THE LANGUAGE OF REFORM:

STEPHEN MARSHALL, JOHN MILTON,

AND MARCHAMONT NEDHAM

By

DAVID LEE VAUGHAN III

Bachelor of Arts in English
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
2008

Master of Arts in Editorial Studies
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts
2009

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 2021

THE LANGUAGE OF REFORM:

STEPHEN MARSHALL, JOHN MILTON,

AND MARCHAMONT NEDHAM

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Edward Jones

Dissertation Adviser

Dr. Chelsea Silva

Dr. Paul Epstein

Dr. David Anderson

Dr. Doren Recker

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my adviser, Dr. Edward Jones. He inspired my interest in Milton, and his wisdom and generosity continue to inspire me. Without his patience, understanding, and guidance, I would not have been able to complete this project. I also wish to thank the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Paul Epstein for his sound advice when most needed, Dr. Chelsea Silva for her kindness and insightful comments, Dr. Doren Recker for his patience, and Dr. David Anderson for his kind messages during the final stages. I would also like to thank those in the English Department at Oklahoma State who have helped me along the way. To my friends, who know who they are, thank you for understanding my being distracted and for offering words of encouragement. To my family, especially my father and mother, David and Jackie, your love and support have helped me through graduate school, and I would not be where I am today without you.

Name: DAVID LEE VAUGHAN III

Date of Degree: JULY, 2021

Title of Study: THE LANGUAGE OF REFORM: STEPHEN MARSHALL, JOHN MILTON, AND MARCHAMONT NEDHAM

Major Field: ENGLISH

Abstract: This dissertation examines the language of reform in the work of Stephen Marshall, John Milton, and Marchamont Nedham during the 1640s when constitutional and ecclesiastical crises led to civil war. There are various narratives about the causes and consequences of the English Civil Wars, and this project assesses how language about reform underscores the search for a unified spiritual and political commonwealth during those tumultuous years. Marshall, the religious voice of Parliament, Milton, the vehement apologist and polemicist, and Nedham, the political opportunist and journalist, display complex linguistic and rhetorical practices that evoke the contentious and combative nature of the Civil War period. This study demonstrates how these authors seek a reimagined religious and political order and attempt to unify England in a stable spiritual, intellectual, or political community. Speaking from the parliamentary pulpit, Marshall insisted that reform required the individual salvation of the godly in order to form a stable, Protestant England. On the other hand, Milton claims that reform is best understood as an intellectual matter, and by focusing on the exercise of reason to discern ideas, he argues that an ordered polity requires rational Protestants to discover truth and enact virtue. Nedham's view of reform embraces practical considerations about an educated political community, and though his political allegiance shifts several times during the Civil Wars, he uses the press to oppose civil strife, to educate the public, and to justify political stability. Examining the language in their sermons, pamphlets, and newsbooks reveals that ideas about reform emerge and change in response to the momentous events of the 1640s. Yet, while competing narratives of reform reinforce the complexity of the period, the language of Marshall, Milton, and Nedham indicates how reform becomes a locus for stability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

The Religious and Political Search for Reform

After the Restoration of Charles II to the throne in 1660, Thomas Hobbes reflected on the causes of the civil wars in the preceding two decades. He frequently blames the seditious sermons of Presbyterian ministers:

> And first, for the manner of their Preaching, they so framed their Countenance and Gesture at the entrance into the Pulpit, and their Pronunciation, both in their Prayer and Sermon, and used the Scripture-phrase, whether understood by the People or not, as that no Tragedian in the World could have acted the part of a right godly man better than these did, insomuch that a man unacquainted with such Art, could never suspect any ambitious Plot in them, to raise Sedition against the State, as they then had designed, or doubt, that the vehemence of their Voice (for the same words, with the usual Pronunciation, had been of little force) and forcedness of their Gesture and Looks, could arise from any thing but zeal to the Service of God. (23)

For Hobbes, ministerial godliness was far from holiness, but instead a carefully designed cover for intentions far more dangerous and threatening to the state. Yet his partiality for the crown and disdain for Presbyterians did not prevent him from identifying key notions underlying the project of puritan reform: an emphasis on preaching, the reading of scripture, and, to some degree, a zeal for godly work. That Hobbes mistakenly attributed sedition to the godly work of reform became

evident when civil war broke out in the summer of 1642 and few Presbyterian ministers voiced support for overthrowing the monarchy. Their focus remained on reforming ecclesiastical structures and constitutional policies that had arisen during the reign of Charles I. It is worth remembering that, for Puritan ministers, "preaching was their attempt to render intelligible for themselves and for the Parliament the period of civil strife which they collectively experienced" (Wilson 18). Hobbes did not limit his censoriousness to ministers. He also cites the role of the "seditious whispering of false and ignorant Politicians" who turned the English people against the king (Hobbes 26). Hobbes does not provide names, but men like John Pym in the early 1640s and regicides later in the decade such as John Bradshaw, Oliver Cromwell, and Henry Ireton, Cromwell's son-in-law, immediately come to mind. However, Hobbes's understanding of "whisperings" does not correspond with soft-spoken discourse in backroom meetings of the Parliament. His use of the term encompasses a range of formal and popular writing that resonated to such a degree that the king became an opposing force of authority to his own subjects. These whisperings in the end became the outpouring of sermons, pamphlets, and newsbooks published in quantities never before attempted. Of course, Hobbes only reiterates the link between speech and sedition. In a 1625 essay, Francis Bacon observes that "Libels and licentious discourses against the state when they are frequent and open; and in like sort, false news often running up and down to the disadvantage of the state and hastily embraced; are amongst the signs of troubles" (76-77). How prescient the 1640s made Bacon appear to be. Although Hobbes was searching for causes and Bacon consequences, both imply questions about the role of language in times of crisis. In the 1640s, English Protestants turned not just to the pulpit but also to pamphlets and newsbooks to understand the tumultuous events they experienced. Ministers, polemicists, and journalists responded to and shaped moments of political and ecclesiastical crisis, and their language prompted the search for reformative action in the church and state.

This project examines the language of reform in the work of Stephen Marshall, John Milton, and Marchamont Nedham, particularly during the constitutional and ecclesiastical crises of the 1640s.

Seventeenth-century Protestants assumed an undivided divine order of the religious and political realms in England. When monarchy and episcopacy *iure divino* were questioned and ultimately destabilized, the foundations of the English nation were shaken. Consequently, reform in the Civil War period might better be characterized as a search for stability. Marshall, Milton, and Nedham seek a reimagined religious and political order in which Protestant individuals can once again participate in the divine order of the world, and whether in sermons, pamphlets, or newsbooks, they attempt to unify England in a spiritual, intellectual, or political community. Marshall insists that individual salvation allows the godly to discover their role in the spiritual community. Milton argues that reform be understood as an intellectual matter, and for stability in England, he requires the rational assessment of ideas in order to discover a divine truth about an ordered polity. Nedham, on the other hand, does not believe in a certain political system but in political order, and he uses the press and laughter to educate the public about political stability. Competing ideas about reform emerged in the 1640s, and by examining the language in their sermons, pamphlets, and newsbooks, reform appears as a fluid idea dynamically employed to criticize, to improve, to justify, and ultimately to embrace a unified spiritual and political community in Protestant England. The ensuing chapters will demonstrate how three notably different men contributed distinctively and productively to a turbulent decade of change. Marshall preached, Milton argued, and Nedham lampooned in order to reveal and to justify their vision of a godly commonwealth.

Chapter 1 examines the education and printed sermons of Stephen Marshall, a Puritan divine who, from 1640 until his death in 1655, was the religious voice of Parliament often called upon to preach Fast Sermons.[1] Marshall's sermons offer timely assessments of the spiritual and political moments that prompted them, most often after momentous political occasions. He creates a mode of

[1] For discussions on Marshall and early modern sermons, see Webster's "Stephen Marshall and Finchingfield," "Preaching and Parliament," and *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*; Hugh Trevor-Roper, "The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament;" Morgan, *Godly Learning*; Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*; Lori Anne Ferrell, *Government by Polemic*; and Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court*.

puritanical piety that capitalizes on political events in order to stress individual salvation, a concept he views as foundational for individual and national reform. For Marshall, the stability of the nation depended upon its godliness, and though his sermons respond to political events, he seeks the salvation of all Protestants in order to establish a settled spiritual community. Chapter 2 explores the distinctive voice of John Milton found in his political prose.[2] It sounds unlike the poetic voice more familiar to literary scholars of seventeenth-century England, yet the ideas from his early poetry inform his polemic in constructive ways. Like Marshall, Milton responded to timely events, but his ideas of reform defy the kind of restrictions that can be identified in Marshall's writing. Indeed the use of terms such as puritan or puritanical have been hotly contested whenever applied because of Milton's conviction that he was "church outed by the Prelates" as he states in *The Reason of Church-Government*. Such a statement does not mean he has lost any of his interest in church reform, but simply that his view of reform defies the demands and expectations of the clergy. For some, Milton voices a particularly aggressive strain of anticlericalism that the established church assigned to its most learned clergy to combat. While his notions seem idealistic, abstract, and intellectual, Milton establishes a view of reform founded first and last on the exercise of reason, properly oriented toward ascertaining truth. Milton's reform does not belong to a stable religious or political community but exists in an abstract, intellectual realm in which Protestants discover truth and enact virtue. The rational Protestant becomes the ostensible sign of a stable England. Chapter 3 investigates the language of Marchamont Nedham, the mercurial author of newsbooks and pamphlets for the

[2] Much has been written about Milton's prose. See, especially, Blair Worden, *Literature and Politics*; Daniel Shore's *Milton and the Art of Rhetoric* and "'Fit Though Few': *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience;" David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* and as editor with James Turner, *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*; David Norbrook's *Writing the English Republic*; Armitage, Himy, and Skinner, eds., *Milton and Republicanism*; Thomas Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*; Christopher Hill, though dated, *Milton and the English Revolution*; and among the essays by James Egan, see especially "Rhetoric, Polemic, Mimetic" and "*Areopagitica* and the Tolerationist Rhetorics of the 1640s."

Parliament and Royalist parties.[3] Though inconsistent in his political allegiance, Nedham's opportunism allowed his voice to remain a constant presence throughout the years of the civil war and interregnum. In his newsbooks and pamphlets, Nedham presents himself as an apologist who opposes his political opponents and educates the public. His serio-jocose language advocates for political stability, whether monarchical, republican, or Cromwellian. Nedham opposed civil strife no matter his allegiance, and he used the press to justify political stability no matter the system. Ultimately, he remains something of a contradiction: he uses the press while lambasting the possibilities it cretes for him; he was a parliamentarian and a Royalist who called Charles a tyrant before writing on his behalf. However, at the core, Nedham's reform embraces practical considerations about an educated political community, and he sought to justify political and religious changes in order to establish a stable community of educated, interested citizens. Contradictory though he may appear, his changing politics indicates the difficult and complex search for settlement in unprecedented circumstances.

The language of Marshall, Milton, and Nedham has been selected for this study because it showcases particular ends to which language could be employed to express ecclesiastical, intellectual, and political reformation and change. Marshall, the religious voice of Parliament, Milton, the vehement apologist, and Nedham, the political opportunist, display complex linguistic and rhetorical practices that evoke the contentious and combative nature of the Civil War period. Their language examines, analyzes, refutes, and judges ideas "in the air," and it admonishes, compliments, ridicules, and dissents as circumstances warrant. Omnipresent in the writings of these three authors is a

[3] For discussions of Nedham, newsbooks, and the popular press during the Civil War period, see Joseph Frank's *Cromwell's Press Agent* and *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper*; Joad Raymond's *The Invention of the Newspaper*, *Making the News*, and *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*; Joad Raymond, ed., *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, especially his chapter "News" and Jason Peacey's chapter "Pamphlets;" Blair Worden's , "Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism," "'Wit in a Roundhead': The Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham," and *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England*; and Jason Peacey's *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, "Marchamont Nedham and the Lawrans Letters," and "The Struggle for *Mercurius Britanicus*: Factional Politics and the Parliamentarian Press;" David Norbrook's *Writing the English Republic*; and Nigel Smith's *Literature and Revolution in England*.

mindfulness to instruct, to clarify, and to remind their readers of what is ethical, dangerous, and trivial. The commitment of all to the search for settlement never wavers and never appears in doubt. Consequently, the motives and intentions of their printed material illustrate fluidity as a trait of reform, often overlooked because it encompasses an idea that was itself altered to accommodate various religious and political events. Even as notions of reform changed, the search for a unified commonwealth remained constant. The focus of this project centers on how the idea of reform requires a broader understanding of the religious, intellectual, and political changes in an unstable time. The language of Marshall, Milton, and Nedham illustrates that reform was not just a desire for ecclesiastical or political settlement but it was a comprehensive search for a unified spiritual and political commonwealth. Reassessing the manner in which language emerges and changes, responds and is responsive to competing ideas for ecclesiastical and political reform demonstrates that ideas were fluid but the goal remained the same. Two implications ensue from this dissertation. First, Stephen Marshall and Marchamont Nedham have remained peripheral figures in the study of the Civil War period, and this study places their work alongside that of John Milton to show that their language is equally central to the crises and changes that characterize the period. Milton may have been a revolutionary poet, but all three men were forced to contend with revolutionary times. Reading Marshall and Nedham alongside Milton reveals that the search for reform and for settlement belonged to all English Protestants, not just the poetic voices who shaped the literature of the period. Second, by focusing specifically on the language of reform as a dynamic marker for instability in the period, this project reassesses the roles of the pulpit and the press in order to demonstrate that a comprehensive view of the Civil War period must include the religious, the polemical, and the political. The struggle for reform, then, becomes neither the opposition to Caroline and Laudian policy nor the puritan struggle for ecclesiastical reform but rather the Protestant search for meaning, stability, and salvation in a divided England.

The crisis for reform that emerged in the 1640s was at times religious and at times constitutional, but as the historian John Morrill notes, the "English civil war was not the first European revolution: it was the last of the Wars of Religion" ("Religious Context" 68).[4] The martial aspects arose largely from the puritan movement that first emerged in Tudor England. In addition to issues that lingered from the Elizabethan reign, constitutional concerns emerged in Stuart England. Understanding the language of reform during the Civil War period and the particular religious and political tensions prior to the convening of the Long Parliament in November of 1640 requires a discussion that contextualizes puritans, their brand of reform, and the omnipresence of Archbishop Laud and Charles I. Even though Marshall, Milton, and Nedham wrote in response to these religious and political tensions, only Marshall as a puritan clergyman overtly represented reform as inseparable from the ecclesiastical and constitutional issues of the time, which underscores the ideological complexity of the period as well as the reality that no writer was exempt from ideas about religious reform. The search for settlement began with, but was not limited to, the ecclesiastical crisis. The first portion of this introduction will discuss diverse historical views of religious and political reform in order to establish the context that Marshall, Milton, and Nedham inherited in the 1640s. Because puritanism emerges as a force in the Civil War period, an account of puritans and puritanism will demonstrate the complexity of this movement that remained central in the project of reform. While the historiography of the period indicates that reform be considered an ongoing process and a struggle for both the national church and for the individual, my reading of Marshall, Milton, and Nedham will illustrate that it was a struggle to discover a resolution to the process of reform. The second part of this introduction will examine prominent voices for puritan reform in the seventeenth century in order to demonstrate how ideas about the process and struggle of reform link clergymen with polemicists and journalists. Beginning with a sermon and treatise of the Puritan divine Richard Stock and ending

[4] See also Glenn Burgess, "Was the English Civil War a War of Religion?" in which he claims that "there seems good evidence to support the view that religion was the key determinant of Civil War allegiance, suggesting in turn that it motivated many in their decision to fight for or against the king" (175).

with the work of Milton, Marshall, and Nedham, the various ideological and biographical connections demonstrate that ideas about reform remain constant as their form changes.

1

What reform and the Church of England mean in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries remains a complicated matter.[5] Certainly, Morrill is not alone in his view that the crisis of the 1640s was primarily religious. Other historians offer similar interpretations of the period as a continuation of reformation inaugurated in Tudor England. In a review of recent historiography of the Reformation, Eamon Duffy lays bare the tendency of historians to depict the Reformation as one of "conflicting positions" that "are all too easily characterized in terms of simple polarities – slow reformation from above, rapid reformation from below" (721). Such a paradigm posits that the Reformation consists of a struggle between any two competing groups: Anglicans, Puritans, Laudians, Arminians, Presbyterians, among others. For the Civil War period, then, the paradigm reduces the conflict to oppositional forces such as Parliament and Royalists or Puritans and Laudians. Morrill's religious view of the civil war rests primarily upon the Puritan reaction to Laudian overreach under Charles I. Other historians follow this view of conflict, but with a twist. For example, Nicholas Tyacke's contentious, if insightful, reading of the Civil War period posits a doctrinal distinction between English Calvinism and Arminianism that arose under Laud in the 1620s and 1630s, and he positions Laud and Laudianism as the group attempting to reform mainstream Calvinism, of which the puritans were part. Such views reduce reformation and Civil War period to a doctrinal contest between Laud's Arminian tendencies and Calvinists who were forced to contend with Laudian ceremonialism. In his reading, William Lamont calls it a "non-existent controversy" because Arminian "theological issues"

[5] See Anthony Milton, ed., *The Oxford History of Anglicanism*, especially Milton's chapter, "Unsettled Reformations, 1603-1662," and Coffey, ed., *The Oxford History of Protestant Dissenting Traditions*, especially chapters by Bernard Capp, "Dissent Empowered: The Puritan Revolution," and Elliot Vernon, "Presbyterians in the English Revolution." For general discussion about the Church of England, see Collinson's *The Religion of Protestants*, Webster's *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*, and Fincham's *Prelate as Pastor*. For the rise of Arminianism, see Tyacke, *The Anti-Calvinists* and "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution."

arose neither before nor during the Civil War period but after (45). Lamont examines the archival papers of the puritan Richard Baxter in which Baxter laments his error in granting "Arminianisme . . . a more intolerable pernicious evill to the Church than since I found it" (qtd. in Lamont 59). However, the reality was far more complex. While theological points of Arminianism may not have been discussed until after the Restoration, the fear of Laud and of encroaching Arminianism represented a threat to church reform, and such fears, in the eyes of Puritans, necessitated a response. Doctrinal Arminianism might be overstated, but rather than dismiss it altogether as a "non-existent controversy," it must remain an integral factor in the struggle for reform, even if at times misunderstood and overvalued. As Duffy indicates, such reductionism glosses over the fact that reformation was "a process and a labor, difficult, drawn out, and whose outcome had been by no means a foregone conclusion" (721). For Duffy, as for other historians, both reformation and the Civil War period resist paradigms of opposition like that of the Parliament and Royalists, Puritans and Laudians, Calvinists and Arminians. At the same time, however, such terms remain inescapable necessities when identifying competing views for ecclesiastical and constitutional settlement in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As such, an account of the religious context of the Civil War period must consider that reform itself was a fluid and dynamic process that served as the background for the ecclesiastical and constitutional concerns of the 1640s. In other words, events of the period cannot be reduced to a series of conflicts, but rather the period must be considered another part—a particularly bloody one—in the process of reform.

Still, some questions remain about the relationship of sixteenth-century reformation to the Civil War period. Of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Anthony Milton identifies three dominant historical views of the Church of England. For some historians, "the easiest solution was to disown the chaotic sixteenth-century Reformation altogether" and to prefer the seventeenth century as the time during which the church was stabilized (A. Milton, "Introduction" 4). However, the chaos of the Civil War period indicates a continuation of reform rather than stability, which did not arrive until

following the Restoration. A second view normalizes sixteenth-century Protestantism and reduces conflicting views, like those of Laud, to "a strange and disastrous aberration" (5). In effect, this view situates Puritans as part of the mainstream English church, a view held by Tyacke with which many historians disagree. The third account separates the Puritans from the "Anglicans," a problematic and anachronistic term used to identify the nascent church. In essence, the early church of the Tudor period was always Anglican, though not "so much by doctrine as by temperament and national character" (6). This mode of Anglicanism sought a middle way between Roman Catholicism and the reformed Protestantism of the continent, and historians of this view situate Puritan values against Anglican ones. Each view presupposes a set of stable categories, which exist only as impositions by historians on a time that resisted such categorizing. For historians, Morrill and Tyacke among others, oppositions between Laudianism and Puritanism, between normative and reactionary values rely to some degree upon the paradigm of oppositional dogmas that resulted in the abrupt and forceful revolutionary period. Indeed, as Milton notes, this view "presupposes an essential unity and coherent identity among those opposing 'puritanism', with the latter thereby representing an un-English dogmatism which ultimately reached its pre-ordained and de-legitimizing end in Dissent, after an unwarranted and violent seizure of power in the 1640s and 1650s" (7). While these views hold value as historical characterizations of a complex time, they do not ultimately account for the dynamic processes at work in the period of reform and civil war.

Struggle underlies each historical view of reform, and the reformation of the Civil War period was itself the continued struggle for stability that arose in Tudor England. Duffy calls the Elizabethan church "anything but settled, but rather the shifting background to a complex struggle for the soul of the nation" (727). Milton seeks a middle way through the oppositional forces at work, and he claims that the "historian's task" must be "to understand the struggle itself, rather than to adjudicate between the different sides on the basis of a preconceived notion of what should be considered orthodox or authentic English Protestantism" (A. Milton, "Introduction" 8). One area of struggle concerns church

government, which reached an apogee during the Civil War period but which began in Tudor England. Andrew Foster calls the Church under Elizabeth neither "settled" nor "helpful for Church and state" before the "combined efforts of Laud and Charles led to a further blurring of the boundaries" (84, 101). For example, while Elizabeth allowed only one bishop in the Court of the Star Chamber, under Charles and Laud, the presence of bishops in the Star Chamber became much more prominent (Foster 100). Other Tudor ideas would resurface in the 1640s. Though never ratified, Thomas Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* of 1552 offers insight into the views of early reformers. Among the ideas were annual diocesan synods, which was an idea revisited by the Westminster Assembly (1643-1648) when discussing and enacting Presbyterianism. Similar views of continual struggle emerge in Peter Lake's account of Cranmer and John Foxe. Lake points out that Cranmer "viewed the Book of Common Prayer itself, not as the last word in religious change—the foundational document of a changeless Anglicanism—but rather as the best that could be achieved under the circumstances and thus as but the opening move in what was expected to be a continuing campaign of further reformation" ("Puritans" 355). Of Foxe's views on the Elizabethan Church, Lake calls him "decidedly ambiguous," and he claims that Foxe's desire to ratify Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* and to revise the Book of Common Prayer "reveals his practical commitment to further reformation of a moderate puritan stamp" ("Puritans" 356-57). In Foxe, Lake sees the struggle for stability that, at times, manifests in "actual or potential contradiction and instability," but nevertheless Foxe "represents a sustained attempt to maintain an evangelical Protestant, reformed vision of the national Church, with the community of the godly at its heart" ("Puritans" 357). Cranmer and Foxe both represent the struggle for stability through the ongoing process of reformation. Calls for reform of church government in the 1640s, then, were not novel but "the latest round in an ongoing struggle over the precise balance between secular and ecclesiastical forces in that Church, and the role that the ecclesiastical hierarchy should perform" (A. Milton, "Introduction" 12-13). Though one aspect of the struggle concerned stability in the church, the larger project of reform dealt with the very soul of the church and the souls of its parishioners.

For both Royalists and for later Anglican apologists, the ecclesiastical changes enacted in the 1640s meant nothing more than a temporarily "disestablished" Church of England or even an "alien . . . strange synod" viewed as a "sideshow" (A. Milton, "Introduction" 18; van Dixhoorn 437). However, a fuller picture of the moment requires an understanding that Puritans did not react to Laudians and to Laudian reforms with revolutionary fervor; rather, with the fervor of continuing reformation, the Puritans struggled to establish a godly settlement in England. For example, the issues of the divine right of episcopacy, hotly debated in the polemic of the early 1640s, and of Laudian and Caroline ecclesiological oversight have roots in the ideas of Hadrian Saravia, a Flemish refugee and translator of the King James Bible (A. Milton, "Attitudes" 337). Saravia's defense of episcopacy against encroaching Presbyterianism in the 1590s rendered him one of the most ardent apologists for the divine right of episcopacy, and he might even be characterized as a Laudian *avant la lettre* because his "extreme clericalism" contributed to "absolutist interpretations of royal authority in a manner that anticipated later Laudian developments" (A. Milton, "Introduction" 24; Foster 97). Both issues found their way into discussions of reform in the early 1640s, but they were not merely responses to episcopal corruption and Laudian overreach. Rather, the events of the Civil War period illustrate the process of reformation in which religious and political authority struggles with issues as they surface in an attempt to establish a settled church identity.

Even the Westminster Assembly, the "strange synod" ostensibly convened for the radical dismantling of the episcopacy and rethinking of the liturgy, considered the "Church of England as constituted" a "true Church," and in the view of the assembly, the Church "must be recognizable" rather than merely "some part of new incarnation of it" (van Dixhoorn 433). For example, according to Chad van Dixhoorn, the "most visible victory for the reformists" in the Assembly became the Directory for Public Worship, which was completed in December 1644 and which was designed to replace the Book of Common Prayer (435). In the Directory, the emphasis on preaching and prayer in the liturgy align with the views of puritan reformers, yet, the authors of the Directory took care to

establish their reforms in relation to an ongoing process rather than a revolutionary rethinking. In the preface, the Assembly claims to have been called by God for "further Reformation" of that which had been started in Tudor England, and they undertook the work of reform

> not from any love to Novelty, or intention to disparage our first Reformers (of whom we are perswaded that were they now alive, they would joyn with us in this work, and whom we acknowledge as Excellent Instruments raised by God to begin the purging and building of his House, and desire they may be had of us and Posterity in everlasting Remembrance, with thankfulnesse and honour;). (6)

Thus, though contemporary Royalists and some historians deem the ecclesiastical events of the Civil War period antithetical to the establishment of an Anglican Church, the members of the Assembly clearly positioned themselves as continuing the struggle for settlement begun by their "first reformers." As Anthony Milton says, "it becomes easier to see the events of the 1640s and 1650s as simply a further (albeit dramatic) development in the history of the Church of England" once we accept that Tudor reformations were often subject to similar religious and political discussions ("Introduction" 20). Not only is it easier to see the events as a continuation in the process of church development, but we must also see the clergymen in the Assembly principally as the "faithful ministers" of reform rather than the "mutineers" of a revolution (van Dixhoorn 439). Among those clergymen in the Assembly were Thomas Gataker as well as the other puritan divines who came to be known as Smectymnuus (Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstowe). In fact, for Eliot Vernon, the Smectymnuans were the "most important group in the early 1640s to advance Presbyterian arguments," but prior to the Westminster Assembly, they advocated for "primitive episcopacy," which suggests reforming rather than abolishing the extant episcopal structure ("Presbyterians" 57; Webster, *Godly Clergy* 322). For many, prior to and during the Westminster Assembly, reform rather than revolution embodied their mindset. At this point, two questions emerge about the contentious process of reform. First, how does Puritanism fit into the

struggle for reform? Second, how do Marshall, Milton, and Nedham respond to the continued struggle for reform and settlement? The writings of a clergyman, a poet and polemicist, and a political journalist offer new responses to old problems that found traction in the Civil War period.

The categories puritan and Puritanism have been a subject of dispute both in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and in contemporary scholarship. However, in both cases, the term refers not to a stable and fixed category, but the term connotes a certain branch of reform and non-conformity, occasionally zealous, within English Calvinism. Given this difficulty, the Puritanism experienced by Milton, Marshall, and Nedham would have meant various things at different historical moments. As noted by John Morgan, "puritan" was initially used as an insult against those who sought ecclesiological reform in the late sixteenth century; at the same time, however, puritans "attempted to dissociate themselves from the radicals, whom they blamed for the opprobrium cast upon reformers" (10-11). This contradiction remained a constant with the definitions and associations with puritans. Yet, generally speaking, during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, the term puritan suggested "opposition to the practices and (sometimes) to the structures of the established church, but at the same time of affinity with its basic theology" (Morgan 12). In her discussion of puritans in Jacobean culture, Lori Anne Ferrell indicates that the term was both empty and powerful: "the word Puritan was in the period both the emptiest and the most powerful religio-political signifier to appear in print discourse. The designation itself, while perhaps embraced as a point of pride by some outspoken hot Protestants, was unequivocally a term of abuse when broadcast from the official pulpits of Jacobean England. The word had such a volatile valency that it was open to any skillful manipulation of its meaning" (16-17). Puritan, then, became a rhetorical category more than a signifier of a specific type of person in Jacobean England, and Ferrell points out that the traits used to designate a puritan were as fluid as the rhetorical situation required (16-17). In Elizabethan and Jacobean England, puritan was both used as a term of opprobrium for those who sought reform and also as term embraced by those who sought reform, and the polarization of this term resulted in a long-standing association of

puritans with radical reform, even though such associations were resisted by more moderate puritans at the time.

In Caroline England, the term puritan remained problematic. While many associate puritanism with a sense of non-conformity, Tom Webster warns that the "dangers" of such a fixed category as puritan "are never more apparent than when it is assumed to have a single, static and essential referent" (3). Furthermore, Webster suggests that the term puritan ought not to be restricted to the clergy, and as a result, he introduces what he calls the more "useful" term, "godly," as a descriptor of those who "referred to themselves as such" (4). Such hesitance to strictly define puritan is echoed by John Morgan who likewise resists a strict, essential, ideological definition into which all puritans fit. Rather, he sees the term as one of a plurality of existences that form a particular "stream of the church" defined by a spectrum of individual ideas rather than a puritan essence that defined each individual (Morgan 17). To clarify his position about the lack of what he calls a "precise" and "constant" definition, Morgan writes that such definitions "put essence before existence. If we approach puritans from a nominalist position, conceding that existence precedes essence, then we can still collect characteristics (which will vary, to a degree, over time with the changing context), but we shall have to recognize that the sum of these characteristics is a 'composite', and that not all of the characteristics were displayed, or even expected by opponents to be present, in all 'puritans' all of the time" (17). Morgan's fluid concept of puritanism allows for the individual existence of numerous types of puritans so that "puritanism" does not "connote a fixed entity" to which all puritans must adhere (16). To further stabilize what seems an unstable category, Peter Lake suggests that the term puritan designates a historical type: "Terms like puritan are usually (and quite properly) viewed as ideal types, conceptual models or caricatures, produced as heuristic devices by the observer. As such, they tend to attain far greater coherence in the observer's mind or texts, than in the far messier world of contemporary action, polemic and argument" (*Boxmaker's Revenge* 390). For Ferrell and Lake, the term and category of puritan become nothing more than a rhetorical signifier through which

observers, both early modern and contemporary, conceptualize an otherwise unstable category. Stability defines the reductive historical paradigm of opposition, which ultimately produces a narrative of reform between conflicting ideological categories that were imposed upon the moment by historical observers. Such a view is untenable. As Lake suggests, the puritan world of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is quite messy, and to reduce puritan to a single definition would be to stabilize what was then, as now, an unstable term and category.

That the term puritan presents more problems than it solves is not new. In his 1626 *Ibis ad Caesarem*, John Yates, lamenting both the instability of such a term and its potential uses, says that "this offensive name of a Puritan, wandring at large, might have some Statute passe upon it, both to define it, & punish it: for certainly Satan gains much by the free use of it" (qtd. in Webster 3). As a contemporary observer, Yates registers the frustration about the term as a category, both useful and opprobrious, and Milton, Marshall, and Nedham all voice similar complaints about the term in the 1640s. In *The Reason of Church Government*, Milton discounts the names of Puritan, Brownist, Familist, and Anabaptist, all of which are categorical aspersions designed to draw attention away from the progress of reformation and toward perceived schism resulting from the abandonment of episcopacy. He suggests that such terms distract the "blinder sort of people to mislike and deride sound doctrine and good Christianity" (24). In his 1644 sermon about the zealous Christian, *A Divine Project to Save a Kingdome*, Marshall singles out the Cavaliers as a group who uses "opprobrious nicknames" such as puritan and precisian in order to devalue their ongoing attempts at religious reform (38-39). Never mind that Marshall uses an opprobrious nickname while discrediting the use of such language. Writing in 1647 on behalf of impartial interest, Nedham publishes *The Case of the Kingdom Stated* in which he illustrates the fluidity of terms like puritan in an attempt to present the interest of the Presbyterian party, then sitting in the Westminster Assembly. He writes that the "*Presbyters*" now "reckon themselves for the *old Puritans* of *England*" (4). Though the Assembly themselves acknowledged a debt to previous reformers to demonstrate the continuity of reform,

Nedham capitalizes on such associations in order to indicate the subjectivity of religious and political interest. Either the Presbyterians are Puritans seeking continued reform, or the Presbyterians are Puritans opposing the Church and Charles I. In these instances, Milton, Marshall, and Nedham demonstrate that categories, then as now, are inescapable polemical devices used to superimpose meaning on what is otherwise a complex moment. In fact, as both Ferrell and Lake note, the ease with which the term puritan can be manipulated as a "religio-political signifier" to designate "ideal types" both simplifies the messy struggle for reform and complicates attempts to ascertain a precise meaning for puritan and puritanism.

Still, certain categories and characteristics are ineluctably associated with puritans, but these characteristics are, to use Morgan's terms, by no means the "essence" but rather observations about its "existence." As Morgan notes, "Puritans were Presbyterians and congregationalists, covenanters and stricter predestinarians, conformists and nonconformists. They were fellow-travellers to an idea rather than the disciplined members of a party" (17). Furthermore, Morgan lists characteristics to demonstrate the breadth of meanings:

> a dedication to preaching; an exceptional hatred of popery; an emphasis on the propagation of the Word even above obedience to the rules of the church and, occasionally, to those of the state; a growing dedication to the sanctity of the Sabbath; an abiding despair, beyond that of other moralists of the age, at the level of licentious behaviour; a passionate willingness to attack any theological innovations that detracted from English Calvinist orthodoxy; a greater emphasis on the pastoral activities of the minister, and therefore also on the purity of the minister's conversation (which led to contemporary accusations of Donatism); a general unwillingness, born of the doctrine of non-separation, to push disagreement with the hierarchy beyond suspension to the point of ministerial deprivation; and a close alliance between ministers and their lay patrons or protectors. (13)

By no means were these characteristics restricted to puritans, and as these categories and characteristics suggest, puritanism resists a simple, never mind a stable, definition. Of the characteristics listed by Morgan, many will be found among the clergyman discussed in the following pages. For example, the dedication to preaching and hatred of popery were both present in the sermons and treatises of Richard Stock. Thomas Gataker also praises Stock as a light who was capable of winning souls and as a minister interested in upholding the Sabbath. In the relationships of Edward Goodall, Thomas Young, and John Milton, one can see the attention to the pastoral duties of the clergy as well as the alliances between ministers and their patrons. In short, these characteristics, in various ways at various times, generally represent the broader project of puritan reform.[6]

To further qualify the concept of puritan, Jeffrey Miller describes three identifiable categories in the seventeenth century: the puritan, the moderate puritan, and the conformable puritan (73). He identifies the puritans as the "zealous wing of early modern English Calvinism" without any "single doctrinal or disciplinary position" (73). He distinguishes moderate puritans by the fact that they are not radical puritans, and of moderates, Miller says that they "subscribed to the episcopal church settlement and worked to conform to the doctrine and discipline insisted upon by the church's acknowledged, ecclesiastical authorities" (74). Puritan divines like Richard Stock, Thomas Gataker, Thomas Young, Edward Goodall, and Stephen Marshall, to varying degrees, all belong in this category as they each maintained livings within the church while advocating for various degrees of reform, even while adhering to and dissenting from church practice. Miller's final category is that of the "conformable puritan," which was a term first used by Archbishop Samuel Harsnett to "describe those puritans who were willing to subscribe to the church's (shifting) doctrinal and disciplinary demands, and even to practice the mandated ceremonies, but who did so with at least a modicum of

[6] Relationships among clergymen often leave little evidence and must often be established using archival and circumstantial evidence. For studies offering differing perspectives on tracing these sorts of relationships, see Jones, ed., *Young Milton*, especially chapters by Jones, "The Archival Landscape of Milton's Youth" and Miller, "Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young."

misgiving, or who regarded any aspect of their conformity as less that theologically essential" (74). Originally a term used for slander, conformable puritanism underwent a change under the persecution of Archbishop Laud in the 1630s who disdained mere "conformity" and who desired "*conformists*, who conformed for the proper reasons" (75). Peter Lake notes that Laud's desire for conformity and for the "beauty of holiness" pushed conformable and even moderate puritans into "separation, or into acts and positions that to their godly colleagues seemed dangerously close to separation" ("Puritans" 373). These categories reinforce the instability of a fixed understanding of Puritanism, which was a movement within the church that had diverse points of intersection with the extant ecclesiology.

Miller's distinction among puritans raises two points central to understanding the struggle for reform in the 1640s. Marshall, a moderate puritan and presbyterian, sought reform by working within the confines of the existing episcopal structure, at least until he was appointed to the Westminster Assembly during which time his moderate presbyterianism becomes evident. However, prior to his appointment in the Westminster Assembly, if he harbored puritanical and presbyterian tendencies for reform, Marshall—like the majority of puritans—advocated for such reforms in a "calculated way" while he remained an "integral and loyal" clergyman within the established episcopal order (Miller 74). Second, Miller raises broader questions about conformity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Clergymen like Thomas Gataker, who was imprisoned by James I in 1625, and Edward Goodall, who was cited for nonconformity during an inspection of his parish church in 1637, occasionally found themselves in trouble with royal and ecclesiastical authority (Usher; Jones, "Horton Parish Church").[7] Stephen Marshall, too, often found clever ways to avoid Laudian ceremonialism and sacramentalism. For example, as Webster reports, "Marshall was only one of the

[7] For a discussion of ecclesiastical oversight in matters of conformity, see Webster's chapter, "The Metropolitical Visitaion of Essex and the Strategies of Evasion," in *Godly Clergy*. See, also, Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, especially the chapter "Clerical Nonconformity," in which he distinguishes between the tolerance shown to nonconformists under James and Charles: "Under Charles I, nonconformist clergy escaped prosecution by promising to conform; under James I, it was sufficient to promise to confer about conforming" (228).

ministers who omitted the word 'Jesus' from the blessing in order to avoid bowing or being seen not to bow at the name" (*Godly Clergy* 248). Yet, all managed to navigate such difficulty to maintain their status and livings. Conformity, like puritanism, resists the stability of a fixed category. Instead, it represents an aspect of puritan divines who adapted to changing circumstances in order to maintain their positions and to carry out their ministerial duties. In many ways, the idea of conformity encapsulates the struggle for reform in that puritan divines exercised freedom or restraint depending on the situation, which suggests that conformity be considered a term of response rather than of revolution.

What Miller suggests about conformable puritanism, Peter Lake names the paradox of puritanism. Lake calls puritanism a "process of conformist differentiation" that allowed for "virtual hegemony" while it also became "distinctive, controversial, and divisive" ("Puritans" 378). In other words, as puritan divines exercised the freedom and restraint of conformity as the "leading edge of English Protestant evangelism," the movement achieved no small degree of power within the extant church hierarchy ("Puritans" 378). However, locating such power in conformity and deviation from ecclesiastical norms resulted in puritanism becoming a divisive force within the Church. For example, Lake says that the "rise of Laudianism" ought to be viewed as "the culmination of a dialectical process of challenge and response, of mutual self-definition and othering" ("Puritans" 378-79). Thus, Laud challenges the Puritans who in turn respond to Laud, and the Puritans challenge Laud's authority, which elicits a Laudian response. Lake's dialectical paradox also applies to the Westminster Assembly that attempted to impose Presbyterian conformity and uniformity. In his assessment of Presbyterian interests in the "design of *Conformity* or *Uniformity*," Nedham calls such interests the "grand *Cheat* whereby the *Devil* makes men run a madding" (*Case of the kingdom* 5). Nedham comments on the paradox of conformity: "though it ever pretend a plausible *end* of Cementing the *State* against *Division,* yet pull off its *Visard,* and you shall finde it to be both the *Mother* and *Nurse* of all *Division* (as it ever was) throughout all *Europe* in matters of Religion"

(*Case of the kingdom* 5). For Nedham as for Lake, the paradox functions as an extension of hegemony that ultimately results in division, whether it involves the Laudians, Puritans, or Presbyterians. In this dialectical paradox, Miller locates different responsive modes of puritanism, each of which inhabits different ecclesiological spheres, but Lake's dialectic might better be understood more broadly as a crucial element in the contest for conformity. Ultimately, the issue of conformity represents the continual struggle for reform that would eventually turn responsive puritans into revolutionary ones.

Though the term puritan presents many theoretical problems, these preliminary remarks underscore the complexity of such terms for contemporaries and historians alike. Though he breaks from the clergy in the 1640s, Milton retains certain aspects of puritanism as a result of having been raised in a puritan environment. The idiosyncratic views about religion and reform he espouses might have their roots in puritan reform, but ultimately he departs from the puritan divines in the 1640s. Marshall's puritanism is perhaps more clear, if also more complex. At various times, Marshall exhibited characteristics of puritanism, presbyterianism, congregationalism, and nonconformism; in short, he was a conformable but not a conformist divine. Certainly, Marshall appears nothing like the radical puritanism of the separatists; rather, prior to his call to London in 1640, Marshall embodied the moderate wing of puritanism that sought reform by working within the established episcopacy. Nedham, on the other hand, was a political chameleon who adhered only to the religion of political ambition, greed, and practical, constitutional reform on behalf of his employer, whether Parliament, Charles I, the Commonwealth, or Oliver Cromwell. Puritan ideas for reform should be seen as a complex struggle for religious settlement and, with the outbreak of the civil wars, political stability. Ideas about reform arose in Tudor England and remained present throughout the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline reigns, the Civil War period, and the years of the English Commonwealth and Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell in the 1650s. However, it was only under Charles I that the monarchy would be questioned, and ultimately dissolved, and under Archbishop William Laud that

puritan reform would take the form of outright rebellion to his imposition of certain ecclesiological ideas.

When he summoned what would become the Long Parliament in November 1640, six months after dissolving what is now called the Short Parliament, Charles ostensibly did so in order to raise money to assist with the Scottish victory over the English in August of that year. Charles, however, miscalculated the temper of the Parliament. Rather than deal with the Scottish army in the north, the Parliament focused on constitutional reform, due in large part to the years Charles I ruled without a Parliament (1629-1640), and on ecclesiastical reform, due to innovations that had been implemented by Laud in the 1630s. In general, the Parliament wished to end the ability of the king to govern without Parliament and to remove advisors who enabled Charles to do so. Bound up in all of this was ecclesiastical reform. Under Charles, Laud had steadily risen through the ranks, first becoming the Bishop of London in 1628 and then the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. Such promotions supported the popular idea that Charles preferred Arminian to traditional Calvinist theology, which fueled fears that the church was becoming anti-Calvinist. Additionally, Laud, sanctioned by Charles, implemented several innovations that were perceived as undermining the church as established under Elizabeth and, especially, under the watchful eye of James I. According to Anthony Milton, Laud's emphasis on "high church ceremonialism, vigorous clericalism, and the doctrinal repositioning of the Church vis-à-vis Rome and Reformed Protestantism" presented problems for Puritan divines ("Introduction" 9). Laud's impositions angered Puritans who in turn reacted against Laudianism. It is not a coincidence that a majority of the migration to New England occurred during the years of the personal rule, which was a move contemplated at the time even by Oliver Cromwell (Woolrych, *Britain* 83). Though no Englishman in the 1630s would have recognized a term like Anglicans, it captures a view of the church's holiness as primarily sacramental in nature, a view stressed and amplified by Laud. Opposed to such a view were the puritans, whose emphasis on preaching and the written word stood in stark contrast to Anglicans in the 1630s. The dialectic, however, ought not to be

seen as reductive but as indicative of the struggle for settlement. Commenting on the tension between the Puritans and the Laudians, Blair Worden points out that they "coexisted" under James I, but with the governance of Charles I and Laud, "coexistence turned to confrontation" ("Introduction" 20). The reasons for such a confrontation will provide a fuller context for the ideas of reform that emerged in response to Laudian and Caroline reform at the calling of the Long Parliament.

One particularly important issue was that Charles I was not James I, in some ways for the better and in others for the worse. Charles observed a stricter morality and devoted himself to matters of state more than his father; indeed, Charles, though uninterested in finer points of church doctrine, was in many ways a more devout Protestant. However, under Charles, certain decisions resulted in the alienation and disillusionment of Puritan divines. In fact, Woolrych characterizes Charles as a man with a "severely limited" political imagination who "too often failed to foresee the results of his decisions or to gauge their impact on other people" (*Britain* 50). As such, Charles often caused problems, the consequences of which were not fully realized until 1649. For example, it was no secret that James I preferred Calvinism, but it was his son Charles who openly preferred and promoted like-minded men to positions of power. His preference for Arminians was owing to their "exaltation of authority and hierarchy in ecclesiastical government" as well as their "insistence on a seemly ritual in worship" rather than any particular interest in doctrine (*Britain* 50). In this sense, Lamont correctly recognized the absence of Arminian theology; however, Charles's preference for tangential aspects—we might call it the spirit—of Arminianism contributed to the perceptions about its significance. Along with this preference for authority and decorum, Puritan opponents of Charles suspected him of having Catholic sympathies on account of his marriage to Henrietta Maria in 1625 and on account of his preference for the ceremony and sacrament of religious worship that Laud implemented (Ashton 78-79). Though ultimately unfounded, these suspicions nevertheless remained in the popular imagination and caused unintended consequences for Charles and Laud. Thus, when the Long Parliament impeached and imprisoned Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford in 1640 and Archbishop

William Laud in 1641, the efforts were led in the House of Commons by the Puritan John Pym, who advocated for constitutional rights and who had staunchly opposed Arminianism since the 1620s (Woolrych, "The Civil Wars" 93-94). Though Charles made some political and religious miscalculations, which were the result of "his lack of insight into human motivation and his fatally weak sense of what was politically possible and what was not," Laud's ecclesiological reforms further alienated those with puritan tendencies (Woolrych, *Britain* 52).

Although Laudian reforms in the 1630s warrant much scrutiny, a definite cause for the outbreak of hostilities remains a matter of debate. Still, Laud's ideas make it clear that he was ideologically opposed—even hostile—to the "integration of more evangelical modes of religion into the Church of England" and to the "perceived damage that they were doing to the worship and institutions of the Established Church" (A. Milton, "Introduction" 10). Kevin Sharpe contends that the confrontation between Laud and the Puritans resulted from the Bishops' Wars in 1639-40. Others, like John Morrill, see the hostilities primarily as a result of religious difference rather than constitutional grievance. Others like Tyacke emphasize Laudian attempts to solidify the ecclesiastical establishment.[8] Any single explanation simplifies the complex struggle of the moment. Rather, the outbreak of hostilities in the 1640s signals the release of much older struggles for reform that discovered a new voice in Laud's ideas for conformity within the church, which put him at odds with Puritan divines who had become a prominent part of the preaching clergy across England. In general, Laud—and Charles—insisted on "uniform and ordered worship as a prime means to national unity" (Woolrych, "The Civil Wars" 85). The Puritans, too, were invested in the creation of a national, Protestant ethos, but while the Puritans emphasized preaching and scripture, the Laudian church emphasized ceremonial aspects "with a reverent ritual and priest-like vestments;" the use of prayer,

[8] For discussions of Caroline England and the English Civil War, see Kevin Sharpe, *Personal Rule of Charles I*; Christopher Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution*; John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution: Essays*; Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*; Conrad Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War*; and J. Adamson, ed., *The English Civil War*.

specifically prayer as mandated in the Book of Common Prayer; and the sacraments and holy communion as the "main channel through which grace was conveyed to believers" (Woolrych, *Britain* 77). "Particularly obnoxious" was Laud's insistence on the divine right of Bishops, the idea that gained traction under Elizabeth but which would erupt in a 1637 trial and in the Smectymnuan controversy of 1641-42, both of which will be discussed below (77). The vehement anti-Catholic sentiment that characterized many puritan sermons in the Elizabethan and Jacobean churches, as in the sermon of Richard Stock delivered one year after the Gunpowder Plot, became obscured by Laud and other Caroline bishops who rather than outrightly reject Catholicism sought a "*via media* between the corruptions of Rome and the excesses of Geneva" (77). Such a middle way only intensified claims about the crypto-Catholicism of Charles and furthered the puritan suspicion that the church under Laud "smacked of popish superstition" (78). Not all religious decisions were the result of Laud, however, as Charles reissued the Book of Sports in 1633 on account of the fact that he cared little for observing the Sabbath, which was regarded by Puritans as a sacred day (79). In his attempts to impose uniformity and to elevate ritual and ceremony at the expense of preaching and extempore prayer, Laud exacerbated religious divisions between himself and the puritans. However, ecclesiological difference was one thing, but the enforcement of conformity with such reforms represented Caroline and Laudian intrusion upon what had previously been allowed, or at least overlooked, during the reign of James. Two examples from the 1630s best illustrate such enforcement that was perceived by many puritans as an attempt at forced conformity, which filtered directly into the attempts of Puritan divines to halt or to reverse Laudian reform in the 1640s.

