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Introduction

The religious settlement created during Elisabeth I’s reign established a church set firmly in the Reformed or Calvinist tradition. This settlement entailed acceptance of double and absolute predestination and a liturgy that concentrated on godly preaching. It de-emphasized ceremonies and ostentatious churches, espoused a vision of the Church of England as the true catholic church opposed to the corrupt and illegitimate Roman Catholic Church. Matters considered indifferent to salvation – “adiaphora” – were the purview of the monarch as supreme governor of the church, and English Christians were bound to follow the directions of the monarch in such disputes. The Puritans, Protestants who did not accept this religious settlement as final nor perfect, were defined in terms of nonconformity to the established liturgy and their attitudes towards the authority of both the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the authority of the monarch. To them the Elizabethan settlement was a “leaden mean,” an impure compromise in which the task of purging vestigial remnants of Roman Catholicism was only half finished. However, Calvinism served as an ameliorating bond between reform-minded Puritans and members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy charged with ensuring obedience to the status quo.

By the 1630s this settlement had been radically inverted. In place of a Calvinist consensus a robust anti-Calvinism or Arminianism enforced its own vision of true doctrine and liturgy in the Church of England. Arminianism was the ideological underpinning behind the aggressive High-Church policies of the 1630s dubbed Laudianism after Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud. Against the determinism of Calvinist absolute and double predestination they posited a much greater role for man’s freewill in achieving salvation and claimed that there was no guarantee that the saints would persevere after falling from grace. This also increased the role that sacraments played in the liturgy and achieving salvation. Their vision of the true Christian church was a broadly based vision of the Christian community, propounded in conscious contrast to the division between the godly and the profane which was taken to be central to puritan piety and Presbyterian ecclesiology; a view of the visible church centered far more on the sacrament and on public worship than on preaching; a justification of the ceremonial arrangements of the English church that transcended the realm of adiaphora and instead attributed a positively religious role and significance to the rituals and observances of the church.

This style of worship and soteriology was

---

1 Worship and Theology I, xvi.
developed in deliberate and overt opposition to an image of puritanism that was not limited to the realms of ceremony and external government but included a whole style of piety – word centered, predestinarian, concerned with separating the godly off from the ungodly rather than celebrating the mystical union which bound all baptized members of the national church together as members of Christ’s body.\(^3\)

That is, Arminians redefined Calvinist soteriology and liturgy as Puritan. This redefinition lumped conformist Calvinists, even moderate Calvinists who were part of the English episcopacy, with nonconformist Puritans and even Presbyterians. To accomplish their goals Arminians were willing to preach up royal power and invest the English episcopacy with the authority of the apostolic succession. To this end they eagerly wed themselves to Charles I’s eleven years of extra-parliamentary rule and preached in support of unpopular financial policies like the Forced Loan in the face of determined Calvinist opposition.

In the interim between the establishment of the Elizabethan religious settlement and the Arminian ascendancy in the 1630s, a disparate group of divines cobbled an English anti-Calvinism by drawing on a wide variety of sources and ideas. Even divines like Richard Hooker, Richard Bancroft, and Lancelot Andrewes who died before the term Arminian so much as gained currency in England served as inspiration to later English anti-Calvinists. Indeed, historian Peter Lake argued that all the constituent parts of English anti-Calvinism were present by the turn of the seventeenth century; it only remained to be assembled into a cohesive package by divines ambitious and motivated enough to challenge the Calvinist hegemony.\(^4\)

The Caroline divines of the 1630s were the inheritors of what Historian Horton Davies described as the “Hooker-Andrewes-Laud” tradition with “Hooker… the theologian, Andrewes the liturgiologist-preacher-bishop, and Laud the fervent disciple and chief executant,” though such a term makes the relationship too linear and neat considering the considerable divergences and discontinuities between Hooker, the Jacobean avant-garde divines, and the Caroline divines of the Personal Rule.\(^5\)

However, Arminianism and Laudianism are the subject of much historiographical controversy. Revisionist historians like Nicholas Tyacke have presented Arminianism as a “radical departure from a previously dominant reformed [Calvinist] tradition” while other Historians such as Kevin Sharpe and Peter White have denied that “the existence of Arminianism as a coherent ideological position,” instead defining it as an “unconventionally zealous pursuit of the largely conventional conformist aims of uniformity, unity, order and obedience.”\(^6\)

According to White, aggressive Calvinist polemicists like William Prynne have mislead Revisionist historians into believing that there was indeed an Elizabethan “Calvinist” consensus destroyed by Arminianism. Only then can Laudian divines – “established churchmen, conservative to the core” – be “metamorphosed

\(^3\) “Avant-Garde Conformity,” 114.
\(^4\) *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 245.
\(^5\) *Worship and Theology*, 337.
\(^6\) “Laudian Style,” 161.
into revolutionaries.” Both positions agree that Laudianism was a departure from previous ecclesiastical policy, the crux of the disagreement is in exactly what manner it differed. So, if one accepts that there was indeed a rise of anti-Calvinism in the Early Stuart Church, how does one reconcile Arminian innovation with the essentially conservative aims of Laudianism?

The answer lies in the fact that Laudian liturgy differed from attempts at conformity in that it positively affirmed a leading role for ceremonies as central to English piety. Similarly, the maintenance of churches, the sacraments, and a host of other religious duties moved to the heart of English piety during the 1630s. They had always been present and indeed an important part of piety but Calvinists had emphasized the need for conformity rather than any intrinsic religious or spiritual benefits of ceremonies, richly adorned churches, and sacraments. Laudians turned these things from things indifferent imposed by the will of the monarch into vital elements of piety, more important than even the preaching at the heart of Calvinist liturgy. The conflict between the two sides boiled down to the Calvinist view that ceremonies, sacraments, and the upkeep of churches were important because they were so commanded, and obedience and conformity were good things in and of themselves, versus the Laudian idea that all the aforementioned things were not mere *adiaphora*, to be dispensed with or included at the will of the monarch, but the very heart and soul of English piety because of their necessity to salvation and spiritually edifying effects.

