babler, also appeared for the first time as a separate with the date 1627 in the imprint and is included in the section for first editions. Of the remaining four, the sermon called Jacob and Esau was by far the most explicitly predestinarian. It was also the earliest of the sermons, delivered at Paul's Cross according to the title on 4 March 1622; if the date is the modern usage, this was before King James issued his 'Directions concerning Preachers'. The first trace of any of these sermons in the registers is an entry dated 19 May 1627 under the title 'five sermons'; this title had been licensed by Worrall. In Jacob and Esau Sydenham defended the double decree against threats from the Pelagian, 'lately backt with a troope of Arminians'. 'God in those he elects, would shew his goodnesse by way of mercie in sparing these, in others he reprobates; his goodnesse too, by way of iustice in punishing them'. 'However, those new sprung Sectaries, out of a turbulent brain and thirst of cavillation, blaspheme the eternity of Gods decree, making our election mutable, incompleat, conditionate, subject to change and revocation...'.

Although the reprints in this sampling by Prynne and Sydenham were actually licensed and entered during the same time period as many of the earliest editions, such is not the case for some of the other reprints: the writings of Arthur Dent and Robert Openshaw date from the 1580's. Dent, whose sermon on repentance was first entered and published in 1582, was in the tradition of experimental predestinarianism when he said: 'Prove your selves, whether you are in the faith: examine your selves: know you not your selves that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?... Now they
understand that God condemneth manie whom the world justifieth....The small number of those which shall be saved, ought to thrust us forward to repentance'. The dedication in Openshaw's catechism is dated 1584/5; the Maunsell catalogue of 1595 stated that Openshaw borrowed heavily from Eusebius Pagit. In any case, the part of the resulting text which called on 2 Corinthians 13:5 was almost identical to that of Arthur Dent above. 'Prove your selves whether you are in the faith, examin your selves: know you not your owne selves, how ye Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates'. 72

Reprints of books by William Cowper, John Hart, William Sclater, and Henry Mason likewise displayed evidence of belief in the double decree. The Triumph of a Christian dates from an early period of the career of William Cowper, from a time before he conformed and was rewarded with a bishopric; it was first entered and published in 1606. Cowper wrote: 'For this chaine of our Salvation reacheth...from eternity to eternity: The beginning of it (albeit before Beginning) is our Election.... Others againe, in wantonnesse and carelesse security, drinke in iniquitie with greedinessse, and so step from the decree of reprobation, that most justlie they procure their everlasting condemnation....Yet let us not despaire, no change in us can alter the Lords unchangeable Purpose, hee who hath begunne the worke in us, will also perfect it....the praise of the whole worke of our salvation, should bee ascribed to the good pleasure of his will onely, and not to our foreseene merites'. The authorship of The Burning Bush might have been shared: John Hart signed the preface but claimed not to be the author. I. D. on the titlepage has been tentatively identified as the nonconformist minister Jeremiah Dyke. In this dialogue between scholar and minister, entered in the registers late in 1615, the minister elaborated on the differences between the elect and the reprobate. After the scholar asked if a child of God could fall into such gross sins as those who were ordained unto destruction, the minister responded:
'Nothing more certaine: hee may fall into the same sinnes, and yet be no cast away. Esau a Reprobate was a Fornicator. David, an Elect, did commit adultery'. The minister continued with the explanation that this was done to show the elect their own weakness - to make them earnest in begging for the grace of sanctification so that their election may be confirmed.  

So also did William Sclater the elder discuss such differences in his exposition on the first epistle to the Thessalonians, dated 29 September 1618 in the dedication. In this piece, from the period of the Synod of Dort, Sclater mentioned that some were in doubt about the finality of reprobation. 'The more strange is that conclusion maintained by Papists and others, that Sanctification is incident unto very Reprobates; that cast-aways as well as Gods Chosen are partakers of the renewing of the Holy Ghost'. Instead Sclater maintained, 'this ground therefore let us hold firme, that truth of Sanctification falls into no Reprobate; [it] is the peculiar priviledge of Gods Chosen'. Sclater also rejected the view that predestination should not be discussed in the pulpit because it might encourage the elect to abuse their status and turn to lives of licentiousness. Henry Mason, brother of Francis Mason and author of the last title in this section, had formerly been chaplain to John King, the Calvinist bishop of London, and thus a licenser in his own right. Two reprints of his works are in this survey; the later of these, The Tribunall of the Conscience, was licensed by Worrall before entrance in January 1626. Although a friend of the Arminian Thomas Jackson from their days together in Oxford at Corpus Christi College and later to publish Arminian views of his own, Mason was here still admitting the existence of unconditional elect and reprobate by quoting St. Gregory: 'it is usually a propertie of reprobates always to do evill, and never to recount what they have done: - and contrariwise, that it is the propertie of the Elect to discusse their deedes every day...'.  
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Four other reprints in this survey contained views of absolute predestination, although the state of the non-elect was not necessarily termed 'reprobate'. The first of these, Lewis Bayly's *Practice of Pietie* was the most popular book of its age, reprinted almost fifty times after its first appearance in 1612. 'From the doctrine of Gods eternall Predestination, and unchangeable Decree, hee gathereth that if he be predestinated to be saved, hee cannot but bee saved: if to be damned, no meanes can doe any good....But he should learne that God hath predestinated to the meanes, as well as to the end'. As previously described in the edition of this title included in the survey for 1617, Bayly also exhibited the views of a staunch sabbatarian. William Bradshaw, who has been termed a non-separating congregationalist, had been vocal in his disappointment with the compromises accepted at the Hampton Court Conference. In *A Preparation to the Receiving of Christ's Body and Blood*, dating from 1609, Bradshaw wrote of the non-elect: 'what sentence shall passe upon the rest? An[swer:] All their sinnes shall bee discovered and laid to their charges, and they shall be cast body and soule into hell fire'. 75

Also writing on the subject of predestination, Nicholas Byfield claimed that election was determined before the foundation of the world, that it was derived from the free grace of God, not works, and that God's decision was unchangeable. The catechism compiled by William Gouge, first appearing in 1615, also propounded a straightforward endorsement of predestination - 'That God from all eternitie elected some to be saved in Christ, and left others to bee damned for their sinnes'. William Gouge was the puritan preacher of St. Anne's Blackfriars who was involved in both the feoffes for impropriations and the circular letter issued with three other ministers in March 1627 to solicit aid for godly ministers in the Palatinate. 76

Other reprints similarly expressed predestinarian views. That of Eusebius Pagit's *History of the Bible*, first printed
in 1602, is certainly part of this tradition. He wrote: 'Q[uestion:] Who are made heires by the Will? A[nswer:] All the Elect Saints and children of God...Q[uestion:] What are the Legacies given by this Will? A[nswer:] True faith. True repentance. Forgiveness of sinnes. And eternall life.' John Donne had preached at Paul's Cross in September 1622 in defence of the King's orders concerning preaching and was a conformist. However in the Devotions, originally entered and published in 1624, his beliefs were at least superficially Calvinist. This work began as a journal which Donne kept during a serious illness and then had published. Because of his close brush with death, Donne was much concerned with sin and confession. 'O my gracious God, that for all those sinnes committed since, yet thou wilt consider mee, as I was in thy purpose, When thou wrotest my name in the Booke of life, in mine Election: so into what deviations soever I stray,... O God, returne thou to that Minute, wherein thou wast pleased with me, and consider me in that condition'. Donne's anxiety, however, did imply that one might be deleted from the 'Book of Life'.

Again, the Seven Sermons of the late bishop of Winchester, Lancelot Andrewes, contained some orthodox Calvinist language even though much of his later writing was to be used in the cause of the Arminians. These sermons had been printed once before, anonymously, in 1592. Michael Sparke, both puritan and pirate, was responsible for bringing out this edition in 1627. William Laud and John Buckeridge had been named by the king to prepare an authorised edition of Andrewes's works and had asked Sparke to halt his efforts; claiming financial pressures, Sparke persisted. In his testimony before parliament in 1628 Sparke switched quickly from the subject of unfairness towards certain religious points of view to threats of impoverishment for the families of printers. For his publishing of these sermons Sparke was apparently sent to prison. In summarizing the conflict between Sparke and Laud over this edition, McCullough writes:
...this evidence from the late 1620s reveals an early official anxiety to control the definition and dissemination of the Andrewes canon, with Laud...not only defining the ecclesiological agenda endorsed by the publication, but,...policing the press to guard his own interests'. 78

Dating from an early period of Andrewes's career, these sermons reveal elements of evangelical Calvinist beliefs. They were not included in the compilation of 1629, edited by Laud and Buckeridge, no doubt because they displayed a side of Andrewes in conflict with his editors. They were, however, printed again in 1642 as part of the Moral Law expounded - Andrewes's work on the ten commandments which was edited by J. Jackson, a member of the Westminster Assembly. Andrewes expressed moderate Calvinist predestinarian views. 'Those whom it pleaseth God to have partakers of his kingdome, he puts them in minde to remember their creator in the dayes of their youth, before the evill dayes come: hee giveth them the grace of timely repentance, and suffereth them not to deferre it to the last cast.... Augustine saith, We may in some cases advise men to have great hope that they shall bee saved: but in no case give them warrant of securitie'. 79

Although there were no sabbatarian tracts as such in this survey for 1627, a treatise of Bishop George Downham of Derry certainly indicated a sabbatarian stance. Downham's Abstract of Duties, dating from 1620, treated the subject of obedience to the ten commandments. In the section on the fourth commandment Downham included 'vanity, in profane sports and pastimes, which more distract and more hinder our workes than honest labours' in his list of abuses of the sabbath. 80 This was seemingly in contradiction to the Book of Sports of King James.

Henry Mason's second reprint, Christian Humiliation, was dedicated to Henry King, eldest son of the deceased bishop of London, John King. Mason stressed his agreement with the late bishop that the church of England was the purest and best reformed church in Europe. This work was specifically
designed to discuss the erroneous practices of the Catholic church in regard to fasts. In that sense it belongs, along with reprints by Bishop Carleton, Richard Bernard, and Samuel Ward, in the category of anti-Catholicism—a perennial favorite of evangelical Calvinists. Mason elaborated on the ways in which Catholics cheated during fasts, by foregoing flesh, but then indulging in fish and the strongest wines. A thankfull Remembrance by George Carleton, bishop of Chichester, had been part of the anti-Catholic outpouring in 1624, after Prince Charles's journey to Spain. It had been licensed by Daniel Featley. Although most of the book dealt with Catholic atrocities from Elizabeth's reign, this book also belongs to the tradition of commemorating the triumph over the Gunpowder Plot. Another anti-Catholic polemic, also licensed by Featley (this one in November 1626), was Richard Bernard's Isle of Man. In this allegory, papistry was tried and found guilty of high treason against his sovereign. 'This fellow under pretence of Religion ...hath set up another spiritual Head over the church [i.e. Antichrist]....He hath set up also Mediators of intercession besides Christ: also in his rebellious pride of heart he hath exalted mans Merit, and made him a party Saviour of himselfe...'.

Samuel Ward, the nonconformist preacher for the corporation of Ipswich, has three reprints in this sampling. It was the visitation sermon first published in 1615 which was obviously anti-papist. In A Coale from the Altar, Ward claimed in rapid succession that Antichrist undermined Christ by pretending to be his Vicar and that many of those dubbed puritans must be defended. 'But with that which most call puritanisme, I desire to worship God', said Ward. Thus Ward, earlier than Montagu's enlargement of 'puritanism' to include more moderate Calvinists, was already criticising the use of the term.

Of all the religious authors who had books printed in 1627, it was Samuel Ward who had the largest number of titles represented for that year. It is an irony that the two
devotional reprints in this survey which appear neutral were written by him. Ironic because he was a nonconformist firebrand, frequently in trouble with his diocesan. Nonetheless both The Life of Faith (entered in 1620) and Woe to Drunkards (entered in 1622) were composed for Protestant edification.

The pattern which emerges from this sampling of twenty-two reprints is the overwhelming dominance of evangelical Calvinism. The authors of eight books at some point elaborated on the immutable double decree of predestination, seven others discussed predestination in its various guises, one (plus Bayly) displayed sabbatarian inclinations, and four were anti-papist. Only two titles were not part of this pattern - the others in theory violated the spirit of the Book of Sports, the 'Directions to preachers' of 1622, or the proclamation for the peace and quiet of the church of June 1626.

Overall, what exactly does this sampling reflect for religious titles in 1627? Altogether there were 454 separate books with 1627 in the imprint; of these 185 (or roughly 41%) dealt with religious topics. Examining every third religious book yielded a sampling of fifty eight separate books for this survey. Of these thirty six were the earliest extant editions and the remaining twenty two were obvious reprints. Of the thirty six earliest editions, only twenty six were published with London imprints. The other ten were divided between Oxford (1), Cambridge (1), Scotland (3), Ireland (1), Holland (1), and France (3). Of the twenty six London editions, only nineteen were entered in the Stationers' Registers. As many as seven were apparently unregistered. All of the reprints were published in London and had originally been entered in the registers.

At a time when there was discussion about licensing and licensing violations in parliament and in contemporary accounts, just over a quarter of the books from the London press do not have a record of registration and therefore
yield no proof of licensing. This is unusually high, especially when considering that all of the reprints for the year in this sampling had London imprints and had been entered when they were first published. Because reprints were not required to be entered or licensed, they provided an easy avenue to make available controversial works without violating any regulations. Of the twenty two reprints, some 90% reflect evangelical Calvinist thought. The breakdown for the licensed London earliest editions is different; there the matter was complicated by the fact that so much interest was focused on the royal issue of the forced loan and on the residue from the Montagu affair, a residue which included the proclamation for the peace and quiet of the church. Six or 19% of the first editions had the support of the regime in their attempt to justify the forced loan or, in the case of Cosin and Jackson, to advance ideas open to charges of popery and Arminianism.

Publishing in the year 1627 appears to have occurred in unusual circumstances; rival systems were in place although the licensing apparatus of Archbishop Abbot was losing ground. The regime used the licensing capabilities of the bishop of London, underwritten by various decrees, proclamations, and injunctions, to insure that political sermons by clerics such as Sibthorpe, Maynwaring, Bargave, and Wren (actually approved by the king) were protected and published. 'Arminian' and 'popish' writings of men such as Thomas Jackson and John Cosin also benefitted from this system. Conversely, the residual effects of licensing done by Abbot's chaplains before May 1627 and the general sloppiness of Worrall permitted publication of the anti-Arminian writings of Pemble, Denison, and Sydenham. While the pre-publication licensing regulations could still be exploited by both sides, so also could different factions employ methods to hinder post-publication distribution. The outcry over the papist tendencies in John Cosin's Devotions caused the elimination of some of the controversial sections in later
printings and the addition of an apologetic epistle from the printer blaming the misunderstandings on carelessness. After Maynwaring was impeached by parliament, his sermons were called in by proclamation. Parliament still functioned as a last court of Calvinist appeal. Conversely, the work of Henry Burton which chided the king and Buckingham for not doing enough to stop the recusants was ordered to be destroyed by the Privy Council.

As opposing parties continued to play off one side against the other, there was at times a certain disingenuousness apparent in the dealings between the authorities and the offenders. When pressed to license Sibthorpe's sermon, Archbishop Abbot had claimed that he disapproved of the contents, but in any case licensing was chaplain's work. Yet he was seen to be accountable for his chaplain Jeffrey's action over Henry Burton's book. Later, in May 1629 when the stationer Nathaniel Butter was rebuked by the High Commission for printing the sections of letters between Bishops Hall and Davenant which had been excised by the licenser, Butter protested that he would take the judgement of two bishops over the opinion of a licensor. Henry Burton in turn used the defence that the stationers rather than the author must be responsible for observing licensing regulations.

Contemporary anecdotes, recorded by those who were caught in the strife, were probably exaggerated. With the hindsight which Michael Sparke had acquired by the time of his parliamentary testimony in April 1628, he complained about some of the publishing events of 1627 and communicated an impression of unfairness, if not actual extortion, on the part of Worrall. His complaint seemed to summarize the murky and confusing picture. 'Another was the Pope's Bull; that was licensed, and his house was searched. And there was Prynne's book; [The Perpetuitie...] that was allowed, and yet at a second press was taken away from him. He says now that Dr. Worrall is the only allower of books, and he takes sometimes
5 1. a book...and sometimes a beaver hat, and he restrains other books without any cause (as Mr. Burton's book, which was a book of conflicts of conscience), only for the author's sake. Also another book of Mr. Prynne's against Cosin's Book of Devotion. Also he says that all books tending to popery are permitted to be printed, as Montagu's books, Dr. Jackson's books, and Cosin's book. And he says that poor printers and their children are undone'. 86 And yet Worrall and his master Bishop Montaigne were viewed by the anti-Calvinist establishment as too soft and lazy. Peter Heylyn reported that the king saw Montaigne as 'a man unactive, and addicted to voluptuousness, and one that loved his ease too well to disturb himself in the concerns of the Church'. This was to be reversed. Even though Montaigne had conducted a visitation late in 1627, Laud held another when he arrived in London in 1628 and 'this visitation prosecuted as many clergymen as Bishop Mountain did in seven years'. 87

All of this goes to illustrate that there was activity on the part of certain anti-Calvinist elements to attain pre-publication licensing for works promoting positions congenial to the government or to prevent the licensing of opposing views; conversely there was activity in the parliaments of 1624, 1625, 1626 and 1628/9 to censure published works by men such as Montagu, Sibthorpe, Maynwaring, Cosin, and Jackson. On the one hand, Henry Burton's book was called in by the Privy Council in 1627, but on the other, parliament eventually prevailed upon the king to recall by proclamation the sermons of Roger Maynwaring and the Appello Caesarem of Montagu.

In making a comparison of licensed London first editions and reprints for 1627, the proportion of evangelical Calvinist works goes from 69% to 90% respectively. Another contrast between earliest editions and reprints, however, is that 19% of the earliest editions dealt with political and religious issues which the regime supported but which were deemed contentious by many subjects, whereas none of the
reprints were in this category. This is the novel aspect of the survey for 1627. Books by divines who supported the royal prerogative or were proto-Arminian or bluntly 'popish' in attitude were taking their place alongside the more traditional Calvinist fare. Notably absent were espousals of polarizing topics such as assaults on the episcopacy or any obvious flaunting of Arminian views on free will. Montagu's example for the moment had a sobering effect on the anti-Calvinists.
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APPENDIX - 1627

A) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND AND IRELAND


STC 1414. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to P. Paxton 28 mr. 1627; licensed by master Doctor Worrall.


STC 4137. Earliest extant edition in STC. There are two editions printed in 1627, no other reprints. Ent. to W. Jones 26 ap. 1627; licensed by master Doctor Jeffray. In this edition the Epistle to the Duke of Buckingham begins *1r and *4 is cancelled without interrupting the text; in the second 1627 edition it begins air. See Greg, Companion, pp.242-3. Dedicated to King Charles I and to George Villers, I Duke of Buckingham.


STC 4698. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Purfoote 14 au. 1627; licensed by master Doctor Ffeatlye. Adapted in STC 20596. Dedicated to the master, wardens and assistants of the Goldsmiths company.

Cockburn, Sir William, Bart. Respublica de decimis. [An address by 'Respublica', or the Commonwealth, on the subject of abuses in tithing.] Edinburgh, J. Wreittoun, 1627. F copy.

STC 5460. Only extant edition in STC. Dedicated to the lords commissioners appointed for reformation of divers abuses.

Cosin, John, Bp. (1594-1672), A Collection of private Devotions: in the Practise of the ancient Church, called the Houres of Prayer. As they were after this Maner published by Authoritie of Q. Eliz. 1560. [cf. 16090, 20375. Anon.] London, R. Young, 1627. F copy is first 1627 printing.

STC 5815.5. Earliest extant edition in STC. There were 4 printings in 1627; 6 printings altogether between 1627 and 1638. Ent. to R. Younge 1 mr. 1627; licensed by the Bishop of

Denison, Stephen (d 1650?), The white Wolfe or, a Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, Feb. 11. 1627. and printed somewhat more largely then the Time would permit to deliver. Wherein Faction is unmasked. Especially, the Hetheringtonian Faction. London, G. Miller, 1627. F copy a variant with: G. Miller f. R. Milbourne, 1627.

STC 6607.5. Earliest extant edition in STC. Two editions printed in 1627, both with variants. There were no printings in any other year. Ent. to G. Miller a. R. Milborne 28 mr. 1627; licensed by master Doctor Jefferay. Beginning on G2r Denison attributes 12567 and 14520 to J. Hetherington and 15111 sqq. to T. L. Dedicated to King Charles I.


STC 11147. Only extant edition in STC. Prints and answers a version of the verses in STC 17505. Dedicated to Anne Campbell Gordon.


STC 11663. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in 1637. No entry in Arber, but two funeral sermons ass'd by Bladon to Brewster 4 au. 1626. Dedicated to Anne and Nicholas Crisp, I Bt., (cousins of author's wife and parents of deceased child)


STC 11978. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to R. Mabb 22 ap. 1627; licensed by master doctor Worrall. A2 differs; recto catchword: 'ous' or 'then' (cancel, pr. as F4), the latter
mentioning a nameless detractor; both present in F.


STC 12479. Only extant edition in STC. Dedicated to Anne Campbell Gordon.


STC 12611. Earliest extant edition in STC; 3 printings between 1627 and 1635. Replies to Godfrey Goodman's Fall of Man (STC 12023) Dedicated to Oxford University.


STC 14319. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to J. Clarke 4 no. 1626; licensed by master doctor Worrall. Dedicated to Sir Richard Anderson of Penley.


STC 15110. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Flesher 16 mr. 1627; licensed by Master Doctor Harris. Sometimes attributed to Sir J. Sempill. Dedicated to King Charles I.


STC 16802. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.

Maynwaring, Roger (1590-1653), Religion and Alegiance: in two
F copy, with B4v catchword: supreames.

STC 17751.5. Earliest extant edition in STC is in 1627; this is second edition printed that year. No other reprints. Ent. to R. Badger 7 no. 1627; licensed by my lord Bishop of London [George Montaigne]. Called in by proclamation 24 June 1628.


STC 18156a. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Last leaf is a second titlepage which says composed by Philip of Morney.
Dedicated by translator to Robert Rich, II Earl of Warwick.


STC 19591. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in 1629. Ent. to J. Bartlett 26 se. 1626; licensed by Master Jefferay. Preface signed by George Walker also included in this.
Dedicated to Nathaniel Stephens of Eastington, Gloucs. by editor Richard Capel.


STC 20894. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.
Dedicated to Edmund Bacon, II Bt.


STC 21186.5. Earliest extant edition in STC. Second edition also has 1627 in imprint. Eight printings between 1627 and 1640. Ent. to N. Newbery and W. Sheaffard 19 fb. 1626; licensed by Doctor Ffeatlye.
Dedicated to Helen Littel Bacon of Shribland Hall, Amy Gourdon Mildmay (wife of Sir Henry of Graces), and Muriel Sedley Gordon (wife of Brampton Gordon of Assington, Suff.).

STC 21241.7. Earliest extant edition in STC; 4 printings between 1627 and 1635. Ent. to E. Brewster 4 my. 1627; licensed by Master Doctor Harris. Dedicated to Anne Beswick Bromley (wife of Sir Henry Bromley) and to Mary Darcy Eden, (wife of Sir Thomas Eden, the younger).


STC 21346. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Bowler 24 my. 1627; licensed by Master Doctor Worrall. (Arber refers to earlier entries, possibly abortive.) Dedicated to his country.

Sibthorp, Sir Christopher (d.1632), A Surreplication to the Rejoynder of a Popish Adversarie. Wherein, the spirituall Supremacy of Christ Jesus and the civill or temporall Supremacie of Emperours, Kings, and Princes within their owne Dominions be defended. Dublin, Soc. of Statrs., 1627. Examined C copy, reel 1117. Substitutes for STC 22240.5 which is not available.

STC 22525. Earliest extant edition in STC; the only other printing is another issue also dated 1627.


STC 22525.5. Earliest extant edition in STC. There were 2 editions (each with a variant) in 1627; no later printings. Ent. to R. Mynne 10 my. 1627; licensed by lord Bishop of London [George Montaigne]. INPRIMATUR on verso of title dated 8 May 1627. Dedicated to King Charles I.


STC 23561. Earliest extant edition in STC. Reissued same year as part one of five to comprise 23563 (Five Sermons); 23563 reprinted several times between 1627 and 1637. Five Sermons ent. to Parker 19 my. 1627; licensed by Master Doctor Worall. Note: 1637 is last extant printing, but five sermons were ass'd by Parker to Haviland and J. Wright 4 se. 1638. Dedicated to Sir Hugh Portman, IV Bt.


STC 24705. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Dedicated to George Carleton, Bishop of Chichester.


STC 24985. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Copies vary, with or without errata on T4r; both at F. Dedicated to John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln.


STC 24987.5. Only extant edition in STC; there are 2 1627 variants. Ent. to J. Clarke 21 mr. 1627; licensed by master Doctor Worrall. Dedicated to George Berkeley, VIII Baron.


Wren, Matthew, Bp. (1585-1667), A Sermon preached before the Kings Majestie on Sunday the seventeenth of February last, at White-Hall. Printed by Command. Cambridge, T. a. J. Buck, 1627 [i.e.1628]. F copy.

STC 26015. Only extant edition in STC.

B) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - PROTESTANT
W., Ez., The Answere of a Mother unto hir seduced Sonnes Letter. [Amsterdam, widow of J. Veseler,] 1627. Examined C copy, reel 1087.

STC 24903. Earliest extant edition in STC. An enlarged, anonymous edition was printed with only 1627 in imprint; STC suggests it was produced in London. Its preface refers to 500 copies of the Dutch edition having been printed. No entry in Arber.

C) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED ABROAD OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - CATHOLIC


Malone, William (1586-1656), A Reply to Mr. James Ussher his Answere. [Douai?] 1627. F copy.

STC 17213. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Answers 24542; answered in 20520 (Puttock) and 23604 (Synge). A&R 494. Dedicated to King Charles I.

Smith, Richard, Bp. of Chalcedon (1566-1655), The Life of the most honourable and vertuous Lady the La. Magdalen viscountesse Montague. Written in Latin. And now tr. into English by C. F. [i.e. J. C. Fursdon.] [St. Omer, English College Press,] 1627. Facsimile of Gillow Library copy.


D) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - REPRINTS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND

Andrewes, Lancelot, Bp. (1555-1626), Seven Sermons on, the wonderfull Combate betwenee Christ and Sathan. London, [Dorothy Jaggard] f. I. Jaggard and M. Sparke, 1627. Examined HD copy, reel 1194. Substitutes for STC 595.3 which is not available.
STC 630. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1592 and is anonymous; this is the only reprint. Ent. 3 au. 1592; ass'd by widow Jaggard to T. a. R. Cotes 19 jn. 1627. See Cal. S. P. D., 1625-1649, p. 341.


STC 1607.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1612; roughly 49 printings between 1612 and 1640. Two editions printed in 1627. Ent. to J. Hodgettes 11 ja. 1612; licensed by master William Peirse.
Dedicated to Charles, Prince of Wales.

Bernard, Richard (1568-1642), The Isle of Man: or, the legall Proceeding in Man-shire against Sinne. Wherein, the chiefe Malefactors disturbing both Church and Commonwealth are detected. London, G . M[iller] f. E. Blackemoore, 1627. F copy.

STC 1946.3. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1626; 11 printings between 1626 and 1640. Ent. to E. Blackmore 4 no. 1626; licensed by Master Doctor Ffeatly.
Dedicated to Sir Thomas and Lady Catherine Thynnne.


STC 3513. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1609; 9 printings between 1609 and 1636. Ent. to S. Macham 21 ap. 1609 as 'A direction for the weaker sort of christians'; licensed by Master Etkins. Ass'd to J. Grismond by mistris Joyce Macham 15 fb. 1628; crossed out and ent. to J. Haviland a. S. Macham 8 ap. 1628.
Dedicated to Grace Redich Darcy.


STC 4228.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1618; 11 printings between 1618 and 1640. Ent. to Man 10 mr. 1618; licensed by Doctor Featly. Ass'd by S. Man to P. Stephens and
C. Meredith 23 oc. 1626.
Dedicated to Dorothy Percy and her daughters Dorothy Sidney and Lucy Hay.


STC 4642. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1624; 4 printings between 1624 and 1630. Ent. to R. Milborne a. H. Robinson 1 my. 1624; licensed by master Doctor Featly. Dedicated to Charles, Prince of Wales.


STC 5940.5. Reprint. Earliest extant editions in STC of 1 and 3 are in 1607; earliest extant edition in STC of 2 is 1606. 1 ent to J. Budge a. W. Firebrand 5 no. 1606; licensed by master Doctor Covell. 2 ent. to W. Firebrand 20 ja. 1606; licensed by master Gwyn. 3 ent. to J. Budge a. W. Firebrand 26 jy. 1607; licensed by Master Barcham. Budge's pt. ass'd to Allott 4 se. 1626. Roughly 10 printings between 1606/7 and 1639. 2 pts. Dedicated to Mary Stewart, Countess of Marre.

Dent, Arthur (d. 1601?, 1607?), A Sermon of Repentance...preached at Lee in Essex. [1581. the 7. of Marche.] London, J. Dawson f. W. Sheffard, 1627. Examined U (Union Theological) copy, reel 1850.

STC 6665.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1582; 38 printings between 1582 and 1638. Ent. 23 ap. 1582; ass'd by mistris Jackson to F. Williams 16 ja. 1626; no licenser involved.


STC 7106.5. Reprint; 1627 and 1626 are variants of 1625 printing. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1620; 3 printings between 1620 and 1635. Ent. to Kingston 6 de. 1619; licensed by Doctor Mockett. Dedicated to Margaret Montagu by editor.


STC 12128. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1615; 9 printings between 1615 and 1637. Ent. to J. Beale 29 mr. 1615; licensed by Master Mason.

Hart, John (fl. 1616-1679), The burning-Bush, not consumed; wherein, one may judge, whether he be the Childe of God, or not. Perused by J. D[yke?] ond divers other Divines. [A Dialogue between Minister and Scholar.] London, G. M[iller] f. W. Sheffard, 1627. Examined C3 (Emmanuel College, Cambridge) copy, reel 1687.

STC 12892. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1616, 4 printings between 1616 and 1636. Ent. to Jackson 11 de. 1615; licensed by Master Mason. Ass'd to F. Williams from mistris Jackson 'by order of a full Court' 16 ja. 1626. Dedicated to William and Katherine Tothil and Francis (I Bt.) and Joan Drake.


STC 17603. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1625. Ent. to J. Clarke 15 oc. 1624; licensed by Master Doctor Worrall. Reprinted only in 1627, when two issues were produced; this is first 1627 issue, second issue has added: The Epicures Fast. Dedicated to Henry King, Bishop of Chichester.


STC 17614. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1626; 4 printings between 1626 and 1634. Ent. to J. Clarke 14 ja 1626; licensed by Doctor Worrall. Dedicated to Thomas Coventry, I Baron Coventry.

STC 18830.8. Reprint. Earliest extant edition of this enlarged version is ca. 1586; nine printings between then and 1633. Shorter, anonymous version printed 20 times between 1579 and 1639. Ent. to Dawson 1 au. 1586. STC suggests this shorter version was really the Pagit catechism, see Maunsell, pt. 1, C4r. Dedicated to Mayor, Bailiffs, Alderman, etc. of Weymouth and Melcombe Regis.


STC 21835. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1619; 5 printings between 1619 and 1638. Ass'd to Parker by Fetherston 3 ap. 1626. Really only the first epistle. Dedicated to John Stanhope, I Baron Stanhope.


STC 23564. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1627; this is later edition for that year. This one has continuous signatures. Three printings between 1627 and 1637, with
various issues and variants. See previous title for fuller information.
Dedicated to Henry Danvers, I Earl of Danby.

Ward, Samuel, of Ipswich (1577-1640), A Coale from the Altar. In a Sermon preached at a Visitation at Ipswich. First edition. [Ed.] (A. Wood.) London, M. Flesher f. J. Grismond, 1627. F copy of 25031. STC 25042.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1615; 5 printings between 1615 and 1627. Also issued as pt. 4 of 25031 (Collection of sermons) which was reprinted once, in 1636. Ent. as preached at a visitation at Ipswich to S. Macham 21 no. 1614; licensed by Master Mason.
Dedicated to Samuel Ward by editor, Ambrose Wood.

STC 25051.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1621; 5 printings between 1621 and 1627. Also issued as pt. 2 of 25031, (Collection of sermons) which was reprinted once, in 1636. Ent. to J. Marriott and J. Grisman 9 oc. 1620; licensed by Master Doctor Featly. Ass'd by J. Marriott to J. Grismand 22 jn. 1626.
Dedicated to Thomas Howard, I Earl of Suffolk.

STC 25056.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1622; 4 printings between 1622 and 1627. Also issued as pt. 8 of 25031, (Collection of Sermons) which was reprinted once, in 1636. Ent. to J. Marriott a. J. Grisman 28 my. 1622; licensed by Master Doctor Featlie. Ass'd by J. Marriott to J. Grismand 22 jn. 1626.
APPENDIX E -- 1627

EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS -- LONDON IMPRINTS -- LICENSERS

Dates supplied from entries in Stationers' Registers

Bp. of London: Cosin (1 mr. 27), Maynwaring (7 no. 27),
(George Montaigne) R. Sibthorpe (10 my. 27)

Daniel Featley: Carter (14 au. 27), J. Rogers (19 fb. 26)
(Abbot's chaplain)

(John?) Harris: S. P. L. (16 mr. 27), T. Rogers (4 my
27), Valentine (25 ja. 27)

John Jeffrey: Burton (26 ap. 27), Denison 28 mr. 27),
(Abbot's chaplain) Pemble (26 se. 26)

Thomas Worrall: Bargrave (28 mr. 27), Gamon (9 de. 26),
(Montaigne's Goff (22 ap. 27), Jackson (4 no. 26),
chaplain) Kenrick (10 mr. 27), Rous (24 my. 27),
Sydenham (19 my. 27), Wall (21 mr. 27).

Unlicensed: Gataker, Looking glass, Mornay, Ressold,
Vicars, Wall, White

REPRINTS, RECENTLY LICENSED:

Daniel Featley: Bernard (1626), Byfield (1618),
Carleton (1624), Prynne (1626), Ward
(Life, 1620), Ward (Woe, 1622)

Wilson: Donne (1624)

Thomas Worrall: Mason (1624), (1626), Sydenham (1627)
EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS — PUBLISHERS

LONDON:
R. Allot: Wall
R. Badger: Maynwaring
J. Bartlet: Pemble
J. Boler: Rous
E. Brewster: T. Rogers
J. Clarke: Jackson, Wall
F. C[oules]: Looking glass
J. Grismond: Gamon
J. Haviland: Gataker
G. Latham: Ressold
R. Mab: Goffe, White
J. Marriot: Valentine
R. Moore: L., S. P.
R. Mylbourne: Denison, Kenrick, Vicars
R. Mynne: R. Sibthorpe
N. Newbery: Mornay, *J. Rogers
J. Parker: Sydenham
P. Paxton: Bargrave
T. Purfoot: Carter
W. Sheffard: *J. Rogers
M. Sparke: Burton
Y. Young: Cosin

CAMBRIDGE: Wren
OXFORD: Hakewill
SCOTLAND: Forbes, Guild
Aberdeen: Cockburn
Edinburgh: C. Sibthorp
IRELAND: C. Sibthorp
Dublin: C. Sibthorp
FRANCE: Harris, Smith
St. Oméär: Malone
HOLLAND: W., Ez.
Amsterdam: W., Ez.


Bernard, Richard, *The Isle of Man: or, the legall Proceeding in Man-shire against Sinne. Wherein, the chiefe Malefactors disturbing both Church and Commonwealth are detected* (London, 1627).


Carter, Thomas, *Carters christian Common Wealth; or, domesticall Dutyes deciphered* (London, 1627).


Cosin, John, *A Collection of private Devotions: in the Practise of the ancient Church, called the Houres of Prayer. As they were after this Maner published by Authoritie of Q. Eliz. [Anon.]* (London, 1627).


Denison, Stephen, *The white Wolfe or, a Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, Feb. 11. 1627. and printed somewhat more largely then the Time would permit to deliver. Wherein Faction is unmasked. Especially, the Hetheringtonian Faction*
Dent, Arthur, A Sermon of Repentance...preached at Lee in Essex (London, 1627).

Donne, John, Devotions upon emergent occasions, and several Steps in my Sicknes. The third edition (London, 1627).


Harris, Paul, A briefe Confutation of certaine absurd, hereticall, and damnable Doctrines, delivered by James Usher, in a Sermon, June 20. 1624. By Paulus Veridicus (S. Omers, 1627).

Hart, John, The burning-Bush, not consumed: wherein, one may judge, whether he be the Childe of God, or not. Perused by J. D[yke?] ond divers other Divines (London, 1627).

Jackson, Thomas, A Treatise of the holy Catholike Faith and Church. Divided into three Bookes. The first Booke (London, 1627).
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L., S. P., One and forty divine Odes Englished, set to King Davids princely Harpe. (An assay, or Buchanan his Paraphrase on the first twentie Psalmes.) (London, 1627).


Malone, William, A Reply to Mr. James Ussher his Answere ([Douai?] 1627).


Maynwaring, Roger, Religion and Alegiance: in two Sermons preached before the Kings Maiestie: the one on the fourth of July, 1627. At Oatlands. The other on the 29. of July the same yeere, at Alderton (London, 1627).

Mornay, Philippe de, Three Meditations upon these three Places of Scripture: I Cor. 2.2. Psal. 6.1. Prov. 3.11,12. Tr. J. Bulteel (London, 1627).

Openshaw, Robert, Short Questions and Answeares, conteining the Summe of Christian Religion: newly enlarged with the Testimonies of Scripture (London, 1627).