In both examples, the policies of Charles and Laud under the guise of church uniformity exacerbated division. The "royal policy" of Charles "emphasized the jurisdiction and authority of the bishop," and he "made the episcopate the linchpin of the programme to reform the church" (Sharpe 364). As part of episcopal power in matters of church reform, Laud, in his roles as Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, carried out a program of church visitation (Sharpe 365). Ostensibly,

the Laudian program of church visitation enforced conformity and uniformity, and even during his time as Bishop of London, Laud developed a "pattern" when enforcing conformity: "Once he had begun the process against a nonconformist minister it soon became clear that he would follow that process to its conclusion" whereby a "contumacious preacher" would either completely submit or be removed (Webster, *Godly Clergy* 202). The pattern continued into his time as Archbishop of Canterbury, but "Laud's own preference was to secure conformity by persuasion rather than coercion," and suspension and deprivation were rare (Woolrych, *Britain* 81). Yet neither Charles nor Laud accounted for the unintended consequences of placing such power in the episcopate, specifically in other bishops. For example, as Kevin Sharpe points out, "bishops were left considerable room to interpret royal orders and pursue their own priorities," some of which meant toleration of Puritans that ran counter to Caroline and Laudian views of uniformity (365). However, to many Puritans, Laudian visitation only served as the attempt to enforce a form of worship close to that of Rome. As Nedham's assessment of religious interest in 1647 shows, enforcing conformity causes division, and Laudian and Caroline presence in this regard was at best meddling and at worst a call for outright conformity.

In addition to church visitation, Laud's opponents were forced to contend with prosecution in the prerogative courts, the Court of High Commission, and the Star Chamber. It was in this last court in 1637 that Laud and Charles inflicted a severe punishments on William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton; they were branded, had their ears cut off, pilloried, fined, and sentenced to life imprisonment. The men had dared to attack the ecclesiastical order of bishops in print, which Laud and Charles viewed as a direct challenge to their authority, to their attempts at imposing uniformity, and to the hierarchical order of the church. Woolrych calls it one of the "worst mistakes" both men made because the highly publicized case turned the men into martyrs (*Britain* 81). Again, the religious and political interests of Charles and Laud were undermined by the unintended consequences of their actions. Subsequently, both the Court of High Commission and the Star

Chamber were abolished in the Long Parliament under Pym's leadership. The remainder of this introduction traces voices in the struggle for reform from the early seventeenth century to the tumultuous years of the 1640s. In those years, tensions reached revolutionary heights, and that struggle for reform serves as the pretext for why Marshall, Milton, and Nedham felt compelled to respond.

2

On November 2, 1606, Richard Stock, the puritan minister of Allhallows Bread Street, which two years later would become the childhood and pre-university parish of John Milton, delivered a pointed sermon about the nature of reform. Stock preached the sermon at the most prominent national pulpit, Paul's Cross, which allowed him to fashion a national ethos of change based upon a form of virulent Protestant anti-Catholicism. Preaching a few days before the first anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot, Stock uses the historical event as a moment to speak to the English people about reform:

> But this I dare say; If we doe not reforme our corruptions and manners, though this cloud bee ouer, yet we shall see and suffer more fearefull things, for whatsoeuer other mens opinions are, for my part I haue euer feared more the securitie of the land, then the wrath of God; because the wrath of God (if we were not secure) were to be expiated, and appeased by our repentaunce, and turning vnto him: but we being secure and setled vpon the dregs of our sinnes, there is no hope that the wrath of God should bee remooued, but that he should doe to vs, as is spoken heere: Cut off head, and taile, &c. and that these should bee but the beginning of sorrows. (*Paules Crosse* 15)

Stock's admonitory strategy calls attention to the past in order to focus on the future. The cloud to which he refers was the plot of the "cruell and bloody papists" of "this time twelue-moneth," and he

portends that still "more fearefull things" may yet await lest reformation of present "corruptions and manners" be undertaken (*Paules Crosse* 14-15). Stock adapts the words of John Chrysostom to draw attention to the need to acknowledge individual sinfulness and to reduce it lest God's wrath follow. Using—perhaps capitalizing upon—the threat of Catholic encroachment, both martial and religious, both actual and perceived, Stock creates a precarious moment of fear that forces English Protestants to confront their recent deliverance and the enduring struggle to avoid future calamity.

Stock's anti-Catholicism provides an exigent moment to discuss the continued work of reform in a national pulpit as a moral and practical issue. According to Lori Anne Ferrell, James was "splendidly logocentric," and as such, he "recognized the remarkable power" of language, both spoken and printed, to be manipulated for political and religious reasons (7-8). Sermons in the national pulpit become, in effect, an extension of royal policy, and the printed sermons from Paul's Cross "may well be the most tangible proof historians have that conflicts of the Caroline age arose from long-standing religious divisions with roots in the peculiarly incomplete nature of England's Protestant Reformation" (7-8). Mary Morrissey, however, argues that the sermons of Paul's Cross "do not presuppose a 'national covenant' or any kind of special relationship between God and England" (54). Instead, she argues that the sermons focus on individual salvation: "They were designed to exhort the hearers to repentance by the most forceful means available—the threat of destruction and the promise of salvation—and assume for the purposes of their sermon that both options were available to their congregation" (54). Stock creates a Protestant ethics founded on a continual fear of both the external threat of Catholicism and the internal presence of sin, which suggests that salvation remains a possibility for the national church and for individual Protestants. Indeed, to avoid being "secure and settled vpon the dregs of our sinnes," Stock implores his audience to "reforme things amisse" and to "withstand corruptions" by removing them. Stock desires active resistance to threats, whether Catholic or individual sinfulness, and the struggle for the Protestant and for Protestantism in England becomes the ability to stave off such corruption. In Caroline England, then, when Laudian

reforms threatened to overturn the progress of evangelical Calvinism in the Jacobean Church, Puritans exposed to anti-Catholic sentiment like that of Stock no doubt imagined that they ought to remove such corruptions as a necessary part of being a Protestant.

In the years following his sermon, Stock refines his position by distinguishing between repentance and reform in an extended treatise, *The Doctrine and Use of Repentance*, published in 1610. For Stock, true repentance is an internal and total break from sin while reform is the external representation of internal change. He defines repentance as the "constant turning of a man in his whole life from al sinne vnto God, arising from true faith and the true knowledge of a mans owne spirituall estate, euer ioyned with true humiliation" (*Doctrine* 1). Stock's "constant turning" repurposes the ubiquitous fear about the threat of Catholicism to an ever-present vigilance against sin. Thus, he changes a national threat to an individual one, and the ethos of the repentant English Protestant turns on the act of turning toward God through "true faith" and "true knowledge of a mans owne spirituall estate." Reform, however, Stock restricts to "the outward act" and may occur without true repentance (11). Stock clarifies the distinction: "There may be an outward reformation of actions & worde, an inlightning of the mind and vnderstanding, a changing of the will and affections from vice to vertue, but no change of the heart from sinfulness to holines" (20-21). While he restricts repentance to the holiness of an individual Protestant soul, Stock allows that "outward reformation" may extend beyond the mere appearance of virtuous action and speech to the machinery of church government. For Stock, clergy bridge the gap insofar as the "ministerie of the word" allows preachers to use sermons as the instrument of god both to facilitate "outward reformation" and to change "the heart from sinfulness to holiness." Stock's piety emphasizes the Protestant individual, and he highlights a distinction that would become central to later ecclesiastical discussions, primarily those of the role of the clergy within a system designed for the pastoral care of English Protestants.

Similar ideas emerged in the years after Stock's treatise. Thomas Gataker, a clergyman and lifelong friend of Stock after they met while attending St. John's College, Cambridge in the 1590s,

does not devote an entire treatise to these ideas, but he articulates similar concerns. In 1623, Gataker published *The Joy of the Just with the Signes of Such*, which was an enlarged explication of a sermon preached in London. Some way into the sermon, Gataker uses the biblical example of Herod and John to illustrate hypocritical reformation. Like Stock before him, Gataker laments the "outwardly reformed" as a mere show, and he observes that to John, Herod's "former reformation and well-doing, was but in shew only, and for other ends" (*Joy* 100). For Herod, the telos of reform was not true repentance but merely a facade designed to conceal his continued interest in his brother's wife. For Gataker, this misalignment of conscience and action represents insincerity. Thus, he concludes, "in like manner when men and women shall be content to reforme their liues, and conforme themselues to the will and word of God in some things, but stand out wilfully in some other things, refusing to practise the like reformation, or to shew the like conformitie in them, albeit they be in heart and conscience conuinced of their dutie therein, it is an euident Argument of vnsoundnesse" (100). The sound alignment of intent and action requires a total conformity, which is to say that inner holiness must be manifest in outward godliness. At first glance, Gataker primarily concerns himself with an individual Protestant ethos of conformity of act and of conscience for the men and women of England. However, conformity also registers on a national, ecclesiastical level with many Puritan divines practicing varying degrees of conformity in the parish churches, which became a contentious matter and defining characteristic of Puritans during the period of Laudian reforms.

Gataker voices other concerns about the Protestant individual and nation in *Two Sermons: Tending to Direction for Christian Cariage, Both in Afflictions Incumbent, and in Judgements Imminent*, which also appeared in print in 1623. In the first sermon on David, he admonishes his audience that "what we finde our selves thus faultie in, we should endevour to reforme" (73).[9] The process of individual discovery is the labor that must be undertaken by all: "As wee must labour to finde out the cause of the euill, and what hath turned Gods face from vs; so should wee withall labour

[9] Pagination in *Two Sermons* is inconsistent. I supply them when available.

to remoue the same, that *the Cause being taken away, the effect also may cease;* and that Gods face that is now turned from vs may bee turned againe toward us" (73-74). The labor "to discover what is amisse" and "to amend and remove the evill discovered, either in our hearts or in our lives" is "the end of our search," and, thus, like David, as Gataker reminds his audience, the work of each Protestant must be that of discovery in order to avoid God's wrath and receive God's blessing (74). Gataker extends this task beyond the individual to the nation itself, and, like other clergymen, he carefully demonstrates the relationship between the blessed Protestant individual and the blessed Protestant nation. At the close of his sermon on David, he discusses the "furthering and effecting of a generall reformation," and he implores each individual to "repent of their own excesses" so as to further the reformation of the city. He writes, "*The whole Citie,* wee say, *would soone be faire, if euery one would but sweepe before his owne doore.* And the whole estate would be soone reformed, if each one would but doe his part, *looke home* to himselfe, and set seriously vpon the amendment of that one, whom it concerneth him most to looke after." The relationship between the individual and the nation was crucial for the idea of Protestant reform in that it allowed the clergymen to stress individual work as part of a more general project. Of course, Gataker avoids any mention of ecclesiastical issues at the national level; rather, he, and other Puritan divines, were especially interested in creating a piety of individual salvation that would turn England into God's chosen people.

Then, in April 1626 after the death of his longtime friend, Richard Stock, Gataker preached his funeral sermon, which was published the following year as *Abrahams Decease*. In the testimony given to Stock, he praises him for his work as a "*winner* of many soules to God," for his "*freedome* of *speech* therefore in *reprouing* of *sinne*," and for his "*Zealous* and *earnest pursuit* of *reformation* of some *prophanations* of the *Sabbath*" (4, 11). In Stock's character, he finds traits central to a puritan agenda concerned with the sanctity of the Sabbath. While Stock's ability to win souls reflects a broad sphere of influence, Gataker speaks to something more important—Stock's

influence on clergymen that live on after him who are "diuers now famous *lights* in *Gods Church,* and *faithfull Ministers* of his *Word,* doe professe to haue lighted their *candles* at his *lampe,* yea some of them to haue receiued their *first beginnings* not of *light* only, but of spirituall *life* and grace, (without which all light be it neuer so great, is *no light,* but meere *darknes)* from his *Ministery*" (5-6). He continues that Stock has the honor not merely of winning a soul but the honor to be "the winner of such as prove winners of soules" (6). According to Gataker, Stock's ministry influenced a circle of divines to continue his work among other clergy and their parishioners. In this sense, Stock demonstrates his interest in individual salvation and in the continued work of reform. In addition to his influence on other divines, Gataker praises the efficacy of Stock's ministry: "And if there be any of those that liued any long time under so *painfull* and *powerfull* a *Ministery* as his was, that remaine still *vnconuerted, vnreclaimed, vnreformed,* let them feare and beware of that dreadfull *censure* of the Apostle," the censure that judgement and doom await without "timely repentance" (7). Not only does he praise Stock's virtues as a minister, but more generally Gataker illustrates the character of a clergyman concerned with individual and ecclesiastical reform as well as the education of a learned and capable preaching ministry. As such, the panegyric for Stock becomes a timely occasion to praise a friend and also a timeless occasion to present the character of a puritan reformer whose interests must extend beyond the parochial to the ecclesiastical.

After the publication of *Abrahams Decease*, Gataker stopped publishing for the next ten years. Two reasons are most likely. As mentioned above, he had been imprisoned for a short time in 1625 after writing prefatory material for two books licensed by his friend, Daniel Featley, who was also the chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury.[10] On the order of King James, the books were

[10] For an account of chaplains in the period, see Adlington, Lockwood, and Wright, eds., *Chaplains in Early Modern England*, especially Adlington's chapter on Daniel Featley, "Chaplains to Embassies," and Morrissey's chapter "Episcopal Chaplains." On licensing, see Arnold Hunt's "Licensing and Religious Censorship in Early Modern England" and Anthony Milton's "Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England."

burned at Paul's Cross for being seditious and subversive, which landed Gataker in prison as an "unwitting victim of court manoeuvres" to discredit the archbishop (Usher). Second, the rise of William Laud as bishop of London in 1628 and the institution of Laudian reforms forced him to further withhold his views from the press. However, with the 1637 publication of *Certaine Sermons*, a collection of several sermons in one volume, Gataker once again entered the realm of public discourse. His calls for reform on an individual and national level continue, and he reminds his audience that "it is *an height of impietie* and ungodlinesse for a man *to be bad in a good age*, and to continue unreformed in a time of general reformation" (*Certaine Sermons* 77). His focus on a piety of reform as part of a collective general reformation was characteristic of many puritan preachers, and Gataker's admonition would have been seen as such. Yet, the emphasis on individual discovery and reformation features prominently in discussions of reform. In one sermon, he reminds his audience about their duty to examine and reform themselves: "And this is also a singular good note of a sincere heart, when a man is carefull to search into his owne corruptions and oversights, is willing to bee informed of them, glad to see them discovered, and ready to reforme them when they are evidently discovered to him, and his conscience convinced of them out of Gods word" (246). Furthermore, Gataker's primary concern remains individual salvation, and he cautions each reader that discovery and reform must be made with upright hearts lest "their *seeming search* was *never made in sinceritie*" (246). Nothing about Gataker's interests in reform had changed, but the religious landscape had changed drastically under Laud. By 1637, general constitutional and ecclesiastical concerns under both Charles I and Laud emerged as a result of the much publicized trial of William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton who questioned episcopacy in print. Gataker's decision to publish represents a continued interest in the salvation of the souls of his parishioners, and it suggests opposition to attempts to impose uniformity and conformity.

Other calls for reform emerge not from the clergy but in the satiric voice of John Milton. In the same year that Gataker published *Certaine Sermons*, John Milton took up residence with his

family at Horton, and it was during this time that Milton's discontentment found expression in *Lycidas*. Such disillusionment with the clergy dates from his time in Caroline Cambridge when he was ostensiblly training for a clerical career. In 1625-1626, Milton composed *In quintum Novembris*, which commemorates the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot. Like Stock's 1606 sermon, Milton uses the occasion to vilify Catholicism while praising the piety of James and deliverance of England. In the poem, Milton depicts Satan, angered that England refuses Catholicism, flying to the Pope in order to instigate what would become the Gunpowder Plot. Often noted for being an early attempt at epic and for its depiction of Satan, in which elements of the Satan of *Paradise Lost* can be detected, the poem also rehearses the puritan disdain for Catholicism as well as the promise for salvation. Milton's satiric view of Catholicism emerges late in the poem when God questions Fame to prompt her into acting on behalf of England: "Fama siles? an te latet impia Papistarum / Conjurata cohors in meque meosque Britannos, / Et nova sceptrigero cædes meditata Jäcobo" [Fame, are you silent? Can it be that the impious cohort of Papists plotting against me and my Britain lie hidden? The newly meditated murder against sceptered James?] (201-03). That Milton calls them the impious cohort of Papists was not novel, but that he puts the phrase in the mouth of God certainly would have elicited laughter at the expense of Catholics. The satiric depiction puts Milton squarely in line with not just the puritan view of Catholicism but with the broader fear that Catholicism threatened the English Church. While the poem indicates that Milton's disillusionment is not a *fait accompli*, he sees such struggles through a Puritan lens as an ideological battle for the soul of the Protestant nation.

While *In quintum Novembris* aligns Milton with Puritan anti-Catholicism of the sort found in the sermons of his childhood parish, he articulates more specific concerns about the education of those who, like him, planned to finish the BA with the intention of becoming members of the clergy. In fact, Nicholas McDowell points out that "of the fifteen other students admitted to Christ's in the same half-year as Milton, eight became clergymen" (97). Milton looked unfavorably upon the ignorance of his fellow students who intended to join the Church and lamented that poorly educated

clergymen might halt the process of reformation. In a letter to Alexander Gil in the summer of 1628, Milton worries that the number of "unskilled and unlearned" students who join the clergy will "make one fear that the priestly Ignorance of a former age may gradually attack our Clergy."[11] The criticism of potential clergy merges with criticism of learning at Cambridge in *Prolusion VII*, which Milton delivered in 1631 as an exercise in oration. For Milton, God "intended" that man "strive" toward "lofty understanding" of the "Ideas of things human or divine," and such pursuits require "a mind trained and enobled by Learning and study" (*Prolusion VII* 15).[12] Milton then describes the state of the universities "a few hundred years ago" when the" Muses had deserted" them, but the image of the university in former times serves only as a thinly veiled critique of the present (15). Milton writes,

> blind illiteracy had penetrated and entrenched itself everywhere, nothing was heard in the schools but the absurd doctrines of driveling monks, and that profane and hideous monster, Ignorance, assumed the gown and lorded it on our empty platforms and pulpits and in our deserted professorial chairs. Then Piety went in mourning, and Religion sickened and flagged, so that only after prolonged suffering, and hardly even to this very day, has she recovered from her grievous wound. (15-16)

Milton paints a stark picture of the present state of religion that still suffers from the absence of piety, a consequence of widespread ignorance. *In quintum Novembris* lauds the piety of James and of England as essential to staving off the work of Satan, the Pope, and Catholicism, but in Caroline England, Milton mourns its absence. Of immediate consequence is the role of an educated clergy to maintain piety, and Milton's "blind illiteracy" becomes an image central to his deteriorating view of the clergy in the 1630s. However, Milton raises more general concerns that piety and religion are still

[11] See Milton, *Epistolarum Familiarium* 11. The translation of the letter provided here is from *CPW* 1: 313.

[12] Here and in the Milton chapter, I cite David Loewenstein's edition of Milton's prose, which reproduces the translation of *Prolusion VII* from *CPW*. The Latin text for passages from *Prolusion VII* is provided in the Milton chapter; for the original text, see Milton, *Epistolarum Familiarium* 135-55.

recovering from such wounds. In his reading of this passage, McDowell detects "a reversal of the Reformation," but outright reversal simplifies the issue (98). Rather, Milton laments the ongoing process for reform in an age when piety wanes, and the emphasis on clerical education and efficacy do not suggest fears about reversal but fears about the prospect of continued puritan struggle for reform.

After graduating from Cambridge, Milton returned to live with his family first at Hammersmith from 1632 to 1635 and then from 1636 through the spring of 1638 at Horton before his departure for an 18 month tour of the European continent. In the years at Hammersmith and Horton, Milton's study suggests that he may have been planning to pursue a divinity degree (Campbell and Corns 86). However, his treatment by the university community coupled with his traumatic reading of the Church Fathers ultimately led him to reject the pastoral vocation, which registers in the image of "blind illiteracy" that reached its culmination in 1637. On the occasion of the death of Edward King, a fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, Milton composed *Lycidas*, in which he laments the death of King and also repurposes the image of blindness to condemn clerical neglect. Milton, who scarcely conceals his views in the pastoral mode of shepherds tending their flocks, characterizes the clergy as "Blind mouthes! that scarce themselves know how to hold / A Sheep-hook" (*Lycidas* 120-21). Not content to merely point out the negligence of the clergy, Milton also describes the state of the flock: "The hungry Sheep look up, and are not fed, / But swoln with wind, and the rank mist they draw, / Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread" (125-27). Milton's poetry intersects on several levels with ideas that emerged in Stock and Gataker. That Milton calls the clergy blind mouths suggests a confusion of sight and speech, which renders speech sightless and sight speechless. By offering this ambiguous, if vivid, image, Milton indicates that the clergy cannot speak because they are blind to the concerns of the parishioners and what the clergy cannot see in turn renders their speech aimless. Furthermore, in Milton's pastoral image, English Protestants require pastoral care, but on account of clerical failure, they are fed wind and thus rot inwardly. For Milton, then, the issues concern the

efficacy of a learned, preaching clergy and the means of salvation for Protestants in England.[13] Unlike Stock, Milton's confused clergy fail to win souls through pastoral influence. The image also recalls the ideas of outward reformation and inner repentance as well as, perhaps most significantly, a failure of the "ministerie of the word" as a means to provide spiritual nourishment. Furthermore, that Milton depicts the clergy as blind suggests that they have not lit "their *candles* at his *lampe*," which is to say that they have followed the guidance of Laudian reform rather than the guidance of ministers like Stock interested in the salvation of the flock. The admonitions of Gataker, who upheld views about self-examination and discovery as part of parochial and national reform, echo in Milton's sentiments about a clergy who lack the capacity for intellectual reflection and who neglect their duties to encourage the flock to "discover what is amisse" so that it may be reformed.

Milton's time at Horton in 1637 suggests ideological connections to clerical reform, but at different periods in his life, he also had meaningful interactions with puritan clergymen. In 1611, Thomas Gataker became the rector of Rotherhithe, Surrey, the post that he would hold until his death in July 1654. While Gataker was in Surrey, his friend from Cambridge, Richard Stock, was the minister at All Hallows Bread Street where Milton's parents resided until the end of the 1620s. Gataker, after becoming rector at Rotherhithe, took on Thomas Young and Edward Goodall as assistants, and both would have a direct influence on John Milton and his family. In 1617 or 1618, Young began tutoring Milton to supplement his education at St. Paul's School, and it is likely that Young was given the position after being recommended to Stock by Thomas Gataker. In 1620, Young left England for a position in Hamburg, but so fond of Young was Milton that in an elegy for him

[13] In 1645, when he published *Lycidas* as part of his collection, Milton added a headnote to the poem in which he calls Edward King his "learned Friend" as if to suggest a stark contrast with the "ruine of our corrupted Clergy," who, given the images in the poem, seem to lack the education, vision, and speech to carry out their pastoral duties.

written at the age of 18 (as Milton tells us) in the spring of 1627, Milton calls Young his other half.[14] Milton composed and sent the elegy to his former tutor, in part, as thanks for the gift of a Hebrew Bible, which presumably he had received along with Young's previous letter (Campbell and Corns 37; Miller 86). Later, Milton would give Young a copy of Thomas Cranmer's *Reformatio*, and as Miller points out, Milton's gift "represented the church's historical commitment to the cause of anti-popery and Reformation, and to a corresponding vision of international Protestant unity" (86). In the elegy, however, Milton praised Young as a learned minister whose pastoral attention was erudite: "Vivit ibi antiquæ clarus pietatis honore / Præsul Christocolas pascere doctus oves" [in that place lives a pastor famed with the honor of ancient piety, learned to tend Christian flocks] (*Elegia quarta* 17-18). Again, like Gataker's praise of Stock who was a light to win souls, Milton imagines Young in Hamburg ministering to souls with their salvation in mind: "Cælestive animas saturantem rore tenellas, / Grande salutiferæ religionis opus" [Or satisfying tender souls with heavenly dew, the great work of saving religion] (*Elegia quarta* 45-46). Though Milton depicts Young as an exemplary clergyman with puritan views of anti-Catholicism, reformation, and pastoral duty, some restraint must be exercised when reading the correspondence between the two. Milton might praise Young, but he also creates an idealized image of a minister whose qualities align with Milton's own idea of the Puritan reformer.

At Horton, Milton surely had interactions with Edward Goodall, the rector of the small parish, but we have no idea about the nature and extent of those interactions except for the notations in the parish registers which indicate Goodall was involved with the burial of Sarah Milton, the poet's mother, and the births and deaths of the children of Milton's brother Christopher.[15] It is possible,

[14] Milton writes, "Hei mihi quot pelagi, quot montes interjecti / Me faciunt alia parte carere mei!" [Alas for me, how many seas, how many mountains are interposed to keep me from the other part of me!]. This line alludes to Horace's *Carmina* 1.3.8 in which Horace calls Virgil half of his soul (animae dimidium meae).

[15] The discussion of Milton's time at Horton as well as the inspection of St. Michael's owes much to the work of Edward Jones. See Jones, "Milton and the 1637 Inspection of the Horton Parish Church" and "Milton, Horton, and the Kedermister Library." For biographical accounts of Milton's time at Horton, see Jones,

however, that the number of Cambridge graduates in the village would make Goodall stand apart as at least a kindred spirit in that respect with John Milton (Jones, "Milton, Horton, and the Kedermister Library" 41; Campbell and Corns 89-91). Both men had obtained graduate degrees, though at different colleges, which may have been a possible subject of discussions. While Goodall's sermons have not survived in print, what has survived is documentary evidence for an inspection of the Horton parish church, St. Michael's, in 1637. The inspection itself, which took place in August of 1637, was at the behest of John Williams, then the Bishop of Lincoln, who may have been sympathetic to clergymen like Goodall and who, at the time of the inspection, was at odds with Laud (Quintrell; Jones, "Horton Parish Church" 45-47; Sharpe 336-38). More specifically, the inspection report reveals that Goodall was something of a nonconformist who overlooked certain matters pertaining to the parish church that did not adhere to Laud's vision of the church: seats in the north and south sides of the chancel were not of uniform height; tombstones were laid the wrong way; strange preachers were allowed to preach, which is to say preachers who had not been licensed by a bishop; Goodall was warned for not reading from the prayer book and for not wearing the proper vestments; and the Milton family was among those cited for having seats that were too high (Jones, "Horton Parish Church" 48-50). Though the citations were addressed, Goodall, it seems, fits neatly within the category of puritans identified by Jeff Miller as a conformable nonconformist, a category of puritan ministers who maintained attitudes and practices of nonconformity but who adhered, generally, to certain aspects of ecclesiastical policy. Whether Goodall was following Stock, Gataker, or Young in conformable nonconformity can only be a matter of speculation. However, for Milton, Goodall's nonconformity meant that he was "both in and out of step" with the program of Laudian reform, and as such, he represents a certain sect of puritan divines who upheld their pastoral obligations while resisting conformity (Jones, "Horton Parish Church" 55). Most importantly, for Milton who in August 1637 was soon to compose *Lycidas*, the inspection provides "legitimate reasons for Milton's

---

"Milton's Life" and "Archival Landscape," and Campbell and Corns, *John Milton*, especially the chapter "Horton."

disaffection" with the Laudian church as well as a continued affection for ministers like Goodall who opposed such reforms while not shirking their ministerial duties (Jones, "Horton Parish Church" 50).

For much of Milton's life, clergymen like Stock, Gataker, Young, and Goodall had exemplified the proper concern for salvation through both the reformation of the Protestant individual and through the reform of the church, which was opposed to the overreach of Laudian reform during the 1630s. Whether or not it was the year Milton decided to pursue poetry rather than the ministry, the events of 1637 had been shaped by ideas of Protestant reform, parochial and national, that aligned generally with the puritan project of reform. It was this year that provided the platform for what was to follow in the 1640s when Milton would emerge in London not only as the apologist for his former tutor and friend, Thomas Young and for Stephen Marshall, among other puritan divines who sought ecclesiastical reform, but also as an advocate for intellectual reform.

In the early 1640s, then, when Milton became embroiled in a pamphlet controversy about the divine right of bishops within the English church, it is no surprise that the controversy centered on rising calls for religious reform in opposition to Laudian overreach in the 1630s. No less surprising, then, is the involvement of the puritan ministers Thomas Young and Stephen Marshall. The controversy began when Joseph Hall, the Bishop of Exeter, was prevailed upon by Laud to publically defend the divine right of episcopacy, a view fervently upheld by Laud and Charles. Hall, who in the 1630s had been accused of having puritan sympathies by Laudians and of having Laudian sympathies by puritans, held a more lenient view than Laud about asserting the divine right of the episcopal system.[16] Hall's defense of episcopacy, more generally, and liturgical matters, more specifically, began in 1640 with the publication of *Episcopacie by Divine Right Asserted*, which was altered by Laud to adhere more closely to his own ideas about episcopacy. Thereafter, in 1641, Hall published

[16] In "Popularity, Prelacy and Puritanism," Fincham and Lake discuss Hall's view of puritanism in the 1630s, and they note that Hall defended himself before Charles I on at least three occasions for his "indulgence towards puritans and frequent lecturing" (866).

An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, again in defense of the episcopal system of church governance. Shortly thereafter, a group of five puritan ministers issued a response under the pseudonym Smectymnuus. The pamphlet, published in February 1641, was *An Answer to a Booke entituled An Humble Remontrance*, and Smectymnuus was an acronym comprised of the initials of the puritan divines responsible for its publication: Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstowe. Several more pamphlets were to follow. In April of that year, Hall published a response, *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against the Frivolous and False Exceptions of Smectymnuus*. In June, the Smectymnuans published a response to Hall in which they attacked Hall and argued again for church reform. In July, as Hall was dealing with charges of impeachment, Milton published *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus* in which he assailed both Hall and episcopacy. The next year in 1642, Hall responded to Milton's *Animadversions* with *A Modest Confutation of a Slanderous and Scurrilous Libel, entitvled, Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus*. Thereafter, Milton responded with *An Apology against a Pamphlet Call'd a Modest Confutation*. At the heart of this exchange of pamphlets was the issue of ecclesiastical governance and liturgical reform. On one side was Hall, the apologist for episcopacy, forced into the position by Laud, and on the other were the Smectymnuans and Milton, the advocates for ecclesiastical and liturgical reform against the imposition of Laudian strictures. This controversy indicates the divisions within the church about episcopacy, and it more broadly indicates the desire for reform. Of this particular moment, John Morrill notes that "there was a broad consensus that the Laudian experiment had to be halted and reversed, but no agreement whether to attempt to restore 'the pure religion of Elizabeth and James' or to make a fresh start" ("The Church in England" 148). At this moment, Stephen Marshall and John Milton, who were both advocating against Hall specifically, and Laud more generally, would take very different paths in future discussions of reform: Marshall would use the pulpit and Milton the pamphlet.

Prior to being summoned to London at the behest of Parliament in 1640, Stephen Marshall was educated within the context of puritan reform and nonconformity. After graduating BA from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1618, Marshall served as a chaplain and lecturer in Essex before becoming the vicar of Finchingfield in 1625. In his time at Emmanuel, Marshall was trained in an atmosphere of nonconformity and puritan reform that nevertheless adhered to a traditional scholastic methodology. Marshall received a nontraditional education at the household seminary of Richard Blackerby in Ashen, Essex, where he learned to preach effectively. Like many Emmanuel graduates, Marshall remained moderate in his desire for reform, and he worked in official posts within the established church hierarchy. Throughout the 1630s as Laud implemented reforms, Marshall was one of the puritan clergy who resisted such reforms privately but adhered publically. However, Marshall's nonconformist attitude shifted from one of resistance to one of opposition when he entered the parliamentary pulpit in November of 1640. Throughout his sermons, Marshall exemplifies the puritan dedication to effective preaching, and an abiding concern for the reformation of morally corrupt behavior in order to create a puritan piety of salvation, both for every Protestant and for English Protestantism.

Marshall was one of four preachers who delivered sermons when Parliament was convened in 1640, and it was on 17 November, the anniversary of Queen Elizabeth's accession, that he delivered his first of many sermons to Parliament. In his sermon, Marshall speaks directly to the House of Commons about the "good worke of Reformation of Religion," and he admonishes the members to continue the work of reformation lest, "through feare, treachery, cowardise, pride, or sloth," they—and England—suffer the consequences (*A Sermon Preached* 3, 47). Then, in December 1641, Marshall delivered a more pointed sermon about the idea of reformation. In *Reformation and desolation: or, A Sermon tending to the Discovery of the Symptomes of a People to whom God will by no meanes be reconciled*, Marshall implores his audience to turn away from sin in order to turn God's wrath away from England. Marshall's turning echoes the turning in the sermon of Richard Stock

insofar as he was imploring the audience to turn away from sin and to turn toward God in order to avoid God's wrath. Additionally, there are also echoes of Gataker's broom at the close of the sermon. He asks that "every one" in the audience, in order to repair the corruption in both their souls and the city, "begin to sweep before our own door" (*Reformation and desolation* 51). In *Reformation and desolation*, Marshall's ideas of reform echo broader concepts of puritan reform that emerged earlier in the century and which are evidenced in the sermons of Richard Stock and Thomas Gataker.

In February of the following year, Marshall's tone would shift from the personal salvation of the English Protestant to that of a politically charged sermon without a single mention of reform. *Meroz Cursed*, Marshall's most fiery and most popular sermon, compels action with language that dramatizes spiritual reform. Marshall singles out individuals who oppose reform: enemies of the church, whether Catholic and the nascent Royalist party, or neutrals who "stand a loofe off, shewing themselves neither open enemies nor true friends" (*Meroz Cursed* 22-24). Marshall speaks directly to the audience, and he suggests that a curse will befall those who fail to take action or those who oppose God, which for Marshall was the side of puritan reform. The tenor of the sermon is action at a precarious moment, and it is the righteous action of a Protestant individual who will either be blessed or cursed. While his message is at times militant, Marshall ultimately compels his audience to pray, and in so doing, he seeks to create a godly individual who is willing to serve the church. It was sermons like this and preachers like Marshall who perhaps caused Thomas Hobbes, reflecting on the causes of the civil war after the restoration, to castigate seditious ministers. As a reformer, Marshall was primarily concerned with the salvation of the Protestant individual in order to create a Protestant nation. Though his sermons often had political implications, sometimes overt calls to action, Marshall's sermons demonstrate how puritan divines responded to the political events of the 1640s with consistent calls for the reformation of the individual in order that a Protestant ethos and morality of reform might remain the foundation of the English nation.

Just as Marshall would use the pulpit to effect the reformation of individuals through religious admonition, so Milton would use the pamphlet to consider the work of reformation as the work of individual reason. For Milton, the matter of reform may have been founded in the religious world of Thomas Young, Edward Goodall, and Stephen Marshall, but with his steady disillusionment with the clergy in the 1630s, reform would become an abstract, intellectual matter. For example, when he entered the Smectymnuan controversy with the publication of *Animadversions* in July 1641, Milton employs a mock-serious tone in a point-by-point refutation of Joseph Hall with the aim of revealing the truth. To reveal the truth, Milton employs "grim laughter" about the folly of Hall and of episcopacy, and he extols the virtues of this methodology because "for even this veine of laughing (as I could produce out of grave Authors) hath oft-times a strong and sinewy force in teaching and confuting" (*Animadversions* 3). Laughter was both a method for pointing out the folly of Hall and his argument and a means of education. In effect, Milton employed laughter as a reformative tool to reveal the truth. In defense of his chosen method, Milton further writes that it is the quickest way to the truth through a mass of sophistry: "Onely if it bee ask't why this close and succinct manner of coping with the Adversary was rather chosen, this was the reason chiefly, that the ingenuous Reader without further amusing himselfe in the labyrinth of controversall antiquity, may come the speediest way to see the truth vindicated, and Sophistry taken short at the first false bound" (4). While he does seem interested in his own power as an orator, Milton also quite seriously defends the "liberty of speaking" for "long persecuted Truth" (8). At the heart of his humorous refutation is a concern for truth as a distinct category that can be both revealed and discovered through laughter and education.

Milton would continue to elevate truth as something to be sought and cherished. While Marshall was interested in reformation as a means to create a mode of puritan piety, Milton was invested in the reformation of reason to ascertain the truth, which, at times, seems to be its own ontological category available to be revealed and discovered by the Protestant individual. In April 1642, when he published *An Apology* in response to Hall's *Modest Confutation*, Milton indicates that

they are beset "by a controversie of great importance" with "no hard solution," but Milton, modest as ever, has "resol'd (of what small moment soever I might be thought) to stand on that side where I saw both the plain authority of Scripture leading, and the reason of justice and equity perswading" (1). Milton's use of scripture to establish the truth about church governance was common among puritan reformers, and yet he is being led there by the persuasion of reason. Milton would later accuse Hall of attempting to "render odious the truth which I had written" (3). Milton's abiding concern for truth as a category able to be distinguished was a commonplace in his early prose work, and, in a sense, Milton upholds the concept of truth in order to subvert the truth being advocated by Hall about episcopacy.

Milton refined his sentiments into a neater position in 1644 when, writing in response to Parliament's Licensing Order in 1643, he published *Areopagitica; A Speech of Mr. John Milton For the Liberty of Vnlicenc'd Printing*. Here, Milton argues for the necessary existence of error, and he claims that encountering adverse positions allows the discernment of good from evil. Milton creates a militant Protestant ethos of reason by which the individual can discover the truth by apprehending vice "with all her baits and seeming pleasures" and still "prefer that which is truly better" (12). He goes on to say that "vice" and error" are necessary to "human vertue" and to the "confirmation of truth," but virtue and truth can only be ascertained by the application of reason to "all manner" of opinions (13). In the 1640s, Milton, as distinct from Marshall, emphasizes reason as a means to ascertain the truth, and reason becomes the foundation for a Protestant mode of piety. In various ways, the emphasis on reason underlies much of his work in the 1640s and 1650s, and for Milton, the language of reform is not a piety of salvation, but a piety of reason.

Calls for reform were not only religious but they were also political, and when Marchamont Nedham took up his pen alongside Thomas Audley for the parliamentarian newsbook *Mercurius Britanicus* (1643-46), the struggle for constitutional and ecclesiastical settlement had erupted into civil war. Of the "seditious whisperings" identified by Thomas Hobbes, Nedham's voice was the

loudest and most consistent clarion call for political opposition and stability in the period. For Nedham, whose political allegiance shifted, reform thrived on combative opposition between distinct sides that competed to justify political change or stability to the masses.[17] Backroom whisperings became the substance of his political writing. Along with regular fast sermons, the weekly newsbooks offered chances to understand the rapidly changing events of the time, albeit the information concerned political and martial matters rather than religious salvation. However, the early issues of *Britanicus* echo a Miltonic concern for truth. After all, Audley and Nedham wrote on behalf of Parliament, and thus their burden was to persuade, to convince, and to reform public opinion in order to justify the truth of the parliamentarian cause. Often, persuasion came at the expense of the Royalist party. For example, in a September 1643 issue of *Britanicus*, Audley and Nedham write, "He tells us of the many abhominable lies written by the brethren of *London* this weeke, Master *Aulicus*, hold your peace, I have made your Epitaph, here lies *Mercurius Aulicus*, and there lies *Mercurius Aulicus*" (4: 27). The "he" to whom Audley and Nedham refer was John Birkenhead, the man responsible for the Royalist counterpart and chief opponent of *Britanicus*, *Mercurius Aulicus*. With the pun on lies, Nedham implies that Birkenhead lied when reporting the news and thus *Aulicus* (i.e. the Royalist cause) itself was dead. *Britanicus*, then, claims sole responsibility for the truth and for the ideological, perhaps actual, death of *Aulicus* and royalism. Such antagonism in print was common; indeed, this is but a variation on the Smectymnuan debate about episcopacy. However, at stake here is not the proper mode of ecclesiastical governance, nor is it the capacity to discern truth, but it is control over truth itself as a means to justify the constitutional and ecclesiastical grievances of the parliamentarians who oppose Charles I. Thus, for Nedham, the language of reform was a mode of persuasion in which he manipulated truth for political ends.

[17] It has been suggested that Audley was primarily responsible for collecting the news and Nedham for writing the newsbooks, a claim which is supported by stylistic and tonal similarities between this newsbook and later work written solely by Nedham.

While the newsbooks were often a mixture of news, propaganda, and refutation of their opponents in print, they also featured editorial interjections. In one such instance in September 1644, Nedham provides a succinct justification of his aims in writing:

> I have got the successe I aimed at, the uncheating, the undeluding, the *undeceiving*, the *unmasquing*, the *uncovering*, the *un-Oxfording*, the *un-Bishoping*, and I hope the *un-Common-Prayering* of the Kingdom too: and now if any other (whose leasure serves them to write beyond all these) take up the notion of *Britannicus*, I must give him this advice, that he dip in the same Inke that I have done, that he spare neither *friend*, nor *foe*, that his *quill* be a pen for the Publicke onely, that he venture through the provocations both of friends and enemies, that he speake truth to the *King*, as well as to Common people, to Queenes, as well as to Gentlewomen of a lower Rancke, and now I must speake to all I writ to, in their severall classis, before I fold up my Paper. (51: 399-400)

For *Britanicus*, there are two competing narratives, that of the Parliament and that of the Royalist party. The truth of the one depends upon the negation of the other, which for Nedham means "the *un-Oxfording*, the *un-Bishoping*, and I hope the *un-Common-Prayering*" of England, all of which concern the puritan drive for reform in the House of Commons. A key distinction, however, between Nedham and the puritan ministers preaching to Parliament is that Nedham's newsbooks offer practical sense, often humorous, about the tumultuous events of the present rather than spiritual guidance.[18] Nedham only requires that his readers acknowledge the singular truth that stands before them: *Britanicus*, and *Britanicus* alone, delivers the truth that undeceives.

[18] In fact, it is worth remembering that the newsbooks were often called weekly intelligencers as if to suggest that they are primarily used to make sense of various events, and furthermore, the allusion to Mercury as bearer of divine truth to humanity would not have been lost at the time.

Of course, Nedham did not just write for Parliament, and after being imprisoned for seditious libel against the crown in 1646, he was sentenced never to publish again, a sentence which lasted until the following year when Nedham began writing *Mercurius Pragmaticus* (1647-49) on behalf of the king whom he had slandered. His political allegiance may have changed, but his methodology to espouse truth did not. In April 1648, Nedham offers another editorial comment about his purpose and his audience; he writes "only to tickle and charme the more vulgar phantsies, who little regard Truths in a grave and serious garb," and on this path he "must still continue" with the brief admonition that "in the midst of jest I am much in earnest" (1: 1-2). Nedham's sentiments echo those of Milton in *Animadversions* when humor reveals truth, yet Milton reveals the truth through humor while Nedham manipulates the truth through humor. Whereas he had earlier defended "the *un-Oxfording*, the *un-Bishoping*, and I hope the *un-Common-Prayering*" as an element of reform, in 1648 Nedham published a short apology for Charles I in which he condemns such actions as wicked and without regard for the common good. In *A Plea for the King, and Kingdome*, Nedham writes,

> For, it is a sure *Rule*, That those that seeke to make themselves *Lords*, by force of Armes, over their *fellow-subjects*, under pretence of reforming their *Princes defects* in government, are alwaies, if they have successe, more cruell and *tyrannous*, then those against whose government they fancied *Exceptions*; and regard the *common-good* no further, then it conduceth to their own wicked ends and purposes. (25)

Here, the truth that Nedham advocates is the negation of what he had negated when writing for Parliament, and he suggests that the "pretence of reforming" is but an extension of the cruel and tyrannical ideas of the parliamentarians seeking said reforms.

After being released from a second imprisonment, this time by Parliament for writing *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, Nedham changed his political allegiance. By this time, he had earned a reputation as a feared journalist, and when he returned to work as the official apologist and newsbook

author for Parliament, his censor was to be John Milton. In the proposal for *Mercurius Politicus* (1650-60), Nedham rehearses the language of his editorial comments in the 1640s, but the proposal he submitted to Milton contains a brevity that carefully distinguishes between fancy and reason, a distinction well known to Milton: "The designe of this Pamphlett being to vndeceive the People, it must bee written in a Jocular way, or else it will never bee cryed vp: ffor those truths which the Multitude regard not in a serious dresse, being represented in pleasing popular Aires, make Musick to the Comon sence, and charme the Phantsie; which ever swayes the Scepter in Vulgar Judgement; much more then Reason" (French 2: 311). Nedham's emphasis on truth and undeceiving through jocose language remains, but he articulates a new distinction of humor from reason. Whether Milton influenced Nedham in this matter remains subject to debate, but Nedham expresses a methodology of jocular persuasion at the expense of reason. As such, Nedham reveals truth through humorous negation of an opposing view rather than truth being discovered through rational examination. Writing about *Politicus* after the Restoration, the Royalist Anthony Wood reports that this newsbook "flew every week into all parts of the nation for more than 10 years," and it "had very real influence upon numbers of inconsiderable persons, such who have a strange presumption that all must needs be true that is in print" (French 2: 311). Indeed, when he first published *De corpore politico* in 1642, Hobbes identifies a key distinction between truth and belief: "And such is the Power of Eloquence, as many times a man is made to believe thereby, that he sensibly feeleth smart and damage, when he feeleth none, and to enter into rage and indignation, without any other cause, then what is in the words and passion of the speaker" (175). Nedham claims to write the truth in order to secure belief. The struggle for reform shifted from intellectual and religious matters to political justification through persuasive humor. Truth was neither salvific nor objective; it was a dynamic concept that could be manipulated to advocate for constitutional reform. Nedham's reform was neither pious nor rational but jocose, and it wrought death and damnation on the impious ideas of his opponents, and all for the common good.

In 1640, ecclesiastical issues emerge as the primary impetus for reform, but constitutional concerns about the monarchy intermingle with religious concerns. The writing of Marshall, Milton, and Nedham comes at a moment when long-standing ideas about church settlement meet revolutionary fervor. Prior to that moment, struggle indelibly defined the imagination of the reformers who sought ecclesiastical settlement, but struggle became a crisis when issues about settlement reached a crucial and violent apogee. The crisis of the Civil War period represents the continuing struggle in response to shifting opinions about constitutional and ecclesiastical tensions. The following chapters explore how the language of Stephen Marshall, John Milton, and Marchamont Nedham responds to the crisis of reform.

CHAPTER II

A Preacher and A Pulpit: Stephen Marshall's Sermons of Reform

In sermons delivered to Parliament in late 1641 and early 1642, Stephen Marshall preaches about reformation at a particularly precarious moment. The Earl of Strafford had been executed in May of 1641. Charles returned to London later that year in November, ostensibly for reconciliation, but he would attempt the arrest of the MPs responsible for the execution the following January. Archbishop William Laud was imprisoned. War was on the horizon. In December 1641, Marshall delivered *Reformation and desolation, or, A sermon tending to the discovery of the symptomes of a people to whom God will by no meanes be reconciled*, and he asks, "What kind of Reformation may meet with desolation?" (42). Given the prospect of political and religious change, this was a serious question for Marshall and for the Parliament to whom he preached. Marshall claims that reformation leads to desolation when sincere reformers are so few that the multitude may be judged by the actions of those few. To avoid desolation, he desires the sincere reformation both of the individual and of society, and his language suggests that the telos of reformation must be "turned home to God" (42). If not, he warns, collective reformation will fail, and collective destruction will ensue.