**Hooker and Travers**

Richard Hooker was the earliest divine in whom historians have detected proto-Arminian positions concerning the sacraments, the nature of the Roman Catholic Church, and a subtle redefinition of Puritanism. For this reason historian Peter Lake labeled him an “avant-garde conformist,” meaning a divine couched in the conservative conformist tradition but who espoused novel positions in defense of the Church of England. His magnum opus *The Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity* (Publication date) was an ambitious work that treated topics as diverse as the proper conception of the Church of England and the nature of the English monarchy. The work was born out of a conflict between Hooker and Presbyterian Walter Travers when both preached at the Temple Church in London. Travers had left Cambridge for Geneva in 1570 where he befriended Theodore Beza, successor to John Calvin. The itinerant Englishmen later traveled to Antwerp where he was ordained as minister of the presbytery there. His eventual resettlement in England was made possible by securing of the positions of domestic chaplain William Cecil, Lord Burghley, and tutor to his son Robert. Cecil’s power and influence were crucial in acquiring the post of deputy to master Richard Alvey of Temple Church for the avowedly Presbyterian Travers and protecting him from persecution. Thus

---


8 *Church History*, III 125-128; ODNB Walter Travers.
Travers was an unabashed disciple of the continental Reformed tradition schooled under the tutelage of eminent Beza.

Hooker, on the other hand, had never imbibed the Genevan draught. Graduating from Corpus Christi College Oxford in 1596, Hooker was born and bred into the English episcopacy. Although he enjoyed close friendships with John Jewel who was later forced to flee to the continent during Mary I’s reign and with moderate Puritan John Rainolds, Hooker remained firmly committed to the Church of England and was an ardent proponent of conformity. When he was appointed as master of the Temple in 1585 at the same time as Travers was appointed lecturer, conflict was inevitable. The Temple now had two lecturers with diametrically opposed theological beliefs, the pulpit speaking “pure Canterbury in the morning, and Geneva in the afternoon.”

Conflict between Travers and Hooker started immediately with Travers insisting in true Presbyterian fashion that the congregation at the Temple confirm Hooker before he gave first sermon there. Hooker’s predictable response was that his appointment was at the pleasure of Queen Elizabeth, not the congregation. Even a conference between the two failed to have any effect, only revealing fundamental disagreement over the use of ceremonial forms such as kneeling in prayer. Although the two men had immense personal respect for each other, their respective convictions were [at cross ends]. The two men also held radically differing beliefs concerning the nature of the Roman Catholic Church and salvation. Hooker maintained that “the church of Rome, though not a pure and perfect [church] yet is a true church; so that all who live and die therein (being weak, ignorant and seduced), upon their repentance of all their sins of ignorance, may be saved” while Travers insisted that “the church of Rome is no true church at all; so that such as live and die therein, holding justification in part by works, cannot be said by the scriptures to be saved.”

Hooker eventually won the contest. Hooker had the advantage of being the master of the Temple Church, and Travers’s identification with Presbyterianism did not work in his favor. Archbishop Whitgift intervened and deprived Travers of his post. The fiery Presbyterian was not completely defanged. He attempted to use his influence with the powerful Lord Burghley to reverse the decision and wrote a supplication to the Privy Council that attacked Hooker’s beliefs. Hooker responded in kind with an answer to the Privy Council, and took up writing a detailed explication of his beliefs and defense of conformity that would become The Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity.

Hooker and Avant-Garde Conformity

9 Worthies, I 407-8, 423; ODNB Richard Hooker
11 Church History, 3:129.
Thus Hooker’s thought was rooted in the tradition of conformist apologists, that most conservative position of defense of the establishment against innovation. However, if the cornerstone of Hooker’s works was making the case for conformity and battling the perpetual Presbyterian bugbear that loomed so large in the minds of conformist apologists, then the question arises as to why Hooker warrants the label of “avant-garde conformist?” The answer lay in the way Hooker resolved the inherent contradictions of the conformist case in novel ways. What began as a refutation of Puritanism morphed into Hooker’s distinctive conception of what English Protestantism was or should be.\(^{13}\) What was a negative “condemnation of nonconformity” transformed into “a positive endorsement of ceremony and liturgy,” demonstrating that emphasis on the “scenic apparatus” of worship in the Church of England was not the sole reserve of high church Laudians.\(^ {14}\)

Hooker diverged considerably from earlier conformist writers in his treatment of the role of ceremonies and sacraments in the English Church. Earlier conformist apologists claimed that although ceremonies were \textit{adiaphora}, things indifferent, their use was commanded by the monarch and the prayer book. Therefore Englishmen were obliged to use them out of deference to public authority. Ceremonial forms “were there because they were there and because order and uniformity and obedience were all good things in themselves the ordinary Christian should simply do what he or she was told.”\(^{15}\) By contrast Hooker argued that ceremonial forms had an inherent value and were therefore a crucial part of worship. He used the words of David to exhort the reader to “worship the Lorde in the bewtie of holines,” the infamous phrase William Laud used to describe his High-Church policies.\(^{16}\) Ceremonies were an equally effective means as godly preaching to turn parishioners minds towards God and to contribute to their spiritual edification.\(^ {17}\) Furthermore, ceremonies could and should represent the grandeur of God: “Duties of religion performed by whole societies of men, ought to have in them according to our power a sensible excellencie, correspondent to the majestie of him whom we worship.”\(^ {18}\) Similarly, the church itself was a locus of worship and the site of that highest of religious devotions of private prayer; the church was “the house of prayer” and “a Court beautified with the presence of the celestial powers; that there we stand, we pray, we sound forth hymns to God, having the Angles intermixed as out associates.”\(^ {19}\) Thus ceremonies were vitally important to the maintenance of men’s souls and should also be performed in a manner fitting the holiness that they represented.