Pagit, Eusebius, The Historie of the Bible, briefly collected by way of Question and Answer (London, 1627).


Rogers, John, The Doctrine of Faith, wherein are handled ten principall Points (London, 1627).

Rogers, Timothy, Good Newes from Heaven: or, Safe-conduct, discovering many Treasons against every ones Soule (London, 1627).

Rous, Francis, the elder, The onely Remedy, that can cure a People (London, 1627).

Sclater, William, the elder, An Exposition with Notes upon the first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians (London,
1627).

Sibthorp, Sir Christopher, A Surreplication to the Rejoynder of a Popish Adversarie (Dublin, 1627).


Smith, Richard, The Life of the most honourable and vertuous Lady the La. Magdalen viscountesse Montague. Written in Latin. And now tr. into English by C. F. [i.e. J. C. Fursdon.] ([St. Omer, 1627]).


Sydenham, Humphrey, Five Sermons preached upon severall Occasions (London, 1627).


Vicars, Thomas, [Greek word] The Sword-bearer. Or, the Byshop of Chichester's Armes emblazoned in a Sermon (London, 1627).

W., Ez., The Answere of a Mother unto hir seduced Sonnes Letter ([Amsterdam, 1627]).

Wall, John, Alae seraphicae the séraphins Wings to raise us unto Heaven. Delivered in six Sermons (London, 1627).

Wall, John, Evangelicall Spices, or, the Incense of the Gospell. Delivered in a Sermon (London, 1627).


Wren, Matthew, A Sermon preached before the Kings Majestie on Sunday the seventeenth of February last, at White-Hall. Printed by Command (Cambridge, 1627).
6. CONTROL OF RELIGIOUS PRINTING IN EARLY STUART ENGLAND: 1637

'Silver Tongue Sydenham' and Bishop Joseph Hall of Exeter were both Calvinist episcopalian. In 1626 and 1627 Humphrey Sydenham had published licensed sermons which not only defended the double decree of predestination but also warned against the threat from Arminians and Pelagians and specifically against the Appello Caesarem of Richard Montagu. Yet in licensed sermons of 1637 he can be seen defending the established church, with its archbishops and bishops, against attacks from some of the same men who had campaigned against Appello Caesarem. In his dedication to Archbishop Laud, Sydenham wrote: 'Witnes their divine Tragedies and impudent Appeales; their late Curranto's, and Legends of Ipswich, and since...Their Looking glasse for Lordly Prelates in which they have not so much wounded the particular Honours of eminent and learned men, as strucke through the sides of Religion it selfe.... A Generall Harmony, as well in Doctrine, as in Discipline is yet wanting in the publike practice of our Church, though not in the Principles thereof; which is the maine Anvile most of my Sermons hammer on...'.

Joseph Hall also appeared at times to bend over backwards to curry favour with the regime in the 1630s. In a treatise licensed and entered in the Stationers' Registers on 11 October 1637, he wrote: 'Bold men! What do we begin at Gods eternall decree of our election, and thence descend to the effects of it in our effectuall calling, in our lively and stedfast faith,...in our unfaileable perseverance; This course is saucily preposterous; What have wee to do to be rifling the hidden counsells of the Highest; Let us look to our owne wayes. Wee have his word for this; that if wee do truly beleev, repent, obey, persevere, wee shall bee saved...'. However, when dealing with these issues in the changed environment of 1646, Hall was less inhibited about examining such hidden counsels. 'Lo, first our calling, then
our election. Not that we should begin with heaven, and thence descend to the earth: it is enough for the angels on that celestial ladder of Jacob to both descend and ascend; but that we should from earth ascend to heaven; from our calling to our election; as knowing that God shows what he hath done for us above by that which he hath wrought in us here below....By thy calling therefore, mayest thou judge of thine election. God never works in vain: neither doth he ever cast away his saving graces, whatever become of the common. But, whom he did predestinate, them also he called; and whom he called, them he justified; and whom he justified, them also he glorified'.

Sydenham and Hall reflected the religious climate of 1637, a climate which demanded conformity to the current principles and practices of the Church of England. By that year two major characteristics of Caroline England were well in place: Charles I had ruled without the assistance of a parliament since 1629, and William Laud had risen to the top of the English religious hierarchy - first as bishop of London in July 1628 and then as archbishop of Canterbury in September 1633. The collaboration of these two men helped to fashion the relationship of church and state. Each contributed to a series of actions in the decade between the sample years of 1627 and 1637, actions designed to tighten control over the religious press.

By mid 1628 the king was eager for parliamentary supply at the same time that some members of parliament were increasingly discouraged by the tenor of licensed works of men such as John Cosin and Roger Maynwaring. As a conciliatory gesture, Charles issued a proclamation on 24 June 1628 which called in and suppressed the Maynwaring sermons. This move, however, did not obscure the fact that the very next month Maynwaring was pardoned and amply rewarded. In addition, in November 1628 a royal Declaration was prefixed to the republished Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion; this prefix was designed to silence religious
disputes. It stated 'That the Articles of the Church of England...do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God's Word...which to that end we command to be new printed, and this our declaration to be published therewith....That therefore...we will, that all further curious search be laid aside....And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way...and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense'.

The importance of the Declaration is incontrovertible, but assumptions about its genesis and impact differ. Assistance in the compilation has been attributed to both William Laud and George Abbot. Kevin Sharpe, simply citing Peter Heylyn, suggests that Laud aided the king with the Declaration, although Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake specify that one reason Abbot had his sequestration lifted was to help in compiling this royal Declaration. Contemporary accounts indicate that the Declaration resulted from a meeting of bishops held at Lambeth about the current religious controversies and 'maintaining the true [faith] against the errors lately crept into the church'.

It might appear that the motivation behind the royal Declaration was to silence all sides. This had also been the presumed purpose for the proclamation of peace and quiet in the church which had caused so much disquiet among Calvinists of all stripes. This proclamation had been blamed in 1628 in a parliamentary remonstrance against the duke of Buckingham: 'restraint of orthodox books is made under color of your Majesty's formerly mentioned proclamation, the intent and meaning whereof we know was quite contrary'. It was in this same climate, in February 1629, that a number of booksellers and printers delivered a petition to parliament 'in complaint of the restraint of books written against Popery and Arminians, and the contrary allowed of by the only means of the Bishop of London...and that the licensing of books is now
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only restrained to the Bishop of London and his chaplains'. Even though Archbishop Abbot as late as 1632 reported to Charles I that 'of Arminian points there is no dispute', in truth it penalized those Calvinists who previously had been free to discuss issues of doctrine. As Lake and Fincham say: 'Yet the practical application of the terms of the Declaration inevitably depended on the theological presuppositions of the interpreter, so that anti-Calvinist assumptions did colour the enforcement of the Declaration at court. Charles and Laud were happy to hear views which fitted their own understanding of what was fair and reasonable'. Or, put another way by William Lamont: 'Here was the paradox: by declaring, in effect, predestination as a "no-go area", Laud and his associates achieved the same effect as if they had flooded the market in the 1630s with Arminian apologetics'.

Philip Olander stresses the importance of this Declaration, along with the Elizabethan Injunctions and the Star Chamber Decree of 1586, as authority for High Commission proceedings against printers. In its 1629 prosecutions of various stationers, the High Commission charged defendants with breach of the Declaration and with publication of unlicensed books.³

As an act of good faith, the king designated the Appello Caesarem the original cause of all these disputes and suppressed it by proclamation on 17 January 1629; he had already consoled its author with the bishopric of Chichester.⁶ After the dissolution of parliament in March 1629, Laud, possibly with the collaboration of Samuel Harsnett, drafted for the king 'Considerations for the better settling of the church-government'. Here the provisions for restraining lecturers who 'are the People's Creatures, and blow the Bellows of their Sedition' were especially uncompromising. A version of these considerations was adopted and sent by the king to the archbishops. The resulting 'royal instructions' were designed to curb the clergy in general and the lecturers in particular. Every lecturer was to read divine service
according to the liturgy printed by authority, in his surplice and hood, before the lecture; even a corporation could not allow a lecturer to preach unless he was willing to take a benefice or cure. The emphasis was to be on prayer and catechizing rather than sermons. Missing from the instructions was a section at the end of the original considerations: 'A consideration also to be had, 1. As to the general Feoffees for Benefices and Preferments. 2. A new authorising of Injunctions'.

Indeed, letters from Laud to Viscount Dorchester in late 1629/ early 1630 reveal that the former participated in a scheme to revive the Elizabethan Injunctions of 1559. Injunction 51 had provided one of the basic foundations for the regulation of printing. A surviving manuscript collated the Injunctions with the Canons of 1604; it is dated 12 December 1629. The paragraph dealing with Injunction 51 stated that in the printing of books and the manner of licensing them to be printed, there was no canon; therefore this injunction was most necessary to be revived with some additions thereto. The idea that one could achieve uniformity and control of the press through more effective use of licensers or correctors had a considerable pre-history. Recent examples had included an attempt to prevent libels and books by religious extremists from circulating. Thus John Williams wrote to Conway on 15 February 1623/4 suggesting that the name of the licenser should be printed upon the first page of each book, and that even buyers should be punished in Star Chamber. Secondly, in a letter of 31 January 1625 to John Cosin, Richard Montagu referred to a hypothetical 'College of Enquisitors you told me of not long since, that must be for surveiwing books. But when?'.

As bishop of London, Laud now held a major responsibility for licensing the books to be printed there. Over the next few years he tightened the reins in London diocese, the diocese which encompassed the membership of the Stationers' Company. On 23 November 1630 the bishop of London
reminded stationers that every printer should set his name to every book he printed, yet none could do this until he was a master printer allowed according to the Star Chamber decree. The level of attempted control rose higher in January 1632: an entry in the records of the court of the Stationers' Company conveyed Laud's demand that every book licensed under his auspices (by him or his chaplains) should display proof in an imprimatur printed in the book. Printers were given the order that 'noe bookes (licensed by my Lord Bp: of London) should be printed by any printer whatsoever without the License printed with the booke'.

Likewise there were salvos from the Privy Council which demonstrated a desire to restrain disorderly bookselling and printing. On 14 July 1630 the Council issued a warrant on behalf of Robert Barker, king's printer, who had claimed that English Bibles, liturgies, and other church books belonging to him by charter, were being illegally imported. These books were also described as 'corrupting of the Text and fostering of heresies, and other great abuses in no sorte to be tolerated...'. The king's officers were instructed to seize such books. This was one skirmish in the on-going struggle between royal authorities and book smugglers. The government also attempted to censor news from abroad. On 17 October 1632 the regime sought to curtail discussions about foreign news and the continental religious wars when 'Stationers, Printers and Booke Sellers were prohibited by a Star Chamber decree from printing and publishing the ordinary Gazetts and Pamphletts of newes from forraigne partes'.

William Laud moved to Lambeth in September 1633. Since his protege William Juxon was able to succeed him in London, Laud had then managed to place trusted followers (including Juxon's chaplains Samuel Baker and Thomas Weekes) in key positions for licensing ecclesiastical works. Laud was consolidating his position on numerous fronts. Late in 1633 a letter originally drafted by Laud was sent to the inns of court urging 'that the preachers in those houses be both
conformable men and very well grounded in their professions'. On the overseas front Laud was able, through the cooperation of Sir William Boswell, ambassador to Holland, to embark on a campaign to eradicate nonconformist preaching from the Merchant Adventurer and military chaplaincies. Orders in Council were passed that October to bring English churches in the Netherlands into conformity with the liturgy and discipline of the Church of England. English churches in the Dutch Netherlands up until that time had been a hotbed of unchecked puritanism and English puritan presses.

Laud's heightened capacity for intervention in press affairs was nowhere more evident than in the activities of his Dean of the Arches, John Lambe; the state papers contain various documents pertaining to printing, addressed to Lambe and annotated by him. He was involved in an investigation of the printing industry between 1635 and 1637. 'Certainly from 1634 or 1635 Lambe was giving serious attention to stationers' affairs. Recognizing that more effective control of the press depended on, among other things, a reduction in the number of printers, he seems to have concentrated his efforts on determining the number of printers who were operating presses in London in the 1630's'. However, much of the perceived disorder was due to the rampant smuggling of books which had been printed abroad. One contemporary account, a letter of 21 April 1637 from Viscount Conway and Kilulta to Sir Robert Harley, described a situation which was not just fluid, but was actually in disarray. 'There will be no warre [between France and us for the recovery of the Palatinate] but betwene the Bishops and the Puritans which growes very hot by bookees written by Bastweeke and Burton and somme other namelesse men, the Bishop of Lincolne being becomme an auxiliary by an answear of his, as is supposed, to The Coale from the Altar. There is yet another booke comme out entituled The Christian Altar [by John Pocklington]; and yesterday was a booke burned [by Francis de Sales], it was a translation and conteined many Popish pointes; it was
licensed by Heywood, complained on by the Archbishop'. The writings alluded to in Conway's colourful account are a few of the forty seven earliest extant editions which fall into this sampling of religious printing in 1637.

The puritan books on Conway's list combined with other titles of high notoriety to illustrate the need for stricter and more consistent regulation if the government was to check the spread of unacceptable ideas. After a trial in Star Chamber, on 14 June 1637 the doctor John Bastwick, the minister Henry Burton, and the lawyer William Prynne were censured for libels against the hierarchy of the church and were sentenced. The background work done on the printing industry by John Lambe and the need to prevent additional cases such as those involving the puritan triumvirate and John Williams coalesced in mid-1637 with the passage of two measures: a proclamation to grant the High Commission legal powers of enforcement and a Star Chamber decree concerning printing.

Anti-episcopal libels had accused the bishops of usurping the royal prerogative by proceeding in High Commission and other episcopal courts without first receiving the required letters patent under the great seal. Royal judges met and on 1 July certified that 'Processes may issue out of the Ecclesiasticall Courts in the name of the Bishops; And that a Patent under the great Seale is not necessary for the keeping of the said Ecclesiasticall Courts, or for the enabling of Citations, Suspensions, Excommunications, and other censures of the Church'. This ruling was proclaimed to the nation on 18 August 1637. What had previously been accomplished on an ad-hoc basis of statutes, decrees, proclamations, injunctions, declarations, ordinances, and letters patent was consolidated in a Star Chamber decree concerning printing on 11 July 1637. This decree utilized the prerogative powers of the monarchy, the enforcement capabilities of the Court of High Commission, and the cooperation of the Stationers' Company to enact stricter
regulations and stricter methods of enforcement. There were, however, some novel elements in the decree.

The decree was designed to close well known loopholes by insisting that, in addition to books, all titles, epistles, prefaces, dedications (and other things annexed) must also be lawfully licensed, and all publications must first be entered into the Registers Booke of the Company of Stationers [article 2]. There had been only ambiguous requirements for entrance previous to this. Article 11 was comprehensive in banning the import of any books in English, not just those with unacceptable subjects. Article 24 introduced corporal punishment for anyone involved in an illegal press. For religious works the most important innovation in the decree was article 18 wherein it was stated that all reprints, even those formerly printed with licence, must be reviewed, and a new license obtained. This struck at the heart of the printing industry as reprints supplied a constant source of income and had not been previously regulated.

The proclamation, trial, and decree of summer 1637 were not the only establishment responses to threats from men such as Bastwick, Burton, Prynne, and Williams: in addition apologists for the government published defences against these men. Peter Heylyn, William Laud, and Christopher Dow all had works licensed and entered in the Stationers' Registers within days of the Star Chamber trial. These first editions by Heylyn and Laud fall within the parameters of the sampling for 1637; that by Dow has been included in the study to help complete the picture. Peter Heylyn had become one of the king's chaplains in 1630. His promotion of the various religious reforms of Charles and Laud continued until his death in 1662. In 1633 he had contributed to the case against William Prynne's Histriomastix and to the move against the feoffees for impropriations; in 1636 he published both a book about the sabbath to rebut puritan sabbatarian views on the subject and a pamphlet in the altar controversy which aimed to discredit Bishop Williams. The eulogistic biography which
he wrote in later life remains the most complete contemporary source for the life of William Laud. A briefe and moderate Answer was composed by Heylyn in response to writings of Henry Burton — writings which had been published in Amsterdam or secretly in England and had been listed as one of five charges in the Star Chamber trial. A briefe Answer contained an imprimatur and was properly entered in the Stationers' Registers. Although the sermons of Burton which had been delivered in observance of the Gunpowder Plot were named in Heylyn's title, the fact that the official service book wording for 5 November sermons had been altered in a controversial way was just one part of the extensive terrain covered by Burton and defended by Heylyn.

Heylyn had been commanded by authority to return an answer to the challenges of Burton because the anonymous News from Ipswich and other libels were seen to have derived from Burton's writings. Burton had contributed to the literature which claimed that the king's power was being expropriated by the bishops, who in turn were acting without special letters patent. Burton's plea for freedom for lecturers and faithful ministers elicited such responses from Heylyn as: 'And certainly this plea of conscience, is the most dangerous buckler against authoritie, which in these latter ages hath beene taken up'. Or, 'Such faithfull ministers of the Gospell as you and yours, must bee suppressed, or else there never will be peace and unitie in the Citie of God'. Heylyn reverted to arguments of adiaphora when stating that the church had power to decree rites and ceremonies or to make laws and canons to enforce conformity. 'And if it please his Majesty with the advice of his Commissioners or Metropolitane, to ordaine new ceremonies...I know no remedy either in Law or conscience, but that you must submit unto them'. One strange convention of these religious controversies was to repeat the arguments of the opponent; thus ironically Heylyn gave exposure to the very doctrines which had been banned in theory by various regulations. In
the section where Heylyn defended the government against charges of printing irregularities, he either claimed that controversial books such as the *Historical Narration* had been called in or he pronounced books such as the writings of Doctor Jackson and the private devotions of Doctor Cosin to be unexceptionable. Even in the mid-1630's there was clearly still potential interest in the topic of the double decree of predestination because it surfaced in this work of Heylyn to the extent that he sought to outlaw such discussions. Heylyn defended King James's Declaration `inhibiting young Ministers to preach of the doctrines of election and reprobation, and that none but Bishops and Deanes should handle those points'. When Heylyn shifted to the Declaration before the Thirty-Nine Articles, he wrote of the problems caused by such disputes. 'Because, say you, "it was no part of his Majesties meaning to prohibit Ministers, to Preach of the saving Doctrines of Grace and Salvation, without the which, the very Gospel is destroyed, the ministery of the Gospel overthrowne, and nothing but orations of moralitie to be taught the people." And doth the whole ministerie of the Gospel, the saving doctrines of Grace and Salvation, depend alone upon those difficult and dangerous points of Gods secret counsells?....Unlesse wee must be taught, that the greatest part of mankind, is cast off for ever, without any regard had to their sinnes, and all the promises of the Gospel made unto them of none effect?...unlesse wee vexe poore people with the noise of doubtfull disputations, which Saint Paul prohibited?' 19 Thus by defending the regime's need to suppress such discussions, Heylyn was at the same time violating the Declaration as he reported both sides of the arguments and, moreover, he took an anti-Calvinist side.

Archbishop Laud was present and delivered a speech at the censure of Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne on 14 June. It was published immediately afterwards, with an entry in the registers, dated 1 July 1637, which named himself as the licenser. Dedicating the book to King Charles, Laud praised
the king for leniency; he claimed that the accused in another
court might have lost their lives for stirring mutiny and
sedition. Laud began with the pronouncement that all he had
done as a prelate was for the good government and honour of
the church. He instanced his emphasis on order, on the
upholding of the worship of God, and on settling the church
to the rules of its first reformation for causing this
'malicious storm'. Arguing that 'Iure Divino' claims for the
episcopate took nothing from the king's right, Laud
maintained that '...no man can Libell against our
Calling...bee it in Pulpit, print, or otherwise, but hee
Libels against the King and the State, by whose Lawes wee are
established'. Of the fourteen 'innovations' defended by Laud,
seven were charges abstracted from the News from Ipswich.
Like Heylyn who relied on the Elizabethan Injunctions, the
Thirty-Nine Articles, Bishop Jewell, and Jacobean canons to
buttress his arguments, Laud also strove to show precedents
and to belie the charge that the reforms were innovations. He
concentrated much of his effort on dealing with the 'placing
of the holy table altar-wise, at the upper end of the
chancel, and placing a rail before it'. Laud depended on
proof from injunction and canon and from practice, and then
quoted the Calvinist episcopalian John Davenant to confirm
his own position. A publication which Laud criticized in this
section was the supposedly anonymous Holy Table, which he
said had ruled on the name and placing of the holy table
without a proper investigation of the rituals nor of the
church fathers. '...I am fully of opinion, this Booke was
thrust now to the Presse, both to countenance these
Libellers, and as much as in him lay, to fire both Church and
State. And though I wonder not at the Minister, yet I should
wonder at the Bishop of the Diocesse [i.e. Bishop Williams as
licenser and in fact also author] (a man of learning and
experience) that he should give Testimony to such a
businesse, and in such times as these'. 20

Laud concluded with the promise that other charges of
'innovations' belonging to matters of doctrine would presently be answered. Peter Heylyn, whose book has already been discussed, and Christopher Dow, who is not actually in this sampling, received a commission to respond to Henry Burton and accomplished what Laud had promised. In his eagerness to go to press, Dow had his writing ready 'at the beginning of Easter Term last, at which time it was expected that M. B. and his Confederates would have had their censure'. Instead he had to wait until 17 June, when it was licensed by Samuel Baker; Dow's *Innovations Unjustly Charged* was entered two days later.

Dow answered Burton's *Apology* by defending the alleged innovations charged upon the church and state. These innovations included a relaxed doctrine of the sabbath, ceremonial and altar practices, and an emphasis on the sacraments. Burton had claimed that godly people were now being persecuted, 'that whereas of old, the censures of the Church were to be inflicted upon disordered and vicious persons, notorious livers, as drunkards, adulterers, &c. Now the sharpe edge thereof is mainly turned against Gods people, and Ministers; even for their vertue and piety, etc'. Dow blamed carelessness for the neglect of customs which derived from the ancient church, customs which had been retained in cathedrals, royal chapels and many parochial churches. He upheld the establishment policy: 'custome not contrary to Law, or good reason hath ever obtained the force of a law: and in things of this nature, the pious customes of Gods people...are to be held for lawes. And being so, must (or at least may lawfully) be observed till some law expressly cry them downe: which I am sure the Common-prayer-book, nor any Statute yet hath done'. A dialogue between Burton and Dow was included to settle the issue of predestination. [Burton:] '...there is not one Minister almost among a thousand, that dare clearely preach of these most comfortable doctrines [of absolute election and reprobation] and so soundly and roundly confute the Arminian heresie'. [Dow] 'And blessed be God that
there are so few that dare; and I wish that Mr. B. and those others that have dared, would have shewed more obedience to his Majesty. As for the comfortableness of that doctrine, as they teach it, let the poore tormented consciences speake, which have by it beene affrighted and driven to desperation....Neither is that...true Christian zeale (but a distempered heat of a contentious spirit) that shall come between, and make an interruption. And if (as hee confesseth) Puritans and Calvinists be such men; no matter if they had no place either in Synode or Church of England'.  

In this rejoinder to Henry Burton, Christopher Dow adopted a clearly anti-Calvinist stance. Apparent in both his and Peter Heylyn's works was a rooted hostility when it came to the absolute decree of predestination: they sought to curtail all discussions on the subject while portraying Calvinists in a very unflattering light. Whether this opposition came from a belief in the role of spiritual free will or from a sincere fear of the divisiveness of deliberations, such a prohibition was a dominant policy during the personal rule. These three first editions were all included in the list of books contributing to the 'total corruption and subversion of religion' which William Prynne compiled for the trial of William Laud. However not everything was reactive: denial of the freedom to discuss the double decree of predestination and justifications for the alleged innovations creeping into the church were not all that was emerging from the religious press during this period of Laudian control. There was also an initiative, an acceleration in the number of writings which attempted to explain the authority behind preferred practices. The following six first editions, all published with license in 1637, were part of that movement; they dealt with themes popular with the leadership of the English church during the Laudian era.

Peter Lake has recently written much about these themes - summarized as 'the beauty of holiness'. Lake thinks that at
times those in the Laudian 'avant garde' went beyond the traditional conformist arguments of adiaphora to support their emphasis on the material fabric of the church, uniform ceremony, bodily reverence, public prayer, and the sacraments. When possible they sought additional authority by reaching to the Old and New Testaments or even to immemorial and apostolic custom. 'Thus, the initial drive toward the beauty of holiness was legitimated with a traditional rhetoric of conformity, which precisely because it was familiar...was less likely to alarm and alienate non-Laudian members of the church....Meanwhile, on the leading edge of Laudian opinion, arguments were being used that cast the whole Laudian project in an altogether less familiar light'.

Written relatively late in the decade, these avant-garde works were clearly taking the offensive; some are part of this sampling. Books by Richard Tedder, Thomas Lawrence, and John Yates were characteristic of the new accent on rites and ceremonies and the exalted role of priests, those by Joseph Mede and John Pocklington were part of the altar controversy, and the sermon on confession by Anthony Sparrow stands out as being especially provocative. The Norfolk sermon preached by Richard Tedder at the primary visitation of Matthew Wren in June 1636 has been used by Kenneth Fincham to identify Tedder as one of the 'fervent clerical supporters of the new order'. Tedder also appears numerous times in Peter Lake's writings on the beauty of holiness. Although delivered in June 1636, this sermon, according to the imprimatur, was not licensed by Samuel Baker until 6 February 1636/37 and was entered two days later. It contained a dedication to Matthew Wren and a preface with a spirited defence of episcopacy. 'It is the Prelates part to see to Discipline,...which otherwise would come to no birth, but dye abortive. They strike at the very foundation of the Church, that speak against the Hierarchy of Bishops:....'. Tedder declared the superiority of public prayer over the potential discord of preaching. 'It is Common
prayer, that hath obtained the name of the service of God, as if that were the summe of all Religion....and never was it [religion] brought into such a consumption, as when raw and extemporary preaching came into the roome of it; for thence came factions, schismses, and perturbations of the Churches peace'. Included in his sermon was an attack on those who had caused impropriations to be alienated from the church and tithes to be withheld. 'The Priest robs the people by not affording them the Divine Service, as the people doth the Priest by not paying him the Tithes'. Dominant in Tedder's book was a stress on prayer and ceremonies in the house of God. 'No Religion was ever without Ceremonies; all nations...used their Rites and Ceremonies in the time of Worship, all meeting in this, as a naturall principle, that Divine worship cannot bee rightly performed without an outward solemnity'.

As chaplain to King Charles, Thomas Lawrence preached at Whitehall on 7 February 1637; the sermon was entered in the Stationers' Registers exactly one month later, with John Oliver named as licenser. This book does not contain an imprimatur, but the titlepage stated that it was published by the king's special command. Lawrence underscored the importance of separating the holy and the profane, the priest and the layman. 'God afterwards designes Moses to the employment of a Priest, that was before a ruler of the people; and to shew the neerenesse of his person, gives him a neerenesse of place: there is one stand for the Layity, another for the Clergy...'. In reference to the solemnity of services in the church, Lawrence wrote: '...enter with reverence, as in the presence of God; for he that prays, as if God were not here, when he hath prayed, shall finde him no where.... Enter by the humiliation of our soules, and enter with the prostration of our bodies; because as this, without that, is a dead oblation, so that, without this, is a maimed one'.

Also licensed by Oliver, this time with an imprimatur
dated 15 June 1637, the treatise by John Yates on the honour of God's house likewise defined some policies of the regime. Yates appealed to the right of national churches to determine the forms for gestures of reverence and for all to adhere to conformity in following the ways of the Apostles. 'But the Ceremony before the Throne...is left us by the example of Elders and Angels: the manner whereof wee know not exactly, and therefore it is wholly left to the Church to prescribe the forme'. Yates stated: 'I see no error to conclude as I have done, that the holy Table is God's Throne first to signify his Majestie as being the Sanctuary and most holy place in the Church where it standeth'. And, in a later chapter 'Contayning an exhortation to constancie in the Doctrine, Fellowship, Sacraments, and Prayers of the Church', Yates wrote, 'He that will not be an Heretick and denye the truth, must continue stedfast in the Apostles doctrine, & he that wil not be a Schismatick...must keepe himselfe in the communion of the Apostles, that he may be partaker of the Altar and Prayers of the Church'.

One of the liveliest issues within the English church was that known as the 'altar controversy'. Already discussed in some of the previous pieces, it was also treated in two other books in this sampling - books by Joseph Mede and John Pocklington. Joseph Mede was primarily a scholar, rather than a polemicist, and his contribution was almost tangential to the real altar problem. However he described his book as an attempt to settle men's minds and 'conduce' to peace. The Name Altar had the proper imprimatur showing that William Bray had granted a license on 17 Calen. June [i.e. 16 May] 1637; it had an 11 June entry in the Stationers' Registers. Mede had delivered his discourse two years earlier. His concern was with the name 'altar', not with its position within the church. Mede's research led him to conclude that the term 'altar' was no less ancient in Christianity than that of the holy table. As a result, Mede did not discredit those who wanted 'altar' to be the preferred term. 'But this
is the true difference, that a Table is a common Name, and an ALTAR is an Holy Table. This Holy Altar ...whereat we stand, is by nature a common stone, nothing differing from other states - but being consecrated to the service of God, and having received the benediction, it is...an HOLY TABLE, an ALTAR inviolable'.

John Pocklington in 1637 published two editions of Altare Christianum: the first, entered 7 March 1637, was directed at the author of the letter which ordered the destruction of the altar created by the Vicar of Grantham - a letter defending Bishop Williams's judgement in 1627 which had recently been printed at the end of Peter Heylyn's Coale from the Altar; the second edition of Pocklington's title was enlarged and included a rejoinder to Bishop Williams's recently published Holy Table. Both editions contained the same imprimatur, that issued by William Bray on 21 February 1636/37. Although the exact month within 1637 that the enlarged edition was released is not known, if it was later than 11 July, it was done in contradiction of the provision in the Star Chamber decree concerning relicensing of reprints. Laud's own account of his trial, William Prynne's account, and the account provided by the clerk in the House of Lords all attest to the fact that Pocklington's writings were perceived to have had damaging effects on contemporary readers. The licenser Thomas Bray was forced to recant in a sermon in April 1641 and to 'disapprove' many parts of Altare Christianum. At Laud's trial, the accusations against Pocklington included charges of advocating auricular confession, popish penance, transubstantiation, and eagerness to reconcile with Rome. Topics handled in this treatise also went beyond the altar policy; this work epitomized writings on the 'beauty of holiness'. In Pocklington's claim to apostolic succession he issued the challenge: 'Let Heretickes shew that they had an Apostle for the Author of their doctrine, or some Apostolike man whom they doe succeed....I would faine see Hereticks to set their heads to devise such a
pedigree'. This passage was later used by Prynne to prove that Pocklington put traditions above the word; in the House of Lords's account it was said to demonstrate that Pocklington claimed a Roman pedigree for the church. Bray later denounced this section. Peter McCullough has noted a special relationship between the publisher of this work, Richard Badger, and Laud, terming the former 'Laud's house stationer'. For example, during...1637 alone Badger printed and sold Laud's speech at the censure of Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne, Thomas Lawrence's court sermon on holiness and order, Francis White's anti-sabbatarian response to Henry Burton, and John Pocklington's notorious defence of altars'.

Because of his advocacy of auricular confession, Anthony Sparrow of Queen's College Cambridge was a divine who appeared to flirt with popery; others, such as John Overall in visitation articles for Norwich diocese in 1619, had touched on the practice of private confession, but in ways perceived as less extreme. Although questioned about his sermon at Cambridge by the vice-chancellor Ralph Brownrig in July 1637, Sparrow had his case dismissed a month later. The book form of the sermon was entered in the Stationers' Registers on 13 July 1637 and licensed by Samuel Baker, although the book lacked an actual imprimatur. Prynne reported that by acquiring a license in London from Juxon's chaplain, Sparrow was able to prevail over his Cambridge critics. When possible Sparrow invoked scriptural evidence for his beliefs. His language was clear. 'He that would be sure of pardon, let him seeke out a Priest, and make his humble confession to him; for God, who alone hath the prime and originall right of forgiving sinnes, hath delegated the Priests his Judges here on earth, and given them the power of absolution....He then that assents to the Church of England, or beleeves the Scriptures, or gives credit to the ancient Fathers, cannot deny the Priest the power of remitting sinnes: and since he can in the name of God forgive us our
sins, good reason we should make our confession to him'.

Although licensed by different chaplains, two Catholic works were actually entered in the Stationers' Registers on 4 February 1637. Even though published in English earlier, those previous translations of Francis de Sales and Johann Justus Landsberger had bucked the system by being printed abroad or secretly in England. A partial exception was in the case of de Sales's Introduction to a Devout Life which had also been produced in a highly expurgated version, with evidence of many cancelled leaves, in London in 1616. A single copy of that bowdlerized edition, now at the Folger Library, includes an additional three leaves of presentation epistle from the bookseller, William Burre, to his kinswomen. While seeking to explain his motivation, Burre wrote: 'The Authour, how ever hee may relish other Positives, it is brought to bee conformable to the true faith we professe: not that we want of our owne, that we need borrow anything from them, but that they may understand that wee refuse nothing from them which is sound and undefiled...I could wish they would hold the like quarter with us'. The surreptitious, English editions of A Devout Life were based on the translation by John Yaxley, possibly an English clergyman educated at Douai (publication site of the first edition of a 'Yaxley' translation) who was a chaplain in the cathedral of Cambrai in 1624. Neither of the books by Francis de Sales nor Johann Justus Landsberger had appeared in their entirety with legal imprints; they were no doubt put through the system in 1637 for respectability by William Brookes, a publisher who seemed interested in dispersing books with appeal to a Catholic audience. The Introduction to a Devout Life acquired a license from William Haywood on 27 November 1636 and was entered on 4 February 1637, even though the expurgated version had been allowed in 1616 and had been properly assigned to W. Brookes on 16 May 1636. In truth because this version was larger and more provocative than the earlier printing, it is correct to treat it as a first
edition. It was complained of in Star Chamber soon after publication and called in to be burned 14 May 1637. Accounts are so conflicting that it is almost impossible to reconstruct an accurate scenario for the licensing of this book. The order of the king in the state papers for 7 May blamed the 'author, translator, and stationer' for having reinserted the popish parts after the licenser had excised them. The proclamation itself eliminated the 'author' as co-conspirator. Although the stationer who was punished for this book was the printer Nicholas Okes, the ambiguous term 'stationer' could have applied as easily to William Brookes; the coincidence that he also published the following Catholic book gives his guilt a certain plausibility. Prynne gave credence to the Okes faction which always maintained that it was Haywood who had insisted on retaining the popish parts. Haywood's licensing career ceased with this proclamation, which suggests that Laud did not view him as blameless.

Two sections included in the 1637 translation which were excluded in the earlier London edition were: How we ought to be present at divine service and how we must honour God's holy saints. In the former section, de Sales wrote of the 'soveraigne oblation of the Sacrament of the sacred body & precious blood of our Savious [sic] Christ Jesus, the very center of Christian religion'; in the latter of 'the holy soules of the Saints in heaven, in company of the blessed Angels...they likewise doe good offices, and helpe to assist us by their sacred intercessions'. The Virgin Mary was also honoured in this section.

Whether this book was part of the ecumenical initiative for reunion with Rome and, in spite of all legal precautions, still met with such a storm of resistance that the government backed down, or whether it was a case of tampering through stationers or licensers, it, along with the Epistle, dramatized the gradual shift by 1637 in the type of religious opinions which were allowed by the system. Often coupled with the Introduction was An Epistle...to every faithfull Soul,
authored by Johann Justus Landsberger. In Laud's trial, the latter followed the former in the list of charges against the archbishop. Laud shrugged off the Epistle as having nothing to do with him or his chaplains; it was licensed by Weekes, chaplain to the bishop of London. The account of the trial by the clerk in the house of Lords confirmed that both books had been entered on the same day and that the Epistle contained many popish passages; it was cited in particular for its stand on purgatory. 

Of the first editions sampled so far, only that written by Joseph Mede was not on Prynne's list of offensive books. Of the fifteen separate works listed by Prynne as subversive titles published in 1637, nine (Heylyn, Laud, Tedder, Lawrence, Yates, Pocklington, Sparrow, de Sales, Landsberger) have fallen into this survey and a tenth, Dow's Innovations, has been discussed. It is curious that the only extant edition of one title by the king's chaplain, Thomas Jackson, was not included in this section of Prynne. This is a work which clearly exhibited a disagreement with the double decree of predestination.

To a certain degree Jackson had become the standard bearer for the Arminian view of salvation after Richard Montagu had fallen silent. Even Peter White, one who has played down the role of Arminianism in the 1630s, allows that 'the only cleric against whom charges of doctrinal Arminianism might have carried weight was Thomas Jackson'. Although Jackson's works are covered in another chapter, one of them does fall into this survey. Printed at Oxford, the component parts of Diverse Sermons had been delivered earlier, some of them in Newcastle, and the appended treatise was borrowed from a larger treatise written during 'younger years'. Jackson claimed he had not had the leisure nor the opportunity to publish any of this before 1637, but of course it may also have been true that the material would not have been allowed earlier. Jackson included criticisms of lecturers and corporations which harbored such 'hireling
shepheards', but of main import was his questioning of unconditional election. 'For if God had manifested himself unto them them [sic] to no other intent than they might be without excuse, they had a better excuse in readinesse then any of the reprobate or damned shall finde, at the day of Judgement. None of them shall be then able to deny either the receipt of a talent, or the receipt of it to some better intent or end, then to leave them without excuse'. One of his tactics was to point out the mercy of God towards those in England and his 'severity towards our brethren professors of reformed religion in neighbour nations, whom he hath of late subiected to the enemies sword....for no man can suspect those foraine Churches...were deeply guilty either of connivance to superstition, or to much favouring Arminianisme'.