While *Reformation and desolation* raises questions about the nature of reformation, a sermon delivered in February 1642 was to become Marshall's most famous and vehement call for change. In *Meroz Cursed*, he emphasizes spiritual guilt in order to prompt religious and political action, and he admonishes the nascent Royalist party for their actions that caused the recent civil

unrest. Throughout the sermon, Marshall implores his audience to learn about individual duty and initiate change in accord with acting. Through a careful examination of God's curse against Meroz in Judges 5, Marshall underscores the culpability of those who fail in God's cause. Their failure becomes a monument for going forward: "Looke upon mee, and learne your own duty, *Looke upon me, and take heed of disserting the cause and Church of God, when they stand in neede of you*" (4). The cautionary monument extends beyond the individual, and Marshall takes care to stress cooperation as essential for success: "And so consequently, the good or gaine of the whole is the gaine of every member, and whatsoever tends to the dissolution of the whole, cannot but be destructive to all the parts" (19). While over time the link between the individual and society becomes commonplace, Marshall consistently stresses its centrality for broader religious and political reform. In *Meroz Cursed*, more so than in his other sermons, he juxtaposes individual guilt and collective culpability with reform and action.

Though first delivered in February 1642, *Meroz Cursed* would be preached over 60 times in the ensuing years, and its popularity catapulted Marshall and his pulpit into the public eye as visible focal points of change. In such a divisive political and religious environment, his voice became a consistent presence throughout London in the 1640s, and he was often employed by Parliament to reinforce their political and religious views at prominent moments. Reflecting on Marshall's role in the Civil War period after the Restoration, Thomas Fuller characterizes his popularity, his presence, and, perhaps most importantly, his prudence:

> In the late *long lasting Parliament,* no man was more gracious with the principal Members thereof. He was their *Trumpet,* by whom they *sounded* their solemn *Fasts,* preaching more *publick Sermons* on that occasion, then any *foure* of his Function. In their *Sickness* he was their *Confessor* in their *Assembly* their *Councellour,* in their *Treaties* their *Chaplain,* in their *Disputations* their *Champion*. He was of so *supple* a *soul* that he *brake not a joynt,* yea, *sprained*

> *not a Sinew* in all the alteration of times; and his friends put all on the account, not of his *unconstancy,* but *prudence,* who in his own practice (as they conceive) Reconciled the various Lections of Saint *Pauls precept, serving the Lord, and the Times*. (53)

Though Thomas Hobbes would certainly number Marshall one of the many "seditious Presbyterian ministers" at fault for civil war, Fuller offers a more subtle portrait. Rather than a Hobbesian revolutionary who became the political instrument of Parliament, Fuller observes a clergyman who exercised caution and prudence to remain attentive to his pastoral duties throughout a tumultuous period. Marshall emerges as a moderate puritan with the capacity to adapt and to reconcile his role as a godly minister with his role as a voice for ecclesiastical and political reform. How was Marshall able to navigate through such a difficult, complex, and divisive moment? How did his moderate puritanism allow him to become the most prominent voice for reform in the pulpit?

This chapter explores Marshall's reformist inclinations in order to illustrate how his most prolific sermons provide spiritual sustenance for those who hear and for those who read them.[19] The first part of the chapter explores Marshall's religious and educational training at Emmanuel College, Cambridge and at the household seminary of Richard Blackerby in Ashen, Essex. At Emmanuel, he received a traditional education from nonconformist puritans like Sir Walter Mildmay and Laurence Chaderton, who exemplified moderation. At Blackerby's household

[19] I approach this study of Marshall as a reader coming to printed sermons rather than as a listener responding to preached sermons. Reading and hearing sermons are different experiences, and the early modern audience was particularly responsive when hearing sermons performed in the pulpit, which underscores the significance of effective sermonizing. For example, Hunt says that sermons "were designed not merely to impart doctrinal information but to elicit an affective response from the audience" who "develop[ed] techniques of listening that enabled them to form an emotional rapport with the preacher, even to put themselves in the preacher's place by appropriating the sermon for their own use and preaching it back to themselves and others" (11). For a complete discussion on hearing early modern sermons, see Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, and Patrick Collinson, "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism."

seminary, he developed the vocational skills that allowed him to become an effective puritan minister. The second part of the chapter situates Marshall within the political and ecclesiastical context for reform that emerges in 1640 and offers an examination of four sermons beginning with the aforementioned *Reformation and desolation* and *Meroz Cursed*. In addition to those sermons, *A Divine Project to Save a Kingdome* and *A Sacred Record to be Made of Gods Mercies to Zion* will illustrate how Marshall's moderate background allowed him to adapt in a rapidly changing political environment. In each of the sermons, he employs distinct ideas about reform in response to particular moments, but for him, individual salvation and the godly community remain primary interests. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Marshall's spiritual and ecclesiastical ideas in relation to John Milton's idea of intellectual reform in a pamphlet controversy concerning episcopacy in the early 1640s. The profile of Marshall that emerges—as a moderate and conformable reformer—falls short of what many might expect a preacher to be in such a divisive period, a religious radical. Indeed, the ensuing account of his education and analysis of his sermons makes clear that Marshall, first and foremost, sees reform as a spiritual matter of individual salvation. By emphasizing the innate spiritual guilt of the Protestant individual, he capitalizes on the interrelatedness of the individual within a community to promote unity through resistance and opposition. Not limited by the religious sphere of discourse in which his language operates, Marshall nevertheless pursues church reform within proscribed limits. His approach appears on display in the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly where he neither condones nor advocates disruptive or experimental ecclesiastical reform. Instead Marshall, from his pulpit or within the Assembly debates, works within and through the existing traditional church structures to offer ecclesiastical, political, and spiritual guidance for English Protestants.

1

Marshall's nonconformity developed slowly and derived from college mandates to which he was subjected as a student and from personal experiences during his college and ministerial

training. The formative influences for Marshall include Sir Walter Mildmay, John Garnons, Richard Blackerby, and, indirectly, Laurence Chaderton, in many ways the archetypal puritan reformer. At Emmanuel College, Sir Walter Mildmay, the founder, instituted mandates that were reformist and nonconformist in outlook and practice. John Garnons, his tutor at Emmanuel, not only informed his ideas of the ministry but also secured Marshall his first post at Wethersfield (Webster, *Godly Clergy* 23). After Emmanuel, Marshall became Vicar of Finchingfield, but, perhaps most significant to his development as a minister, he participated in Blackerby's informal seminary. Finally, in the figure of Laurence Chaderton, Marshall received an education in classical humanism supplemented with the logic of Peter Ramus, owing to Chaderton's interest in Ramist logic, but he also indirectly learned how to moderate his nonconformity. Lessons learned at Emmanuel and in the years following allowed Marshall to utilize his pastoral vocation to serve the political aims of his superiors in Parliament. Ultimately, Marshall's ability to dramatize guilt in the pulpit to prompt political action stems from his time at Emmanuel College and in Essex more generally.

From its beginning, Emmanuel College, Cambridge was an institution of nonconformity. Sir Walter Mildmay obtained the license to establish the college from Queen Elizabeth in January 1584, and the following year in October, Mildmay wrote the statutes for the college, which he modeled on those of the moderately puritan Christ's College. He insisted that the college produce effective, educated clergy, and according to L.L. Ford, "Emmanuel College was firmly puritan in outlook but the intention was to provide a more highly educated protestant clergy, with better training in preaching, a natural reflection on the founder, who understood, and relied upon, the persuasive power of effective speech" ("Mildmay"). Though Emmanuel College earned a reputation for nonconformity in the years following its establishment, Mildmay himself embodied moderation. Lehmberg recounts an exchange between Queen Elizabeth and Mildmay. When the queen said to him that he had established a Puritan foundation, Mildmay remarked, "no, madam,

far be it from me to countenance anything contrary to your established laws; but I have set an acorn which, when it becomes an oak, God alone knows what will be the fruit thereof" (Ford, "Mildmay"). His response hints at a moderate, reforming puritanism that works within the bounds of royal authority rather than contrary to it. Mildmay's tact demonstrates the efficacy of speech as a moderate reformist, and the majority at Emmanuel followed his example of moderation.

That Mildmay felt compelled to establish Emmanuel College in an effort to further the process of reform was perhaps not unexpected. According to Morgan, wholesale reform of the universities was "never more than a remote possibility," and he adds that "Puritans perforce looked away from the cumbersome legal machinery of the universities, and toward the individual colleges – self-governing bodies which, within the bounds of their charters, enjoyed immense liberty" (245). The structure and statutes of the college reflect Mildmay's nonconformity, and even the college chapel "remained unconsecrated" and "faced northwards where all other chapels looked east" (248). In addition to its physical structure, Emmanuel followed several other nonconformist practices: the college did not make use of the Book of Common Prayer; for communion, Emmanuel admitted the entire college rather than the customary ministers and deacons; and the rules for clothing were different from other colleges (248). On account of these practices, many treat the college as a "house of nonconformity," which "also was the verdict of contemporary opinion" as William Laud wanted to cleanse Emmanuel in the 1630s (247). For example, according to the Emmanuel puritan Samuel Rogers, whose father Daniel took a BD from Emmanuel in 1608 and who was suspended by Laud in 1629 for nonconformity, the college became unrecognizable as a place of conformity (Yiannikkou, "Daniel Rogers"). In a diary entry of 1636, Samuel Rogers calls the college a "sinful decaying universitye," and he describes it as a "colledge much declined and vanishing into shadowes and formalitye; many of the fellows bowing at Jesus; Lord be merciful to the place" (qtd. in Webster, *Godly Clergy* 178). That Rogers

laments the decline of Emmanuel under Laudianism underscores its previous reputation as a nonconformist college.

In the college statutes, Mildmay provides many examples of what might be regarded as an ideology of puritan reformism. For example, he required the Masters at the college to take an oath that privileged scripture at the expense of orthodox opinion: "I will set the authority of Scripture before the judgment of even the best of men . . .; I will refute all opinions that be contrary to the Word of God, and that I will in the cause of religion always set what is true before what is customary, what is written before what is not written" (qtd. in Morgan 249). Because the oath emphasizes the truth and "what is written" while rejecting custom, Emmanuel stressed individual interpretation of scripture, which fostered an effective clergy that both adhered to and even exceeded Mildmay's moderate puritanism. In its founding ideology, even in its physical structure, Emmanuel became the embodiment of nonconformity. If Mildmay merely planted an acorn, the oak and fruit became Emmanuel itself and the clergymen who were educated there.

While at Emmanuel, Marshall received formal and informal instruction. Formally, training had more to do with habit of mind than with content: lectures adhered to the scholastic methodology of questions leading to further questions; dialectical disputations required disputants either to defend or to object, which often made these exercises adversarial; and declamations allowed the student to perform rhetorically on a given subject (Bendall et al. 70). These elements of education, however, "were evidently for many undergraduates less rewarding ways of spending time than constant, even daily, exposure to one-to-one or small group instruction by their tutors" (Bendall et al. 72). John Garnons, Marshall's tutor, played a significant role in his scholastic and humanist education, and an account of the curriculum and of Garnons's connections to Suffolk will illuminate much about Marshall's later views.

The Emmanuel curriculum contributed much to the methodology and style of Marshall's sermons, but Ramus emerged as most significant. The lecturers at Emmanuel were encouraged to teach Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero, and as part of the curriculum before the end of the sixteenth century, "undergraduates studied Greek, Ramus' *Logic* and Aristotle's *Organon*, *Ethics*, *Politics* and *Physics*, and if time permitted, also Phyrgius' *Natural Philosophy*" (Morgan 250). Ramus's *Logic*, in particular, provided a foundational methodology to explicate scripture in sermons in order to dramatize individual experience. Ramus gained popularity in the universities, particularly certain colleges at Cambridge, during the Elizabethan and Jacobean reigns because of its opposition to the predominant Aristotelian system that "had no real application to living *experience*" (Morgan 106). More specifically, Ramus appealed to puritan ministers because he suggested an interrelatedness between the individual and the divine that allowed the minister to demonstrate how the individual experience might partake in the divine (107). In other words, Ramism provided the minister with a structure in which the subject became an essential part within Protestantism, and it also provided a sound method by which preachers might single out and stress the individual's role within the hierarchy of the universe. For Marshall, as evidence from the sermons will show, preaching facilitated the practical matter of individual reform and salvation. He was concerned with the lived experience of those in his care, but he also stressed the relationship of the individual to the universal project of reformation, or possibly of desolation. In the abstract, Marshall's sermons link the divine universality of God with the rational, lived experience of the Protestant individual, and in a practical sense, Marshall dramatizes this relationship so that his audience can discover, through the process of self-examination and reflection, their individual place in a universal hierarchy.

Ramist logic was deductive, which allowed for the discovery of truth rather than its invention, and this method compelled puritans "to explain the coordination of the human individual struggle with the external universe" (Morgan 111). Thus, puritan preachers animated

their sermons with self-examination as the focal point while asking that individuals discover their place as part of a reformed, English Protestantism. As John Morgan notes, puritan ministers "used Ramism not because it removed blockages to the free use of reason, but rather because it was so constructed that it allowed only one direction for man's reason" (111). Ramist logic allowed ministers to direct the individual experience toward the Christian world. While such direction emphasized the power of the individual to discover a Protestant truth, at the same time, the deft minister also created a vision of a reformed Protestant that suited the ideological aims of the minister and his employers. In his sermons, Marshall relies upon his classical humanist education in rhetoric, but perhaps more precisely, he utilizes the structure of Ramist logic to emphasize individual reason, which allowed him to deliver sermons without the need for rhetorical flourish but rather to proceed with logical precision. Marshall's education provided him with the tools to emphasize the individual experience as essential to the larger project of reform, and it allowed him to demonstrate how English Protestants participated in a divinely ordered universe.[20]

Still, John Garnons's connection to Suffolk offers some general insight into Emmanuel as a locus for training and placing clergymen in an established religious system. Garnons laments the death of Edward Lewkenor of Suffolk in an elegy appended to a sermon delivered in 1636 by Tymothy Oldmayne, *Lifes Brevitie and Deaths Debility*. By this time, the link between the Lewkenor family of Suffolk and Emmanuel College had been well established because this was the third such person in the Lewkenor family to be eulogized by men of Emmanuel. In 1604, the sons of Sir Edward Lewkenor of Denham returned home from Emmanuel to escape an outbreak of plague; however, a friend who had returned with them became infected with smallpox, and after being infected themselves, both Lewkenor parents died within a day (Bendall et al. 67).

[20] For a discussion about the identify of an English Protestant, Bendall et al. mention that nonconformity at Emmanuel "would become, not a minor scruple about a piece of white linen cloth, but a different conception of what it was to be a Christian, and an Englishman" (179). Marshall's own moderate puritanism, nonconformity, and Presbyterianism can be seen as part of the project to create a reformed identity of the Protestant living in England.

Following the tragedy, epitaphs were published in *Threnodia, or Funerall verses upon the death of the right worshipfull Sir Edward Lewkenor knight and Madame Susan his lady*. Among the contributors were graduates of Emmanuel College and future bishops: William Bedell and Joseph Hall. The participation of Garnons, Bedell, and Hall illustrates the close link between college and county, links which were common in the seventeenth century: "The university itself was at one and the same time a melting pot, imposing a common formative experience on young men from diverse backgrounds and different regions, while actually consolidating county identities and contributing to regional differentiation" (Bendall et al. 63). Emmanuel became most fervently associated with the puritanism in two counties: Suffolk and Essex. In these counties, Marshall begins his career with the help of John Garnons (Webster, "Stephen Marshall"). Marshall's tutelage under Garnons no doubt provided the formal aspects of education in the scholastic and humanist traditions, but more broadly, the social connections between Garnons and Suffolk reinforce a project of reform within the existing framework of the church, specifically at the local level of the county household and parish. As Tom Webster points out, the "life-cycle" of a "godly cleric" begins in the university but soon moves "into the country, to household seminaries and to meetings for further education, and then on into the mature ministry" (*Godly Clergy* 13). With the guidance and connections of Garnons, Marshall transitioned away from the university first to Suffolk and thereafter to Essex where he continued on the godly path.

In the years after taking his BA from Emmanuel College in 1618, Marshall occupied various positions and continued to develop as a popular preacher with a nonconformist ideology. In the years immediately following his time at Emmanuel, he became the household chaplain to the Barnardiston family in Suffolk, which is perhaps owing to the connections of Garnons and Emmanuel more generally.[21] Then, in 1619, he was a lecturer at Wethersfield before becoming

[21] For information on chaplains, see Adlington, Lockwood, and Wright, eds., *Chaplains in Early Modern England*, especially the chapter by Kenneth Fincham, "The Roles and Influence of Household Chaplains, c. 1600-c. 1660."

ordained deacon in December of the same year, and three months later, he was ordained priest. He remained at Wethersfield until October 1625 when he became the Vicar of Finchingfield, a position he would retain throughout his time in London beginning in 1640 until his death in 1655. As Vicar, he became "renowned for his preaching, delivering moving sermons in a direct fashion with rather more passion than rhetorical decoration" (Webster, "Stephen Marshall"). He developed his famed style of sermonizing in the years preceding his post at Finchingfield. On the border between Suffolk and Essex situated in a community with like-minded puritans, Blackerby's informal seminary provided younger clergymen like Marshall with practical opportunities to become effective preachers.

Following the Dedham conference in the 1580s, practical training of preachers was conducted in household seminaries in which inexperienced preachers were trained by established ministers, a practice especially prominent in puritan counties (Morgan 296-97; Bendall et al., 193). Like the atmosphere at Emmanuel College, the seminaries were centers of nonconformity, though it is difficult to characterize them as a whole given that they were largely run by men who were no longer associated with the Church of England. As John Morgan points out, the majority of these seminaries "ceased to exist in the 1630s upon the death of their founders," which suggests that the seminaries were centers of individual interest rather than widespread and organized nonconformity, and household seminaries were places where resistance rather than opposition to conformist ideology was practiced (299). Thus, seminaries reflected the character of those who ran them, and perhaps the most famous of these household seminaries was that of Richard Blackerby. He was a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, who was renowned for his ability in Hebrew and scriptural exegesis (Yiannikkou, "Richard Blackerby;" Morgan 118). So formidable was the erudition and authority of Blackerby that Daniel Rogers, the 1608 Emmanuel graduate suspended by Laud in 1629, said that "he could never come into the presence of Mr. *Blackerby* without some kind of trembling upon him; because of the Divine Majesty and Holiness

which seemed to shine in him" (Clarke 65). However, because of his nonconformity and ecclesiastical principles, he was never ordained, though he served as chaplain and minister at various times in his life. In addition to his puritanical principles, Blackerby's connection with Emmanuel was perhaps through the Lewkenor family of Suffolk as he lived with Sir Edward Lewkenor in the 1590s following his time at Trinity College. After being deprived of his position as minister in Norfolk for nonconformity, Blackerby moved to Ashen, Essex in 1603 where for the next 23 years he would hold the informal seminary.

Little can specifically be said of household seminaries, but they generally developed vocational skills that supplemented university training, which allowed experienced men like Blackerby to "turn learned graduates into worthy ministers before they met their congregations" (Morgan 293). Training at the seminary might be divided into more formal elements of biblical exegesis and informal influence from senior ministers. Of the traditional elements taught by Blackerby were Hebrew, scriptural exegesis and study, and divinity (Yiannikkou, "Richard Blackerby;" Morgan 297). Having been trained in Ramist logic at Emmanuel, Marshall would have observed how to implement such logic in sermons for a lay audience at the seminary. In addition to the more traditional elements, Marshall received ministerial training of the sort that focused on the style of his sermonizing. According to Morgan, the "seminaries, offering young graduates frequent opportunities to preach (out of the eye of the church authorities) and to be helpfully evaluated, likely contributed heavily to the perpetuation and wide propagation of the puritan 'plain style'" (296). The seminary complemented Emmanuel, and it positioned Marshall to transition from formal education to practical application as an effective minister.

In terms of his indirect influence, Blackerby's character offers much evidence because it was from him that Marshall would have learned about the role of scriptural exegesis in sermons designed to prompt godliness and holiness. Indeed, Blackerby's style "was not altogether in the usual manner, but much in opening the Scripture, and making excellent, spiritual, short

observations, and brief and close Applications" (Morgan 296). Much of this style of sermonizing has its roots in the puritan practice of prophesying, but Blackerby seems to have been particularly adept at reforming the older style of sermons. In Blackerby's unusual—perhaps reformed—style of sermons, Marshall witnessed the practical application of scripture to the project of reform in the audience, and it was an application that offered structured guidance for the individual experience. Clarke records that Blackerby "was a mighty man in wounding Consciences by the Sword of the Spirit, and in healing them by the Blood of Jesus. His Voice used not to be very loud, but his Preaching was accompanied with such an Authority of the Divine presence and power of the Spirit, that Souls fell exceedingly under the Yoke of Christ by his Ministry" (59). Blackerby's methodology focuses on biblical authority and scriptural exegesis as the foundation for the sermon. He prompted reform, then, by "wounding Consciences," which required him to depict individuals as sinful so that "healing" became a necessary component of the Protestant experience. Blackerby taught Marshall that scriptural exegesis provides a foundation for sermons, and in order to reform the reprobate, the sermon must focus on the individual conscience and possibility for reform as part of Protestant England. Additionally, his ecclesiastical nonconformity and lack of ordination would have been a stark contrast to Marshall's own ideas about the project of reform within the established framework of the church. Though he distanced himself from the outright nonconformity of Blackerby, Marshall learned much about the practical aspects of preaching to effect reform of individuals.

Under the mastership of Laurence Chaderton, students at Emmanuel benefited from clerical training and indirectly learned how to moderate radical, nonconformist tendencies.[22] In Chaderton, Mildmay saw an exemplary puritan reformer, and, in fact, Mildmay reportedly would

[22] For a more detailed discussion about the character of Laurence Chaderton and his participation in the Hampton Court Conference, see Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, especially chapters 1, 3, and 10, and Arnold Hunt's "Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference." The discussion here owes much to their accounts.

not have founded the college if Chaderton declined to be its master (Ford; Collinson, "Chaderton;" Shuckburgh 7). Like Mildmay, Chaderton remained loyal to the Elizabethan church and government and sought to educate and train effective clergymen (Ford). For example, he instituted additional conferences designed to prepare divinity students for the ministry, and during these conferences, held in secret, participants would study and explicate scripture (Webster, *Godly Clergy* 17-18; Lake, *Moderate Puritans* 36-37). These conferences were perhaps not unlike the household seminaries that many students would attend following their time at Emmanuel. Chaderton's intellectual and religious character was something of a contradiction. Some call him a "kind of nonconformable conformist," but Arnold Hunt's study of Chaderton's annotations reveal a more nuanced portrait: "a lifelong Presbyterian, a reluctant semi-conformist and a student of resistance theory; in short, a man of radical views" (Bendall et al. 181; Hunt, "Laurence Chaderton" 223).[23] His contradictory character illustrates how a clergyman can moderate private "radical views," even presbyterianism, for the "sake of the greater good of working within the established system" (Bendall et al. 178). As Hunt recounts, the "stability of the Elizabethan settlement depended on the ability of moderate puritans to persuade their radical brethren to remain in communion with the Church of England rather than lapsing into separatism" ("Laurence Chaderton" 207). Chaderton's intellectual outlook highlights the complexity of the period in which puritanism meant many different things, and that men such as Mildmay and Chaderton had conflicting, even contradictory, views about conformity indicates the distinction between private, intellectual ideas about reform and its public application in an established system.

[23] In *Moderate Puritans*, Lake argues for Chaderton's presbyterianism by examining a 1584 sermon published anonymously but which he attributes to Chaderton. Lake notes that the "actual text of the sermon corresponds almost exactly with Chaderton's other known attitudes and in fact provides a beautiful example of the moderate, respectable puritan attitude to presbyterianism (27). For the full discussion, see pages 26-35.

A fuller picture of Chaderton's character as moderate reformer emerges at the Hampton Court Conference in early 1604 and in the Lambeth Papers. The conference considered ecclesiastical—and to some degree, puritan—reform under the watchful eye of James I who sought to settle the question of his church; however, moments of the conference were clearly designed to enforce conformity on Chaderton, Emmanuel, and other puritan delegates (Lake, *Moderate Puritans* 243; Bendall et al. 179-180). Chaderton and other puritans maintained a "studied moderation" that "studiously ignored and avoided" radical puritanism in an attempt to frame nonconformity in its "relative offensiveness and inoffensiveness" (Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 248). Such moderation allowed him to successfully navigate between the Scylla and Charybdis of puritan radicals who sought reform and Jacobean authority that sought stability. Lake calls the result of the strategy a "tie" that allowed the puritans to "fight another day" (248). It is reported that at tense moments of the conference, Chaderton sat "mute as any fish," and in his few remarks, he advocated for the right of ministers neither to wear the surplice nor to make the sign of the cross (Bendall et al. 180). In the Lambeth Papers, his puritanism emerges as "a halfway house between simple conformity and outright nonconformity" (Bendall et al. 183). Chaderton also writes that the ceremonies of the established church be used "to purchase and procure liberty to win souls by preaching the Gospel" (qtd. in Bendall et al. 185). For Chaderton, then, the line was drawn: his private interests in radical presbyterian and puritan reform were secondary to practical and public interests in reform through the salvation of souls by preaching within the ceremonial boundaries of the established church, even while advocating for ministers who did not conform to established ceremony.

Marshall's moderate puritanism follows the model of Chaderton. As Miller notes, there are several recognizable categories of puritan: zealous, moderate, and conformable (73). In general, however, puritans from Emmanuel fit into two categories: "A minority remained radical and unreconstructed Puritans, unemployable or deployed on the fringes of the establishment and

in pockets of private puritan patronage" but the "majority moderated their Puritanism (without necessarily losing its essence), and some became serviceable and successful pillars of the establishment" (Bendall et al. 81-82). Like Chaderton, Marshall's own religious sensibilities are moderate, but also something of a contradiction. He was certainly a puritan, a presbyterian, a congregationalist, conformable but not conformist, and also a nonconformist. However, he was no radical. While the majority of "unreconstructed Puritans" departed for either the Low Countries or New England, some, like the early Emmanuel graduate John Rogers, remained in England. Rogers and Marshall both exhibit nonconformist tendencies, but an example from 1631 illustrates that where Marshall moderated his views to remain within the church, Rogers did not.

As lecturer of Dedham in Essex from 1605-1636, Rogers earned a reputation as a passionate minister, yet he often ran afoul of ecclesiastical authority. During sermons, he impersonated God, threatened parishioners, made dramatic use of the canopy supports over the pulpit to roar at his audience, and moved his audience to tears so that sermon gadders often went "to Dedham to get a little fire" (qtd. in Yiannikkou, "John Rogers").[24] Though an effective preacher, he attracted the attention of church authorities. Giles Firmin, a contemporary of Rogers in the 1620s, reports that he conformed but neglected the surplice and recited prayers from memory rather than reading them, but most striking is Firmin's report that during his preaching, he would "draw his finger around his throat, and say, let them take me and hang me up, so they will but remove these stumbling Blocks out of the Church" (qtd. in Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 191). Rogers's antics and occasional conformity led him inevitably to Laud, then Bishop of London, in September 1631. Laud pressed Rogers to ascent to official ceremony and liturgy, but he declined. Laud suspended him.

[24] Sermon gadding was the practice of attending sermons outside of one's parish. The practice caused much contention. According to Arnold Hunt, the practice was a "sign of godly zeal" for puritans who endorsed the practice (not all did) as well as a "legal grey area" for anti-puritans who claimed that the 1552 Act of Uniformity required attendance in the parish church (*Art* 190). For the full discussion, see Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, pages 190-203.

By contrast, the following day on 4 September, Laud summoned Marshall along with three other puritan ministers, Samuel Wharton, Edmund Brewer, and Daniel Rogers. All were suspected of nonconformity, and when he spoke on behalf of the godly group, Marshall moderated his private views to indicate his conformable nature. Webster, who examined the Winthrop Papers, quotes from them and recounts the exchange between Marshall and Laud:

> "Mr Mar[shall] said he was misinformed. Ay but said he [Laud] do you conforme always? He ans[wered] he did somet[imes] but not alwa[ys.] he was much employed in preaching and in catec[hising] the youth. The B[ishop] ans[wered,] your prea[ching] I like wel and your Catec wondrous well but I mislike your answers, (which he spoke angerly) you wear the Surplesse sometimes, and then you lay it aside from you for a long time, and what say your people then?" (qtd. in *Godly Clergy* 194)

"Sometimes but not always" characterizes much puritan nonconformity. However, when confronted by ecclesiastical authority, Marshall's capacity to moderate his views in order to maintain his clerical status and living separated him from the "unreconstructed radicals" like Rogers. Though likely unknown to Marshall, Chaderton demonstrated moderation at the Hampton Court Conference. When asked about the practice of sitting at Communion in Emmanuel, Chaderton replied that "they had some kneeling also" (qtd. in Hunt, "Laurence Chaderton" 213). Marshall and Chaderton dodge the issue, and unlike Rogers, Marshall's case was dismissed, which, in Lake's words, allowed him to "fight another day."

Marshall and Chaderton held intellectually nuanced ideas concerning church governance and reform, but they shared a sincere interest in the spiritual reformation of the Protestant individual through pastoral care and preaching while remaining within the established church. Like the majority of other Emmanuel graduates, Marshall may have privately held nonconformist

attitudes, but he moderated those ideas to work within extant church hierarchy and governance for the reformation of individuals through his preaching. At Emmanuel College, then, Mildmay and Chaderton exemplified the attitude of puritan nonconformity and reform that was conformable to the existing episcopate. Garnons functioned within this general framework to tutor and position Marshall within the social context of the godly in Essex. Marshall's own moderate puritanism follows the model of Chaderton, and his behavior when summoned before ecclesiastical authority allowed him to maintain a living that ultimately positioned him for further reformation in the coming years. Thus, when nonconformity moved from resistance to Laudian ceremonialism in the 1630s to outright opposition in the 1640s, Marshall had been and would remain an integral part of the reformist movement.

When called by the Parliament to preach, Marshall's sermons exhibited the broader interests of reform he learned at Emmanuel College and the exegetical and practical elements of sermonizing he learned at Blackerby's seminary, but with a twist. Marshall often anticipates or responds to particular moments, and by tuning his sermons to momentous events, Marshall turns the pulpit into a platform for ecclesiastical and constitutional reform that was founded upon the ideas learned during his developmental years. Marshall's reformed, Protestant ideology means that he remained interested in individual salvation. However, by using the pulpit for political aims, he unifies the audience in opposition to ecclesiastical conformity, which heretofore hindered the project of establishing a godly England.

2

By November 1640, mistrust of the existing power structure brewed, and questions about reform circulated. At that time, according to John Morrill's account, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, was the "most feared man in England," Archbishop Laud the "most detested," and Charles I the most suspected of Catholic sympathies and of a "partial royal tyranny" ("Religious

Context" 50, 54). The constitutional reformers portrayed Charles I as "a particular monarch" whose "misgovernment" and "misuse of agreed powers" resulted in a "lack of trust" (50-51, 60). Yet, constitutional reform was buried under the deluge of publications from 1640 until late 1642 concerned with the necessity for ecclesiastical reform, which, for some, meant a wholesale reordering of the church along "pure biblical lines" (56). In addition to the impeachment and execution of Strafford in May 1641 and the imprisonment of Laud following the Grand Remonstrance later that year, there was a general attack on churchmen not seen in the political arena. In December 1640, thirteen bishops were impeached, and another twelve were impeached in December of the following year (56-57). That contemporary printed material focuses on religious grievances about the impeachment of bishops rather than political issues like the arrest of MPs by Charles indicates the significance of religious questions about reform (61). For some in Parliament, it was not simply "ecclesiastical reconstruction," but the "Elizabethan settlement was to be dismantled and reconstituted" more broadly in the project of "building a godly commonwealth" (51, 66). Though hostilities between Charles I and Parliament did not erupt until later in 1642, ideas about reform received much consideration and led to serious consequences.

As a reforming clergyman, Marshall was not a man apart, a voice in the wilderness. By 1640, others shared his concern for change, and many felt compelled to speak out against the Laudian statutes and the comprehensive program that the Archbishop and his supporting clergymen imposed throughout the 1630s. As Morrill has noted, Laudianism had to be "halted and reversed," but the methodology for such halting and reversing was an emerging question ("The Church in England" 148). While ideas for reform were fluid, many saw the pulpit as the most advantageous place from which to rehearse any and all approaches to it. When Parliament convened in November 1640, the House of Commons set aside two days to mark the occasion. The first was Queen Elizabeth's Day, 17 November, a day for general fasting with sermons in the

morning and afternoon.[25] The second, 29 November, would include sermons accompanying the taking of the sacrament. The House of Commons selected four men to preach: Stephen Marshall and Cornelius Burges preached on Queen Elizabeth's day, John Gauden and George Morley eleven days later.[26] A single subject comprised the activities of both days—reform.

Marshall and Burges address political and religious stability in the wake of social unrest and conflict that had made an indelible mark on the 1630s. Marshall implores the House of Commons to continue the "good worke of [the] Reformation of Religion" in order to secure stability. Burges, like Marshall, seeks godly reformation, and he preaches "to perswade" the House of Commons "into a *Religious Covenant with God*, as himselfe hath prescribed and commanded; and, his people, in the best times of Reformation have readily admitted" (57). Both clergymen offer religious and political critiques designed to impress upon members of Parliament their role in initiating and implementing various kinds of reform. The work of godly reformation, the two sermon-givers insist, cannot take place in isolation.

A consideration of a third preacher of the featured four, John Gauden, provides a more tempered, intellectual, and abstract approach to the work of reformation. He exhorts the House of Commons to pursue "Truth, Peace, and Love; all eminent in God, and from him" (4). In his sermon, *The Love of Truth and Peace*, Gauden describes what would become a commonplace throughout the 1640s: the uncertainty of truth in political and religious language that fosters divisive opinion through printed material. He writes,

---

[25] This day has definite political and religious associations with the Elizabethan Church. It was perhaps wished that the ideas of reform that would emerge in these sermons would hearken back to an Elizabethan, or even Jacobean, church rather than the church under Charles I and Archbishop Laud.

[26] Morley's sermon is not discussed here because, according to Trevor-Roper, it was not printed on account of a general dislike for what he said (300).

> nothing is more needfull to be preached than the love of *Truth* and *Peace*. The Winters distemper of our age is such, that the *Love* of many (if not most) is grown cold to both: *Truth* much obscured, depraved, blemished, prejudiced, undermined, discountenanced, suppressed: *Peace* very crazy and shaken: rumors of wars, preparations for wars, study of sides & parts, great division of thoughts, pertinacy in opinions, breeding disaffections; and disaffections flaming to open contention and hostility; so far, as from the strife of pens and tongues, writing, and disputing, we are come to the terror of war, to swords and arms. (2)

Though hostilities would erupt within a few years, Gauden's attention to the manner in which "the strife of pens and tongues, writing, and disputing" cause "division of thoughts, [and] pertinacy of opinions" underscores the seriousness of political and religious agitation in 1640. However, rather than discuss practical reform like Marshall and Burges, Gauden instead questions the concept of truth, which suggests both that the concept itself was subject to dispute and that he may have preferred reform at an abstracted intellectual level rather than a practical one. Given that he would become the apologist for Charles I in the *Eikon Basilike*, Gauden's sympathies in 1640 may have already been aligned with Charles I and the established episcopal hierarchy. His distinct view of reform indicates the variety of opinions circulating at the time, and his attention to reform in public discourse suggests that he preferred a corrective other than full-scale episcopal change. With leanings toward the abstract rather than the practical, he views prudence and temperance as means to restore objective truth and offset London's love for division and dissent. Most telling about Gauden's intuition is the tenuous relationship between truth and opinion that he attributes to the power of "pens and tongues, writing, and disputing."

While four preachers delivered sermons in November 1640, Marshall became the most consistent and prominent presence in the coming years, specifically at parliamentary fasts. Though he would preach in the intervening time, Marshall, along with Edmund Calamy,

inaugurated the practice of monthly fast sermons in February of 1642, which were to be delivered on the final Wednesday of each month until 1649 (Trevor-Roper 294). Regular sermons allowed Parliament to use the "pulpit both for strategic and for tactical purposes," and the sermons in November 1640 represent a beginning for the parliamentary pulpit (294). According to the historian Hugh Trevor-Roper, whether "he is thumping his pulpit on great occasions" or "bustling through Westminster Hall to push voters into the Parliament before division," Marshall's presence in the pulpit and Parliament was felt at "every stage of the revolution" (297-98). Yet, in November 1640, Marshall was not yet the "inseparable political and spiritual ally of Pym" whose chief aim was "to preserve the unity of opposition against royal and clerical reaction;" rather, he was a moderate, nonconformist clergyman who sought ecclesiastical reform without overthrowing the episcopacy and monarchy (297-98). Still, at that time, while Gauden proved to be the most prescient and Burges the most overt champion of reform, Marshall's language carried the day and would make him the most powerful preacher in London.

Marshall's sermons of the early 1640s deal broadly with ideas of justice, guilt, culpability, liberty, dissolution, discovery, zeal, and punishment, yet by capitalizing on the innate sinfulness of the individual, he compels his listeners to embrace reformative action. A striking example occurs in his sermon of 17 November when he directly condemns listeners for their guilt in order to compel them to righteous action for their guilt:

> Resolve upon it this day to bee for God, make this another blessed seventeenth of *November*. But if through feare, treachery, cowardise, pride, or sloth, you withdraw yourselves from Gods work; *Deliverance shall come* to Gods people another way; and you for your part shall not onely lose your share in the comfort: but you shall bring all the guilt, and sinnes that the Nation groanes under, to stand upon your owne score before God. Yea, (you will think it is a great word; but I speake it not rashly) it may bee more guilty, than the very Authors of our

> mischeifes, who have been firme to their own principles, in the bringing of them in: and you contrarie to your light, and office doe further them, if you not withstand them. (47)

In this passage, Marshall mixes action with individual sinfulness. The first imperative, resolve, elicits reflection on the present moment to become godly on "this day." With the second imperative, make, he calls to mind Elizabeth's accession, which bridges the gap between past settlement and present struggle. In effect, Marshall uses the coronation as a historical marker by which his present audience might be judged. The two emphatic verbs also imply spiritual deficiency and suggest that the audience must be compelled to godliness and blessedness. Then, Marshall explicitly mentions a sinfulness that heretofore was merely implied. He writes that "all the guilt, and sinnes" fall upon "you," which shifts the blame for national problems to individuals and forces them to confront and discover their place in the ongoing ecclesiastic and civic unrest. The ultimate force of Marshall's language relies on "Yea." If he thought it insufficient to place *all* the guilt and sins on individuals, he further emphasizes their sinfulness by saying "Yea" and by suggesting that they may be subject to greater judgement than those who started the turmoil. In the aside, he draws attention to his own language not only to anticipate possible objections but also to supply a rational justification for its use, which only intensifies what has been already emphasized. He closes with action, and exhorts the audience to withstand or become complicit through inaction, which renders an individual "more guilty" than those who act wrongly. Because he embeds—and stresses—guilt in the Protestant imagination, Marshall compels his audience to resist inaction, to recognize spiritual deficiency, and to become godly so that England might continue the work of reformation as in the halcyon days of Elizabethan England. This brief passage from the November 1640 sermon illustrates how Marshall can use guilt to compel action, which would become a prominent feature of his sermons throughout the period.

The ensuing account of sermons will demonstrate how Marshall's moderate puritanism and views of reform emerge at various points in the early 1640s. In late November 1640, Charles returned to London with hopes of settlement, and in December, Marshall preached *Reformation and desolation: or, A Sermon tending to the Discovery of the Symptomes of a People to whom God will by no meanes be reconciled*. In the sermon, he attempts to reconcile crown with Parliament, and he also shifts broader ecclesiastical and constitutional concerns onto the Protestant individual. In February of the following year, amidst rising tensions between king and Parliament, Marshall preached *Meroz Cursed*, which resulted in him being called "the great incendiary of this unhappy war" (qtd. in Trevor-Roper 307). *Meroz Cursed* was a sermon of action, and in it, Marshall departs from his moderation and advocates opposition, which in many ways anticipates the outbreak of war later that year. Yet, the sermon simplifies the moment of crisis between king and Parliament, and he prompts his listeners to political action. Two years after *Meroz Cursed* with England embroiled in civil war, he preached *A Divine Project to Save a Kingdome*. In this sermon, he discusses the discovery of zeal as the means to end rebellion, and in particular, he demonstrates that the minister inflames zeal through the sermon. Then, following a watershed moment at the battle of Naseby in 1645, he preached *A Sacred Record to be Made of Gods Mercies to Zion*. Marshall portrays Naseby as possibly the final step in the ongoing struggle for reformation that had started in the sixteenth century. In an attempt to redefine the martial moment as the locus of ecclesiastical reform, he explains how the written word facilitates reform, and he also asks when reform takes place. Over the course of these four sermons, Marshall's puritanical ideas about reform emerge in response to distinct political moments. Reform is not static, and as the political context shifts, Marshall's sermons follow. Though he was able to maneuver through the political, religious, and martial challenges in the early years of the 1640s, Marshall always maintained his interest in the godly community and its salvation.

Just over a year after he first preached to the House of Commons, Marshall delivered a pointed message about the link between personal reformation and collective desolation. On 22 December 1641, in *Reformation and desolation*, he preached about the necessary discovery of sin that roused God's wrath so that desolation might be avoided and the state preserved. Personal labor defines the moment. Marshall proclaims himself one of the "unworthy Ministers of Christ" who must "further your humiliation and reformation," "*rent*, and *break*, and *teare* every one of your *hearts* in the *sense* of your *sins*," "humble you in the sight of God," and "provoke you to a *strong resolution* to leave the waies of sin in time to come" (17-18). The members convene to "*Fast* and *Pray* and *mourne*" and to "acknowledge that the Wrath of God is kindled, and that your selves are called to take a course to turn away Gods wrath" (17). The language promotes spiritual action and discovery so that individuals understand their own sinfulness and their own place in averting God's wrath. Such language indicates Marshall's view that reform is personal, which reinforces his interest in individual salvation. In this sermon, he focuses on the godly service of the Protestant individual, whether king, MP, or layman. Marshall makes reform a personal labor and service that belongs to all, and as a moderate working within the bounds of the established episcopate, he creates a Protestant ethos rather than a revolutionary ethos for reforming English Protestantism.

In order to establish the character of an archetypal reformer, Marshall uses a biblical monarch to illustrate how a sovereign illustrates personal repentance that averts desolation. He preaches about *2* Kings 23.25-26, which details the story of King Josiah's piety and God's wrath.[27] In Marshall's view, reform need not contravene the monarchy, and at this point, reconciliation with Charles was not out of the question. Like Mildmay and Chaderton before him,

[27]"And like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; neither after him arose there any like him. Notwithstanding the Lord turned not from the fierceness of his great wrath, wherewith his anger was kindled against Judah, because of all the provocations that Manasseh had provoked him withal" (2 Kings 23.25-26).

both of whom adhered to royal authority and worked within the existing hierarchy, Marshall understood that although the misgovernment of Charles and the misguided religious reforms of Laud caused political and religious damage, there was no "incompatibility between serving God and the Crown" (Morrill, "Religious Context" 52). In fact, Marshall views the Crown as an essential part of the settlement. He presents Josiah as "one of the Worthies of the world" and the "illustrious Starre in a darke night" who preserved his kingdom (1-2). He opens with the ideas of possibility and hope in the figure of the monarch, and he builds upon that foundation with an explicit depiction of Josiah as a reformer capable of unifying and saving a kingdom:

> hee carried all before him like a torrent, and walked like a man of fire, (as his name signifies the fire of the Lord) and brought the whole Nation so about, that there was scarce ever such a Covenant made as hee procured, and that not by a prevailing party, but the universality of his Kingdome joined with him in it, and continued in it, and held close to it all the time that *Iosiah* lived in the world. (3)

Dangerous though his thinly veiled critique of the polarized present may have been, he nevertheless depicts a monarch who by himself brought the "whole Nation so about" so as to dispense with party allegiance for the universal good of the kingdom. Not only does he depict him as a fervent ruler, but in the aside, Marshall reinforces the idea that the name Josiah itself represents a divine reflection of godly fire. Such language imbues the monarch with divine power to facilitate reform, and it allows Marshall to use biblical grounds as evidence that monarchs ought to transcend party divisions in order to stabilize the kingdom. In Josiah, Marshall sees a "godly man" with "such a perfect heart to make the most compleat and absolute reformation of the Church that ever was wrought by any mortall man since God had a Church on earth" (2). Successful reformation requires the godly fire of a Christian—Protestant—sovereign, and when he uses words such as covenant, party, universality, and kingdom, Marshall shifts the valence of those words from the biblical to the present. Josiah becomes an archetypal monarch whose

conduct enacts political and religious reform. Ultimately, by shifting the context from the biblical king to the Stuart monarch, Marshall sets up Charles I in the position of a potential political savior and religious reformer. His moderate views about reform meant that he would not oppose the monarch; rather, in a sense, the sermon represents Marshall's attempt to reform Charles himself and to bring him back into the fold.

Marshall also advocates for godly service, and the spirit of Calvinism becomes evident when Marshall limits humanity to the work of reformation rather than to its success, which belongs to God. He begins with the archetypal Josiah who may "bee stirred up with admirable spirits" but whose work nevertheless might "miscarry" (5). However, he reminds the audience that "*though their work come to nothing, yet themselves shall be highly magnified with the Lord*" (5). Rather than render the work of man meaningless, he instead emphasizes the struggle for godliness as the sole work of man. He writes that the "plaine reason" for the potential miscarriage of godly labor is "because sincere endeavours to doe Gods service is our whole worke, but the successe of these endeavours is Gods worke" (6). Desolation, then, remains an inevitable possibility because providence determines success or failure, but, as he emphasizes, the godly must be "his servants, to obey his will" so that "they shall not misse of their reward" (6). In Calvinist terms, though every man may not be of the elect, every man must remain godly lest the wrath of God be kindled against all. In this regard, he prioritizes the idea of individual reformation in order to avoid collective desolation. He energizes the audience "to attempt glorious things for his name, for the purging of his house, and the establishing of this great people in the peace of the Gospel" (7). He takes care that his language remains ambiguous, yet direct. He may not specify ecclesiastical reform according to biblical precedent, but his language certainly implies that such actions might be the godly work he seeks. By limiting the work to man and reformation—or desolation—to God, Marshall galvanizes the collection of individuals to focus on godly service.

Typical of his sermons, Marshall's message in *Reformation and desolation* about godly labor depends upon the universal recognition of sin. Whether monarch, noble, or laymen, the focus remains Protestant salvation. He tells his immediate audience "forget that any of you are *Earles* or *Lords*, *Knights*, or *Gentlemen*" and to look to their "own soules" (18). By removing titles, he democratizes salvation and elevates its status above extant political and social hierarchy. He then speaks to his audience not according to titles but as Protestants, and he uses rhetorical questions to promote self-reflection about sinfulness: "Are yee not children of *Belial*? (that is the very thing which you must answer in your own bosome) *that is*, are there not amongst you such as refuse to carry the *yoak* of *Christ*? who will not take Christ to be your Saviour as he offers himselfe to you in his Gospel?" (18). He suggests condemnation but, with the use of the aside, he demands contemplation. He cuts through difficult ecclesiastical and constitutional issues to posit a simple opposition: either be a child of Belial or be godly. The rhetorical dichotomy limits choice and allows him to indirectly compel the audience to discover the potential depth of their own sin. He also cuts through social distinctions, which allows him to suggest that sin, like godly service, is the universal work of all Protestants.

Not content to merely indicate the universality of sin, Marshall also discusses various types of sin, individual as well as political and religious. The sermon hinges on the idea of sin as the foundation that prompts personal, and thus, national reform. He mentions "one rule" by which God ruins "Churches and Kingdoms:" "whensoever the sins of any Church, Nation, City, Family, or Person (you may take it as large or as narrow as you will) are come to a full measure, then God infallibly brings ruine upon them" (29). Sin applies to all, as he stresses in another characteristic aside, and he provides many instances about its ubiquity. For example, when he questions the audience about being children of Belial, he has already provided the characteristics of such disobedience. These individuals are, first, "all unbeleevers" who know about Christ but have refused "to come in, to accept of him," and second, those "whose lives and conversations are

contrary to the rules of the Gospel" (15). He depicts the obstinate and intractable as well as those contrarians who refuse a godly life. On the one hand, he appears sincerely invested in the salvation of individuals, and yet, on the other hand, such language condemns those who oppose Marshall and Parliament in their puritan attempts at reform. Sin might be universal and individual, but it is also political and ecclesiastical.