Hooker made an even more dramatic departure from previous writers in his views on the sacraments. Contrary to a common trope that held that sacraments were merely symbolic or stamps of grace upon men already saved, he argued that sacraments were spiritual nourishment through which individual believers were

\(^{13}\) \textit{Anglicans and Puritans}, 145-146
\(^{14}\) Ferrell, 85.
\(^{15}\) \textit{Anglicans and Puritans}, 164.
\(^{16}\) Hooker, \textit{Works}, 2:61.
\(^{17}\) Ibid 151-152.
\(^{18}\) Ibid 34.
bound to Christ and grace was dispensed. Indeed, sacraments were crucial to salvation. The grace bestowed in baptism might have been enough to secure “eternall life” but it was inevitable that faith would be “hindered and impaired after baptisme” because of the sinful nature of man and the daily travails of existence.20

The Eucharist served the purpose of renewing grace and covenant with God; it also provided spiritual medicine to heal wounds of faith.21 He rejected the notion of Zwingli and other continental Reformed Protestants that the Eucharist was a mere symbol that was “destitute emptie and voide of Christe.”22 However, Hooker went to great lengths to emphasize that the sacraments did not convey grace ex operato. Sacraments were powerful tools through which God effected salvation: baptism might plant the seed of faith and the Eucharist might nourish it but God remained the final arbiter of salvation.23

His views on the sacraments and ceremonies were directly tied to his views on the nature of the church. Many Calvinists conceived of two churches: one visible and containing all Protestants, the other invisible and containing only those predestined to salvation. The Roman Catholic Church and all those faithful to it were damned to hell. Hooker’s views were more inclusive. The invisible church was exactly what its name implied: invisible and unknowable. This meant that the physical church would be assortment of both the “profane and the godly, the saved and the damned.”24 Therefore “impious idolators, wicked heretiques, [and] persons excommunable” would rub shoulders with saintly and godly men.25 Since who was truly saved could only be known to God, the only yardstick by which mortal men could judge membership in the church was “One Lord, one faith, one baptisme.”26

This stood in stark contrast to Puritans’ definition of the church as tight-knit fellowships of the saints, the “coetus electorum.”27 The fact that only God ultimately knew who was elected from salvation did not mean

Hooker’s criterion for membership in the visible church, “baptism and a profession of Christian belief,” was “so minimal as to exclude no one in a formally Christian country.”28 This meant that according to his schema Roman Catholics were necessarily included in the visible church, anathema to many contemporaries who considered Rome the seat of the Antichrist.29 Indeed he was much more charitable to Rome than the majority of his English contemporaries. While he concurred that Rome was guilty of “sundrie . . . grosse and greevous abominations” it had not erred in fundamentals of faith, those “maine partes of Christian truth wherein they

21 Ibid 330-331.
22 Ibid 331.
23 Anglicans and Puritans, 175; Compare to Richard Montagu’s position on baptism and the Eucharist pp. 22-24 above.
24 Anglicans and Puritans, 161.
26 Ibid.
27 Worship and Theology, 2:6.
28 Anglicans and Puritans, 161.
29 Hooker, Works, 1:198-199.
constantantlie still persist.”

To cleave off Roman Catholics, who despite their manifold errors were baptized and professed faith in Jesus Christ, from the visible church smacked of attempts by Puritans to unchurch the Church of England because of its supposed errors and mistakes.

Thus, having cleared the Roman Catholic Church of any grievous errors in fundamentals, he had no problem with the retention of “popish ceremonies,” acknowledging the unbroken apostolic succession bishops, and seeing the Church of England’s popish past as a strength, not a weakness. Concerning ceremonies inherited from the church’s Roman past, “we are to reteine as much, in the other as little of former things as we may.” It was an absurd exercise to make “nonconformity with the church of Rome” the standard by which the Church of England was governed. Similarly, he rejected that conformity with Reformed liturgy and church governance was inherently desirable. Bishops were invested with authority by both the apostolic succession and by the traditions of the church.

However, despite all the similarities between Hooker’s though and later Arminian divines, there remained important major differences. Hooker’s populist conception of the origins of royal power did not sit well with later Arminian support of Charles I’s political experiments. Although he skirted around the edges of challenging Calvinist conceptions of predestination, and was indeed criticized for his views on baptism and the nature of salvation, he never espoused election based on faith foreseen. Thus he left a somewhat ambiguous legacy. Richard Montague revered Hooker as that great “Puritanomastix [person who argues against beliefs or doctrines of Puritans]” and Francis White could cite Hooker, the “scourge of Puritans and a divine of most exact judgement,” in defense of his decision to license Montagu’s books to the press. However, fiery Puritan William Prynne felt equally comfortable citing Hooker in his anti-Arminian polemics. Though his soteriological views wavered and perhaps never achieved stable coherence, Richard Hooker was the first Elizabethan divine to assert a style of worship and piety that can be identified as proto-Arminian. His vision of a church in which oft-criticized ceremonial forms were essential represented a marked departure from previous conformist thinkers. Rightly or wrongly, he served as an inspiration to later Arminians, both avant and après la lettre.

The Religious Climate of the Jacobean Church

Prior to the Laudian ascendancy, the Calvinist episcopacy had worked a modus vivendi with Puritans following the Hampton Court Conference (1604):
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30 Ibid 202, compare to Montagu’s position on the Roman Catholic Church and the fundamentals of faith pp. 28-29 above.
31 Ibid; Anglicans and Puritans, 157.
32 Hooker, Works, 2:63.
33 Anglicans and Puritans, 158.
36 Montagu 1625, 271,291; Anglicans and Puritans, 229.
37 Vide Anti-Arminianisme pp. 88, 97, 203-204.
acceptance of the legality of the Prayer Book and the legitimacy of the episcopacy in addition to “occasional conformity.” James I had pursued a policy that combined “de iure insistence on subscription” with “de facto toleration of a certain variety of liturgical practice,” reinforced by his willingness to deal with moderates regardless of what side of the theological fence they were on. This de facto toleration was extended to Arminians and even English Catholics who were willing to accept the king as supreme governor of the church and practice their faith privately.

It was expected that English Christians would differ on other secondary issues and, for James, it appeared that that the “theology of grace” was one of those issues where difference of opinion was tolerated. Personally, James I appeared to have espoused a moderate Calvinism. But his willingness to tolerate diverse views in his church meant he was perfectly willing to patronize divines who held Arminian opinions, provided that they refrained from open disputation that would disturb the peace of the church.