The following four books, written by Francis White, James Buck, John Squire, and Bartholomew Parsons, also contributed to the propaganda efforts of the regime; they contended against sabbatarians, lecturers, and improper impropiations, and for tithes and church beautification.

Francis White had been associating with anti-Calvinists since he resided in Lincoln under Richard Neile; in 1625 White agreed to license Montagu's Appello and again in 1626 he took their part at the York House Conference. For his services, by 1637 he had advanced to the bishopric of Ely. The king's insistence that the Book of Sports be reissued and read and observed had occasioned resistance. But it was virtually impossible to publish legitimate defences of sabbatarianism. Theophilus Brabourne and Henry Burton had had their sabbatarian tracts published in Holland. Francis White answered both of these: the response to Burton's criticism of White is included in this survey. Once again White bent the normal licensing rules, this time by acting as licenser himself.

Here again Henry Burton achieved a public viewing of his writing as White repeated much in order to refute it. White
accomplished his stated purpose by defending the regime's policy regarding the sabbath: 'There is no Divine Law extant in the old, or in the New Testament, prohibiting all secular labour, and all bodily exercise, and honest recreation, upon some part of the LORD'S-day'. However this pamphlet war between Burton and White also involved predestinarian doctrine. Because he had licensed the Appeal, White had been accused by Burton of subscribing to Montagu's Pelagian and Popish tenets and thus admitting the possibility of falling away from grace. In his own defence, White concluded 'It is evident by the former Positions of S. Augustine, that his constant and expresse Tenet in his Confutation of the Pelagians, was: That some persons really justified, might afterwards bee overcome by temptations and fall away from saving and justificant grace'.

Likewise, in a treatise on the Beatitudes, the Suffolk divine James Buck denigrated sabbatarians. 'Not to goe farre for instance, you see the judaizing sabbatarians and ridiculous pointers as more erroneous, exceed in pretence of sanctimony and zeale the hottest unconformitants'. There were also condemnations of lawyers or any laymen who presumed to teach skillfull church men and bishops about divinity and faith. Lecturers, raising doctrines of their own fancy, were reproached as were their audiences. Especially revealing was Buck's use of a quotation from the Catholic 'Lansperg', whom he described as a 'worthy writer of devotion'. The imprimatur in Buck's treatise was signed by Samual Baker and dated 28 March 1637; the entry was actually made earlier, on 9 March. Buck was to be accused of Arminianism and was included in 1643 in John White's survey of scandalous priests. There White cited Buck for beliefs in auricular confession, papal supremacy, transubstantiation, and universal grace.

The vicar of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, was another to be included in John White's survey; John Squire was there accused of favouring the king's popish subjects. His sermon
was preached at St. Paul's on 1 January 1637, licensed on 9 January, entered on 11 January, and published with an imprimatur signed by Samuel Baker—in sum, a model of proper procedure. Although delivered as a thanksgiving for the decreasing of the plague and dedicated to the Lord Mayor of London, this sermon contained evidence of his support for government policies. Squire stressed prayer in preference to sermons, the need to beautify St. Paul's, and the dangerous implications of the News from Ipswich. He even went so far as to suggest that it would be an honour if St. Paul's be so beautified that it excell the 'Popish Laterane...or...any Cathedrall, in, or neere Christendeom'. A Rossingham newsletter dated 13 July 1637 affords us a revealing peek at Squire in his congregation. It recounted that the minister of Shoreditch had preached that they incurred damnation who thought well of the three delinquents [Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne]: 'this doctrine made divers goe out of the church, for the common people are extreamely compassionate towarde them'.

Bartholomew Parsons wrote about tithes in lay hands, part of the Laudian policy to improve the financial position of the clergy. Parson's work was produced by the Oxford press and thus needed no entry; however, the dedication to Sir William Dodington was dated 7 June 1637 by the author. Dodington was credited with restoring his impropriations to the church. Parsons reported that 3,895 out of 9,284 parish churches had been snatched away by impropriations. In his defence of church tithes, he was also reacting to 'the schismaticall and upstart generation of the Brownists [who] cry out...that Tithes are ceremonies; (an opinion of yesterday, scarclely [sic] devised an hundred years since) and therefore to be throwne headlong out of the Church of Christ, as well as all other ceremonies which Christ hath taken away and nailed to his cross'. Parsons invoked 'testimonies out of Fathers, Councels, Oecumenicall and provinciall, lawes Ecclesiasticall and Imperiall: all of them
acknowledging payment of Tithes to bee a morall duty, commanding them now to be paid to the Church'.

Arguments for the authority of the church and pleas for unity were legion in the heated atmosphere of 1637. Joseph Hall, Henry Leslie, Samuel Ward of Cambridge, Humphrey Sydenham, Joseph Henshaw, Thomas Drant and Samuel Page all contributed to this literature. Although the first four could be classed as Calvinist episcopalian, all seemed interested in the security of their own careers. In spite of their strict Calvinism at the onset of the Arminian ascendancy, Joseph Hall and Henry Leslie had been exceptions to the rule when in 1627 royal favour had fallen on them. In August Leslie was invited to preach before Charles; even though the sermon aired uncompromising predestinarian views, Leslie was not punished. In November Hall had been appointed bishop of Exeter, the first Calvinist to be so rewarded since York House.

The shifting emphasis in the published opinions of Joseph Hall has been discussed earlier. Both parts of The Remedy of Prophanenesse received imprimaturs signed by Baker on 11 October 1637, the same date as entry in the Stationers' Registers. Calvinist themes did appear in Hall's writing, but they were stated in a way acceptable to the regime. In section XVIII where he cautioned against rifling the hidden counsels of the highest, Hall concluded: 'What need we to look any farther, than conscionably and cheerfully to do what we are enjoined, and faithfully and comfortably to expect what he hath promised?...But if we, in a groundless conceit of an election, shall let loose the reins to our sinful desires and vicious practices, thereupon growing idle or unprofitable, we make divine mercy a pander to our uncleanness, and justly perish in our wicked presumption'. When William Prynne turned against the moderate bishops in 1641, he was especially critical of Bishop Hall; Hall's defence of episcopacy and other writings were included on Prynne's list of subversive books.
Henry Leslie, a Scot, spent most of his professional life in Ireland. Wentworth and his chaplain Bramhall had appeared on the Irish scene in 1633; one of their main religious objectives was to introduce the English Thirty-Nine Articles to Ireland. Leslie was the prolocutor of the lower house in the 1634 Irish Convocation, during which the strictly Calvinist Irish Articles were replaced by the less strict English ones. Bramhall became bishop of Derry in May 1634, and Leslie became bishop of Down and Conor in October 1635. Together in August 1636 they held a visitation, followed by a meeting in which certain puritan ministers were required publicly to accept various ceremonies, especially that of kneeling at communion. The treatise which Leslie published in Dublin in 1637 was based on a Belfast visitation sermon preached in August of the previous year. Printed by the Stationers' Society in Dublin, which operated under the patent of the king's printer in Ireland, and dedicated to Wentworth, this writing was both a polemic against presbyterians (strong in Ulster) and a treatise on the authority of the church, preaching that orders must be observed and laws obeyed. Leslie's argument for obedience appealed to the tradition of adiaphora: 'Thus have I proved...that the Church hath power in things Indifferent, to make Lawes, and appoint Orders to be observed, in the administration of Gods worship; And that obedience is due unto such Lawes; or if there be no certaine constitution, that the received custome of the Church hath the force of a Law'. Defending especially the need to kneel at communion, Leslie concluded: 'But ther is no Commandement for any gesture; And will any man lose the substance for the ceremony?...I beseech them to consider how to the disturbance of the churches peace, and great prejudice of their owne soule, they contest about trifles'. Leslie may have been a traditional Calvinist episcopalian in the 1620s, but he later became so identified with the enforcement of Laudian policies in Ireland that he was discredited.
Samuel Ward was a moderate Calvinist who held positions as master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge and Lady Margaret professor of divinity during the period of Laud's preeminence. His Latin work *Magnetis reductorium Theologicum Tropologicum*, which first appeared in print in 1637, had been licensed by Weekes with an imprimatur dated 5 June 1637; it was then entered on 12 June. Dedicated to King Charles, this work was later translated into English by the puritan M.P., Harbottle Grimston, and published in 1640.

In translation, the double message of this metaphorical piece by Ward can be seen. He condemned popery while also deploring the practice of exploring predestination. 'He [God] shewed the use of the Loadstone, to restore the light of his Gospell, to dispell the mists of Popery, to discover the deceits of Antichrist, to reforme his Church upon earth, and in conclusion to kindle again the light of his Word...'. 'How much more...unprosperously have the Schoole men employed their houres and endeavours in searching out, and declaring the causes of Gods election, and mans vocation....The mysteries of his Empire must bee reserved and left unto God, who will not suffer his servants, without punishment, to look so curiously into the Ark of his secrets....Predestination is an incomprehensible impenetrable depth, and bottomlesse pit...'. Ward was probably covering his attack on papists with an effort to curry favour with the regime. The passage of Humphrey Sydenham from outright Calvinism to judicious support for the Caroline religious program has also been charted earlier. Sydenham had to walk a tightrope as he was rector in Somerset, within the diocese of the Laudian William Piers. His *Sermons upon solemn Occasions* were collected and then entered in the *Stationers' Registers* on 12 December 1637. The imprimatur was signed by Weekes and appeared at the end of the last sermon, but it was dated earlier, 10 July 1637. These sermons signaled outrage at those who caused trouble in the church and meddled with the mysteries of religion. 'Those vaine-glorious opinions of merit and
perfection here are but the dreams, or delusions rather of two opposite and wayward Sisters, Popery and Puritanisme'. Sydenham applauded the stricter observance of ceremonies and of outward show. 'Canons, Constitutions, Decrees, which were formerly without soul or motion...have recover'd a new life and vegetation. Ceremonies,...have gotten their former lustre and state again. The Academicall Hood and Surplesse,...are visible here in our Congregations....Those knees...begin...to bowe at the Name of Jesus'. The last sermon, the one ending with the imprimatur, was preached at the primary visitation of Bishop Piers in 1633 and stressed the primacy of prelates in response to those who 'whilst they endeavour to dis-pope her [the church], they would un-Bishop all Christendome'. Although Sydenham was able to avoid discussing the most disruptive issue in the diocese of Bath and Wells - that concerning altar placement - he did take the offensive on other government policies. Fincham sees him as exemplifying the conversion from pastoral ministeries to those based on obedience and conformity. 39

Joseph Henshaw, later to become bishop of Peterborough, was another who urged parishioners to respect the authority of the church. The imprimatur from Weekes on Henshaw's Meditations was undated, but the title was entered on 26 April 1637. Dedicated to Lord Coventry, this work was the product of younger years but was being published now in order to conduce to the peace of the church. The message was: 'In Religion examine, but not broach opinions; ever incline to Antiquity, and suspect novelty; in middle things ever submit to the Authority thou livest under, and let the Churches opinion be thine'. A relatively obscure divine, Thomas Drant of Shaston in Dorset, had two sermons published in 1637; both had been delivered in 1636 according to their titles, but were not entered in the Stationers' Registers until late in 1637. Each contained an undated imprimatur from Weekes. In these two sermons there was a certain reliance on the Greek father St. Chrysostom, known to be favoured by anti-
Calvinists. This was part of the general flavour of anti-Calvinism found in Drant. One of these sermons was preached at the assize in the beginning of Lent. It concluded that 'there is a Spirit of giddinesse, it rules much in some braine-sick hot-spurs, whom it doth possesse at once with a zealous phrensie...spitting against the Church, whose Hierarchy they beare downe,...this Spirit, whether in a Church-parlour at Amsterdam, abroad there, or an uncharitable conventicle of our Zealots, at home here, is as farre from grace, as unity, it at once rents into Schismes...& opens a sluice for Anarchy, disorder, irreligion...'. His _The Divine Lanthorne_ was preached at Paul's Cross in July 1636; it was dedicated to Sir Christopher Clitherow. Clitherow had had another anti-Calvinist sermon dedicated to him and was possibly an Arminian sympathizer. In this sermon, Drant revealed a view of predestination as indefinite. 'God powres out of His treasures upon all, even reprobates have a pension out of this Exchequer...'. 'Whether wee reflect then on the ungodly or godly man, we may discover without a perspective, Gods goodnesse to both, as well the sonnes of darkenesse as of light...'. He prayed 'whatever tympany of knowledge swels others; grant me, O Lord, to know thee savingly; So inspire us all, as to obey thee in they Word, not curiously prie into thy nature'. His concluding remarks suggested the possibility that salvation was influenced by works rather than God's decree: '...charitie, which like oyle makes no noyse in falling, doth swimme above when it is fallen; our wealth, which may seeme lost, is indeed put into a Banke, whence we shal have it with interest, that, and Heaven to boote'.

Another relatively obscure divine, Samuel Page, both advocated church ceremonies and revealed apparently anti-Calvinist prejudices. His posthumous meditations were edited by Nathaniel Snape of Gray's Inn and then entered on 8 April 1636. The work carried an imprimatur of 24 December 1635 from William Haywood; these dates suggest a delay before the book actually appeared in print. Page wrote: 'Yet in our way, we
must not retyre all Religion to the heart, but such outward acts of Religion as remaine in force and use, we may not omit: as comming to Church, reverent kneeling to make confession of our sinnes, attentive hearing of the Word, making the voyce of Gods praise to be heard;...standing upright to make a publique joynt confession of our faith, to shew that we are all of one common faith, paying our due tythes and offerings'. In addition to these words of instruction on outward appearances and public observance of religion, Page also hinted that election was conditional on repentance. 'God is above his law: his lawes bind him not, neither is his truth or justice prejudiced, or any way blemished by his dispensation and indulgences and maintenance of his prerogatvies...he will show mercy on whom he will. Neither is he bound to his owne ordained meanes of grace...for, though it come to a decree, yet before the decree come forth, it may by repentance be delayed in the very egression...'.

All of the works studied thus far have exhibited a certain bias towards the practices and policies associated with the English church during the Laudian hegemony. There were also, however, books properly licensed and printed which were written by men with a reputation for nonconformity. First editions by such authors as Thomas Hooker, Richard Sibbes, Thomas Goodwin, Ezekiel Culverwell, and William Whately all appeared in this survey of 1637. Flamboyant behavior of puritans like Hooker did not prevent their books from being legally published, but it was this quiet and unprovocative nature which bought these writings respectability. In the books in this group there were no assertions of the double decree of absolute predestination, no charges about the popery of novel ceremonies, no attacks on arrogant bishops, and no reference to the Pope as Antichrist.

Rival petitions concerning the nonconformity of the Essex lecturer, Thomas Hooker, greeted Laud early on in his
tenure as bishop of London. Hooker sensed that the new bishop would seriously enforce rules for conformity. After being cited in 1630 to appear before the High Commission, Hooker fled to Holland. The silenced Chelmsford lecturer thus joined the ranks of nonconformist ministers from London diocese who made their way to the Netherlands. After auditioning for the role of co-pastor in the English Reformed Church at Amsterdam, Hooker was rejected for his new 'congregationalist' ideas by the incumbent pastor, John Paget. Hooker found a home at Delft as assistant to John Forbes of the Merchant Adventurers' church and served there between 1631 and 1633. Through his collaboration with Forbes, Hooker became a core member of the English Synod, all of whom 'were distinguished by a Congregationalist style of Puritanism. Their Reformed religion, in deviating from the Church of England, did not conform to Dutch Reformed practice on several points'. By March 1633 Thomas Hooker had left Europe to become a congregationalist minister in New England.

Although Hooker had deserted England to avoid persecution and had been too extremist to remain comfortable in the Netherlands, nevertheless he had works legally published in London in 1637; two anonymous ones fall into this survey. Neither contained an imprimatur, but each was entered in the Stationers' Registers with Weekes named as licenser. The correct initials of the author were supplied in these entries. Almost none of Hooker's sermons were published until after he left for America; it was almost as if the great distance from England made him appear less sinister. These two publications have been identified by R. T. Kendall as the third and fourth in a cycle on the preparation for faith. The third, The Soules Humiliation, was entered on 28 February 1637. Although the ideas in this can be perceived as compatible with Calvinism, there was nothing inflammatory. Salvation is in the hands of God, not of man. '1. First thing that God will doe to the Soule, and which the Soule must be
contented with, is that salvation, and happinesse, and the acceptation of a mans person now, must be no more in a mans own hands, nor in his owne abilitie, the Lord hath taken the staffe out of his hand; and salvation must bee no more put in his owne power....The same Soule that is saved by the Covenant of Grace, cannot be saved also by the Covenant of Works'. The Soules Implantation was entered on 22 April 1637. This continued the description of the long process of preparation for faith, and, like its predecessor, was devotional, not confessional. 'Before the soule of a man can share in the merits of Christ Jesus...two things are required: first, there must be a preparation of the soule to receive and entertaine the Lord Jesus Christ: and secondly, there must be an implantation of the soule into Christ; and then being thus ingrafted into Christ, it hath a title to all those good things which he hath purchased for his Elect'. 43

Richard Sibbes led a professional life style which at times confirmed his Calvinist convictions. He had been one of the four who issued a circular letter in March 1627, requesting relief for godly preachers in the Palatinate, and one of four clergy who were involved in the feoffees for the purchase of impropriations. Although reprimanded by Laud and the High Commission for the former and halted in 1633 by proceedings in the Court of Exchequer for the latter, Sibbes continued as one of the great London lecturers. He preached at Gray's Inn until his death in July 1635. In his work on lectureships, Paul Seaver attributes this staying power to the fact that 'with frustrating regularity the Puritan preachers escaped the full force of episcopal displeasure by finding shelter under the protection offered by their lay patrons'. In the case of Richard Sibbes, it was Solicitor General Henry Yelverton who arranged for the position at Gray's Inn. However, in a revisionist study of Sibbes's life, Mark Dever challenges the legend that he was ever deprived in Cambridge in 1616 - this deprivation had become part of the legend surrounding Sibbes. Instead Dever claims that Sibbes
may have been a 'conforming reformer'... 'a hesitater, and a questioner, but not a dissenter'. Kendall includes Sibbes in the ranks of those in the experimental predestinarian tradition and stresses that his prime preaching years were carried on right under Laud's gaze. 'His sermons do not delve into ecclesiology at all. Because of Laud's power, men were forbidden to discuss issues like free will and predestination as early as 1628, and this may account for Sibbes's small attention to the doctrine of predestination. However, Sibbes's pastoral concern leads one to suspect that he would almost prefer that men forget about the decrees of predestination. In any case, Sibbes appears to have bowed more and more to Laud's wishes'.

During his lifetime Sibbes was often an editor, but seldom a published author. Of the more than twenty five titles listed in the revised Short Title Catalogue, only three were dated earlier than the year of his death - the earliest date was 1629, when Sibbes was already in his fifties. He may have lacked incentive for having his own works published, but one witnesses an explosion in the number of his sermons which were entered posthumously in the Stationers' Registers during the second half of 1637 and early 1638; several of the entries refer to over forty separate sermons. With one exception, all these entries listed Weekes as licenser. Given these numbers, it is not remarkable that three titles of first editions by Sibbes should be part of this sampling.

All three of these titles were entered in the Stationers' Registers in 1637 and all bore imprimatur signatures by Weekes. The Spirituall-Mans Aime had the earliest entry, dated 12 June 1637; there was actually a second, corrected edition also printed with 1637 in the imprint, but both editions contained the same undated imprimatur. In this sermon Sibbes warned that earthly pleasures shall pass away even though man is overly concerned about them and 'neglect[s] these things that abide for ever.... Wee cherish
our Faith in the assurance of the favour of God to everlasting: the sweetnesse, the strength, and the comfort of this food endures forever'. A collection of diverse sermons by Sibbes was entered on 18 September 1637; in a reversal of normal sequence, the imprimatur by Weekes was actually dated later, 5 October 1637. Although the general titlepage of The Saints Comforts has 1638 in the imprint, all the sub titles were dated 1637; hence the book's inclusion. Here Sibbes did question the popish doctrines of penance and of using saints as mediators, but his main thrust was again the idea that death buries temporal things and only grace and glory extend to all eternity. The Christians Portion, with an undated imprimatur from Weekes, was entered on 10 November 1637; in this case there was a separate entry on 19 February 1638 for an enlarged and corrected edition. Sibbes appeared to be skirting the real issues of election and reprobation. 'The longer a man liveth...the richer he should be in good workes, and the more rich he is in good workes, the more he shall have his part and share in glory after....The very judgement of the wicked and the eternall sentence of them, it is the Churches, why? It adds a luster to Gods mercy in advancing his owne, as it is Rom.9.23. God magnifies his mercy to the Vessells of mercy by this, by punishing a company of Reprobates in whom he hath noe delight, by reason of their sins...'.

In two of these books written by Sibbes, Thomas Goodwin had acted as co-editor. In protest over the demands of conformity, by 1634 Goodwin had resigned from the vicarage of Trinity Church, Cambridge - Sibbes's replacement of him there is the example Kevin Sharpe uses as evidence of puritan advancement during the personal rule, although Dever would instead attribute this preferment to Sibbes's practice of not provoking those in power. Probably existing as a lecturer, Goodwin lasted in London until 1639 when he left for the church of Arnhem. His prominence was really to emerge in the 1640s when he became a leader of the Independents and member
of the Westminster Assembly. Both parts of Goodwin's *Aggravation of Sinne* were licensed and entered (on 20 and 18 July 1637 respectively) in the *Stationers' Registers*; each part received an undated imprimatur from Weekes. Goodwin did venture an opinion on the need to observe the sabbath. 'Thus those also sin in a higher measure, who have had a cleare conviction, that they ought to be thus strict, and ought to sanctifie the Lords day, and pray privately, but now...think they need not be so strict:...these sinne against their knowledge, and are the worst of such sinners'. He also made reference to the power of God: 'I say he chose thee to have a being: for as there is an election of things that are to salvation, so out of things that were not unto being'. A clue as to why this work may have been received favourably was in the first sermon. 'And indeed, sinne being committed against God the King of Kings, it can never be punished enough. But as the killing of a King, is amongst men a crime so hainous, that no tortures can exceed the desert of it: we use to say, all torments are too little, any death too good for such a crime'.

As Goodwin belonged to a later period, so Ezekiel Culverwell was from an earlier era. He came from a family of staunch Calvinists (connected through his three sisters to Laurence Chaderton, William Whitaker, and William Gouge), but it was his own behavior which gained him a nonconformist reputation. He was suspended by Bishop Aylmer in 1583 or 1584 and deprived in London diocese on 20 March 1609. The only extant edition of his table to the Old and New Testament was this posthumous publication in 1637. Although it had originally been entered 17 December 1624 with license by the Calvinist Daniel Featley, it was entered again, presumably as a safeguard, on 3 October 1636. This time the title was licensed by Baker, but there was no imprimatur. Culverwell performed a primarily practical service: to produce a handy outline for the contents of the scriptures. 'Election' was a term used as a cryptic identification for certain passages,
but there was no polemic here. 47

William Whately can also be said to have nonconformist credentials, but the sermon which he preached in the parish church in Banbury, which is extant only in a 1637 edition, was noncontroversial. Containing an undated imprimatur by Weekes, it was entered on 2 May 1637. Whately was offering comfort to dejected sinners. 'Understand that the Scripture never calleth any sin unpardonable. Some sinnes indeed are never pardoned, because the committer thereof doth never repent; but that a sinne repented of should bee uncapeable of pardon, it is more then the Word of God doth ever affirme'. 48

The case, however, involving a posthumous collection of sermons by Richard Clerke, who had been one of the translators of the authorised Bible and preacher at Canterbury cathedral, serves to demonstrate the fact that Calvinist writings were indeed scrutinized by licensers. The verso of the titlepage contained an undated imprimatur signed by Weekes, yet the entry of 14 November 1636 in the Stationers' Registers listed Haywood as licenser for 'twenty-seven sermons'- there were in total almost seventy-five sermons. The various accounts of Laud's trial all provided details about numerous passages in Clerke's sermons which were ordered expunged by several licensers. These sermons were edited by Charles White, a fellow preacher at Canterbury; the work was dedicated by White to Isaac Bargrave, Dean of Canterbury. According to Prynne, in his attempts to get the sermons approved White had gone from Haywood to Weekes and received unwelcome results from both. The editor Charles [mistakenly named 'Thomas' in Prynne's account] White later presented a catalogue of 210 separate 'corruptions and purgations' caused by the licensers. This twenty three page catalogue survives in the state papers. The account by the clerk in the House of Lords confirmed that there were sundry charges that parts of the text had been eradicated; the numbers used by the clerk refer to
corresponding numbers in the 'catalogue'. Laud's version of the trial used the defence that since it was never explained which passages were expunged by his chaplain (Haywood) and which by Dr. Weekes, 'the charge in that behalf is left very uncertain'.

It is clear from a study of White's 'catalogue' that the argument of Clerke was different before and after censorship; Prynne must have used this source in his own summary of the alterations. For instance the use of the term 'Antichrist' for the Pope was changed from: 'But the Pope is the Antichrist' to 'As there be many Antichrists, but one is the Antichrist; so are there many Christs, but Iesus is the Christ'. On page 63 of Clerke's sermons, following 'of Gods vouchsafing', this entire section was excised: 'Not ex praevisione, but ex dilectione; not by foreseeing ought in us, but by foreknowing us in Christ; peace here againe proud Papist, and thrust not upon God thy works to obtaine this peace; it is sent to men of good will, not of good works'. So also, 'a whole Sermon of his touching election of free grace, not of works or foreseen faith was rejected by the Licenser'. Prynne summarized that all chief passages against the pope, popery, priests, Jesuits, and Arminians were expunged or altered to support different opinions. Criticisms of schismatics remained. 'But the Church hath some of her owne seed, troublers of her Peace, Pragmaticall Schismaticks...despisers both of Magistracy and Prelacy...and slanderers of the Gospel in this Realme more then the Papists. Judge then whether Prayer for the Churches Peace, be not needfull in our Age'.

The Clerke item is most suggestive of the sort of control which was exercised by the ecclesiastical authorities. Perhaps as a result, none of the nine works in this patch of Calvinist writers expressed openly controversial opinions, even though authored by men of proven Calvinist opinions. Nevertheless, all these books were licensed and, except for Culverwell, all licensed by Thomas
Weekes. Six out of the nine had imprimaturs; in other words, they all went through the system and, as printed, did not challenge the reigning orthodoxy of the Laudian church.

There were numerous other first editions of a religious nature in this survey for 1637 which were not doctrinaire. Of the following nine writings, some were the product of a certain set of circumstances, some were designed for a particular project or purpose, and some just simply did not reveal any interest in controversial topics. The sermon by John Tillinghast, occasioned by an actual shipwreck in his neighborhood, was delivered in Sussex in February 1634/35, entered on 24 January 1637, and dedicated to the wife of William Gratwick, Viscount Sussex. It contained an imprimatur from Haywood which was good for only three months but which was curiously undated. In his pastoral role, Tillinghast needed to encourage his parishioners to be more accommodating to victims of shipwrecks along the Sussex coast. Charles Fitz-Geffrey's sermons, like the one by Tillinghast, were confined to matters at hand. Fitz-Geffrey delivered his three sermons in Plymouth in October 1636 and dedicated them to the mayor of Plymouth; he preached compassion for countrymen who were captives in Barbary. He reminded his auditors that British cathedral churches could also be threatened and destroyed, as those in Carthage and Hippo had been. Fitz-Geffrey's sermons were printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield for Edward Forrest. A sermon by George Stinton also had Lichfield and Oxford in the imprint. He preached in Worcester cathedral in November 1636 and was concerned with the terrible pestilence in the land. Stinton relayed a history of plagues, but manipulated this history into a devotional theme by emphasizing that sin is the plague of the heart.

A sub-librarian at Oxford, Jean Verneuil compiled a guide to tracts and sermons based on scriptural passages; he arranged the guide by biblical verses. Printed at Oxford by William Turner, this source is useful even today, but it reflected no real point of view. Another religious project
first published in 1637 was the result of a compilation originally done by the bishop Nicetas, a compilation of the Greek fathers on Job. With parallel columns in Greek and Latin, this book was edited by the Greek scholar and sometime librarian, Patrick Young. It exemplified the new emphasis which the church placed on the Greek fathers; in addition it was dedicated by Young to Laud. In January 1633/34 the king had informed Laud that Young planned to publish the texts of Greek fathers regularly. The king proposed that the fine recently levied on the royal printers be used to buy Greek type, and that the royal printers be required to print one such volume annually. The imprint on this was 'ex typographico Regio'. None of these three Oxford printings nor the book by the king's printer were entered in the Stationers' Registers; it was not required.

The next Latin work, a report of a conciliatory meeting in Leipzig in March 1631 between rival German theologians, was properly entered on 13 April 1637. This entry was the last one with Haywood named as licenser (before the ignominy of the de Sales proclamation), but the imprimatur was dated much earlier, 29 March 1636. The attempt to remove barriers between Lutherans and Calvinists was part of the plan for Protestant renewal which the minister John Dury championed. The English government gave this movement only mild support. If the diarist William Whiteway understood properly, Dury had already been rebuffed. In an entry for 27 February 1634, Whiteway recorded, 'This month Mr Durans a Scottish Minister, having taken incredible pains with...all the Protestant Princes and States in Germany about the reconciling of the Calvinists and Lutherans, returned into England, and came to Dr. Lawd Archbishop, to know what assistance or furtherance he might expect out of England for that weighty busyness. The Archbishop told him that it was a mystery of State, and that he durst not meddle in it: but offred him a good Parsonage in Cornewall, if he would accept it...'. A work by the Italian historian Virgilio Malvezzi was translated into
English and published in 1637. This was based on the story of Saul and David, was entered on 9 March 1637 and licensed by Weekes. This was primarily a political essay, using the biblical story of David's persecution in an illustrative manner.  

Two discourses by John Trapp which exist only in a 1637 edition are difficult to categorize. A preacher in Warwickshire, he appears to have been patronized by Viscount Conway and in fact served as chaplain to Conway's wife. Trapp was later to side with parliament during the civil war. However, these two discourses based on a chapter in Revelations were of a devotional nature and served as directions for the right use of personal and public crosses and calamities. They were properly entered on 25 September 1637 and contained an undated license from Weekes. The last in this group of nine, a poem by John Rhodes, was entered once, in 1588. The 1637 printing, however, is the sole surviving edition. Originally composed to proclaim the miraculous delivery from pope and Spaniards, it was enlarged after deliverance from the gunpowder treason. It is clearly anti-papist, but because entered earlier, it apparently escaped the requirement for perusal. As the only extant edition, it is an aberration in this survey of earliest extant editions.

The following six books, of an entirely different flavour, were all published surreptitiously. The tenor of the feud between John Williams, the fiercely independent bishop of Lincoln, and William Laud was bitter indeed. Lord Dacre has written of the twenty year rivalry between them, describing Williams as Laud's 'most powerful enemy'. The protracted series of skirmishes culminated in the Star Chamber in July 1637 when Williams was censured for tampering with witnesses, suspended, fined, and sent to prison. To add to his other provocations, Bishop Williams had issued anonymously, with an imprint stating only 'Printed for the Diocese of Lincoln, 1637', a book titled The Holy Table, Name
& Thing; this was in response to Coale from the Altar of 1636 penned by Peter Heylyn. Williams in essence challenged the policy of calling the holy table an altar and of insisting that parish communion tables must be placed altarwise, at the end of chancels, by reconstructing a case in 1627 in the diocese of Lincoln when he had had to mediate in a dispute over the proper placement and name of the communion table. He had ruled that the vicar of Grantham was mistaken in positioning the communion table altarwise. When the altar controversy resumed in the mid-1630's, Williams issued this printed version of the letter conveying his original judgement against the vicar of Grantham, with a commentary appended; it contained an imprimatur granted by himself as dean of Westminster and bishop of Lincoln to the mythical minister/ author. Holy Table was not entered in the Stationers' Registers and is conspicuous for its prelatical imprimatur in English, dated only 'the last day of November' [1636]. Archbishop Laud and Bishop Francis White had licensed their own writings in 1637 but did not provide imprimaturs.

In no uncertain terms Bishop Williams stated his opinion on the proper term. 'And because a Communion is an Action most proper for a Table, as an Oblation is for an Altar; therefore the Church in her Liturgie and Canons calling the same a Table onely, do not you now, under the Reformation, call it an Altar'. He relied on the Elizabethan Injunctions, the section in the Book of Common Prayer before the communion service and canon 82 in his conclusion that the table need not stand altarwise and ought to be officiated upon in that place of church or chancel most convenient. 'This very Injunction saith in the next words, that in the time of the Communion it shall be in the Chancell. The Rubrick saith, in the body of the Church or Chancell. The Canon (82) in force, in the Church or Chancell'. The revised Short Title Catalogue lists seven separate editions of this work, all dated 1637, but none of them provide information about stationers in the
imprints. Predictably, there was a reaction to this. Three stationers were fined in the court of the Stationers' company on 3 July 1637 for 'undue printing...without the wardens hand and orderly Entrance'. These stationers were different from those four on John Lambe's list of printers for the Star Chamber decree who were cited for 'reprinting' Holy Table. Arber's transcription of Lambe's list is prefaced with the suggestion that this forbidden book was ever to be associated with the Star Chamber decree of 1637. Laud's Star Chamber speech in June devoted considerable space to the issues concerning the communion table and chastised the bishop of Lincoln for his part in approving the 'anonymous' work. A six page list of the passages in this book which caused the most offense is extant in the state papers, dated 30 September 1637. Peter Heylyn responded in Antidotum Lincolniense, entered in the Stationers' Registers 15 May 1637; Pocklington, in the second 1637 edition of Altare Christianum, did so too.

   The issues which Bishop Williams raised were a mere quibble when compared to the accusations against the bishops which were surreptitiously produced at home and abroad. Five titles of this nature by William Prynne and John Bastwick were first published in 1637 and fall into this survey.

   Because of his reprinted criticism of Richard Montagu's Appello Caesarem in 1627 and his later account of the trial of Archbishop Laud, William Prynne has already figured prominently in this study. As witnessed in the trial account, Prynne's attitude toward the church hierarchy and its courts had worsened considerably in the interim since 1627. Although in his own trial in June 1637 Prynne was charged, along with Bastwick and Burton, with several libels against the hierarchy, none of the five titles listed were directly connected to Prynne. However, his opinions were known and feared. All three of the surreptitious works printed in 1637 which are included in this survey were highly critical of the episcopacy. The anonymous work which began 'Brief
instructions to church-wardens...to observe in all Episcopall or Archdiaconall Visitations and Spiritual Courts' appeared in two separate editions secretly printed in London in 1637; one of these editions was printed by two apprentices, Gregory Dexter and William Taylor, but they escaped with light punishment after their testimony. This work focused on the 'illegitimate' visitations, fees, and spiritual courts of the bishops; Prynne demanded that specific royal authorization by patent under the great seal be granted in advance for each one of these episcopal activities. 61

Another anonymous work attributed to Prynne and assigned to the press of J. F. Stam in Amsterdam was XVI new Quaeres proposed to our Lord Prelates. In this Prynne challenged the prelates to answer his questions or else he would 'proclaime to all the world, you cannot doe it, and so are open enemies to his Majestie, his Imperiall Crowne, Lawes, Subjects, and in severall premuniras, for all you beare your heads so high, like petty Kings and Popes:....' Not surprisingly, Prynne often demanded legal precedents for ecclesiastical privileges, and he employed that lawyerly tactic here repeatedly; for example, he asked by what law prelates consecrated churches, chapels, or churchyards as if they had been unholy earlier. He urged prelates to read Magna Carta to see how they were infringing it by illegal punishments; he furnished as one illustration of this the fact that those who would not read the Declaration of Sport were being disciplined. Prynne concocted fanciful scenarios, such as Christ being forced to take the ex officio oath while being examined about his disciples and doctrines; would Christ go to prison if he refused? He appealed to the king to appoint a layman to sit above the archbishop of Canterbury and oversee all cases touching ecclesiastical jurisdiction. 62

Both these writings pointed out that bishops were often acting without specific royal authority and were in this way purloining some of the king's prerogative powers. In the anonymous Dutch publication called A Catalogue, attributed
later to Prynne, the author focused on what he saw as the myth of 'jure divino' episcopacy. Although William Lamont sees Prynne as having faith in moderate bishops until 1641, Stephen Foster has a strong case in claiming that he was already 'willing to do away with them' in this Catalogue. Likewise Tyacke perceives Prynne's 'almost total disillusionment with the institution' [of the episcopacy] as already apparent in 1636. In this book, Prynne's charges against the bishops were multifold. 'From all our Lordly Prelates [come] evill and mischiefe,...in any of their courts and High Commissions,...from all their sedition and privy conspiracy (with Rom. Priests, Iesuites and betweene themselves)...from al their false doctrine and Heresie (both in Presse and Pulpit)...by setting up Altars, images, crucifixes, crosses, etc., and bowing downe unto them, by idolizing their owne canons, ceremonies, and Romish Fopperies, by maintaining the open prophanation of Gods holy Sabbath with all Heathenish sports and pastimes...'. Prynne's argument was that bishops and presbyters were equal, that the name of a bishop was only a title of administration, not dominion, of humility, not of prelacy. 63

John Bastwick was quite clear in his judgement that the corruption of the bishops rendered episcopacy an evil obstacle to truth. It was the four part Letany which was charged against him at his trial in Star Chamber; it was the third part which falls into this survey. Although originally assigned to the Leiden press of William Christiaens, it is now thought to be a production of James Moxon in Delft. This last attribution is maintained by the testimony of the stationer Matthew Symmons who early in 1638 reported his observations on the situation in the Netherlands. Bastwick's main target was the service book, which he saw as originating in the mass book, but he devoted much space to demonstrating the many transgressions of the bishops. He concluded: ' [that which] Christ and his Apostles left unto the Church,...to the eternall honour of God and the King, and for the perpetuation
of his throne and dignity for ever, and for the overthrow of Father Antichrist and his adherents, and all Popery, Arminianisme, Schisme and Heresy - of all which glorious reformation, the preists and prelats are onely the hinderance, ... therefore [I continue] still my Letany from Plague, Pestilence and Famin, from Bishops, Preists and deacons, Good Lord deliver us'.