Another type of sin identified in *Reformation and desolation* brings the sermon closer to discussions of puritan opposition to Laud and to popular fears about Catholic encroachment. Marshall calls these "Church-wasting sinnes" (33). Chief among these sins is idolatry, and it is followed by malignancy against God, which is "*prophaning, contemning, scorning and persecuting of Gods holy things, his holy day, his holy servants*" (15-16). These sins echo popular fears about ceremonialism and the sanctity of the Sabbath, both of which were largely puritan concerns and both of which were exacerbated under Charles and Laud. The sanctity of the Church itself comes under attack on account of these sins. In fact, in the account of the monarch as exemplary reformer earlier in the sermon, Marshall points out that Josiah was born in the "darkest times of Antichristianity" (2). Josiah—Charles—lives with and must reform an anti-Christian church. If the signs of puritan anti-Laudianism and anti-Catholicism were missed, Marshall offers a more overt reference later in the sermon: "you know that we have not onely abundance of Idolatrous Papists, who are proud, insolent and daring, but abundance of Popish idolatrous spirits, superstitiously addicted, willing to embrace any thing that goes that way, onely they will not have it goe under the name of Popery" (45). Denouncements against Rome and Laudian sacramentalism united puritan reformers, and since November of 1640, preachers like Marshall and Burges used the pulpit in London to establish a uniform opposition (Trevor-Roper 197-98). Marshall's moderation, however, did not extend to toleration, and he advocated that the church must be purged of such sins. With "Church-wasting sinnes," he hints at larger ecclesiastical concerns about Laudian idolatry as well as the purity of the Sabbath, and in doing so, he equates

these sins with the potential ruin of the Church. He projects broader concerns about puritan reform into an ecclesiastical discussion about the purity of the English Church. The very concept of sin allows him to move freely from individual salvation to ecclesiastical opposition to Laud.

Throughout discussions of the monarch, of godly service, and of sin in *Reformation and desolation*, Marshall creates an idea of reform that is neither religious nor political; reform is personal. Marshall closes the sermon with action: "Let us labour in the right way to turn this wrath of God from us" by trembling and by cleansing themselves of sin (49-51). Godly labor and repentance avert God's wrath. Rather than focus on the work of broader ecclesiastical reformation, Marshall's puritan interests in the godly individual and personal salvation dominate the sermon. Drawing upon the historical figure of Junius Brutus, he asks his audience another pointed question about the individual in relation to the church and state: "shal I walk in these wayes, to be the ruine of the Church and Common-wealth?" (50). The reduction of a complex problem to a simple question of godliness allows him to suggest that "every one" must "begin to sweep before our own door, and we know not how soon the whole street may be made cleane" (51). At the prospect of desolation, various signs of which he detects in England, Marshall implores his immediate audience to be "our Physitians, and repairers of our breaches," which can only be accomplished by "the turning away of Gods wrath" (51). Indeed, as he says, "no mortall man can possibly determine when the precise time of this or that Nations utter ruine is certainly come," yet he creates an ethos of reform that focuses on personal salvation as the guard against inevitable collective desolation. Marshall simplifies broad constitutional and ecclesiastical concerns so that his message becomes a practical and concrete matter about the experience of being a Protestant who is invested in avoiding collective desolation: when individuals err, the nation suffers.

After he preached about reconciliation in December 1641, Marshall's tone changed in response to changing circumstances. In early January, Charles attempted to arrest five MPs,

which unsettled and united Commons and Lords against him, and according to Woolrych, even the "citizenry seemed on the brink of revolution and even the staid corporation had swung round to Pym's support" ("The Civil Wars" 97). Yet, some remained tentative about the drawing of battle lines and the choosing of sides. According to Trevor-Roper, neutrals emerged as a "great problem" in early 1642 because they "insisted, and would long insist, that there was no cause for civil war and demanded that king and Parliament make concession to each other to restore the old 'mixed monarchy'" (305). The stage was set for action. Marshall entered the pulpit on 23 February 1642 to inaugurate the monthly fast sermon and to preach what would become his most famous sermon, *Meroz Cursed*. In the opening remarks, he says that the sermon concerns a "Text and Theme exceeding seasonable," and he describes a time "when abundance of mighty enemies rise up against the Lord, and against his Church" (4). Then, he turns his attention to those neutrals who remain opposed or apathetic to the cause at hand, and he declares that the sermon is "*Seasonable* to the *temper* of most people who generally minde their own things, and not the things of Christ" (4). Marshall capitalizes on the tension in London, and the sermon is a timely response to mounting fears about the inevitability of hostilities between king and Parliament. *Meroz Cursed* signals Marshall's break from moderate ecclesiastical resistance to outright political opposition. The sermon's simplicity and structure allowed his message to cut through complex questions of allegiance to crown or Parliament, and Marshall conceals political action with spiritual choice, which pleased his employers in Parliament and also forced neutrals to choose sides.

The simplicity of *Meroz Cursed* makes it a powerful statement about the spiritual choice between damnation and salvation. Marshall begins the sermon with an explication of Judges 5.23: "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." In his observations on the verse, he uses Meroz as a symbol of a cursed man, and he also explains that

the inhabitants, of whom "wee finde no mention in the whole Booke of God, nor I thinke in any other Story, but onley in this place, upon this unhappy occasion," represent a cursed people (3). Marshall makes Meroz and the "inhabitants thereof" admonitory symbols of damnation, which he likens to the "lake of *Sodome* as a monument of their sin, or as a Mast of a Ship swallowed up in the quicksand, to warne passengers to take heed of that dangerous place" (3). By using Meroz and the inhabitants as cautionary symbols, Marshall implies a choice between either following Meroz into damnation or heeding and learning from the symbol in order to avoid damnation. Specifically, he asks the audience to "Looke upon mee, and learne your owne duty," and he warns the audience to "*take heed of disserting the cause and Church of God, when they stand in neede of you*" (3-4). For him, the cause was reform, both constitutional and ecclesiastical, and he implies that desertion of that cause will result in damnation like that of Meroz. He presents the dilemma in the beginning, but over the course of the sermon, he develops the idea so that a simple choice becomes an eschatological and ontological one. He says that "*all men are blessed or cursed according as they help or help not the church of God*" (20). By limiting the choice to blessedness or cursedness and helping or not helping, he confronts "*all men*" who seek to be godly with a choice between helping or not helping. Somewhere between being blessed or cursed, between helping or not helping, Marshall carves out a space for the very existence of the godly Protestant who must offer proper aid to the "*cause and Church of God*." It seems an obvious choice. Indeed, he seeks to make "what is thus cleare to your judgement and conscience" become an indelible part of the "hearts and conversations" of the Protestant individual (20). Yet, what appears to be a clear choice obscures complex constitutional and ecclesiastical issues. Using Meroz as a symbol of damnation allows Marshall to posit a choice not merely between helping or not helping but between being godly or not being godly, and such a choice allows Marshall to direct the reason of his audience towards his version of godliness.

The structure of the sermon reinforces its simplicity. *Meroz Cursed* has the most defined structure of all Marshall's sermons, and it follows a fairly rigid pattern of puritan sermonizing outlined by William Perkins in Elizabethan England. In *The Arte of Prophecying*, Perkins says that preachers should first explicate and interpret scripture, extrapolate certain points of doctrine, and apply the text to the lives of the audience.[28] The sermon hinges on the application, also called the exhortation, and according to Perkins, it must be fervent and distinct from the explication and interpretation: "For though it be a worthy gift of God to speake mildely, & moderately, so that his speach shall fall like deawe upon the grasse: yet it is the *fierie tongue* that beates down sinne, & works sound grace in the heart" (qtd. in Morgan 137). While some see the application as the unity of "reason and enthusiasm," in *Meroz Cursed*, Marshall uses mild speech to conceal fiery action (Morgan 137). By doing this, he accomplishes two things: first, he draws attention to his own language and limitations, and second, like the choice to be godly, he simplifies the action he seeks.

He begins the application by presenting himself with humility. As mentioned above, he calls on his audience to "*help or help not the church of God*," which condenses complexity into a simple choice. However, he then laments the inadequacy of his speech: "Oh that I were able to speake somewhat to raise up your spirits, to make you these blessed men who willingly helpe the Lord against the mightie" (24-25). At first glance, such humility undercuts the fervency of his message, but Marshall's calculated modesty allows him to suggest action without actually prompting it. He implies that his speech cannot compel action, which leaves the burden of acting with his audience. However, having already suggested damnation or salvation as the two potential outcomes, he removes himself from the difficult choice about how to act. Additionally, because he presents his language as ineffective, Marshall seems to struggle with his own limitations just

[28] For a discussion about the form and structure of sermons, see Blench, *Preaching in England*, pages 100-112, and Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pages 132-141.

as his audience might struggle with godly action. According to Morgan, both the sinner and preacher "had to work" for faith, and the struggle "might well produce a greater sense of solidarity between preacher and people" (130). In this section of the application, Marshall does not necessarily beat down sin so much as wrestle alongside his audience with the limitations of action.

Further along in the exhortation, Marshall does not call on his audience to take up arms in a violent rebellion; rather, he asks that godly individuals do two things: inquire and pray. Before moving to these specific actions, Marshall offers various "*motives* or incentives to inflame your hearts after such a temper of spirit, that you may be willing to give up your selves to the help of the Lord and his Church" (25). He illustrates the connection between the individual, the Church, and God before discussing "godlinesse, self-deniall, and love" as the qualities of a "good Church-man" (25-28, 38). If they wish to be numbered among the godly, the audience must choose for themselves because Marshall restricts himself to initiate the act of stirring up (25). What he stirs up, however, are two possible courses of action. First, he compels his audience to question their usefulness to the Church. Godly individuals must "*informe*" themselves about "the state and condition" of the church in order to ascertain the manner in which they might be "helpful to it" (38). However, it is no idle inquiry, but a true examination about the state of the Church. The godly must truly "know, as to work our hearts to a *fellowfeeling* of their condition, otherwise all our intelligence will be dry as clouds, flying over our heads without a drop of raine" (39). A substantial inquiry, then, creates sympathy between all members. Then, he compels the godly to "enquire what is in *our power* to do" for the Church "wherein *we* may be helpfull" (39). At this point, it is not communal sympathy but individual capacity to help the Church. True Protestants, then, inquire for two reasons: to define themselves as godly lest damnation follow and to establish a spiritual community.

At the close of the sermon, he also focuses on the spiritual action of prayer as a necessary component of the godly individual and of the godly nation. Though he acknowledges that there are yet "many obstructions to bee cleared, many enimies to be overthrown," he advocates for "fervent, humble, constant" prayer (46-47). Marshall remains invested in individual, spiritual action that will contribute to the godly nation. Nevertheless, he claims that prayer will allow all obstructions to be overcome, and with prayer, "wee may overmatch all our enimies" and "discover all their plots" (46). Prayer, then, becomes the foundation for the godly, but it is not liturgical prayer. Rather, prayer is individualized, and in this sense, Marshall's puritanism becomes evident. He first indicates that it must be true prayer: "many can read *prayers*, say *prayers*, sing *prayers*, many can conceive and utter *prayers*, who yet cannot pray" (47). The liturgical recitation of prayer is no longer sufficient for the godly in February 1642. Marshall instead describes proper prayer as "a pouring out of the soul to God," and such prayers must be poured out in a "pure spirit" with faith and with constancy (47). Ultimately, the act of prayer becomes a beginning, and it "must quicken us up *to* the use of other means, and sanctifie us *in* the use of other means," which are "fruitlesse without prayer" (47). Marshall builds his case to help the Church upon the godly action of prayer, and no political, martial, or ecclesiastical action can be taken without first praying. By focusing on inquiry and prayer in the application, he shifts the collective action of reformation to individual actions. In this sense, he capitalizes on the sermon structure to subvert expectations about fiery action and instead offers modest spiritual action. Thus, rather than a vehement call for opposition to Charles or denouncements of Laudian ceremonialism, Marshall instead offers relatively mild correctives. Do not oppose Charles, but ask how to serve the Church. Do not pray according to the liturgy, but pray according to reformed practices. Of course, the application may only stir his readers to action, but the modesty of the application allows Marshall to provide simple solutions that amplify the spiritual choice he presents.

Marshall may have simplified spiritual matters in *Meroz Cursed*, but he did not avoid political matters. According to Trevor-Roper, the sermon was the "first of a long series of incendiary sermons" that "were part of the horrible propaganda" written on behalf of Pym and Parliament to oppose Charles (308). Throughout the sermon, he conceals political action with spiritual choice. Ostensibly, the sermon presents the choice to be godly or not godly, to be blessed or cursed, and to help or not to help the church. However, as seen with his definition of true prayer, Marshall subtly redirects the audience away from Laudian ceremonialism to puritan ideas of prayer, and he does the same with political action. Though he does not explicitly voice opposition to the crown, he presents inquiry and prayer as first steps in the opposition "against the mighty." Recall that he says that through prayer, they might "overmatch all our enimies." Yet, prayer only serves to conceal political violence. For example, he offers a biblical and moral justification of violent opposition to the enemies of God. Early in the sermon, he discusses Psalm 137.8-9: "O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones againts the stones." Though he acknowledges the "inhumanity and barbarousnesse" of such violence, Marshall nevertheless says that "if this worke be to revenge Gods Church against Babylon, he is a *blessed man that takes and dashes the little ones against the stones*" (12). That he offers a religious and moral justification of violence and yet ends with the spiritual action of prayer indicates that Marshall's sympathies for reform tend toward the spiritual salvation of the godly individual and Church rather than overtly toward the political realm. Yet, he nevertheless justifies religious violence against the enemies of God, which suggests that he has moved from benign resistance to outright, even violent, opposition. And indeed, violence between the nascent Royalist party and the Parliament would erupt later that year.

Because *Meroz Cursed* offered a simple spiritual solution to a political moment of crisis, the sermon resonated with Marshall's audience. As Trevor-Roper indicates, the "great problem"

for Marshall and for Parliament in early 1642 was the neutrals who sought reconciliation and refused to take sides. However, the simplicity, structure, and timely message of *Meroz Cursed* allowed Marshall to reframe hesitance, opposition, or apathy in terms of godly action or inaction. In the course of interpreting the verse in Judges, he writes that the "text *curses* all them who *come not out to helpe* him, as well as those who *came to fight* against him" (22). Both inaction and opposition result in being cursed. He singles out two groups who are most prone to their private rather than godly desires. First, he identifies one group as "enemies of the Church" who "do mischief" against it (20). These people, who "yet professe themselvs to be Christians," do the inverse of Judges 5.23: "instead of helping the Lord against the mighty, do help the mighty against the Lord" and "instead of joyning all their strength, and giving all their assistance to the Church in her distresse, doe give all the assistance they can to enemies of the Church" (20). For a puritan reformer like Marshall, the first group suggests two interrelated possibilities: Catholics and the emergent, though not yet named, Royalist party under Charles I and clerics who supported Laudian ecclesiology. Though he does not know "by what name or title" to call this group, Marshall asserts that they are the "Gyants who make war against heaven" (21). The second group are the "neuters," whom he condemns for inaction, a graver sin than opposition. There are two types: those who "stand a loofe off, shewing themselves neither open enemies nor true friends," and those who out of "mere sluggishnesse and desire of ease or baseness of spirit" love "only their worldly profits and sensuall pleasures" rather than "what concernes religion, or the Church" (22-24). Whether active or inactive, opposition to the Church unites these groups. By singling out these individuals as adversarial to the Protestant cause, Marshall positions them as potentially subject to being cursed, not unlike Meroz, or, through appropriate action, to being blessed. These distinctions between the active and inactive, between the blessed and cursed, represent the struggle for the Protestant individual. Such distinctions allow Marshall to prompt action that resolves the struggle and leads to personal salvation. In the sermon, the idea of spiritual reform that emerges is one that hovers precariously in the space between action and

inaction, between salvation and damnation. Ultimately, Marshall presents a problem of spiritual salvation, a problem for which there are two possibilities: blessedness or cursedness. Marshall attempts to persuade neutrals and those who oppose Parliament with the threat of salvation or damnation, and his reading, as he himself indicates, "is a strong argument to prove men blessed or cursed, according as they joyn with, or oppose the cause of God" (16). By limiting the distinction to joining or opposing, he makes action inevitable. As such, he forces neutrals and adversaries to consider that action ought to be directed toward the godly in order to avoid being cursed.

Two years after he first delivered *Meroz Cursed*, the nation was embroiled in civil war, and Marshall turned his attention to the zealous character of a militant reformer. On Easter in 1644, he preached *A Divine Project to Save a Kingdome*, and in the sermon, he delivered a pointed message about the discovery of zeal in order to kindle holy indignation in his audience. The situation in England was dire. He depicts England as a country "in the miserablest condition that ever had beene in these 100. yeares" (11). He lists the reasons for such a condition:

> impenitencie for our old villanies, both of Idolatry and whoredome, and blood, the blood of Prophets, and the blood of just men, and the unprofitablenesse under great meanes, that unthankfulnesse for late mercies, that breaking out into new rebellion, such terrible divisions in Church matters, in State-matters, in Parliament, in Citie, every where, as if we were divided *in minutula frustula*. (10-11)

Division is ubiquitous as civil war rips England apart, and the reasons range from a failure to fully remove Catholic idolatry and reform Laudian ceremonialism to thanklessness and division. Yet, he says that the country has lately been "by a mightie hand upheld" because they have entered into a "Covenant and sworne for reformation of Religion" (9). At this point, ecclesiastical

reform was well underway in the Westminster Assembly, and Marshall and Parliament stand in stark contrast to the Royalists who "seeke our ruine [and] have more apparently owned Idolatry by joyning with the bloody Rebels of *Ireland* that are setting up popery, and rooting out our Religion in *Ireland*" (9). The distinction between Parliament and crown allows Marshall to characterize a division that is primarily religious rather than political. The party of Charles, then, threatens the project of reform with encroaching idolatry and religious persecution. In this divisive moment, Marshall's sermon accomplishes two things: first, he positions himself as a Promethean figure who can kindle zeal, and second, he uses the biblical example of Phinehas to show how the discovery of zeal can inspire action to end rebellion.

In *A Divine Project*, Marshall defines and discusses zeal, but he ultimately uses zeal as a means to characterize the godly Protestant and to stress the sermon's power to kindle it. He lists three categories: sincere; blind, corrupt, or counterfeit; and zeal against zeal. He focuses, however, on sincerity, and he defines zeal as "*a spirituall heat kindled by the Spirit of God, whereby all the affections are drawne out to the utmost for God*" (27). He stresses that the "holy Ghost is the author of it" and that spiritual heat "is to burne, or hisse as burning coals when water falls on them" (27-28). Though he devotes a great portion of the sermon to zeal, he ultimately questions the source of spiritual heat on earth. At the close of the sermon, he asks, "what *Prometheus* may wee send to heaven to fetch downe this sacred fire?" (43). Rather than ask what divine messenger will bring fire to mankind, he asks how the human may ascend to the divine realm in order to discover the sacred fire of zeal. Inverting the Promethean myth allows him to emphasize human agency. It is not a question of what God gives to man, but what man acquires from God and how man acquires it. First, Marshall advocates for prayer because "prayer and zeale mutually produce one another, as water and Ice doe" (43). Then, having obtained heavenly fire, man must sustain it by "*reading*, *hearing*, and *meditating* on *Gods Word*" (44). Puritans emphasize the role of scripture as a foundation for piety, and Marshall capitalizes on scripture as

the primary means by which zeal can be fostered by individuals. Not only can reading, hearing, and meditating maintain zeal but also conversing with "active zealous men" because "their zeale will provoke others" (44). Because he presents both private and public work, Marshall demonstrates the interconnectedness of the godly community. What is done by zealous individuals reflects their piety, which furthers the cause of the Protestant community, and by extension, of the Protestant state. In essence, each man becomes a Prometheus unto himself and unto his community.

Marshall also positions himself as a Promethean figure who kindles zeal through sermons and who mediates between the divine and human worlds. While neither the sermon nor preacher acquire or preserve it, the sermon functions as a holy wind that inflames zeal. He calls sermons the "bellowes for this purpose" and they "are of great power to stirre up these coals" (44). He discusses not only the sermon but the preacher as well, and he says that "experience shewes us that zealous preaching makes zealous people" (44). The sermon and the preacher inflame the audience in two ways: hearing and reading. First, Marshall subjects the immediate audience to the force of his words. In this sense, the practical methodology that Marshall learned under Blackerby provides some clues as to Marshall's potential efficacy. That sermon gadders visited puritans like John Rogers of Dedham to "get a little fire" indicates the fervency with which sermons were consumed and the spiritual impact they may have had. Though he lacked the radical, fiery reputation of Rogers, Marshall earned a reputation as a powerful preacher who, perhaps more like his mentor Richard Blackerby, was quite capable both of wounding and of kindling consciences. Marshall knows that sermons were consumed by both hearing and reading. In the epistle to the printed sermon, he confirms how the minister and printed sermon serve their readers:

> The Ministers Lungs some make the Prophets Bellowes to blow up a dying fire, I desired that mine in preaching this Sermon might helpe to blow up yours to a yet brighter flame; and if this further publishing of it (at your request) may any whit

> serve to keep still alive this holy fire on the Altar of your hearts, whilst Incendiaries set on fire from hell, are every where shooting fiery bullets to set all into a further combustion, I am but subservient to my great Master in his present work.

Marshall establishes himself as a servant to his "great Master," and though he means God, a certain ambiguity lingers in that he might also make reference to his parliamentary employers. Whether heard or read, his words kindle and preserve "holy fire." While each Protestant may "fetch downe" the sacred fire of heaven, Marshall too becomes Promethean when preaching. Reformed ministers, particularly puritans, view themselves as mediators, and according to Morgan, following the reformation, God "was content to allow his ministers to act for him as mediators, to spread the Word, to urge repentance, to comfort struggling and doubting souls" (81). In the epistle, Marshall comments on his powers of preaching to mediate between the divine realm and the Protestant community, and in his comments, the puritan emphasis on preaching as a means to salvation becomes evident.

Gauging the effectiveness of his sermons remains problematic, but contemporary clues about the consumption of printed material provide some insight into the struggle for godly individuals to hear and read appropriate material. Marshall knew his sermon would be printed, and he cautions his audience to "beware of such things as extinguish zeale" (44). He mentions that neglecting public and familial duties diminishes holiness, but he focuses on the individual's obligation to read godly material. He writes that the zealous Christian must avoid the "study of things as *tend not to edification in truth and obedience*, or *letting out the affections after worldly things*, this *outward heat* cooles our *inward*, choakes zeale for God" (44). In a diary entry dated 1645, Nehemiah Wallington, a puritan turner who resided in London throughout the 1640s, echoes Marshall's admonition:

> Another saith that I am one that spends my time well for I am always either reading or writing when indeed the Lord knows and my conscience chids me for misspent of precious time, especially now of late when insteed of godly conference to edify one another we have jares and jangelings at one another and instead of reading good books, time is spent in reading pamphlets and controversies which doe littel edify mee. (292)

Wallington's anxiety underscores the struggle to be a zealous puritan at a time when there were competing narratives about what it meant to be godly. Though he was one puritan among many in London, Wallington more broadly represents the "quintessential puritan, introspective, bookish, sermon-going, scrupulous in his business relations, and constantly struggling for even-tempered acceptance of life and of himself" (Seaver). What Marshall preaches, Wallington embraces, and the stakes were high. For puritans like Wallington, the struggle to live zealously did not mean choices between episcopacy and presbyterianism, king and Parliament, pamphlet and sermon; it meant salvation or damnation. Marshall understood such struggles and often relied upon the choice between salvation and damnation, and he wrote this particular sermon to edify the Protestant community, to kindle zeal, and, most importantly, to allow individuals to discover zeal.

A Divine Project also demonstrates how Marshall relies upon the biblical example of Phinehas to create an archetypal Protestant reformer. A characteristic feature of his sermons is the ability to shift broader ideas about reform to the individual, and in this sermon, he focuses on the discovery of zeal in the soul so that actions can themselves become zealous. He preached on Numbers 25.10-11: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel, while he was zealous for my sake among them, that I consumed not the children of Israel in my jealousy." He opens the sermon with an explication of the story of Phinehas who stopped a plague by slaying Zimri and Cozbi who had "committed the same villany [whoredom] with her that had thus

provoked God to send this plague among them" (3). However, Marshall's interest in Phinehas concerns neither the plague nor violent justice but rather his character. He describes him as "so filled by the Spirit of God with holy indignation" that he "nayled them [Zimri and Cozbi] both to the ground," and he describes God as pleased "to see him so inflamed with the zeale of justice, that he presently commanded the Angell to put up his Sword" (3). In fact, among the "long series of incendiary sermons," Trevor-Roper mentions that the "virtue of Phinehas" served as "horrible propaganda" because he "did not wait for authority but slew the transgressors with his own hand and thus stayed the plague that visited Israel" (308). A godly Protestant filled with holy indignation and zeal might pacify the wrath of God, and in the course of the sermon, Marshall defines such godliness as befitting the zealous reformer. Phinehas becomes a Protestant everyman who must strike down those who oppose the will of God.

Marshall sees the story of Phinehas as part of the "divine project" to stabilize a kingdom, and through the exemplary reformer, he demonstrates "*how one, or a few men, may save a whole People, a whole Nation, when they seeme to bee sinking under utter ruine*" (4). First, however, godly individuals must recognize that they have the possibility, even the responsibility, to save the nation by discovering their own zeal. Marshall's training becomes evident when he capitalizes on the individual experience to illustrate the universal need for zeal to save England. Though he encourages "every one who hath a good heart to the cause of God and to the safetie of England" to be prepared to receive God's instructions, he continually stresses individual piety: "In the meane time doe thou learne for one, for thou canst not tell what one man or woman may doe . . . however if the worst come, *thou shalt deliver thy owne soule*" (12-13). Work belongs to the individual who must learn to look after the salvation of his or her own soul. Indeed, he says that "till God be pacified, *England* shall never be quiet" (20). England remains embroiled in civil war because the Royalists have thus far "neglected" the "maine worke" of "weeping and mourning" to regain the favor of God (20). He does not restrict this accusation to those who oppose Parliament,

but he makes it a state of universal neglect: "and truly thus deale many of us, our worke lieth with God, and we looke to men, wee looke to Armies and assocations, and in the meane time let the wrath of God kindled by our sinnes grow more hot against us" (20). Though division and strife in England are national concerns, Marshall indicates that all Protestants in England ought to seek personal salvation that may pacify God's wrath.

Phinehas acted while zealous, and while his sermon might kindle such zeal, Marshall stresses that discovery must be the work of godly individuals. He presents the plague of the civil war not as a matter of constitutional division and rebellion but rather as a total rebellion against God. In this sense, he limits the cause to universal sin and a lack of zealous reformers, which allows him to reinforce the need for pious individuals. He writes that "there will never bee a pacifying of Gods wrath" without a "laying downe the armes of Rebellion that are taken up against him" (22-23). In order to pacify God's wrath, he emphasizes self-examination and discovery:

> Labour every soule of you, first for your owne parts, to inquire what the sinnes are that you are guiltie of, and find out what the sinnes are that England is guiltie of, I meane especially in relation to this judgement that lieth upon us: what the sword-procuring sinnes are; what the sinnes are for which God doth use to send a sword to avenge his quarrel; labour to find them out, to reforme them, labour that repentance may doe his worke on them, and then the Lords wrath will cease quickly. (23)

The repetition of labor, discovery, guilt, and sin underscores the significance of these ideas for godly individuals. To become like Phinehas requires careful self-examination and labor in order to discover and to reform sin. Here, Marshall's exposure to Ramism becomes evident when he explains "the coordination of the human individual struggle with the external universe" and

directs man's reason to one purpose (Morgan 111). To that end, he indicates that these sins are "in relation to this judgement," which allows him to limit personal labor and discovery only in relation to the external state of division. Thus, Marshall's idea of labor exempts no individual from discovering the depth of their own sin, and thus no individual can avoid the necessity of personal reform. Discovery kindles zeal, but because he focuses labor on discovery rather than zealous action, Marshall aligns himself with the discovery of zeal but distances himself from its violent results. He directs reason to discover zeal, but subsequent action he only implies in the figure of Phinehas. However, by portraying Phinehas as a zealous everyman, Marshall makes the work of discovery the foundation for turning every man into a Phinehas.

By 1645, England was weary with war, and a clear path to settlement remained elusive. The neutrals whom Marshall sought to rally in 1642 now formed groups like the Clubmen who "were neither royalist nor parliamentarian but neutralist, and their general purpose was to see off the troops of either side that plundered or oppressed them" (Woolrych, "The Civil Wars" 106). However, Parliament won a decisive victory at Naseby on 14 June 1645, which effectively destroyed the Royalist army, and though hostilities would not cease until the Royalist surrender the following June in 1646, Naseby was a watershed moment for the parliamentary cause. Five days after the battle, Marshall marked the occasion with a thanksgiving sermon, *A Sacred Record*. He preached on Psalm 102.18: "This shall be written for the generation to come: and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord." In the opening epistle appended to the printed sermon, he claims that the "plaine sermon" merely continues the work "of rescuing these bleeding Kingdomes, and the Church of Christ in and with them." Not content to rescue, he also seeks to give proper thanks for the recent victory. In his explication and interpretation of the Psalm, he writes that the people created have "no other end" than to "glorifie God" because the idea of a people being created "does ordinarily in the Scripture signifie a People brought from an extreame low, despicable condition, to a state of happinesse and blessednesse, fit to serve God"

(3). To ordinarily signify leaves space for things not ordinarily signified, and in that space, he cautions the English people that after watershed moments of divine deliverance, sin might yet remain. He writes that "though wee bee lifted up one day, or one moneth, wee are suddenly brought and cast back again into as forlorne a condition as ever we were in," but he remains "perswaded" that "God does intend to have a People here in England that shall bee for his praise" (8). God may lift and cast down, and Naseby presents an opportunity for thanks and praise after being lifted to victory. Marshall uses the battle to signify that the struggle for reform does not conclude with a battle. So many of Marshall's sermons deal with godly action and salvation as part of reform, but *A Sacred Record* turns on two interrelated questions: how does writing facilitate reform? And, when is reform accomplished? Marshall discusses the power of writing to suggest that it yields lasting monuments for the edification of posterity, and in so doing, he aligns the martial victory with the ongoing battle for ecclesiastical reform.

Naseby provides the opportunity to praise God, and in order to illustrate proper praise, Marshall uses David as the biblical example. However, he also capitalizes on the moment to solidify the presbyterian and puritan agenda for reform. He writes that the Church and people who praise God are sometimes greater in number and sometimes fewer in number, but he presents David as the "man after Gods own heart" who "exceeded all others" in his praise (13). Though "hee never thought his own parts, his wit, fancy, thoughts, tongue, pen, &c. sufficient for it," David always asked "Quid retribuam? what shall I render unto the Lord?" (13). Marshall implies that such a question ought to be part of the experience of every godly man. He wastes no time in supplying an answer:

> I am perswaded your hearts are so warmed with the unexpected Victory, that you would readily swear with *David*, to take no rest until you were doing that very Work; if once you knew what it were, I shall tel you, *Even in doing that where in his glory is most concerned in all ages; and that is the setting up of his*

> *Kingdome*, the purgation & reformation of Religion, setting up his Ordinances in purity, providing that his Church may bee governed and ruled by his own laws according to his owne Word. This would indeed bee a lasting Monument of your thankfulnesse. (15-16)

He may be persuaded, but at the moment, he persuades the audience that the presbyterian and puritan agenda for reform is the proper way to give thanks. At the time of this sermon, the Westminster Assembly had been attempting to reform the church for two years. Yet, he is not merely interested in purging any remnants of Laudian ceremonialism, purifying the liturgy, or changing from episcopal to presbyterian governance that adheres to the scripture, but he is also interested in how this project of reform functions as a "lasting Monument." Marshall does not limit the work of reform to the victory at Naseby. Rather, the victory allows him to present the particular agenda for reform and to suggest that its completion will become a sufficient monument of praise. He shifts the very idea of reform from the victory at Naseby to a creation that will stand for posterity.

David may have thought his tongue and pen insufficient to praise God, but Marshall suggests that the written word can be the locus for eternal praise, practical use, and recognition of past deeds and virtues. He claims that "writing and registering" makes events like "pretious and excellent pearles put upon a golden thred" that become of the "eternall commemoration of them" (23). Though occasioned by a historical event like the battle at Naseby, the written record has no temporal restrictions. He uses both biblical and historical events to justify his views about the power of the written word. In his reading of Exodus 17.14, for example, he writes that "When God had begun to appeare for his people in a Warre against *Amalck*; write it (said he) in a Booke, a Book of the Warres of God for his Church, and against his enemies, must bee written and kept

as a record from age to age" (22).[29] In his explication of Deuteronomy 31.19, he writes that a "song must be written and learned to expresse what God had done for a people who were most unworthy of the Mercies bestowed upon them" (22).[30] Biblical evidence supplies the justification for writing, but he also explains how writing records and teaches virtue. He writes that the "present age" may use written records to enrich their spiritual lives: "the present age that enjoyes them, may also bee great gainers by it, for it makes the favour and mercy deeplier written in their owne hearts and indelible characters: and the frequent reading of them would keep the mercy alwayes fresh and green, always of the same efficacy and vertue unto them who have received it" (24). The virtue found in writing retains its power for eternity, and each age may turn to it for edification.

Marshall draws attention not just to writing but to the writer who must record truth. He reminds the audience that even Achilles and Odysseus required a Homer, and without Homer, their deeds would be lost to posterity (24). By drawing upon Achilles and Odysseus, the paragons of Hellenic epic, he demonstrates that the written word transcends time and illustrates virtue, whether Hellenic or Protestant. He beseeches Parliament to record events for posterity, which he says is "a duty they owe unto God, and to the present and future age" (31). Just as God has made it a "law and an Ordinance, that the generations to come should know his wonderfull Workes," so too should Parliament ensure that these recent events be faithfully recorded for future generations (31). Drawing upon biblical evidence allows Marshall to turn historiography into a divine decree. But what sort of historian does Marshall require? He condemns the "Diurnalls, and Weekly

[29] "And the Lord said unto Moses, write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven" (Exod. 17.14).

[30] "Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it the children of Israel: put it in their mouths, that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel" (Deu 31.19).

Intelligencers" for their unfaithful, perhaps unsanctioned, accounts of recent events (34).[31] Instead, he asks that "some of the choicest men in the Land be set about it" (31). He does not restrict true history to the recent recording of events, but he suggests that the record of deeds must be truthful and apolitical: "let him not be discouraged with the Politicians fear, *That it is dangerous to write truth in the present age, not safe to come too neere the heels of truth, lest it kicke out his teeth*" (35). He ascribes such significance to history because it edifies posterity. As such, he writes that "the World is more beholding to them who write Histories, then to any men living, except onely those that did the excellent Works which others writ" (31). Then, he quotes Cicero to emphasize the necessity of history as the record of truth: "History is the witnesse of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the school-Mistris of ourlife, &c." (31).[32] Marshall, however, shifts the meaning of history away from Cicero, and he repurposes it for religion so that it might "teach us the administrations of God, and the way hee hath taken in carrying on his Church, which is the Kingdome of our Lord Jesus Christ" (31-32). While the battle at Naseby may have had historical significance, recording such an event ultimately demonstrates its religious significance as part of the ongoing project of reform. Marshall understands the religious advantage of controlling the historical record of events in order to create a "lasting monument." Because God ordains historiography, Marshall sees writing as a central aspect to record events for posterity, and he seeks a faithful writer to record Naseby as part of the larger project of godly reform rather than as merely another step in the political violence between king and Parliament.

Though the battle at Naseby occasioned *A Sacred Record*, Marshall uses the pulpit to redirect attention away from the battle to the ongoing struggle for reform. For him, the work was

---

[31] Marshall's sentiments echo those of John Gauden in November 1640 when he discusses the "strife of pens and tongues, writing, and disputing" as well as the ways in which truth has been "obscured, depraved, blemished, prejudiced, undermined, discountenanced, suppressed" (2).

[32] See Cicero, *De Oratore* II: 36: Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia nisi oratoris immortalitas commendatur?

not yet concluded, and his ability to focus on the past and future settlement suggests that he continues the work of Elizabethan and Jacobean puritans who sought but never concluded reform. He does not discuss the particulars of ecclesiastical governance and liturgy but rather the eternal and lasting monument of the Church as part of a reformed, Protestant England. He uses the rise and fall of nations to describe the possibility of England being a godly nation: "it is not so with other Monarchies and Empires, one carries it [praise for God] a great while in the world, and then it is dissolved" (11). Naseby becomes the opportunity to finally complete the work of reformation and to establish a godly commonwealth as praise to God. Typically, he shifts the focus of national work to individual work, and he implores his audience not to "make a slight businesse of the Worke of Religion" lest they "provide ill for Christs honour, ill for the Church, worst of all for your owne souls, in betraying the cause of Religion, and spoyling the most glorious opportunity of advancing the honour of Christ, that ever men were betrusted with, these thousand years" (16-17). Mentioning Christ, the Church, the soul, Religion, and history allows Marshall to emphasize the interrelatedness of these elements as part of the "Worke of Religion," and he condenses a thousand years to this particular moment, which underscores the gravity of the situation. The burden of history and of reformation falls upon the individual at this moment. Yet, he also places the burden of the future and of all Christendom on other individuals who must complete national reform: "few of us, though raised to our highest, are able to do any great things for his glory; but if the Lord enlarge your hearts to doe your worke aright, the whole Christian world in her severall ages shall be able to give glory unto him, by your improvement of these mercies which our God hath given us" (18). Improvement implies that work remains, and he emphasizes the potential and enduring success of reform leads to a stable, reformed Church for Protestant England. In order to stabilize and to establish a Church for posterity, Marshall asks that the work of reformation be final so that "there shall not need a reformation to come the second time" (17). Marshall's desire to avoid a second reformation indicates that he views the current efforts at reform as part of the struggle that started in the sixteenth century. He seeks finality, and Naseby becomes the exigent

moment to prompt action to resolve the struggles of the Elizabethan and Jacobean past and to secure salvation for future Protestants. Placing the burdens of the past and future on individuals allows Marshall to condense all the action of reform to the present moment. For him, reform happens now.

Marshall's moderate puritan background provided him with the skills to navigate the tumultuous years when ecclesiastical and constitutional issues gave way to war between Parliament and king. Thomas Fuller suggests that prudence rather than inconstancy allowed Marshall to remain a godly clergyman throughout the Civil War period (53). Hobbes would have called him seditious. Yet, whether inconstant, prudent, or seditious, Marshall found success as a clergyman because he remained constant in his devotion to individual salvation. As circumstances surrounding ecclesiastical reform changed drastically, he adapted the idea of reform accordingly. These four sermons illustrate how he used reform as a fluid concept, and whether preaching about reconciliation, spiritual choice, the discovery of zeal, or the role of writing, Marshall's primary interest remained the godliness of the individual, community, and nation. He may have preached for Parliament, but he was first and foremost a puritan clergyman who sought ecclesiastical settlement, even when it meant that his moderation turned to violent opposition to Charles.

3

Marshall, the clergyman, and Milton, the anti-clericalist, make an unlikely pair. The picture of Marshall that emerges in his sermons complements but remains distinct from the figure who participates in the episcopal debates of the early 1640s. In fact, though they held distinct views of reform, two things unite Stephen Marshall and John Milton in the early 1640s: their mutual acquaintance, Thomas Young, and their mutual dislike of Laudian reform and episcopacy. By November 1640 when Charles convened Parliament, Marshall, Calamy, Young, Newcomen,

and Spurstowe had been meeting at Calamy's house in Aldermanbury to discuss ecclesiastical reform (Webster, *Godly Clergy* 318; Campbell and Corns 137).[33] Early in 1641, this group of puritan clergyman adopted the pseudonym Smectymnuus and entered the public debate about episcopal reform. Young, being Milton's former tutor, links him to the clerical group, but the extent of his interaction with the Smectymnuan group remains circumstantial. Campbell and Corns, who acknowledge the lack of evidence confirming any interaction, cannot resist suggesting that Milton "may at least intermittently have moved among" the Smectymnuans (137). One tentative conclusion may indicate something more than mere speculation. In their postscript to *An Answer to a Booke entituled An Humble Remontrance*, the Smectymnuans append a brief history that may have been written by Milton (Campbell and Corns 139; Hoover and Corns). Because authorship remains doubtful, yet probable, the exact nature of Milton's relationship with the Smectymnuans remains murky, but their dislike of bishops and the episcopate certainly support a mutual interest in ideas about episcopal reform.

In the exchange of pamphlets in 1641 and 1642, the puritan divines and Milton combat Bishop Joseph Hall, bishops more generally, and the episcopacy. However, the controversy also encompasses ideas about truth in public debate. Vernon observes the nascent presbyterianism of the Smectymnuan group, and he calls the clergymen the "most important group" of the period ("Presbyterians" 57). Webster offers another view of the puritan divines, and he argues that the Smectymnuans do not actually advocate for the abolition of episcopacy in these early tracts (*Godly Clergy* 321-22). Rather, the language about abolition remains ambiguous, which allows them the freedom to suggest "primitive episcopacy without losing the powerful rhetoric of a call for abolition" (322). Both Vernon and Webster focus on the episcopal concerns of the

[33] For further discussions of these clergymen, see their entries in the *ODNB*: Vivienne Larminie, "Smectymnuus;" Tom Webster, "Stephen Marshall;" Sharon Achinstein, "Edmund Calamy;" Edward Jones, "Thomas Young;" Tom Webster, "Matthew Newcomen;" and Sharon Achinstein, "William Spurstowe."

Smectymnuans that would fully emerge with their participation in the Westminster Assembly. Yet, by limiting the scope, both obscure the fact that the pamphlet controversy also indicates how the struggle for an ecclesiastical settlement mirrors the struggle for the individual to ascertain the truth about reform. For example, Vernon points out that puritans like the Smectymnuans focused on the individual rather than the ecclesiastical realm: "As the heirs to the Jacobean and Caroline puritan movement, the Presbyterians of the revolutionary era were agreed that true reformation meant moving beyond merely formal religious duties to the enlivening of the individual conscience and, unlike the anti-formalists who argued that prescribed Church structures 'shut up' Christ, they saw ecclesiastical discipline as a vehicle for awakening sleepy Christians to divine grace" ("Ministry" 119). At this early stage in the 1640s, the struggle for reform manifests itself as a dispute about truth and about negating Laudian and Caroline ecclesiastical policy, namely the truth of the divine right of episcopacy. At the same time, the debates demonstrate that "sleepy Christians" must recognize where truth may be found. In large part, Marshall's sermons of the revolutionary period deal primarily with individual salvation as a necessary part in the struggle for national reform. With the Smectymnuans, however, his personal view about reform shifts from church structure to a collective interest in ideological truth. Milton shares such interests in the idea that reform belongs to the "individual conscience" that must wake up to the truth of reform.

While discussions about episcopal reform emerged in 1640, the controversy between Hall, the Smectymnuans, and Milton began with Hall in early 1641. Hall, himself a graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, who was sympathetic to puritans in the 1630s, inaugurated the pamphlet debate when he published *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, by a dutifull Sonne of the Church*. In addition to his defense of the liturgy and the divine right of episcopacy, Hall also addresses the nature of recent public debates: "Lest the world should think the Presse had of late forgot to speake any language other then Libellous, this honest paper hath

broken through the throng, and prostrates it selfe before you . . . it presents it selfe to your view, yet it comes to you on a great errand, as the faithfull Messenger of all the peaceable and right-affected sonnes of the Church of *England*" (1-2). Hall positions himself as the "faithfull Messenger" who "prostrates" himself before his readers so that he is able to offer the truth in a public discourse that is otherwise "Libellous." In so doing, Hall employs a common trope of pamphleteering in the 1640s by which the author rectifies the heretofore libelous discourse with the truth of the matter. Throughout the pamphlet, Hall establishes himself as the authoritative voice on liturgical matters, episcopacy *jure divino*, and even the role libel plays in sowing discord in the state. The Smectymnuan reply to Hall, *An Answer*, appeared in February or March of 1641. The Smectymnuans summarily address each of Hall's arguments, and in addition, they also dismiss Hall and his pamphlet as "a heape of confident, and ungrounded assertions" (1). The pamphlet is much more expansive than Hall's, and they follow a familiar pattern of polemical disputation in which they state the point of an adversary and then refute it. In doing so, Smectymnuus offers a rational argument to dispense with Hall's justification of liturgy and episcopacy. Moreover, according to Webster, the polemical strategy "obviated the necessity of developing a systematic model of an alternative ecclesiology and such as is contained within the piece must be carefully reconstructed" (*Godly Clergy* 320). Smectymnuus created space to negate Hall's truth without having to replace an ecclesiastical system. In the initial exchange of pamphlets, Hall's emphasis on slander and libel puts his tract in the mode of popular print discourse while the scholastic disputation of Smectymnuus indicates an interest in negating without replacing the finer points of liturgy and episcopacy. As a result, Hall's tract remains more general and accessible—even more rhetorically effective for public consumption—while the Smectymnuan's refutation is an erudite, argumentative declamation.

Later in the same year, Hall and Smectymnuus would again exchange pamphlets. In April 1641, Hall published *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against the Frivolous and False*

Exceptions of Smectymnuus, in which he expands his arguments about liturgy and episcopacy with more substantial evidence. While in *An Humble Remonstrance* he acknowledges the proliferation of slander and libel in public discourse, Hall does not necessarily engage with it; however, in *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*, Hall employs ad hominem attacks, which alters the tenor of his language to align more closely with popular aspersions. Likewise, in the epistle to the reader of the Smectymnuan reply, *A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance*, which appeared in June, the authors address the culture of slander and libel: "The Booke which we here undertake to answer, is so full fraught with bitter invectives, false aspertions, hyperbolicall confidence, selfe contradictions, and such like extravagancies, as that we have thought fit to lay them all before thee in one full view by way of preface." Specifically, in the address to the reader, the Smectymnuans provide an array of ad hominem attacks against the "remonstrant," as Hall identified himself, in which they indicate the faults in his argument, rhetoric, and character. While both pamphlets feature additional and expanded evidence, biblical and classical, both pamphlets are suffused with the sort of libel that each claims to refute. The argument about episcopacy reached a stalemate, but the dispute for truth remained a point of contention. The second exchange of pamphlets contains the sort of vituperation that would become common in the popular press during the Civil War period, and this mode of popular rhetoric, which had been missing from the first exchange, noticeably presents itself in the second.

As part of Smectymnuus, Marshall emerges alongside his fellow clergymen as a voice for moderate reform within the church rather than abolition of the entire system. In the midst of the pamphlet controversy, Bishop Williams convened a committee at Westminster to discuss episcopal reform, and reports indicate a peaceable meeting among participants who included four Smectymnuans, Marshall, Calamy, Newcomen, and Young, and their polemical opponent, Joseph Hall (Webster, *Godly Clergy* 323; Quintrell). The clergymen in Smectymnuus did not seek the abolition of episcopacy, but the ambiguity in their arguments made it clear that they "were not

unwilling to see episcopacy fail" (323). Yet, in Hall, Smectymnuus found a polemical opponent by whom they were "simply outclassed" (Corns 28). According to Thomas Corns, Hall was the "so-called 'English Seneca'" who "brought a distinctive and accomplished prose style into the service of a well-conceived polemical strategy" (28). Fincham and Lake might call Hall's pamphlets a "private position-paper" aimed at securing public opinion about the divine right of episcopacy as understood by Laud (859). However, publishing private positions blurs the distinction between inner belief and outward appearances. Though he may have privately been sympathetic to the puritan cause for reform—as an Emmanuel graduate, I suspect he was—Hall moderated his private beliefs about church reform and advocated publicly for the Laudian position. One senses the political shrewdness of Laud at work here in that asking Hall, a puritan sympathizer, to sacrifice his reputation to defend episcopacy granted more credibility to the Laudian agenda. However, the inverse merits attention, too, in that Hall becomes a moderate reformer who outwardly advocated for the existing church structure while tempering his private beliefs to function within the extant system. Hall, it seems, may have been more like Marshall and other Smectymnuans than might be expected. Yet, Hall became the named representative for Laudian ecclesiology while Smectymnuus remained the anonymous representative of moderate reform and ecclesiastical truth. Milton, on the other hand, entered the fray as the anonymous representative of intellectual reform and truth.