Foreign policy pressures cause him to flit from one side to the other: Dutch Arminianism’s threat to the political stability of the United Provinces and Dutch Calvinists favorable stance toward England led him to support the Calvinist faction but his increasing emphasis on the Spanish Match after 1622 led him to deemphasize maintenance of good relations with Dutch Calvinists and favor the domestic Arminian faction. Prior to the ramping up of negotiations for the Spanish Match, public airing of Arminian views could land one in hot water. Even prior to the Synod of Dort, James I had warned the heads of Cambridge to let “no seed” of Arminianism “grow in the university.” He had earlier violently opposed the appointment of Conrad Vorstius to Leiden professorship vacated by Arminius and in the process disparaged Arminius as an “enemie of God” and the “first in our age that infected Leiden with heresie.” Thus despite the king’s toleration of a wide diversity of views, Arminian divines, especially ones like Andrewes who were in contact with Dutch Remonstrants, had to tread carefully.

That being said, James I concurred with Arminians on several points of doctrine. He espoused the traditional Arminian view that the Roman Catholic Church had not erred in fundamentals, although it was corrupt in some respects and had made sundry errors in other less crucial areas. He conceived of the Pope and

---

38 Anti-Calvinists, 185-186.
40 Fincham and Lake 1993, 31.
41 James I, A Meditation upon the Lord’s Prayer (1619), 118; Anti-Calvinism, 24-25, 41-45, 91; Fincham and Lake, 32-33.
43 Fincham and Lake 1985, 190.
44 James I, His Majestie’s Declaration . . . in the cause of D. Conradus Vorstius (1612), 5, 15.
English Catholics as political threats to his authority, labeling the pope the Antichrist because of his claim to have the authority to depose secular rulers. English Catholics could be a political threat if they accepted the pope's authority to depose kings and that rebelling against enemies of the Roman Catholic Church was "meritorious to salvation."  

In summary, the Jacobean church was united around the assertion and defence of James's God-given powers as a Christian king against the threats posed to them by the Presbyterians on the one hand and the papists on the other. However within the ideological limits thus set by the king a considerable latitude remained for the expression of different and indeed mutually exclusive styles of divinity. As the reign went on different groups and factions sought to exploit one aspect or other of the king's religious and political susceptibilities in order to push royal policy in what they took to be the right direction.

_Lancelot Andrewes_

Many divines like Lancelot Andrewes held prominent positions and were highly influential at court. James I was well aware of Andrewes's Arminianism, but the price of his inclusion in the Jacobean Church was silence. He limited himself to correspondence with Dutch Arminian divines and "biting asides" to Calvinists in his sermons. Thus Andrewes enjoyed appointment to three bishoprics, numerous court offices and a place on the Privy Council. He owed this as much to his willingness to keep relatively quiet as to his "eloquence and erudition," much appreciated by the scholar king. Andrewes also provided a link between Hooker, "avant-garde conformity" in the Jacobean Church, and many of the divines who would later dominate the 1620s and 1630s.

Andrewes was the sole avant-garde divine of the 1590s who lived to see the triumph of Arminianism in the 1620s. Not only was he a personal friend of Hooker but he also enjoyed unparalleled influence at the Jacobean court, appointed to the Privy Council in 1616 and from 1605 until his death was one of the most prominent court preachers. Furthermore, he was venerated by the later generation of Arminian divines who lauded him as their premier ideological antecessor and they fought vigorously to control his legacy to prevent use of his printed works by Calvinists to support their ideology. To Arminian controversialist Richard Montagu, he was "our Gamaliel," a sentiment shared by the rest of the Durham House Group. He was a close friend and patron of John Buckeridge, who would later become directly involved in the controversy over Richard Montagu. William Laud lamented his

---

45 Fincham and Lake 1993, 28-29.
47 Memorials, 3:459.
48 Fincham and Lake 1985, 190.
49 Anti-Calvinism, 20.
50 "Avant-Garde Conformity," 114; ODNB Lancelot Andrewes (6/1/13)
51 Montagu 1625, 215,265.
death, opining that “the greatest light of the Christian world has been extinguished.”

He was crucial in helping further the early careers of Matthew Wren and Jerome Beal, both of whom attended his casket during Andrewes’s funeral and Wren furnished the memorial inscription for Andrewes’s tomb.

Andrewes’s views bore the familiar hallmarks of both Hooker and Laud. He despised Presbyterianism and Puritanism, which were inseparable in his mind. In his mind Puritanism was “organised around a Presbyterian threat to order and hierarchy in the church and to the power of the prince and state;” thus Puritan non-conformity was “part of the devil’s plot to undermine the church, as the first step on a slippery slope that led from seemingly trivial ceremonies to schism and even heresy.” In a sermon preached before James in 1607, he warned the king that radical Protestants posed a great threat to his authority.

The Anabaptists of our age, by whom all secular jurisdiction is denied. No lawmakers they, but the Evangelists; no courts, but Presbyteries; no punishments, but Church-censures. These rise against the very estate of Kings; and that should they find and feel, if they were once grown enough to make a party.

Such statements were common and uncontroversial. However, he went on to make the assertion that any form of Puritanism, no matter how moderate or conformist, inevitably led to religious and political radicalism. Reform of the church, “the house” of the nation, inevitably led to calls for reform of the “Commonwealth but the hangings.” The sermon, given on the anniversary of the Gowrie conspiracy, clearly displayed Andrewes’s views that Puritanism constituted both a threat to both the authority of the king and the church and furthermore that even moderate Puritanism was inextricable from Presbyterianism and radical Protestants sects like Anabaptism.

Andrewes’s distaste for Puritans did not stop at his belief that they were a threat to the English body politic. He was vehemently opposed to their sermon-centered style of piety; complaints that English piety had become too focused on sermons were a “familiar refrain in the mouth of Lancelot Andrewes.” The “sermon-hypocrites” would focus on sermons to the detriment of all other aspects of English piety; an Englishman hears “sermons upon sermons” but no “fruit there comes.” “For what,” Andrewes queried, was the aim of this lopsided emphasis on preaching; “is the pouring of the Spirit to end in preaching? and preaching to end in itself, as it doth with us? a circle of preaching, and in effect nothing else, – but pour

---

52 Trevor-Roper, 34.
53 ODNB Lancelot Andrewes (6/1/13)
54 “Avant-Garde Conformity,” 115.
55 Lancelot Andrewes, “A sermon preached before the king’s majesty at Rumsey, on the fifth of August, A.D. MDCVII,” Works, 11.
56 Ibid., 12
57 Anti-Calvinists, 186.
58 Lancelot Andrewes, “A sermon preached before King James, at Whitehall, on the sixth of March, A.D. MDCXXII, being Ash-Wednesday,” Works, 407; Lancelot Andrewes, “A Sermon preached before King James, at Whitehall, on the twenty-sixth of February, A.D. MDCXXIII being Ash-Wednesday,” Works, 421.
in prophesying enough, and then all is safe?" For Andrewes, a Christian was better served by the "piety of his prayers" than "by the fluency of his speech." However, Andrewes himself was a lecturer and preacher of great renown. He disliked the lopsided emphasis on preaching because ceremonies and public prayer were an equally important part of English piety.