The last of these fugitive tracts is Bastwick's report of the Star Chamber censure of himself, Prynne, and Burton. This Kafkaesque account of the trial recreated the dialogue between the three prisoners and their accusers. The proceedings were 'pro confesso' because no one had responded to the charges properly. The prisoners's answers were not read either because they were received too late or were considered too impertinent. The outspokenness of the prisoners seemed to continue through the proceedings and during the later execution of the censure on 30 June. Prynne was quoted as reviewing the history of the libel laws to the effect that previous punishments had been for libel against monarchy, not against prelates. Prynne continued: 'the Prelates find themselves exceedingly . agrieved and vexed against what wee have written concerning the usurpation of their calling, where indeed wee declare their calling not to be Iure Divino'. Bastwick quoted himself as referring to the licensed books by Peter Heylyn which were directed against them and a book by Pocklington: 'they be as full of lyes, as doggs be full of fleas; but were the Presses as open to us, as they are to them, wee would pay them and their great Master that upholds them, and charge them with notorious Blasphemy'. The actions of the defendants and Bastwick's subsequent account sought to magnify the unfairness of the proceedings against them. The reaction to these allegations are evident in Laud's speech at the trial and in the works which resulted from the enlistment of the services of Peter Heylyn and Christopher Dow.

This concludes an examination of the titles which
appeared for the first time in 1637. The examples of Joseph Hall and Humphrey Sydenham who, although known Calvinists, acted as mouthpieces while adapting to the new environment of the Laudian church were typical of the majority of these writings. The books going through the system of pre-publication censorship and entrance in the Stationers' Registers did not present a challenge to the religious preferences of the regime, nor did the books printed legally in Oxford or Ireland. Even those licensed writings by puritans such as Thomas Hooker and Richard Sibbes did not contradict the party line.

Of the forty one first editions in this sample which were openly printed in England or Ireland, two were actually by Catholic authors, twenty one supported the policies of the regime for the beauty of holiness, unity and peace of the church, or against delinquents, and nine were by proven Calvinists but were unprovocative. The remaining nine were either miscellaneous or impossible to categorize because not touching on controversial subjects. None were Calvinist attacks on Arminians, Catholics, or church policies; none taught the double decree of predestination. Not all these earliest editions were books printed in London: five were printed in Oxford, one in Dublin, and one was by the king's printer. None of these therefore would be expected to have an entry in the Stationers' Registers. (Thomas Comber, who was later ejected from his preferments during the civil war period, served as vice-chancellor at Cambridge from late 1636 until late 1637 although no Cambridge imprints surfaced in this study; on the other hand Richard Baylie, who was to be executor of Laud's will, was the counterpart at Oxford who served for two years beginning in mid-1636). The Protestant books which were produced surreptitiously were critical of government religious policy, as with Bishop Williams, or challenged the church hierarchy. Although two Catholic books were licensed and printed in London, no surreptitious Catholic works appear in this survey.
Thus there were thirty four legal London printings, and every one had an entrance in the **Stationers' Registers**. Of these entrances, only one did not name a licenser; this was the entry in 1588 for the poetry of John Rhodes. Twenty four (or 71%) of these books also contained an imprimatur; two of those without were the self licensed works of Laud and White whose printed permission might be considered redundant. The book by Johann Justus Landsberger merits special consideration as it might have had an imprimatur if a perfect copy had survived. Eliminating these three from the total, there were 24 out of 31 or 77% with imprimaturs. In summary, the legal London first editions in this sampling for 1637 exhibited extraordinary cooperation on the part of both stationers and the authors; books were licensed and entered and their contents adhered to the expectations of the regime.

This compliance camouflaged a situation in the England of 1637 which was anything but peaceful and conformist. One of Thomas Wentworth's informants in London, the reverend Mr. Garrard, late in April 1637 reported of the plans to curb activists like Bastwick and company: 'So that it is committed to the Judges to give their Opinions, whether these three may not be tried in King's-Bench for their Lives, for Sedition...tis well, something were done, for in my Experience, I never have known so many strange Books printed as come out daily'. Laud himself wrote to Wentworth in August: '...for, the Truth is, I have been so exercised with Libellings and Star-Chamber business, and the Consequences which have followed upon them, that had any Packet come from you, it must have lain by me...observe most rightly that these men do but begin with the Church, that they might have freer Access to the State'.

In truth, religion and politics blended so that it was difficult to distinguish between them. Bishop Williams had defied the establishment of the church with his fugitive book on altar policy, but he was censured in Star Chamber in July for tampering with and corrupting witnesses in the king's
cause. Dean of the Arches John Lambe, so instrumental in studying the stationers' problems as prelude to the Star Chamber decree to curb disorderly printing, was also zealous in the business of ship money, still one of the most divisive issues even in 1637. 67

The events of 1637 reflect an unsettled situation. After one of Laud's chaplains had approved a book by the Catholic Francis de Sales, the regime backed down and called in the book by proclamation in May. On 1 July a decision was made to certify that ecclesiastical courts could meet without first receiving patents under the great seal. This was made public by proclamation a month later. There were two Star Chamber actions which reflected a government crackdown on mutinous religious writing and disorderly printing. In response to puritan provocations, the Star Chamber censured Prynne and the others in June; the Star Chamber then issued a decree concerning printing for 11 July. On 23 July the Scottish Service Book was introduced. It met with immediate defiance when first read in Edinburgh; resistance to the ecclesiastical policy of the Caroline church was now rampant in Scotland. Even though it was possible that Scottish bishops themselves were most responsible for these 'innovations', Laud has shouldered most of the blame for this liturgy and its imposition. It did not sit well with Calvinist Scots that their king's chief ecclesiastical advisor was in Canterbury and not in Scotland. 68

Only two men were promoted into the ranks of the bishops in 1637 - both could be classed as Laudian. Robert Skinner was consecrated as bishop of Bristol in January and John Warner was nominated bishop of Rochester in November. Robert Skinner has been singled out by Fincham as a preacher who, in court sermons delivered throughout the 1630's, was able to take advantage of the royal Declaration of 1628 against contentious preaching to flaunt his own anti-Calvinism. When late in 1641 thirteen bishops were under impeachment for their part in cooperating with Laud in the enactment of
illegal canons in convocation, Skinner was among them. John Warner, chaplain to Charles I, was a more shadowy figure, but presumably was within the circle trusted by Laud; Gilbert Burnet related how Laud sent Warner to destroy all incriminating documents when the archbishop's impeachment was brought to the bar of the lords. 69

Some of Laud's victories proved hollow. After becoming archbishop, he sought to establish his dominance through metropolitical visitations. Laud encountered the most resistance from Bishop Williams in the diocese of Lincoln and from the two universities. Early on, in a letter of 25 February 1633/34, Laud notified Williams 'Yet this much, I think, is clear, that de jure ordinario, I have as much power to visit your Lordship's diocese as any other part of my province'. Attorney General Noy decided in Laud's favour, but the visitation of Lincoln, like most of Brent's visitations on behalf of Laud in 1635, left no lasting impression. The universities were able to hold out longer, but even they were overruled in June 1636 when the King in Council judged that they could not be exempt from metropolitical visitations. Thus Laud triumphed by having his authority to investigate religious matters, the obedience of scholars to the discipline and doctrine of the Church of England, recognized. This victory was especially crucial in the case of Cambridge where there were reports of puritan nonconformity; however Laud never had time to perform proper visits to either Cambridge or Oxford. Although the increased visibility of clerics in church governance and the remarkable consistency in the observation of orderly religious printing indicated a church hierarchy which was dominant, this church government in reality contributed to the unpopularity of the personal rule. Dissent could not be measured in London printing, but it was obvious in surreptitious printing. The Star Chamber decree contained much emphasis on eliminating the smuggling of such fugitive tracts. The informer Matthew Symmons reported on the irregularities he had observed in the Low
Countries in November 1637. He provided abundant details of the prohibited puritan printing activities of Moxon, Christiaens, and Stam and of their books being smuggled into England. 70

Another area of publication which was likely to offset the image conveyed by the controlled press was that of religious reprints. There was no regulation of reprints until the decree of 11 July. It is not possible to distinguish among those reprinted before and after that date; all would say 1637 in the imprints. There was an additional charge for entrance of titles in the Stationers' Registers, beyond that for acquiring permission from the Stationers' Company itself. Since clause 18 of the decree specified that no extra charge would be incurred when reprints were relicensed, they were apparently not expected to be approved again by the company and then re-entered in the registers. Thus there is no way to detect or date relicensing activity unless there is a dated imprimatur in the book, specifically for relicensing. No reprints in this study were so endowed. There is some evidence that reprints with the date 1638 in the imprint did on occasion include imprimaturs, but they contained the same language as that used for first editions. The revised and enlarged edition of the book Virgilii evangelisantis Christiados libri XIII, last printed in 1634, ends with an imprimatur from William Bray dated 14 June 1637 - the day of the Star Chamber trial of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton; so also the 1638 edition of John Donne's Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions acquired an imprimatur from William Bray, this time dated 23 November 1637. Examples of books outside this survey which have imprimaturs with language specific to relicensing will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

An inspection of all entries in the Stationers' Registers between June 1636 and June 1638 suggests that there was a certain time lag in responses to the decree. For instance, ballad entries do not begin to contain the name of a licenser until 8 January 1638, and the licenser is then a
clerical one. Also, beginning only gradually in October, the Master of Revels was replaced as licenser of drama by clerical licensers. This would lead one to suspect that for most of 1637, reprints would still not necessarily reflect an enforcement of the new regulation for relicensing. Instead, texts might be reprinted because they were still fashionable and popular with consumers, not just reflective of subjects that were safe for licensing.

There were twenty six reprints of religious writings by twenty four different authors which appear in this survey. Of these, only three can easily be identified as reproducing the views of the dominant power in the church; two of these, by Richard Bancroft and by Edwin Sandys, had already provoked opposition during the pre-Caroline period and had disappeared for long periods of time without being reprinted.

Richard Bancroft had delivered a sermon at Pauls Cross in February 1588/89; although it was printed then, there is not another surviving edition until that of 1636. Because there has been a tendency to view this sermon as the earliest example of an English Protestant bishop espousing full-blown theories of 'jure divino' episcopacy, it would seem logical that the government might resurrect it during a time of anti-episcopal sentiment. J. P. Sommerville writes: 'Was "jure divino" episcopacy, which many clerics asserted in the decades after Bancroft's famous sermon of 1589, in fact incompatible with the traditional English theory of the Royal Supremacy?' - thus linking the theory with Bancroft's sermon.

Bancroft delivered his sermon in the context of the Martin Marprelate controversy; it did not specifically mention 'jure divino' episcopacy. This is not its claim to fame. However both John Penry, publishing anonymously and secretly in Scotland, and an unidentified author publishing through William Jones's secret press in 1608, responded; the latter included the contents of a letter critical of Bancroft which John Reynolds had written at the request of Francis
Knollys.  

At the time of the sermon, Knollys had overreacted to the perceived episcopal threat to the royal prerogative and had shot off a letter - now lost - soliciting Reynolds's opinion. It is the supposed contents of this lost letter which may have given rise to the legend that Bancroft was claiming 'jure divino' episcopacy.  

For many years the Reynolds's letter existed only in the surreptitious 1608 publication and in manuscript copies. Christopher Hill has listed this Reynolds's epistle along with other writings which could not safely be printed until the 1640s; it was reprinted in 1641 as a Long Parliament manifesto of the 'root and branch' party.

Issues which Bancroft did address in his sermon were: 1) the heretical tendency of those who had separated themselves from the orders and ceremonies of the church and 2) the authority of the bishops over the other clergy.  

'Schismatikes, are such as retaining with us the true faith, do separate themselves from us, for orders, and ceremonies.... Schismatikes in short time for the most part do prove heretikes.... For the better understanding whereof, you must know that the Church of God ever since the Apostles times, hath distributed the Ecclesiasticall ministry principally into these three parts, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: according as it is contained in the apology of the Church of England. Nay it is manifest by the History of those, and the former times, that as at the first for the repressing of schismes, Bishops had authority given them over the rest of the Clergy...'. As W. D. J. Cargill Thompson says: 'it is true that he [Bancroft] did not state that episcopacy was a divine institution nor did he categorically claim that it was instituted by the Apostles. Nevertheless, it was possible to infer the suggestion that episcopacy was of apostolic origin from some of Bancroft's cautiously-worded remarks and there can be little doubt that the inference was intended'.  

Thus this reprint of Bancroft's sermon can certainly be viewed as part of the propaganda defence against
attacks on the bishops.

The *Europae Speculum* of Edwin Sandys was another publication with a chequered past. Originally published as *A Relation of the State of Religion* in 1605, supposedly without the author's permission, this book was condemned by the High Commission for portraying a relatively flattering view of the continental Catholic church and burned on 2 November 1605, literally days before the Gunpowder Plot was exposed. Sandys was said to have consented to the order for burning. Sandys had been a pupil of Richard Hooker at Corpus Christi College, Oxford and in 1625 was one who would not join the parliamentary vote against the *Appello Caesarem* of Richard Montagu; his sentiments might be characterized as proto-Arminian. In the year of Sandys's death, 1629, an edition now called *Europae Speculum*, and, if the publisher's preface is to be believed, done according to the author's original, appeared; this was described as distinct from the 'stolen and falsified' earlier edition. It was published by Michael Sparke - sometimes in trouble for publishing 'puritan' works - as was this 1637 reprint. As T. K. Rabb has suggested, 'its appearance in the 1630's may serve as an indication that the attitude of the royal court toward Catholics had changed markedly since the early days of James'.

In this book Sandys was very critical of the continental Protestant churches because of the bickering amongst them; he contrasted this with the Church of England which had no Calvin nor Luther, but rather continued in an orderly fashion with the succession of bishops and solemnity of the service. His unsympathetic portrayal of predestination completed the picture. 'The other ground of their [Romans] hope, is the division of the Protestants into their factions of Lutherans and Calvinists...that it threateneth a great ruine & calamity of both sides....both the Lutheran Preachers rage as bitterly against them [Calvinists] in their Pulpits as ever, and their Princes & people have them in as great detestation, not forbearing to professe openly they will returne to the
Papacy, rather than ever admit that Sacramentary and Predestinationary pestilence; for these two points are the ground of the quarrel, and the latter more scandalous at this day than the former'. After suggesting compromises for Catholics in preparation for reconciliation, he then recommended for Protestants: 'And contrariwise in themselves looking with a more single and less indulgent Eye than they doe, they shall finde that there is no such absolute or unproveable perfection in their doctrine and Reformation, as some dreamers in the pleasing view of their own actions doe fancy'.

The author of the third reprint which appeared compatible with the regime's policies was Sir Richard Baker who wrote meditations while in prison for debt. Although entered three years earlier and licensed by Laud's chaplain William Bray, Baker's Meditations upon the Lords Prayer had first been published in 1636; there remain four editions between then and 1640. The 1637 edition does not contain an imprimatur, although two other first editions by this same author were entered and licensed in 1637 and contained imprimaturs from Samuel Baker. A posthumous publication released after the Restoration, Theatrum Redivivum, or the Theatre Vindicated, was designed to answer the Histrio-Mastix of William Prynne. Dedicated to King Charles and containing a section which defended the need to be taxed for tribute to Caesar, this reprint of 1637 was understandably the work of a man who had good reason to ingratiate himself with the regime. When Baker considered doctrine, he injected an element of doubt about the unconditional nature of predestination. The will of God is that 'wee should bee holy. And if any man sinne, his Will is, he should repent: and if a man repent, his Will is, hee should bee saved....These wills in God, are as the chaine of his mercy; whereof every linke is fastned to one another; and all of them firmly fastned up on us, unlesse by the violence of our sinnes, and the sinfulnesse of our wills, we doe wilfully breake them'.
These reprints of works by Bancroft, Sandys, and Baker can be seen as conforming to the religious orthodoxy of the regime, but they are only a small fraction of the reprints in this survey for 1637. The following eighteen reprints, however, take a very different line, containing evangelical Calvinist themes such as the doctrine of the double decree of predestination, sabbatarian views, and anti-papist sentiment. Although Sheila Lambert has seen the needs of the stationers as the driving force behind the printing decree of 1637, even she admitted that the stationers were distressed by clause 18 which required the relicensing of reprints. In their reaction to this clause, stationers emphasized the crucial value of reprints to their financial security. Judging from the high percentage of reprints in this survey which conveyed views attractive to Calvinists, if reprints are an accurate measure of a strong market, then the market for Calvinism was still brisk.

Eleven divines contributed twelve writings which expressed the discredited doctrine of predestination. The first of these titles, John Ball's catechism, had been appearing in print since 1615, although it was not until 1627 that it was entered in the Stationers' Registers. The licenser at that time was the permissive Dr. Worrall. In answer to the request to define the 'Decree', Ball wrote: 'That whereby God hath from eternity set down with himselfe whatsoever shall come to passe....The speciall Decree of God concerning Angels and men is called Predestination....Of this decree there be two parts: Election and Reprobation....The cause of this decree, is the absolute will and good pleasure of God'. There is no evidence that this reprint went through a relicensing process; other unpublished sermons of Ball were not printed until 1642. Two works by Nicholas Byfield which concerned the signs of assurance of salvation were reprinted in 1637. The Signes was first printed in 1614 and was dedicated to Jane Ratcliffe; she later rated inclusion in Samuel's Clarke's Lives of Thirty-Two Divines where Byfield
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was mentioned as having been crucial in her conversion to a religious life. In his examples from scripture, Byfield included the following passage: 'And the Apostle Peter exhorteth Christians to use all diligence to make their calling and election sure whatsoever carnall persons speake against it'. In The Spirituall Touch-Stone, first printed in 1619, Byfield referred back to the earlier treatise, but also specified more clearly 'the large Catalogue I intend especially, as a more infallible and effectuall way of tryall, as containing such signes as for the most part are not observed by other men, or not fully, but are knowne to himselfe, and can be found in no reprobate'.

So also the sixteenth century nonconformist Arthur Dent discussed the elect and reprobate in Pastime for Parents - which had been entered once, in 1603. In responding to a father's question about the differences in knowledge between the elect and the reprobate, the child reported: 'The knowledge of the reprobates is onely literall and historicall. The knowledge of the Elect is spirituall, and experimentall'. When the dialogue moved on to differences in feeling, the child recited: 'The reprobate hath a kinde of natural feeling of sin, but it is without the true hatred of it, for in his heart he loveth it. The elect doth so feel his sin, that hee hateth it, taketh counsell against it, and prayeth against it'. The Scottish divine David Dickson, whose work on the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews had been printed only in Scotland before the Irish reprint of 1637, was one who had stood against the Five Articles of Perth of 1618. It comes as no surprise that Dickson should attack what he called 'Leviticall Ceremonies'; however, he also discussed those people set apart for Gods use, by election, before time: 'All those for whom Christ did offer Himselfe, are sanctified in God's Decree; and in due time, by vertue of Christ's offering.... Those who are never sanctified, the Body of Christ was never offered for them'. Later, in discussing reprobation, Dickson explained that 'the
Sanctification internall, by renovation, consisteth in a man's separation from the state of Nature, to the State of Grace; from his old conditions, to be a new creature indeed. By this latter sort, a Reprobate can not be called sanctified; but by the former, he may be called sanctified, and that by vertue of the Blood of the Covenant, albeit he should not get any farther good thereby. 81

The treatment of a different epistle of St. Paul, this one done by Edward Elton, had first been printed in 1615 and was never entered in the Stationers' Registers. Elton had earned himself a reputation for nonconformity. A later work of his, Gods Holy Mind, although entered and properly licensed by Daniel Featley, was ordered burned in 1625 because it was in contradiction to the Book of Sports concerning the sabbath and because of Elton's treatment of deathbed communion. The reprint of the exposition on Paul's letter, unentered and therefore without evidence of license, stated the double decree of predestination distinctly. 'Hence followes this conclusion, that none are redeemed by the death of Christ, but only Gods Elect:...Remission of sins is a part of justification in the sight of God; and none are justified in Gods sight, but those whom he predestinated....if we should say Christ died for all, Elect and reprobate, then...he died for some who now are frying in the fire of hell, which is a most absurd conclusion....Whom God hath elected to life and salvation before all times, they shall in time be sanctified and made holy'. The 1622 collection of sermons by Thomas Gataker was reprinted in an enlarged form in 1637; most of the sermons had been previously entered in the Stationers' Registers, although none had an entry dated later than 1626. Davids Instructor, one of the pieces near the front of the 1637 reprint, was a sermon first printed in 1620 without trace of entry or licensing. Here Gataker tackled the subject of reprobates: 'There is a blessing of God promised on those that so doe [listen to instruction]....As on the other side, there is a Curse of God
denounced against those that doe otherwise...Yea, to doe otherwise it is made a note of a reprobate and a castaway, of one that God is fully determined everlastingly to damne and destroy...'.

The Markes of Salvation by the obscure Norfolk preacher Thomas Howes was another work which showed no evidence of a licenser's name, but then its entrance in 1616 was for printing at Cambridge. It presented a view of election as having been decided by God before all time. Verse 2 Peter 1.10 'sheweth, that the election of God (which is most certaine in him, and in it selfe) is made known and certaine to us by good works, wherunto God hath appointed us; not that it is grounded upon our will or workes...but upon his gracious decree, by which before the world was made, he chose us...'. By comparison the moderate Calvinist, John Preston, was a commanding figure whose various preferments as chaplain to Charles I, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, master of Emmanuel College, and Trinity lecturer in Cambridge earned him influence at court. Three of his treatises were posthumously issued together as Remaines in 1634; each had been licensed by Archbishop Abbot's chaplain Robert Austin. The imprimatur signed by Austin on 30 July 1633, which appeared in the first edition in 1634, was simply repeated at the end of this 1637 reprint; this certainly suggests that the book was not relicensed. John Legate printed the section which contained the imprimatur. On the subject of election, Preston wrote: '...the sanctifying Spirit is a free gift...which appeares by the prosecution of his decree, both of Election and Reprobation; nothing more free then the Spirit is;...for there cannot a reason be given wherefore hee should chuse the one, and not the other'. Although a conformist, Preston was indeed a Calvinist. It is significant that such views persisted in these writings and were first allowed into print therefore through the offices of one of Archbishop Abbot's chaplains. Had Preston lived, he might have fallen into serious disfavour. The Dorchester diarist William Whiteway
reported that in December 1627 Preston was banished from the court for preaching plainly against idolatry; seven months later he was dead. 83

John Smith, preacher at Clavering in Essex, left benefactions to deprived ministers when he died in 1616. Posthumously edited by J. Hart, *Essex Dove* was entered in the Stationers' Registers in 1629; Jeffrey, another of Abbot's chaplains, was named as licenser. In three constituent treatises Smith expressed anti-Catholic and sabbatarian opinions, both discouraged by the regime. In responding to a request to describe the difference between Popish opinion and his, Smith selected the following: 'They thinke that they eate Christ corporally and carnally with their teeth....But we...affirme that Christ is not eaten carnally with the teeth, but spiritually by faith'. In his laundry list of ways in which one must sanctify the sabbath, Smith included setting oneself apart from worldly business in order to devote oneself to the service of God; he declared as unlawfull any attempt to journey, sow, reap, load carts, weed, or buy and sell on the sabbath. This work was also notable for stating the distinctions between the elect and the reprobate. 'Q[uestion]. In whom doth the Spirit of God worke these things? A[nswer]. In none but the Elect. A Reprobate may have the Spirit of God, according to some effects of it, as to make him see his sinnes,...to live civilly in the world: But the Spirit of God inwardly killing sinne, and sanctifying the Soule in all his gracious effects, is never given but to Gods Elect. Q[uestion]. May a man loose the Spirit of God? A[nswer]. The wicked...may wholly lose it. The godly cannot lose it wholly'. The sixteenth century puritan divine John Udall died in prison for his faith. He had been tried at the Croydon assizes in 1590 and imprisoned for having published a libellous book, *A Demonstration of the Trueth*. Udall died two years later. In 1593 an anonymous work of his, *A Commentarie upon the Lamentations of Jeremy*, first appeared. Several extant editions date from the sixteenth
century and one from 1608; then there was no reprint until 1637. The title was never entered in the Stationers' Registers and thus could have eluded the licensing process altogether. Presumably considered the property of its first publisher, Thomas Man senior, the Commentarie seems in 1635 to have passed along with all Man family copyrights to the daughter-in-law Joan and to Benjamin Fisher; they were named in the imprints for both 1637 variants. The second variant was the first to name Udall as author. Not unexpectedly, Udall embraced a belief in the unconditional nature of predestination. 'God punisheth sinne in his children in this World as severely as if they were Reprobates:....The reason is, first, to declare that he is not partiall, but hateth sinne in those whom he most of all loveth. Secondly, that it may appeare what great wrath remayneth for the ungodly....It is impossible that God should forsake for ever, any one of his children. The reason is, because, first, whom once he loveth, to the end he loveth them....Thirdly, upon what ground to condemn their doctrine that think, any of the elect can perish, or any of the reprobates be saved'.

The last in this group of eleven divines whose reprints discussed openly the details of predestination was Josias White, brother of John White, the puritan preacher made famous by studies of seventeenth century Dorchester. The earliest extant edition of Josias White's Plaine and familiar Exposition was dated 1632, although the only record of entrance and licensing by Featley was made in March 1623. Anthony Wood has confirmed the existence of this 1623 edition. White's Exposition was arranged in the question and answer format typical of catechisms; he was concerned, among other things, with the creed, ten commandments, Lords Prayer, and sacraments. Regarding predestination, he wrote: 'Q[uestion]. What is Gods decree? A[nswer]. It is Gods unchangeable appointment concerning all things. Q[uestion]. What decree of God is cheifly to be considered? A[nswer]. That which concerneth men and Angels, which we call
Predestination: namely, God's decree concerning their everlasting estate....Q[uestion]. What is the Church? A[answer]. It is a company of men chosen by God to eternall life and made one in Christ'. 85

Discussions about predestination were clearly prohibited by the Declaration of 1628. Moreover, the reissue of the Book of Sports in 1633 caused sabbatarians to be viewed with suspicion. Reading aloud the Book of Sports was a test of loyalty and refusal to do so could be seen as a sign of defiance. Fincham has identified a number of sabbatarian tracts which, although written earlier, could not safely be printed in England until 1641, after Laud's disgrace. However, sabbatarian sentiments did survive in reprints. In the group of authors just discussed, John Smith expressed convictions about proper observance of the sabbath - so also did Paul Baynes, Robert Bolton, and John Brinsley, some of whose writings were reprinted in 1637. Paul Baynes's credentials as a nonconformist were well established; he had been silenced in 1608 by Samuel Harsnett. The posthumous publication of Briefe Directions had first been licensed by Featley and published in 1618. This book too included discussions about the elect. 'They [the godly] are often considering of God's unutterable kindnesse, of mans mortallity, the momentary estate of all things under the Sunne, the blessed estate of the Elect, the endlessse woe of the damned, and such like;...'. But Baynes also took a hard line concerning the sabbath: '...that upon the seaventh day all our workes bee laid aside as much as is possible, and the whole day to bee bestowed in his worship and service, and in things directly tending to the same'. 86

A group of sermons which had been delivered in Oxford or at Paul's Cross by Robert Bolton was entered in the Stationers' Registers in 1610 and first printed in 1611. There were a number of reprints. In these sermons, Bolton similarly acknowledged the division between the elect and the damned. 'Yet it belongs not to him [a reprobate] though the
promises of life, in the word of truth, bee made unto us, without limitation of time, or exception of sinne; yet he hath no part in them, his name was never writ in the Booke of life, he is out of the degree of election, he stands reprobate unto the covenant of grace...'. Bolton in addition spelt out how one should properly observe the sabbath. 'He doth not onely give quiet and cessation to his body from worldly businesse, and workes of his calling, but also empties his head, and disburdens his thoughts of all earthly cares'. Those who properly observe 'spend themselves in godly and extraordinarie meditations, fitting the feast day of the soule, and the Lords holy day'.

The elder John Brinsley was suspended as a school teacher about 1620, although he then seems to have survived as a lecturer in London. The first two parts of the True Watch had been produced earlier - entered in 1606 and 1607 respectively. His stated purpose was to provide direction for an examination of the spiritual estate and, in so doing, he glossed the commandments, the articles of the creed, and the Lord's Prayer. In a preface to the reader, Brinsley recognized his debt to the work of Greenham and Perkins; all three of these men stood in the experimental predestinarian tradition. Also in the preface Brinsley cautioned against the 'simple seduced brethren [who] have bin drawne to a dislike of our Religion, and a likeing of Popery'. Brinsley wanted to convince such that 'ours indeed is a religion of perfect holinesse and unity prescribed by the Lord himselfe...'. While discussing those things which must be avoided on the sabbath, he included 'All vaine delights and sports'. In this he was in direct contradiction to the Book of Sports.

One of the charges against Laud at his trial was that his licensers had caused deletions of anti-Catholic sentiment before approving books for publication. Daniel Featley, whose difficulty over licensing Clavis Mystica, 1636, is recounted in Prynne, and the editor of Richard Clerke's sermons both provided ample evidence of such tampering. In explaining why
Laud sought to control the mechanism for licensing books, Prynne claimed that this was a way to deny license to works attacking popery and Arminianism and to suppress such books when printed by the previous license of others. Some of the reprints already listed employed anti-papal rhetoric; there are several other reprints in this study in which the main arguments were directed against the pope and Catholicism. Although Richard Crakanthorp died in 1624, his brother George edited his treatise on a church council held during the reign of Justinian. This book was part of the program to discredit the claims of Cardinal Baronius. It was entered on 26 October 1630 with a Doctor Harris named as licenser; Greg has identified this licenser as warden of Winchester College. Within the prefatory matter was an endorsement from Daniel Featley which placed him at Lambeth in April 1631. In brother George's words, he [Richard] 'assaulteth the maine sort of the Romish faith, and by impregnable authorities and ineffable reasons overthoweth the Popes supposed ineffability, when hee sits in his Chaire, and with his Romane Synod, determineth out of it questions and defineth Articles of faith...'. Richard himself wrote that 'to dissent from the Pope in a cause of faith, makes one neither an Hereticke, nor a Schismatike: the other, That to assent absolutely in faith to the Pope or present Church of Rome, makes one both an Heretike, and a Schismatike'.

The title of the anonymous reprint Romes Wickednes. Or, wicked Rome spoke for itself. This work had been licensed by Featley and entered in September 1623, just slightly ahead of the anti-Catholic literature which flooded the market in 1624. The author pulled no punches. 'Hence come those many Powder plots, Poysons, Poniards, Gunnes, Inquisitions, Croysadoes, Rackes, and a thousand more such devillish things, invented by the Pope and his Monkes, and put in practice...'. A second collection of John Preston's writings was reprinted in 1637; like the Remaines, the
Sermons preached before his Majestie had been licensed by Abbot's man Austin when they were first edited by Thomas Ball and Thomas Goodwin in 1630. These sermons did not delineate the fine points of predestination - instead they were more political, containing outspoken frankness about the threats from Catholics and even, in one place, from Arminians. 'Seeing it is the received and approved doctrine of the Papists, That the Church of Rome cannot erre in points of Faith and Doctrine: wee see how little hope there is that we and they should ever be reconciled,... Notwithstanding we the Ministers of God have bin...moulded by the Holy Ghost, that thereby we may discover wherein we have fallen short, and be carefull to amend it:...that is, to make freer passage for the truth, and dam up the current of errors, whether Popish or Arminian, or of what Kinde els soever...'.

There were five reprints in this sampling which either were dubious about absolute predestination or which remained noncontroversial. Three Sermons by Henry Smith and Gerards Meditations were in the first category. Henry Smith had been celebrated as a brilliant preacher and, although dead by 1591, the popularity of his sermons endured; he became one of the bestselling divines of the early Stuart age. A reprinted edition of Three Sermons has already appeared in the sampling for 1607.

In most ways Smith's work should be counted with the predestinarian reprints. When writing of godliness, for instance, Smith stated: 'For godlinesse is not called gaine, in respect of God, but in respect of us:....so it is not called a Kingdome in respect of God, but in respect of us, because we are intituled to the kingdome by this difference from the reprobates'. Likewise, in a sermon occasioned by the appearance of a man pretending to be the prophet Elias, he wrote 'Truly Elias, thou canst not seduce the Elect, for their names are written in the book of life, and the Lord hath promised, no man shall pluck them out of my hands'. Yet at the end of this work were questions which Smith considered
still unanswered. These included 'Whether predestination, election, etc. are to be preached unto lay men? What free-will had Adam, and what free-will remaineth unto us?' This section has led Kendall to comment that Smith 'claims that while our election is certain with God, "in respect of ourselves it is uncertain." Therefore we "must strive to make the same sure by good works." He never says that election becomes certain in ourselves'.  

The work of the German theologian Johann Gerhard has been described as the 'consummation of Lutheran dogmatic theology as initiated by Melanchthon'. Gerhard had composed the Meditations in 1606 while still a student; the English translation by Ralph Winterton was printed first at the Cambridge press in 1627. This edition of Winterton's translation was issued, along with Gerhard's Prayers, in Edinburgh in 1637 - the year of the author's death. On the subject of predestination, his approach was cautious. 'God elected us before the foundations of the world were laid; but yet he elected us in Christ:....If with a firm confidence of heart thou adherest unto Christ, do not doubt but that thou art in the number of the elect. But if thou goest further beyond the limits of the word, and wilt search into the profunditie of predestination, it is greatly to be feared that thou wilt fall into the profunditie of desperation. Without Christ, God is a consuming fire:...Take heed therefore that thou drawest not the mysterie of predestination out of the law. Search not into the reasons of Gods counsels, lest thy cogitations do much seduce thee'.  

The three remaining reprints were written by John Adamson, William Austin, and Arthur Warwick. Indications are that the Scottish educator and poet, John Adamson, was devoted to Andrew Melville and was probably a Calvinist. However this Latin catechism was bereft of clues. As principal of the University of Edinburgh since 1625, he chose to dedicate this work to David Aikenhead, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, when it was first published in 1627. This is the
only other extant edition. Meditations written by William Austin, barrister of Lincoln's Inn, were collected posthumously by his widow and first printed in 1635; entrance was done on 24 July 1634. John Legate printed the first part of this, which included a reprint of the original imprimatur from S. Baker, dated 2 July 1634. Although the license here was good for only nine months, reprinting it was in the same pattern as in another joint venture of Legate and Badger, John Preston's Remaines. Approbation from Baker would indicate that this devotional work was acceptable to the authorities in the Laudian church; Wilfrid Prest has described Austin as a 'lay high-church man'. Lastly, there were more posthumous meditations, these composed by Arthur Warwick and reprinted in a 'sixt edition' in 1637. These were dedicated to William Dodington, who was commended by Bartholomew Parsons for returning impropriations to the church. Some of this book was devotional in nature, but the second section disintegrated into diatribes against secular targets such as law courts and usurers. This was entered on 24 March 1632 with the unidentified Dawson named as licenser.

On the whole these reprints provide examples of earlier norms in the English church and are distinctly unlike the works which were issuing from the printing press for the first time in 1637. Of the twenty six reprints in this study, twelve, among other things, were decidedly predestinarian, three were arguably predestinarian but obviously sabbatarian, and three were anti-papist - thus eighteen titles communicated strong points which were pre-Laudian. Of the next five, two (H. Smith and Gerhard) relayed a mixed message, and three could not be classified. Only three titles (by Bancroft, Sandys and Baker) were intellectually linked to the prevalent positions of the late Caroline church. There were no surreptitious printings in the sample of reprints.

Therefore almost 69% of the reprints (eighteen of twenty six) reflected a market for writings unsympathetic to
Laudianism. None of the legal earliest extant editions did. Only three reprints, or 12%, were notable for philosophies dominant in the church of Laud and his associates. On the other hand, twenty three (or 56%) of the forty one legal first editions were obviously in support of these regime policies. Among reprints only 19% (five of twenty six) appeared neutral, with viewpoints mixed or undetectable, whereas fully 44% (eighteen of forty one) of the legitimate first editions seemed cautiously uncommitted. Examination of the six first editions which were printed secretly at home or abroad shows that all of them, 100%, tackled topics which would not have been acceptable to Laudian licensers. Except for the Ball item licensed in 1627 by Worrall, none of the eighteen reprints with evangelical Calvinist themes had been licensed by known Arminian censors; many had been licensed by Daniel Featley. Conversely, except for the Rhodes book (which had been entered once almost fifty years earlier and then not printed), Laudian censors licensed all the London earliest extant editions.