In the summer of 1641, John Milton would write in support of Smectymnuus. In previous months, he had already entered the clerical debate when he published *Of Reformation* in May and *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* in either June or July, but with the publication of *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus* in July, Milton indicated his direct support of the puritan divines. However, his objectives and his methodology distinguish him from his clerical allies. In *Animadversions*, Milton adopts the point-by-point style of refutation used by Smectymnuus, but he employs the style to combat and negate Hall as a representative Laudian

rather than to denounce episcopacy. Such a strategy allows Milton to avoid nuance and ambiguity and instead mount a direct attack against Hall and, by extension, bishops, Laud, and the episcopate. Such a strategy allows Milton to shift the goalposts: reform is no longer about episcopacy but about truth.

Milton's overt interest in truth sets his polemic apart from that of Smectymnuus. Where the puritan divines and Hall merely acknowledge the libel and slander present in public discussions of episcopacy, Milton embraces it. His use of "grim laughter" to reveal the truth becomes a pivotal strategy in *Animadversions* (3). Thus, when he claims that laughter cuts through sophistry, Milton mentions not only his adversary but also his reader and truth. He writes, "Onely if it bee ask't why this close and succinct manner of coping with the Adversary was rather chosen, this was the reason chiefly, that the ingenuous Reader without further amusing himselfe in the labyrinth of controversall antiquity, may come the speediest way to see the truth vindicated, and Sophistry taken short at the first false bound" (4). Milton sides not with the episcopacy but with the "ingenuous Reader" who might put aside amusing controversy to ascertain the truth. Of course, Milton chooses laughter to counter a laughable point, which allows him to surpass the polemical strategy of Smectymnuus. Campbell and Corns call Milton's methodology "unusual and unpredictable," and they see him "leavening academic disputation with the mordant irreverence of a Cambridge 'salting'" (143).[34] Additionally, though he "engaged episcopalian propaganda," Milton used the platform for his own interests in truth that were "relatively detached" from the cause of Smectymnuus (Corns 12). When discussing Milton's prose in the early 1640s, Corns observes that "Milton's dialectic has been directed towards the excitement of prejudices, opinions, and values latent within his readers" (26). In *Animadversions*, then, Milton

[34] Salting was a "humiliating initiation rite" in many colleges at Cambridge, though it was discouraged at Emmanuel (Bendall et al. 58). The ritual of salting was often associated with tucking: "Freshmen were summoned to a hall to meet with their seniors, and were obliged to pronounce a witticism. If the audience laughed, they were rewarded with beer. If not, they had to consume a salt-based concoction and were 'tucked', which involved making an incision in the lip and an abrasion from lip to chin" (Bendall et al. 58).

does not necessarily reveal truth to his readers, but through laughter, he allows his readers to discover a truth they may have already held.

Whereas Marshall's sermons allowed his audience to discover spiritual truth as a means to personal salvation and national reformation, Milton's prose anticipates his readers' objections or grievances so that his readers might discover the truth vis-à-vis the faults of bishops, Laud, and the episcopal structure of the church. Additionally, Smectymnuus engaged Hall, but Milton negates him. One particularly noteworthy example illustrates how Milton employs laughter to simultaneously negate Hall and tap into prejudicial attitudes about the episcopate. Near the end of *Animadversions*, the following exchange between the Remonstrant and his Answerer takes place:

> Remon. No one Clergie in the whole Christian world yeelds so many eminent schollers, learned preachers, grave, holy and accomplish'd Divines as this Church of *England* doth at this day.
>
> Answ. Ha, ha, ha. (61)

Milton's attitudes about the erudition of clergymen date to his time at Cambridge, but rather than engage the Remonstrant about the state of the clergy, he merely laughs. His response offers nothing substantial, but in this instance, laughter signifies something rather than nothing. Laughing, rather than engaging, allows Milton to confirm a latent prejudicial opinion—whether his own or that of his readers—and to turn those opinions into truth. Because he only responds with laughter, Milton renders the claim itself laughable and unworthy of substantive refutation. Neither Milton nor, one might presume, his readers feel compelled to respond with anything but laughter, which simultaneously negates the Remonstrant and defends an unspoken truth about the erudition of the clergy. Such a rhetorical strategy works because Milton anticipates, and by anticipating he also defines, potential opinions in his readers. By laughing with, or for, them, he confirms their assumptions as the truth. Laughter precipitates agreement in truth without refuting

the Remonstrant, and, more importantly, laughter negates the Remonstrant's claims and by extension, Hall, Laud, and the episcopate. Laughter diminishes the distance between author and reader and between assumption and truth.

The final exchange of pamphlets between Hall and Milton illustrates the personal nature of the attacks rather than any substantive discussion about episcopal reform. *A Modest Confutation*, published anonymously in 1642, precipitated a direct response from Milton in April. At the time, Hall was imprisoned so authorship of *A Modest Confutation* "was and remains a subject of speculation," though Milton himself conjectured that Hall and perhaps one of his sons wrote it (Campbell and Corns 145). Though its authorship remains contentious, its subject matter targets Smectymnuus and Milton, in particular. In the epistle to the reader, the author mentions the "*late and hot bickerings between the* Prelates *and* Smectymnuans" before mentioning Milton: "*To make up the breaches of whole solemn scenes, (it were too ominous to say tragicall) there is thrust forth upon the Stage, as also to take the eare of the lesse intelligent, a scurrilous* Mime, *a personated, and (as himself thinks) a grim, lowring, bitter fool*." The Confuter follows a fairly predictable pattern of episcopal apologetics before closing with a point-by-point refutation of *Animadversions*; however, the Confuter assails Milton and his claims to truth. The author presents his adversary as lacking "morall precept" in his attempt "to weary God and man, with lewd profanations, scurrilous jests, slanderous and reproachfull calumnies" (1). The author later refutes Milton's claims that he was a "notorious enemy to truth," "a false Prophet," and a "belly-god, proud and covetous" (17). The Confuter seeks to dispense with the "tyrannous malice and affected barbarisms of these present times," and he laments the "Blind men! that will not see our own good; that shut our eyes, and then complain that we want the Sunne!" (20). The Confuter's interest in refutation and truth advances the arguments neither for episcopacy nor for Laudianism, but it does demonstrate the concern for truth at the expense of one's adversary. Such polemic

shifts the discussion away from ecclesiastical reform and toward individual character and truth, and when he responds, Milton does not hold back against his adversary.

In April of 1642, Milton published *An Apology*, which takes him further afield of Smectymnuan interests in ecclesiastical reform and closer to a defense of truth and of himself. According to Campbell and Corns, "Milton may well have thought what posterity would generally concede, that among participants in the Smectymnuan debate, whatever the others' pretences to patristic lore, his was the towering intellect, the withering analysis, the persuasive rhetoric, and the potent style" (146). Milton's desire to surpass and to outwit Hall leads Richard McCabe to call *An Apology* the "most savage condemnation of Hall's life and works ever to appear in print." Yet, in the midst of the intellect, analysis, rhetoric, style, and condemnation, Milton presents himself as a representative for truth. In response to the Confuter's slanderous remarks against him, Milton removes himself and upholds the truth of the cause in which he participates:

> But when I discern'd his [the Confuter's] intent was not so much to smite at me, as through me to render odious the truth which I had written, and to staine with ignominy that Evangelick doctrine which opposes the tradition of Prelaty, I conceav'd my selfe to be now not as mine own person, but as a member incorporate into that truth whereof I was perswaded, and whereof I had declar'd openly to be a partaker. (3)

Milton distances himself in an attempt to diminish or even nullify the attacks against his character, which also allows him to uphold a category of truth in which he merely partakes. Thus, the Confuter attacks not Milton but Milton the apologist. In another sense, Milton also distances himself from the Smectymnuans whom he calls "respected friends," which allows Milton to uphold the truth of "Evangelick doctrine" without necessarily subscribing to the views of the

clergymen (4). Milton positions himself as the apologist who upholds truth and negates Hall, Laud, and episcopacy, but not necessarily as the defender of Smectymnuan reform.

Marshall and his fellow Smectymnuans seek ecclesiastical reform on account of grievances that arose under Laud in the 1630s. The pamphlets of Smectymnuus illustrate a sincere attempt to engage Hall and other Laudians in a discussion about the divine right of episcopacy, and though they do not forthrightly advocate for the abolition of episcopacy, Smectymnuus maintains the necessity of structural reformation. In his sermons, Marshall advocates for spiritual salvation, and he creates a Protestant piety that focuses on the individual as part of the collective. His participation with Smectymnuus represents a distinct side of his reformist character in that he advocates for moderate change to the structure of the national church, which would become fully realized in the Westminster Assembly. Marshall and his fellow clergymen, however, were not polemicists, and they lacked Milton's humor. Thus, while they remained invested in ecclesiastical issues, Milton opted for a mode of reformation through negation, through humor, and through an unerring adherence to the truth. In these early pamphlets, truth may be discovered through laughter, but in his other pamphlets throughout the 1640s, Milton creates a militant Christian who discovers truth through the use of reason.

CHAPTER III

John Milton: Truth and Reformation

Areopagitica; A Speech of Mr. of John Milton for the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing, to the Parlament of England was published in November 1644. Milton felt compelled to write in response to a Licensing Act passed by Parliament in June 1643 that attempted to control the press by restricting unsanctioned printed material. The Act ostensibly concerned regulation of the press but had broader implications about the toleration of religious dissent in a state undergoing radical religious and constitutional reform. In his discussion of the political context for *Areopagitica*, Nigel Smith says that the "politics of 1643 and 1644 were confusing," but, in reality, they were a mess (104). Civil war between crown and Parliament had broken out in 1643 with no clear end in sight. Parliament itself was divided about the best path forward. The episcopate was essentially abolished in 1641, though not formally until 1646, and the Westminster Assembly convened to replace it in July 1643. Contentious issues divided a nation in the process of redressing constitutional and religious grievances. Among the issues, the Licensing Act caused no small degree of controversy because it hearkened back to Caroline censorship. In the 1630s, Charles and Laud exercised greater control of the press than either Elizabeth or James (Feather 42).[35]

[35] The history of licensing in England is complex. The method of controlling printed materials was through pre-publication censorship, which was a practice maintained with only a few exceptions from the 1530s to the 1690s. In general, the crown controlled the press through a variety of mechanisms, primarily the Stationers' Company. Established by Elizabeth I in 1559, the Company licensed books to be printed, which required the approval "either by six Privy Councillors or by any two of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, the Bishop or Aldermen of the place of printing, or the Vice-Chancellors of the two universities" (Feather 34). Authority to enforce these regulations fell to the High Commission and the Star Chamber, which was granted greater authority in 1586 and again in 1637 under Charles I and Laud who sought to control printed materials. From Elizabethan to Caroline England, the "underlying concern was with the censorship of religious dissent in print, with all its implications for creating political instability" (Feather 34). For fuller discussions about the regulation of printing, see John Feather's *A History of British Publishing*, especially pages 32-50, Anthony Milton's "Licensing, Censorship, and

In particular, the Star Chamber and High Commission adopted stricter measures to control the press in 1637, and they "required rather than encouraged" the lawful registration of books (43). The infamous trial of Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne in 1637 illustrates the severe consequences for those who transgressed. However, when Caroline and Laudian authority began to wane in 1640, control over the press diminished, and by 1641 both the Star Court and High Commission were abolished by acts of Parliament. Yet, their abolition only shifted the power of licensing from the crown to Parliament, particularly the House of Commons, which attempted on several occasions to enforce regulation: they established a Committee for Printing in 1641, they issued an order to the Stationers' Company in 1642, and they passed the Licensing Act in 1643 (44). These measures all failed to control the press, and London was inundated with unlicensed printed material. Milton's earlier experience with print controversy—the debates about episcopacy *jure divino* in which he refuted Hall and defended Smectymnuus—meant that he was no stranger to the public forum. With the publication of *Areopagitica*, Milton once again entered the fray.

Milton argues against the Act and advocates for the freedom of the press from pre-publication censorship. The pamphlet's full title offers some insight into Milton's views about the recently enacted regulations. That his name appears in the title of the tract, which may seem rather commonplace, indicates Milton's sardonic attitude toward the Licensing Act. As Thomas Corns points out, the Act "required that all books must bear the name of author and printer, and that all books must be approved for publication by a licenser" (*Virtue* 56). *Areopagitica* was printed without being licensed, and the printer was not named.[36] However, by placing his name in the title rather than, as one might expect, indicating his authorship below the title of the tract on

---

Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England," and Cyndia Susan Clegg's "Censorship and the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission in England to 1640."

[36] As Corns notes, other tracts published by Milton in the mid-1640s follow similar patterns: the first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* provided the printer's initials but not the author's name, the second edition provided Milton's initials but no printer, and *Colasterion* and *Tetrachordon* both provided the author's initials but no printer (56).

the title page, Milton follows but flouts the requirements of the very act he challenges. According to Corns, Milton's decision to name himself, omit the printer, and neglect to have the tract licensed places him within "the radical paradigm" of authors who opposed the newly instituted Presbyterian "machinery for press control" (56). Another conspicuous aspect of the title is the direct address to Parliament, which Ann Hughes calls "obvious" but also "illuminating" (200). Milton views the tract as his public contribution to an ongoing issue about licensing, and he speaks directly to Parliament to advocate that they repeal the regulation on licensing. Such a view, says Hughes, illustrates Milton's "association of regulation of printing with a more general Presbyterian drive towards thorough-going, authoritarian reformation" (201). Milton speaks to Parliament for two reasons. First, he argues that "grievance"— views contrary to mainstream opinion—in a "Commonwealth" not be censored because "when complaints are freely heard, deeply consider'd, and speedily reform'd, then is the utmost bound of civill liberty attain'd, that wise men looke for" (*Areopagitica* 1). Rather than the authoritarian censorship of the Presbyterians, who sought an "effective control over dissent," he proposes that dissent be heard, considered, and reformed when erroneous (Corns, *Virtue* 56). He seeks secular, individual liberty rather than Presbyterian control. Second, he positions himself as a participant in the discussion about licensing in order to suggest that the Act be repealed. He beseeches the "Lords and Commons" that he "be thought not so inferior" that his council be dismissed, and he suggests that "there can no greater testimony appear, then when your prudent spirit acknowledges and obeyes the voice of reason from what quarter soever it be heard speaking; and renders ye as willing to repeal any Act of your own setting forth, as any set forth by your Predecessors" (*Areopagitica* 3). Having argued that complaints be heard, considered, and reformed, Milton registers his complaint about the Act, asks to be heard, and seeks the repeal of the Act. By petitioning the Parliament with a rational plea to repeal the Licensing Act, he enacts the very liberty he espouses. By addressing the Parliament directly, he shifts the discussion about control and toleration from the parliamentary to the public realm, which allows him to suggest that intellectual reform of

individuals in the civic realm might directly contribute to religious, political, or legal reform. The title reveals how Milton turns an act of Parliament into an occasion for public discourse about the nature of civic liberty. In short, he shifts the goalposts: a legal matter about censorship becomes an intellectual matter about toleration.

In an immediate sense, Milton responds directly to the Licensing Act. In a broader sense, however, he proposes an ethics founded upon the liberty to confront error in order to ascertain truth and facilitate Christian virtue, which necessarily requires the freedom of the press. In a particularly poignant image, he depicts a militant Protestant who actively resists vice and prefers virtue:

> He that can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better, he is the true warfaring Christian. I cannot praise a fugitive and cloister'd vertue, unexercis'd & unbreath'd, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortall garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. (12)[37]

Rather than martial action, intellectual discernment forms the basis for the "true warfaring Christian." In the midst of civil war and of political and ecclesiastical crisis, Milton repurposes the language of battle in order to shift the conflict away from the battlefield and onto the Protestant individual. His language—apprehend, consider, abstain, distinguish, and prefer—characterizes the universal struggle for virtue. Milton was not alone with this language. In a tract published earlier in 1644, *The Compassionate Samaritane*, William Walwyn writes about toleration as a battle between truth and error: "all mens mouthes should be open, that so errour

[37] I have emended *wayfaring* to *warfaring*. In the first edition of *Areopagitica*, the printed text reads *wayfaring*, but a note corrects the text to *warfaring*.

may discover its foulnes and trueth become more glorious by a victorious conquest after a fight in open field; they shunne the battell that doubt their strength" (60). Walwyn and Milton rely upon combative language to depict the struggle for truth and virtue, and both elevate the ideas of truth and virtue as the prize for such a conquest. In addition to the language of battle, Blair Hoxby traces other similarities between Walwyn and Milton, specifically in their presentation of truth. Whereas Walwyn uses the aforementioned image of truth as an "isolated metaphor," Milton provides "fleeting manifestations of Truth" throughout *Areopagitica* (Hoxby 233). Milton depicts truth as a commodity, "our richest Marchandize," that is not to be "monopoliz'd and traded in by tickets and statutes," as a "streaming fountain" that must not be allowed to "sick'n into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition," and, similar to Walwyn, as a combatant "in the field" who must "grapple" with error in "a free and open encounter" (29, 23, 26, 35). According to Hoxby, the "fleeting manifestations of Truth" indicate that truth is a "continuing revelation" that has "more shapes than one" (234). For Milton, true virtue can only be acquired by the "warfaring Christian" through continual intellectual exercise in the battleground of ideas. The Licensing Act limits the battlefield, which in turn limits the possibility to foster Christian virtue. Thus, Presbyterian authorities do not merely enforce pre-publication censorship; rather, they limit the possibility for Protestant virtue.

Milton not only provides the image of the "warfaring Christian" but also describes virtue in a fallen world. He writes, "Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world, we bring impurity much rather: that which purifies us is triall, and triall is by what is contrary" (*Areopagitica* 12). Postlapsarian ethics requires trial, and original sin must be countered with the active struggle against vice. He seeks neither salvation nor a return to Edenic perfection, but rather he seeks to foster virtue in a fallen world by resisting the very vices that arise on account of original sin. In Milton's polemic of the 1640s, William Poole finds a new "political emphasis on man's freedom, rooted in Adam" (132). In his reading of *Areopagitica*, for example, Poole points out that Adam

"fell from a state which is figured as pre-ethical" and thus "'fell *into'* a state of ethical cognition" (138-39). Only after the fall can mankind encounter good and evil, discern between the two, and become virtuous. Edenic virtue, on the other hand, does not deserve praise because it remains, in Milton's terms, "fugitive and cloister'd" (Poole 139). True virtue requires that one seek out temptation and resist, and in a sense, Milton suggests that the Christian individual must remedy the imperfections of original sin by reenacting the Edenic choice between good and evil in a fallen world. *Areopagitica* becomes crucial because "it reveals tensions in Milton's new understanding of the possibility and origin of virtue," which requires that the political realm not restrict freedom lest virtue itself be restricted (Poole 139-40). In Adam, Poole sees "not a calm philosopher but a warfaring Christian, itching in front of a forbidden object and a mysterious 'thou shalt not'" (140). Adam becomes the archetypal Protestant who must confront temptation and resist. Consequently, Protestant identity lingers "half in and half out of Eden," which suggests that cloistered, Edenic virtue be avoided and that postlapsarian virtue be sought through the active resistance of temptation and preference for virtue (Poole 141). The prerequisite for Miltonic virtue is the political freedom to encounter vice, and his view of the press allows error so that virtue might be discovered. Thus, current attempts by the Parliament to control the press in order to suppress religious dissent are akin to the impossible attempt to return to a cloistered, Edenic virtue. Rather, such attempts only restrict freedom for the Christian, which creates a complacent virtue rather than a militant ethos to guard against vice. What, then, does Milton's response to the Licensing Act reveal about his attitude toward reform? How does his emphasis on virtue and truth as foundational elements for the Protestant ethos figure into the continuing struggle for reform in the 1640s?

Areopagitica provides several crucial insights about Milton's views of reform. In previous print skirmishes about episcopacy, he sought ecclesiastical change, and from the success of those earlier tracts, he acquired the confidence to place his name in the title and to appeal

directly to Parliament. Contrary to his earlier participation in the public forum, Milton now attacks recent measures that are meant to continue the work of the reformation he once defended. Flouting the sanctions of the Act confirms his disapproval of Parliament's attempts to impose new press regulations, and the address to Parliament signals his desire to engage with the ecclesiastical and legislative authorities. Milton turned to print because for him, "no pulpit was open, nor had he actual access to parliament or the Assembly," and he "believed he was in dialogue with moderate, rational, scholarly men like Calamy and Marshall," the "ec" and "sm" of Smectymnuus (Campbell and Corns 173). However, Milton's relationship with Calamy had deteriorated by November 1644. In *Areopagitica*, Poole detects an allusion to Calamy's fast sermon of 22 December 1641, *Englands Looking-Glasse* (133).[38] Preaching to the House of Commons, Calamy says that their work must be "to *reform the Reformation it self*," and according to Poole, Milton may echo the phrase when he writes that the "generall instinct of holy and devout men" extends "ev'n to the reforming of Reformation it self" (46, 31). Poole considers it "plausible that his [Milton's] quotation was also a dig" because of Calamy's recent appointment as a licenser, which Milton would have detested at the time, but the allusion reveals much more about Milton's view of Calamy and of reform (133). Calamy writes that reformation has "two Properties:" personal and national (39). He compels "Every man" to "turne" away from "the sin of his constitution" (39). Moving from the personal to the national, he writes that "this Nation needs Reformation, not onely in reference to the Common-wealth, but also the Church" (46). He places the responsibility for such work with Parliament: "If you that are the representative Body of this Nation, as you stand under this relation, be reformed, the Nation it self may be said to be reformed" (45). For Calamy, "to reform the Reformation" requires personal repentance as well as

[38] This sermon was preached on the same day that Stephen Marshall delivered *Reformation and desolation*, a sermon in which he questions the nature of reformation. Calamy raises similar concerns in *Englands Looking-Glasse*, and he says that "this all the faithfull Ministers in the City preach for this day, Reformation, Reformation, Reformation" (38).

political and ecclesiastical change enacted by individual members of the Parliament. Milton echoes not only the words but also the ideas of Calamy, and he does so in order to indicate the limitations of such a view. Milton imagines "a new political order, in which the eloquent and right-minded, though unelected, could sway decision-making" (Campbell and Corns 173). Thus, when he claims that the "utmost bound of civill liberty" demands that grievances be "freely heard, deeply consider'd, and speedily reform'd," he speaks to Parliament in an effort to redirect their thinking about legislative control over the press. After all, such control was a key component of Caroline and Laudian governance against which puritans like Calamy rebelled. Additionally, Milton's interest in the Protestant individual was not in personal repentance but in intellectual discernment. When he calls for ideas to be heard, considered, and reformed, he also speaks to the "true warfaring Christian" who must actively struggle against intellectual error, not sinfulness. Parliament may have the capacity to enact and to repeal laws in the effort to create a settled political order, but individual Protestants possess the ability to discern good from evil, which is a necessary component of Christian virtue. Thus, the allusion suggests that Milton seeks to reform Calamy's bad ideas about reformation by shifting the work away from the personal and national and toward the intellectual. While it may have been a dig at Calamy, it was also disgust, and where Calamy's reformation failed, Milton suggests that his views will indeed reform the "Reformation it self."

The remainder of this chapter explores how Milton responds to ecclesiastical and political moments of crisis in order to illustrate that his polemic emphasizes the Protestant individual who must struggle to discover truth. The first part of the chapter discusses Milton's poetry and prose prior to the Civil War period to provide a fuller picture of his development. An examination of *In quintum Novembris*, of *Prolusion VII*, and of his time at Hammersmith and Horton in the 1630s reveals that Milton held traditional, moderate puritan views. He was not always the radical revolutionary. The second part of the chapter turns to Milton's involvement with the

Smectymnuan controversy. In the anti-prelatical tracts, Milton enters the debate about the divine right of episcopacy, but a close reading of three tracts, *Of Reformation*, *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, and *The Reason of Church-Government*, will demonstrate how Milton shifts the debate about episcopacy to reason and truth in the Protestant individual. In these tracts, Milton's growing disillusionment with the clergy becomes palpable, and though he advocates for ecclesiastical reform, the changes he proposes are not limited by the expectations of the clergy. The third part examines the controversy surrounding Milton's divorce tracts from 1643-1645. In particular, this section analyzes select passages from *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* as well as *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion* that reveal Milton's attitudes toward the process of reform and toward the role of truth in reform. The chapter concludes with Milton's involvement in the years around the regicide and establishment of the Commonwealth. An analysis of *Eikonoklastes* and Milton's relationship with Marchamont Nedham, of whose newsbook he was the licenser, reveals that both men viewed the press as a corrective to reform public opinion. A complex, even contradictory, picture of Milton emerges, but by situating him within the ongoing struggle for reform, we can see that Milton continually emphasizes the primacy of reason and of intellectual discernment throughout the tumultuous changes of the 1640s. In Milton's Protestant England, reason oriented toward truth forms the foundation for reform. In *Areopagitica*, he beseeches the "Lords and Commons of England" to "consider" that England is "a Nation not slow and dull, but of a quick, ingenious, and piercing spirit, acute to invent, suttle and sinewy to discours, not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to" (30). Within such a nation, Milton envisions a city beset by the struggle to defend truth:

> Behold now this vast City; a City of refuge, the mansion house of liberty, encompast and surrounded with his [God's] protection; the shop of warre hath not there more anvils and hammers waking, to fashion out the plates and instruments of armed Justice in defence of beleaguer'd Truth, then there be pens

> and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new nations and idea's wherewith to present, as with their homage and their fealty the approaching Reformation. (31)

The reformed city does not shun battle, but martial warfare holds an equal footing with intellectual battle. Milton does not provide a program of martial, ecclesiastical, or constitutional reform; rather, he suggests every Protestant must struggle for virtue so that the apprehension of truth conquers the perversity of intellectual error. Ultimately, Milton presents a doctrine of truth and reformation.

1

In his time at Christ's College, Cambridge, and in the intervening years prior to 1640, Milton intended to become a member of the clergy. However, disillusionment with the clerical vocation set in, and Milton would become a polemicist and public servant throughout the years of ecclesiastical and constitutional crisis in the Civil War period. During those years, Milton would advocate for reform through the medium of print, but the ideas that emerge have their roots in the conflicts and tensions that arose during his time at Cambridge and thereafter at Hammersmith and Horton. Two works from his time at Christ's College illustrate Milton's puritanism as well as growing dissatisfaction with the state of education. *In quintum Novembris* reveals a strain of anti-Catholicism common to Protestants, especially those of puritan outlook, and it also confirms how Milton draws upon a prominent narrative of national identity. *Prolusion VII* indicates that Milton considers education as a necessary component in the ongoing process of reform, particularly the education of the clergy. After leaving Cambridge, Milton lived with his family at Hammersmith and Horton where he continued to study as though he was pursuing a degree in divinity (Campbell and Corns 86; Poole, "Scholarship" 26). A consideration of Milton's study in these years illuminates much about his decision to reject a clerical vocation and opt instead to take up

his pen to oppose Bishop Hall and episcopacy *jure divino* in the years after 1640. Though he grapples with ideas of reform throughout the Civil War period, these early instances reveal how Milton's relative conservatism paved the way for his staunch opposition to episcopacy and later for his radical polemic.

Many often discuss *In quintum Novembris* as a juvenile exercise in epic with a depiction of Satan that prefigures the Satan in *Paradise Lost*, but the poem also demonstrates how the young Milton portrayed the ethos of Protestant England.[39] The poem is a study in contrasts between the pious and impious, Protestant and Catholic, Edenic and fallen, and even classical and British, but these antagonistic notions demonstrate how Milton's view of Protestant England follows the puritan narrative of reform. Milton arrived at Cambridge in early 1625, a few months prior to the death of James I on 27 March. In his second year, he composed *In quintum Novembris* in which he lauded James as "pius . . . pacificusque . . . felix divesque" [pious . . . pacific . . . happy and blessed] (1, 5).[40] He wrote the poem to commemorate the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 in which James and England were delivered from Catholic plotting. At the time Milton composed the poem, according to Kevin Sharpe, "fear of Catholics, always present but usually latent in English gentry society, burst into at times near hysteria" (301). Thus, the description of James goes beyond mere panegyric for the recently deceased king, but it taps into mainstream fears about Catholic attempts to subvert a blessed nation. The adjectives commemorate James both as a pious ruler and as a Protestant representative of the English nation.

---

[39] For a discussion of epic in Milton's poem, see Macon Cheek's "Milton's 'In Quintum Novembris': An Epic Foreshadowing," and for a brief discussion about the depiction of Satan, see Paul Stevens, "Milton and National Identity," pages 349-350.

[40] The date of this poem's composition remains the subject of some speculation, especially since Milton's poem seems indebted to Phineas Fletcher's *Locustae*, not published until 1627 but which Milton may have seen in manuscript form. The most likely date for composition remains 1625-26. For dates pertaining to Milton's life and work, see Gordon Campbell's *A Milton Chronology*. For a discussion of the poem's date of composition, see Bush's introductory note to the poem in the *Variorum Commentary*, particularly pages 168-171.

Contrary to the piety of James are the machinations of Satan. The poem describes Satan flying to the Pope in order to instigate the plot against Parliament. Satan, whom Milton calls a "ferus . . . tyrannus, / Eumenidum pater, æthereo vagus exul Olympo" [wild tyrant, father of the Furies, the roving exile from ethereal Olympus], seeks to bring turmoil into England (7-8). The opposition between James and Satan echoes religious and national animosity between England and Rome, which allows Milton to depict a blessed country being assaulted by the wild tyrant. Like many in England, Milton was familiar with the threat of Catholic opposition to England. As already noted, Richard Stock, the minister of his boyhood parish, All Hallows Bread Street, held particularly virulent anti-Catholic views that found their way into a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in November 1606. Like Milton, Stock commemorates the Gunpowder Plot, and in his sermon, he relies upon the fear of Catholicism as well as personal repentance in order to create an image of an enduring English Protestantism. The threat to Jacobean England becomes a locus for Protestant identity. As Paul Stevens points out, the Gunpowder Plot, along with the defeat of the Spanish Armada in Elizabethan England, became one of the "focal points of England's new national narrative," which was "exclusively" and "emphatically" a Protestant story (346-47). At stake for Milton was the English story: "It is a story that announces the English as a nation foremost in God's favor, possessing a character uniquely inclined to the pursuit of religious liberty, jealous of its political sovereignty, and confident in its civility" (347). In pious James and impious Satan, Milton rehearses the national narrative of anti-Catholicism to set England apart as a Protestant nation delivered from possible ruin by God.

Though he opens the poem with the piety of James and the impiety of Satan, Milton employs other characters in the poem to reinforce central aspects of the Protestant narrative. The most potent image is that of God, who appears briefly in the poem to save England from Catholic plots. Milton's God serves two purposes. First, God speaks to Fame and asks whether Catholic plots have escaped her notice, which implies that they, in fact, have (*In quintum Novembris* 201-

03). Thus, Milton claims a form of superiority for his God and suggests that the Protestant tradition supersedes classical deities. Additionally, when speaking to Fame, Milton's God decrees the piety of the English and the impiety of the Catholics. God calls the Roman Catholics the "impia Papistarum / . . . cohors" [the impious cohort of Papists] (201-02). Though satiric, Milton's Protestant God reaffirms the pious distinction between England and Rome, and by putting these words into the mouth of God, Milton suggests that these distinctions are divinely ordained. Like God and James, the English people are also depicted with reverence and piety. When he first beholds England, Satan finds a reverent people: "venerantem numina veri / Sancta Dei populum" [a people venerating the sacred will of the true God] (33-34). Later in the poem, Milton writes that the English are capable both of venerating the true God but also the mythic Fame who served God to propagate the rumors that foiled the plot. Milton writes, "tibi reddimus æqua" [we return to you just praise] (198). Milton closes the poem with scenes of dancing and mirth that unite the English people in a yearly celebration of their providential deliverance. As Stevens notes, the yearly celebrations normalize the narrative of deliverance, which allows Milton to focus on the "precariousness of the order to be preserved rather than the promise of its millenarian end" (348). Through James, Satan, God, Fame, and the English people, Milton exploits the tradition of English anti-Catholicism to depict aspects of piety and deliverance that uphold the national Protestant narrative.

In his poetic reimagining of the Gunpowder Plot, Milton ascribes other qualities to England that reveal much about the national profile he seeks to create. Under the rule of pious James, England resists Satan and by doing so approaches a prelapsarian state. For Stevens, "Milton's Jacobean England . . . is quite clearly a version of paradise" captured by the poet's descriptive landscapes (349). Yet, other elements indicate how Milton conceives of his native country as a land of Edenic virtue. In addition to ruining friendships, arming nations in internecine war, and toppling peaceful nations, Satan tries to corrupt the virtuous (*In quintum*

Novembris 13-15). Milton's notions of virtue culminate in the image of the "true warfaring Christian" of *Areopagitica*, but here, England itself becomes a land that maintains its virtue. About Satan, Milton writes, "Et quoscunque videt puræ virtutis amantes, / Hos cupit adjicere imperio, fraudumque magister / Tentat inaccessum sceleri corrumpere pectus" [and whatever lovers of pure virtue he sees, those he desires to subject with his sway, and the master of frauds attempts to pervert the soul uncorrupted by sin] (16-18).[41] Because Satan has not yet corrupted the virtuous, England remains free from the vices of the fallen world. Milton's England might be Edenic, but it is confronted with Catholic attempts to compromise its political and religious stability. Ultimately, Milton's vision of paradise is not one that is free from threat; rather, English virtue depends upon its deliverance from external threats, like the encroachment of Catholicism, which are instigated by Satan. The Edenic moral landscape anticipates that which emerges later in *Areopagitica* in that the poem is both pre and postlapsarian. The Protestant Eden retains its virtue only because it foils the plots of those who would corrupt it, and commemorative poems both rehearse the moment of deliverance on 5 November and amplify its message about the ongoing struggle for England to maintain its Protestant virtue and identity.

Of particular note is how Milton uses allusion to reinforce his narrative of Protestant England. Carmela Perri reminds us that allusion comes from the Latin *alludere*, which means to play, jest, or mock, but she also says that "the effects of a successfully performed allusion" are "recognizing, remembering, realizing, [and] connecting" (301). As discussed earlier, Milton alludes to Edmund Calamy's fast sermon in *Areopagitica*, and he plays with language to illustrate the limitations of Calamy's vision of reform and also his character in enacting it. While it

[41] *Pectus* has a variety of meanings. In a physiological sense, it means the breast or breastbone. In a more general sense, it can mean the heart, disposition, soul, mind, individual, or even conscience. To translate the word as soul obscures the variety of connotations, but the English language lacks an exact equivalent. In the context of Milton's poem, then, *pectus* means more than soul; it refers to the total Protestant in body, mind, disposition, and conscience. Thus, virtue as a quality encompasses all aspects of the Protestant *pectus*, and Satan attempts to corrupt not just the soul but also the body and mind of individuals. For the variety of definitions, see Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.

connects Milton with Calamy, the allusion also connects the reformer Calamy who opposed Laudian control of the press with the licenser Calamy who enacts Presbyterian control of the press. Just as the allusion in *Areopagitica* collapses past with present so that Milton can comment, an allusion to Catullus in *In quintum Novembris* allows Milton to connect the poetic tradition of ancient Rome with Protestant England. When the shores of England first appear to Satan, Milton writes, "*Jamque fluentisonis albentia rupibus arva / Apparent* [And now the lands white with resounding cliffs appear] (25-26). The allusion to Catullus is slight, but meaningful. In his own miniature epic, Catullus describes Ariadne, standing on the shores of Dia and watching Theseus depart: "*namque fluentisono prospectans litore Diae* [and now gazing out from the wave-sounding shore of Dia] (64.52).[42] At this moment, Ariadne watches silently, enraged that Theseus has abandoned her, and only the sound of waves fills the landscape. Milton echoes the sound and sense of Catullus. Like the Roman poet, Milton's description evokes the image and sound of waves breaking against the rocks. Additionally, while Catullus uses the sonorous landscape to emphasize Ariadne's silent despair, Milton relies upon the sonic elements of the poetry to emphasize Satan's silent rage as the blessed land of England comes into view. This mode of intertextual allusion draws attention to the alluding poet and the poet alluded to in a self-conscious verbal echo. Stephen Hinds writes that "alluding poets exert themselves to draw attention to the fact that they are alluding" and that "allusions are so constructed as to carry a kind of built-in-commentary, a kind of reflexive annotation, which underlies or intensifies their demand to be interpreted *as* allusions" (1). Thus, Milton uses *fluentisonis* as a poetic signpost, a footnote for poets, which allows him to remember and connect—and appropriate—the shores of

[42] Catullus 64 is perhaps one of his lesser known works. Certainly it has not attracted the same level of attention as have the lyric poems about Lesbia. Poem 64 is a miniature epic in which Catullus recounts the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. At the wedding, a guest sees a tapestry that portrays Theseus and Ariadne, and so Catullus recounts the mythic tale including the abandonment of Ariadne on the shores of Dia. In his description of the poem, Kenneth Quinn says that the poem "served as a demonstration of technical virtuosity and devotion to the poet's craft" (297). One possibility, then, is that Milton was drawn to the form as an exercise to test his poetic skills.

Dia into a thoroughly English landscape. Milton transplants the Roman to the English, and in doing so, the waves of classical Rome fill the landscape of Protestant England. Allusion serves the dual purpose of, as Christopher Ricks might say, waiving and waving at the poetic tradition, and for Milton, allusion becomes a method to establish and to write a poetic and a national identity.[43] Allusion includes both possibilities. In Milton's description of the English shore, Stevens rightly detects traces of "England's paradisal happiness . . . that excites Satan's anger and envy," but the shore also demonstrates how Milton connects with the poetic tradition to establish himself and England as the proper heirs to the classical tradition (349). Whether in prose or in poetry, allusion allows Milton to engage with his predecessors so that he might question, critique, and appropriate their words for his own purposes. In the context of reform, then, allusion becomes a linguistic mechanism with which Milton reforms his sources to create his own narrative of Protestant England.

In addition to writing a poem that fits within the puritan narrative of Protestant England, Milton's time at Caroline Cambridge illustrates the complicated mixture of religious attitudes at the time. On the one hand, Christ's College was mildly puritan in outlook, yet Milton's tutors, William Chappell and Nathaniel Tovey, were decidedly ceremonialist. While colleges like Emmanuel were thoroughly puritan, the religious attitude at Christ's College presents a more complicated picture. Campbell and Corns acknowledge that while "Cambridge had its anti-ceremonialist and Calvinist hothouses," Milton's college is "more difficult to place on the spectrum" (26). John Morgan indicates that from "1560-1640 puritans established themselves as a force at a good number of colleges," and he points out that Christ's was one of the colleges that "retained their puritan reputations" (232-33). However, Tom Webster points out that "Puritan

[43] For his discussion of allusion, see Christopher Ricks, *Allusion to the Poets*, especially the chapter on plagiarism in which he discusses borrowing in Renaissance poetry. For allusion more generally, see Carmela Perri, "On Alluding," and William Irwin, "What is an Allusion?" For allusion in poetry, see John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo*, and for allusion in Roman poetry, see Steven Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*.

control of Christ's College had been lost in 1609 with the election of Valentine Cary" who would remain master until 1622 (42). Following Cary, Thomas Bainbridge became master, and though he was "well affected to the crown," he maintained his position as master into the 1640s when others were ejected, which suggests that his moderate puritanism appeased the reformers of the period (Knighton). The Fellows and tutors, also, indicate the difficulty in establishing a single outlook for Christ's. For example, Joseph Mede, perhaps the most noted Fellow, embodies the ecclesiastical complexity of the period that Milton was at Cambridge. According to Campbell and Corns, Mede "secured his Fellowship through the patronage of Lancelot Andrewes, and his own inclinations were certainly ceremonial and Arminian" (28). However, Ball suggests that it "would be incorrect to denominate him a party man in any strict sense." Rather, Mede—like many who live at complex times—held more nuanced views. According to Ball, his "theological and ecclesiological allegiance was finally settled in favour of moderation and episcopacy," though he held decidedly puritan views about the godly life and about Rome being the antichrist. Bainbridge and Mede represent the range of attitudes held by those overseeing the college, and they underscore the difficulty of attempts to identify Christ's simply as a puritan college.

The college master and fellows exemplify the range of ecclesiological and political tensions experienced at the college, but Milton spent the most time at Christ's with his college tutors, William Chappell and Nathaniel Tovey. Milton's first two years as an undergraduate at Cambridge were spent with Chappell in whose chambers he would have resided while in residence at Christ's (Campbell and Corns 27). Unlike Bainbridge and Mede, Chappell's views were distinctly Arminian. Though he once held puritan and Calvinist views, by the time of Milton's residence he was "openly espousing Arminian views" and quickly became the "most outspoken Arminian" at Cambridge (27). Milton fell out with Chappell, and in 1627, Milton's

father arranged for a new tutor, Nathaniel Tovey (38-40).[44] Like Chappell, Tovey held Arminian views so the change in tutor did not necessarily mean a significant change in ecclesiological outlook. Tovey would become something of a nonconformist during the years of presbyterian reform, and he was ejected from his position in 1647 for "refusing to use the *Directory for the Publique Worship of God* instead of the *Book of Common Prayer*, railing in the altar, and raising the steps in the chancel" (Campbell, "Tovey"). Additionally, the selection of Tovey as tutor may have been on account of a link with Richard Stock, the puritan minister of Milton's childhood parish (Campbell and Corns 40). These relationships indicate that the ecclesiological world of Milton's Cambridge did not reflect the battle lines that were to be drawn later in the 1630s and 40s. Adherence to Arminianism did not necessarily mean the rejection of Puritanism in the college, but it did reflect the change from Jacobean to Caroline interests. Charles sought unity in the church, and he preferred Arminians so their presence in prominent colleges was no surprise (Woolrych, *Britain* 50). According to Sharpe, Charles "rigorously proceeded against puritans – less for what they believed in conscience than for their challenge to the commonweal of church and state" (281-82). And, of course, William Laud followed Charles, and the "unity of the church rested not on narrowly defined dogma but on the community and uniformity of worship" (Sharpe 288). Charles and Laud desired unity in the church, which might account for the more prominent Arminian presence after 1625; however, such unity did not necessarily exclude puritan interests in the educational system.

A vital part of the puritan project of reform was the training of effective, learned clergy, but Milton's views about education differ in that he values humanist erudition rather than vocational training. The educational program at Cambridge required that he participate in public

[44] The reasons for the change in tutor remain unclear. Milton's brother Christopher reported to John Aubrey that John Milton had received some "unkindnesse," above which Aubrey wrote "whip't him." However, as Campbell and Corns relate, the "nature and date of the dispute [between Milton and Chappell] are not clear, nor is the evidence for whipping conclusive" (39). In addition to Campbell and Corns discussion (38-40), see Leo Miller's authoritative account, "Milton's Clash with Chappell."

debates and orations. In *Prolusion VII*, a declamation delivered in the chapel at Christ's College possibly in the autumn of 1631, Milton discusses "how and to what extent Learning and Ignorance respectively promote that happiness which is the aim of every one of us" (14).[45] Throughout the oration, he upholds the value of humanist education and condemns ignorance, which is the result of improper teaching and indolence (19). In particular, he asserts that the intellect provides the surest path to happiness. He writes, "For who can worthily gaze upon and contemplate the Ideas of things human or divine, unless he possesses a mind trained and ennobled by Learning and study, without which he can know practically nothing of them: for indeed every approach to the happy life seems barred to the man who has no part in Learning" (15).[46] He stresses the actions of gazing and contemplating as central to the activity of the intellect, and importantly, those activities allow the discernment of Platonic ideas, both finite and infinite. To understand both the finite and infinite truth, the mind must be trained, and for Milton, intellectual endeavor allows the Protestant subject to perceive human and divine truth. On the other hand, without learning, the intellectual capacity for happiness becomes nonexistent. Thus, to perceive the universal truths of the Platonic realm, Milton suggests that the intellect must be nurtured and nourished by learning. In effect, he creates an ethos of self-conscious reason that becomes the prerequisite for the capacity to understand the truth. Yet, for all his optimism about learning, he paints a bleak picture of the university in the absence of such learning. In perhaps the most famous passage of the prolusion, Milton recounts the disappearance of the "noble arts," which allowed "blind illiteracy" and "Ignorance" a place at the university:

---

[45] See Milton, *Epistolarum Familiarium*: "nunc illud mihi unice elaborandum video, ut ostendam quid in utraque re, & quantum habeat momentum ad illam in quam omnes ferimur beatitudinem" (138).

[46] See Milton, *Epistolarum Familiarium*: "Quis enim rerum humanarum divinaumque ιδεας intueri digne possit aut consideare, quarum ferme nihil nôsse queat, nisi animum per artem & disciplinam inbutum & excultum habuerit; ita prorsus ei cui Artes desunt, interclusus esse videtur omnis aditus ad vitam beatam" (139).

> Throughout this continent a few hundred years ago all the noble arts had perished and the Muses had deserted all the universities of the day, over which they had long presided; blind illiteracy had penetrated and entrenched itself everywhere, nothing was heard in the schools but the absurd doctrines of driveling monks, and that profane and hideous monster, Ignorance, assumed the gown and lorded it on our empty platforms and pulpits and in our deserted professorial chairs. Then Piety went in mourning, and Religion sickened and flagged, so that only after prolonged suffering, and hardly even to this very day, has she recovered from her grievous wound. (15-16)[47]

For Milton, the university, the very center of learning, has become the seat of illiteracy and ignorance, and the results of such incompetence extend to the pulpit, to the idea of piety, and even to the general notion of religion itself. Ignorance and illiteracy are not merely particular concerns, but they have universal implications. Individual incompetence in the pulpit leads to a lack of piety, which results in the waning of religion itself. At stake is not merely learning but the very essence of Protestantism itself. Milton's critique of the university, couched in historical terms, fits neatly within contemporary puritan concerns about educating the clergy, and so Milton really condemns the present level of education in the pulpit that seems destined to prolong the suffering of religion rather than remedy it. The puritan project of educational reform largely concerned particular aspects of teaching rather than global aspects about the dogma of university curriculum. As such, John Morgan notes that puritan practice had more to do with pedagogical practices within colleges than with restructuring and resisting "restrictive authority:" "Generally, the

[47] See Milton, *Epistolarum Familiarium*: "qua tota superioribus aliquot sæculis omnes bonæ Artes interierant, omnes tunc temporis Academias præsides diu Musæ reliquerant; pervaserat omnia, & occuparat cæca inertia, nihil audiebatur in Scholis præter insulsa stupidissimorum Monachorum dogmata, togam scilicet nacta, per vacua nostra & pulpita, per squalentes Cathedras jactitavit se prophanum & informe monstrum, Ignorantia. Tum primum lugere Pietas, & extingui Religio & pessum ire, adeo ut ex gravi vulnere, sero atque ægre vix inhunc usque diem convaluerit" (141-42).

puritan approach was . . . to work within existing structures, though to introduce activities which would *in practice* demonstrate the aphorism that learning was but a handmaid to divinity" (232). However, Milton's critique suggests that vocational training in divinity began to supersede actual humanistic learning to the detriment of the pulpit, piety, and religion itself. While Nicholas McDowell suggests that this passage indicates "a reversal of the Reformation," Milton's critique—when taken in the context of the entire prolusion—actually suggests not a reversal but a continued struggle between learning and ignorance as a necessary part of reform (98). For Milton, the Protestant ethos depends upon the precarious struggle between learning and ignorance. Where ignorance flourishes, piety and religion wane, but when learning flourishes, piety and religion become the "Ideas of things human or divine" that contribute to human happiness. Milton is less concerned with the halting of the reformation than he is with how the intellect overcomes the struggle with ignorance. Milton might critique the methodology of educating puritan divines, but he remains invested in the idea of erudition as a necessary component for the pulpit, for piety, and for Protestantism.