This denigration of ceremonies manifested in disrespect for the ceremonial apparatus of the church and the church itself. The church, the "holy mansion" and "house" of God wherein "the fair beauty of the Lord" and his "honour dwelleth," was due proper respect as an apparatus of worship. However, contemporary Englishmen treated it with disrespect; even the communion table, where the holy mystery of transubstantiation occurred, was too often treated like "an oyster board, or a table to eat oysters on, than the table fit for God's sanctuary." His conception of proper worship can be divined from his Prayer for Consecration for Jesus Chapel, Peartree, Southampton in 1620. This church should be, and by extension all churches, a

habitacion for thee, and a place for us to assemble and meete together in, for the observacion of thy divine worship, invocation of they great name, reading, preaching and hearing of Thy Heavenly Word, administering thy most holy Sacraments, above all, in this place, the very gate of heaven upon earth . . . to sett forth Thy most worthie praise, to laud and magnifie thy most glorious Maieste for all Thy goodness to all men.

He espoused another key tenet, an exalted view of the sacraments. Sacraments were an essential for a Christian to obtain salvation; "it was only through the medicine of the sacraments that we could be purged of sin and receive the enabli

we taste, and there we see; ‘taste and see how gracious the lord is.’ There we are made to ‘drink the spirit,’ there our ‘hearts are strengthened and stablished with grace.’ There is the blood which shall ‘purge our consciences from dead works,’ whereby we may die to sin . . . for he that ‘eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him,’ no inneth, or sojourneth for a time, but dwelleth continually . . . never can we more truly, or properly say, in Christo Jesu domino nostro, as when we come new from that holy action, for then he is in us and we in him, indeed.
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61 Ibid., 256-257.
62 Lancelot Andrewes, Patterne of Catechisticall Doctrine (1630), 298-299.
63 J. W. Legg, English Orders for Consecrating Churches in the Seventeenth Century (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1911), 41:57.
64 Avant-Garde Conformity, 124.
65 Lancelot Andrewes, "A sermon preached before King James at Whitehall, on the fourteenth of Februrary, A.D. MDCXXI being Ash-Wednesday," Works, 39.
Thus sacraments were not only due reverence, but were also one of the most effective means of communicating grace; far more direct and effective than preaching. Such an exalted view of the sacrament explains their insistence on kneeling and other ceremonial veneration of the sacrament; it was not something done merely because it was required but because it was an essential element of salvation central to English piety.\textsuperscript{66}

Andrewes’s views on predestination were less clear and stable. In the 1570s and 1580s he adhered to mainstream Elizabethan Calvinist views on predestination, a fact that often embarrassed Arminians seeking to use his legacy to support heir own cause, but by the 1590s his held recognizably Arminian views on predestination.\textsuperscript{67} By the 1620s he was attacking Calvinists in his sermons before the king, albeit obliquely. God was not, as the Calvinists would have men believe, the “author of Evil,” “sentencing men to death only for his pleasure, before they have offended him at all.”\textsuperscript{68} This was the familiar refrain in the mouths of Arminians that equated absolute and double predestination with Antinomian perversion and other unacceptably radical elements of the Protestantism.

His dislike of Calvinism eventually came to encompass the international Calvinist community. Royal support for the rulings of the Synod of Dort had a chilling effect on nascent English Arminianism, albeit very temporarily as maintenance of relations with Dutch Calvinists became increasingly secondary to currying favor with Spain as negotiations for the Spanish Match dominated foreign policy.\textsuperscript{69} Following he change of religious climate, Andrewes lambasted the Synod of Dort in 1621:

\begin{quote}
I pray God he be well-pleased with his licentious touching, nay tossing of his decrees of late, this sounding of the depths of his judgment with our line and lead, too much presumed upon by some in these days of ours . . . God’s secret decrees they have them at their fingers’ ends, and can tell you the number and the order of them just with 1,2,3,4,5.\textsuperscript{70}
Therefore we have “in the piety of Andrewes” and other divines like Buckeridge “the chain of avant-garde conformist thought which runs between Hooker and Laud.”\textsuperscript{71} All of the elements present in Montagu and Laud’s thought can be found in Andrewes. But, however tempting it would be to draw a direct connection between Andrewes and the developments of the 1630s, there a number of discontinuities. As Peter Lake has pointed out, it is easy to assemble a comprehensive anti-Calvinist soteriological and liturgical picture from Andrewes’s writings but he never produced one himself.\textsuperscript{72} All of the constituent parts remained
\end{quote}
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scattered across the staggering amount of literature and sermons he produced, many of which were not published in his lifetime. He did not write any comprehensive polemical works like Richard Montagu therefore his ideas were fragmented and the totality of his ideas was only fully clear in retrospect. No did Andrewes ever attempt to enforce anything resembling the Laudian altar policy in his dioceses.\textsuperscript{73}

Historian H.R. Trevor Roper judged Andrewes to be a man of “serene detachment ... and a clear conscience, displayed his learning” who “advanced his theories without disturbing the world by any dangerous attempt to apply them.” He was content “in ecclesiastical politics to let what would be be.”\textsuperscript{74} Peter Lake judged him to be a man “chronically devoid both of political sense and gumption, unwilling to take the necessary risks to fight what he believed in.”\textsuperscript{75} Montagu, although endorsing him as “our Gamaliel,” also wished that “our Gamaliel will now open his mouth and speak out, haply he will do that good for which God will reward him, and all posterity thank him.”\textsuperscript{76} Perhaps, but he was constrained by the religious climate of the Jacobean Church. The king’s concern for keeping a balance of power within his church between opposing factions, despite the periodic shifts in that balance caused by foreign policy pressures, meant that Andrewes and other Arminian divines were prevented from mounting sustained assaults against Calvinists and enforcing their ideas in the church. Andrewes ultimate achievement was keeping the cause alive and well in that church. However his ideological successors displayed none of his temperance or moderation and were not constrained by a king concerned with maintaining peace in his church.