This apparent triumph in controlling religious works which were going through the system of pre-publication approval and entrance is corroborated by three kindred studies. Already cited is Fincham who tracked a number of sabbatarian titles, kept from print until 1641 or later. Performing his own study of the sabbath publications, Milton comes to the same conclusion. 'If we look at print figures relating to the sabbath dispute, for example: whereas no replies to Laudian pamphlets were published in printed form in the 1630's (except for Burton's solitary clandestine publication) no less than eight were published in 1641, all in response to Laudian tracts that were published over the period 1634-7.... Some of these confutations can be shown to have been in manuscript circulation as early as 1635...'. Likewise, David Cressy has studied the history of the commemoration of the Gunpowder Plot on 5 November. Typically this tradition had included authorized prayers and emotional,
anti-Catholic sermons. However, 'in the 1630's the Gunpowder anniversary began to lose its unifying character....On the one hand puritan preachers used 5 November as an occasion to emphasize the dangers of creeping popery and the necessity of further reformation; on the other, the Caroline regime sought to muffle the commemoration'. The official service book for 5 November was revised in 1635, a bone of contention for true anti-Catholics. Henry Burton was one who reacted to this, with famous consequences. One of the other hardliners was John Goodwin, whose 1634 Gunpowder Treason sermons were not published until 1640. John Vicars was allegedly unable to get his verse history of the Gunpowder Treason relicensed for reprinting. 95

The most precise of these three inquiries was done by Philip Olander in 1976. He studied thirty nine catechisms and concentrated on content as well as on date of entrance and name of licenser. He concluded that: 'an assessment of some of the catechisms of the period will show that, until 1637, controversial opinions and indirect criticism of the episcopal hierarchy were published without hindrance on the strength of licenses granted before 1625.'. Moreover, 'these Calvinist or anti-Arminian catechisms were all licensed at earlier dates than their opposite numbers. Daniel Featley's *Sum of saving Knowledge*, licensed by the author in 1625, was the only catechism approved after 1624 to maintain the doctrine of election and reprobation by the decree of God'. The list of catechisms included in Olander's study will be reproduced at the end of the appendix to this chapter. He cites the reprinting of continental Calvinist catechisms of Zacharias Ursinus and Matthew Virel as being especially controversial in the Laudian milieu of the 1630's, but also lists reprints of English catechisms by the likes of Browne, Dension, Egerton, Elton, and Gouge as maintaining 'Calvinist double election categorically'. Henry Burton's *Grounds of Christian Religion*, 1631, described as saying 'nothing about doctrinal reprobation but which characteristically condemned
popery as Antichristian', is among the nine catechisms licensed after March 1625; it is important to remember that Abbot's chaplains were still a viable alternative until 1633, and it was one of these, Buckner, who licensed Burton's work. The two catechisms licensed post-1625 which Olander found most Arminian were those by Edmund Reeve (Communion Book Catechism Expounded, licensed by Weekes in 1635) and Daniel Rogers, (Practical Catechism, licensed in 1632).  

The content of religious books going through the London system in 1637 was largely supportive of the various aims associated with Caroline and Laudian rule. There is strong evidence that London religious publication was indeed 'politically correct'. So also is there evidence of a high degree of compliance regarding the incidence of entrance in the Stationers' Registers and the incidence of imprimaturs in printed books. On the other hand, from the results of more general surveys there has been a widespread impression of casual response on the part of stationers to regulations for entrance and imprimaturs. Nonetheless, conformity to the rules for orderly printing was very desirable to the regime in 1637, and religious printing was arguably the source of greatest frustration in this respect. As this survey entailed an examination of one third of all relevant religious titles printed in the pivotal year of 1637, it is a very specific sampling and in this sense offers a clear measurement of orderliness in religious printing.

As already described in the introduction, (and given in greater detail in Appendix G of this chapter), previous studies of entrance rates in the Stationers' Registers done by W. W. Greg in 1944 and by Maureen Bell a half-century later established a quite different picture of cooperation. The results of Greg's three separate counts of books between 1576 and 1640, two of which eliminated religious works entirely, gave him an overall average of between 60% and 70% as the proportion of London-printed books entered at Stationers' Hall. Even this statement was dubious as the
study considering only dramatic works did not even eliminate books printed outside London. The only count which was broken down chronologically, by decades, calculated that 69% of dramatic titles were entered between 1631 and 1640. \(^{97}\)

Bell, taking advantage of the revised *Short Title Catalogue* and its chronological index included all disciplines, but confined herself to only three time spans: 1594-96, 1614-16, and 1634-36. She carefully limited herself to earliest extant editions printed in London and then instituted some fine tuning by adding in those London books covered by official patent and monopoly which would not require licence. Even so, her examination of titles between 1634-36 (not broken into individual years) reported that only 74% of titles were entered. \(^{98}\) My own sampling of religious works records a 95% entrance rate for titles in 1637. Of the thirty six London first editions in this survey, only two titles, notorious and surreptitiously printed in London, were not entered. These two were a work of William Prynne, printed while he was in prison, and the *Holy Table* of Bishop Williams. (The translation of Bishop Nicetas's work was done by the king's printer and can be disregarded). Without the two illicit books, the rate of conformity is 100%. By enlarging the range of this survey to count all the London first editions of religious works for 1637 and by including the official publications as well, my calculations produced an 89% compliance rate.

Another earlier, but still influential, measurement of stationers' cooperation was that done by F. B. Williams. Focusing on the licit trade publications of London printers for the years 1634 and 1640 only, Williams attempted to examine all books. He also reported a low incidence of compliance to government regulations, in this case to the order of Laud in 1632 (repeated in the Star Chamber Decree of 1637) that the licenser's permission be printed in the book. For 1634 Williams found only 14% with imprimatur and for 1640 he found 35%. \(^{99}\) In my sample of thirty four legal
London religious books, there were twenty four, or 71%, with imprimaturs. Two unusual exceptions were those books written by Archbishop Laud and Bishop Francis White: each was named as licenser of his own work. Presumably no intermediate step to approve the manuscript was expected since the author was also the licenser; if so, that explains the absence of imprimaturs. The unique, imperfect copy of the title by Johann Justus Landsberger may have originally contained an imprimatur. (Bishop Nicetas's title has already been eliminated because as a privileged work, it would not need ecclesiastical approval before printing). If these three are eliminated from the total, twenty four of thirty one, or 77% of the books have imprimaturs.

Printers may have been observing the spirit of the law when they remembered to include imprimaturs, but clause four of the Star Chamber Decree specified that the license should be imprinted in the beginning of the book. The observance of this directive was uneven, and there were other variations which may have had more to do with the licensers themselves. For lack of a true formula, imprimaturs sometimes reflected the work habits and personalities of their creators. The two chaplains to Juxon, Samuel Baker and Thomas Weekes, licensed the greatest number of books in this sampling. However their licenses were not repeated in imprimaturs as often as were some of Laud's chaplains. Of the six books licensed by Baker, four contained imprimaturs; for Weekes it was twelve of fifteen which had imprimaturs. An imprimatur for the title by Johann Justus Landsberger may exist in a perfect copy. Weekes supplied the imprimatur for the Clerke book, part of which had been licensed by Haywood and listed in the registers.

All of Baker's imprimaturs were dated. Only the license for Hall's title came after the decree of July, and each part contained an imprimatur properly placed at the beginning. The imprimatur in Buck's book was valid for only six months. As the most overworked of the licensers, Weekes was often brief in the style of his approbations. Nine of twelve imprimaturs
had no date at all. Placement varied, even for those issued after the decree. Since Weekes was used most frequently, he was presumably the primary licenser. Moreover, his impossible workload may have made him more attractive for Calvinist writers: Goodwin, Hooker, Sibbes and Whately all received permission from him.

Those affiliated with Laud as chaplains or in other capacities, William Bray, William Haywood, and John Oliver, were less active, but the works they licensed were, with the partial exception of Clerke's book, not by known Calvinists. All three of the books licensed by William Bray contained dated imprimaturs and were clearly done before the decree. Each was verbose and detailed; the license for Mede was good for three months and the one for Pocklington was to last for five. As mentioned earlier, Bray had to preach a recantation for Pocklington's work. William Haywood lost his job as licenser after the fiasco with the de Sales's book; however there were five works licensed by him in this survey. Four contained imprimaturs; three imprimaturs were dated. There was wide inconsistency in Haywood's style, varying from the simple name and date in the work described as by 'German theologians' to lengthy imprimaturs in the Page and de Sales books, each granting permission for two years. Rather amusing was the detailed license for Tillinghast's sermon which limited approval to three months, but in the printed version neglected to provide a date. In the case of Richard Clerke's book, Haywood was cited in the registers as licenser for some of the sermons, but the imprimatur for the whole book was actually signed by Weekes. Haywood's difficulties did not seem to end with de Sales: in March 1637 he was in trouble because one of his parishioners had been influencing others to turn papist and refuse to attend church. A publication of 1641 records a petition to parliament against Haywood by his parishioners. John Oliver's role at this time is not completely clear - he may not have become Laud's chaplain until later. Oliver seems to have been mainly in Oxford and
was later named president of Magdalen College. He was responsible for licensing the books by Lawrence and Yates, but only the latter included an imprimatur, dated June 1637.

In the matter of reprints it is difficult to gauge the effectiveness of article 18 in the printing decree - the article which required all reprints to be relicensed. That the clause was vastly unpopular with the stationers can be documented. In an early draft of the decree, the regulation for reprints was found as clause 14. A copy of this draft, accompanied by notes from stationers' clerk Henry Walley, survives. Walley predicted 'To haue all Bookes (formerly licensed) now licen[sed] againe before they be reprinted tends to the vtter vndoing of the greater number of the Society of Stationers whose meanes & livelihode...doo depend on the Benefits they haue by these copies....It will be a cause to make them try all waies to haue them printed (as they were formerly allowed) either by stealth or in corners here, or otherwise beyond the seas....It is impossible for all the chaplains of the Lo. Archbp of Cant. & Bp of London with twenty more joyned to them to doo the worke'. Presses would stand idle.

Whatever its effectiveness, to its opponents article 18 of the Star Chamber decree rankled. William Prynne, reporting the failures of stationers to gain more lenient rules for reprints, listed works against popery by Jewell, Willet, Foxe and John Vicars which were allegedly refused relicensing. The Root and Branch Petition of 11 December 1640 specified as complaint number nine: 'The hindering of godly books to be printed, the blotting out or perverting those which they suffer, all or most of that which strikes either at Popery or Arminianism; the adding of what or where pleaseth them, and the restraint of reprinting books formerly licensed, without relicensing'. That same month Sir Edward Dering fumed: 'To these I parallel our late Imprimatur Licensers for the Press, so handled, that Truth is suppresse, and Popish Pamphlets fly abroad cum privilegio,...I
add...that the most learned Labours of our antient and best Divines must be new corrected and defaced with a Deleatur, by the supercilious Pen of my Lord's Young Chaplain...'.

Peter Heylyn, on the defensive when later writing the history of William Laud, explained why it was thought necessary to curb reprints. Many works dated from the time of Elizabeth when the Pope was the greatest enemy; others expressed 'Calvinian Doctrines' from the time when they were embraced by many. 'And not a few of the Books then Printed, and such as after were Licensed in Abbot's Time, aimed principally at the Maintenance of these Opinions, which the latter Times found inconsistent with the Churches Doctrines. With equal diligence he [Laud] endeavoured by his Decree to hinder the Reprinting of the one and the other, that so the Church might rest in quiet...'.

The most melancholy contemporary comment came from the topographer William Burton in his appeal of 19 September 1637 to Sir John Lambe. Burton had just learned that a new Star Chamber decree demanded that even for reprints, two copies of a book must be supplied: one for the examiner and one for the printer. But his book 'is now grown so great that he knows not how to get another copy transcribed, for that he is so troubled with the stone that he cannot sit long to write'. Since his book did not touch on religion, he requested that Lambe 'would procure license that this only copy may pass for all'. Here the decree served as a deterrent indeed; only the 1622 edition survives.

There was no requirement in the decree of 1637 that reprints be re-entered in the registers, and no reason for stationers to undergo the added expense since they already retained copyright. As a matter of fact, article 18 specified that stationers 'bee put to no other charge hereby, but the bringing and leaving of two printed copies of the book...with all additions'. However theoretically reprints needed a new license after 11 July 1637; it would not be unreasonable to expect therefore that the reprint contain an imprimatur with
licenser named as proof of relicensing. None of the reprints in this study displayed a fresh imprimatur. Titles by Preston and Austin, both printed by John Legate, have imprimaturs repeated from earlier editions. However, in his review of imprimaturs, F. B. Williams did note several reprints with new imprimaturs; the wording in these was different and distinctive. Arthur Dent's *Sermon of Repentance*, 1637, contained an imprimatur of 28 November 1637 from Samuel Baker which read: 'Fiat ultra impressio'; Thomas Tymme's *Silver Watch-bell*, 1640, received one from William Bray on 17 March 1640 stating: 'Fiat altera Editio'. The best evidence of stationer and licenser trying to follow the decree is a holograph imprimatur in the Folger copy of Ezekiel Culverwell's *Way to a blessed Estate*, 1633, which had the word 'Imprimatur' crossed out and 'fiat altera Editio' substituted by William Bray on 18 May 1638. Yet for some reason there is no trace of a reprint at this time. These three books were devotional in nature. A reprint of *English villainies*, written by Thomas Dekker and dated 1638, on the final leaf has instructions from the licenser Matthew Clay: 'Recudatur. Febru. 27. 1637/8'. So although admittedly the occurrence and reproduction in print of such relicensing was slight, yet there were some stationers whose adherence to the new requirement confirms that the regulation must have survived in theory. 105

In looking again at religious printing for the year 1637, one can see that the results of this study disclose a distinctive pattern. The contrast between legitimate first editions in England, (virtually all of which went through the system of pre-publication licensing and entrance in the registers), on the one hand, and surreptitious printing and unregulated reprints on the other, is striking. Of the earliest extant editions, fully 56% lent support to the current policies and doctrines of the Caroline Church: a program which aggressively pushed a preference for the beauty of holiness, -whether in church fabric, collective ritual, or
ceremonies - doctrinal peace and unity in the church, a more ecumenical approach to Catholicism, and a relaxed treatment of the sabbath. Supported by the Declaration of 1628 and the reissuance of the Book of Sports, loyalists also reacted to assaults from puritans. Even known Calvinists conformed to the requirements of the ruling party. There were no licit first editions which proclaimed the absolute nature of predestination or the binding nature of the sabbath. Attacks on the papacy or Roman Catholics more generally were similarly muted. The other 44% of the legal first editions in 1637 were devotional and neutral - supplying more evidence that there was indeed a politics of publication in matters of religion. One might be tempted to see this as a form of theological consensus, were it not for the existence of contrary opinion issuing out of secret printings, and reprints from an earlier period, and the return of Calvinist printing in the 1640s; all this suggests instead a Star Chamber consensus.

All six of the underground first editions, books by the likes of Bishop Williams, William Prynne, and John Bastwick, were openly critical of the practices and leading personnel of this Caroline church. The reprints, none of which were surreptitiously produced, provide a revealing glimpse of the market for unregulated books. 69% contained pre-Laudian themes: the forbidden doctrine of the double decree of predestination, advocacy of strict sabbath observance, or diatribes against popery. Another 19% were neutral and only 12% were measurably supportive of the aims of the regime.

When success in controlling the content of legal religious first editions is combined with the hundred percent rate of entrance for London trade publications and the high number of imprimaturs in the books comprising this survey, a picture is revealed of remarkable cooperation between church, state, divines, and stationers in 1637. The products of this collusion however did not reflect the taste of the reading public as a whole as much as they did that of the upper
echelons of the government; thanks to the unsuccessfully regulated sectors of the printing world, we can now see that there was indeed still a considerable market for alternative, Calvinist evangelical thought.
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APPENDIX - 1637

A) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND


STC 5410. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Alchorne 14 no. 1636 as 'conteyning Twenty and seaven sermons vpon seuerall texts'; licensed by Master Haywood. Has undated IMPRIMATUR for entire work signed by Weekes. Dedicated to Isaac Bargrave, Dean of Canterbury, and prebendaries of the Metropolitan Church of Christ Canterbury by editor.
This title not in Wing.


STC 6111. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to J. Clarke a. H. Skelton 17 de. 1624 and licensed by master Doctor Ffeatly; ent. to Clarke alone 3 oc. 1636 and licensed by Master Baker.
This title not in Wing.

Drant, Thomas, of Shaston (b.1602?), The divine Lanthorne: or, a Sermon preached in S. Pauls church appointed for the Crosse the 17. of July [1636.] London, G. Miller f. Walter Hammond, 1637. F copy.

STC 7164. Only extant edition in STC; one variant, also in 1637, with imprint: G. Miller, sold by Henry Hammond in Salisbury. Ent. to W. Hamon 6 no. 1637; licensed by Master Wekes. Has undated IMPRIMATUR. Dedicated to Sir Christopher Clitherow, Merchant; John Hawes, Goldsmith; and Richard Caswell, Baker - all officers of Christ's Hospital.
This title not in Wing.
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Drant, Thomas, of Shaston, (b. 1602?), The royall Guest: or, a Sermon preached at Lent Assises [1636.] At the Cathedrall of Sarum being the first Sunday of Lent, before Sr. John Finch and Sr. John Denham. London, G. Miller f. Walter Hammond, sold by M. Sparke, 1637. F copy.

STC 7165. Only extant edition in STC; one variant, also in 1637, with imprint: G. Miller, sold by Henry Hammond in Salisbury. Ent. to W. Hamond 1 se. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. Has undated IMPRIMATUR. Dedicated to Sir Peter Ball, recorder of Exeter. This title not in Wing.

Fitz-Geffrey, Charles (1576?-1638), Compassion towards Captives, chiefly towards our Bretheren in Bondage in Barbarie. In three Sermons. [With] an Epistle of St Cyprian [etc.] Oxford, L. Lichfield for E. Forrest, 1637. F copy. Substitutes for STC 10838.5 which is not available.

STC 10937. Only extant edition in STC. Dedicated to John Cawse, Mayor of Plymouth. This title in Wing as reissue dated 1648.


STC 11321. First appearance of this edition in STC. Earliest was 1613 Douai edition; 8 printings between 1613 and 1637. Two were done openly in Enlgand: this one and an expurgated edition in 1616. Ent. to W. Burr 26 au. 1615 on condition that it be 'purused and purged'; licensed then and again on 12 se. 1615 by Master Doctor Nid. Ass'd by Mistris Burre to J. Spencer 3 jy. 1630 and from J. Spencer to W. Brookes 16 my. 1636. Ent. to W. Brookes 4 fb. 1637; licensed by Master Haywood. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 27 no. 1636. Called in by proclamation 14 my. 1637 (STC 9087). See also Greg, Companion, pp. 347-50; Arber IV.528. Dedicated to Anne Roper Constable. This title in Wing with 8 printings between 1648 and 1686.


STC 11785. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to H. Blundon 13 ap. 1637; licensed by Master Haywood. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 29
mr. 1636. In the preface authorship of the original is attributed to M. Hoe von Hoenegg.
This title not in Wing.

This title in Wing with printing in 1650.

Hall, Joseph, Bp (1574-1656), The Remedy of Prophaneness...In two Bookes. (A Sermon preach't in the City of Excester.) London, T. Harper f. N. Butter, 1637. F copy. Substitutes for STC 124 91 which is not available.
STC 12710. Earliest extant edition in STC; one reissue done in 1638. Ent. to Butter 11 oc. 1637; licensed by master Baker. Has IMPRIMATUR for each book dated 11 oc. 1637. F has copies with and without errata below the IMPRIMATUR. This title not in Wing.

STC 13171. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in 1639. Ent. to T. Andrews 26 ap. 1637 without author named; licensed by Master Weekes. Some copies have initials 'I. H.' handstamped at end of dedication; L has separate titlepage with 'I. H.' handstamped. Has undated IMPRIMATUR. Dedicated to Thomas Coventry, I Baron Coventry.
This title in Wing with printings in 1652, 1658, 1686.

Heylyn, Peter (1599-1662), A briefe and moderate Answer, to H. Burton, in [4141.] And in [4134.] London, R Hodgkinsonne, sold by D. Frere, 1637. F copy.
STC 13269. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to R. Hodgkinsone 1 jy. 1637; licensed by Master Bray. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 23 jn. 1637. r2 and d2 are in 2 settings; in some copies a1, D4 and T1 are cancels.
This title not in Wing.

STC 13728. Earliest extant edition in STC; 4 printings between 1637 and 1640 (1 of them in Amsterdam). Ent. to Crooke as by T. H. 28 fb. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. This title not in Wing.


STC 13731. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in 1640. Ent. as by T. H. to Young and F. Clifton 22 ap. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. This title not in Wing.

Jackson, Thomas, Dean of Peterborough (1579-1640), *Diverse Sermons, with a short Treatise befitting these present Times, now first published.* Oxford, L. Lichfield, 1637. F copy (imp.).

STC 14307. Only extant edition in STC. Dedicated to Prince Charles [King Charles II]. This title in Wing in works, 1653, etc.

Johann Justus, Landsberger (1489-1539), *An Epistle, or, Exhortative Letter sent from Jesus Christ, to every faithfull Soule. Tr. (The Manuell of St. Augustine.)* London, R. H[odgkinson?] f. W. Brookes, 1637. Unique at D.

STC 14628.5. Earliest extant edition in STC printed openly in England. Four printings between 1592 and 1637. Ent. to W. Brookes 4 fb. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. [Same day as Francis of Sales book ent.] This title not in Wing.


STC 15306. Earliest extant edition in STC; two more printings in 1637. Ent. to Badger 1 jy. 1637; licensed by my Lords grace of Canterburie [Laud]. It is possible that only 25 copies of this edition (with type ornament on titlepage)
were printed.
Dedicated to King Charles I.
This title not in Wing.

Lawrence, Thomas (1598-1657), *A Sermon preached before the kings Maiesty [7 fb. 1637.]* London, R. Badger, 1637. F copy.

STC 15326. Earliest extant edition in STC; two editions and two variants in 1637. Ent. to Badger 7 mr. 1637; licensed by Master Oliver.
This title not in Wing.


STC 15499. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other issue in 1639. No entry in Arber.
Dedicated to Thomas Wentworth, I Earl of Strafford.
This title not in Wing.


STC 17218. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to T. Knight 9 mr. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes.
This title in Wing with printings in 1647 and 1650.

Mede, Joseph (1586-1638), *The name Altar, or [Greek word], anciently given to the holy Table.* London, M. F[lesher] f. J. Clark, 1637. F copy, with 'St Peters' in imprint.

Has IMPRIMATUR dated 16 my. 1637.
This title in Wing in Works, 1648.


STC 18527. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.
This title not in Wing.


STC 19347.5. Only extant edition in STC; one other 1637 issue. Dedicated to Sir William Dodington of Breamore. This title not in Wing.

Pocklington, John (d. 1642), *Altare christianum: or, the dead vicars Plea. Wherein the Vicar of Grantham. being dead, yet speaketh.* London, R. Badger, 1637. F copy, which has hand-stamped in red ink below imprint: 'sould by N: Vavasour'.

STC 20075. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other printing in 1637. Ent. to Badger 7 mr. 1637a; licensed by Master Bray. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 21 fb. 1637. Answered by Prynne [STC 20474]. Ordered burned 12 Feb. 1641; see JHL IV. 161, 180. Regarding publication of the sermon (Wing B 4316) by W. Bray, the licenser, disavowing Pocklington's ideas, see Greg, Companion, p. 108. This title not in Wing.


STC 20961. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to A. Hill 16 de. 1588, no licenser named. This title not in Wing.


STC 22486. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted, enlarged, once in 1638. Ent. to J. Rothwell 10 no. 1637 a. 19 fb. 1638; both times licensed by Master Weekes. Has undated IMPRIMATUR. This title not in Wing.

STC 22502. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to R. Cotes 18 se. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 5 oc. 1637. All subtitles have 1637 in imprints. Copies vary: Sibbes variously described on general tp as 'now with God' or 'now deceased'.
This title not in Wing.


STC 22513.5. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1637; this is a corrected reprint of that. Another printing in 1638. Ent. to J. Rothwell 12 jn. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. Has undated IMPRIMATUR.
This title not in Wing.

Sparrow, Anthony (1612-1685), A Sermon concerning Confession of Sinnes, and the Power of Absolution. Preached by Mr. Sp[arrow] of Queenses Colledge in Cambridge. London, R. Bishop f. J. Clark, 1637. F has second issue of first 1637 printing, with imprint 'and are to bee sold at his shop...in Cornhill'.

STC 23029.5. Earliest extant edition in STC; altogether 2 printings (with one issue) in 1637; 2nd printing really sold in Dublin according to STC. Ent. to J. Clarke 13 jy. 1637; licensed by Master Baker.
This title not in Wing.


This title not in Wing.

STC 23271. Only extant edition in STC.
Dedicated to the city of Worcester.
This title not in Wing.


Dedicated to William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury; individual sermons have various dedications.
This title not in Wing.


STC 23857.7. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other issue in 1637. Ent. to Godfrey Emerson 8 fb. 1637; licensed by Master Baker.
Has IMPRIMATUR dated 6 fb. 1637.
Dedicated to Matthew Wren, Bishop of Norwich.
This title not in Wing.


STC 24075. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to A. Kembe 24 ja. 1637; licensed by Master Haywod. Has undated IMPRIMATUR.
Dedicated to Margery Lee Gratwick, wife of Sir William, Viscount Sussex.
This title not in Wing.


STC 24175. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Master Badger 25 se. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. Has undated IMPRIMATUR.
Dedications to Anne Brett Cranfield (wife of Lionel I Earl of Middlesex) and Katherine Hueriblock Conway (wife of Edward I Viscount).
This title not in Wing.

Verneuil, Jean (1583?-1647), A Nomenclator of such Tracts and

STC 24674. Only extant edition in STC. This title in Wing with 1642 printing.


STC 25027.5. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other issue in 1637, a printing in 1639, and a translation into English in 1640. Ent. to Master Mathews 12 jn. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. Translation licensed by doctor Wykes 29 ap. 1640. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 5 jn. 1637. Dedicated to King Charles I. This title not in Wing.


STC 25314. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Master Edwards 2 my. 1637; licensed by Master Weekes. Has undated IMPRIMATUR. This title not in Wing.

White, Francis, Bp. (15647-1638), An Examination and Confutation of a lawlesse Pamphlet, [4137.7, attrib. to H. Burton.] London, R. B[adger,] sold in S. Dunstans Church-yard...at the little shop turning up to Cliffords-Inne, 1637. F copy (lacks Y1).

STC 25379. Earliest extant edition in STC; 2 other variants in 1637. Ent. to Master Badger 13 fb. 1637; licensed by my Lord Bishop of Elye [Francis White.] This title not in Wing.


STC 26089. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to William Cooke 15 jn. 1637; licensed by Master Oliver. Has IMPRIMATUR dated 15 jn. 1637. Dedicated to Clere Talbot, LL.D. This title not in Wing.

B) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS - PRINTED ABROAD
OR SECRETLY IN ENGLAND - PROTESTANT

Bastwick, John (1593-1654), A briefe Relation of certain Passages, in the Starre-chamber, delivered June the 14th, 1637. at the Censure of Dr. Bastwicke, Mr. Burton and Mr. Prynne. [Amsterdam, J. F. Stam,] 1637. F copy.

STC 1569. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted twice in 1638, both in Holland. No entry in Arber. This title not in Wing.

Bastwick, John (1593-1654), [Pt. 3 of the Letany of John Bastwicke:] The Vanity and Mischeife of the old Letany. To follow the Letany as a third Part of it. [Leiden, W. Christiaens or, more probably, Delft, J. Moxon,] 1637. F copy.

STC 1574. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Four parts of this printed in Holland in 1637, no extant reprints. This title not in Wing.

Catalogue. A Catalogue of such Testimonies as evidence Bishops and Presbyters to be both One, equall and the same in Jurisdiction, Office. [By W. Prynne.] [Leiden? W. Christiaens?] 1637. F copy.

STC 4788. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Copies vary in size and pen corrections to date: F copy has added epistle to reader and errata (a)-(b)4, apparently printed in London and has date altered in pen to 1641 (= Wing P 3922). Title listed in Wing, but all are 1637 edition with date altered in ink.

Prynne, William (1600-1669), [Heading lr:] Briefe Instructions for Church-Wardens and Others to observe in all episcopall or archdiaconall Visitations and spirituall Courts. [Anon.] [London? 1637.] Examined HD copy, reel 1823.

STC 20454.5. Only extant editions in STC have both been dated 1637; both were probably printed secretly in England. No entry in Arber. See Cal. S.P.D., 1637, pp. 174-5. This title not in Wing.

Prynne, William (1600-1669), XVI. new Quaeres proposed to our lord Praelates. [Init. M. E.] [Amsterdam, J. F. Stam,] 1637. Examined General Theological Seminary copy, reel 1253.

STC 20475. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. This title not in Wing.
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Williams, John, Abp. (1582-1650), The holy Table, Name & Thing, more anciently, properly, and literally used under the New Testament, then that of an Altar: written by a Minister in Lincoln-shire, in Answer to D. Coal [13270. Anon.] [London? Eliot's Court Press,] Printed for the Diocese of Lincoln, 1637. F copy is of 2nd 1637 printing.

STC 25725. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1637; altogether there are 7 printings in 1637. No entry in Arber. Has IMPRIMATUR in English signed by Jo. Lincoln, Dean of Westminster, dated 30 no. [1636]. Arber IV.528 has list of printers, 4 of whom (Alsop, Fawcet, Mathewes, and A. Griffin of ECP) are stated to have reprinted eds. Answered by STC 13267 [P. Heylyn.]
This title not in Wing.

C) RELIGIOUS WRITINGS - REPRINTS - PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND


STC 139. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1627 in Scotland; this is only other printing. No entry in Arber. Dedicated to David Aikenhead, Lord Provost of Edinburgh.
This title not in Wing.

Substitutes for STC 588.5 which is not available.

This title not in Wing.

STC 1224. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1636; 4 printings (and 1 issue) between 1636 and 1640. There are two 1637 issues, which also differ in the address of the bookseller on the title page. Ent. to [J.] Boler 21 my. 1633, licensed by Master Bray. Ent. in trust for T. Boler 7 se. 1638.
Dedicated to King Charles I; includes epistle to Baker from Sir Henry Wotton.
This title not in Wing.


STC 1318.3. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1615, printed at Cambridge; 9 printings (and 1 variant) between 1615 and 1637. There are 2 1637 variants, the second one printed for E. Brewster. Ent. to E. Brewster and R. Bird 1 au. 1627 as by J. Ball and master Nichols; licensed by master Doctor Worrall.
This title in Wing with 7 printings between 1646 and 1670.


STC 1350. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1588; 3 printings (and 1 issue) between 1588 and 1637. This is a reissue of 1636 printing. Ent. to G. Seton 3 mr. 1589 as preached the first Sunday of parliament; licensed by archbishop of Canterbury [John Whitgift]. Answered by John Davidson [STC 6322] and John Penry [STC 19603].
This title not in Wing.


STC 1627. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1618; reprinted only once, in 1637. Ent. to Nathanael Newbury 11 my. 1618; licensed by Master Doctor Ffeatlie. [STC 1633 also reprinted by Griffin for Newbery in this year.] Dedicated to Nicholas Jordan, of Chichester and Inner Temple by publisher, N. N[ewbery.]
This title not in Wing.

Bolton, Robert (1572-1631), A Discourse about the State of true Happinesse. Delivered in certaine Sermons in Oxford, and

STC 3233a. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1611; 8 printings (and one variant) between 1611 and 1638. This is a variant of 1636 printing. Ent. to E. Weaver 29 no. 1610, described as 'sermons in Oxford and att Paules Crosse'; licensed by Doctor Mokett. Ass'd to T. Weaver 19 de. 1638. Dedicated to Sir Augustine Nicolls, Judge. This title listed in Wing as reissue of 1638 printing, in Works, 1641.

Brinsley, John, the Elder, The true Watch and Rule of Life. [Parts 1 and 2.] London, J. Beale, 1637. F copy. Substitutes for 3412.3 which is not available.

STC 3785. Reprint. Earliest extant edition of first part is 1606 and of second part is 1607. First part ent. 7 jn. 1606; second 4 jy. 1607. 9 printings of two parts together between 1611 and 1637; ass'd by S. Macham to Master Beale 15 se. 1637. Dedications to Henry Hastings, V Earl of Huntingdon, and his wife Elizabeth Stanley Hastings. This title in Wing with printing in 1648.


STC 4236.6. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1614; 5 printings (and 2 variants) between 1614 and 1637: there are three 1637 variants, each for a different publisher. Most recent ent. to W. Sheffard, J. Bellamye a. B. Fisher 27 jn. 1625; no licenser involved. Fisher's pt. ass'd to P. Stephens a. C. Meredith 20 ja. 1628; Sheffard's pt. to H. Overton 13 my. 1630; [Bellamye retained his own; widow Sheffard m. H. Overton.] Dedicated to Jane Brerewood Ratcliffe, wife of mayor of Chester. This title not in Wing.


STC 4237. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1619; 3 printings between 1619 and 1637, although also issued as pt. of The Marrow of the Oracles of God, printed 11 times between 1619 and 1640. This title first ent. to W. Sheffard, J. Bellamye a. B. Fisher 27 jn. 1625; no licenser involved.
Assignments in 1628 and 1630 respectively are the same as in previous entry.
Dedicated to Ruth Hampden Scudamore.
This title not in Wing.

Crakanthorp, Richard (1567-1624), *A Treatise of the fift general councel held at Constantinopole, Anno 553. Wherein is proved that the Popes definitive Sentence, in Matter of Faith, was condemned as hereticall. And the Frauds of Cardinall Baronius are discovered.* Published by G. Crakanthorp. London, [M. Flesher] f. R. M[ilbourne,] 1634. F has only 1634 issue.

STC 5984. Reissue. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1631; 5 issues of this (all with cancelled title pages) produced between 1634 and 1637; 3 of them dated 1637. Ent. to Milborne 26 oc. 1630; licensed by master Doctor Harris. Dedicated to Edward Barrett, I Lord Baron of Newburgh, by editor; Advertisement to the reader signed Daniel Featley, Lambeth, April 26, 1631. Imprint cites children of R. Minshew. This title not in Wing.


STC 6625. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1606; 5 printings between 1606 and 1637. Ass'd from Thomas, Paul, and Jonah Man to widdow [Joan] Mann a. B. Fisher 12 au. 1635; from B. Fisher to [R.] Young 27 mr. 1637. This is only printing since 1617. This title not in Wing.

Dickson, David (15837-1662), *A short Explanation of the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrewes.* Dublin, Soc. of Statrs., 1637. F copy.

STC 6825. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1635, printed in Aberdene; this is only reprint. This title in Wing with printing in 1649.


STC 7614. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1615; 3 printings between 1615 and 1637. No entry in Arber for 1615, but ass'd by Mab to Kingston 6 mr. 1618 and ass'd by Mab to
J. Bloome 4 jy. 1635.
Dedicated to Rowland Trappes, of Bermondsey.
This title not in Wing.


STC 11652. Reprint. Earliest collected edition in STC of some of these sermons is 1622, which is a reissue of 8 sermons. That collected edition reprinted and enlarged only once, in 1637. This is the first of 4 1637 variants. Bladen's rights ass'd to Brewster 4 au. 1626. Of 19 separate titles in F copy, almost all were previously ent. in Arber. Subtitles name other publishers. Assorted dedications. This title not in Wing.

Gerhard, Johann (1582-1637), Gerards Meditations....Translated, and revised by Ralph Winterton. The fifth Edition. [And Prayers.] Edinburgh, heires of A. Hart, 1637. F(imp.)

Substitutes for STC 11706.6 which is not available.

STC 11777. Reprint. Earliest extant English edition of meditations is 1627 at Cambridge; of the prayers is 1625 in London; ent. to R. Jackson 8 no. 1623. Printed together 7 times between 1631 and 1640 (with one variant). All of these were printed at Cambridge (including 1638 and 1640) or in Scotland. This title in Wing with 7 printings between 1644 and 1695.

Howes, Thomas, Markes of Salvation: wherein are briefly handled these three Points. London, R. Bishop, sold by P. [Col]e, 1637. Examined HD copy, reel 1854.

STC 13877.7. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1615; three printings (and one reissue) between 1615 and 1637. Ass'd from Welbey to T. Snodham 2 mr. 1618; from Mistris Snodham to W. Stansby 23 fb. 1626. The titlepage is a cancel, probably replacing one printed by Stansby not more than 4 or 5 years earlier since this ed. has initial 'u' and medial 'v'.

Dedicated to Caius College, Cambridge, and to its master. This title not in Wing.

STC 20250. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1634; this is only reprint. 'Tract on 27 Mathew' ent. to A. Crooke 28 au. 1633; licensed by Master Austen. 'Tracts on Ephesians and Acts' ent. to A. Crooke 3 fb. 1634; licensed by Master Austin. Legate pr. quires R to end. IMPRIMATUR signed by Austin 30 jy. 1633 repeated here at end. This title not in Wing.


STC 21303. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1623; three printings between 1623 and 1637. Ent. to A. Mathewes 28 se. 1623; licensed by Master Doctor Featlie. This title not in Wing.
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STC 22747. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1599; thirteen printings between 1599 and 1637. Three sermons ass'd from N. Lyng to J. Smythick 19 no. 1607. This title in Wing with printings in 1642 and 1673.


STC 22800. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1629; 3 printings (and 1 variant) between 1629 and 1637. Ent to G. Edwards 15 jn. 1629; licensed by Master Doctor Jefferay. Dedicated to Thomas Coventry, I Baron, and Lady Coventry by editor. This title not in Wing.

Deleted STC 22845.7 because none of 3 titles in sequence were available.