Milton also condemns the curriculum, students, and teachers at Cambridge. The curriculum, in particular, has been the subject of some dispute among historians. For example, Campbell and Corns write that the "syllabus at Cambridge has long been the Cinderella topic in studies of the university in the seventeenth century" on account of the lack of specific research into the particularities of the curriculum (30). However, Mordechai Feingold's exhaustive study of Oxford University sheds some light on Cambridge because the two universities were essentially the same in this regard. Feingold notes that the university statutes, often used to understand the curriculum, have misled historians to assume a scholastic model. The statutes stipulate that "the first year shall teach rhetoric, the second and third logic, [and] the fourth shall add philosophy" (213). Feingold calls the statutes the "most obvious" and "most detrimental" aspect in the misunderstanding of the curriculum because though they provide a general outline,

the statutes do not offer particulars (213). Instead, Feingold indicates that the curriculum was "shared by all students, irrespective of social background or length of stay" and that it was "quintessentially humanistic in nature" rather than scholastic (212-13). In fact, when he altered the statutes, Laud made it "clear that the ultimate purpose of both the BA and MA courses was to ensure, above all, the acquisition of a mastery of language and literature" (Feingold 215). Milton's own views confirm his interest in a humanist education, and his critique of the university curriculum appears to stem from a lack of this mode of learning. For example, in a letter to Alexander Gil in July 1628, Milton laments the learning in his fellow students who would soon enter the clerical ranks:

> There is really hardly anyone among us, as far as I know, who, almost completely unskilled and unlearned in Philology and Philosophy alike, does not flutter off to Theology unfledged, quite content to touch that also most lightly, learning barely enough for sticking together a short harangue by any method whatever and patching it with worn-out pieces from various sources—a practice carried far enough to make one fear that the priestly Ignorance of a former age may gradually attack our Clergy. (*CPW* 1: 313)[48]

As he would in *Prolusion VII*, Milton insists that clergy must be learned, and he fears that many of his fellow students do not share a sincere interest in humanist education. He does not limit his censure to students, but he also includes various subjects and teachers. For example, in *Prolusion VII*, he writes that the university ought to "select branches of learning that are useful" (19). He then laments the "despicable quibbles" that occur in "grammar and rhetoric," the teachers of

[48] See Milton, *Epistolarum Familiarium*: "Sane apud nos, quod sciam, vix unus atq; alter est, qui non Philologiæ, partier & Philosophiæ, prope rudis & profanes, ad Theologiam devolet implumis; eam quoq; leviter admodum attingere contentus, quantum forte sufficiat conciunculæ quoquo modo conglutinandæ, & tanquam tritis aliunde pannis consuendæ: adeo ut verendum sit ne sensim ingruat in Clerum nostrum sacerdotalis illa superioris sæculi Ignorantia" (11-12).

which talk "sometimes like savages and sometimes like babies" (19). Though he calls it the "queen of the Arts," Milton derides the teachers of logic who are "not like men at all, but like finches which live on thorns and thistles" (19). He was not alone in his concern about the state of education for the clergy, and as Feingold points out, William Laud registered similar complaints about Oxford. Laud laments that students are required to read Calvin's *Institutes* before they are capable to judge them: "to begin with it so soon, I am afraid doth not only hinder them from all grounds of judicious learning, but also too much possess their judgements before they are able to judge" (qtd. in Feingold 222). Laud, like Milton, stresses the need for suitable education to foster an intellect capable of judicious discernment rather than education being nothing other than vocational training. Milton, like Laud, considered the proper education of the clergy to be a fundamental part of the Protestant world. It was not that the clergy might neglect their pastoral duties, but rather the primary concern seems to be that the clergy are ignorant. Education, then, represents a central aspect of the ongoing reformation, and Milton's time at Cambridge showed him that the virtues of the intellect were to be nourished by humanist education rather than the merely vocational. Ultimately, Milton emphasizes individual reason rather than more general attempts to reform education in order to train clergy. He views individual reason as the focal point of a Protestant nation, and the educational system at Cambridge must be reformed lest ignorant clergy corrupt the people of England.

The years after Cambridge would be the most formative of the young Milton's life. From 1632 to the spring of 1638 when he departed for the continent, Milton lived with his family first at Hammersmith and then at Horton. During these years, the nature of his study suggests that he may have planned to pursue a divinity degree, and though he would ultimately reject a pastoral vocation, this time period reveals several key aspects of the Milton who would become a polemicist in the 1640s. First, in his assessment of Milton's reading during these years, William Poole confirms that Milton "was, in his own way, studying as if for the Baccalaureate in Divinity,

and as if he had never left Christ's College" ("Scholarship" 26). In fact, Campbell and Corns recount a story told by Anthony Wood that Milton's degree was incorporated at Oxford in 1635 because he "may still have been planning to take a BD . . . and he may have thought it prudent or decorous or appropriate to take the degree in the university which in the course of the 1620s had become a predominantly Arminian institution (from 1630 with Archbishop Laud as its chancellor) rather than in one in which a puritan consensus was emerging" (86-87).[49] That Milton was caught between Laudian Arminianism and Puritanism reflects the religious tensions of the period, and indeed the focus of Milton's study in these years was largely ecclesiastical.[50] Ultimately, this period of study, coupled with his previous views of the clergy at Cambridge, would lead to his decision to forego a clerical vocation, which is important for two reasons. First, as Poole suggests, his ecclesiastical reading of the 1630s "harmonizes with his polemic rhetoric" in that "Milton writes as a scholar for scholars, deriding the intellectual shortcomings of his opponents" (26-27). While Poole looks forward to the 1640s, such derision was already present in Milton's time at Cambridge. Thus, though he may have acquired a broader understanding of ecclesiastical history through extensive study, Milton's emphasis on the intellect has its roots in his time at Cambridge. Second, in these years, Milton was not a zealous, puritan radical, at least not yet. The tensions between Laud and the puritans were present, and to say that Milton was either a Laudian ceremonialist or puritan reactionary reduces the complexities of his life to a simple dichotomy. Rather, his family certainly had "Laudian tastes," and he was educated at a puritan college by Arminian tutors, which indicates that Milton experienced many modes of competing ecclesiology (Campbell and Corns 89). Poole redirects our attention to the contradiction and tension in Milton between his conservative reading and intellectual radicalism:

[49] No record exists of the incorporation of his degree, and the story is merely recounted by Wood. For a full discussion, see Campbell and Corns, pages 86-87.

[50] See William Poole's "Milton's Scholarship" for Milton's reading during this period.

> My own feeling is that Milton was an intellectual radical before he was a practical radical, and when he was reviled as the latter without respect to the former he was horrified. For he did not think of himself as straying away from a political centre; ever the moralizing scholar, he rather envisaged crown policy as having done so, and therefore being in need of just correction. The fact that this genuine, bookish radicalism could arise out of an (almost) impeccably conservative reading programme is surely the point of lasting interest. (43)

Milton's period of study at Hammersmith and Horton allowed him to pursue his academic interests in ecclesiastical history that may have initially been undertaken to pursue a degree in divinity. However, as Poole indicates, the result of such study was a "bookish radicalism" that would position him to later enter the polemical debates of the 1640s.

It was not necessarily Milton's reading in the 1630s that shifted him toward disillusionment with a clerical vocation. Rather, numerous events throughout the period drove Milton to reject a pastoral career for a poetic—and polemical—one. According to Campbell and Corns, 1637 became the "most important year of Milton's Horton period," and it "marks a turning point in his life" (92). In that year, Milton's father was involved in litigation, and perhaps more significantly, his mother Sara died (Campbell and Corns 92-93). Other political and religious events contributed to the momentous year. The most notorious was the trial of the puritans William Prynne, Henry Burton, and John Bastwick by the Star Chamber; as punishment, they were publically mutilated. At this moment, Campbell and Corns note that while "Milton had been a contented Laudian both in his personal loyalties and in his theology," this event meant that "Milton began to bid William Laud good night" (95). Additionally, the inspection of St. Michael's, the Horton parish church, in August only contributed to Milton's anti-Laudian sentiment (Jones, "Horton Parish Church" 50). Poole offers other suggestions. For example, he points out that Milton may have "perceived to some extent where the now eight-year-old Personal

Rule was tending," and he "worried about tyrants and liberty" ("Scholarship" 42). He may have been concerned about the mutilations of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick because of the "incarceration and near-mutilation of Gil in 1628, an admired older friend and teacher of Milton" (43). However, another event occasioned the most vivid image of Milton's discontent, and after the death of Edward King in 1637, Milton wrote *Lycidas*. In the pastoral elegy, Milton characterizes the clergy as "Blind mouthes! that scarce themselves know how to hold / A Sheep-hook" (120-21). The depiction recalls the "blind illiteracy" and "ignorance" in *Prolusion VII*, but coupled with Milton's disillusionment with Laud, the image becomes an even timelier indicator of Milton's compounding disgust with the state of the clergy. In her reading of Milton at the university, Sarah Knight detects the tension in Milton between adherence to Laudianism and disdain for those educated at the university who now serve Laud. Though there are Laudian elements present in *Lycidas*, Knight instead focuses on the prevailing idea that the poet's speaker forsakes the university for individual study (143-44). *Lycidas* represents the culmination of Milton's growing dissatisfaction with the university, clergy, and Laud, and it was ultimately a dissatisfaction that contributed to his decision to become the apologist for five puritan clergymen who sought to reform the episcopate.

2

Milton returned from the continent probably in August 1639, and rather than return to live at Horton, he chose to reside in London.[51] As Campbell and Corns indicate, "Milton had returned to a London in which the political future was bewilderingly uncertain," and uncertain for two reasons (133). Tension and anger after years of Personal Rule were growing, and discontent with Laudian control of the church had reached a breaking point. Milton's disaffection with Laud became evident in 1637, and in 1640, he registered those complaints in a print controversy. The

[51] The exact date of Milton's return remains uncertain, but Campbell and Corns suggest the probable date of August 1639.

general controversy began in early 1640 when Joseph Hall, then Bishop of Norwich, published a pamphlet, *Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted*, under the direction and influence of Laud. Milton entered the debate the following year, and between May 1641 and April 1642, he published five pamphlets in response to the ongoing public debate about episcopacy *iure divino*: *Of Reformation touching Church-Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it* appeared in May or possibly June 1641, *Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and Whether it may be deduc'd from the Apostolical times by vertue of those Testimonies which are alleg'd to that purpose in some late Treatises: One whereof goes under the Name of James Archbishop of Armagh* appeared in June of July, *Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence Against Smectymnuus* appeared in July, *The Reason of Church-Government Urg'd against Prelaty* appeared in January 1642, and *An Apology Against a Pamphlet Call'd A Modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus* appeared in April. In the fourth of these anti-prelatical tracts, *The Reason of Church-Government*, he describes the nature of his discontent at being "Church-outed by the Prelats" in a now famous biographical passage:

> But were it the meanest under-service, if God by his Secretary conscience injoyn it, it were sad for me if I should draw back, for me especially, now when all men offer their aid to help ease and enlighten the difficult labours of the Church, to whose service by the intentions of my parents and friends I was destin'd of a child, and in mine own resolutions, till comming to some maturity of yeers and perceaving what tyranny had invaded the Church, that he who would take Orders must subscibe slave, and take an oath withall, which unlesse he took with a conscience that would retch he must either strait perjure, or split his faith, I thought it better to preferre a blamelesse silence before the sacred office of speaking bought, and begun with servitude and forswearing. (41)

Milton, once destined for the church and whose course of study in the 1630s suggested that he might pursue a divinity degree, now describes the clergy as slaves under the tyranny of Laud. Earlier in the tract, he writes about the "impertinent yoke of prelaty, under whose Inquisitorius and tyrannical duncery no free and splendid wit can flourish" (40). To his concerns about an ignorant clergy, Milton adds that a clerical vocation under Laud denies the flourishing of wit. His disillusionment with the clergy, with Laud, and with the episcopate are evident, and he entered the controversy for several reasons: to attack Hall, Laud, and the episcopacy, to defend his former tutor Thomas Young as well as other puritan clergymen, and to espouse his own views about polemic as a mechanism of reform. Over the course of the five anti-prelatical tracts, Milton airs his grievances with the ecclesiastical establishment as well as his increasing interest in the rational individual as part of a Protestant congregationalism.

As has been discussed earlier, the print controversy began when Hall published *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament* in 1641. Shortly thereafter, puritan clergymen, writing under the pseudonym Smectymnuus, responded to Hall in a series of pamphlets. In these exchanges, Hall and the Smectymnuans carried out a public debate about ecclesiastical grievances that had been simmering under the surface throughout the period of Laudian control in the 1630s. Hall, the "so-called 'English Seneca,'" attempted to secure public opinion about Laud's views on episcopacy *iure divino*, and he "simply outclassed" the Smectymnuans (Corns 28; Fincham and Lake 859). To support Thomas Young, his former childhood tutor, Milton entered the debate. Because he responds to specific authors and ideas, Milton often employs combative, personal, and acerbic language in his polemic, and it shows the hallmarks of dialectical disputation he would have encountered at Christ's College as part of the university curriculum. Of the five tracts, only the third and fifth were immediate responses in defense of Smectymnuus: *Animadversions* and *An Apology*. In *Animadversions*, Milton employs "grim laughter" to refute Hall and to reveal the truth about episcopacy (3). In *An Apology*, Milton

again opposes Hall with a "savage condemnation" of his character, but he also depicts himself as a defender of truth (McCabe). In this sense, Milton's self-interest becomes evident as he presented himself as the polemicist with "the towering intellect, the withering analysis, the persuasive rhetoric, and the potent style" (Campbell and Corns 146).[52] The two tracts written in defense of Smectymnuus illustrate how Milton uses laughter as a reformative tool, which was a methodology that will characterize his relationship with Marchamont Nedham in 1650. However, my focus here will not be on laughter but a close reading of Milton's ideas in *Of Reformation*, *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, and *The Reason of Church-Government*. Though disillusioned with the church, Milton retained his puritan interests in scripture and the individual. Consequently, instead of advocating for a form of primitive episcopacy as did his Smectymnuan allies, Milton relies upon scripture to emphasize the rational individual who must exercise self-conscious reason to ascertain the truth. Ultimately, the locus for reform becomes neither the church nor salvation but the individual and truth.

Of Reformation was published anonymously, and in this tract, ostensibly about the many faults of episcopacy and of the clergy, the discovery of truth emerges as the telos of reform. Milton's disdain for the Laudian church emerges early in the pamphlet. He calls the reformation the "bright and blissful" act that "strook through the black and settled Night of *Ignorance* and *Antichristian Tyranny*" (6). He further laments the ruin of the church, which is now "no better then a Schisme, from all the Reformation" on account of the "sencelesse Ceremonies which wee onely retaine, as a dangerous earnest of sliding back to Rome" (7). The ideas of ignorance and tyranny had been on Milton's mind since the 1630s, and though the reformation may have purged these ideas, they have become especially pertinent during the years of "sliding back to Rome" under the Personal Rule and Laudian church. Implicit within ideas of ignorance and tyranny are

[52] A fuller discussion of Milton's tactics in these two pamphlets appears in the chapter on Stephen Marshall.

their opposites, knowledge and liberty, which Milton uses to redefine the Protestant reformation. In this first tract, Milton's establishes eternal truth as a stable category, which all Protestants have the capacity to access through scripture. For example, though he might "have otherwise inveighed against Error and Superstition with vehement Expressions," he has done so of "mere necessity, to vindicate the spotlesse Truth from an ignominious bondage" (12). In other words, the ecclesiastical establishment holds truth captive, and Milton writes to free truth from its captors. Truth, then, becomes a category distinct from the ecclesiastical establishment. Consequently, Milton implies two things: he writes to liberate truth and in liberating truth, he diminishes the need for the episcopate. If the latter implication was not clear, Milton later condemns the clergy for the ambitions to obtain "their Bishopricks" at the expense of their true purpose "for the saving of Soules" (83-84). About the truth, however, Milton contrasts its "plainnesse, and brightnes" with "the darknes and crookednesse" of humanity. By recalling the image of the "bright and blissful" reformation that has the capacity to banish ignorance and tyranny, Milton indicates that the human limitations of original sin might be conquered by the pursuit of truth. He writes,

> The *wisdome* of *God* created *understanding,* fit and proportionable to Truth the object, and end of it, as the eye to the thing visible. If our *understanding* have a film of *ignorance* over it, or be blear with gazing on other false glisterings, what is that to Truth? If we will but purge with sovrain eyesalve that intellectual ray which *God* hath planted in us, then we would beleeve the Scriptures protesting their own plainnes, and perspicuity, calling to them to be instructed, not only the *wise,* and *learned,* but the *simple,* the *poor,* the *babes,* foretelling an extraordinary effusion of *Gods* Spirit upon every age, and sexe, attributing to all men, and requiring from them the ability of searching, trying, examining all things, and by the Spirit discerning that which is good. (37)

Milton's reform hinges upon the God-given capacity, the "intellectual ray," of understanding that allows each Protestant, irrespective of erudition, age, gender, or social class, to perceive the divine truth present in scripture. He requires action, searching, trying, examining, and discerning, to understand the good. Furthermore, the end which the Miltonic individual seeks is truth, and consequently, the telos of Miltonic reform implies the removal of episcopacy as an object of ignorance that obscures the truth. Though he would continue to develop ideas about truth and reason over the course of the 1640s, *Of Reformation* signals the moment that Milton divorced truth from the ecclesiastical establishment. To free truth from its Laudian and ecclesiastical confinement, Milton becomes an ecclesioclast.

While *Of Reformation* was written as a general response to the ongoing debates about church governance, the second anti-prelatical tract was a direct response to Archbishop James Ussher, and it is worth noting that this response was much more cordial than the refutation of Joseph Hall. In *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, Milton refutes Ussher's views about Elizabethan church hierarchy, and in so doing, he draws upon a puritan emphasis on the individual interpretation of scripture rather than an ecclesiastical interpretation, which may serve ends other than what the scripture reveals. In short, the central question revolves around whether proper exegesis requires an authoritative episcopal hierarchy to provide such interpretation. In one sense, Milton uses himself as the exemplary individual who can expose the limitations of hierarchical power. He writes that if episcopacy is of human origin, then "we have the same humane priviledge, that all men have ever had since *Adam,* being borne free, and in the Mistresse Iland of all the *British,* to retaine this *Episcopacy,* or to remove it." Thereafter, he claims that the official purpose of the episcopate was "to distract, and stagger the multitude of credulous readers, & mislead them from their strong guards, and places of safety under the tuition of holy writ." Milton equates episcopal interpretation of scripture, which may be misleading, with the official purpose in the pamphlet controversy, which was to "distract" and "mislead." Milton conflates a problem

of scriptural interpretation with polemical methodology so that a victory in the polemical battle might cast doubt on the episcopate. Thus, he suggests that he might expose the insufficiency, inconvenience, and impiety of episcopal arguments to retain the extant church hierarchy by asserting a truth different from what has been claimed by Ussher in order to cast doubt on the manner in which truth itself is derived. For example, Milton refutes the use of Ignatius as a defense for episcopal government because Hall used Ignatius for "a truths sake" rather than for the sake of the truth (11). Ultimately, Milton refutes the claims about the scriptural tradition used to uphold the divine right of episcopacy by illustrating that the act of interpretation can manipulate truth to suit ecclesiastical or polemical ends.

In the following year, Milton published *The Reason of Church-Government*, and while the previous tracts had been published anonymously, Milton's name appears on this one. That his name appears is not uninteresting, and as Campbell and Corns point out, officially announcing himself as the author coupled with the autobiographical digression may have been Milton's attempt to stave off any "attempted character assassination" of the sort he experienced in previous exchanges with Hall (146). Written in response to *Certain Brief Treatises Written by Learned Men Concerning the Ancient and Modern Government of the Church*, which Campbell notes may have been edited by Archbishop Ussher, Milton's reply is his most sustained piece of polemic in the controversy ("Milton"). Most noted for the biographical digression in the preface to the second book, the tract offers several significant insights into the developments of Milton's ideas of reform. First, Milton condemns the outward appearance of external reform in order to shift the emphasis of godliness to the individual. Perhaps recalling the inspection of St. Michael's in Horton, Milton asks, "Did God take such delight in measuring out the pillars, arches, and doores of a materiall Temple, was he so punctuall and circumspect in lavers, altars, and sacrifices soone after to be abrogated, lest any of these should have beene made contrary to his minde?" (7). The critique of Laud's fastidious attention to architectural uniformity as part of holiness allows Milton

to redirect notions of godliness away from external architecture to the "soule of man which is his rationall temple" (7). However, unlike puritan divines who were interested in individual salvation, Milton's interest in the "soule of man" has to do with man's intellectual capacity to understand that true reform lies not in ecclesiology but in God's ability to "regenerate in us the lovely shapes of vertues and graces" (7). Milton also targeted the current ecclesiastical hierarchy which has not sufficiently restructured the church. He writes, "Let them make shewes of reforming while they will, so long as the Church is mounted upon the Prelaticall Cart" (5).[53] In *Of Reformation*, Milton denounces Laudian ceremonialism as a "sliding back to Rome," and here he implies a different sort of "sliding back" into the constraints of episcopacy. True change, he suggests, takes place in the Protestant individual.

Not only does he advocate that reform takes place in the godly individual but Milton also envisions a certain type of intellectual Protestant. Positing that the "birth of reformation" depends upon a "fierce encounter of truth and falsehood together" and "so violent a jousting" that it creates an atmosphere of competing views about the church, Milton holds an idealized view of the truth, and as such the "reformation shall be perfected" only when "truth has the upper hand" over "fond errors and fanatic opinions" (29). Though this view predates the toleration controversy, his view here anticipates the necessity for a variety of opinions in order to discern the truth. Eventually, Milton argues that such division and factionalism "shall be only the exercise of our knowledge, not the disturbance, or interruption of our faith" (29). By distinguishing between knowledge and faith, he differentiates an intellectual exercise from a matter of belief. For Milton, the godly Protestant must discern truth from falsehood without allowing such

[53] At this point, it is worth remembering the words of the puritan divine Richard Stock who, in *The Doctrine and Use of Repentance* of 1610, distinguishes between "outward reformation" and an inward "change of the heart from sinfulness to holiness" (20-21). Thomas Gataker, too, defines the insincere Protestants as those who appear "outwardly reformed" but who lack spiritual godliness "(*Joy* 100). I am not advocating that Milton consciously echoes Stock or Gataker, but I am saying that these similarities in thought about external and internal reform illustrate the continued puritan investment in spiritual salvation rather than ecclesiastical change.

distinctions to become a matter that compromises faith. Ultimately, Milton seeks to create an ethos of intellectualism, which depends upon two things: the presence of instruction and the exercise of reason. In the preface to the second book, Milton describes the power of epic poetry to make the truth look "easy and pleasant" to a nation even though it is "rugged and difficult indeed" (39). Poetry becomes a mode of instruction second only to the pulpit,

> to inbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of vertu, and publick civility, to allay the perturbations of the mind, and set the affections in right time, to celebrate in glorious and lofty Hymns the throne and equipage of Gods Almightinesse, and what he works, and what he suffers to be wrought with high providence in his Church, to sing the victorious agonies of Martyrs and Saints, the deeds and triumphs of just and pious Nations doing valiantly through faith against the enemies of Christ, to deplore the general relapses of Kingdoms and States from justice and Gods true worship. (39)

While the elevation of poetry calls to mind Milton's decision to pursue a poetic rather than a clerical vocation, both poetry and the pulpit become places to provide spiritual sustenance and moral instruction. While poetry and the pulpit might be messengers, the intellectual Protestant remains the locus of truth and virtue. The second aspect of godliness is the exercise of reason, and he relies upon the polemical controversy to illustrate the need for self-conscious reason. He hopes that his pamphlet will "leave a calme and pleasing solitarynes fed with cherful and confident thoughts" as it embarks "in a troubl'd sea of noises and hoars disputes" (41). He contrasts the "bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightfull studies" with the "hollow antiquities sold by the seeming bulk" complete with their "marginal stuffings" (41). Milton uses this opposition about his own polemical struggle in the episcopal debates to illustrate the violent jousting between truth and falsehood, and as Poole indicates, ""Milton writes as a scholar for scholars, deriding the intellectual shortcomings of his opponents" ("Scholarship" 26-27). As such,

Milton beseeches “any gentle apprehension that can distinguish learned pains from unlearned drudgery” to “imagin what pleasure or profoundnesse can be in this, or what honour to deal against such adversaries” (41). Milton’s disingenuous humility serves only to elevate himself as a polemicist and to undermine the erudition of his ecclesiastical opponents, but to understand this distinction, he seeks a “gentle apprehension.” If truth is to be victorious and the reformation perfected, then the truth about reformation must be understood by godly individuals rather than the ecclesiastical establishment.

While “gentle apprehension” is a far cry from the “warfaring Christian” that would appear in November 1644, the anti-prelatical tracts reveal much about Milton’s views of reform in response to the public controversy about episcopacy *iure divino*. Though he was unsatisfied with ignorance of the clergy prior to 1640, the controversy confirms Milton’s move away from the established church, most notably the episcopacy but also the nascent push for a presbyterian mode of church governance. As a corrective for what he viewed as a tyrannous and oppressive mode of church doctrine, he asserts that the godly individual must ascertain his or her own relation to the truth as revealed by scripture. As such, a few notable ideas emerge. As a reformer, Milton retained certain puritan attitudes in terms of the emphasis on self-examination and the primacy of scripture, but he moved away from mainstream reformist tendencies related to the church. Milton positioned himself as a reformer who was interested in a stable, ontological category of truth that could be revealed by scripture and sought by the Protestant individual. Through writing, through refutation, through argumentation, and through humor, Milton revealed that the truth is an intellectual pursuit. Though he positioned himself as an emerging voice for the truth of reform amidst the tumultuous debate about episcopacy, he also shifted the debate about ecclesiastical change from the church to an ideal realm of truth.

In the anti-prelatical tracts, Milton responded to a public controversy about episcopacy, and the tracts confirm his break from the ecclesiastical establishment as well as his ideas about the godly individual being at the center of religious change. Milton's next foray into public debate came shortly after the Westminster Assembly convened in the summer of 1643. In August of that year, Milton published *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, which was revised into a second edition published in February of the following year. As Thomas Corns notes, the pamphlet "represents his first unmistakable deviation from the prevailing orthodoxies of Calvinist Presbyterianism, his first pamphlet written outside a polemical exchange, and his first real gesture towards intellectual independence and originality" (*Virtue* 39). Because of its argument, ostensibly that unsuitable marriages not in accord with God's purpose for the institution ought to be annulled, Milton and his pamphlet were denounced.[54] Consequently, Milton was alienated from the mainstream religious establishment which he had defended only a few years before. In the midst of the controversy, Milton published *Areopagitica* in November 1644, and in March 1645, he published *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion*, both defenses of his views on divorce which had been attacked in the time after *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* was published. While *Areopagitica*, discussed in the introduction to this chapter, responds to the Licensing Act issued by Parliament in 1643, the image of the "true warfaring Christian" represents the culmination of Milton's views about the role of individual reason in the ongoing work of reformation. On the other hand, the Divorce Tracts, as the four pamphlets are commonly known, illustrate how Milton attempts to contribute original ideas about social reform, how he engages with the public discussion about toleration, and how he responds to being attacked from the pulpit and in the

[54] There has been much speculation about the reasons for Milton's interest in divorce, namely his unhappy marriage to Mary Powell. However, as Campbell and Corns indicate, reading the tract biographically obscures Milton's purpose in addressing Parliament and the Assembly about social reform; they note that the tract "should not be regarded as a window into Milton's own sexuality or his relationship with Mary" (161).

press. By examining the Divorce Tracts, we can see how Milton views himself in the context of reform. From the first to the second edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, Milton's argumentative emphasis shifts from sincere attempts to offer a program for a reconsideration of Christian marriage to attempts at refuting the truth of those who attacked him in print. In *Colasterion* and *Tetrachordon*, on the other hand, Milton employs similar tactics as those used in the anti-prelatical tracts, but with a twist. When mainstream Presbyterians opposed and ridiculed his ideas on reform and branded him a heretic, Milton adopted their very rhetorical strategies in order to vindicate his own ideas and negate theirs.

As was the case with *Areopagitica*, one of the most obvious elements of these pamphlets are their title pages, and these pages in the first and second editions of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* reveal much about Milton's intentions and attitude. In the first edition, published anonymously, Milton seeks to reform marriage through the proper reading of the scriptural tradition. The title page indicates that divorce will be "Restor'd to the Good of both Sexes, From the bondage of Canon Law, and other mistakes, to Christian freedom, guided by the Rule of Charity."[55] Additionally, the author suggests that within the pamphlet, "many places of Scripture, have recover'd their long-lost meaning," which is "Seasonable to be now thought on in the Reformation intended." Ideas of bondage and liberty emerged earlier in the anti-prelatical tracts, and here Milton suggests that this tract, in particular, will liberate the idea of Christian marriage from its ecclesiological constraints. Additionally, Milton speaks indirectly to the Assembly because the ideas in the tract are timely, given the newly inaugurated discussions about ecclesiastical reformation. As Sharon Achinstein points out, the "very title echoes the Protestation sworn by each member each day, an oath swearing to 'maintain nothing in point of doctrine but

[55] Much has been written about whether Milton's ideas of divorce were actually for the "good of both Sexes." For further discussion, see Diane Purkiss, "Whose Liberty? The Rhetoric of Milton's Divorce Tracts," Annabel Patterson, "'No meer amatorious novel'?", and Mary Nyquist, "The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in *Paradise Lost*."

what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God; nor in point of discipline'" (175). The puritan emphasis on the primacy of scripture is evident in the daily Protestation, and by echoing that declaration, Milton establishes himself as an unofficial member of the Assembly who submits an idea about marital reform for their consideration. Anger at the reception of the first edition is evident in the title of the second, which I provide in full: *The Doctrine & Discipline of Divorce: Restor'd to the good of both Sexes From the bondage of CANON LAW, and other mistakes, to the true meaning of Scripture in the Law and Gospel compar'd. Wherein also are set down the bad consequences of abolishing or condemning of Sin, that which the Law of God allowes, and Christ abolish not. Now the second time revis'd and much augmented. In Two Books: To the Parlament of* England *with the Assembly*. The title retains much from the first edition, but canon law receives greater emphasis as does the necessity of scriptural interpretation. Whereas the Parliament and Assembly were only the implied audience of the first edition, in the second, Milton, whose initials appear on the title page, directly addressed both the political and the ecclesiastical bodies lest there be any confusion. These are minor, but conspicuous, distinctions that demonstrate Milton's desire to participate in the reformation as well as his disillusionment at being alienated for voicing such ideas.

In addition to the changes on the title page, Milton also changes the mode of address to his readers, and he includes a lengthy address to Parliament and the Assembly in the second edition. At the opening of the first edition, Milton writes that "the perversenesse of our folly is so bent, that we should never lin hammering out of our owne hearts, as it were out of a flint, the seeds and sparkles of new miseries to our selves, till all were in a blaze again. And no marvell if out of our own hearts, for they are evill" (1). He emphasizes individual work to correct for the faults of original sin. In his reading of the passage, Thomas Corns indicates that Milton sees his readers as "participants in the process of rediscovering hidden truth, fellow-toilers under the burdens of postlapsarianism" (*Virtue* 45). For Milton, the "hidden truth" of the postlapsarian

world can be located in prelapsarian Eden. According to William Poole, the "ideal of marriage Adam and Eve represent carries forward beyond the Fall and operates now. But the realization of that perfection is at best uncertain, and divorce caters for those occasions in which human weakness, whether through over-hasty union or genuine mistake, has led to a disastrous marriage" (*Fall* 134). In a fallen, imperfect world, a perfect union might not be possible, and Milton relies upon postlapsarianism to justify divorce in a fallen world. Beginning the first edition with such a statement allows Milton to assert the universal "perversenesse" of mankind that must be hammered out. Ultimately, such a statement invites his readers, ostensibly Parliament and the Assembly, to participate in the project of marital reform as corrective to mankind's fallen nature.

In the prefatory letter to the second edition, Milton does not discuss the need to overcome man's postlapsarian nature but rather the need to dispense with custom, which he says "still is silently receiv'd for the best instructer."[56] He seeks to redefine the stakes for his ideas about reforming divorce, and rather than it being a deviation from Calvinist orthodoxy, he presents it is a matter of custom and error that must be remedied. He calls custom the "swoln visage of counterfeit knowledge and literature" that "in publick is the common climer into every chaire, where either Religion is preach't, or Law reported." Custom has infiltrated both the pulpit and the court, and so Milton suggests that he is not questioning religious or legal orthodoxy but attempting to reform custom. By shifting the terms of the debate from custom to truth, he implies that customs about marriage have obscured the truth about divorce. To overcome the errors wrought by custom is the work of mankind who must pursue the truth:

[56] In the original pamphlets, prefatory material was not paginated. As such, when citing such material from Milton, Nedham, and other authors, the absence of page numbers indicates that the citation comes from the prefatory material. In this paragraph, all citations come from the prefatory epistle of the second edition.

> Error supports Custome, Custome count'nances Error. And these two betweene them would persecute and chase away all truth and solid wisdom out of humane life, were it not that God, rather then man, once in many ages, cals together the prudent and Religious counsels of Men, deputed to represse the encroachments, and to worke off the inveterate blots and obscurities wrought upon our mindes by the suttle insinuating of Error and Custome.

For Milton, hope for reformation comes not in the conquest of the imperfections of original sin but in the Assembly, the "prudent and Religious counsels of Men," which has the capacity to alter custom and law if it is no longer in accord with the truth. By separating custom from truth, Milton seeks to break the hold that custom has on religion and law. In some sense, he suggests that to break from religious and legal customs *is* the very work of the reformation, which implies that the Assembly remains beholden to such custom. Later in the prefatory epistle, Milton addresses the issue of divorce more explicitly when he writes that "no effect of tyranny can sit more heavy on the Common-wealth, then this household unhappiness on the family. And farewell all hope of true Reformation in the state, while such an evill as this lies undiscern'd or unregarded in the house." The Assembly of divines might represent hope for change, but so long as the tyranny of custom remains, "true Reformation" remains impossible. By linking the particular issue of marital change with the national project of reform, Milton suggests that the latter cannot happen without the former. Reformation becomes not merely an ecclesiological matter but an opportunity to reassess religion, law, and social custom according to scriptural tradition.

The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce was not well-received. William Poole calls it "phenomenally unpopular," and he suggests that Milton was "naive to think that the posture of moral austerity would win him a fair hearing from the Assembly" (*Fall* 137). Contemporary opinion about Milton's tract supports Poole's assessment, and many have long noted how his tract was treated by heresiographers during the toleration controversy. In January 1644, one

month before the second edition of Milton's *Doctrine* was published, Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, and William Bridge, a group of independents who had fled England under Laud but had since returned to serve on the Westminster Assembly, published *An Apologeticall Narration*. The tract broadly advocates for liberty of conscience and toleration for views that did not adhere to mainstream Presbyterianism. Others voiced similar concerns. Two months later in March, Henry Robinson published the *Liberty of Conscience* in which he argues that "all other Christians who are now reproached under the name of Puritans, Separatists or Nonconformists of what kind soever, who are so far from being suspected, that they must needs be acknowledged the greatest enemies to Idolatry, may enjoy such peace and freedome, as will permit them to keep alwayes a good conscience both before God and man." As Presbyterians sought to control dissent by portraying the tolerationists as heretics, Milton was caught in the crossfire. The most notorious example is Herbert Palmer's fast sermon, *The Glasse of Gods Providence*, preached in the summer of 1644, in which he condemns Milton and his tract as wicked: "If any plead Conscience for the Lawfulnesse of *Polygamy;* (or for divorce for other causes then Christ and His Apostles mention; Of which a *wicked booke* is abroad and *uncensured;* though *deserving to be burnt,* whose *Author* hath been so *impudent* as to *set his Name* to it, and *dedicate it to your selves,*) or for Liberty to *marry incestuously,* will you grant a *Toleration* for all *this?*" (57). The Stationers' Company, too, became involved when they petitioned Parliament "to inquire out the Authors, Printers, and Publishers, of the Pamphlet against the Immortality of the Soul, and concerning Divorce" (qtd. in Campbell and Corns 165). Though he merely sought to contribute ideas about marital reform, Milton's views were cast aside because what he thought was intellectual and practical advice for social reform was viewed as radical heresy.

In this moment of toleration and condemnation, Milton defended his position on divorce in two pamphlets published in 1645: *Colasterion: A Reply to a Nameles Answer against The*

Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce and *Tetrachordon: Expositions upon The foure chief places in Scripture, which treat of Mariage, or nullities in Mariage*. Both pamphlets reveal different, and new, aspects of Milton's reformist strategies. In *Colasterion*, Milton returns to a familiar mode of polemic in which he refutes the "Nameles Answer" in a point-by-point conversational style. This tactic recalls that of the anti-prelatical tracts written in defense of Smectymnuus when Milton refuted Hall with a similar strategy. The 1645 tract bears many hallmarks of Miltonic refutation: he appeals to the truth, he accuses his opponent of showing "us nothing but his own contemptible ignorance," and he observes the "singular note of stupidity" of his adversary for "his Trade is not to meddle with Books" (1-4). In short, Milton turns his adversary into an unfit caricature that he then refutes. In addition to his normal tactics of refutation, Campbell and Corns point out that Milton "claims his own status both socially and intellectually, speaking to the elite theologians in the Assembly and the propertied men sitting in parliament" (171). In his insightful reading of Milton's rhetorical strategies in these two tracts, James Egan concludes that "*Colasterion* silences *An Answer* by redefining its author as a buffoon, a pretentious lackey whose literality merely generates raw material for Milton's creative inference: the dramatic dialogue of *Colasterion* evokes the commonplace genre format of animadversion even as it mocks and surpasses that genre" (130). Though his polemic certainly silences the "Nameles Answer," the rhetorical strategies employed by Milton do not necessarily surpass the genre; rather, Milton simply rehearses reformist tactics developed in earlier years when he opposed Hall.

Tetrachordon, on the other hand, suggests a distinct development in Milton's ability to surpass the views of his political and especially his religious detractors in Parliament and the Assembly. Ostensibly, the tract does as its title suggests, and Milton offers a thorough exegesis of four instances in scripture that deal with marriage. In the pamphlet, however, his views about the power of writing to facilitate reform reach new heights. Again, he addresses the pamphlet to Parliament, and in the prefatory epistle, he acknowledges the recent "printed Calumny" that was

directed at him. Without naming him, Milton singles out Herbert Palmer's fast sermon that was preached before Parliament. Though it no doubt fell on deaf ears, Milton beseeches the "Parlament of England" to consider his "Expositions of Scripture." However, as Campbell and Corns point out, the pamphlet was "written in an idiom better suited to learned divines like those currently sitting in the Assembly" than it was to those who sat in Parliament (171). The language and erudition of Milton's exegesis may not have been "better suited to learned divines," but it may have been a direct response to divines like Palmer.[57] As Egan points out, Milton's rhetorical strategy in *Tetrachordon* mimics that of the puritan sermon, with its emphasis on scriptural interpretation. He argues that Milton elected the rhetorical strategy "to evoke the format of the Parliamentary preachers who had attacked" him (122). Milton's exegetical strategy confirms Egan's reading, and for each of the four instances, Milton explicates and interprets scripture, extrapolates certain points of doctrine, and applies the text to public concerns about Christian marriage.[58] In *The Reason of Church-Government*, Milton suggests that poetry is second to the pulpit. However, in *Tetrachordon*, Milton's rhetorical tactics reveal how polemic surpasses the pulpit in its ability to appropriate language, form, and style to refute and surpass opponents. Milton's strategies in *Colasterion* and *Tetrachordon* illustrate how he responds to his polemical opponents by adopting the very strategies they use to critique his ideas. In *Areopagitica*, Milton alluded to Edmund Calamy in order to suggest that his ideas of reform ought to be reformed. In *Tetrachordon*, Milton not only alludes to detractors such as Palmer but also employs their own strategies to, in Egan's words, beat them at their own game (122).

---

[57] Egan lists other sources that most likely attracted Milton's attention: Daniel Featley's *The Dippers Dipt*, William Prynne's *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions Touching Church Government*, Thomas Young's *Hope's Incouragement*, and Matthew Newcomen's *A Sermon, Tending to Set Forth*.

[58] The puritan method of sermonizing is laid out by the Elizabethan William Perkins in *The Arte of Prophecying*. For further discussion, see Blench, *Preaching in England*, pages 100-112, and Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pages 132-141.

Milton's polemic in the mid-1640s illustrates two things, namely, his sincere interest in participating in the project of reform and his subsequent disillusionment with the Presbyterian establishment that he once supported. As Campbell and Corns note, "No Smectymnuan ever attacked Milton by name in print or, so far as we know, in the pulpit, nor did he attack them" (161). However, as his changing attitudes toward the Parliament and Assembly indicate, Milton's views differed from those enacting ecclesiastical reform. Consequently, Milton's disillusionment with the clerical establishment reached its breaking point, and while the Assembly considered the nature of religious reformation, Milton was not bound by the same religious strictures on reform. Thus, his intellectual ideas about reform were, in some sense, detached from the practical constraints of the moment. Milton may have opposed episcopacy and defended Smectymnuus, he may have desired to participate in social reform of the press and Christian marriage, but ultimately, Milton's ideas about true reform existed in the ideal realm of truth. For Milton, true reformers were not bound by the limitations of ecclesiology or political constraint, but instead, they were "warfaring" Christians who exercised reason to justify even the most radical of ideas about change. Ultimately, Milton's notions of the intellectual Protestant failed to resonate with the ecclesiastical reformers of the 1640s. Sometime in 1646-47, Milton composed a sonnet that captured the vehemence of his anti-clericalism. In the final line of "On the new forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament," Milton closes with a damning analogy: "New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ Large" (20). Laudian tyranny had not been reformed. It was only renamed.

4

John Milton's relationship with Marchamont Nedham, at first glance, seems surprising, even inconsistent. Milton became what he had years before detested in *Areopagitica*, and in March 1651, he began licensing the official newsbook of the newly established Commonwealth, *Mercurius Politicus*, which was written by Nedham. After the execution of Charles and the abolition of monarchy and the House of Lords, the Council of State appointed Milton to be the

Secretary for Foreign Tongues in March 1649, and it was in his capacity as public servant that their relationship began. Milton's obligations included the investigation into subversive material. Campbell and Corns report that in June of that year, he was asked to look into Nedham's Royalist newsbook, *Mercurius Pragmaticus* and to submit a report on his findings (247). At that time, Nedham was in prison for his work on behalf of the Royalists, during which time he was "brought into danger of his life" (Wood 3.1181). In November 1649, he was released, and in May, he was employed by the Council of State. In a professional capacity, Milton would officially license Nedham's newsbook until January 1652, but the two quickly became friends after their work began. Both men were employed by the Commonwealth, and both, in different capacities, were asked to justify the newly established government after monarchy had been abolished. In this regard, their work shares two ideas: first, both relied upon laughter as a reformative tool in print controversy, and second, they shared similar rhetorical strategies about how to persuade their audience.

Just after being employed by the Council of State, Nedham submitted a prospectus to Milton that outlined his design for *Mercurius Politicus*. The proposal distinguishes between truth and deceit, seriousness and jocularity, and fancy and reason: "The designe of this Pamphlett being to vndeceive the People, it must bee written in a Jocular way, or else it will never bee cryed vp: ffor those truths which the Multitude regard not in a serious dresse, being represented in pleasing popular Aires, make Musick to the Comon sence, and charme the Phantsie; which ever swayes the Scepter in Vulgar Judgement; much more then Reason" (French 2: 311). Nedham's proposal would have sounded familiar to Milton. Though he advocated that the locus of reform was the intellectual Protestant, Milton was no stranger to the use of humor in polemic. Dating back to his engagement in the public debates about episcopacy in the early 1640s, Milton's primary strategy in *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus* was laughter. He advocates for the role of "grim laughter" to refute Hall and denounce the follies of episcopacy

(3). He writes that "even this veine of laughing (as I could produce out of grave Authors) hath oft-times a strong and sinewy force in teaching and confuting" (3). Milton sees laughter not just a tool to confute but also a tool to educate. Self-conscious reason might have been the necessary quality for godly Protestants, but Milton also acknowledged the efficacy of laughter as a polemical tactic. In fact, in *Animadversions*, Milton demonstrates how a polemical occasion warrants the use of "grim laughter" and rough language rather than reason; it will be Milton who

> stands up for all the rest to justifie a long usurpation and convicted Pseudepiscopy of Prelates, with all their ceremonies, Liturgies, and tyrannies which God and man are now ready to explode and hisse out of the land, I suppose and more then suppose, it will be nothing disagreeing from Christian meeknesse to handle such a one in a rougher accent, and to send home his haughtinesse well bespurted with his owne holy-water. (1-2)

For Milton, as for Nedham in his proposal for *Politicus*, laughter sways the emotional response of the individual. Milton asks his Protestant readers to put aside their Christian values while he lampoons his opponent and ultimately sends him home "bespurted with his owne holy-water." Nedham, in a similar fashion, suggests that by presenting quotidian affairs in a jocular style, the audience will react emotionally, and thus become more inclined to read his newsbooks. In order to reform public opinion, whether it be to justify the need to reform the episcopate or to justify the *de facto* sovereignty of the Commonwealth, both Milton and Nedham recognize the efficacy of laughter.

In addition to the use of laughter, Milton and Nedham employed similar rhetorical strategies to define their audience. In October 1649, Milton published *Eikonoklastes* as a polemical refutation of the *Eikon Basilike*, which had been published earlier that year when Charles was executed. As Campbell and Corns report, *Eikonoklastes* "is both an officially

endorsed response to *Eikon Basilike* and the personal statement of John Milton," which made him the "principal defender of the English republic" (223). As such, Milton was given a monumental task to justify regicide and republic, to refute Royalist propaganda, and to express his own views to a potentially hostile audience. Milton's description of his audience in the preface reveals much about how he views the challenge:

> And though well it might have seem'd in vaine to write at all; considering the envy and almost infinite prejudice likely to be stirr'd up among the Common sort, against what ever can be writt'n or gainsaid to the Kings book, so advantageous to a book it is, only to be a Kings, and though it be an irksom labour to write with industrie and judicious paines that which neither waigh'd, nor well read, shall be judg'd without industry or the paines of well judging, by faction and the easy literature of custom and opinion, it shall be ventur'd yet, and the truth not smother'd, but sent abroad, in the native confidence of her single self, to earn, how she can, her entertainment in the world, and to finde out her own readers; few perhaps, but those few, such of value and substantial worth, as truth and wisdom, not respecting numbers and bigg names, have bin ever wont in all ages to be contented with.

Milton suggests that the task may be futile among the "Common sort" on account of their "prejudice" after the execution of Charles. In other words, part of his audience is predisposed to disagree, no matter his argument. In spite of its potential reception—or because of it—Milton writes to send the truth abroad to find "her own readers," and "those few" will be the ones who are capable of understanding the truth of the matter. In short, Milton dismisses those who already disagree with him and accepts those who agree. In his reading of Milton's audience, Daniel Shore writes that the "fit-though-few trope" employed by Milton acts as a "heuristic device for the reader: the choice made while reading is not so much who you are as who you want to be and

how you want to be treated" (132). As Shore suggests, Milton forces the audience, before reading the argument, to choose whether to be of the "Common sort" who envy and prejudice or one of the "few" who possess truth and wisdom. In this way, Milton constructs his audience to "exclude so as to include exclusively" (Shore 136). Ultimately, this rhetorical device shifts the objective from persuading readers to grant their assent to presenting readers with a choice to be common or fit.

In May of 1650, Nedham makes a similar distinction in *The Case of the Commonwealth of England, Stated*. After being released from prison for writing for the Royalists, Nedham wrote the tract to justify the new republic and to persuade readers to assent to its political sovereignty. In the preface to the reader, he begins by announcing that he, like many of his readers, may have once held an "Opinion contrary to what is here written." Nedham then divides his readers, like Milton, but unlike Milton, he bases his rhetorical strategy on political interest:

> I have divided them into *Two Parts,* and accommodated Them with a *Method,* suitable to those two Parties whereof the world consists; *viz.* the *Conscientious* man, and the *Worldling.* The former wil approve nothing but what is *just* and *equitable;* and therefore I have labored to satisfie him (as I have done my Self) touching the *Justice* of Submission: The latter will imbrace any thing, so it make for his *Profit;* and therefore I have shewn him the *Inconveniences* and *Dangers,* that will follow his opposition of a *settlement.* Now, though the other should continue *obstinate* in their *erroneous pretences;* yet of this latter sort, I dare promise my Self an abundance of *Proselytes,* the greater part of the world being led more by Appetites of *Convenience* and *Commodity,* than the Dictates of Conscience: And it is a more current way of perswasion, by telling men what will be *profitable* and *convenient* for them to do, than what they *ought* to do.