The Laudian Ascendancy

Laudianism, in its simplest definition, was shorthand “for the policies and religious temper of the Personal Rule ... [represented] by visitations sermons and works of polemic and justification.”\textsuperscript{77} Charles I’s decision to not call Parliament after the debacle of the 1629 Parliament from 1629 to 1640 freed Arminian clergy from the attack from the Calvinist parliamentary opposition that had dominated the first four years of Charles I’s reign.\textsuperscript{78} After the death of Calvinist Archbishop of York Tobias Matthew in 1628, three Arminians held the post until 1640: George Montaigne (1628), Samuel Harsnett (1628-1631), and Richard Neile (1632-1640). William Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury following Calvinist George Abbott’s death in 1633, though Abbot had been effectively sidelined since 1628 when the authority of the archbishop was invested in a group of Arminian bishops including Laud.\textsuperscript{79}
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Contrary to his father, Charles I had no taste for moderation. The king had issued “A Proclamation for the establishing of the peace and quiet of the Church of England” in 1626 that sought to contain the growing controversy over Richard Montagu and Arminianism but was enforced selectively in order to suppress Calvinist publication. Calvinist polemicist William Prynne complained that the edicts were enforced in a manner that

we are not a little discouraged and deterred from preaching those saving doctrines of God’s free grace in election and predestination . . . [we are in] danger of being censured for violators of your Majestie’s said acts, if we preach these constant doctrines of our Church and confute the opposite Pelagian and Arminian heresies both preached and printed boldly without feare of censure.

Another proclamation was issued in 1628 and affixed with the Book of Common Prayer which asserted that the clergy in Convocation, backed up by the authority of the monarch, were the final arbiters of the “external policy [of the church] . . . injunctions, canons, and other institutions.” Anyone who preached or published ideas that diverted from the current orthodoxy “shall be liable for our displeasure” and “we will see there shall be due execution upon them.” Words were backed up with deeds. Archbishop Abbot remarked as early as 1632 that “there is not in the Church of England left any inconformable [nonconformist] minister.”

Thus by the beginning of the 1630s, Arminian clergy had relatively free rein to enforce their religious policies. However, this did not mean that the opposition slunk quietly into the background and offered no resistance to the imposition of High-Church ceremonialism onto the Church of England. But the prosecution of Calvinism itself by the Arminian episcopacy removed any incentive for Puritans to conform to or accept episcopacy and Prayer Book. An informative example is the Puritan John Davenport who early in his career conformed to the Church of England’s liturgical practices because he was “convinced that differences over such matters must be subordinated to the need for a united Calvinist front against Catholicism and Arminianism.” However, as it became clear that Arminianism had “stolne in and taken possession of the house,” such a line of reasoning lost its force and Davenport fled to Amsterdam in 1633. Similarly, Henry Burton, who had written a vigorous defense of Calvinist conformists in response to Richard Montagu’s *Appello Caesarem*, recounted that the rise of Arminian divines had cause him “to fall off from the ceremonies” both in conviction and practice.

Laudianism in Theory
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The Laudian style of worship sought to rectify what Laudians considered to be the “unbalanced sermon-centered nature of English piety.” If traditional Calvinist piety had centered on preaching from the pulpit, then Laudian piety centered on the sacraments dispensed from the altar. Combined with this sacramental piety was a novel ceremonialism that insisted that ceremonial forms were not things indifferent but integral to English piety. The sum of all these constituent parts was the “beauty of holiness:” a radical reorientation of English piety away from godly preaching and towards the altar, the sacraments, and the church itself. Thus the 1630s saw a clash between two deeply opposed views of the Christianity: on one hand, the Laudian view that emphasized the altar, ceremonies, and sacraments; on the other, the Calvinist view that emphasized preaching as a means to exhort the elect, “those foreknown of God from all eternity” and “predestinated to life of God’s pure favour,” to fulfill their godly mission.

Churches were much more than simply places where service took place; they were an integral part of the worship and the liturgy. As royal chaplain and Arminian partisan Robert Skinner preached in a sermon before Charles I in 1634 in which he expounded upon Psalms 96:9 “O worship the Lord in the beautie of holiness,” the church was the “proper mansion, or and dwelling house” of God wherein he “doth inhabit.” A dignified church in good repair was just as effective a means of turning parishioner’s mind towards God and holiness as preaching. For although some Englishmen despised the beautification of churches as “matter[s] of distraction” and “palpable inducements to superstition,” it could not denied that “a goodly, reverend, beautifull Church” was better suited to “beget in our hearts a religious regard and venerable thoughts” than “a naked, deformed, ruinous temple, adorned with nothing but dust and cobwebs.”

The maintenance and beautification of churches was an integral part of Laudian worship, and a properly adorned church could be just as effective in turning a parishioner mind towards God. Thus the Laudian church should “glow with the beauty of holiness,” “beautified . . . with all kind of ornaments, that might adde glory and grace unto them, as curious paintings, hangings, guildings, sumptuous vestments” and bequeathed with “rich gifts in mony, chalices, plate, farmes, lordships, besides great privileges and immunities.” Such magnificence befitted the house of God and was the practice of the ancient church. A well-adorned church played a critical role in the liturgy and worship therefore their maintenance was as great a priority as great as supporting lectureships for the provision of sermons.

Within this house of God, the altar became the locus of piety. In Laud’s famous speech before the Star Chamber in 1637 during the trial for sedition of...
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lawyer William Prynne, divine Henry Burton, and doctor John Bastwick, he explicated that the altar was “the greatest place of God’s residence upon earth” because the pulpit was where the word of God was preached, but the altar was where the “body” of God resided. Therefore the altar was a more proper locus for the liturgy than preaching because “a greater reverence” was “due to the body than to the word of our Lord.”