Udall, John (1560?-1592), A Commentarie vpon the Lamentations of Jeremy. London, [T. Harper f] assignes of Joane Man a. B. Fisher f. P. Stephens a. C. Meredith, 1637. F copy. STC 24498.5. Reprint. Earliest extant edition in STC is 1593; 5 printings between 1593 and 1637 (and 1 1637 variant). This is the 1637 variant and is the first to have Udall's name on titlepage. Not in Arber at all. This title not in Wing.


mr. 1623; licensed by Master Doctor Featlie. Ass'd from Mistris Pavier to Robert Birde and Edward Brewster 4 au. 1626.
This title not in Wing.
APPENDIX D — 1637

EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS: -- LONDON IMPRINTS -- LICENSERS

* = Book has imprimatur

Dates supplied from entries in Stationers' Registers

Samuel Baker: Buck(*9mr. 37,), Culverwell(3oc. 36), Hall(*11oc.37) Sparrow(13jy.37), Squire(*11ja.37), Tedder(*8fb.37)

William Bray: Heylyn(*11jy.37), Mede(*11jn.37), Pocklington (*7mr. 37)

William Haywood: Clerke(*14no.36), de Sales(*4fb.37), (German(*13ap.37), Page(*8ap. 36), Tillinghast(*24 ja. 37)

William Laud: Laud(1jy. 37)

John Oliver: Lawrence(7mr. 37), Yates *15jn. 37)

Thomas Weekes: Drant(*6no.37), Drant(*1se.37), Goodwin(*18&20jy.37), Henshaw(*26ap. 37), Hooker(28fb.37), Hooker (22ap.37), Justus(4fb.37), Malvezzi(9mr. 37) Sibbes(*10no. 37), Sibbes (*18se. 37), Sibbes (*12jn. 37), Sydenham(*12de.37), Trapp (*25se.37), Ward(*12jn.37), Whately(*2my. 37)

Francis White: White(13fb. 37)

UNLICENSED: Rhodes(ent. 1588, no earlier extant editions), Nicetas (king's printer), Prynne, Williams (although with English imprimatur)
APPENDIX E - 1637

LICENSERS WITH IMPRIMATURS

Samuel Baker:
- Buck (28mr. 37, for 6 months)
- Hall (11oc. 37)
- Squire (9ja.37)
- Tedder (6fb. 36/7)

William Bray:
- Heylyn (23jn. 37)
- Mede (16my. 37, for 3 months)
- Pocklington (21fb. 36/7, for 5 months)

William Haywood:
- de Sales (27no. 36, for 2 years)
- German (29mr. 36)
- Page (24de. 35, for 2 years)
- Tillinghast (undated, for 3 months)

John Oliver:
- Yates (15jn. 37)

Thomas Weekes:
- Clerke (undated)
- Drant (2 titles, both undated)
- Goodwin (undated)
- Henshaw (undated)
- Sibbes (2 titles, undated)
- Sibbes (5 oc. 37)
- Sydenham (10jy. 37)
- Trapp (undated)
- Ward (5jn. 37)
- Whately (undated)
APPENDIX F -- 1637

EARLIEST EXTANT EDITIONS: -- PUBLISHERS * = several publishers

LONDON:

T. Alchorn: Clerke
T. Andrewes: Henshaw

R. Badger: Laud, Lawrence, Pocklington, Trapp, White
H. Blunden: Germans
A. Boler: Rhodes
W. Brookes: de Sales, Johann Justus
N. Butter: Hall

J. Clark: *Buck, Culverwell, Mede, Sparrow, Squire
R. Cotes: Sibbes
W. Cooke: *Buck, Yates
A. Crooke: Hooker

R. Dawlman: *Goodwin
G. Edwards: Whately
G. Emerson: Tedder

W. Hammond: Drant (2)
T. Harper: Page
R. Hodgkinson: Heylyn

A. Kembe: Tillinghast
T. Knight: Malvezzi

A. Mathewes: Ward
H. Robinson: Sydenham
J. Rothwell: *Goodwin, Sibbes (2)
Typ. regio: Nicetas
R. Young: Hooker

OXFORD:

H.C.: Stinton
E. Forrest: Fitz-Geffrey
L. Lichfield: Jackson
W. Turner: Verneuil
W. Webb: Parsons

SECRETLY IN ENGLAND: Prynne, Williams

IRELAND: Dublin: Leslie

HOLLAND:

Amsterdam: Bastwick, Prynne
Leiden: Bastwick, Catalogue
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APPENDIX G -- 1637

ENTRANCE IN THE STATIONERS' REGISTERS


Three studies of W. W. Greg:

1) 26 most prolific authors (eliminating divines): 67% entered
2) 10 pages of STC: 66% entered
3) dramatic productions between 1581 and 1640: 67% entered

In the study of dramatic works, the only study with a breakdown for chronology, Greg found a 69% rate for the 1630's.


Working from the chronological index in STC and thus including all extant output (including divines) for the nine years studied, Bell concluded that little more than half were entered in an orderly manner. However, she recognized that there were officially sanctioned titles, products of patents and privileges, which did not have to be entered; these she included in her totals for legal printing in London.

1634-1636:
Entered: 49.4%
Official: 25.0%
Total: 74.4%

Towers: Sampling of 36 London religious first editions
Total entered: 95.0% - the only 2 London printings without entrance were also printed secretly without printer named on title

Towers: London religious first editions for 1637 - larger than survey
Entered: 71.0%
Official: 18.0%
Total: 89.0%
### Catechisms by Author and Short Title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catechism</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensed before 1625</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BÀll, Short Treatise</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, Common Cat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Sum of Xian Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byfield, Principal Grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crashaw, Milk for Babes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison, Compendious Cat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent, Pastime for Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dering, Short Catechism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton, Brief Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton, Form of Catechizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton, So Short a Cat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouge, Short Catechism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Brief and Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieron, Doctrine of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton, Brief Catechism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer, English Catechism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mico, Spiritual Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openshaw, Short Q's and A's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr, Grounds of Divinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins, Foundation of Rel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinus, Sum of Xian Rel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesey, Scope of Scripture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virel, Learned Treatise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Plain Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting, Short Questions and Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, Short Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catechisms licensed after March, 1625:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton, Grounds of Xian Rel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton, Explication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featley, Sum of Saving Know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N,M; D,B; P,P, Catechism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeve, Communion Book Cat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Practical Cat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisse, Brief Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicars, Grounds of Doct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitaker, Short Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catechisms without recorded licences:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleine, Brief Explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attersoll, Principles of Rel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, Joshua's Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Adamson, John, [Greek word] eloquiorum Dei, sive methodus religionis christianae catechetica. Secunda editio (Edinburgi, 1637).

Austin, William, Devotionis Augustinianae flamma, or, certaine Meditations. Set forth, by his Wife Mrs. A. Austin (1637).

Baker, Sir Richard, Meditations and Disquisitions upon the Lords Prayer (1637).


Bancroft, Richard, A Sermon [on 1 John iv.i] preached at Pauls Crosse the 9. of February, being the first Sunday in the Parliament, 1588 [i.e. 1589]. Wherein some Things are added (1637).

Bastwick, John, A briefe Relation of certain Passages, in the Starre-chamber, delivered June the 14th. 1637. at the Censure of Dr. Bastwicke, Mr. Burton and Mr. Prynne ([Amsterdam], 1637).

Bastwick, John, [Pt. 3 of the Letany of John Bastwick:] The Vanity and Mischeife of the old Letany. To follow the Letany as a third Part of it ([Leiden or Delft], 1637).

Baynes, Paul, Briefe Directions unto a godly Life. Written by Bayne, to Nicholas Jordane his Brother (1637).


Brinsley, John, the Elder, The true Watch, and Rule of life. [Parts 1 and 2]. The tenth edition. (1637).

Buck, James, A Treatise of the Beatitudes. Or Christs happy Men (1637).


Byfield, Nicholas, The spiritual Touch-stone, or, the Signes of a godly Man. Together with Directions, how the weak Christian, may establish his Assurance (1637).

Catalogue. A Catalogue of such Testimonies as evidence Bishops and Presbyters to be both One, equal and the same in Jurisdiction, Office. [By W. Prynne.] ([Leiden? W. Christiaens?] 1637).
Clerke, Richard, Sermons preached by that reverend Divine Richard Clerke. Since his Death, published by C. White (1637).

Crakanthorp, Richard, A Treatise of the fift general councel held at Constantinople, Anno 553. Wherein is proved that the Popes definitive Sentence, in Matter of Faith, was condemned as hereticall. And the Frauds of Cardinall Baronius are discovered. Published by G. Crakanthorp (1634).

Culverwell, Ezekiel, A ready Way to remember the Scriptures. Or, a Table of the old and new Testament (1637).

Dent, Arthur, A Pastime for Parents: Or a Recreation, containing the most principall grounds of Christian Religion (1637).

Dickson, David, A short Explanation of the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrewes (Dublin, 1637).

Drant, Thomas, The divine Lanthorne: or, a Sermon preached in S. Pauls church appointed for the Crosse the 17. of July [1636.] (1637).

Drant, Thomas, The royall Guest: or, a Sermon preached at Lent Assises [1636.] At the Cathedral of Sarum being the first Sunday of Lent, before Sr. John Finch and Sr. John Denham (1637).


Francis, of Sales, An Introduction to a devoute Life. Tr. by J. Yakesley (1637).

Gataker, Thomas, Certaine Sermons first preached, and after published (1637).


German Theologians, Colloquii inter praecipuos aliquot Germaniae theologos, de conciliandis ecclesiarum evangelicarum dissidiis. Anno MDCXXXI. Mense Martio Lipsiae habiti consignatio ex Germanico in Latinum sermonem traducta (1637).

Hall, Joseph, *The Remedy of Prophanenesse...In two Bookes. (A Sermon preach't in the City of Excester.)* (1637).


Heylyn, Peter, *A briefe and moderate Answer, to H. Burton* (1637).


Howes, Thomas, *Markes of Salvation: wherein are briefly handled these three Points* (1637).

Jackson, Thomas, *Diverse Sermons, with a short Treatise befitting these present Times, now first published* (Oxford, 1637).

Johann Justus, Landsberger, *An Epistle, or, Exhortative Letter sent from Jesus Christ, to every faithfull Soule. Tr. (The Manuell of St. Augustine.)* (1637).

Laud, William, *A Speech delivered in the Starr-Chamber [14 in. 1637], at the Censure, of J. Bastwick [etc.]* (1637).

Lawrence, Thomas, *A Sermon preached before the kings Maiesty [7 fb. 1637.]* (1637).

Leslie, Henry, *A Treatise of the Authority of the Church. A Sermon preached at Belfast the tenth August 1636* (Dublin, 1637).


Mede, Joseph, *The name Altar, or [Greek word], anciently given to the holy Table* (1637).


Page, Samuel, *The broken Heart: or, Davids Penance. Published by N. Snape* (1637).

Pocklington, John, Altare christianum: or, the dead vicars plea. Wherein the Vicar of Grantham. being dead, yet speaketh (1637).


Preston, John, Sermons preached before his Majestie, and upon other Occasions. Fift impression. [Ed.] (T. Goodwin, a.] T. B[all]) (1637).

Prynne, William, [Heading Ir:] Briefe Instructions for Church-Wardens and Others to observe in all episcopall or archdiaconall Visitations and spirituall Courts. [Anon.] ([London? 1637]).

Prynne, William, XVI. new Quaeres proposed to our lord Praelates. [Init. M. E.] ([Amsterdam], 1637).

Rhodes, John, The countrie mans Comfort. Or religious Recreations. Printed in 1588. And since corrected, and enlarged by the Author J. R[hodes. In verse.] (1637).

Rome, Church of. Romes Wickednes: or, wicked Rome with her seven deadly Sins. [Signed 'Anonymous'] (1637).

Sandys, Sir Edwin, Europae Speculum or, a View or Survey of the State of Religion in the westerne Parts of the World (1637).

Sibbes, Richard, The Christians Portion; Wherein is unfolded the unsearchable Riches he hath by his Interest in Christ. Published by T. G[oodwin] and P. N[ye.] (1637).


Smith, Henry, Three Sermons made by Mr. Henry Smith (1637).


Squire, John, A Thankes-giving, for the decreasing, of the
1637.] (1637).

Stinton, George, A Sermon preached in the Cathedrall of

Sydenham Humphrey, Sermons upon solemne Occasions: preached
in severall Auditories (1637).

Tedder, Richard, A Sermon preached at Wimondham, at the
primary Visitation of the Bishop of Norwich [3 in. 1636.]
(1637).

Tillinghast, John, Saint Paul's Ship-Wrack in his Voyage to
Rome. Delivered in a Sermon [8 fb. 1634?] (1637).

Trapp, John, Gods love-Tokens, and the afflicted mans
Lessons: in two Discourses upon Revel. 3.19 (1637)

Udall, John, A Commentarie vpon the Lamentations of Jeremy
(1637).

Verneuil, Jean, A Nomenclator of such Tracts and Sermons as
have beene printed or translated into English upon any place
of holy Scripture. Opera, studio & impensis. J. V[erneuil.]
(Oxford, 1637).

Ward, Samuel, of Cambridge, Magnetis reductorium theologicum
tropologicum (1637).

Warwick, Arthur, Spare-minutes; or, resolved meditations.
Sixt edition (1637).

Whately, William, The Oyle of Gladnesse....Certaine Sermons
(1637).

White, Francis, An Examination and Confutation of a lawlesse
Pamphlet (1637).

White, Josias, A plaine and familiar Exposition upon the
Creed, ten commandements...by Question and Answer (1637).

Williams, John, The holy Table, Name & Thing, more anciently,
properly, and literally used under the New Testament, then
that of an Altar: written by a Minister in Lincoln-shire, in
Answer to D. Coal [13270. Anon.] ([London?] Printed for the
Diocese of Lincoln, 1637).

Yates, John, A Treatise of the Honor of Gods House: or, the
ture Paterne of the Church. With a Discovery of the true
Cause and Cure of our present Contentions (1637).
7. THOMAS JACKSON AND THOMAS TAYLOR

The preceding examination of religious titles for 1637 displays dramatic evidence of an active and effective censorship, both in terms of subject matter and adherence to bureaucratic regulations, under the direction of Archbishop Laud. It demonstrates, moreover, that it is imperative to separate religious from other forms of literature in order to gain true insights into this most vigorous model of press censorship. A statistical survey of the religious press in the early Stuart period permits a glimpse of the norms: what material was allowed through the proper channels created for pre-publication licensing and registration with the Stationers' Company as opposed to what appeared in books produced outside this system. To amplify these findings the writings of two contemporary clerics - Thomas Jackson (1579-1640) and Thomas Taylor (1576-1632) - have been investigated. The lives of these two men embodied the beliefs and activities of the competing forces within the Church of England. Thomas Jackson emerged as spokesman for the Arminian or anti-Calvinist viewpoint after Richard Montagu fell silent on the subject in the late 1620's; Jackson's fortunes rose with those of the Laudian party. By contrast, as early as 1608 the puritan Thomas Taylor was under suspicion for criticizing Archbishop Bancroft and was subsequently suspended by Samuel Harsnett, performing a metropolitical visitation on behalf of Bancroft. By reputation and deed, Jackson and Taylor were undeniably representative of opposing factions.

The writings of these men provide intriguing case studies because modern authorities do not agree on the patterns which their publications reveal. Sheila Lambert maintains that 'Thomas Jackson and Thomas Taylor were poles apart in doctrine, yet the publishing history of their works is very similar. Most of the titles they had published in the 1620's and 1630's were still in print in their original first editions when collections were attempted in 1653'. (It is not at all clear what Lambert means by 'still in print'. How would she know if they were still available in the book shops? Perhaps she means they had never been called in or burned?). Lambert concludes that 'books of all complexions
were published in the 1630s. Sermons of all complexions were preached and printed. In response to this, Nicholas Tyacke suggests that Lambert's argument 'concerning religious censorship, is vitiated by the fact that she fails to analyse the content of the published works which she instances'. His statement that 'censorship was not by author, but of views expressed' has stimulated this bibliographical study of Jackson and Taylor.

Thomas Jackson was born on or about St. Thomas's day in 1579, the second son of Henry Jackson of Witton on the Wear in Durham. His father died soon thereafter, in 1587. Existing biographical sketches are heavily reliant on that provided by Edmund Vaughan for a projected collection of Jackson's works which began appearing in 1653. According to him, Jackson was related to Newcastle merchants and originally intended for a life in commerce. It was due to the timely intervention of Lord Eure that he was instead sent in 1595 to Queen's College, Oxford, where he was tutored by Richard Crackanthorpe. However the next year Jackson accepted a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, which provided him with a lifetime academic affiliation as well as a final resting place. Jackson received the following degrees: B.A. in 1599, M. A. in 1603, B. D. in 1610, and D. D. in 1622. Henry Mason, the brother of Francis Mason, must have been a college contemporary; he also received the M.A. in 1603, the B.D. in 1610, and had been appointed college chaplain in 1602. In later years he was to interact with Jackson both as friend and as licenser for the press. Vaughan, Jackson's biographer, likewise received all his degrees from Corpus Christi College; he was later to face ejection from his position as rector in Northamptonshire and was not restored until 1660, so the biography was penned during a time of hardship.

Even though Jackson spent much time at Oxford, he never lacked for outside preferment. He became chaplain to the Arminian bishop of Durham, Richard Neile, and was presented to two livings in that diocese: St. Nicholas, Newcastle on Tyne, in 1623 and Winston in 1625. In May 1625 he was granted a special dispensation to hold Winston and Newcastle together. He was described on the title of a publication in 1627 as chaplain in ordinary to the king. As Jackson's printed writings took on an increasingly anti-Calvinist
posture, he became a subject of criticism in the House of Commons. Condemnations issuing from members of the parliament of 1628 bracketed Jackson with the likes of Cosin and Maynwaring. Nevertheless Jackson prospered and parliament did not; early in 1629 it was dismissed by the king. Two years later Jackson became president of Corpus Christi College - a post which he retained until death and burial in the college's inner chapel. Between 1632 and 1637 he served as vicar of the crown living of Witney; in addition he was made prebendary of Winchester in June 1635. In January 1639 Jackson became dean of Peterborough, but held that post for less than two years as he died in September 1640. In his will he bequeathed books to his 'faithful amanuensis' Richard Benson - a young man from Bradley Bourne in Jackson's home county of Durham who was yet another member of Corpus Christi College, having first matriculated there in June 1637 - and to the library of his college. Gilbert Sheldon, then warden of All Souls but later archbishop of Canterbury, and his 'loving friend' Robert Newlin, who was to succeed Jackson as president of the college, were named as overseers of the will, and Jackson commended "to their care and custodie all my papers and manuscripts to be perused and published as they thinke fitt...".

Jackson's life's work was his series of commentaries on the Apostles Creed: nine books and part of a twelfth were printed before his death. An effort by a devotee, Barnabas Oley, to collect and publish his works resulted in three volumes between 1653 and 1657 - book ten of the commentaries was contained in the second volume and book eleven in the third and final volume. Each volume was preceded by a preface with Oley's account of how the contents had been gathered. According to him it was because the stationer John Clarke, owner of the copies for books four through eight, would not permit reprints nor attempt them himself, that only the first three books of commentaries on the Creed were collected for volume one. Therefore the set was woefully incomplete. In a dedicatory epistle to Sheldon in the third volume, Dominus Veniet, 1657, Oley credits Sheldon with having convinced Newlin to allow an inspection of Jackson's papers in his custody - the results were the publication of books ten and eleven of the commentaries. Oley was a Cambridge man who endured great privation during the period of the Civil War;
he acknowledges Nicholas Ferrar as having introduced him to Jackson's work. A more successful compilation, again spearheaded by the admiring Oley, was achieved in 1673 in three volumes, including all the commentaries; this represents a second stage in the procurement of Jackson's papers. Oley, indebted to Gilbert Sheldon for his own professional advancement, publicized the fact that Sheldon had once again been instrumental in making Jackson's works available. As Oley says in the preface added to the 1673 edition: 'There were published in the year 1654 and 1657...the tenth and eleventh books of Comments upon the Creed. For which two excellent books, as also for what additions are 'de novo' made to the former in this new edition, the church is indebted to... [Gilbert Sheldon] (who procured the papers from the reverend Doctor Newlin, successor and executor to the author, and the careful preserver of his manuscripts,) besides what she owes his Grace for his indefatigable vigilancy and care of her welfare'...

Interest in Jackson's work was rekindled by the Oxford movement of the last century and his complete works, in twelve volumes, was produced by the Oxford Press in 1844.

The earliest trace of any personal involvement by Jackson with a printed title was the translation into English of Gabriel Powel's De Adiaphoris. Originally written in Latin in 1606 by Powel, chaplain to the king, this translation has been tentatively attributed to Jackson in the revised Short Title Catalogue. Peter White accepts this attribution; the note from the translator to the reader, dated at Oxford on 28 November 1606, was initialed 'T. J.' The English version was licensed by Powel himself and entered in the registers on 6 March 1607, but no translator was named. Jackson was at Oxford, a fellow of Corpus Christi as of 10 May 1606, and was working towards his divinity degree. The philosophy inherent in this work was certainly compatible with Jackson's consistent defence of the Church of England and its ceremonies against attacks by dissenting ministers. De Adiaphoris was issued in conjunction with a response to a surreptitious work done by Bradshaw on behalf of deprived ministers; both of Powel's works were written against the backdrop of a crackdown on nonconformist ministers in the years after 1604. Powel cautioned, 'because in the externall Discipline and Ceremonies of the Church...God would not
particularly prescribe what we ought to follow....Therefore hath hee delivered nothing expressly concerning these things, because they are not necessarie unto salvation: and ought to bee diversly fitted for the edification of the Church, according unto the different manners of every Nation and Age'. The work ended with a plea to nonconformist ministers: 'think with your selves, and consider diligently and seriously, how much honester is your godly submission and conformitie in things indifferent, than is your superstitious pride and arrogancie in forsaking your churches'.

Six years elapsed before any of his own work was printed; during this time Jackson received a B.D. and was licensed to preach. Then in 1613 appeared the first two books, in a single volume, of his ambitious project to construct commentaries on the Apostles Creed. The dedication to his early patron, Lord Eure, now Lord President of Wales, indicated that Jackson was Eure's chaplain. Here Jackson credited Eure with having transported him to this 'famous nursery of good learning [Oxford]'. The volume, entitled The Eternall Truth, 1613, was licensed by Henry Mason as chaplain to the bishop of London, John King. On the surface the stated purpose of this volume was to show the 'Grounds of Reformed Religion to be so firme and sure, that the Romanist cannot oppugne them, but with the utter overthrow of the Romish church, Religion, and Faith'. However already Jackson was challenging the obdurate behaviour exhibited by some of the more precise Protestants. In the second book Jackson contrasted the extremes. 'The Papists on the one side demand infallible assent, and illimited obedience unto whatsoever the Church shall propose, without examination of her doctrine, or appeale,...On the other side, sundrie by profession Protestants, in eagernesse of opposition to the Papists, affirm, that the Church, or spirituall Pastors must then only be beleived, then onely be obeyed, when they give sentence according to the evident and expresse law of God....Let us see how their [Romanist] errour may bee fully contradicted, not strive to bee most contrarie unto them, but rather to seeke out the meane betweene these two erroneous extreemes'. Jackson was to preach often of this middle way between extremes. Here also was a clarion call for conformity in matters indifferent. 'So as, not onely the obedience is to be thought good, but the very action wherein obedience is
seen, though before indifferent, is now inherently good, and the omission of it would be in itself evil, and not by consequent only. The very next year, 1614, the third book of commentaries, directed specifically against Jesuits, was published. Although no entry exists in the Stationers' Registers, this book may have been included in the entry of 23 July 1612 to William Stansby for An Exposicon on the Creed. In the dedication to The Eternall Truth, Jackson indicated that the third book was originally intended for that volume; Stansby was indeed the printer of books one, two, and three. This one was dedicated to William James, bishop of Durham, the diocese of Jackson's family. The author referred to his own labours 'under your benigne protection, which the unconstant frowning season would hardly afford them in their growth'. Jackson's prefatory note to the reader led off with the disclaimer that each day he was more unwilling to act in quarrels of this nature, partly to spend his time in other pursuits and partly because so many divines in the English and other reformed churches had 'demonstrated most properties of [the] great Antichrist upon the Pope'. His attack on the heresies of the Roman church was twofold: 'their Churches absolute priviledge from all errour, and that other of Christs reall presence in the Sacrament, by transubstantiation'.

This prolific publishing streak continued with the appearance the next year of Justifying Faith, the fourth book of commentaries. Although John Beale was named in the imprint, the entry in the registers for 2 December 1614 is crossed out and John Clarke's name substituted. Albeit retroactive, this would thus herald the beginning of a long association between Clarke as publisher and Jackson as author. Henry Mason is again named as licenser; some copies contain an endorsement by him, a type of proto-imprimatur very uncommon for this period. Addressed to the author, the paragraph commences: 'according to your request I have perused your booke: I would my occasions had beene such, that I might have overseeen the Presse also'. This was signed 'your ever loving friend Henry Mason'. Another very strong affiliation for Jackson was with the Spencer family. Lord Eure at one point married into the family of John Spencer, and it was possibly through this connection that
Robert Spencer's sons, Richard and Edward, became Jackson's pupils. Richard was to defend Arminianism in general and Jackson in particular in the parliament of 1628. A dedication to the two sons, dated 1619 but not printed until 1654, revealed the closeness of their communication. 'For of my choicest meditations heretofore, either published or privately perused, I have ever liked the impression much better, whilst I lookt upon it in your disposition and conversation, than whilst I read it in mine own papers, or from the Presse'. The dedication in Justifying Faith, dated 20 April 1615 and therefore later than the entry in the registers, was to the father, Robert Spencer, baron of Wormleighton.

Already in this work were traces of doubts about some of the strongest tenets of the reformed church. On faith and works he wrote: 'Most protestant writers acknowledge them [faith and works] to be of entire blood, yet somewhat farther removed then in my opinion they are....By these deductions drawne forth at large in the sixth Chapter, the Reader may easily perceive the linke betweene faith and works, to be most immediate and essentiall'. Later on, in chapter eight of section two labelled 'How farre the Law must be fulfilled in this life: of the regiment of grace: of the permanencie of justification, what interruptions it may admit, how these must be repaired:....', Jackson stated: 'thus I dare boldly say, that not the least sin against the Law of God, committed after regeneration,...would...exclude them from life eternall. Nor doth this argue...that a man may fall either finally or totally from the state of grace, but rather that all impossibility he hath of not so falling, essentially depends upon a like impossibility of not continuing his indulgence to knowne offences, or negligence in repenting or bewailing his secret sins'. In a sense Jackson is here fudging issues, employing language so that nothing appears to be controversial.

The only book of commentaries to be reprinted in a major new edition in Jackson's lifetime, Justifying Faith was rereleased by John Clarke in 1631. There were two basic changes. Added was a new preface from Henry Mason which praised the powerfull instructions for godliness and mentioned in general that there had been some corrections to the text. Chapter eight of section two, quoted above, had
been deleted. Mason, who was by now prebendary in St. Paul's cathedral and thus in direct contact with Laud, also expressed regret that the disputes with Rome remained in this edition as he felt they would distract the reader from more important sections. Presumably because it was the property of Clarke, this title was not included in attempts to collect Jackson's works before 1673. Then Barnabas Oley explained: 'The Fourth Book was twice Printed in Quarto: once in the year 1615, a second time (divers years after) with some small variation in Obedience to the King, who prohibited Divines to meddle with Quinquarticular Controversies: This last Edition is made according to the first impression of that Fourth Book, as being conceived to be the better'. Issues concerning predestination which had been discussed at the Synod of Dort in 1618 had become so threatening to the peace of the church that Charles had issued a proclamation in June 1626 and a declaration prefixed to the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1628 which required silence on these matters. But Jackson by 1631 was no longer silent; this omission may simply signal that he no longer felt the need to add disclaimers to his work.

Jackson's first extant work to be published at Oxford was issued in 1617; it comprised two sermons preached at St. Mary's Church in Oxford. The book, Nazareth and Bethlehem, was dedicated to James Montagu, newly appointed bishop of Winchester. This dedication was a cautious overture to the bishop who served also as visitor to Corpus Christi College. Jackson promised a longer preface to fit with a larger work. The subject matter of the sermons was not theologically provocative as they dealt rather with the relation between male and female, the latter the proverbial weaker vessel. Of importance is the fact that a Folger copy was owned by Henry Mason - additional testimony of his attentive monitoring of Jackson's career. Mason is not known to have licensed any of Jackson's later works, but despite his own chaplainship to the Calvinist John King, he went on in the 1630s to co-author an Arminian work with Samuel Hoard.

Jackson's publishing efforts slowed temporarily until in 1625 two titles surfaced, both entered to the stationer John Clarke and licensed by Thomas Worrall, chaplain to the bishop of London - the latter was George Montaigne who was an Arminian sympathizer. *Christ's Answer*, entered 1 December 1625.
1624, was a collection of sermons delivered at St. Nicholas Church in Newcastle where Jackson had been presented sometime in 1623 by the Arminian bishop of Durham, Richard Neile. St. Nicholas was the mother church in Newcastle. In a recent essay on Laudianism, H. Trevor-Roper depicts the model diocese of Durham where Neile and his loyal lieutenants, including John Cosin, were able to translate their Arminian concepts into actions. What the Durham House set represented in London, Neile's partisans in Durham diocese implemented on a practical level. One of Neile's innovations was to include a clause encouraging confession and absolution in the visitation articles of 1624. Not surprisingly, Jackson dedicated this book to his diocesan, Richard Neile. Dated 20 December 1624 at Corpus Christi College, Jackson's dedication to Neile conveyed a vivid impression that its author had been a conscientious preacher at Newcastle even though not always resident there. Northumberland in 1623 was not a setting for peace and prosperity; troublesome recusants abounded as a starving population eked out an existence in the lowlands. Additionally, the puritan Robert Jenison was a preacher in Newcastle; he and Jackson were to engage in a series of protracted disputes. Nevertheless Jackson benefitted from his posting there; these were just the first of his many sermons delivered at St. Nicholas Church which made their way into print. Again there was evidence that Jackson was opening the door to spiritual free will. 'At this time I will only acquaint you with that, which I have elsewhere delivered, as the true mean of betweene the contrary opinions of the Lutherans and the Calvinists...in the point of free-will, or power of man to work or not to work his own salvation. The mean is, that albeit man hath no freedome of will or ability to do that, which is good, or to dispose his heart for the better receiving of Grace: yet he hath a true possibility of freedome of will to do, or not to do something required by God; which thing being done by man, God will dispose his heart, and make it fit for his grace'. In addition, Jackson endorsed ceremonial conformity. 'Wee receive it [holy communion] kneeling, because this is the best and most significant sign of submissive obedience, that is in use or practice in these Western parts of Europe'.

In the meantime Jackson continued with the commentaries on the Apostles Creed. The second publication in 1625, book
five, was entered 22 January of that year - after licensing by Worrall. A Treatise containing the Original of Unbeliefe was dedicated to Sir Henry Danvers for his 'honourable favours and munificence towards that famous Universitie'. In 1622 Danvers had donated to Oxford several acres of land and funding for its development into a botanic garden. Although seasoned with anti-Catholic rhetoric - for example, 'that the Worship which Sathan demanded of our Saviour, was the very same wherewith the Romish Church worshippeth saints' - here Jackson reserved space to criticize the contemporary preoccupation with predestination. 'But in the points of Reprobation and Election, as in diverse others; the best and safest method is to beginne with the practise of knowne precepts concerning men, and to end in contemplation of the divine decree....For seeing his mercy and loving kindnesse are absolutely infinite in themselves, why should wee deny them to be truely and sincerely extended unto all men?....For matters of sanctification, of election and salvation, are as the onely trade or facultie which these men [Anabaptist, the Separatist, or maintainers of other moderne errours] professe, and of which they deeme their owne corporation onely free...'.

The first part of book twelve of the commentaries, A Treatise of the Holy Catholike Faith and Church, was published next, in 1627. Entered in the registers to John Clarke on 4 November 1626, this book also was licensed by Worrall. The dedication was dated 1 January 1626/7 in Newcastle and praised the family of the dedicatee, Richard Anderson of Hertfordshire. This treatise derived from catechism lectures given at Pembroke College; Jackson had lectured there on a weekly basis early in his tenure at Oxford. In his prefatory matter Jackson referred to this writing as having been in the hands of others, among them Dr. Birkhead in the north. Birkhead, as prebendary of Durham, had no doubt been part of Neile's circle there; when he died in 1624 both John Cosin and Richard Montagu mourned his passing. Birkhead had been rector of Winston, a living which Jackson was also to hold. As a product of earlier times, this treatise was concerned mainly with the rebuttal of Catholic writers. 'That the present visible Church of England retaines the Holy Catholike Faith, which the Romish Church hath defiled; and by defiling it, hath lost that true union with
the primitive and Apostolike Church, which the visible Church retaineth'. In the course of discussing the true church, Jackson complained: 'against which definition or description, this exception may bee taken, that the Authors and Maintainers of it, have intangled this...point of Beliefe, necessary to all that hope to be saved, with intricate and unnecessary questions concerning Predestination or Election, with which I doe not meane to trouble the Reader...'.

By 1627 Jackson's Arminian inclinations became obvious when on 4 October the first part of his Treatise of the divine Essence and Attributes, book six of the commentaries, was entered to Clarke; it was licensed by a Dr. Wilson. The book caused a reaction when it was published in 1628. Especially controversial was the dedication to the earl of Pembroke, then chancellor of Oxford and important for Jackson's career prospects. In this dedication Jackson raised the possibility that his views might be interpreted as Arminian. 'It is not so unusuall, nor so much for mee to be censured for an Arminian, as it will be for your Lordship to be thought to patronize Arminianisme'. He then outlined his own position: 'If the man which most mislikes the Arminian or Lutheran doctrine in the points most controverted through reformed Churches, will but agree with me in these two, That the Almighty Creator hath a true freedome in doing good; and Adams offspring a true freedome of doing evill, I shall not dissent from him in any other points controverted, unlesse it be in this one, that there needs to be no other controversie at all betweene the Arminiens and their opposites in point of Gods Providence and Predestination'. In the text he emphasized the role of contingency...that the Omnipotent doth eternally decree an absolute contingency in most humane acts: Secondly, that this eternall act or decree (which we thus conceive to be throughout the whole succession of time...) doth not only perpetually support our faculties, but...uncessantly inspire them with contingency in their choice...'. As Sarah Hutton has observed after discussing this book, 'Jackson's liberal attitude to predestination places him in the Arminian camp in the broadest sense of the term.'

Contemporary reaction was swift. In March 1628 Robert Harley included Jackson in his litany of authors who were reintroducing popery. 'I will add another to Montagu, no less
dangerous. Tis one Doctor Jackson. They would introduce popery. They pretend they are the reformed religion and Church of England. They do introduce a supremacy. They are possessed of churches amongst us. Let there be a committee named to consider of the books of Cosin, Sibthorp, and Maynwaring'. The bookseller Michael Sparkes a month later complained that books tending to popery were permitted to be printed; he mentioned Dr. Jackson's books in his protest. Henry Burton responded the same year with an unlicensed, surreptitious book called Israel's Fast in which he attacked both John Cosin and Thomas Jackson for their works of 'Popish Arminianism'. Dedicated to parliament, Burton's work bewailed the fact that authors such as Cosin and Jackson had authority on their side to approve or prohibit books. 'We hope and pray, that [parliament] will take such order, that instead of Popish and Arminian Bookes, Orthodox bookes may be freely published by Authority'. That same year Burton mounted another assault - unlicensed and printed by William Jones. In The Seven Vials Burton specifically addressed Jackson's dedicatory epistle: 'he gives a dangerous by-blow to the opposites of Arminius....As if the Divine Decree did impose necessity upon mens wills to prosecute evill actions, because it leaveth them to their wicked wills, which of their owne nature corrupted are now free only unto evill'. 23 Jackson penned a response but it was not published until 1654; perhaps it was deemed prudent to allow the uproar to subside. Nevertheless the second part of the treatise was licensed by Thomas Turner, Laud's chaplain, and entered to Clarke in the registers on 20 August 1628, literally weeks after Laud became bishop of London. It was controversial. 'Everything in respect of Gods decree or knowledge is altogether such as God hath decreed it should be. If then God hath decreed there should be contingency, as well as necessity; it is altogether as necessary that some events should be contingent as others necessary: and as truly contingent as the other is necessary in respect of Gods decree'. Robert Harley carried his concern about Jackson into early 1629, the waning days of parliament. 'That the bookes written by Dr. Montague...Dr. Jackson, Dr. Cosins, Dr. Duncombe have been great causers of the increase of Arminianisme ....[I] desire the lords to joyne with us in a Remonstrance to the King that he would be pleased to cause
these persons forenamed to be punished, and their bookes to be publiquely burnt'. 24 No such royal action was forthcoming; instead the king dissolved parliament and did not summon it again for a decade.

Prynne's account years later summed up the frustration felt by Calvinists at the time. After the king's proclamation and declaration for peace in the church, Jackson had still published the first part of his treatise in which he was perceived to profess himself an Arminian. 'This book though publiquely complained of, was never called in by the Bishop; but the second part thereof printed by License, An. 1629. and the Author of it advanced to the Presidentship of Corpus Christi Colledge'. In an earlier book, dated 1629 and enlarged a year later, Prynne refers to attempts to stop Jackson's book in parliament, convocation, and through disavowal by most divines. It was left to William Twisse to offer a more scholarly criticism. In an underground collaboration of Dutch printers and William Jones and entitled A Discovery of D. Jacksons Vanitie, Twisse used Aristotelian arguments against the Platonism of Jackson. However, according to Sarah Hutton, the crux of the difference between Jackson and Twisse was the issue of divine providence, the relationship of man's free will to God's omnipotence. As Twisse said accusingly, 'when you talke of contingency in our choice, you might have spoken plainly and called it libertie in our choice'. 25 Later biographers such as Anthony Wood, the author of the sketch in the Dictionary of National Biography, and even W. W. Greg in Licensers for the Press have linked An historicall Narration of 1631 to the pen of Thomas Jackson. This is incorrect and no doubt stems from the placement of complaints about Jackson's Divine Essence just before those concerning the Narration in various sections of Canterburies Doome. 26

By the late 1620's Richard Neile was intent on placing key Arminians at Oxford. Featley, in a surviving note, reported his suspicion that Jackson was being groomed to become regius professor of divinity. What did transpire early in 1631 was the elevation of Jackson, already royal chaplain, to the presidency of Corpus Christi. Shortly thereafter he left his vicarage at Newcastle to Mr. Alvey, but took up the crown living of Witney, Oxfordshire, in 1632. 27 Although no doubt Jackson's administrative duties encroached on his time,
his publishing proceeded apace: John Clarke brought out a revised edition of *Justifying Faith* in 1631 and the seventh and eighth books of commentaries in 1634 and 1635. Both of these last two books of commentaries contained imprimaturs in response to Laud's directive of 11 January 1632 which required that licenses be printed in the books themselves. The earlier of these, *The Knowledge of Christ Jesus*, was licensed by William Bray at Lambeth on 10 October 1633, apparently after its entrance on 8 July 1633, and was dedicated to King Charles. In the dedication Jackson explained that at Woodstock two years earlier the king had commended the subject of Jesus Christ and his crucifixion to the Oxford divinity faculty. Jackson went on to raise questions about the relationship between sin and free will. He listed several queries. 'How Evill should mingle itselbe with the workes of God, seeing every thing made by him (and he made all) was good; How that evill which wee call sinne should finde entrance into, and hold possession of the heart of man, who was the accomplishment of all God's visible workes, and upon whose creation it is said, that God saw every thing that hee had made, and it was very good....Wherein that servitude which Sinne did bring upon us, doth consist; What freedome of will is compatible with our naturall servitude unto Sathan, (for without some freedome of will, wee might bee Sathan's instruments, his slaves or servants unto sinne we could not be)'.