Milton's "common" and "few" have become the "Conscientious man" and the "Worldling," and though the terms have shifted, the same rhetorical strategy holds. Nedham requires his readers to make a choice: to live by reason or by profit. While Milton seems beholden to the idea that truth and reason reign supreme, Nedham is more politically pragmatic and inclusive. Milton seeks a readership of the few, Nedham seeks a readership of the many while implying that the few are incapable of seeing what lies in their best interest. Milton and Nedham use the same rhetorical strategy to define and to create their audience but for distinct purposes. Although they may have disagreed about the role of truth and interest in the attempt to reform public opinion, both men would have acknowledged that successful polemic depends upon effective rhetorical strategies. Ultimately, their similar methodologies reveal distinct views of reform. Whether educated by laughter or persuaded by a choice to be common or fit, Milton viewed self-conscious reason as the locus for reform. Nedham, on the other hand, though he employed similar tactics, viewed practical, political interest as the foundation for reform.

CHAPTER IV

Marchamont Nedham: Reform by Serio-Jocose Refutation

In August of 1643, Thomas Audley and Marchamont Nedham began publishing a parliamentarian newsbook, *Mercurius Britanicus*, that responded to the claims of John Birkenhead, their Royalist counterpart from Oxford who wrote *Mercurius Aulicus*.[59] For Audley and Nedham, the primary aim of their newsbook, generally published a week after its Royalist opponent, was to oppose and to refute, often factually and occasionally humorously. For example, in September of 1643, Birkenhead reported a story about how the "Ladies and other publick Gentlewomen for the service of the pretended *Houses* . . . have legislative power to compel their obedience," and he proceeds to discuss the affairs of Sir Arthur Haselrig who had apparently allowed a "handsome Merchants Wife" to "passe his vote" and to join him on board a ship to London (17-23 Sept. 1643).[60] In a typical reply, Audley and Nedham begin the issue by refuting the very character of Birkenhead: "I will not say Master *Aulicus* is mad"—implying that he is, in fact, mad—"but I am sure he hath lost his wit" (26 Sept.-3 Oct. 1643). They go on to discuss the role of women, and in doing so, they provide a response that negates and undermines the Royalist

[59] As Blair Worden relates, the exact roles of Audley and Nedham in preparing *Mercurius Britanicus* remains unclear, but he suggests that "Audley seems to have collected the material for *Britanicus*, Nedham to have written it up" ("Roundhead" 305). Certainly, the structure of *Britanicus* suggests a rigid refutation of news items published by Birkenhead, which might be the influence of Audley; however, the style of *Britanicus*, particularly the humorous moments, is entirely Nedhamesque.

[60] In the citations for newsbooks, I will provide the weekly range of dates to identify each issue because original pagination and issue numbers do not remain consistent throughout the dates of publication. When quoting from the same issue in sentences following a citation, I will not repeat the parenthetical citation unless there are intervening quotations from other sources or when the citation is not obvious.

cause by resorting to popular depictions of Henrietta Maria as the true sovereign. They write, "Master *Aulicus* if our Ladies have a legislative power, I am sure some of your ladies have a *Soveraigne power* . . . we know who can rule her husband at *Oxford* . . . I tell you we doubt here whether this be the year of the Kings raigne or the Queens." Fears about the influence of Henrietta Maria on Charles stem from popular fears about her Catholicism. As Keven Sharpe points out, in 1639 before Charles convened Parliament, "The ascendancy of the queen's faction, and more especially of the Catholics within her entourage, undoubtedly fostered a fear that began to seize the nation, and "a suspicion of popish plots and a fear of a Catholic invasion or rising" provided "fertile ground for anxiety" (842). Audley and Nedham tapped into this fear and anxiety about the religious influence of Henrietta Maria in order to suggest that political power itself had been compromised. What began for Birkenhead as an attempt to undermine parliamentary political power in the "pretended Houses" in London became for Audley and Nedham an opportunity to cast doubt on the politics and religion of Charles and Henrietta Maria.

Then, to refute the report about Haselrig, they explain that "Master *Aulicus* is woefully strayned here betwixt *a lye*, *a story*, *and a iest*," and they advise him to "lay thy conceit in *Lavander*, drinke the other pinte in the meane time, and talke with a Court wit, and by that time you may do good on it" (26 Sept.-3 Oct. 1643). Of course, lies, stories, and jests about Henrietta Maria formed the basis for their earlier refutation. However, the point is not logical consistency but refutation by any means necessary. According to Audley and Nedham, Birkenhead lacks the wit to understand distinctions between truth, lies, and jests, which implies that they possess the wit to make these differentiations. Audley and Nedham demonstrate that the news depends less upon fact and more upon the ability to refute, to oppose, and to challenge the narrative of their political opponents. To report the news meant that facts, like lies, stories, and jests, served the purpose of constructing a narrative that legitimizes Parliament and delegitimizes the Royalists.

Although his career in journalism started alongside Thomas Audley, Nedham became one of the most popular and feared polemical voices in the civil war period. According to the Royalist Anthony Wood, Nedham earned quite a reputation in London, and he reports that "this Nedham being become popular, and an active man in person among the rout, he was commonly called capt. Nedham of Greys inn, and what he said or wrote was looked upon as gospel" (3.1181). While we can sense his disdain for "this Nedham," Wood's comments also reveal that Nedham had something akin to a religious following. In the years of political violence and ecclesiastical reform, Nedham emerged for the public as the gospel truth, so to say. Additionally, his affiliation with Gray's Inn, where he served as an under-clerk before his turn to journalism, indicates that he was known in legal and political circles.[61] Nedham's reputation was not entirely positive. Wood, referring to his work for Parliament, called him the "Goliah of the Philistines . . . who might very well have challenged the precedency of Satan" (3.1181). John Cleveland, another Royalist, wrote in 1650 that Nedham's tongue was so "virulent" that there was surely "some venereal cause" and added that Nedham had a "publique Brothell in his Mouth" (2-3).[62]

Designed to disparage their political opponents, such invective was commonplace in popular print during the period, but these characterizations reveal that Nedham, in particular, possessed the power to sway public opinion as though he spoke from the pulpit. How, then, does a polemical journalist fit into the context of ecclesiastical and constitutional reform? How does Nedham view the press as a tool both to stabilize a political community and to destabilize political opponents? This chapter explores how Nedham contributes to the ongoing struggle for reform throughout the 1640s and early 1650s. The substance of his political writing, primarily his weekly newsbooks, provided the public with a chance to understand the rapidly changing

[61] Joad Raymond reports that his time at Gray's Inn contributed to the "legal knowledge that informed his later political thought" ("Nedham").

[62] The short pamphlet was published anonymously, but Cleveland was its author.

political, martial, and religious events of the period. Nedham's primary goal, whether writing for the Parliament or for the Royalists, was the negation and refutation of his opponents. Though his political allegiance changed, Nedham's combative strategy, designed to persuade, to convince, and to reform public opinion, remained consistent. Both politics and truth were fluid concepts that he manipulated in order to secure public opinion. For Nedham, language was a means to reform for political ends, irrespective of party or of truth. Beginning with an example that illustrates how Nedham and Audley negate accusations of religious discord in London, the remainder of the introductory section traces various views about the role of discord and strife in public opinion. Images of discord from historical sources as well as from contemporary poetry and prose underscore the anxiety about controlling the press and public opinion, and they indicate why Wood and Cleveland may have been so eager to discredit Nedham's role in the 1640s and 50s.

In addition to political issues, newsbooks often reported information pertaining to religious matters. The Westminster Assembly had convened for the first time in the summer of 1643 to begin the process of reforming the church, and in the September issues of *Aulicus* and *Britanicus* mentioned above, the authors discuss feuds among the divines. Birkenhead reported that a "spirit of discord" had erupted in London on account of differences between "good honest Brownists and Anabaptists" and the "Crafts-men of the New Assembly" (17-23 Sept. 1643). Though Audley and Nedham claimed that he lacked wit, Birkenhead depicts the clergymen who undertook the serious endeavor to reform the church as mere "Crafts-men," which illustrates the contempt for the Assembly at Oxford. The attempt did not go unnoticed, and Audley and Nedham reply, "For our Divines whom ye call the new *Crafts men*, is this the worst you can call them, you that have railed, and miscalled thus long, and no better at it yet?" (26 Sept.-3 Oct. 1643). Aside from the repartee about wit, Britanicus claims that "for the spirit of discord in London, there is none now" unless it had been sent from Oxford. They not only deny the existence of discord, but

they also redirect the accusation into a description of constructive rather than destructive argumentation:

> We can dispute and *shake* hands at the same time, we can argue, like brethren one against another, and both against you at *Oxford*; we can discusse our differences in our own seates and no man go out nor excentricate [sic], we can warme our Church with Arguments, and not set our Chappell where we sit on fire, we can agree on our owne Latitude and space in divinity, and can mutually move in our severall Orbes of judgement and discipline without grazing or fretting on each others conscience.

Such a view on dispute and dissent as part of a Protestant nation fits with the ongoing tolerationist debates in the Assembly that would erupt in the following year with *The Compassionate Samaritane*, *The Apologeticall Narration*, and, in November 1644, John Milton's *Areopagitica*. However, Britanicus portrays a picture of unity and dissent that may not have been entirely true. In June of 1643, Parliament passed the Licensing Act, which was the futile attempt by the Presbyterians and the House of Commons to regulate printed material in order to tamp down on dissent (Corns, *Virtue* 56). In fact, as Ann Hughes reports, Parliament was committed "to the political use of print, as the means through which it became established as an alternative government, as well as a tool of its propaganda" (208). As an example of such control, Hughes recounts the distribution of 11,000 copies of the Protestation Oath in May of 1641 that "bound its takers to the defence of true religion, the privileges of Parliament, and the royal prerogative" (208). MPs and all adult males were required to take the oath. By 1643, in the midst of civil war with the oath a thing of the distant past, Parliament sought to control the press and to eliminate dissent with the Licensing Act, which makes the claims of Audley and Nedham somewhat disingenuous. Thus, while claims of discord in London may have been truthful, Britanicus painted a different picture of Parliament's toleration that implicitly condemned, and recalled,

Caroline press regulation. As this exchange indicates, newsbooks often obscured or altered truth in order to justify or to condemn a particular side. At stake was not necessarily fact but truth, and throughout the Civil War period, an ideological battle for public opinion was waged in the press.

Concerns about public opinion and discord were not new, and these specific reports about religious discord in 1643 only continue a historical narrative about the fears that printed material might foment unrest within the state. For example, Sallust, a significant influence on Nedham's political thought, discusses the fickleness of the common people in the *Catilinae Coniuratio* (Raymond, "Nedham"). Thomas Heywood's 1608 translation captures the early modern insistence on changeable public opinion:

> The Commons, constant in inconstancie, and who at first in their inherent dispositions to novelties, wished well to the war; now as soon as the plot was discovered, with chaunge of opinions, chaunged likewise their prayers into curses against Cateline and his Counsels, extolling Cicero to the heavens, and as people newly redeemed into liberty, made publicke demonstrations of joy and jollity. (98)[63]

The discovery of plots that changes prayers to curses confirms how public opinion can be shaped, and, for Nedham in particular, the capacity to sway public opinion became an essential part of his methodology in printed material. The unflattering portrait of public opinion in Sallust continues, and Heywood's translation depicts the ease with which reason is dismissed at the expense of inclination: "Our inclinations followe our fancies: if Liberty possesse them, then Will

[63] See Sallust, *Catilinae Coniuratio*, 1: 48: Interea plebs coniuratione patefacta, quae primo cupida rerum novarum nimis bello favebat, mutata mente Catilinae consilia execrari, Ciceronem ad caelum tollere: veluti ex servitute erepta gaudium atque laetitiam agitabat.

predominateth and Reason is of no regard" (101).[64] Not only Sallust but Virgil and Tacitus, too, register similar complaints about public opinion. When Aeneas relates the debate in Troy about whether to allow the Trojan Horse into the city walls, Virgil depicts the opinion of the common people as divided: "Scinditur incertum studia in contraria volgus" [the inconstant person was divided into contradictory opinions] (2.39). In the *Historiæ* Tacitus says something similar about the senate being divided into fervent opposition: "ea ultio, incertum maior an iustior, senatum in studia diduxerat" [this retribution had divided the senate, uncertain whether it was greater or more just, into zealotry] (4: 6). Sallust, Virgil, and Tacitus each voice similar admonitions about the fickle nature of the individual in response to public discourse, and what these classical authors warn against would echo into early modern discourse.

Other politically-minded images of discord emerge in poetry. The Elizabethan poets Thomas Sackville and Edmund Spenser provide allegorical images of Debate and Errour. In his *Induction*, the prefatory proem to the *Complaint of Buckingham*, which first appeared in the 1563 *Mirror for Magistrates*, Sackville describes a series of allegorical figures. Following closely behind the figure War "that kings and kingdoms rued," he depicts "Deadly Debate, all full of snaky hair, / That with a bloody fillet was ybound, / Out-breathing nought but discord everywhere" (390, 401-03). Debate begets discord, which follows closely behind War, but Sackville's image offers more than a mere correlation between War, Discord, and Debate. By portraying Debate as a medusa-like figure who breathes nothing but discord, Sackville draws upon the mythic Medusa who turned onlookers to stone to suggest that Debate itself has a similar mythic control over those upon whom it breathes. Discord becomes the inevitable consequence for all those who look upon—and engage in—debate. Edmund Spenser, on the other hand, provides a more concrete image of printed material that is the product not of "Deadly Debate" but

[64] See Sallust, *Catilinae Coniuratio*, 1: 51: ubi intenderis ingenium, valet; si lubido, possidet, ea dominator, animus nihil valet.

of "Errour." In Book I of *The Faerie Queene*, as Red Cross Knight enters a "place vnknowne and wilde," he is cautioned to "Be well aware" lest he encounter "suddaine mischief" and "danger hid" (1.1.12.1-3). Shortly thereafter, the "Gentle Knight" enters "the wandring wood, This *Errours* den, / A monster vile, whom God and man does hate: / Therefore I read beware" (1.1.13.6-8). During Red Cross Knight's battle with Errour, Spenser's description of the grotesque monster equates error with the printed word:

> Therewith she spewd out of her filthie maw
>
> A floud of poyson horrible and blacke,
>
> Full of great lumps of flesh and gobbets raw,
>
> Which stunck so vividly, that it forst him slacke,
>
> His grasping hold, and from her turne him backe:
>
> Her vomit full of bookes and papers was,
>
> With loathly frogs and toades, which eyes did lacke,
>
> And creeping sought way in the weedy gras:
>
> Her filthie parbreake all the place defiled has. (1.1.20.1-9)

The gruesome and vile image of the allegorical monster Errour allows Spenser to link errancy with the printed word, and it is no coincidence that both God and man hate Errour, in whom lies "bookes and papers." Though allegorical, Spenser's monster provides a monstrous image about the idea that error lurks in the printed word. For Spenser, errancy begets error, and the cautionary allegory moralizes the act of wandering; or, to put it another way, lest one exercise caution, Spenser suggests that the act of reading may lead to wayward opinion. Caroline poets, too, lament the presence of discord in the state. Though he died in 1635, Thomas Randolph writes of the

pleasures of pastoral retreat to the country so that he might escape the "chargeable noise of this great town" and bid "Farewel" to the "city-wits that are / Almost at civil war" (4, 10-11). From a collection published in 1648, the Royalist Mildmay Fane offers a timely assessment about the lack of sense in the combative language: "Awake, thou best of sense, / Intelligence, / And let no fancy-vapor steer / Thy contemplation t'think that peace is near, / Whilst war in words we do bemoan, / There's nothing less left in invention" (1-6). Intelligence, no doubt, plays upon the weekly intelligencers like *Mercurius Britanicus* and *Mercurius Aulicus* that purport to offer news but that represent—especially to Royalists like Fane—the sort of discord and debate that begets error and leads to war.

Political voices also censure public discourse as a cause of political unrest. Francis Bacon, for instance, who experienced a rapid rise after the accession of James I before being expelled from office for accepting bribes in 1621, demonstrates the shrewdness of his mind about political, legal, and moral matters in his 1625 collection of essays, *The essayes or counsels, civill and morall, of Francis Lo. Verulam, Viscount St. Alban*, the enlarged edition of essays that he began publishing in 1597. Appearing a short way into the 1625 collection, the essay "Of Seditions and Troubles" recounts various reasons for discord in the state, and Bacon singles out libel and false news as matters of concern. He writes that "Libels and licentious discourses against the state when they are frequent and open; and in like sort, false news often running up and down to the disadvantage of the state and hastily embraced; are amongst the signs of troubles" (76-77). That he laments the frequency and openness of discourse published against the state and that he singles out false news as an indicator of dissension becomes a prescient observation given the explosion of newsbooks during the Civil War period. His admonition reflects the ambivalence about the possibility for print culture to create insurrection. He also highlights how libel, licentious discourse, and false news if "hastily embraced" will be done so without reason or reflection. Spenser's Errour looms over Bacon's admonition about news, and it

underscores the fears about the political consequences of unlicensed printing. Others expressed anxiety and distrust about the stationers as well as the printed word. In *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, Robert Burton criticizes the rampant printing of books in English rather than in erudite Latin: "Any scurrile pamphlet is welcome to our mercenary Printers in *English*" (10). Furthermore, he laments the number of uneducated writers who publish what he calls "a vast *Chaos* and confusion of bookes" (8-9). Burton's criticism, while not directly aimed at popular pamphlets and news, prompts questions about the nature of the "mercenary stationers" who print without discretion and about the mass of printed material which oppresses its readers. Still other cautionary voices would emerge in the 1640s following the collapse of the Star Chamber and High Commission, which facilitated the rampant pamphleteering and distribution of newsbooks during the revolutionary decade. John Milton suggests that books, though possibly contentious, provide the opportunity to exercise reason. In *The Reason of Church Government Urg'd Against Prelaty*, Milton sends his tract into a "troubl'd sea of noises and hoars disputes" so that it might "leave a calme and pleasing solitaryness fed with cherful and confident thoughts" (41). Milton later condemns both the nature and mass of published pamphlets in which he sees little thought; he writes that the "bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightfull studies" has "come into the dim reflexion of hollow antiquities sold by the seeming bulk, and there be fain to club quotations with men whose learning and belief lies in marginal stuffings" (41). Bacon, Burton, and Milton register different levels of anxiety about printed material and about the mechanisms to regulate the press. That Parliament sought some measure of control with the Licensing Act of 1643 indicates that printed material was seen as a method to control opinion, to limit dissent, and to legitimize political and religious action. In this divisive and contentious environment, the battle raged for public opinion in the press. Nedham became the chief combatant in the ideological contest between truth and lies, and he ultimately sought to use print in order to reform public opinion.

The remainder of this chapter investigates the language of Marchamont Nedham in his newsbooks and pamphlets throughout the 1640s. Nedham's political fluidity allowed him to navigate the tumultuous period by applying the same methodology of reform on behalf of Parliament and Royalists. Over the course of the Civil War period, he presents himself as an apologist who refutes his political opponents in order to educate the public. The first section provides a brief historical overview of the emergence of the newsbook in order to demonstrate that it was a novel phenomenon that shaped public discourse throughout the period. The second section offers a close reading of select passages from *Mercurius Britanicus*. By attending to discussions about the efficacy of language, Audley and Nedham emerge as journalists who develop a methodology of jocose refutation to alter public opinion. The third section discusses *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, which Nedham wrote on behalf of the Royalist party. Nedham bore the sole responsibility for writing *Pragmaticus*, which he managed to do while living in London, then controlled by Parliament. While writing for the Royalists, Nedham's combative language reached its satirical heights, and he embodied the motto for *Pragmaticus*: *nemo me impune lacessit* [let no one attack me with impunity]. The final section of the chapter turns to Nedham's work for the Parliament in 1650 and subsequent years. After the execution of Charles I and the abolition of monarchy, he became the apologist for the newly established Commonwealth. By looking at select passages from *The Case of the Commonwealth of England, Stated* as well as *Mercurius Politicus*, the officially licensed newsbook of the new government, this section demonstrates how Nedham applies his serio-jocose methodology to attract and to convince a specific readership. Studies of Nedham tend to situate him as a journalist caught up in the explosion of early modern printed material or as a political polemicist who advocates for parliamentary republicanism.[65]

[65] For discussions of Nedham, newsbooks, and the popular press during the Civil War period, see Joseph Frank's *Cromwell's Press Agent* and *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper*; Joad Raymond's *The Invention of the Newspaper*, *Making the News*, and *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*; Joad Raymond, ed., *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, especially Raymond's chapter "News" and Jason Peacey's chapter "Pamphlets;" Blair Worden's "Marchamont Nedham and the

However, in the context of constitutional and ecclesiastical reform, Nedham emerges as a practical reformer who develops a specific methodology to refute, to persuade, to oppose, to proselytize, to justify, to manipulate, and to laugh in order to defeat and silence his political opponents.

1

To understand Nedham's work in the period of constitutional and ecclesiastical crisis, some preliminary remarks must be made about the newsbook and pamphlet. In his discussion of civil war newsbooks, Joad Raymond remarks that they were "the product of a particular political moment; not the release of old pressures, but a response to something new" (*Invention* 81). When Nedham began writing for Parliament with Thomas Audley in 1643, the country was embroiled in civil war, which only marked the beginning of the tumultuous events that were yet to come. Constitutional concerns about the power of the crown and Parliament came to a head after years of Charles I's Personal Rule, and ecclesiastical concerns about the structure of the English church led to the Westminster Assembly, convened in the summer of 1643 to establish a new mode of church governance. The "particular political moment" was a confusing jumble of political and religious ideas, and these ideas were being voiced in public debate through cheap print publications like newsbooks and pamphlets. The "something new" was the need for information in a political and spiritual moment of crisis. In an immediate sense, the collapse of the Star Chamber and High Commission in 1641 allowed for the rampant proliferation of printed materials. However, as Jason Peacey notes, to suggest that there was one single cause overestimates the early modern censorship mechanism and devalues the larger social atmosphere

---

Beginnings of English Republicanism," "'Wit in a Roundhead': The Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham," and *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England*; and Jason Peacey's *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, "Marchamont Nedham and the Lawrans Letters," and "The Struggle for *Mercurius Britanicus*: Factional Politics and the Parliamentarian Press;" David Norbrook's *Writing the English Republic*; and Nigel Smith's *Literature and Revolution in England*.

at the moment: "Only when these three factors—censorship, religious and political tension, and the willingness to engage in debate—are considered in unison can the pamphleteering revolution of the 1640s and 1650s be fully understood" ("Pamphlets" 462-63). Nedham capitalizes on the lapse in censorship, resolves religious and political tension, and expresses a willingness—and delight—to enter public debate. Raymond observes that the newsbook "had become history, but also a means of understanding the present" ("News" 378). Nedham's work allowed him to record events and to provide clarity in a complex time of rapid change. Consequently, he was a historian, a journalist, and a propagandist who used current events to shape public opinion for his political employers, and the primary methods to re-form public opinion about events were newsbooks and pamphlets. The remainder of the section outlines some pertinent aspects to understand Nedham's work: an overview of the newsbook, a discussion of the literacy rates in England, and some remarks about the emergence of a public sphere.

Newsbooks have received much attention as documents central to our understanding of print culture in the early modern period, but some misunderstandings remain.[66] The best way to understand the newsbook is to distinguish it from what came after and before, the newspaper and the coranto. In his account of the English newspaper, Joseph Frank offers several distinguishing characteristics of the modern newspaper:

> The first is that a newspaper is printed, not written by hand. As a result it has always been potentially available to a large audience. Second, a newspaper is published at regular and frequent intervals – and during the seventeenth century the normal interval was a week. Weekly publication, in turn, distinguished the early newspaper from the nonrecurrent pamphlet of news and from the precursors

[66] See, for example, volume one of *The Oxford History of Print Culture*, which covers print culture up to 1660. I suspect, also, that the digitization of newsbooks has contributed to the growing interest in these documents.

> of the modern magazine which were issued monthly or semi-annually. Third, a newspaper concentrates on current events, though in the seventeenth century there were many borderline journals whose concern with news was dubious. (1)

To some degree, these features apply to newsbooks: they were printed at regular intervals, with some exceptions, and they discussed recent events, albeit they regularly tended toward propaganda. While these characteristics demonstrate how the modern newspaper emerged from the newsbooks, linking the two of them obscures the distinct significance of the newsbook as a phenomenon that emerged during the Civil War period. In the strictest sense, the newsbook was just that: a book of news published as a quarto pamphlet (Raymond, *Invention* 80). As such, the newsbook, as a printed document, has more in common with the pamphlet than with the modern newspaper. Raymond stresses the need for the term newsbook because it "is preferable not only because it most conveniently describes the object, but because it enables the historian to differentiate the publications between 1641 and 1660 from what came before and after" (*Making the News* 2). Though, Raymond concedes, the "newspaper can be said to have been *invented* in 1641," care must be taken to differentiate between the newsbook as predecessor and the newspaper as successor ("News" 384).

The predecessor to the newsbook, small pamphlets of news called corantos, contain certain features that both distinguish it from and link it to the newsbook. Corantos have their roots in pamphlets of news dating to the 1590s and to Dutch imports of newsletters at the outset of the Thirty Years War. Joseph Frank identifies the Dutchman, Pieter van den Keere, as the first to publish the English coranto. In his *Corrant out of Italy, Germany, &c.*, van den Keere provided foreign news at a continued interval of twice-monthly (3). Two features distinguish the coranto from the newsbook: first, the coranto lacked the weekly interval of publication, and second, they were often "plodding and impersonal, and it lacked both highlights and human interest" while newsbooks often conflated news with propaganda (Frank 4-5). Things changed rapidly, and in

1622 Nathaniel Butter developed the coranto into something akin to a newsbook (Frank 7-11; Raymond, "News" 380-81). Frank discusses how Butter adapted the form of the coranto: "From a single sheet of small folio size they shifted to a quarto pamphlet usually consisting of from eight to twenty-four pages. Thereafter, until the founding of the *Gazette* in 1665, all English newspapers were published in this semipamphlet form, and people viewed them as 'books' of news; hence their title pages and their being 'authored' rather than 'edited'" (7). In addition to the form of the book, Raymond notes that Butter gave his pamphlets "a more or less continuous title—for a while this was the solemn *Mercurius Britannicus*," and Butter also "added a method of continuous dating on the title-page and then introduced issue numbers" ("News" 381).[67] Butter inherited and adapted the conventions of the coranto into something resembling a weekly book of news, though the intervals between publications distinguish Butter's work from what would become the regularly published newsbook.

In form and substance, the newsbook that would remain a constant presence during the civil war period first emerged in late 1641. The demand for news was growing as tensions between the crown and Parliament mounted. As Raymond notes, either late in 1640 or early in 1641, "scriveners began to produce manuscript accounts of proceedings in both Houses of Parliament" (*Pamphlets* 151). These manuscript reports appeared weekly, which was a crucial aspect that differentiated the coranto from the newsbook. When finally they were printed, it "increased the numbers in circulation" and "substantially reduced the price and therefore attracted a more heterogeneous audience" (151). Though parliamentary speeches had been published during the reign of Elizabeth, the practice lapsed under the Personal Rule (Frank 20). However,

[67] The precedent of using "Mercurius" in the title, a commonplace in newsbooks of the Civil War period, dates to the semiannual *Mercurius Gallobelgicus* of 1594. Using "Mercurius" in the title indicates that the authors of newsbooks followed historical examples, but it also indicates how they viewed themselves as something like Mercury, the divine messenger of ancient Rome, who communicated eternal truth to the people. Wood's comment that Nedham's words were "looked upon as gospel" indicates that newsbooks were consumed as though they communicated divine truth about political and religious events.

speeches are not printed accounts of the weekly proceedings in Parliament. Political debate had been shifted from the Parliament to the public, but the tipping point came in November 1641 when the House of Commons decided to publish the Grand Remonstrance. It was a bold decision to expose constitutional disagreements between the crown and Parliament in order to garner public support. On the one hand, it represented a mode of "public accountability" and transparency in government, but on the other hand, it was pure propaganda (Raymond, *Pamphlets* 151). The first official newsbook, distinct from the coranto and the newspaper, was printed in the same week that the Remonstrance was approved (151-52). It was a printed account of the manuscript proceedings in Parliament, which violated the "conventions of parliamentary privilege," but it seems to have been printed as an exercise in propaganda under the direction of John Pym (151). Raymond calls this moment "startling" and "electric" because never before had political news been widely distributed as a means to justify parliamentary grievances with the crown (151). From that moment on, London was flooded with a variety of weekly newsbooks that mingled news with propaganda in an attempt to sway and secure public opinion. Before this moment, "Politics did not happen in public," but after John Thomas published the first newsbook, politics only happened in public (151).

The newsbook and pamphlet may have been available to a broad audience, but it is difficult to gauge how many in that audience were able to read. Literacy is a notoriously difficult problem, but a brief account will provide a fuller, if more complicated, picture of Nedham's readership. Few things about literacy may be said with any certainty: first, literacy in London was much higher than in rural England; second, there is no accurate way to measure or to determine literacy in London; and third, literacy rates may reasonably be said to improve over the course of the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, there are some helpful ways to address the question without answering it. For instance, David Cressy offers a type of literacy that is "directly measurable, the ability or inability to write a signature" (106). Limited to Norwich, Cressy's

study demonstrates the limitations of estimating literacy in England, but his study confirms that among the most literate were the clergy and gentry while women remained the most illiterate (108). He admits the limitations of his own study, and rightly calls it a "fruitful starting place" rather than a definitive measurement (106). Not all follow Cressy's caution, however, and some venture percentages about literacy rates. John Feather, for example, contends that while literacy is a "matter of debate" in the latter half of sixteenth-century England, "it seems reasonably safe to conclude that up to 60 per cent (and rising) of tradesmen and craftsmen in London and the south-east of England were literate" (11). However, Raymond offers different percentages: "by 1600 . . .about 70 per cent of men and 90 per cent of women, and by 1700 about 50 percent of men and 70 percent of women were illiterate" ("Introduction" 4). Numbers are misleading, and conclusions about literacy will remain contentious estimates. However, Feather singles out a burgeoning class of reader that is neither clergy nor gentry: the tradesmen and craftsmen. Nehemiah Wallington, the puritan turner who resided in London throughout the 1640s, belongs to this class of reader, and because the literacy of this class continued to grow throughout the seventeenth century, by the 1640s and 50s, a substantial portion of London would have been able to interact with printed material. Carlo Cipolla approaches the matter tentatively:

> It is not easy to draw a general conclusion from the scattered evidence that I have quoted and the similarly scattered evidence that I have not quoted . . . I could go on to conclude that at the end of the sixteenth century "there were more literate people than we generally believe" . . . I could equally conclude that "there were less literate people than we generally believe" for in all truth one never knows what it is that "we generally believe." (qtd. in Eisenstein 34)

Literacy rates will remain a subject of dispute, but there was an energetic readership in London as evidenced by the sheer number of newsbooks and pamphlets that were printed during this period. Thus, discussions about literacy do not limit the reach of newsbooks and pamphlets; instead, such

discussions should expand because readers who were not members of the clergy or gentry consumed political material for the first time. Rising literacy rates reflect the growing public interest in politics.

Attempts to measure literacy in the early modern period remain doubtful, but questions about what constitutes being literate also emerge. Cressy distinguishes between active and passive: "Theoretically it may be useful to distinguish passive literacy, an ability to read without knowledge of writing, from active literacy, where writing as well as reading has been mastered, but the documents at our disposal do not permit such sophistication" (105). Though active and passive literacy cannot be determined, the distinction remains helpful. Early modern education models taught reading before writing so theoretically, if we follow Cressy, the number of those with active literacy would have been fewer than those with passive. However, this distinction does not often figure into estimates of literacy, and it is perhaps helpful only as a theoretical distinction. Clanchy, although writing about medieval England, makes a similar distinction amongst the literate, but the two groups are not based solely on the ability to read and write, rather on the ability to understand. Clanchy asserts that "It was a commonplace of medieval schoolroom practice that *legere* (meaning 'reading' in the sense of pronouncing the text correctly) preceded *intellegere* (meaning 'understanding' the text through grammar and vocabulary" (205). Together, both Cressy and Clanchy suggest a distinction amongst the growing literate population in England, and while writing about separate time periods, their observations are helpful to establish a general characterization of the London audience. Simply being able to read a newsbook or pamphlet did not necessarily equate to understanding the political implications of such material. For example, when he proposed *Mercurius Politicus* to John Milton in 1650, Nedham claimed that he would "vndeceive the People." Considerations about reading and understanding reveal the scope of Nedham's purpose. Those who read without understanding cannot recognize that they have been undeceived, which means that Nedham deceives them into

assenting to his views about the Commonwealth. For those who both read and understand, Nedham reforms their previously held views by providing them with the truth, which suggests that these readers are capable of understanding that they had been deceived about their previous political opinions. A full consideration of how Nedham manipulates his readership will be provided in section 4, but because newsbooks essentially conveyed parliamentary debate to the public, the consequences of such debates loomed large for the readership. Questions of literacy do not close off possibilities about Nedham's readers, but rather these questions indicate that newsbooks and pamphlets consequentially shifted the moral, political, and religious landscape of the early modern readership.

Historians of the period often speak about the public sphere and about popular print culture. However, both terms are just as misleading as they are helpful. Jurgen Habermas introduced the idea of the public sphere in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, and he considered it as a broadly accessible public space with discourse characterized by the participation of a bourgeois public with a vested interest in the state.[68] However, since its introduction, the concept of the public sphere has been subjected to scrutiny, to the point that "only the name 'public sphere' remains (and it does remain), with few of its original contours" (Raymond, "Introduction" 5). In particular, it remains useful when describing the 1640s and 50s in England, even though Habermas himself did not extend his thesis back into the period. Instead, the terms have shifted to discussing a popular print culture. Raymond claims that the term is

[68] See Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. For an account of the changes to the Habermasian thesis, see Raymond, "Introduction" 4-14. For his earlier investigation of the Habermiasian thesis and the popular public sphere, see Raymond's "The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century." For a reconsideration of the public sphere, see Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England." Instead of the Habermasian public sphere, Lake and Pincus introduce what they call the "post-Reformation public sphere," and in their study, they identify the Civil War period as a sort of transitional moment that established a new norm (273). They characterize the new norm by "the intensity, speed, and sheer volume of popular and public political discussion" (280).

useful to describe print culture "not because it is the voice of the people, nor necessarily because it was widely read among the people or reflected their views, but because the people were understood to be involved in the publicity dynamic, the dynamic by which print came to play a part in public life and the political process" ("Introduction" 6). Somewhere between popular print culture and the public sphere is the tumultuous period of the English Civil Wars when newsbooks and pamphlets both allowed for and defined the public participation in the political realm.

Nedham's newsbooks and pamphlets fit within the public sphere of popular print culture that emerged amidst the political and religious tensions in the 1640s. Raymond concludes that popular print culture "is the social dialogue, and the mediations of experience, that these objects [cheap print] facilitated," and he adds that the "demonstrable growth of cheap print does not itself constitute the popular print culture, but is the evidence of this dialogue" ("Introduction" 12). Nedham's work mediates between the parliamentary discussions at the national level and the experience of those changes at the local level. Jason Peacey writes that the "growth of pamphleteering, and the behavior of contemporaries, demonstrates that it was at least perceived to be of immense cultural significance" ("Pamphlets" 470). Thus, when he participates in pamphlet apologetics for the Royalists and Parliament, Nedham communicates with and creates politically-minded contemporaries who regarded his work as a dialogue about the consequences of their own political choices. Furthermore, Nedham's newsbooks created a dialogue between himself and his readers that established a political community. For example, Raymond writes, "News shaped readers' sense of geography and of belonging to imagined national and international communities, but it affected more dramatically their sense of participation in a political world, and hence their ideas of sovereignty and authority" ("News" 397). In other words, newsbooks facilitated a new mode of political engagement with the English people that ultimately allowed for their participation in the political realm. Such participation fostered a new outlook on political

sovereignty, and as such, ideas about the reconsideration of political sovereignty became a public subject for those who had been rendered silent during the years of Charles's Personal Rule.

2

In a September 1643 issue of *Mercurius Britanicus*, Audley and Nedham counter the claims of John Birkenhead that there were lies circulating in London. The response comes in the orderly fashion of Audley, but the style and sensationalism of the language suggests that Nedham authored it. They write that he "tells us of the many abhominable lies written by the brethren of *London* this weeke, Master *Aulicus*, hold your peace, I have made your Epitaph, here lies *Mercurius Aulicus*, and there lies *Mercurius Aulicus*" (12-19 Sept. 1643). Audley and Nedham respond to the regular accusation that the London news contains "many abhominable lies" by suggesting that the Royalist newsbook both here and there lies with unfaithful news accounts and here and there lies dead, which calls to mind lurid images of Royalist death, both ideological and actual. The accusation of lies in the weekly news accounts that proliferated during the early years of the Civil War period was a rhetorical commonplace, and to some degree each party relied upon it to discredit the other. For example, when *Britanicus* first appeared, Birkenhead's *Aulicus* welcomed it as more lies from London: "All other Newes (I meane *Lyes*) you must expect from a fine new thing, borne this weeke, called *Mercurius Britannicus*, for Mercuries (like *Committees*) will beget one another" (27 Aug.-2 Sept. 1643). Birkenhead equates the newly founded newsbook with the recently established Westminster Assembly, the committees of which were intended to reform the ecclesiastical establishment. For Royalists like Birkenhead, both the London newsbooks and the Westminster Assembly beget further lies about the political and religious changes that were being undertaken. In another early issue, Audley and Nedham end their exaggerated refutation and correction of Birkenhead lest he be forced to relate the truth in subsequent issues: "There are many more lies, but we will not dishearten him too much for feare we make him hereafter tell truth, and undo himselfe. He tels us he will not answer a syllable still,

and bids us raile on, provided we meddle with none but himselfe" (26 Sept.-3 Oct. 1643). The exchanges between *Britanicus* and *Aulicus* exemplify the role that dialogue plays in creating a popular print culture that allows for the exchange of political ideas in public forums. It invites public participation because choosing which side to believe was not a choice between truth or lies but between crown or Parliament. Moreover, the language in these early exchanges—often bombastic, combative, and humorous—conceals a fear that the truth is a contentious matter, and through printed discourse, both the Parliament and Royalists sought to control truth by disproving dissident fact. For Audley and Nedham, in particular, control of the press relied upon the ability to blend sensational propaganda with serious news in such a way that the two were inseparable.

These disputes highlight the tension between truth and lies, certainty and uncertainty in printed discourse that would become a prominent rhetorical feature throughout the 1640s. In particular, Audley and Nedham's early work for *Britanicus* relies less upon the factual truth of a statement as it does upon the jocose manner in which the truth was delivered and lies were rebuked. Nedham's prominence was due in large part to this rhetorical strategy, and though his politics varied, he consistently employed a strategy of refutation that relied upon humor. Markuu Peltonen demonstrates that authors of pamphlets in Elizabethan and Jacobean England often created an oratorical ethos while "claiming to defend the official line of policy" (260-61). He points out that there are obvious links between what he calls the "post-Reformation popular public debate"—his attempt to shift the terms of the Habermasian thesis so as to include the public sphere of the Reformation—and the proliferation of print in the 1640s (261). By refuting Birkenhead, Audley and Nedham establish an oratorical ethos for *Britanicus*, and it is founded on two things: truth and humor. The following close reading of select passages from *Mercurius Britanicus* will illustrate how Audley and Nedham create a public persona for *Britanicus*, which in turn shapes the parliamentarian ethos.

In the same September 1643 issue in which the pun on lies appears, Audley and Nedham demonstrate how humor can be used to negate not only accusations from Oxford but also religious observances associated with Laud and Charles. Views of the church under Laud and Charles were often decried in sermons and pamphlets, and the puritan push for reform sought changes in the ecclesiastical establishment that ranged from the sanctity of the Sabbath to the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Audley and Nedham capitalize on these popular views to refute claims about what the Westminster Assembly was actually going to change. The authors imagine a Royalist Synod that will propose their own "intended Cannons," and each canon plays upon puritan accusations against the Laudian and Caroline church (Audley and Nedham, 12-19 Sept. 1643). For example, in the *Reason of Church-Government*, John Milton lamented that "tyranny had invaded the Church," and in his sermon *Reformation and desolation*, Stephen Marshall voiced his own anti-Laudian sentiment: "you know that we have not onely abundance of Idolatrous Papists, who are proud, insolent and daring, but abundance of Popish idolatrous spirits, superstitiously addicted, willing to embrace any thing that goes that way, onely they will not have it goe under the name of Popery" (41, 45). These were both popular accusations. Consequently, in the first of the "intended Cannons" designed to reverse the reforms of the Assembly, Audley and Nedham write, "That all Archbishops and Bishops with all their high Commissioners be restored to the former Liberties, viz. Tyrannies and Superstitions" (12-19 Sept. 1643). The fifth canon calls to mind Milton's experience of Laudian oversight during the 1637 church inspection and his condemnation of those who mistake godliness for "measuring out the pillars, arches, and doors of a materiall Temple" (*Reason of Church-Government* 7). Again, Britanicus writes, "That the Altar be set a foot higher, and fastor then it was before, and that those Masons which came last from Rome be advised with for that purpose" (12-19 Sept. 1643). Finally, common to most puritan reformers was an interest in the sanctity of the Sabbath, and when Charles reissued the Book of

Sports in 1633, this caused no small degree of controversy.[69] Britanicus writes, "That the Sabbath be restored to its former liberty, viz. Carding, Dicing, Drinking, Bowling, or any such Christian or lawfull exercise." This method of refutation uses popular stereotypes to lampoon the Royalist position as tyrannical, superstitious, popish, and anti-Sabbatarian. Ultimately, Audley and Nedham create an opposition between parliamentarian godliness and Caroline and Laudian godlessness, which allows the godly Protestants to laugh along with Audley and Nedham at the ungodly Royalists. To laugh *with* encourages mutual participation and to laugh *at* encourages condescension, and Audley and Nedham combine both possibilities into a single rhetorical strategy in order to create a community of Protestants who opposed to the overreach of Caroline and Laudian ecclesiastical power. In this instance, Audley and Nedham use humor to redistribute political and ecclesiastical power to their audience who must choose between puritans and Laudians, Parliament and Charles.

In addition to providing news and humorous refutation, newsbooks occasionally featured editorial interjections. In September 1644, Britanicus announces that he has been victorious over the Royalist cause, and in the process of defeating his foes, Britanicus establishes its ethos:

> I have got the successe I aimed at, the uncheating, the undeluding, the *undeceiving*, the *unmasquing*, the *uncovering*, the *un-Oxfording*, the *un-Bishoping*, and I hope the *un-Common-Prayering* of the Kingdom too: and now if any other (whose leasure serves them to write beyond all these) take up the notion of *Britannicus*, I must give him this advice, that he dip in the same Inke that I have done, that he spare neither *friend*, nor *foe*, that his *quill* be a pen for

[69] About the decision to reissue the Book of Sports, Kevin Sharpe writes that "perhaps more than any other of his injunctions it raised opponents who were not natural enemies to the church and forced them to a radical choice that presaged the choice many were to have to make in 1642: that between conscience and obedience" (359). Similarly, Audley and Nedham, by using fictionalized canons to critique the Laudian and Caroline church, require readers to make a political choice about allegiance and ecclesiastical governance: that between parliament and crown.

> the Publicke onely, that he venture through the provocations both of friends and enemies, that he speake truth to the *King*, as well as to Common people, to Queenes, as well as to Gentlewomen of a lower Rancke, and now I must speake to all I writ to, in their severall classis, before I fold up my Paper. (23-30 Sept. 1644)

There are two competing narratives, that of the Parliament and that of the crown, and each side claims to represent the truth about political sovereignty. Britanicus announces its success in negating various aspects of the Royalist narrative. Negation works on several levels: linguistically, humorously, and ideologically. The linguistic negation of "un" in each instance allows Audley and Nedham to distance the parliamentarians from those ideas while insisting that the Royalists maintain them. Thus, the cheating, deluding, and deceiving Royalists have been conquered. The linguistic negation becomes humorously Nedhamesque when Britanicus extends the negation to Oxford, to Bishops, and to the Book of Common Prayer. Then, as now, negating such words seems ridiculous, yet also perfectly reasonable. The humor lies in the absurdity of the negations, and Britanicus implies that such wit belongs irrevocably to the parliamentarians. Ideologically, Britanicus negates the identity of the Royalists, and in so doing, Audley and Nedham claim dominion over the category of truth for it is they who have saved the kingdom from the deceiving Royalists. Additionally, Britanicus—as the embodiment of the parliamentary cause—speaks directly to readers, and asks that they participate in speaking the truth for the "Publicke onely." In this sense, Britanicus not only establishes an oratorical ethos but also a broader parliamentarian ethos that is devoted to the egalitarian truth. In other words, truth belongs to no class but to all, and by inviting the public to participate, Britanicus suggests that the truth is a collective endeavor for an entire kingdom.

Yet, Audley and Nedham were not the only ones employing such rhetorical tactics. In the battle for ideological control over truth, the Royalists, like Parliament, had their defenders. In

1645, John Cleveland anonymously published a short attack on London newsbooks, *The Character of a London Diurnall*. While addressing more than one London publication, his remarks indicate the general displeasure with which these newsbooks were received by Royalists: "A *Diurnall* is a puny Chronicle, scarce pinfeather'd with the wings of time: It is an History in *Sippets;* the English *Iliads* in a Nut-shell; the *Apocryphal* Parliaments book of *Maccabees* in single sheets. It would tyre a Welch pedigree, to reckon how ma|ny aps 'tis remov'd from an Annal: For it is of that Extract; onely of the younger House, like a Shrimp to a Lobster" (1). Cleveland refers to *Mercurius Britanicus* by name, and he mentions it as one of the notorious newsbooks that relate "horrible Plots" (2). While Audley and Nedham sought to humorously offset the Royalist narrative through negation, Cleveland opts for condescension. He looks down upon the press, as did most Royalists, as a "cause and symptom of the collapse of old values and deference" (Worden, *Literature* 57). Thus, he does not reject outright the views of *Mercurius Britanicus* but instead discredits the entire outpouring of newsbooks that have dismantled the extant power structures of the older monarchical and ecclesiastical system.

Cleveland also participates in another Royalist endeavor to create a "shared cultural identity:" poetry (Worden, *Literature* 57). In addition to writing short characterizations about the newsbooks, Cleveland composes and publishes satirical poetry. After Nedham's arrest for disparaging Charles and the subsequent end of *Mercurius Britanicus*, Cleveland sends to the press *The character of a London-diurnall with severall select poems*.[70] Two poems, "Britanicus his Blessing" and "Britanicus his Welcome," mention *Mercurius Britanicus* from the point of view of a triumphant Royalist, and the first of the two offers an epitaph:

> Yet we will write for thee an Epitaph,

[70] Because they appear only in some of the extant editions and are not given in the collected works of John Cleveland published in 1677, the authorship of these two poems remains in question. However, the interest here is in the language of the attack against *Mercurius Britanicus*.

Which who ere reads, he shall not choose but laugh:

Hic jacet Britanicus, Scurra, Rabula, Lixa, Lanista,

Et filius Belial, & Reges Antagonista.[71]

Here lies Britanicus that snarling cur,

That son of Belial, who kept such a stur:

Who every Monday spent his stock of spleene,

In venomous railing on the King and Queene:

Whom though they both in goodness should forgive,

Yet we have vow'd Britanicus must not live. (21-30)

Just as Audley and Nedham had written an epitaph for *Mercurius Aulicus*, Cleveland reciprocates. However, even though he instructs his readers to laugh, Cleveland's poem lacks the wit of the Nedhamesque pun in *Mercurius Britanicus*. Instead, he relies on vitriol to announce Royalist supremacy and to distinguish "we" from "thee." Britanicus may have been dead, but Nedham's voice would not remain silent for long. In September 1647, Nedham adopts some of the Royalist rhetorical strategies and begins publishing the "darling of the royalist cause," *Mercurius Pragmaticus* (Raymond, "Nedham").