Public prayer and its accompanying ceremonies in the house of God was the highest expression of Laudian piety. Instead of preaching and hearing of sermons that was commonly the focus of Calvinist liturgy, “the laity’s outward, physical acts of reverence and piety, choreographed by the liturgy and performed at the promptings of the priest” were the defining characteristics of Laudian piety. Following the example of earlier avant-garde divines like Buckeridge who had argued that “ritual body worship” and ceremonial forms were a “duetie” and could not be “omitted as an indifferent thing,” Laudian divines asserted that public ritual and ceremony was the apogee of divinity; when we behave ourselves in this place [the church] as in the presence of God; when every man begins with due obeisance to God . . . and then fall down upon our knees. When the minister like an angel of light appears in his white vestment behaving himself with the gravity and reverence and decency which well befits his calling and the religious duty he hath in hand. When th whole congregation shall appear in the presence of God as one man, decently kneeling, rising, standing, bowing, praising, praying altogether . . . like men of one mind and religion in the house of God.

Thus in the Laudian program we see the realization of the long-held Arminian idea that ceremony and accompanying public prayer were not things indifferent but at the heart of piety. This necessarily diminished the role of preaching in the liturgy, though not eliminating it altogether. Preaching’s role was further diminished and the “beauty of holiness” further reinforced by the Laudian view of the sacraments.

Sacraments were the spiritual medicine, direct conduits between parishioners and God’s grace. “God’s presence in the church was therefore most intense in the areas given over to the administration of the sacraments;” “the font and the altar and the life of the Christian could be construed as a journey from one to the other.” A Christian’s faith was “dedicated and consecrated in baptism, it is re-edified by confirmation and the holy Eucharist;” the Eucharist especially was thought to be the “highest advancement of a Christian” and “the greatest perfection and consummation of the Christian religion.” Thus sacraments, like public prayer and ceremonies, were at the very center of Laudian piety.
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The Laudian reverence for the altar, ceremonial forms, and sacraments was evident William Laud’s consecration of St Catherine, Cree on January 16 1630/1.\textsuperscript{97} The only surviving account of the consecration was from the pen of fiery Puritan William Prynne, bitterly opposed to Arminianism and Laudianism, which also allows insight into how Laudian worship looked to someone deeply opposed to it. He recollected that

the Bishop approached neare the Communion table, he bowed with his nose very neare the ground some six or seven times; Then he came to one of the corners of the Table, and there bowed himself three times; then to the second, third and fourth corners, bowing at each corner three times; but, when he came to the side of the Table where the bread and wine was, he bowed himself seven times, and then, after the reading of many praier by himselfe and his two fat chaplins (which were with him, and all this while were upon their knees by him, in their Siriplisses, Hoods, and Tippits) he himselfe came neare the Bread, which was cut and laid in a fine napkin, and then he gently lifted up one of the corners of the said napkin, and peeped into it till hee saw the bread (like a boy that peeped after a bird-nest in a bush) and presently clapped it downe againe, and flew backe a step or two, and bowed very low three times towards it and the Taple: when he beheld the bread, then he came neare and opened the napkin againe, and bowed as before; then he laid his hand upon the gilt Cup which was full of wine, with a cover upon it; so soone as he pul’d the Cupp a little nearer to him, he let the Cupp goe, flew backe, and bowed againe three times towards it: then hee came neere againe, and lifting up the cover of the Cupp peeped into it, and seig the wine, he let fall the cover on it againe, and flew nimbly backe and bowed as before: After these and many other Apish Anticke Gesturs he himselfe received, and then gave the Sacrament to some principall men onely they devoutly kneeling neere the Table, after which more prayers being said, this Sceane and Enterlude ended.\textsuperscript{98}

*Laudianism in Practice*

The Laudian program did not go unopposed. However much the Laudian divines insisted on conformity, exacting it from parishioners in the localities was another matter entirely. Such attempts necessarily involved confrontation between Laudian functionaries and Calvinists, Puritan or no, in the localities. The confrontations between these two camps shed light on the beliefs that animated opposition to Laudianism and the attitudes towards Laudianism in the localities. One such example involved commissioners under the command of Bishop Matthew Wren and Sir Simonds D’Ewes, who sat at the town of Bury St. Edmunds from twenty-ninth to the thirty-first of March, 1636.\textsuperscript{99} The commissioners and D’Ewes appeared to have never met personally but, D’Ewes, a mere ten miles away, kept
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himself informed of their actions and later visited Wren, a man of “most damned life” according to D’Ewes, at Ipswich to discuss the changes made in the diocese.100

Sir Simond D’Ewes provided an excellent example of a moderate Puritan or a “conservative respectable Puritan-parliamentarianism.”101 Beginning his education at Cambridge, he later entered the Middle Temple where he studied law from 1620 to 1626 but his marriage to a wealthy widow freed him from the burden of practicing it. His interests turned towards history, especially concerning English political history. Fiercely Calvinist and deeply opposed to Charles I’s financial policies, he was motivated by a “theologically stoked ‘fire in the belly’” to defend a beleaguered Calvinism and attack Arminianism.102

D’Ewes was not a radical Presbyterian.103 He was willing to accept a church governed by bishops if “true doctrine and worship” – meaning Calvinist soteriology and Reformed liturgy – could be found therein.104 He admired greatly Archbishop Abbott and mourned his loss, especially since he was replaced by that “little low redd faced man, of meane parentage” William Laud.105 Such beliefs in no way softened his opposition to Laudian policies and Arminian divines.