*The Humiliation of the Sonne of God*, book eight, had no dedication and the imprimatur by Samuel Baker was dated at Fulham for 22 June, without an identifying year. It was entered on 9 June 1635. In the text Jackson reprimanded those who spent their time in 'setting forth maps or systems of the manner of Gods decrees before all times, or disputes about election or reprobation, as they are immanent acts in him....It is a preposterous presumption to determine the manner how they have been or shall bee executed, by prying into the projection or contrivance of the almighty Judge before man or Angel or any thing besides God himselfe had any being'. Appended to this book was a catalogue of the treatises heretofore published by the author; the list reflects precisely all the titles examined thus far.

The remaining two titles which were published by Jackson before his demise were produced by Lionel Lichfield at the
Oxford press. *Diverse Sermons*, dated 1637 and dedicated to Prince Charles, was already included in the survey for that year; it represents a collection of sermons, some of which had been preached at Newcastle. In an updated section, Jackson claimed that one treatise — that concerning the signs of the time: the sum of some few sermons delivered partly before the king, partly in Newcastle — derived from a large work which he had not had opportunity nor leisure to publish. This may have been a way of describing the publishing climate of those earlier years when he did not feel it was prudent to publish all of his beliefs. Jackson's views on contingency were once again aired. 'Yet even this wee know was determined from eternity, that every man in every nation should be rewarded, not according to the identity of their persons or place, but according to the diversity of their ways, to the variety of their workes'. The third sermon on Jeremiah 26.19 provided a good summary of his stand. 'It is not possible either for that man not to love God, which truly beleeves that he hath mercy in store for all; or for that man not to hate him, or at least not to occasion others to hate him, which is perswaded that he hath reserved iudgement without mercy to some men, as they are men; or that hee hath destined them to inevitable destruction before he gave them life or preservation'.

Thomas Jackson continued to receive offices: as already recounted, in 1635 he was named prebendary of Winchester and in January 1639 added the Peterborough deanship to his holdings. That was the same year of his ninth book of commentaries, *A Treatise of the Consecration of the Sonne of God*, although it was preceded some months earlier by the unauthorized pirating of two of his sermons, coopted by William Milbourne, possibly John Cosin's curate. Legally entered on 12 December 1637, without an author named, and containing an imprimatur signed that same day by Thomas Weekes, *Sapientia Clamitans* included Jackson's sermon 'Of Gods just hardning of Pharoah'. In this Jackson asserted 'whosoever will grant me these two propositions, [that the unregenerate man hath a true freedome in doing evill,] [sic] and [the eternall creator a freedome in doing good:] [sic] I will engage my selfe to give him full satisfaction, that no difference betwixt Reformed Churches concerning Predestination or Reprobation, is more than verball, or hath
any other foundation besides the ambiguities of unexplained
terms'. In *A Treatise of the Consecration* of the same year,
Jackson declared that the former was published without his
consent or knowledge; his comments indicated it had been
composed some twenty-six years earlier, in 1612. When the
sermon was collected and published posthumously in 1654, Oley
confirmed the preceding information and referred to the
previously unpublished dedication (to Richard and Edward
Spencer, dated 1619) as prefixed to the original, exact copy.
In 1654 the editor included this dedication but discreetly
hid it "in the Dark behind a Curtain".  

Book nine, *Consecration*, dedicated to King Charles and
produced at Oxford, was especially revealing in the undated
epistle to the reader where Jackson expressed all his
optimistic plans for future publishing ventures. In addition
to having unspecified sermons and short treatises ready 'to
be published as soon as God shall be pleased to grant me
ability, and opportunity. Other three [sic] Bookes I have in
like readiness for the Presse; to wit, the 10th Book of
Comments upon the Creede...together with directions for the
right use or employment of Free Will'. He also assured
readers of the imminence of the eleventh book of commentaries
and the second part of his *Treatise of the Holy Catholike
Faith*, book twelve. 'What I here promise...shall by Gods
assistance be shortly or in good time performed, either by
myselfe or by my Executors: unto whose disposalls, I am not
likely to leave much; scarce anything else besides Books and
Papers'.

It is obvious that Jackson was feeling optimistic,
possibly buoyed by the acceptance of the pirated sermons
released by Milbourne. He may have felt confident that he
could continue to publish material which had been composed at
an earlier time. Such enthusiasm was somewhat misguided as by
May 1640 even Laud was aware of how volatile the situation
had become on the subject of Arminianism. King Charles
dissolved the 'Short Parliament' on 5 May; on 22 May Laud
found himself cautioning the vice-chancellor of Oxford,
Accepted Frewen, against allowing any of Jackson's sermons
'if they offend against his majesty's declaration'. Laud
betrayed his fear that he and the university were under close
scrutiny. Frewen was instructed to explain to Jackson that,
out of duty to the king and for the peace of the church, no
one must print anything which might break the rule of the declaration one way or the other'. 33 Nothing more of Jackson's appeared in print until 1653.

Jackson's speculation that his executors might have to fulfill his publishing schemes was prophetic for he died in September 1640. In his will of the fifth of that month, as mentioned previously, he bequeathed some of his books to the library of his college and to Richard Benson; he named Gilbert Sheldon and Robert Newlin overseers of his will with directions to peruse and publish his papers and manuscripts as they saw fit. Jackson's memory was kept alive by foe and friend alike. Laud's accusers cited Jackson's advancement and publishing as evidence that Laud had favoured a known Arminian. On the other hand Barnabas Oley, in the life of George Herbert attributed to him which was prefixed to Herbert's Remains in 1652, considered Jackson to be in the same sacred company as George Herbert and Nicholas Ferrar. Oley there related Jackson's abuse at the hands of parliament in 1628 and at the hands of his adversaries William Twisse and, in Scotland, Samuel Rutherford. 34

It was in the relatively relaxed Cromwellian publishing milieu of 1653 that the full range of Jackson's thought was revealed. The initial volume of his works, collected by Oley and introduced by Vaughan's Life, was released that year although it contained texts of only the first three commentaries on the creed. Following the failure to obtain permission to reprint books four through nine, Oley organized the next volume to include unpublished material. Among the more clearly anti-Calvinist contents of this 1654 volume were: the sermon 'Of Gods just hardning of Pharoah' with its dedication to the Spencer sons, already excerpted above, the response to Henry Burton, a sermon preached on St. Simon and Jude's Day, 1629, and book ten itself of the commentaries, Christ Exercising his Everlasting Priesthood. All these writings were outspoken in their denial of absolute predestination.

Dr. Jackson's Vindication of Himself was described as written twenty years earlier although it was not previously published; it was designed to counter Burton's falsifications and 'to prevent the further spreading of that rigid Doctrine of Absolute Reprobation, as it is held by most, if not by all, which have hitherto excepted against the forementioned
Treatise of the Divine Essence and Attributes'. In the denigration of his enemies and their print houses, Jackson recalled the twenty three years 'during which time, whilst such Schediasticks as these have preached of absolute Election or Reprobation, I still have prayed, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they said'. Such outright denunciation of the double decree was not evident in his earlier publications—not even those of the Laudian hegemony.

The sermon preached (probably in Newcastle) on 28 October 1629, St. Simon and Jude's Day, dated from the period when Jackson was under siege for Divine Essence. Here again he attacked the tenet of God's absolute decree. 'Our Apostle then, if we will follow his directions, puts us into the Middle or safe Way between the contrary extreems of Reprobation and Election, and the Mean or Middle Way is, That a Great Part of men, which have been Baptized, are neither in the one State nor in the other'. In the treatise which comprised the tenth book of commentary, Jackson elaborated more fully on his criticisms of unconditional predestination. 'My purpose is...to take into consideration...Whether, According to Forrain Rigid Tenets of Predestination....it be possible for us or them to maintain by any rational way; That our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ either now is, or hath been a true Priest or Sacrificer, rather then a meer Sacrifice predestinated from eternitie for takeing away the sinnes of the Elect Onely'? He quoted the 'pious Hemingius' in exhorting all 'That we seek not our assurance of Faith or hope in Parcarum Tabulis, which were irreversibly written before any part of the world was made...but in Gods promises made to Abraham, and to be performed by Jesus Christ...as the Supreme Judge of Quick and Dead'.

As part of the project to publish Jackson's works in the 1650's, Barnabas Oley prefaced each of the first two volumes with a wealth of information concerning his efforts to locate manuscripts of Jackson's texts; the epistle to Gilbert Sheldon and preface to the reader which began the third and final volume, Dominus Veniet, carried on the tradition. As already related, Oley acknowledged his debt to Sheldon who had used his connection as co-overseer of Jackson's will to convince Robert Newlin (surviving until 1688) to allow Oley access to the manuscripts in his possession — thus furnishing the tenth and now the eleventh books of commentary. In this
last book, the anti-predestinarian rhetoric of Jackson is particularly forceful. 'And the only remedy to prevent despair or being swallowed up with grief, ... is, to purge our selves of that Erroneous Opinion concerning Absolute Reprobation, or irreversible ordination to death, before we were born, or from the time of our second birth by baptism'. In one of the sermons appended to book eleven, he also maintained that this doctrine had caused 'publick and farre-spread- ing licentiousness of tongues and pens in bitter invectives against their brethren, ... in libelling against lawful Superiors ... [that in this] no State or Nation since the invention of that Art [printing] hath exceeded or may compare with ... those people with whom we live'. An unpublished sermon, missing from this and other compilations, is extant only in manuscript at Cambridge University. Attributed to Jackson and situated at St. Mary's Oxford, the sermon is undated. Preaching on Jeremiah 32, verses 3-4, Jackson questions the immutability of the divine decree. 'That, albeit, no event ever did or possibly can come to passe, but by Gods decree ... yet every event that de facto comes to passe, is not the complete object of his decree concerning that subject or business. For his decree may be alike immediately terminated [i.e. directed?] to as many particulars as it pleases him, all alike possible until one prevent another by actual existence. So as of two, or three, or a thousand no one is absolutely necessary, but upon presupposall the others be omitted. That actually all should come to passe is impossible, because their co-existence oftimes implies a contradiction'.

There is very little evidence in the Stationers' Registers of any activity after Jackson's death. The first trace is of a collection of his works, entered to John Martin and Richard Chiswell on 5 July 1679. This was after the fact, for a Restoration edition of the works of Jackson had been published by John Martin, Richard Chiswell, and Joseph Clark in 1673. This compilation included all the commentaries, and it contributed some new material to the Jackson canon. Here the second part of The Holy Catholike Faith and Church, commentary twelve, appeared in print for the first time; it was called A Treatise of Christian Obedience. Oley repeated a previous lament that the manuscript of Treatise of Prodigies or Divine Forewarnings was still lost; this was intended to
be annexed to book six, the controversial Divine Essence. Treatise of Prodigies was still unlocated when the nineteenth century edition of Jackson's Works was published. Not surprisingly, the three volume set of 1673 was graced with even fuller tributes to Jackson and to Gilbert Sheldon, now archbishop of Canterbury, by the ubiquitous Oley. In a new preface Oley expressed gratitude to the three stationers listed above who had voluntarily undertaken the project, who had had to acquire the right of copy previously dispersed among five or six different hands, and who had vanquished all difficulties. The publisher of the incomplete collected works in the 1650's had been Timothy Garthwait, so it was costly for the three in 1673 to gain control. Oley forgave them for using his name when they appealed for subscriptions abroad as it was, after all, for a good cause. Oley described the 'difficulties as more than any spectator could imagine, unless experienced in like affairs'. This suggestion of the hurdles involved in locating and editing manuscripts seems in sharp contrast to Lambert's supposition that 'the Jackson edition [of 1653, etc.] was a failure and twenty years passed before an edition was published on subscription'.

This is the problem with an economic analysis, such as Lambert's, which claims that Jackson and Taylor had a similar publishing history in the 1630's. Even if her statement were correct, this approach neglects the content of the publications - certainly a mandatory component of any censorship discussion. It is clear from this review of Thomas Jackson's publications that he was censoring himself until late in his career, after the religious climate had changed. Some of his most anti-Calvinist statements, penned when Jackson was a young man, were included in titles not published until the late 1630's or even the 1650's and 1670's. The pattern for Thomas Taylor is quite the reverse. His views, acceptable during the Jacobean era, became increasingly unacceptable with the death of George Abbot and his replacement at Canterbury by William Laud.

When compared with Thomas Jackson, the life of Thomas Taylor furnishes some similarities. A fellow northerner, Thomas Taylor was born in Richmond, Yorkshire in 1576. His father, town recorder and a pillar of the community, was known for his opposition to popery and his hospitality to silenced ministers; four of his sons went into the ministry.
Thomas studied at Christ's College, Cambridge, a bastion of Calvinism and nurturer of puritans such as William Perkins, Arthur Dent, Arthur Hildersham, John Udall, Richard Bernard, and Paul Baynes. Taylor took a B.A. in 1595 and an M.A. in 1598 and then remained at Christ's College; he was an ordained minister by the age of twenty one and was serving as Hebrew lecturer by the age of twenty five. 39

However Taylor's zealous approach to religion was soon to attract notice, not all of it desirable. Because of his skill as an orator, he was said to have been appointed to preach at Paul's Cross in the reigns of both Elizabeth and James. However he also earned displeasure. On 22 May 1603 Taylor preached a sermon in St. Mary's which the vice-chancellor, probably William Smith of Clare Hall, maintained had given offence to the congregation. Among the articles gathered out of the offending sermon were Taylor's claims that only preaching of the word, not words read or sacraments, were the means to beget faith. Taylor found fault with the Church of England for its 'reading' ministers,' non-resident ministers, and substitute ministers. Taylor was ordered to read a retraction to the congregation in which he would say that he had not meant to reprove the royal government or its prelates with charges of non-residency or pluralism. Then in 1608, while Samuel Harsnett was conducting the metropolitical visitation for Ely diocese in Great St. Mary's, both Taylor and Paul Baynes were suspended on a count of unlicensed preaching. 40

We next catch sight of Taylor in Watford, Hertfordshire, where John Peile says 'he was resident for a considerable time...[and] was probably curate (about 1612)'. The dedication to dignitaries of the town in a 1612 publication was signed by him at Watford. Also, the dedication to A Commentarie upon the Epistle to Titus was dated 16 March 1612/13 at Watford and refers to his situation: 'for beeing hindered in my course of ministerie, how could I better spend my silent time'. William Urwick lists a Thomas Taylor as curate in Watford as early as 1598, during the period when Anthony Watson, described by Urwick as a puritan, was vicar. This was probably not the same man. Taylor may have served there as a teacher: a John King, baptized in Watford in 1597, was described as receiving his early education from Dr. Taylor of Aldermanbury, where Taylor ended his career.
Another possibility was that he may have been the recipient of a special endowment by the Morrison family to provide someone to preach every Tuesday forenoon, on market day. Charles Morrison was the object of one of his dedications. 41

By 1618 Taylor's titlepages began to list him as preacher at Reading in Berkshire; his brother Theophilus was vicar of St. Lawrence parish in that city. (Laud, coincidentally, was a native of Reading and maintained an interest in the city). An early biographer credited Thomas Taylor with overseeing 'a little nursery of young Preachers, who under his faithful Ministry flourished in knowledge and piety' in Reading. William Jemmat, about twenty years Taylor's junior, was part of this. A native of Reading, Jemmat may have served as Taylor's assistant. He edited Taylor's Gunpowder Plot sermons, signing the preface at Reading on 12 October 1619. It was with this work edited by Jemmat that the religious publisher John Bartlet inaugurated what was to be a protracted affiliation with Taylor's writings. By 1632 Jemmat was lecturer at Isleworth in Middlesex, the locale chosen when ill health forced Taylor to retire. 42 Jemmat continued as publicist and editor of Taylor's thought for decades after Taylor's death.

It was in the parish of St. Mary Aldermanbury, where Taylor was elected curate and lecturer in January 1625, that he finally found job security; by then he was almost fifty years old. Only since 1621 had the parish owned the advowson and the select vestry been able to elect its own curate. Taylor succeeded fellow puritan Robert Harris in this capacity. Answerable only to his vestry and shielded by influential parishioners such as Robert Harley, Taylor was able to preach; his publishing flourished also. The diocese of London was to have a series of anti-Calvinist bishops after the death of John King in 1621, but there were still the more sympathetic chaplains of Archbishop Abbot available to vet manuscripts before publication. It was possibly through Harley, son-in-law of Sir Edward Conway, that Taylor became chaplain to the latter. 43 Taylor's publications had become increasingly strident in their antipopery, especially during the early period of the Thirty Years War when King James was considering a Spanish Match for Prince Charles. His interest in political events in Germany continued. By March 1627 Taylor had joined forces with three of the feoffees for
impropriations, the London preachers Richard Sibbes of Gray's Inn, John Davenport of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, and William Gouge of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, to sign a circular letter which solicited relief for the hundreds of godly preachers and thousands of godly private persons cast from their homes in the upper Palatinate. The next year the High Commission referred the four divines to the new bishop of London, William Laud, who reprimanded them for venturing into matters of policy not concerning them. Nevertheless in 1628, when there was a royal collection for refugees from the Palatinate, the parish of St. Mary Aldermanbury led with the largest contribution. 44

Taylor thrived in his London lectureship. Finally in May 1628, when Taylor was already fifty two, despite opposition from Matthew Wren as vice-chancellor, he was awarded a Cambridge D.D. Sir Edward Conway had assisted in the campaign to obtain this recognition, interrupted all those years earlier by Marnett. In 1630, when about to retire to Isleworth, Taylor was incorporated at Oxford. Taylor died at Isleworth early in 1632, leaving behind his widow Anne, some siblings, and children. The will was proved 15 May 1632; in it Taylor left five pounds to the poor of Aldermanbury. In bequeathing his books he specified that they be safely reserved for the use of his sons except for the Book of Martyrs, which his wife would hold in safekeeping for the oldest son, and 'a dozen of the best English bookes for her owne use and hir daughtirs'. 45

Between 1633 and 1635, the years immediately following Taylor's demise, William Jemmat was able to arrange for the publication of three of his writings; two of these were licensed by George Abbot's chaplain, Robert Austin. However with the increased surveillance of London publishing which began in 1637, including new regulations for relicensing reprints, and with the difficulties, both financial and religious, of the publisher John Bartlet, publication of Taylor's writings ceased. It was not until August and September of 1640, with the shadow of the Long Parliament looming, that there was renewed activity concerning Taylor's writings. Five titles and sundry sermons on eighteen biblical texts appeared in the registers, licensed by Thomas Weekes and entered to John Bartlet. Production began almost immediately with A Treatise of Contentment in 1641, but then
it stalled. Not until 1653 was the attempt to collect and print the titles registered to Bartlet (and never before printed) successful; a collection of some of the titles published during Taylor's lifetime appeared in 1659.  

Like Jackson, Taylor's first appearance in print was in connection with another's writings: each was equally symbolic. Jackson had probably translated from the Latin a work on adiaphora by Gabriel Powel which pleaded for conformity; Taylor edited a work of his puritan mentor, William Perkins. Appearing in the registers only later, as part of a transfer from Thomas Man to his sons Paul and Jonas on 3 May 1624, this Perkins title included a dedication signed by Taylor and dated 24 May 1606 in Cambridge. The work exhibited classic Calvinism. The reader is directed from the heading 'reprobation' in the table of contents to the following words in the text: 'we learne, that as God hath before all worlds decreed the electing of some to salvation: so he hath decreed the refusall and rejecting of others to condemnation'. Printed marginalia concluded: 'predestination then is not only to be referred to the elect'.

Taylor's earliest extant publication, The Beawties of Beth-el, dated from his time of troubles in Cambridge. Preached in St. Peter's, Cambridge, and dedicated to Thomas French, who was mayor of Cambridge in 1608-1609, the sermon collection was printed in London for Thomas Man, also the publisher of Perkins's book. It was entered to Man on 7 April 1609 and licensed by James Speght, a contemporary of Taylor's at Christ's who, according to Peile, by 1592 was also rector of St. Mary Magdalene, Milk Street. Two of Taylor's major themes are found here. His definition of the people of God was: 'I meane those of God's election; that are called of his purpose, that have obtaind mercie, and who proceed on in the waies of sanctification unto salvation...It is a glorious thing to be admitted even to the outward profession of religion, nothwithstanding all are not of the church that are in it'. And, secondly, in the dedicatory epistle Taylor worried about sabbath-breakers 'as that numbers given-over to Atheisme and liberty, are bold not onely to move...but strongly defend that our Saboth is either not to be kept, or not so straightly: that either our Sermons neede not to bee heard or not so frequently'.

Taylor had two of his works published at Cambridge which
had 1612 in the imprints; both dedications issued from his new residence in Watford, Hertfordshire, but the material had been preached in Cambridge. A Commentarie upon the Epistle of Paul to Titus was dedicated to Robert Rich, later earl of Warwick; the dedication was dated 16 March 1612 but may actually have been 1613. Again the doctrine of unconditional predestination was clearly stated. 'These few...are chosen, 1. from all eternity, for no new thing can fall into the prescience, and will of God. 2. they are chosen of his good pleasure, even before they have done good or evil. 3. and they are chosen to the certain fruition of life eternal, as being immutably elected....all this paveeth no way to a dependent election or reprobation, which hangeth upon some outward thing without the most absolute will of God'. Sections of this work give evidence that Taylor was wrestling with the question of conformity. 'So that if any sinner shall move and wooe us unto any ungodly practise, we must reason the case with our own hearts; I may not doe any such thing as may dishonour God, or my profession, let others doe thus...I am the Lords peculiar, and must live to his glory, which I cannot doe if I withstand not such motions, as whereby his glory is hazarded...'. The other Cambridge imprint, Japhets first publique Perswasion, was dedicated to Sir James Altham and Sir Charles Morrison, dignitaries of Watford. Both men were nationally prominent as well as active in local religious affairs: Altham established a chapel in his house and Morrison's family had created an endowment for preaching on market day. Taylor extolled the virtues of godly rule by magistrates in this dedication. In the text he presented scriptural evidence for the doctrine of unconditional grace. '4. The Scriptures not only deny true and saving faith to the reprobate, whose eyes the Lord blindeth, and whose hearts he hardneth, least they should see and believe; but improprieth it to the elect, whence it is called the faith of the elect: To them whom God hath predestinated to life: for so many as were ordained to life everlasting, believed...'. Taylor continued with an attack on popish doctrine, accusing Catholics of believing what 'is common, not onely to Heretikes and reprobates, but to the verie Devils themselves...'.

David's Learning, 1617, was printed in London for Henry Fetherstone, but was not entered in the registers. The
dedicatee, William Knollys, viscount Wallingford, was described as 'noble leiftenant of our Country' which could indicate that Taylor was already in Berkshire. Taylor described himself as 'one whom you pleased to favour as a soules Physician'. In a reprint the next year, 1618, the address to the Christian reader was redirected to the 'loving hearers of the town of Reading'. In the preface to the reader Taylor sought to destroy the myths of universal election and universal atonement. 'God loveth all men, but not alike: for wee must distinguish of Gods love unto man, which is twofold: I. Universall or generall, by which he loves men as his creatures. 2. Speciall and particular, whereby hee loves them as new creatures. By this speciall kinde of love he loves onely his elect, and no wicked men, who yet as his creatures are loved of him, but not in such effects of love as the elect are...Christ dyed for all men, that is, all kinds and degrees of men, but not for every severall and individuall person: for then could there bee no place left either for election or reprobation seeing, where all are taken, none are either chosen or left'. And, in the text itself, Taylor summarized that 'such exhortations argue neither universall grace nor free-will, as the Lutheran Divines and the Papists hold'.

The next eight titles were all published while Taylor was lecturer to the town of Reading; one assumes that by now he was once again licensed to preach. The first two books, Christ's Combate, 1618 (dedicated to Sir Francis Knollys and his wife Lettice), and Circumpsect Walking, 1619 (dedicated to Sir Robert Naunton), were published at the Cambridge press. The Cambridge vice-chancellors for those years were William Branthwayt, John Gostlin, and Robert Scott. These were the last two titles published at Cambridge until a reprint of the Commentarie to Titus in 1652. In Christ's Combate Taylor concentrated on Satan's temptations of Christ and of the elect. 'He [Satan] maligneth faith, as beeing a speciall gift and marke of Gods elect, because it is given to them onely, and to all them, and therefore is called the faith of Gods elect....All Satans temptations tend to breve off the covenant and communion betweene God and his Children, and therefore must in speciall manner aime against faith...'.

In the pre-war period, this book was not reprinted after 1618 although Circumspect Walking was reprinted in London in
1631.

The most striking element in the titles published at London while Taylor remained in Reading was the increasingly shrill nature of his anti-Catholicism. No doubt this was a product of the consternation generated between 1618 and 1623 as King James was thinking the unthinkable - to marry his heir to a Spanish princess whose family was destroying the Reformation in central Europe. But with the Calvinist George Abbot still at Canterbury, the stationer John Bartlet - publisher of all six titles - could arrange to have the manuscripts licensed by Abbot's chaplain, Daniel Featley. This was the case with five out of six of these titles. David Cressy has written of the increased stake in revitalizing the horrors of the 'Gunpowder Treason' just as international Protestantism was jeopardized and James was negotiating with Spain. It was in this charged atmosphere that William Jemmat gathered together five of Taylor's Gunpowder Plot sermons and turned them over to Bartlet, who had them licensed by Daniel Featley and entered on 27 October 1619. The dates and locations for these sermons are unspecified, although the author requests the reader to 'consider [that] these Sermons were preached many years asunder'. In an address to the reader dated at Reading 12 October 1619, Jemmat expressed his own fears of rapprochement with the enemy. 'For when our nation shall see, and consider a fresh, how insatiable she hath alwaies beeone of blood, and English blood. I cannot thinke we can be so inconsiderate, as to dreame of any toleration, much lesse any sound reconcilement with so implacable an enemie'. 'I thought it not altogether impossible hereby to stop the slanderous mouthes of misse-conceiving persons...who seeing in some good men a difference of judgement in some small matters, presently conclude them enemies of the State &'. Jemmat was concerned about those who wanted to drive a wedge between Protestants. When Taylor himself wrote of the difference between Protestants and Catholics, he warned: 'Never heare such whisperings, as speake of a reconciliaion of our religions, for that cannot be'. This work was reissued the next year and reprinted in 1634.

There was a lingering involvement with Taylor's writings on the part of the stationer Thomas Man, listed in the imprints of Perkins's title and Beawties of Beth-el and then
as bookseller of *A Mappe of Rome*, the compilation of Gunpowder Plot sermons. *The Kings Bath*, 1620, was printed jointly for Man and Bartlet; Man was originally Bartlet's master. Again licensed by Featley, the latter title was entered to Bartlet on 7 January 1620. A devotional work dealing with the baptism of Christ, it nevertheless included robust endorsements of election and condemnations of popery. ‘But what difference is there betwenee the deepes of the godly and the wicked; betwenee the Lords forsaking his owne and his enemies? Answ[er]. Very much. For Gods displeasure lyeth against the persons of the one: but onely against the sinnes of the other’. ‘The Saints of God in Scripture ascribe the whole matter of their salvation from first to last unto God, acknowledging that it is God, who worketh the will and the deed, that he is the author and finisher of their faith and salvation...The God of all grace; namely both of that first and eternall grace of election; and also of all secondary and consequent graces...’. Then came the warning: ‘abhorre all Popish religion, which joyneth the doctrine of free-will, merits, and humane satisfactions with Christs merit'. And, much later, 'away with those fond devices of merits, and workes of supererogation; away with Popes pardons...away with foreseene faith and foreseene workes, with which some men say God was pleased, and so moved to elect his people'.

*The Parable of the Sower*, published by Bartlet in 1621, was the first imprint to list Bartlet's address as the bookseller; the previous two London publications were sold by Man. Again licensed under the auspices of Daniel Featley, this was entered on 8 August 1620. There were numerous dedicatees, all local: mayor Walter Bateman; Edwarde Clarke, Master of Chancery and Steward of Reading; John Saunders, Justice of the Peace; Nicolas Gunter, former mayor; and Christopher Turner, Taylor's special friend. In addition there was a Latin dedication to local divines: Taylor's brother Theophilus, John Denison, and Hugh Dicus. In large part anti-Arminian, Taylor's title promised that he would oppugne the ‘fifth Article of the late Arminians [that of the perseverance of the Saints]; and shortly and plainly answere their most colourable Arguments and evasions'. Taylor also expressed his sabbatarian beliefs, in effect at variance with the expressed views of King James who had issued the *Book of
Sports in 1618. All these views appeared in rapid succession in a section describing the religious tenets which Taylor feared were withering away. '1) Justification is by faith only. 2. Gods Election and Reprobation are absolute depending only upon Gods will and pleasure: according to the Scripture, Ephes. I.45. But how generally are men withered, and gone from this truth, as if their wits were now to be refined by Arminius? concluding them to be conditionall, depending upon mans willing or nilling to receive the grace of God....3. Pope is Antichrist....Time would faile to speake of the generall withering in judgement, in the doctrine concerning the strict observation of the Sabbath which some thinke alterable and observable at the will and pleasure of the Christian Prince; though it were written by Gods owne finger in Tables of stone....And lastly, concerning a mans falling wholly and finally from Grace, who is truly justified and sanctified'. Included also in this catalogue of hazards was the restoration of auricular confession - Taylor's apprehension possibly occasioned by the Norwich visitation articles of John Overall in 1619. Taylor by now had confirmed credentials as a Sabbatarian and as a strong evangelical Calvinist, one who understood the implications of a Spanish marriage. This title was reprinted in 1623 and again in 1634, when it was combined with the Mappe of Rome - all published by John Bartlet.

A funeral sermon for Mary Gunter, wife of Berkshire gentleman Humphrey Gunter, appeared in 1622 - licensed by Montaigne's chaplain Thomas Worrall and entered to Bartlet on 14 June 1622. Accompanied by a narration of Mary Gunter's life by her widower, who emphasized her conversion from Catholicism, Taylor's sermon claimed that because heaven was home, the godly were strangers while on earth. Even so, he managed to inject reminders of the oppression which continental Protestants were experiencing from the captains of Antichrist. The narration was dedicated by Humphrey Gunter to Lettice, countess of Leicester, who had masterminded the conversion; all of these pieces were reprinted as part of a larger work in 1624, 1625, and 1633.

Thomas Cogswell has highlighted the flood of anti-Catholic literature available in 1624. Taylor's Two Sermons (the second of which was described as delivered at 'Black-Friers in London'), licensed by Featley, entered to Bartlet
on 24 May 1624, and dedicated to the House of Commons, was part of this, in which Taylor excelled himself with anti-Catholic invective. 'As by Babylon, we meane not only the walls, and plot of ground, on which the Citie of Rome standeth, but the whole Papall State and Religion'. Taylor also challenged those Protestants who were not absolutely firm in their resistance. 'More secretly, our indifferent and wary Protestants partake of her sinnes. I. By externall reverence to, or at Idol worship, as bowing the knee, uncovering the head; condemned in the second commandement as an approbation of the Idol...3. By defence of Popish persons, doctrines, and practises: not a few undertake the defence of grosse Popery in their table discourse, as Free-will, the Reall Presence, Merit of Workes....4. By silence, and not professing against the Idolatry of Popery in doctrine or practise'. In the dedicatory epistle, Taylor implored the Commons to move the king for the Sabbath, for the fourth commandment was 'the sinewes of all the Lawes of men, without observation of which, all other good Lawes would be broken'. In parliament in 1624 there was a bill against profanation of the sabbath. Also in 1624 The Pilgrims Profession was reprinted as part of Two Treatises. More important was the addition of a new treatise, the Pearle of the Gospell, which had been licensed by Featley and entered to Bartlet several years earlier, on 1 December 1621. Within the text this was described as sermons preached on several fair days; they contained defences of sabbath observance and of the idea of predestination.

Taylor was elected curate and lecturer of St. Mary Aldermanbury in January 1625; the following six publications identify him as such. The first of these, A good Husband and a good Wife, 1625, was a wedding sermon composed earlier and then brought to the press by a John Sedgwicke as editor. It lacked a dedication and an entry in the registers. The sermon assumed a like-minded couple, both names written in the book of life, both heirs of the same salvation. Admonitions included: 'First get the power of godlinesse, and then the forme, &. They sinne, that for ceremonies cast downe substance of worship. When Gods sacred ordinances must go downe, rather then mens foolish inventions not stand up'. Sedgwicke took the piece to William Sheffard, a publisher who does not appear again in Taylor imprints.
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King James had issued directions to preachers in August 1622 which specifically prohibited any under the rank of bishop or dean from preaching on the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility or irresistibility of God's grace; likewise no preachers were to fall into bitter invective against either papists or puritans. This was enhanced in June 1626 by a royal proclamation from Charles which restricted preaching and printing of anything which might disturb the peace and quiet of the church. Nevertheless the two titles published by Taylor in 1628 challenged these regulations. A Man in Christ and The Practice of Repentance were actually not entered until 2 April 1629 when in a joint entry to Bartlet they were described as licensed by Doctor Harris; Featley's licensing activities had been seriously curtailed by 1627. Although the actual licensing date is not known, the entrance postdated the Declaration of November 1628 which was prefixed to the Thirty-Nine Articles: this ruled that all further 'curious search be laid aside and no man print or preach to draw the article aside any way'.

Whatever the chronology, these two writings defied all three attempts at regulation. Taylor continued to spell out the double decree of absolute predestination and opposed Arminian free will as well. In A Man Taylor wrote, 'Nothing in us, either in being, or foreseene to be in us, was any cause of Gods decree...to create us....Creation is the cause of the whole being: secondly, what faith or good works could bee foreseene in them, who were all in a forlorn and lost estate?' On the attack, he asserted that 'the late refiners of Pelagianisme and Poperie, followers of Arminius, lest they should lose all nature; hold the doctrine of free will in man to his own conversion....to say that God by his omnipotent power doth not incline our wils to his will, or that hee hath not our wills more in his power than ourselves have; all this is the Pelagian Heresie'. In the table to Practice of Repentance occurred the heading: '...wee hinder our repentance withall, VIZ. the certaintie of Gods decree of election and reprobation'. This led to the part of the text which read: 'so are the meanes as certainly decreed as those ends. And unto these the elect are as certainly predestinated, as to the ends themselves'. Other sections proclaimed the fact that Christ died only for the elect and
denounced sabbath breakers. Neither publication was dedicated, although in a preface added to the second edition of Practice in 1629, Taylor confessed that he had not taken time to work with the printer for the first printing, thus it was published too hastily and now the second edition boasted many corrections. It does certainly appear that Taylor was too busy with parish duties and sermonizing to spare time for publication. Nonetheless these two were among his most popular writings, reprinted in 1629 and 1632 and then issued together in 1635 as the fourth edition of The Practice of Repentance.

However it was The Progresse of Saints, printed by the controversial William Jones for John Bartlet in 1630, which provided the most 'brazen wall against Arminianism', as Taylor's activities were characterized in the biography preaced to his Works, 1653. Licensed by Abbot's chaplain Robert Austin, this title was entered to Bartlet on 19 November 1630; it had been dedicated by Taylor on 17 November 1630 to Sir Richard Young, Sir Robert Harley, and the rest of his loving people in St. Mary Aldermanbury. There were two issues produced, this and another in 1631, but no additional reprints in the pre-war period. Taylor stated clearly his objections to Arminianism. 'In his decree of the finall salvation of the Saints, hee [God] is faithfull and unmoveable. 2. Tim. 2.19. The foundation (that is, decree of Gods election) abides sure, it stands on a sure foundation, and hath this seale, the Lord knowes who are his...Papists doubt whether the Saints shall lose their grace, but where then is Gods faithfullnesse, who shall confirme them in grace to the end? This faithfullnesse stirres them up to the meanes,...raiseth them after their falls, and leades them by the hand to eternall life. The Arminiens drawing the same line with these Bellarminians, object, that God in all his decrees implies some conditions'. Earlier in the text Taylor had expressed his concerns about general corruption, pollution of the Sabbath, and a return to popery. 'Instead of honouring Gods worthies, the restorers of holy Religion, have not some of our pulpits, presses, and discourses disgraced Calvin, Beza, and such as stood more stiffe against Popery'.