3

After receiving a royal pardon from Charles at Hampton Court in 1647, from September 1647 to May 1649, Nedham authors *Mercurius Pragmaticus* (Raymond, "Nedham").[72] Nedham

[71] The adjectives are difficult to translate, but I will give the sense of the epitaph: Here lies Britanicus, idle rake, raucous, party-adherent, trainer of followers, son of Belial, and antagonist to kings.

introduces a new, conspicuous feature of the newsbook as he opens each issue with a short lyric poem that conveys news about political and religious events in the form of song. As Blair Worden notes, in the late 1640s "political poetry had become almost the preserve of royalism" (*Literature* 52). Because of his contribution to popular print culture and presence throughout the Civil War period, Nedham's short lyrics merit notice alongside noted Royalist poets like Richard Lovelace, Thomas Carew, and Sir John Suckling.[73] However, in terms of reforming public opinion, Nedham's poetry employs a new way to attract attention and to persuade. By writing avowedly Royalist verse, he also capitalizes on the cavalier poetry's efforts to fashion an ethos for a readership through "verse joined . . . with prose" (Worden, *Literature* 18). Nedham's specific weapons include "satire, lampoon, mockery, and burlesque" and a definite methodology of reform (18). Unlike his approach in *Mercurius Britanicus* where he never defined his serio-jocose method to persuade readers, *Mercurius Pragmaticus* creates a haughty and boastful persona who employs laughter to garner public support and dictate the terms of political discussion. It is to these two aspects of *Mercurius Pragmaticus* that the rest of this section will address in order to show how Nedham's satiric verse set the tone for each newsbook so that his serio-jocose methodology could win public opinion.

In the ballads that begin each issue, Nedham employs several tactics that reveal how he participates in public discourse. Because the news allows readers to understand history as well as the present, Nedham relies upon his readers' memory of the past to point out the flaws of the present. While Cleveland considered newsbooks to be "History in *Sippets;* the English *Iliads* in a

---

[72] Raymond notes that Nedham was most likely assisted by other writers in the preparation of *Pragmaticus* and that he probably stopped editing the newsbook around January 1649 ("Nedham"). That he had help is perhaps not surprising given that he lived in parliamentarian London while writing the newsbook, and he was constantly on the run from authorities who sought to shut down the organization responsible for it.

[73] For more on cavalier poetry in the civil war period, see Thomas Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, especially 64-128 and 221-68, and Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, especially the sections on Cavalier poetics, 13-30 and the chapter on Lovelace 112-54.

Nut-shell," Nedham goes further to dilute history into a cavalier *Iliad*. For example, in the first issue of *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, Nedham asks his readers to remember "When as we liv'd in Peace" so that he can shift to the present when "we (forsooth) must hire the Scot / To all-be-Parliament us" (14-21 Sept. 1647, 1, 3-4).[74] He relies upon the memory of a peaceful England under Charles to point out how Parliament has subjected England to war. In this sense, he not only writes but also rewrites history. By diminishing the ecclesiastical and constitutional issues that arose during the Personal Rule and emphasizing the "Peace" that then existed in the kingdom, Nedham revises his narrative so that the idea of peace supersedes any remembrance of past problems ascribed to Charles and Laud. Peace, Nedham contends, is better than war. He closes his opening lyric by returning to the present in order to suggest the political consequences of war: "But now we must have Peace againe, / Let none with feare be vext; / For, if without the King these reigne, / Then hiegh downe they goe next" (13-16). As he calls for a return to peace in the kingdom, he cautions that to rule without a monarch will bring about the downfall of those who attempt to usurp political authority. By recasting the historical landscape to obscure the issues between crown and Parliament, Nedham creates a narrative of moral virtue in which Charles represents peace and Parliament, by implication, represents war. Furthermore, he discourages those who would give political authority to Parliament rather to the king on the grounds tha they will fail. Nedham closes each poem with his motto: *Nemo me Impune lacessit*, or let none assail me with impunity. The motto does not only apply to Nedham-as-*Pragmaticus* but also to *Pragmaticus*-as-Monarchism, which paints a bleak picture about the moral and political consequences of attacking the monarchy.

In a later issue, Nedham again focuses upon peace but here to illustrate the rise of religious factionalism that ultimately led to war between crown and Parliament. Because Nedham

[74] I provide the line numbers of the poetry as they appear in each issue.

condenses so much into each lyric, the full twelve lines appear below in all of their sound and sense:

Long *Peace* a *Plentie* did beget,

And *Plentie* brought forth *Pride*,

Through *Pride* to *Faction* men were set

In *Parties* to divide.

The *new-form'd Priests* first led the way,

And said it was no *Sin*

by Force to drive the King away,

And draw the *Citie* in.

The *Lords* and *Commons* they consent

To what each *Rabbi* saith,

And so the *CATHOLIQUE* downe went

T'advance the *PUBLIQUE* Faith.

This brought a *Warre* and *Taxes* on,

T'inslave a *free-borne* People;

And now the *Worke* is thus farre gone,

Next, have at *Crowne* and *Steeple*. (28 Sept.-6 Oct. 1647, 1-16)

Two aspects of the lyric stand out: first, the political oppositions, and second, the manner in which Nedham uses the poetic form to illustrate the moral and political consequences of factionalism. First, the most noted opposition is between Oxford and London, crown and Parliament, and in the middle of that opposition are the "*new-form'd Priests*." Nedham refers to the Westminster Assembly which, through the pulpit, asserts that the political grievances are not sin. Stephen Marshall's *Meroz Cursed*, one of the most notorious and popular sermons of the period, comes to mind. In that sermon, Marshall conceals political action under the guise of spiritual salvation, and the Royalists detested him for it. In fact, some years earlier, the Royalist *Mercurius Aulicus* condemns "Master *Marshall*" as a "spirituall Usurer" before sardonically calling him a "modest honest man, Iudas himselfe scarce honester" (27 Aug.-2 Sept. 1643). Nedham himself lampoons Marshall in *Mercurius Pragmatics* as one of the clerical "*Pick-locks*" of the Assembly who can "open the Consciences of both the Factions [Presbyterians and Independents] at any time, that the Purses of the City may be opened with the more ease and unanimity" (21-28 Dec. 1647). Nedham capitalizes on these popular aspersions about the clergy who played a part in the division between king and Parliament in order to demonstrate that the result of such factional politics was "Warre and Taxes," by which the people of England were now enslaved. Through opposition, Nedham presents how political division defines the everyday experience of the people.

Second, the lyric form allows Nedham to create consequential relationships from line to line. In the opening stanza, *Peace* begets *Plentie* who brought forth *Pride* who gave rise to *Factions* that divided men into *Parties*. The meter of the lyric generates momentum that mirrors the process of begetting. As Nedham moves from line to line, momentum builds, and one idea gives way to the next. Each stanza reflects a version of this poetic momentum. Priests "said it was no Sin / By Force to drive the King away." Nedham begins with priests, moves to sin, and—with a break in line but no pause in momentum—moves to the expulsion of the king. He uses the

brevity and rhythm of the lyric form to posit oppositions and resolve them line by line. He condenses difficult political and religious matters into song, and thus distills dense factional politics into an entertaining poem. Ultimately, Nedham introduces nothing new to the lyric form itself, but by combining the lyric and the newsbook, he bridges the gap between the Royalist preference for verse and the need for news that functions as propaganda. In doing so, Nedham establishes an ethos as Pragmaticus, the poet-journalist who justifies the monarchy and reforms public opinion in poetry and prose.

Along with his contribution of poetry to the newsbook, Nedham clearly articulates a rhetorical method by which he engages his readers in dialogue through which he hopes to reform public opinion. In the first issue of *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, he writes, "But (to speak truth) 'tis a dangerous businesse now to write Newes; for, Truth comes within the compasse of Treason . . . wee shall have old Snarling on every side" (14-21 Sept. 1647). His truth is the political authority of the king, and at one point, he claims that he will not stop until he "had writ his Majesty into his throne" (5-12 Sept. 1648). A dangerous ideological proposition to present in a newsbook, especially one printed in London, this matter remained a concern of Nedham's in not just how his version of political news would contradict the parliamentarian narrative but also put his safety at risk. Of course, Nedham turned Parliament's attempts to arrest him into a boast that they could not catch his "printing-presse upon wheels" (14-21 Dec. 1647).[75] In order to achieve his stated goal, Nedham identifies a distinct methodology by which he can win public opinion. In an editorial comment, Nedham states his purpose: "to tickle and charme the more vulgar phantsies, who little regard Truths in a grave and serious garb," and on this path he "must still continue" because "in the midst of jest I am much in earnest" (28 March-4 April 1648). Though he boasts about the dangers of writing newsbooks, of telling truth, and of evading the Parliament, Nedham

[75] At this time, printing was done on small, wooden hand presses, which would have allowed Nedham to conceal himself and his press as he moved throughout the city in order to avoid Parliamentarian authorities.

remains perfectly serious about restoring political authority to the crown. In order to accomplish that task, he offers entertaining writing to the common people so that they can grasp truth through humor. For Nedham, the realm of popular opinion was no place for rational arguments; humor must conceal the intellectual and political truths being espoused. He uses the guise of humorous disputation and satiric verse in order to recast political truth in a public forum, a move that allows him to recast the public forum as the political realm. Serious truth, for Nedham, gets expressed through humor that entertains and edifies the public. This serio-jocose methodology makes Nedham a prominent and popular voice in the public forum. Eventually, in June of 1649, the Parliament apprehends him, and he does not write again for almost a year until familiar serio-jocose prose appears in defense of the newly established Commonwealth.

4

Having written for the Parliament and for the Royalists over the course of the 1640s and having been imprisoned for doing both, Nedham emerges once again to write on behalf of the nascent republic. In May of 1650, he published the pamphlet, *The Case of the Commonwealth of England, Stated*, which his biographer called his "most unified, most thoughtful, and most persuasive work" (Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent* 75). In the *Case*, Nedham justified the *de facto* sovereignty of the Commonwealth. The following month, the first issue of *Mercurius Politicus*, Nedham's officially licensed parliamentarian newsbook, was published, and it would remain in print over the next 10 years. The *Case* and the newsbook are distinct contributions to discussions about political authority but interrelated in one important way. Over the course of the first few years, *Mercurius Politicus* featured a series of editorials in which Nedham educated his readership about republican government. Essentially, Nedham took the dense political theory in the *Case* and serialized it into short editorials appearing in individual issues. Blair Worden indicates that these "republican editorials departed from the preoccupations of Puritanism, which looked to godliness to stabilize the land," and instead, Nedham "urged his countrymen" to seek

stability in political theory (*Literature* 24). Nedham, then, replaces the pulpit with the press, and he seeks constitutional settlement by disseminating political theory to a broad audience through newsbooks. As a reformer, Nedham's editorials in *Mercurius Politicus* combine the pamphlet and the newsbook to supplant the pulpit and to advocate for political stability. What becomes vital in the wake of such a decision is not *what* he said so much as *how* he said it.[76] Rather Nedham's attention to his audience reveals that practical reform lies in how ideas are disseminated rather than in their inherent intellectual value. Nedham's practical sense of political reform needs to be understood by looking at how he defines his audience in the *Case* and *Mercurius Politicus* and at how he alters material from the *Case* to be accessible for public consumption in the newsbook.

Nedham begins the *Case* with an address to the reader in which he openly admits his change of political allegiance and hints at the purpose of the treatise that follows: "Perhaps thou art of an opinion contrary to what is here written. I confess that for a time I myself was so too, till some causes made me reflect with an impartial eye upon the affairs of this new government" (3). Nedham's *thou* refers to those who are, or were, of a different opinion than those who sided with the Parliament following the execution of Charles I. He employs *thou* to reinforce the polarization of the political spectrum in order to suggest that a transfer of opinion is not out of the question. Indeed, he claims that he changed his opinion with an "impartial eye" as if to confirm the

[76] Nedham's politics are fascinating but lie just outside the scope of his rhetorical methodology as a reformer. Nedham's political thought owes much to Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy*, and by far the most comprehensive study on the subject is Pocock's *The Machiavellian Moment*. Pocock writes that with his editorials, Nedham had "hit upon a new mode of expressing democratic ideas in English," and "what matters is that he was describing a *vivere civile e popolare*, based on the classical ideal of the armed citizen and the Machiavellian ideal of the armed and militant people" (383). In short, he advocated that authority be granted to those who had power, but the editorials allowed for the political justification of such power to be disseminated to those who were subject to and involved in the political community upholding that power. Aside from Pocock, Blair Worden has done the most work on Nedham, and for Nedham's politics, see *Literature and Politics*, especially the first two chapters on Nedham and Milton, "Milton and Marchamont Nedham," "Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism," and "'Wit in a Roundhead': The Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham." For Nedham's involvement with republicanism, see David Norbrook's *Writing the English Republic*, especially chapter 5 on the Commonwealth.

existence of a reasonable explanation to justify the change in political authority, and it just so happens to come in the tract which follows. He identifies this *thou* on the title page as the Royalists, Scots, Presbyterians, and Levellers, which represent only a small minority of those who might question the legitimacy of the new government. However, the *Case* was not simply directed at those groups but to a broader, educated audience. Nedham further qualifies his readership in his address to the reader when he divides his audience into two categories:

> And that they may be the fitter to walk abroad in the world, I have divided them into *Two Parts,* and accommodated Them with a *Method,* suitable to those two Parties whereof the world consists; *viz.* the *Conscientious* man, and the *Worldling.* The former wil approve nothing but what is *just* and *equitable;* and therefore I have labored to satisfie him (as I have done my Self) touching the *Justice* of Submission: The latter will imbrace any thing, so it make for his *Profit;* and therefore I have shewn him the *Inconveniences* and *Dangers,* that will follow his opposition of a *settlement.* Now, though the other should continue *obstinate* in their *erroneous pretences;* yet of this latter sort, I dare promise my Self an abundance of *Proselytes,* the greater part of the world being led more by Appetites of *Convenience* and *Commodity,* than the Dictates of *Conscience:* And it is a more current way of perswasion, by telling men what will be *profitable* and *convenient* for them to do, than what they *ought* to do.

At the outset, Nedham both addresses and categorizes his audience into the man of conscience and the man of appetite, the worldling. Of the first, Nedham expects few, if any, converts from the obstinate group but has offered a treatise with sufficient learning to potentially satisfy them. With regard to the second, Nedham realizes that individual circumstance and profit will dictate

their allegiance and seeks to make the Commonwealth appear to improve their station in life.[77] Oddly enough, Nedham, who aligns himself with the former by reasoning his way into a republican mindset, might better be suited to the latter because he seems to have readily switched parties when "convenience and commodity," not to mention "profit," suited him. Nevertheless, Nedham allows for all possibilities, which indicates that he sought to create a complete political community that united the factional politics of the previous decade. To avoid a return to such factionalism, Nedham refers specifically to "our modern Pharisee, the *Consciencious Pretender,* and principall Disturber of the publique Peace" (i.e., puritan ministers), and he says that if they do not assent to his argument, then "all this noise of *Church-Reformation, Conscience,* and *Covenant*" is merely to upset the legitimacy of the present government. Ultimately, Nedham shifts from the puritan mode of godly reformation to a public mode of political reformation, and he includes all types of potential readers. With this pamphlet, he seeks to legitimize a commonwealth and create a unified political realm in which all readers can participate. Thus, Nedham adopts a rational method of argumentation to persuade readers through political theory and personal interest, and as such, reform becomes rational and practical.

However, in *Mercurius Politicus*, he returns to the serio-jocose style that he developed in *Mercurius Pragmaticus*. In the proposal for the newsbook, Nedham outlines the aim of *Politicus*: "The designe of this Pamphlett being to vndeceive the People, it must bee written in a Jocular way, or else it will never bee cryed vp: ffor those truths which the Multitude regard not in a

[77] Nedham's theory of political interest also lies just beyond the limits of the present argument. Blair Worden reports that "One of his conceptual innovations was to apply to English politics the idea that men's public behavior is governed by their competing interests, and that the political health of a community rests on its identification and management of the interests contained within it" (*Literature* 17). Interest finds its way into Nedham's newsbooks throughout the civil war period and especially in his apologetics for the Commonwealth where he identifies that the "greater part of the world" are led by "appetites of convenience and commodity" (i.e. interest). Nedham's most definite view of political interest was published in May 1647, and in the pamphlet, *The case of the kingdom stated, according to the proper interests of the severall parties ingaged*, he relies upon political interest as a possible method to seek political settlement.

serious dresse, being represented in pleasing popular Aires, make Musick to the Comon sence, and charme the Phantsie; which ever swayes the Scepter in Vulgar Judgement; much more then Reason" (French 2: 311). In the newsbook, then, Nedham seeks to inform a much broader audience than those he imagined for the *Case*, and the multitude to which Nedham refers may very well be the worldlings he previously identified. In the case of *Politicus*, however, Nedham realizes that in order to reach a popular audience in London, the erudition that informed much of the *Case* had to be made "pleasing" and had to "charme the Phantsie." These tactics are reminiscent of the reformist methodology Nedham espoused in *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, and here, he merely repurposes it so that he can justify the Commonwealth, establish popularity, and create a community of politically-minded citizens. In addition to the proposal, the first number of *Mercurius Politicus* illustrates other aspects of Nedham's style. The subtitle indicates that he writes "In defence of the Common-wealth, and for Information of the People." Nedham becomes both apologist and messenger, and in this dual capacity, he establishes a political community. Like *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, he includes a motto that illustrates the method and ethos of the newsbook: *Ita vertere Seria Ludo* [thus to turn seriousness into play]. Additionally, in the opening lines, he announces himself as the "fool" of the "common-wealth," and he further declares that he has "authority enough to create a fashion of my own, and make all the world to follow the humor" (6-13 June 1650). Nedham designs *Politicus* in order to avoid the seriousness of pamphlets like the *Case*, and yet by serializing the *Case*, he manages to bring political theory to the masses. The jocularity with which Nedham approaches the newsbook reveals a distinct difference from the "impartial eye" with which he composed the *Case*, but in each instance, Nedham takes care to identify the style with which the work will be written and to define the audience for whom he intends the work.

Aside from Nedham's views about his own audience, contemporary accounts provide further insight into the literate audience in London. The most famous case is that of Nehemiah

Wallington who recorded much of his thoughts during the 1640s when newsbooks and pamphlets circulated widely. In February 1642, Wallington was concerned about his frequent acquisition of pamphlets: "I finding so many of these littel pamflets of weekly news about my house I thought they were so many theeves that had stole away my mony before I was aware of them" (156). Wallington was drawn to the small newsbooks and pamphlets to such a degree that he regarded them as thieves. As Jason Peacey points out, because "of their form and format, therefore, pamphlets were a fairly accessible genre, more or less susceptible to being understood and appreciated by a broad cross-section of the literate population" ("Pamphlets" 455). In 1645, Wallington once again writes about pamphlets in his notebook:

> Another saith that I am one that spends my time well for I am always either reading or writing when indeed the Lord knows and my conscience chids me for misspent of precious time, especially now of late when insteed of godly conference to edify one another we have jares and jangelings at one another and instead of reading good books, time is spent in reading pamphlets and controversies which doe littel edify mee. (292)

In one sense, Wallington underscores Protestant guilt about not pursuing the godly, but in another sense, he presents the real temptation to seek out these pamphlets in order to make sense of the rapidly changing political environment. Protestant salvation was one thing, but political turmoil that shapes the future is another. Wallington's conflict represents the difficulty in attempting to reconcile the desire for spiritual salvation with political news, and seeking printed material to help, whether sermons or pamphlets, illustrates the need for both spiritual and political sustenance to shape any understanding of events. In terms of Nedham's audience, Wallington illustrates how Nedham's tactics were practically effective. Wallington feels guilty for being drawn to these publications, but by writing in a jocular style, Nedham lures readers because they are so pleasing to read. Although not sharing Wallington's interest in spirituality, Nedham strived nonetheless to

make readers such as Wallington members of a political community. The key to success depended upon a writing style at once serious and jocular designed to feature political and spiritual realms existing side by side. Underlying all is Nedham's goal of political stability.

In addition to an attractive prose style, Nedham's method of serializing material from the *Case* to *Mercurius Politicus* illustrates how he could distribute political theory to a popular audience and shape public opinion about *de facto* sovereignty. Nedham's *Case* requires readers to possess a specific level of education not available to the majority of England while *Politicus* contains the same message in a markedly different tone. In the *Case*, Nedham's use of Latin and references to Roman authorities disqualifies the uneducated readers, or at least renders them incapable of recognizing the Roman precedent upon which Nedham founded his argument. In the pamphlet, Nedham's message invariably turns to the "Jewell of *Liberty,* which hath cost the Common-wealth so much Blood and Treasure," and he declares that the new sense of liberty, this "precious Pearl," is now being trampled upon by those who know not how to cherish it (88). Nedham thereafter offers two reasons, both of which he takes from Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy*: "But for this, there are two speciall Reasons, which may be collected out of the *Florentine*'s subtile discourses upon *Livy*" (88).[78] First, those who are born under "*Monarchy* or *Tyranny*" too easily "vassalize Themselves, and neglect the maintenance of their *Liberty*" (88-89). Second, the nation being "Slaves to their owne Lusts " becomes "more easily inslaved unto the Lusts of another" (89). Nedham explicates his point by drawing upon Machiavelli and Livy, both of whom figure largely into the political discussion of republicanism at the time. Referring directly to the relevant passages in his marginal notes, Nedham employs his use of source material as evidence to grant authority to his argument. The marginal notes invite readers who are able to turn either to Machiavelli or to Livy, both of whom he cites, so that they might discern for themselves whether

[78] Raymond reports that the "single greatest influence on Nedham's political thought was Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy*, though he was also inspired by Aristotle and Sallust" ("Nedham").

his reading holds true. However, this sort of active engagement with the text may only have been appealing to the conscientious reader rather than the worlding; after all, Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy* had only been translated into English in 1636. In the instance of the *Case*, then, the content of the pamphlet, the intent of which was to proselytize through reasoned judgment, limits the number of people who could have fully engaged with the ideological republicanism underlying Nedham's argument. The learned content, while presented in an easily accessible pamphlet, suggests that this apology was to be widely disseminated to a broad audience, some of whom may not be able to follow the entirety of the argument.

Just as there was a change in style and tone, so too was there a distinct change in material from the *Case* to *Mercurius Politicus*. In an October 1650 issue of *Mercurius Politicus*, Nedham repeats ideas from the *Case* without the scholarly marginalia in order to allow for a broader reception and dissemination of the principles used to justify the authority of the Commonwealth. For instance, the following passage appears in *Politicus*:

> if the Authority be divided betwixt a *King* and his people in *Parliament*, so that the *King* hath one part, the *people* another; the *King* offering to encroach upon that part which is none of his, the *people* may lawfully oppose him by force of Arms, because he exceeds the Bounds of his Authority; And not only so, but he may lose his own part likewise by the *Law of Arms*. From whence it is plainly to be inferred; That if a *King* may thus by *Right of warr*, lose his Share and Interest in Authority and Power, being conquered; than on the other side, by *Right of warr*, the *whole* must needs reside in that part of the *people* which prevailed over him, there being no *middle power* to make any Claim: And so it must be a clear Consequence, that the whole Right of *Kingly Authority* in *England*, being by military decision resolved into the *prevailing party*, what Government soever it

> pleases them to erect, is as valid *de Jure*, as if it had the *consent* of the whole Body of the people. (26 Sept.-3 Oct 1650)

Nedham discusses the lawful authority of a monarch who, having exceeded the limits of authority, may be opposed by the people. Furthermore, those people in military opposition to the monarch may *de jure* erect a republican form of government if they so choose. In a brief passage, Nedham condenses political theory about monarchy and republicanism for a popular audience. Nedham takes the passage verbatim from the *Case*, with a few important exceptions. The first sentence is not at all Nedham, but is taken from Grotius' *De jure belli*; the *Case* provides not only the marginal note citing Grotius, but in the text itself Nedham provides the passage in Latin which is translated in the *Case* and *Mercurius Politicus*. Furthermore, following the passage wherein he ascribes power to the "part of the people which prevailed over him," Nedham, in the *Case*, cites Livy's *Ab urbe condita* to justify the claim. While much has been said about Nedham's republicanism and his apology for the newly established Commonwealth, more attention should be paid to *how* he said it. In other words, the manner in which he defends the new government in both the pamphlet and the newsbook anticipates the sort of readers he expects to encounter. The *Case*, with scholarly references in the text and marginalia, invites readers into educated discourse while *Mercurius Politicus* educates readers about that scholarly discourse. By restructuring the material in this way, Nedham accommodates a broader audience with *Mercurius Politicus*, which allows his readers the opportunity to understand the political theory that shapes the political world in which they live. In these editorials, Nedham puts aside the jocular style in order to educate a reading public about the political realm, and by doing so, Nedham effectively reforms his readers into politically-educated members of the Commonwealth.

CHAPTER V

Conclusion

In his reassessment of the history of Anglicanism, Anthony Milton moderates the tendency to view the reformation as opposition, whether between Protestant and Catholic or Laudian Arminianism and Puritanism. He suggests that the "historian's task" must be "to understand the struggle itself, rather than to adjudicate between the different sides on the basis of a preconceived notion of what should be considered orthodox or authentic English Protestantism" ("Introduction" 8). Over the course of this study, the examination of Stephen Marshall, John Milton, and Marchamont Nedham has attempted to do just that. The struggle for reform that emerged in the sixteenth century carried on into the seventeenth, and by the 1640s, it had taken on political dimensions with dire consequences. Thus, by including the pulpit alongside the pamphlet and the newsbook, this project presents a complicated picture of the struggle for reform that existed in the religious realm as well as the intellectual and the political. Accordingly, ideas about the reformation must be expanded to incorporate the changing circumstances of the 1640s and any comprehensive understanding of the struggle for religious reformation must include the struggle for intellectual and political reformation. The Protestant Reformation and the establishment of English Protestantism deal broadly with ideas about religious doctrine and church governance, but at the center was the English Protestant whose daily concerns animated the political and ecclesiastical upheavals of the seventeenth century. Thus, accounts of reform must consider how Protestants recognized their own spiritual limitations as well as their place in a spiritual and political community.

The sermons of Stephen Marshall, the pamphlets and poetry of John Milton, and the pamphlets and newsbooks of Marchamont Nedham have been ideal for such a study. The intersection of sermons, pamphlets, and newsbooks confirms that the spiritual and political realms were intertwined in the struggle for reform. Marshall's sermons rely upon Protestant guilt to prompt spiritual and political action. His sermons embody the puritan project of spiritual salvation in order to establish a godly nation, but his work with the Westminster Assembly and association with Parliament demonstrate that his concerns were also political. John Milton, on the other hand, demonstrates the fluidity of reform: he was a Laudian turned anti-Laudian, he supported the clergy before being branded a heretic, and he detested pre-publication censorship but became a licenser. Milton's work indicates how categories of reform obscure the complexity of the period. Furthermore, in his pamphlets, Milton shows that reform is not merely the domain of the church. Rather, he shifts the terms of debate from the ecclesiastical to the intellectual, from episcopal governance to notions of truth. Milton's interest in intellectual discernment suggests that reason, in addition to spiritual guilt and salvation, plays a key role in the Protestant individual's struggle to establish a godly nation. Nedham represents still another aspect of reform: the political. And yet, throughout his newsbooks and pamphlets, he confronts the religious aspects of reform in order to realign the discussion to the political community. Not a reform of salvation or of intellect, but a reform of private interest and political allegiance, Nedham's advocacy for change employed humor rather than guilt or reason to accomplish it. Each of these men illustrates how the language of reform represents the religious and political instability of the period, and yet their views on reform attempt to find a locus for stability, whether through the pulpit, the pamphlet, or the newsbook. Ultimately, the cross fertilization of the work discussed here underscores the fact that the struggle for reform did not belong solely to the ecclesiastical realm or to oppositions but to various competing aspects within a Protestant nation seeking to find settlement.

This project also argues for the centrality of Marshall and Nedham alongside major figures like Milton in the Civil War period. It calls attention to two matters in particular. First, that their language in many respects overlaps, whether Marshall refers to the public realm of politics or whether Nedham and Milton respond to religious tensions in pamphlets and newsbooks. Consequently, a full understanding of the crises during the 1640s both allows and demands a critical investigation of reform that extends into the religious, intellectual, and political realms. Such a picture does not marginalize Marshall and Nedham but rather emphasizes their place in the search for ecclesiastical and constitutional stability. While studies of Marshall are scarce, the emergence of Nedham in the past few decades as a figure central to understanding the politics of English republicanism has meant that he has been moved from the footnote to the page. Where this dissertation has built upon the work done by others on Nedham, my hope is that this project might inaugurate further investigation into the sermons of Marshall.

Second, the study also raises broader questions about the nature of the historian's task to understand struggle, as Anthony Milton puts it. In his account of the centrality of texts in reconstructing historical moments, Pocock writes,

> The history of political thought becomes primarily, though not finally, a history of language games and their outcomes. The historian's reconstitution of the context that makes the text, as action and event, intelligible now becomes a matter of reconstituting the languages in which certain illocutions—those defined as existing for the purpose of political thought—were carried out, and of discerning what the individual text, author, or performance did with the opportunities offered and the constraints imposed by the languages available to it. (26)

What Pocock says of political thought applies to religious and intellectual thought as well. To reconstitute the context of the 1640s, then, literary and historical scholars must attend to the intersection of these areas, especially because the explosion of printed material at the time vastly altered the spiritual, intellectual, and political communities. Additionally, such a diverse context requires the inclusion of a variety of texts. Marshall, Milton, and Nedham illustrate how language shapes and responds to an emergent public community of religious and political discourse. The motives and intentions of their work confirm that the context—even the very concept itself—for reform was fluid and often adapted to accommodate the exigent spiritual or political circumstances. Thus, the freedoms and constraints faced by each author indicates how language creates and recreates categories like reform, which underscores the fact that they are constantly changing, both for those in the 1640s and for historians looking back to make sense of the period. In the end, because any text offers multiple possibilities for interpretation, scholars must not only attend to the struggle to understand the context in which the texts are written, but the historian must also remove critical assumptions that put constraints on the text that were not present at the time.

Finally, Marshall's is a name that one encounters only in passing, and no comprehensive study of Marshall's work has yet been undertaken. Part of the neglect likely stems from the tedium of reading early modern sermons that lack the sparkle, wit, and color found in those by Lancelot Andrewes and John Donne. And yet, reading Marshall's sermons reveals how he engages with a variety of issues pertaining to both the religious and political context of the seventeenth century. The lack of work is especially surprising given how much work has been done on the reformation, on puritanism, and on the civil war period, and yet Marshall's sermons have yet to merit serious attention in a Civil War that has been described primarily as a religious matter. The most important work on Marshall casts him as a puritan minister in the godly community, and Tom Webster's *Godly Clergy* contributes much to our understanding of Marshall

as part of a puritan community in Caroline England. The historian Hugh Trevor-Roper provides the most substantial reading of Marshall's sermons in his account of the parliamentary fast sermons, but in his study, Marshall remains one among many who used the pulpit to communicate parliamentary politics. Minna Weinstein calls Marshall the "most influential, and most political, of the saints," but rather than focus on his influence as a reformer, she offers a thoughtful account of Marshall's views about the power dynamics between the monarch and Parliament (2). This study has reassessed Marshall's role in the tradition of Webster, Trevor-Roper, and Weinstein but has paid substantially more attention to the language of the sermons to indicate how Marshall participated not just as a member of a godly clergy but also as a member of a thriving spiritual community that was attempting to understand political and religious crisis. Marshall may not be the most prominent figure of the civil war period, but his voice was among the loudest. As such, perhaps Marshall will follow Nedham from the footnote to the page

WORKS CITED

Achinstein, Sharon. "Calamy, Edmund." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [10/3/13].

_____. "'A Law in this Matter to Himself': Contextualizing Milton's Divorce Tracts." *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*. Ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 174-85.

_____. "Spurstowe, William." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/28/06].

Anon. *The Character of Mercurius Politicus*. London, 1650.

Ashton, Robert. "Caroline Politics 1625-1640." *Stuart England*. Ed. Blair Worden. Oxford: Phaedon P, 1986. 71-92.

Audley, Thomas, and Marchamont Nedham. *Mercurius Britanicus*. London, 1643-46.

Bacon, Francis. *The essayes or counsels, civill and morall, of Francis Lo. Verulam, Viscount St. Alban.* London, 1625.

Ball, Bryan. "Mede [Mead], Joseph." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [5/28/15].

Bendall, Sarah, Christopher Brooke, and Patrick Collinson. *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell P, 1999.

The Bible. Authorized King James Version. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Birkenhead, John. *Mercurius Aulicus*. Oxford, 1643-45.

Blench, J. W. *Preaching in England in the late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons, 1450-c. 1600*. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1964.

Burges, Cornelius. *The First Sermon, Preached to the Honourable House of Commons now Assembled in Parliament at their Publique Fast. Novemb. 17. 1640*. London, 1641.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Oxford, 1621.

Bush, Douglas, ed. *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton. Vol. 1. The Latin and Greek Poems.* Gen. ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. 3 vols. in 5 to date. New York: Columbia UP, 1970-75.

Calamy, Edmund. *Englands Looking-Glasse*. London, 1642.

Campbell, Gordon. *A Milton Chronology*. London and New York: MacMillan, 1997.

_____. "Milton, John." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/8/09].

_____."Tovey, Nathaniel." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/3.08].

Campbell, Gordon, and Thomas Corns. *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Catullus. *Catullus: The Poems*. Ed. Kenneth Quinn. 2nd ed. St. Martin's P, 1973.

Cheek, Macon. "Milton's 'In Quintum Novembris': An Epic Foreshadowing." *Studies in Philology* 54.2 (1957): 172-84.

Clanchy, M. T. “Parchment and Paper: Manuscript Culture 1100-1500.” *A Companion to the History of the Book*. Ed. Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009. 207-19.

Clarke, Samuel. *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Later Age*. London, 1683.

Clegg, Cyndia Susan. “Censorship and the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission in England to 1640.” *Journal of Modern European History* 3.1 (2005): 50-80.

Cleveland, John. *The character of a London-diurnall with several select poems / by the same author.* London, 1647.

Collinson, Patrick. "Chaderton, Laurence." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/23/04].

_____. “Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture.” *The Culture of English Puritanism: 1560-1700*. Ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales. New York: St. Martin’s P, 1996. 32-57.

Corns, Thomas N. *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Cressy, David. “Levels of Illiteracy in England 1530-1730.” *Literacy and Social Development in the West: A Reader*. Ed. Harvey J. Graff. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981. 105-24.

A Directory for the Public Worship of God, Throughout the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. London, 1645.

Duffy, Eamon. “The English Reformation after Revisionism.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 59.3 (2006): 720-31.

Egan, James. "*Areopagitica* and the Tolerationist Rhetorics of the 1640s" *Milton Studies* 46 (2006): 165-190.

_____. "Rhetoric, Polemic, Mimetic: The Dialectic of Genres in *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion*." *Milton Studies* 41 (2002): 117-38.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Fane, Mildmay. "Upon the Times." *Seventeenth-Century British Poetry: 1603-1660*. Ed. John P. Rumrich and Gregory Chaplin. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006. 332.

Feather, John. *A History of British Publishing*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Featley, Daniel. *The Dippers Dipt*. London, 1645.

Feingold, Mordechai. "The Humanities." *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford*. Ed. Nicholas Tyacke. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. 211-357.

Ferrell, Lori Anne. *Government by Polemic: James I, the King's Preachers, and the Rhetorics of Conformity, 1603-1625*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford UP, 1998.

Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake. "Popularity, Prelacy and Puritanism in the 1630s: Joseph Hall Explains Himself." *The English Historical Review* 111 (1996): 856-81.

Ford, L. L. "Mildmay, Sir Walter." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/3/08].

Foster, Andrew. "Bishops, Church, and State, c. 1530-1646." *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*. Ed. Anthony Milton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 84-102.

Frank, Joseph. *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1961.

_____. *Cromwell's Press Agent: a Critical Biography of Marchamont Nedham, 1620-1678*. Lanham, MD, U Press of America, 1980.

French, John Milton. *The Life Records of John Milton*. 5 vols. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1949-58; Rpt. Gordian P, 1966.

Fuller, Thomas. *The Histories of the Worthies of England*. London, 1662.

Gataker, Thomas. *Abraham's Decease*. London, 1627.

_____. *Certaine Sermons*. London, 1637.

_____. *The Joy of the Just with Signs of Such*. London, 1623.

_____. *Two Sermons Tending to the Direction of Christian Cariage both in Afflictions Incumbent, and in Judgements Imminent*. London, 1623.

Gauden, John. *The Love of Truth and Peace*. London, 1640.

Glare, P. G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012.

Hall, Joseph. *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament*. London, 1641.

Heywood, Thomas. *The Conspiracy of Catiline and the War of Jugurtha*. New York: Knopf, 1924.

Hinds, Steven. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Behemoth*. London, 1679.

_____. *De Corpore Politico. Or The Elements of Law, Moral & Politick*. London, 1650.

Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1981.

Hoover, David L., and Thomas N. Corns. "The Authorship of the Postscript to *An Answer to a Booke Entituled, An Humble Remonstrance*." *Milton Quarterly* 38.2 (2004): 59-75.

Hoxby, Blair. "*Areopagitica* and Liberty." *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*. Ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 218-37.

Hughes, Ann. "Milton, *Areopagitica*, and the Parliamentary Cause." *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*. Ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 200-17.

Hunt, Arnold. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010.

_____. "Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference." *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from his Students*. Ed. Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 1998. 207-28.

Irwin, William. "What Is an Allusion?" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59.3 (2001): 287-97.

Jones, Edward. "The Archival Landscape of Milton's Youth, University Years, and Pre-London Residences." *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*. Ed. Edward Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. 3-20.

_____. "'Church-outed by the Prelats': Milton and the 1637 Inspection of the Horton Parish Church." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 102.1 (2003): 42-58.

_____. "'Ere half my days': Milton's Life, 1608-1640." *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*. Ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 3-25.

_____. "'Filling in a Blank in the Canvas': Milton, Horton, and the Kedermister Library." *Review of English Studies* 53.209 (2002): 31-60.

_____. "Young, Thomas." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/3/08].

Knight, Sarah. "Milton and the Idea of the University." *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*. Ed. Edward Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. 137-60.

Knighton, C. S. "Bainbridge [Bainbrigg], Thomas." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/3/08].

Lake, Peter. *The Boxmaker's Revenge: "Orthodoxy," "Heterodoxy," and the Politics and the Parish in Early Stuart London*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001.

_____. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

_____. "'Puritans' and 'Anglicans' in the History of the Post-Reformation English Church." *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*. Ed. Anthony Milton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 352-79.

Lamont, William. "Arminianism: the Controversy that Never Was." *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*. Ed. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 45-66.

Larminie, Vivienne. "Smectymnuus." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2014. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/28/06].

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "The Church of England and International Protestantism, 1530-1570." *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*. Ed. Anthony Milton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 316-32.

Marshall, Stephen. *A Divine Project to Save a Kingdome*. London, 1644.

_____. *Meroz Cursed*. London, 1641.

_____. *Reformation and desolation*. London, 1642.

_____. *A Sacred Record to be made of Gods Mercies to Zion*. London, 1645.

_____. *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, now Assembled in Parliament, at their Publike Fast, November 17. 1640*. London, 1641.

McCabe, Richard. "Hall, Joseph." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/3/08].

McCullough, Peter. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

McDowell, Nicholas. *Poet of Revolution: The Making of John Milton*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2020.

_____. *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Miller, Leo. "Milton's Clash with Chappell: A Suggested Reconstruction." *Milton Quarterly* 14.3 (1980): 77-87.

Miller, Jeffrey. "Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young." *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*. Ed. Edward Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. 72-103.

Milton, Anthony. "Attitudes towards the Protestant and Catholic Churches." *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*. Ed. Anthony Milton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 333-51.

_____. "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England." *The Historical Journal* 41.3 (1998): 625-51.

_____. "Reformation, Identity, and 'Anglicanism,' c. 1520-1662." *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*. Ed. Anthony Milton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 1-27.

Milton, John. *Animadversions upon the remonstrants defence against Smectymnuus*. London, 1641.

_____. *An apology against a pamphlet call'd A modest confutation of the animadversions upon the remonstrant against Smectymnuus*. London, 1642.

_____. *Areopagitica; a speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of vnlicens'd printing, to the Parlament of England*. London 1644.

_____. *Colasterion: A reply to a nameless answer against The doctrine and discipline of divorce*. London, 1645.

_____. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*. Gen. ed. Don M. Wolfe. 8 vols. in 10. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1953-82. [*CPW*].

_____. *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. London, 1643.

_____. *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. 2nd ed. London, 1644.

_____. *Eikonoklastes in Answer to a Book Intitl'd Eikon Basilike, The Portrature of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings*. London, 1649.

_____. *Elegia quarta*. *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*. Ed. Stella Revard. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 158-67.

_____. *In quintum Novembris*. *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*. Ed.Stella Revard. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 210-23.

_____. *Joannis Miltonii Angli, Epistolarum Familiarium Liber Unus: Quibus Accesserunt, Ejusdem, jam olim in Collegio Adolescentis, Prolusiones Quædam Oratoriae*. London, 1674.

_____. *Lycidas*. *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*. Ed. Stella Revard. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 74-80.

_____. "On the New Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament." *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*. Ed. Stella Revard. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 314-15.

_____. *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*. London, 1641.

_____. *Prolusion VII*. *John Milton: Prose*. Ed. David Loewenstein. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. 13-21.

_____. *The Reason of Church-Government Urg'd Against Prelaty*. London, 1642.

_____. *Of Reformation: Touching Church-Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it*. London, 1641.

_____. *Tetrachordon: Expositions upon The foure chief places in Scriptures, which treat of Mariage, or nullities in Mariage*. London, 1645.

Morgan, John. *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Morrill, John. "The Church in England 1642-1649." *The Nature of the English Revolution.* London: Longman, 1993. 148-75.

_____. "The Religious Context of the English Civil War." *The Nature of the English Revolution.* London: Longman, 1993. 45-68.

Nedham, Marchamont. *The Case of the Common-wealth of England, Stated*. London, 1650.

_____. *The case of the kingdom stated according to the proper interests of the severall parties ingaged*. London, 1647.

_____. *A plea for the King, and kingdome*. London, 1648.

_____. *Mercurius Politicus*. London, 1650-1660.

_____. *Mercurius Pragmaticus*. London, 1647-49.

Newcomen, Matthew. *A Sermon, Tending to Set Forth the Right Use of the Disasters that Befall our Armies*. London, 1644.

Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Nyquist, Mary. "The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in *Paradise Lost*." *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*. Ed. Margaret Ferguson and Mary Nyquist. London and New York: Routledge, 1988. 99-127.

Palmer, Herbert. *The Glasse of Gods Providence*. London, 1644.

Patterson, Annabel. "No meer amatorious novel?" *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*. Ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 85-101.

Peacey, Jason. "Marchamont Nedham and the Lawrans Letters." *Bodleian Library Record* 17 (2000): 24-35.

_____. "Pamphlets." *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*. Ed. Joad Raymond. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 453-70.

_____. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2004.

_____. *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013.

_____. "The Struggle for *Mercurius Britanicus*: Factional Politics and the Parliamentarian Press, 1643-1646." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 517-44.

Peltonen, Markku. "Political Argument." *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*. Ed. Joad Raymond. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 252-62.

Perri, Carmela. "On Alluding." *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289-307.

Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1975.

_____. "Texts as Events: Reflections on the History of Political Thought." *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*. Ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987. 21-34.

Poole, William. "'The Armes of Studious Retirement'? Milton's Scholarship, 1632-1641." *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620-1642*. Ed. Edward Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. 21-47.

_____. *Milton and the Idea of the Fall*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Prynne, William. *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions touching Church Government. London*, 1644.

Purkiss, Diane. "Whose Liberty? The Rhetoric of Milton's Divorce Tracts." *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*. Ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 186-99.

Quinn, Kenneth, ed. *Catullus: The Poems*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1973.

Quintrell, Brian. "Williams, John." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [1/3/08].

Randolph, Thomas. "An Ode to Mr. Anthony Stafford to Hasten Him into the Country." *Seventeenth-Century British Poetry: 1603-1660*. Ed. John P. Rumrich and Gregory Chaplin. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006. 342-44.

Raymond, Joad. "Introduction." *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*. Ed. Joad Raymond. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 1-14.

_____. *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.

_____, ed. *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England, 1641-1660*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

_____. "Nedham [Needham], Marchamont." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/17/15].

_____. "News." *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*. Ed. Joad Raymond. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 377-97.

_____, ed. *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.

_____. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Ricks, Christopher. *Allusion to the Poets*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Robinson, Henry. *Liberty of Conscience*. London, 1644.

Sackville, Thomas. *The Induction*. *The Mirror for Magistrates*. London, 1563.

Sallust. Catilina. *Iugurtha, Orationes et Epistulae Excerptae de Historiis*. Ed. Axel Ahlbert. Leipzig, GE: Teubner, 1919.

Seaver, P. S. "Wallington, Nehemiah." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/23/04].

Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1992.

Shuckburgh, E. S. *Emmanuel College*. London: F. E. Robinson & Co., 1904.

Shore, Daniel. "'Fit though Few': *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience." *Milton Studies* 45 (2006): 129-48.

Smectymnuus. *An Answer to a Booke Entitled An Humble Remonstrance*. London, 1641.

_____. *A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance form the Unjust Imputation of Frivolousnesse and Falsehood*. London, 1641.

Smith, Nigel. "*Areopagitica*: Voicing Contexts, 1643-5." *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*. Ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 103-22.

_____. *Literature and Revolution in England*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1994.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A. C. Hamilton. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 2007.

Stevens, Paul. "Milton and National Identity." *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*. Ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 342-63.

Stock, Richard. *The Doctrine and use of Repentance*. London, 1610.

_____. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse, the Second of November. 1606*. London, 1609.

Stubbings, Frank, ed. and trans. *The Statutes of Sir Walter Mildmay Kt Chancellor of the Exchequer and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors; Authorised by Him for the Government of Emmanuel College founded by him*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Tacitus. *Historiae*. Ed. Charles Dennis Fisher. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1911.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament." *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. 294-344.

Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

_____. “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution.” *Origins of the English Civil War*. Ed. Conrad Russell. London: Macmillan, 1983. 119-43.

Usher, Brett. "Gataker [formerly Gatacre], Thomas." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [10/3/13].

van Dixhoorn, Chad. “The Westminster Assembly and the Reformation of the 1640s.” *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*. Ed. Anthony Milton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 430-43.

Vergil. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. Ed. J. B. Greenough. Boston, MA: Ginn & Co., 1900.

Vernon, Eliot. “A Ministry of the Gospel: the Presbyterians during the English Revolution.” *Religion in Revolutionary England.* Ed. Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby. Manchester, UK: Manchester UP, 2006. 115-36.

_____. “Presbyterians in the English Revolution.” *The post-Reformation Era, c. 1559-c. 1689*. Ed. John Coffey. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2020. 55-72.

Wallington, Nehemiah. *The Notebooks of Nehemiah Wallington, 1618-1654*. Ed. David Booy. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2007.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Walwyn, William. *The Compassionate Samaritane*. London, 1644.

Webster, Tom. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement c. 1620-1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

_____. "Marshall, Stephen." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [10/8/09].

_____. "Newcomen, Matthew." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/28/06].

Wilson, John, F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1969.

Wood, Anthony à, and Philip Bliss. *Athenae Oxonienses. An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford. To which are added the Fasti, or Annals of the said University*. London, Rivington, 1813.

Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution 1625-1660*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

_____. "The Civil Wars 1640-1649." *Stuart England*. Ed. Blair Worden. Oxford: Phaedon P, 1986. 93-122.

Worden, Blair. "Introduction." *Stuart England*. Ed. Blair Worden. Oxford: Phaedon P, 1986. 7-22.

_____. *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

_____. "Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism, 1649-1656." *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649-1776*. Ed. David Wootton. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford UP, 1994. 45-81.

_____. "'Wit in a Roundhead': The Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham." *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early-Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown*. Ed. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995. 301-37.

Yiannikkou, Jason. "Blackerby, Richard." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/23/04].

_____."Rogers, Daniel." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/28/06].

_____. "Rogers, John." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004. Online edition, www.oxforddnb.com [9/23/04].

Young, Thomas. *Hopes Incouragement*. London, 1644.

VITA

David Lee Vaughan III

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE LANGUAGE OF REFORM: STEPHEN MARSHALL, JOHN MILTON, AND MARCHAMONT NEDHAM

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in English at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2021.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Arts in Editorial Studies at Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts in 2009.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in English at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in 2008.