Wren’s commissioners were armed with an extensive set of visitation articles or questions to investigate within the diocese. Of first import was the traditional goal of ferreting out any suspected Puritans or Roman Catholics.106 However the articles also revealed a new goal of investigating opposition to Laudianism in the localities. Wren included two articles inquiring whether any parishioner had spoken against or disparaged the liturgy or the Book of Common Prayer. Furthermore, the articles asked whether anybody had the temerity to interrupt or hinder the administration of the sacraments or the service.107 Traditional concerns about the wearing of surplice by ministers, the administration of the sacraments, and the use of church property for secular purposes dominated many of articles. Such questions, while irksome to parishes inclined towards nonconformity, were certainly nothing new. What struck D’Ewes as “new and strange” were the questions concerning the altars and communion tables, “never before used in the visitations of former bishops since the reformation of the religion.”108 Indeed, Wren’s commissioners were charged with ensuring that the altar was moved into pride of place where the communion table formerly stood and, if removal of the communion table proved an impossibility, it could be sidelined to the eastern section of the church reserved for the ministers, and “that the raile be made before it (according to the archbishops [William Laud] late injunctions) reachinge crosse from the north wall to the south
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According to D’Ewes, this was an unconscionable departure from the practice of the church since the reformation, in which in order to avoid “idolatrie, superstitition, and offence . . . the altars were removed and taken away in most churches of England and communion tables placed instead of them” and the communion tables, though not removed from the churches, were moved to the wall and railed off from the parishioners. D’Ewes’s repeated emphasis that the commissioners were reversing an arrangement in place since the reformation indicated that he saw the change as an attempt to turn back the clock of the reformation, meaning a move towards Roman Catholicism and idolatry.

**Ideological Opposition to Laudianism**

What views informed his opposition to Laudian policies? He had been deeply opposed to Arminianism and ceremonialism long before Wren attempted to meddle in his home diocese. By his account, Arminians were so “many wicked, anabaptistical or popishly affected divines and scholars” who “maintained . . . justification by works, free-will, Christ’s bodily presence in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper” and sought to “increase the multitude and burden of the ceremonies and intermixtures in the Church.” Furthermore they unjustly persecuted many conforming and virtuous Christians whom they “nick-named Puritans.” These divines were a fifth-column within English Protestantism to be despised more than Roman Catholics, who at least honestly espoused their beliefs and against whom any true Protestant was already inoculated.

D’Ewes, in contrast to Arminians who insisted on the very real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the necessity of receiving it, disparaged the idea of transubstantiation. For him it was analogous to idolatry, veneration of the “imaginairie breaden God” being “abominable idolatrie.” He scorned even the Lutheran position of consubstantiation that asserted that although the bread and wine did not magically transform into the body and blood of Christ, they were present alongside the bread and wine. The Lutherans had “indeed most vnhapsilie fallen vpon one parte of the Popish error in holding a carnall reall presence or a consubstantiation” but even they had not committed the grievous error of Roman Catholics and Laudians by “bowing vnto & adoring of the sacrament as abominable idolatrie.” He did not believe in transubstantiation or that communion communicated any grace therefore any veneration of the sacrament was idolatry, bowing and kneeling to mere piece of bread.
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Laudian piety, with its ceremonialism and veneration of the sacraments, was noting more than a Trojan horse for Roman Catholicism; a fifth column bent on corrupting English Calvinist piety with importation of Roman Catholic idolatry. These ceremonies were not necessary parts of piety, "they were inoffensiue ceremonie[s], alterable at any time by authoritie." These ceremonies were offensive to the Protestant religion; D'Ewes anxiously queried what shall become of Gods saints in any protestant church where adoracion is given to an altar or communion table & that made the object of idolatrie, & vnder couler of adoring or bowing to & towards that [sic] Images in the windowes or walls; & the elements of the blessed sacrament on the table it selfe bowed to and adored, & soe the horrible Idoll of the Masse erected & sett vpp in a Church professing it selfe absolutelie Protestant? Cann they with a quiet spirit or safe conscience bee present at such abominations within the very rules, & ledd by those identicall cautions of the same learned Bishopp?

No Protestant of the true religion could idly stand by while their church was corrupted by the Laudian innovations; there could be no compromise, only reckoning. For, D'Ewes asserted, "if an Angel from heauen would prouoke us to adore or bow vnto either sacrament or altar or any other creature let him bee accursed."

**Conclusion**

Laudian piety and the extreme adverse reaction to it can appear paradoxical because, as historians like Peter White have pointed out, one of its primary goals was the very traditional goal of conformity. It is a possibility that the Laudian experiment might have had more success if it had not been pursued so heavy-handedly and wedded to Charles I’s unpopular policies. Nevertheless, Arminianism and Laudianism represents a definitive break from Calvinist thought in not only the areas of soteriology but also in the sacraments and especially the ceremonies. Controversial ceremonies present in the English liturgy were justified, often in an almost pleading and desperate tone, as things indifferent but commanded by the monarch. With the Laudian ascendancy, ceremonies and sacraments became the crux of English piety, commanded by the authority of God and not of the monarch.

Thus some of the aims of Laudianism appeared to be very traditional at first glance but the reasoning behind them was revolutionary. It was difficult to extend tolerance or at least as blind eye to nonconformity when the very ceremonies at dispute were no longer performed at the wishes of the monarch but were instead at the heart of piety. This reorientation of English piety away from preaching and towards ceremonies in the 1630s grated on Englishmen already on edge from the acrimonious polemical wars and political conflict of the 1620s. Similar to how royal patronage and protection in the 1620s strengthened Arminians while
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simultaneously making them more prominent targets, the Laudian ascendancy allowed them to impose their ideas on the English people but increased opposition to a fever pitch.
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Peter Lake and Kenneth Fincham’s work is equally invaluable. Their article “The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I” is the most succinct and well written treatment on the subjects, providing an excellent insight into the two monarch’s personalities and politics. With the political background this article provides, it is easy to dive into Peter Lake’s “The Laudian Style” and “Avant-garde Conformity at the Court of James I,” which are analyses of the ideas and some of the personalities of Arminianism in two important eras. These two articles, combined with Anti-Calvinism, allow one to come to grips with the complicated subject of Arminianism and Laudianism. Davie Horton’s five-volume Worship and Theology in England is also an excellent reference work, covering a vast period of time. Published from 1961-1975, much of the analysis is very Whiggish but is well researched with an extensive bibliography.

Fincham’s Visitation Articles has two advantages: it brings what would otherwise be a large collection of disparate documents and transcribes them into modern typeface, valuable because some of the EEBO scans of various visitation articles are essentially unreadable. The other most helpful primary source is The Folger Library Edition of Richard Hooker’s works. It is significantly more modern than comparable compilation of works for Andrewes or Laud, and contains an exhaustive collection of essays and prefaces by historians which make tackling an intimidating work like Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity far more manageable.