Two last publications from Taylor's Aldermanbury period were significant in different ways. The first of these, The
Valew of true Valour, was delivered on 25 July, presumably in 1629, the year of publication. Preached before a 'military company', this sermon exemplified a distinctive genre, the military sermon; frequently preachers relied on the Bible to justify the appropriateness of warfare. In the dedication to this society Taylor exhorted them to defend the gospel, the king, and the honour of their kingdom. In the sermon he consulted the scriptures for evidence that the Lord believed in the value of their profession. He held up to his audience the example of a different company, the society of the Artillery Yard, and their achievements. But above all he reminded them of the fate of continental Protestants. 'Looke upon the state of this part of Christendome; tyrannized on by Antichrists forces: behold the fury of the enemies against the Churches every where: take to heart the inundation and floods of misery and destruction let in upon our neighbour Churches'. This title was licensed by John Jeffrey, yet another of Abbot's chaplains, and was entered to Thomas Jones on 13 December 1629. The last of these Aldermanbury titles - and the last of any first edition to be published during Taylor's lifetime - was Regula Vitae, 1631, an attack on sects such as the one he called 'Antinomians'. Still relying on Robert Austin for licensing, a new publisher, Robert Dawlman, arrived on the scene; Regula Vitae was entered 15 September 1631 and a second edition brought out by Dawlman in 1635. The book is undedicated, but contains a preface to the reader which recounted that Luther in his last Wittenberg sermon had foretold that Satan would raise up thirty sects against him. Here Taylor continued to uphold the commandments as laws: 'To say, we obey God by the spirit without a Law or commandement, is a meere nonsence: For is any obedience without a law?' Reiterated was his belief in God's decrees. 'True it is that God alone decreeth our salvation, Christ alone meriteth it, the spirit alone sealeth it: but yet the Gospell revealeth it, and that saveth; faith apprehendeth it, and that saveth: the Ministers they preach it, and they save, namely ministerially'. Mention of this book in the preface to the 1653 collection of Taylor's works was intriguing. 'Onely one thing we cannot passe over in silence, and that is the successe of his Treatise against the errors of the Antinomists, which it pleased the Lord to blesse to the conviction of one of the then chief Ringleaders of that
Faction, so that of his own accord he brought Dr. Taylor his recantation or renunciation of that error'. 62

Soon after retiring to his country home in Isleworth, early in 1632 Taylor died. He was buried at Aldermanbury on 4 May 1632, with a funeral sermon preached by William Jemmat; this sermon does not appear to be extant. The will named his wife Anne as sole executrix with the expressed desire that friends Robert Edwards and Gerard Forde would assist and direct her. 63 For a while the publishers Bartlet and Dawlman were able to reprint books even after Laud became archbishop of Canterbury because they were unhindered by controls over such reprints. As late as 1635 Bartlet brought out a fourth edition of The Practice of Repentance, by then combined with A Man in Christ, and Dawlman produced another edition of Regula Vitae. William Jemmat was also involved in this spate of posthumous publication. Still at Isleworth near London, Jemmat, although unnamed in the will, strove to edit and deliver Taylor's writings for publication; he succeeded with a few, three in number. It was Dawlman who in 1633 published Christs Victorie, a diatribe against Catholicism. Entered on 10 August 1632 with Abbot's chaplain Austin as licenser, the dedication to the inhabitants of Aldermanbury parish was dated at Isleworth on 25 February 1632/3 by Jemmat. Jemmat noted that he had preached Taylor's funeral sermon and that he was presenting this book on behalf of Taylor's widow. This polemic did not lack for details of papist delusions, nor for advice to the godly. 'Content not thy selfe to be well read and seen in the Scriptures...but labour especially to make thine owne Election sure, for the dragon can cast downe none of the elect...'. In this year of the reissue of the Book of Sports - 18 October 1633 - Taylor's sabbatarianism is still evident. In an attack on those who would reintroduce popery, Taylor also complained: 'whosoever shall endeavour to sow our field with the miscelen of Popery, who treacherously with one wipe would cast out all the reformed churches from being the true churches of God, with whom wee have joyned as sisters, ever since the restoring of the Gospell,...and with another, wipe out the fourth Commandement [sabbath], as the whole second Commandement [images] is most sacrilegiously cast out....especially beware of the delusion of Antichrist, who is that beast that must goe into destruction, and the King of these Locusts...'. 64
The publication of *Christ Revealed* in 1635, after Laud's elevation to Canterbury, might be attributed to the fact that it had been licensed by Austin much earlier - on 25 July 1632. A compendium of Old Testament persons and things, this work on the types and figures of Christ was published by Dawlman, reprinted as *Moses and Aaron* in 1653, and was the only one of Taylor's works to appear in an eighteenth century edition. In the dedication to Sir Miles Fleetwood of the Court of Wards, dated 26 June 1635, Jemmat referred to him as a 'hearer' of Taylor's preaching and coyly dubbed the work an orphan whom the widow would like to see become one of Fleetwood's wards. In this work Taylor expressed his reservations about the surplice and ceremonies in general. '...Every godly Minister weares a white linnen garment, not woven and made by man, but by God; not without him, but within him; not a shadow or ceremony, but the substance and truth, to which all shadowes give place'. Earlier in the book Taylor had explained: 'As the body is solid,...even when the shadow is gone: So the Ceremonies as shadowes are flown away, but Christ the body and his true worship lasteth for ever. In all which Christ and his grace are advanced, as the publisher and perfecter of our salvation without any shadowes...'.

It was Bartlet who published the last of Taylor's pre-1640 titles. In this instance the manuscript, *The Principles of Christian Practice*, was licensed by Bishop Juxon's chaplain Thomas Weekes and entered 2 October 1634; an imprimatur which granted license for five months was dated 1 October 1634. Although Juxon was in the Laudian camp, Weekes was a marathon licenser for the press, credited with over six hundred titles during his term. Jemmat dedicated the book on 20 December 1634 to Edward Clarke, Steward of Reading and a Master of the Court of Chancery, and to his wife Anne, said to be one of Taylor's patrons. This was to be the last appearance of Taylor in print for almost six years. The Star Chamber Decree of 1637 attempted to stop the practice of reprinting titles without having them first relicensed by current authorities. Jemmat and Dawlman were presumably restrained by this decree along with a general tightening up of the licensing regulations; Bartlet, who owned many of Taylor's titles, was literally so. At the end of 1637 Bartlet was charged by John Lambe and taken before the High
Commission for buying and selling schismatical books such as Bastwick's *Letany*, Burton's *Appeal*, and *Scottish News*. In spite of pleas of financial hardship for his family, Bartlet was committed to prison. He was also in trouble for keeping his shop on Goldsmith Row open, contrary to a mayoral ruling, and was in the loan book of the Stationers' Company for borrowing money in 1639. Late in 1640, when the political situation was worsening for the crown and Laud, it apparently became easier to have Taylor's evangelical Calvinist manuscripts approved for printing. A series of entries in August and September lists three titles and sermons on eighteen biblical verses by Taylor which had been licensed by Weekes and entered to Bartlet. Only one was published immediately thereafter; this was *A Treatise of Contentment*, 1641. With Jemmat as editor, this was a small compilation of three separate items - the third of which, *The Holy War*, had been a visitation sermon. Included were references to the familiar themes of the elect and of caveats against Antichrist. 'And for the godly themselves, they cannot be seduced...Heresies, schisms, scandals, apostasies may molest and grieve them, but...they are preserved by the power of God to salvation...and all that are begotten of God, overcome the world, and let Antichrist come into the world, the Elect are fenced'. Conveniently appended to this treatise was a catalogue of the sermons and tracts which were licensed for the press but not yet printed. The biblical verses for most, although not all, of these matched the entries in late August/ early September 1640.

Bartlet was staking out a claim - a claim not fully realized until he and his son published a volume of Taylor's writings in 1653. Rather than a collection of previously printed titles, with two exceptions this was an attempt to collect and publish short sermons and tracts which had not been allowed earlier. As stated on the titlepage they were 'not hitherto published (though earnestly desired by very many experimental Christians,) because the iniquity of those times could not bear such Burning and Shining Light...'. The dedicatory epistle by one of Taylor's successors at Aldermanbury, Edmund Calamy, was addressed to the inhabitants of the parish. The imprimatur, dated 9 May 1653, was granted by Joseph Caryl, also one of the twelve compilers. In a preface to the reader signed by the compilers, including
Calamy, Caryl, and Jemmat, the difficulties in bringing these discourses into print were recited again. 'The present volume which is now put into thy hands, is made up either of such Treatises as have been already published, but now are out of print [The Kings Bath and Principles of Christian Practice] (which is the smaller part) or some other excellent Discourses, fitted indeed by himself for the Presse, but never yet divulged; the iniquity of former times not permitting such births as those, a kindly delivery: but now conceiving them seasonally useful we have encouraged the Stationer, in whose hands they were to print them, not doubting but the profit will exceed the charge, and being unwilling that such jewels should any longer be shut up from publick sight and use'.

The largest single entity in this collection was Certain Catechisticall Exercises, previously entered separately on 24 August 1640. This was an anti-Catholic polemic masquerading as catechetical lectures; possibly this was one way of getting around Laud's 'Instructions' of 1629 which directed clergy to use the catechism for afternoon sermons. The entry in the Stationers' Registers describes it as 'delivered on the lords dayes in the afternoon sermonwise in Aldermanbury church'. After charging that Catholicism 'teacheth, that the assurance of salvation is a damnable presumption', Taylor recommended: 'give all diligence to make your Calling and Election sure'. Later he insisted 'for thus also the bodies of the Saints in heaven shall become immortal...not out of the propriety of their own nature,...but by the gracious ordination of God; Thus also the bodies of the damned shall be immortal in eternal torments, not in the propriety of their own nature, but from the justice and power of God so ordering them.' Taylor had indeed returned. More despairing was a treatise in this collection, The Famine of the Word, in which Taylor lamented the decrease in godly preaching. Among the signs of this crisis were 'when Rulers and Teachers conspire against the Truth and the Preachers and Professors of it, and esteem the overthrow of Religion, of Gods Worship, of the Ministry and Sabbaths...this is a sure sign of sorrowfull times, for Wicked Rulers'. Taylor warned against apostacy and a return to popery. These rather pointed complaints were surely not acceptable to Caroline licensers. In another passage the fate of those Protestants who were
zealous was described. 'How doth the common Protestant
esteeme of him that is truly religious? Is not he hated and
reproached as an hereticall Puritan? Doth not every mouth
almost say that Papists are far better than such?' Although
this treatise was included in the catalogue of books, claimed
as licensed but not yet published, which was appended to the
Treatise of Contentment (1641), it does not appear in the
1640 entries in the registers. At the end of this 1653
edition of the Works, the editors kindly supplied a catalogue
of previously printed works which pretty accurately reflected
those titles extant from the pre-1640 period. The tenacity
with which Bartlet held his copies, as did John Clarke with
his ownership of most of Jackson's books of commentaries,
does not suggest that these authors were unpopular and a
liability. Ownership of Taylor's non-Bartlet titles continued
to pass between stationers, speeding up especially between
1658 and 1659; there are fourteen separate entries in Wing
for Taylor, all before 1660, and twelve of these were printed
in the 1650's. Bartlet's failure to complete a more ambitious
collection of Taylor's works in 1659 may have been caused by
the drastic change in the political situation. Conversely,
Jackson's works were successfully edited and published in
1673, after the Restoration.

The parallel lives of the Arminian Thomas Jackson, born
1579, and the puritan Thomas Taylor, born 1576, were
significantly contemporary with the life of William Laud,
born 1573. And it was Laud's ascendancy and rule in the
Church of England from the late 1620's until 1640 which set
the stage for these two actors. Both Jackson and Taylor were
northerners of respectable families; both received the finest
possible education for the ministry. Both participated in the
anti-Catholic barrage in the decade after the Gunpowder Plot,
although Jackson's contributions to the cause may have been
primarily as a royal controversialist. Already in the preface
to the third book of commentaries on the creed in 1614,
Jackson indicated that he was loath to persist in these
quarrels. Taylor's antipopery, on the other hand, remained a
lifelong obsession. Jackson was educated at Corpus Christi
College, Oxford - a college with early anti-Calvinist
associations; he flourished there and even returned as its
president in 1631. Taylor attended Christ's College, Cambridge - at one point the puritan stronghold of men such
as John Udall and William Perkins, but by Taylor's time no longer willing to shelter puritans critical of Richard Bancroft. Taylor was ousted from there in 1608; only years later did he receive his doctorate, following intervention on his behalf by Sir Edward Conway.

Jackson and Taylor both worked within the system. All their publications had proper imprints and, when not university press, almost all were licensed and entered in the registers. It is only through a comparison of their careers and published writings, or in their relations to a pivotal figure such as Sir Robert Harley who was a loyal parishioner to Taylor at the same time he was condemning Jackson in parliament, that the differences emerge. Jackson was the ultimate insider, rising regularly through the ranks of the church thanks to the support of men such as the Arminians Richard Neile and William Laud and King Charles himself. Except for a few dedications to his early patron Lord Eure and members of the Spencer family, and the infamous dedication to Pembroke in 1628, most of Jackson's dedications were to pillars of the church hierarchy or to royalty. By contrast, Taylor was an outsider. Banished from Cambridge, he found some work at Watford and then progressed as a lecturer, first in Reading and finally to the London parish of Aldermanbury where he reported to a select vestry. His dedications were primarily to magistrates in the localities where he lectured or to some of the neighboring gentry—in short to lay figures who could offer some protection. Although each cleric preached and published sermons, Jackson's life was above all devoted to scholarly pursuits, to labour on his twelve books of commentary on the Apostle's Creed. Taylor, conversely, spent most of his life in or near London and was more politically involved: he was especially sensitive to the Catholic victories on the continent. Practically on his deathbed, Taylor was depicted as 'much cheered in his spirits for the great successes of the King of Sweden then victorious in Bavaria'. When Jackson, a bachelor, died, his will provided for some of his books to go to the college and his manuscripts and papers to be overseen and published by two prominent men. Taylor's books went to his sons and his executrix was his wife; two friends, presumably from the Aldermanbury parish, were to assist her in her duties. William Jemmat voluntarily undertook to edit
Taylor's manuscripts, much as Barnabas Oley was to do after Jackson's death.

Jackson's printed works were mostly products of the Oxford press or of the religious publisher John Clarke. Similarly, Taylor's were most often produced at Cambridge or by the puritan publisher John Bartlet. The 1640's were an unsettled time and there were no known attempts made to collect and publish the works of either man. In 1653 the copies not held by Clarke began to be compiled for Jackson's works; Clarke's lack of cooperation inhibited the project. On the other hand, it was material owned by Bartlet and not previously published which largely comprised Taylor's works of the same year. But it is the content of their published material which is most vital for this study. There were complementary curves in the publication patterns of this Arminian and this Calvinist divine at the beginning and end of the period under review. By 1625 Jackson was criticizing in print the contemporary preoccupation with reprobation and election, but it was really in 1628 with the Divine Essence that his criticism of unconditional predestination aroused Calvinist ire. By 1635, with Laud now archbishop of Canterbury, Jackson in the eighth book of commentaries was openly berating those who spent their time examining God's decrees about election and reprobation; he proclaimed it a preposterous presumption to try to determine how these decrees were to be executed. During this period of Arminian ascendancy, some of Jackson's earlier works were published. Diverse Sermons, 1637, contained sermons which had been delivered in Newcastle in the 1620's and a treatise which he had not had 'opportunity' to publish earlier. The sermon purloined by William Milbourne in 1638 had been written in 1612, when Jackson was already challenging the irrevocable nature of the double decree. Also in 1638, perhaps emboldened by Milbourne's success, Jackson's preface to Consecration was replete with promises for other books awaiting the press - books which we know were more extreme in their criticism of Calvinism. All of this came to a screeching halt in 1640 as nothing more was published in his name until 1653. Taylor's publications, on the other hand, had been stalled five years earlier.

Taylor had been able consistently to publish his sabbatarian, predestinarian, antipopish thought into the
early 1630's. The Progresse of Saints, 1630, violated various directions, proclamations, and declarations of the 1620's; even the posthumous Christs Victorie in 1633 contained the same themes. However gradually Taylor's voice died: 1635 marked its demise. In comparing the publishing stream of these two divines, several striking contrasts emerge. Jackson had to wait until the Laudian hegemony before he could begin to publish some of his earlier works, but by then, especially after the disbanding of parliament, he was relatively unrestrained. Meanwhile, the flow of Taylor's publications, in spite of the posthumous efforts of Jemmat, terminated two years after Laud became archbishop. For Taylor, represented by Jemmat, the 1637 decree would seem to have spelt total silence. With the royal reversal of fortune during 1640, the configuration was inverted. Nothing by Jackson issued from the press until 1653. On the other hand, by autumn 1640 Bartlet had Taylor manuscripts vetted by Weekes and entered; by 1641 one of Taylor's works was printed. Both sides suffered from the upheavals of the 1640's and then both benefitted from the relative toleration of Cromwell's time. With the Restoration, projects to collect Taylor's works ceased, while a major set of Jackson's works was published in 1673.

Although the rule of the Arminian George Montaigne in the diocese of London during the 1620's enabled some printed works displeasing to Calvinists to take their place in the public domain next to standard Calvinist texts, it was primarily after Laud succeeded to London, parliament ceased to meet, and Abbot still had his chaplains available for licensing duties that the pattern of publishing of both men was closest. Through the rival set of licensers, it was possible for publishers of each to find a means to obey printing regulations and still to publish in London. The situation then was both ambiguous and complicated. Yet overall during the period from 1605 to 1640, Taylor was the more popular and prolific author. Twenty two new titles, followed by roughly twenty five reissuings and reprintings, fell into this time span. During the same three and a half decades Jackson contributed only thirteen new titles and four succeeding printings. Once Laud became archbishop of Canterbury, only one further title by Taylor was licensed. Taylor's death in 1632 does not account for this. His editors
in 1653 said he had many titles ready for the press, and, in any case, Jemmat was consistently involved in editing and publishing Taylor's writings. In the anti-Laudian atmosphere of late 1640, over twenty new works were licensed and entered. Between 1633 and 1639 Jackson's publishing, both in Laudian Oxford and in London after vetting by Arminian censors, picked up apace. Jackson had licensed four major titles or thirty one percent of the whole between 1633 and 1639, whereas Taylor had one title licensed or four percent of his total. Similarly when Jackson's output in 1637 and 1638, the peak of the Caroline enforcement of religious censorship, is matched against Taylor's utter silence, the publishing patterns are sharply diverse.

The pattern of publication of the Arminian Thomas Jackson and the evangelical Calvinist Thomas Taylor simply reflects those patterns found on a larger scale in the previous survey of religious books dated 1607, 1617, 1627 and 1637. The healthy proportion of earliest extant editions containing evangelical Calvinist thought, reported to be 63% in 1607 and 71% in 1617, dwindles to zero in 1637. Thus isolating religious publication over a period of time in early Stuart England reveals stark contrasts to some of the prevailing wisdom concerning government control of printing and censorship. Concentrating on a religious model finds in 1637 a far greater incidence of entrance in the Stationers' Registers (100%) and inclusion of printed imprimaturs (77%) than was previously implied by W. W. Greg, Maureen Bell, and F. B. Williams. 75 Concentrating on the content of licit religious publication contradicts the view that publishing decisions were based mainly on economic factors; rather there is a persistent pattern of the evangelical Calvinist themes which were prevalent in Jacobean publishing being replaced by Laudian themes of anti-Calvinism and ceremonialism in the 1630's. When the licit religious titles of 1637 are compared to the products of unregulated printing (whether it be reprints, surreptitious presses, or titles composed in the 1630's but first printed in the 1640's), what emerges is proof that the change in the definition of religious orthodoxy was in large part due to the successful control of religious printing in the England of Archbishop Laud.
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APPENDIX A - THOMAS JACKSON - BIBLIOGRAPHY

Earliest Extant Editions


STC 14308. Earliest extant edition in STC; another issue dated 1613. Ent. as An exposicon on the Creed to Stanesby 23 jy. 1612; licensed by master Mason. This is parts 1 and 2 of the Commentaries on the Creed. Dedicated to Ralph Eure, III Baron Eure.


STC 14311. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other printing in 1631. Ent. to J. Beale 2 de. 1614, 'crost out by order of a Court and Consent of master Beale to be entred to John Clarke'; licensed by master Mason. Also ass'd to Clarke 1 mr. 1631. Dedicated to Robert Spencer, I Baron Spencer.

1617: Jackson, Thomas, Nazareth and Bethlehem, or, Israels

STC 14314. Only extant edition in STC. Dedicated to James Montagu, Bishop of Winchester.


STC 14319. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to J. Clarke 4 no. 1626; licensed by master doctor Worral. This is part 1 only. Dedicated to Sir Richard Anderson of Penley.


STC 14313. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to J. Clarke 8 jy. 1633; licensed by master Bray. Imprimatur 10 oc. 1633.
Dedicated to King Charles.


STC 14309. Earliest extant edition in STC; one variant dated 1636. Ent. to J. Clarke 9 jn. 1635; licensed by Master Baker. Imprimatur 22 jn. [nd].

1637: Jackson, Thomas, Diverse Sermons, with a short Treatise befitting these present Times. Oxford, L. Lichfield, 1637. F copy.

STC 14307. Only extant edition in STC.
Dedicated to Prince Charles [King Charles II].


STC 14317. Only extant edition in STC.
Dedicated to King Charles I.


Responses to Jackson


STC 4146. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. Dedicated to the elders of parliament.


STC 4155. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.
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Dedicated to King Charles.


STC 24402. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber. no dedic.

**WING editions of Jackson**


Wing J 88. No entry in registers. Preliminary matter: 'An account of the Work' by B. Oley; Life of Jackson by E. Vaughan.


Wing J 89. No entry in registers. Preliminary matter: Preface to the Reader by B. Oley
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Wing J 90. Ent. to Martin and Chiswell 5 jy. 1679.
Preliminary matter in volume 1: 'To the Christian Reader'; Life of Jackson by E. Vaughan; new dedication to Gilbert Sheldon by B. Oley
APPENDIX B - THOMAS TAYLOR - BIBLIOGRAPHY

Earliest Extant Editions


STC 23830.5, Earliest extant edition in STC; there are 3 variants dated 1612, differing in the name of the bookseller. Ent. to Legg, L. Greene, and R. Mabbe 28 no. 1622; no licenser named. Dedicated to Sir James Altham and Sir Charles Morrison of Watford, Hertfordshire.


1618: Taylor, Thomas, Christ's Combate and Conquest: or, the Lyon of Judah. [A treatise.] Cambridge, C. Legge, pr. to the Univ. of Camb., 1618. F copy.

STC 23822. Earliest extant edition in STC; there are three variants dated 1618, differing in the name of the bookseller. The entry listed in STC to T. Man, L. Greene and C. Legge 20 no. 1618 does not seem to apply to this title. Dedicated to Sir Francis Knollys and his wife Lettice.

1619: Taylor, Thomas, Circumspect Walking: describing the severall Rules, as so many Steps in the Way of Wisedome. Cambridge, C. Legge, pr. to the Univ. of Camb., 1619. Examined C copy, reel 1843.


STC 23837. Earliest extant edition in STC; one variant in 1620 and another printing in 1634. Ent. to J. Bartlett 27 oc. 1619; licensed by Doctor Featly.


STC 23831. Earliest extant edition in STC; there are two issues dated 1620, the other has imprint: F. Kyngston f. J. Bartlet, sold [by T. Man,]. Ent. to J. Bartlett 7 ja. 1620; licensed by Master Doctor Featlie.


STC 23840. Earliest extant edition in STC; two other printings in 1623 and 1634 when it is combined with The Mappe
of Rome. Ent. to J. Bartlett 8 au. 1620; licensed 'under the
handes of Master Doctor Bayles, by the appointment of master
Doctor Featlie'.
Dedicated to Walter Bateman, Mayor of Reading, and other
magistrates of Reading: Edward Clarke, John Saunders, Nicholas
Gunter, and Christopher Turner. Latin dedication to John
Denison, Hugh Dicus, and Theophilus Taylor.

1622: Taylor, Thomas, The Pilgrims Profession. Or a Sermon
preached at the Funerall of Mrs Mary Gunter. London, J.
printing.
STC 23843. Earliest extant edition in STC; reprinted once in
1625 as part of Two Treatises. Ent to J. Bartlett 14 jn. 1622
where Mary is described as wife to 'Master Humphrey Gunter';
licensed by Master Worrall.
Dedicated to Lettice, Countess of Leicester, by H. Gunter.

1624: Taylor, Thomas, Two Sermons: the One a heavenly Voice,
calling all Gods People out of Romish Babylon. The Other an
everlasting Record of the utter Ruine of Romish Amalek.
STC 23853. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to J. Bartlett 24
my. 1624; licensed by master DoctorFeatly.
Dedicated to the House of Commons.

1624/5: Taylor, Thomas, Two Treatises: the Pearle of the
Gospel, and the Pilgrims Profession: to which is added a
Bartlet, 1624 (1625). Examined F copy of variant with 1625
date on general title.
STC 23854. Earliest extant edition in STC; three printings:
variants dated 1624 and 1625 on general title and a reprint
in 1633 to which is added A short Introduction to the Lords
Supper. Parts ent. to J. Bartlet 1 de. 1621, 14 jn. 1622 and
13 de. 1624; parts one and three licensed by Master Doctor
Featlie, part two by Master Worrall.
Part one dedicated to Elizabeth Borlase Backhouse, wife of
Samuel, and her three daughters; part two to Lettice,
Countess of Leicester.

1625: Taylor, Thomas, A good Husband and a good Wife: layd
open in a Sermon. Published by J. Sedgwicke. London, [G.
STC 23829. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.
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STC 23832. Earliest extant edition in STC; four printings: 1628, 1629, 1632, and 1635, which was issued as part of The Practise of Repentance. Ent. to J. Bartlett 2 ap. 1629; licensed by master Doctor Harris.


STC 23845. Earliest extant edition in STC; four printings: 1628, 1629, 1632, and 1635 (when it was issued with A Man in Christ and Meditations) and a variant of 1632 printing dated 1633. Ent. to J. Bartlett 2 ap. 1629; licensed by master Doctor Harris.


STC 23851. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other printing in 1635. Ent. to Dawlman 15 se. 1631; licensed by Master Austen.

Dawlman, 1633. F copy.

STC 23823. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Daulman 10 au. 1632; licensed by Master Austen.
Dedicated to the inhabitants of Aldermanbury parish, London, by editor.


STC 23821. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Dawlman 25 jy. 1632; licensed by Master Austen.
Dedicated to Sir Miles Fleetwood by editor.


STC 23949. Only extant edition in STC. Ent. to Bartlett 2 oc. 1634; licensed by master Weekes. Beale printed quires 2nd R.-Dd.
Dedicated to Sir Edward Clerke, steward of Reading, and Lady Anne Clerke by editor.


STC 23819.5. Only extant edition in STC. No entry in Arber.
Probably preached during 1625 plague but issued during the 1636 plague.


STC 24048. Earliest extant edition in STC; one other issue in 1640 with different bookseller. Ent. to Mabb as thirty one funerall sermons by Day, Sibbes, and Taylor 18 oc. 1638; licensed by Master Wykes. Only Featley part has the author identified; this ent. to N. Bourne 28 jn. 1639; licensed by Doctor Wykes.

WING editions of Taylor
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Wing T571. Ent. to Bartlet 24 August 1640; licensed by doctor Wykes.
Dedicated to Sir Francis Darcy by editor.

Wing T563B.

1653: Taylor, Thomas, Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows of our Saviour. London, f. J. Williams, 1653.
Wing T567. Reprint of Christ Revealed.

Wing T569. Also printed as part of Works, 1653.

Wing T 560. No specific entry in registers.
Dedicated to the inhabitants of Aldermanbury parish.

Wing T563.

Wing T563A.

Wing T565.

Wing T566. Reprint of Christs Combate.

Wing T568.

1659: Taylor, Thomas, The Works of the judicious and learned Divine...collected together in two [volumes] which are here
Religious printing in early Stuart England was a very important aspect of contemporary culture. While it is difficult to separate out events at court, in parliament, and in the daily lives of the populace from religious concerns, nonetheless the pattern of such printing provides significant evidence of the prevailing doctrine and practices of the Church of England at different dates. As with many matters relating to the origins of the English Civil War, religious developments during the reigns of James I and Charles I have been variously interpreted. However there is now good reason to believe that by 1637, in the area of religious printing, press control through ecclesiastical licensers was effective for newly printed works. This control produced dramatic results. The evangelical Calvinist religious teachings which had been readily available in first editions to literate consumers in 1607, 1617, and 1627, were replaced in 1637 by first editions which displayed the anti-Calvinist and ceremonialist themes of the Laudian church. Only in reprints and other unregulated areas of printing is it possible to observe that as late as 1637 there was still a brisk market for alternative Calvinist material. Paradoxically, therefore, although the official definition of religious orthodoxy had demonstrably changed over time, this is only half of the picture.

The preceding examination of religious titles in early Stuart England breaks new ground in several important respects. Those portions which concentrate on evidence of adherence to bureaucratic controls, as revealed in entries in the Stationers’ Registers and imprimaturs, for the first time isolate religious titles from those of other disciplines. In the earlier measurements of entrance and imprimaturs done by W. W. Greg and F. B. Williams, religion was either subsumed into a general study or eliminated entirely. Since many regulations were generated from a need to oversee the religious press, it is crucial to view religious publications separately, and such printing in fact produced the most robust model of press control.

The thesis is also very much concerned with the content of books - surely an
obligatory component of any study of censorship. A majority of the first editions in this sampling were licit London religious publications—books which included an accurate imprint and which for the most part followed the rules for licensing and entrance. Recent articles by Sheila Lambert which claimed an economic rather than an ideological motivation for publication neglected to consider the content of the works produced. Instead she relied on the reputation of the authors who were published to prove her contention that Caroline religious printing was no different from that which preceded it—that ‘books of all complexions were published in the 1630’s’ and that ‘Thomas Jackson and Thomas Taylor were poles apart in doctrine, yet the publishing history of their works is very similar’. Nevertheless my chapter on Jackson and Taylor demonstrates striking contrasts between the publishing of these two men—Taylor’s voice was stilled with the demise of Archbishop George Abbot in 1633 while, with William Laud now at Canterbury, Jackson was able to publish controversial works composed at a much earlier period.

The chapters which contain a statistical sampling of four survey years provide a systematic survey of religious printing on a much larger scale. This investigation reveals percentages of evangelical Calvinist works in samplings of first editions for 1607, 1617, and 1627 of 63%, 71%, and 69% respectively. No evidence of such teaching is found in licit first editions in 1637. Although systematic, this survey of four sample years was not comprehensive. Examining only one third of the religious titles published in a given year may unconsciously have eliminated those special cases which might disprove the results. For this reason also it was deemed prudent to include the chapter on the publishing history of Thomas Jackson and Thomas Taylor, a study which extends into the 1650’s. This comprehensive treatment of two opposing viewpoints arrives at the same conclusions as the larger, systematic survey.

Although the contrast between Lambert’s conclusions and mine is remarkable, it remains to place this study within the larger context of modern historiography. What can this thesis and its findings contribute to the ongoing discussion about control of religious printing in Jacobean and Caroline England? Conducted in a
systematic way, this investigation is designed to avoid charges of being anecdotal. For this reason it does not focus only on well-known special cases. Anecdote is to some extent the weakness of work produced by Peter White, who comes to conclusions in line with those of Sheila Lambert. It is also vitally important to distinguish between books which were printed for the first time and those titles which were reprints and therefore did not have to be relicensed. Such distinctions were applied consistently in this thesis. Additionally, with books printed for the first time it is necessary to pay attention to the specific licenser noted in the Stationers' Registers, or, at a later time, in the imprimatur. Until August 1633 it was still possible for Archbishop Abbot's chaplains to license evangelical Calvinist works, even though Laud as Bishop of London was overseeing other licensors. White is not careful in these regards.

It is the section of White's book discussing licensing which relates most directly to this thesis. As proof that Calvinism flourished even during the Personal Rule, White cites books printed for the first time between 1629 and 1633 - although he has already credited Abbot's chaplains Jeffrey, Buckner, and Austen with granting most of the authorizations during those years. This may show that Charles was not trying to stop Calvinist themes from reaching print, yet this time span precedes the full Laudian hegemony, and therefore White's examples are not surprising. White also mentions books which were reprinted after 1629 as part of his argument to show that Calvinist doctrine continued to appear in print, but there were no regulations until mid-1637 to deal with works which had been licensed and first printed earlier, so the appearance of such publications is not unexpected. Another of White's oversights is his neglect of information about the date of entrance in the registers and about the licenser, if known. His claim that the Calvinist imbued Lectures on Psalm LI by Arthur Hildersham was published in 1635 sounds like a convincing argument that Calvinism continued to prosper, but the registers reveal that this title was actually entered earlier, on 26 August 1633, after licensing by Abbot's chaplain Austen. The licit publication of new works by known...
evangelical Calvinists such as Richard Sibbes does not prove anything since the content could be strictly devotional - as it was with the titles by Sibbes in the survey chapter for 1637. This is not to say that there could not be Calvinist titles which slipped through the net even during the time when Laud was at Canterbury and Juxon in London, but the chances are such instances would have involved the licensing of Thomas Weekes in London. He was the most overworked of the licensers and the most likely to overlook problem passages. In claiming that it has now been established that the principal purpose of the decree of 1637 was to protect the monopoly of the Stationers’ Company and not to target religious works, White exposes the same vulnerabilities as his source, Sheila Lambert.

The work of Ian Green on early English printed catechisms reveals comparable methodological problems. Although his ‘finding list’ of catechisms, works of instruction through dialogue, is very comprehensive, Green chose to use only a small selection of some sixty best-selling catechisms to illustrate his findings. Because his sample spans publication sequences of many years and shows scant regard for dates, it is difficult to determine whether or not there was change over time, although Green suggests instead that there was continuity and common ground. Green defines ‘best-sellers’ as those catechisms which fulfilled the criteria of popularity and potential influence. Popularity was additionally described as those works which ‘prompted the printing of at least five editions in the space of ten years’. However this selection process overlooks large numbers of texts - including Arthur Dent’s _Plaine mans path-way to heaven_ which was printed at least nine times between 1601 and 1610 and moreover purveyed Calvinist doctrine.

One of Green’s points is that catechisms did not usually concern themselves with discussions of the absolute nature of the double decree of predestination: ‘it is obvious that most authors either chose not to discuss the aspects of predestinarian doctrine...or treated them as briefly or as generally as possible’. According to Green there were only two catechisms in his sample which taught double predestination and were dated before 1640, and these he suggests ‘implied rather than stated
specifically that elect and reprobate had been chosen without regard to their faith’.

Yet in the instances where other titles in his sample overlapped mine, as was the case with Stephen Egerton’s *Briefe Method* and Robert Openshaw’s *Short Questions*, each contained a discussion of predestination with a Calvinist bias. There were additional titles in my survey, such as that by Dent (just mentioned) and others by Richard Bernard and Josiah White, which were included only on Green’s comprehensive list, but which also expressed a view of double and unconditional predestination. This further erodes the credibility of the summaries based on his small sample.

In addition Green’s results are in contradiction to a close study of catechisms made by Philip Olander. Olander’s approach included a careful scrutiny of the content of thirty-nine catechisms then known (1976) to have been printed in London between 1625 and 1637. Especially alert to the question of when each was licensed and by whom, Olander identifies at least six catechisms, all licensed before 1625, which maintain the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation by the decree of God. An additional catechism by Abbot’s chaplain Daniel Featley, licensed by the author, was the only one containing this doctrine in Olander’s poll which was entered in the registers under Charles I. Surely this suggests not only that an explanation of absolute predestination was once considered appropriate fare for catechumens but also that it ceased to be acceptable once Charles ascended the throne. All of the catechisms listed among Olander’s thirty-nine are included in Green’s master list, but Green appears to ignore Olander’s work.

Furthermore Anthony Milton in a recent article which addresses licensing, censorship, and religious orthodoxy in early Stuart England, challenges the historians Lambert, White, and Green and doubts their denial of effective press censorship. Milton says that their views do not ‘offer a comprehensive analysis of the regulation of print in the 1630’s and there is a very great deal that they fail to explain’. Working with evidence of actual acts of censorship, Milton arrives at conclusions similar to those drawn from my examination. He relies on outside confirmation that
texts of licit publications had been tampered with - often through the efforts of licencers. Both Milton's study and this one concur that the licensing process is of paramount importance when dealing with subjects of censorship and religious orthodoxy.

This thesis, which provides evidence that there was a great deal of change in the subject matter and nature of orthodoxy in religious printing between 1607 and 1637, is also in obvious contradiction to the work of Lambert, White, and Green. The latter three did not find it necessary to make distinctions between religious printing during the periods of George Abbot and William Laud at Canterbury. Instead the evidence from this examination confirms the findings of historians such as Nicholas Tyacke, Kenneth Fincham, and Peter Lake who have argued that evangelical Calvinism dominated the reformed Church of England until the reign of Charles I, when it was supplanted during the term of William Laud as archbishop of Canterbury. It was then that an emphasis on preaching, the absolute nature of the double decree of predestination, anti-Catholicism, and sabbatarianism was replaced by a preference for common prayer, ritual, the beauty of holiness, a more ecumenical attitude toward Catholicism, and a virtual ban on discussions of predestination. A change in the nature of religious orthodoxy is reflected especially in the survey of four sample years. The remarkable contrast in 1637 in the subject matter between unregulated reprints (69% of which contained evangelical Calvinist themes) and regulated earliest editions (none of which were perceptibly Calvinist) as demonstrated in this thesis supports the position of Tyacke, Fincham, and Lake.

This investigation brings a fresh approach to the problem of dealing with religious printing in early Stuart England. Not only does it separate religion from other areas and thus show that by 1637 there was a high degree of cooperation with the regime's regulations, but it is also careful to separate the content of books from the reputation of their authors. The books themselves were selected through a very systematic, not anecdotal, methodology. All of this gives added weight to the conclusion that it was the successful efforts of those involved in the licensing
process which exercised a strong influence over the version of religious orthodoxy offered in the licit first editions of the religious press. At the same time it is imperative to realize that this perceived shift did not necessarily reflect the beliefs of the reading public as a whole.
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